

Early Intervention Planning Council
September 10, 2008
Minutes

Members present:

Rhonda Allen
Christina Ball
Patricia Jones
Marilyn Pfisterer
Brant Ping

Members not present:

John Brandon
Doris Clark
Taren Duncan
John Kennedy
Judge Marilyn Moores

Staff present:

Eric Wright
Daniel Clendenning
Lyndy Kouns
Laura Littlepage
Tom Stucky

Guests:

Bob Cockrum, Council President
Jason Dudich, Deputy Chief Controller

Eric Wright: An important item, which is why Councilman Cockrum is here, to talk about budgetary issues that have come up based on the plan - do you want to start with that one since Councilor Pfisterer has to leave as well?

Rhonda Allen: Absolutely. Let's get the two big ticket items out of the way and as Laura comes in she can hand out whatever we need.

Eric Wright: We had hoped to have the plan in front of you so you could look at the numbers but as you may remember the plan has five components, four goals we had identified and one based on organizational support of the EIPC in the long term. The discussions we've had over the last couple of months, since our last meeting we've actually had quite a few conversations, Councilor Cockrum and the Controller's office and various other folks, talking about different components of that and basically I think the consensus is that we might be able to do something but at a much more scaled down version than we had initially proposed. Prior to the EIPC meeting there was a prioritization of the goals with the two most important being the creation of the Coordination Agency to support the nonprofit sector around early intervention and

prevention and the second one was to initiate or expand management services for early intervention and prevention. In the discussions that we've had it became pretty apparent that one way that we could actually save money is for the component to support the EIPC to be rolled into the Coordinating Agency proposal. So one idea was rather than having two separate budgets for, one for support for the EIPC and the other for the Coordinating Agency, that support for the EIPC would be merged with the Coordinating Agency. So basically then, the staffing support infrastructure wouldn't be as significant. So we had actually floated a budget to talk to various folks about that and had come up with an estimate of what that is, and I'd hoped to show that to you, I don't remember the numbers off the top of my head unfortunately. But basically what it came down to was investing around \$200,000 in the Coordinating Agency which would combine all the functions we had set forward to have in that Coordinating Agency plus the support for EIPC continued meetings and coordination and that kind of stuff. Then there was an additional pot of money, which is the part that wasn't as clear, about how much we could afford to do and that was to support the expansion of either a NACS-like or YES-like program in terms of early intervention and case management. So those were the two budgetary concepts. I'm not sure if we have a quorum, either, to make a formal decision here but I think the question would be is what can we give to these folks in terms of guidance about this?

Councilor Cockrum: You had given me some financial numbers.

Eric Wright: Right. That's what we were going to distribute this morning.

Councilor Cockrum: This came with the booklet that doesn't have the attachment and then when I got the booklet with the attachments the numbers didn't track.

Eric Wright: Right, because that's the cut down version.

Councilor Cockrum: So these are no good?

Eric Wright: No, no, actually those are the ones that are in the book, we took a composite of the proposal. So actually what those represent is a synthesis of the larger proposal.

Councilor Cockrum: One is the Coordinating Agency budget and the other is goal four, early intervention.

Eric Wright: Right. So the first one, the Coordinating Agency actually, that budget actually reflects the combined support for the EIPC for next year as well as the Coordinating function. So that budget reflects the merging of those two. The second budget is the estimation of the case management costs to expand case management services.

Councilor Pfisterer: Those are the latest figures?

Eric Wright: Yes, those are the latest ones.

Councilor Cockrum: These are the latest ones?

Eric Wright: Right. So if you wouldn't mind, maybe we could pass those around so other folks could see...

Councilor Pfisterer: I could probably run upstairs to copy them.

Eric Wright: Or if you could just let them know, we could have Daniel run upstairs.

Councilor Pfisterer: To the Council office, 241. How many copies do we need? Because there are more people coming.

Eric Wright: Make 12. Do we know who is coming? Judge Moores?

Brant Ping: She's at the Judicial Conference.

Eric Wright: Laura is usually in correspondence with the RSVP's. The basic idea again, to reiterate, is trying to consolidate budgets so the Coordinating Agency, however that would be defined, would basically support the EIPC in its operations which is a slight change from our original idea.

Councilor Pfisterer: And then there would be an additional budget for expanding case management.

Eric Wright: Correct.

Councilor Pfisterer: Which would be about how much?

Eric Wright: I don't remember what that number was. Do you remember that number?

Councilor Cockrum: No.

Eric Wright: It was 300-ish. That budget didn't change as much from what we had previously.

Councilor Pfisterer: So we're looking at about a half a million.

Eric Wright: Right. Roughly. And I think one question we've had was, and based on the conversations we've had previously, there might be some interest on the philanthropic side to pick up a piece of that if the City County Council were to commit now to do some of it. So one possibility would be to, I think the Coordination function would be ideal for the City County Council to pick up, make a commitment on that level and split the cost on the philanthropic side on case management services.

Councilor Pfisterer: Is that a possibility or a probability? Because I know we talked about that, there was a discussion there. How real is that?

Eric Wright: It's a possibility, it's not a probability. Because basically I think they're, that community is waiting to see what the City County Council does. So how far down the road you can go, I was waiting to have that conversation after this meeting to have that guidance so we can figure out where the City County Council was going and how we would proceed from this point. To make sure everyone understands, that means we would not be doing anything on the mental health side, we wouldn't have any budget for education services that was goal two, at least this go round. I think the idea here would be to get a foot hold, getting us moving in this direction, in the current fiscal environment that may realistically be all we can expect.

Councilor Pfisterer: Is there a possibility that IPS would be able to fund some of the issues? Because IPS would be the school system that would be the most impacted.

Eric Wright: I don't know.

Councilor Pfisterer: At least I'm assuming that.

Eric Wright: I'm not aware, IPS has not made that appointment to the EIPC yet as far as I know.

Rhonda Allen: No.

Councilor Pfisterer: My fault. I did talk with Dr. White early this year and he indicated to me that schools out, or about to be out, and they wouldn't have anyone appointed until September and I have neglected to talk to him since school started.

Eric Wright: OK. I know Laura had also talked with the clerk and tried to get that on somebody's agenda, I'm not sure who.

Councilor Pfisterer: The clerk of IPS?

Eric Wright: No, the City-County Council. Melissa. She sent an e-mail summarizing the positions we still had to fill. That was after our last meeting.

Councilor Pfisterer: OK, mental health, and I talked with Rhonda on that. And again I'm waiting until decisions are made as to whether or not we're going to go forward before I get everybody all excited.

Eric Wright: OK. So I think we've got a temperature gauge here? I mean, does the general plan and outline, we'll see the numbers here momentarily. Or maybe what we should do is take a break and have Tom, while we're waiting on the copies, present on the survey?

Rhonda Allen: That would be a very good idea.

Tom Stucky: We had hoped to have draft copies on the agency part of the survey. Remember, we're doing two stages – we got the agency first and then the programs second. But we're not quite there yet. I think it's probably going to be early next week that we'll be able to have a draft to you. It's really close but we just ran out of time on the last few wordsmithing things we needed to do. We ended up having 73 respondents out of the total of 110 that were identified. Initially we had a much higher number but we found that a lot of those agencies that were initially identified either were no longer in service or were not really providing services to youth. So the response rate actually ended up being fairly good and thanks in large part to Lyndy Kouns who was absolutely determined to find every possible respondent and so she deserves a large amount of the credit for that. So we're in the process of just finishing up that part and we're in the process of finishing up the data collection on the program side and there are a large number of programs but many of them are housed at one site so you can finish a lot of those interviews at one time in chunks so we anticipate being finished with the data collection probably the end of this month so we would be looking at data analysis and write up hopefully by the end of next month. Optimistically, possibly but we're very near the end on this so we're coming close.

Councilor Pfisterer: The range of services these agencies provide cover the whole spectrum, is that correct?

Tom Stucky: Well, it's hard to answer that question. When you say cover the whole spectrum, what do you mean?

Councilor Pfisterer: All the issues that were identified.

Eric Wright: That was by design. We cast the net as widely as we could and so part of what we're trying to figure out is exactly what's covered in the range of services so that's an empirical question. You start with every agency we could think of and everybody told us was providing services to youth. That's where that long list started and then we discovered a lot of them weren't really providing services to youth and so that came back so now we have – how many are there, total agencies? 73?

Tom Stucky: 73 out of 110.

Eric Wright: 110. So there's roughly that, so each of them represents a range of 1-12 programs, there's a lot of programs. Not just 73 agencies it actually represents a couple hundred programs so part of what the survey is trying to do is describe what that range of services is. Which will be the first time we have an enumeration of what's been going on in Marion County.

Councilor Pfisterer: I guess what I'm trying to get to is, the agencies that were identified, of the 73, are after school programs, or...

Eric Wright: I don't think we focused on after school programs. We actually have more data on that from another source but it's more formal services, long range because we

didn't include day care programs or after care programs because those are pretty well enumerated. So it's additional to those.

Councilor Pfisterer: It's from mental health, addressing family problems, that's what I'm trying to get to.

Eric Wright: Yes.

Councilor Pfisterer: How serious are the services that the agencies provide?

Eric Wright: Pretty serious. There's camps in there as well so it is really quite the full range and that's part of the research question is to figure out, if you remember the continuum, our goal is to describe what's there and what's not there so we can identify gaps in the process. So I think we're on track to do that.

Councilor Pfisterer: I'm trying to ask global questions because there are folks here that haven't had the benefit of hearing the discussion.

Eric Wright: Oh, OK. I'm with you. The idea was to create the beginnings of a database of all the child/youth serving agencies in Marion County which is the 73 and we suspect that once we begin to publish this information the other ones that didn't respond will probably respond because they begin to see this information is used. But then more importantly at the program level, because typically the way the Rainbow Book and so forth has been organized has been at the agency level which doesn't necessarily provide really good descriptions about what is happening at the child level and so what we asked each agency to tell us is how many programs are you serving and there we actually have close to 95% response rate on the programs of the 73 agencies that participated so that's really high participation level. We are collecting all sorts of information about the number of children served, the kind of services they are providing, if there's a theoretical model that is driving what they're doing, that's all been reported and the goal is to enumerate essentially all the programs in Marion County that are available for children. So this will be really the first systematic description of that array of services outside the formal.

Councilor Pfisterer: And that would be something that the courts, the juvenile courts could tap into? I'm aware that the whole concept here is to not let the child get that far but I think we're starting there because we don't really have, we can't really start at the step 1 when we have so many at step 10. Does that make sense?

Eric Wright: Yes.

Councilor Pfisterer: So these are services that the courts, to begin with, could tap in to?

Eric Wright: In theory yes. Although I think the more, these are more upstream services. Some of these are providers that I know the court already knows about but some of these

are also providers the court doesn't use because in fact they're not their traditional array of services because remember we're trying to refocus upstream further.

Councilor Pfisterer: Right.

Eric Wright: These are more of the programs that we would think of as being programs that would hopefully keep kids from getting to the court, at least that's the theory. And after school programs and early childhood education are part of that array but when you add those to the list, there's hundreds and hundreds of those and that would have been very hard to enumerate entirely so there are other data sources that are a little more reliable for that kind of information and this is the place where I think we were going to augment that information. Should we do introductions? Does everybody know everybody?

Rhonda Allen: I think we should back up. I don't know everybody here.

Eric Wright: OK. My name is Eric Wright. I'm with IUPUI and I'm also chief support staff for the EIPC at the moment.

Brant Ping: My name is Brant Ping. I'm with the Juvenile Court.

Chris Ball: I'm Chris Ball, I'm the Chief Juvenile Probation Officer.

Patricia Jones: Patricia Jones, Decatur Township, representing township school districts.

Rhonda Allen: Rhonda Allen, I'm the Director of the Marion County Department of Child Services.

Jason Dudich: Jason Dudich, Deputy Controller for the City-County.

Councilor Pfisterer: Marilyn Pfisterer, City-County Council District 14.

Councilor Cockrum: Bob Cockrum, City-County Council District 22.

Councilor Pfisterer: And President.

Councilor Cockrum: President.

Eric Wright: And Lyndy, do you want to introduce yourself?

Lyndy Kouns: Lyndy Kouns, Center for Health Policy.

Tom Stucky: Tom Stucky, support staff with IUPUI.

Laura Littlepage: Laura Littlepage.

Daniel Clendenning: Daniel Clendenning, Center for Health Policy.

Eric Wright: Any other questions on the survey, otherwise we can jump back to the budget issues.

Tom Stucky: Just to follow-up briefly, the questions you are asking in terms of where the gaps are and some of those things, that's mainly going to come from the second stage of the survey so we're just not at this point able to give a lot of detail on that, where those gaps are. The main purpose of the agency survey was to give us the description of the programs to go talk to to get that detail about what services are specifically being provided so that's where a lot of the information is. Unfortunately we can't quite answer that question yet, but we should be able to have a lot better information as we do the program level analysis.

Marilyn Pfisterer: Can I ask a favor? Because Mr. Dudich has, he has heard of EIPC, I don't know if he is even aware of what EIPC stands for. I think from a global perspective, I think it would be helpful if there would be a mission statement, kind of a general explanation of what EIPC aims are and what we've done to date. I don't know if you can do what we've done to date like this, but just give a global perspective so everyone understands clearly.

Eric Wright: Verbally now or do it in writing?

Councilor Pfisterer: If you could do that verbally now it would be helpful.

Eric Wright: OK. Do you want to do that Forewoman?

Rhonda Allen: Absolutely not, Eric.

Eric Wright: Actually, yes, Laura just pointed out, on page four of the plan is an executive summary of the whole initiative here. But basically the original idea was there is a growing recognition of the problem in juvenile justice, the problem primarily is one of over, too much growth and cost associated with that, there is also a lot of literature that would suggest that probably the most effective long term solution for reducing the burden on juvenile justice is to think further upstream and trying to address the needs of youth before they actually get to the point where they become in trouble with the law. There's pretty good evidence in the scientific literature that we know with I would say fair accuracy, approximately the kinds of risk factors that highly predict likelihood of entering the juvenile justice system and there's some evidence now that if we intervene between the ages of 5 and 10 we can actually avoid their ending up in juvenile detention at 16 or 17 years of age. So the charge to the EIPC was to develop a plan to try to strengthen the upstream services related to early intervention and prevention so that was the main charge. Over the last year we've gone through a lot of discussions, representatives presenting on different pieces, kind of a study period and we arrived at four major goals in there. The first one is to expand, coordinate the nonprofit sector. By that, what I mean is, most of the formal sector services are represented on the EIPC. The

place where early intervention/prevention services are done are typically in the grassroots nonprofit sector and that is the place where government, policy makers, have the least amount of authority and they tend to do what they want to do based on their funders initiatives, based on their own work, so the issue of coordination has become a hot topic because in fact if we really want to do an effective job upstream, we need to get the nonprofit sector working together in a more systematic way. The first recommendation was to actually create an organization or augment the function of an existing organization to basically bring those groups together and do a couple of things. One was strategic planning and this is a little different than the child welfare strategic planning that was done, three years ago now? Supported by the Lilly Endowment, because the child welfare was more focused on child welfare in work further upstream but the basic idea was they would bring groups together to talk about strategic initiatives, talk about overlapping services which is where the survey will help us provide some data on who is doing what and how much overlap do we have in certain areas vs. other areas. The other piece would be to work in a coordinated fashion around development. Most of these agencies are really small, they don't have the capacity to go out and get grants. We know Indiana really lags behind the nation in terms of our ability to leverage outside dollars, outside here meaning outside Indiana, philanthropic and federal dollars and so the idea would be by investing in this organization and strategic planning with the coordinating development officer, they could then basically work on programs, developing new programs where there is gaps but also then bring the agencies together and to provide a little hook if you will for them to play together a little more effectively. And the third piece was to actually build on what 211 tried to do, provide information to agencies but do so at a deeper level and this is where the survey data would become the foundation of the database and the idea was then the coordinating agency would use that information both to do strategic planning and also to help to coordinate what is going on in the community in a more systematic way but then also to provide that information referral network. We had envisioned a web based system which would probably be managed by the coordinating agency system that would link somehow with 211. That was the first goal. The second goal was to provide, related to that last piece, the coordinating agency was to provide more information to primary care providers and social service agencies because again they have the Rainbow book but that's not necessarily the kinds of clinical information the case manager would need to make appropriate referrals as well as geographic information. Because one of the things that is pretty clear, some agencies only serve parts of the city and so there are big gaps in geography, in terms of what is available to services. So our hope is that this database system would then be used as a foundation for providers so that primary care doctors who are usually the first people to see something would have some place to refer other than child welfare, so that's the second goal. The third one, which is the one that is probably the biggest challenge and probably the most significant structural challenge is improving mental health services. We really didn't have a good answer for that because many of the decisions about mental health services for children are being made at the federal level and the trickle down problem, the most looming problem, is the changes in definitions of case management which will dramatically affect mental health centers ability to draw down funds and pay for using Medicaid dollars for children with these particular needs at the front end as opposed to the back end. Tends to focus more and more resources on kids that have the

most severe problems and so makes it hard for them from a capacity point of view as well as a payment point of view to focus on kids in a more prevention kind of framework, which are small problems before they become big problems. The last one, then, is also to expand early intervention case management services. There are two programs in existence right now that serve as a model for what we had in mind. One is the Youth Emergency Services which has basically been the brainchild, that's probably not the right word, the initiative out of child welfare. The other one is the Neighborhood, NACS, I don't know what the acronym stands for, but Neighborhood something Coalition?

Rhonda Allen: The last two are Child Safety.

Eric Wright: Thank you. Anyway, they have basically four offices where they operate case management and the interesting thing about that one is it is totally a grassroots sort of phenomena. They do work with DCS but, and they're funded partially by DCS, but basically their job is to deal with families before they ever have contact with DCS. So it's more of a voluntary referral system. That is the kind of case management program we see as the potential. They're maxed out in terms of their capacity and we think right now, our estimates are there are about 38,000 kids in Marion County who have what we call four or more risk factors and those risk factors put them in the high likelihood of ending up in juvenile justice and so our idea is to try and get as close to serving about that many family of kids in Marion County that are outside of the existing Juvenile Justice System. And that would be, in terms of an investment point of view, have a longer term impact in terms of reducing the burden on juvenile justice. Did I do OK?

Rhonda Allen: Excellent job. Absolutely.

Eric Wright: Questions? You guys want to add anything?

Laura Littlepage: Actually there are a lot of reports and things we can send you if you are interested.

Eric Wright: I should also add, the reason the mental health one is a proposal specifically is to fund the mental health centers to basically hire somebody to work across the mental health centers to coordinate the activities around the mental health centers to work with the State Office of Medicaid and federal groups to make sure they are leveraging as much dollars as they can. So it's kind of an omnibus person and that's why I think of all the proposals we have that's probably one we could probably go to the mental health centers and try to talk to them about this but they're so strapped for funds as it is but we thought this was a case where system coordination, much like the coordination issue for the nonprofit sector was important, this was also particularly important for the mental health sector so they could work more as a unit than the County.

Jason Dudich: Each mental health center currently receives reimbursement from the Medicaid program from the state, so would this be having one single person working with Family Social Services Administration to coordinate reimbursement?

Eric Wright: No actually it wouldn't be reimbursement related. And that's part of the problem, it's so, the mental health centers everything is reimbursement driven. Administration functions in terms of program function across agencies is something they usually cannot afford to pay for because it's not a billable service. So the idea here was to give them a little infrastructure dollars to basically work more as a system but also then to advocate within the system to work with IPS, to work with the providers to identify new ideas about how they could better coordinate what's going on in the frontlines. I know there's a lot of investment going on in the school based mental health services that all the mental health centers are doing but they're kind of doing it on a school by school basis as opposed to coordinating out of the system. And the idea would be is that this really would be a system level thinker and that would be the charge this person would have.

Jason Dudich: So more like an omnibus man, like you said, who is working on administrative overview, or oversight of all the mental health centers in coordination with various entities of the communities?

Eric Wright: Exactly. Things to add? Did I leave anything out?

Councilor Pfisterer: I did have a question and it circles back to money. You know me, I'm always circling back to money.

Eric Wright: Yes, that's why we love you.

Councilor Pfisterer: This is an if. If the city could commit to 60% of these figures that are on the sheet, do you think the nonprofits would, or could, do 40% of the budget?

Eric Wright: I don't know but I can ask.

Councilor Pfisterer: In previous conversations was there any kind of indications of what level they were willing to support?

Eric Wright: No, there were no numbers generated. I think what they were, the sentiment that was conveyed to me was they want to see some real commitment on the part of the City-County Council for a long term solution to this. And I think before they would – because they are equally concerned about lack of coordination, so I think that's why the investment in the Coordinating Agency that would have some authority attached to it would be of great interest to the local funders.

Council Pfisterer: Well that's kind of what I was trying to establish. What level of interest is there on the part of these nonprofits that you talked to. Is it a concept that they totally support, kind of support, or they're just willing to talk about it.

Eric Wright: At this point I would say they are willing to talk about it.

Councilor Pfisterer: OK.

Eric Wright: I do think they do feel pretty clearly that they invest a whole lot in this system because actually most of these agencies that we're talking to, a lot of them are already paying for, the philanthropic sector is paying for most of the services in many cases already. And I think what they are looking for is, they see the same problem with lack of coordination and how much they could bring to the table I don't know. The economy is affecting everybody including the foundations so I think the question would be if the city wanted to take a step then we could spend the next few months rallying and putting together proposals and bring the EIPC members in to sit down and talk to the various foundations and see what happens.

Councilor Pfisterer: Would one of the benefits to the foundations be if this whole system were coordinated eliminating duplication of effort that it might save them money on the trunk end that could be devoted to the whole coordination that we're talking about?

Eric Wright: I suspect that would be a real sale-able idea. But again, since those are early conversations, I haven't really gone back to them since we are getting down to the point where we actually have a plan in front of us with money actually attached to it.

Jason Dudich: In terms of the case management piece you mentioned Youth Emergency Services and the fact that they have capped out of the ability, would this case management service be filling the void that Youth Emergency Services couldn't fill and is that not creating two case management systems or are you going to coordinate if you have that with Youth Emergency Services or other case managers where it's not, all the sudden you've got two and three years from now one is operating this way and the other's operating that way because case management systems, when you start developing them, little pockets to create their own world. So is this filling the gap of 38,000 Youth Emergency Services can't fill, is this a new case management service that is actually going to have clients that report to the case manager, what's the build of the case management?

Eric Wright: Well, the way we've articulated it so far and I think obviously there's a challenge here in the sense that we've been struggling with, do we identify an agency, at the EIPC, and anoint them to do the job and then put some constraints on them vs. RFP model where we take applications and then develop, work with that organization. Some of that's tied into what's the responsibility of the EIPC in terms of oversight. That's an important set of questions so some of the specifics would have to be worked out depending on how those other structural arrangements get put into place, but the way we've articulated the proposal is YES focuses on kids who touched the child welfare system, they're sort of on the brink. They're sort of, they haven't been CHINS'd technically, some of them may have, but most of them haven't. A report has been filed so they're on the brink. What we're focusing on is really more the NACS model that is primarily referral driven as well as volunteer driven and so those are the kids that we see as being the biggest void to fill. In the proposal we clearly said, if they become a YES client then they would be disenrolled from the other program. The idea would be they are moving downstream in the level of severity and so I don't know that we would necessarily – we're talking about if we were to say YES is going to do it. We've had

conversations how they would do it if they were to do it, they say they would create a whole separate unit that would be more dedicated toward this because it would have different referral procedures, it would have different reporting procedures, there would be no obligation to report back to DCS about what is going on in any given child's basis and the ideas would be is maybe more coordination with the primary care physicians, schools, but the idea would be is it would be a separate system and our sentiment was, chime in guys, is that it should be something that should augment the existing system not replace it. And there's the argument for building on NACS or even YES because they already have systems in place, they could move faster, get up to speed faster, and I think the other thing would be there is a relationship there between the city and those organizations and I think in that sense it would be easier to do that. There was some concern about whether or not the EIPC had the authority to say "go do this", even if the funds were available. I'd be happy to hear your thoughts about that.

Jason Dudich: I was just, knowing case management systems, there is a lot of coordination at the state level to bring in the case management system, have like a single case management system or a single case manager vs. like in developmental disabilities they had 400 case managers and each one of them was different. So I wasn't sure if this was, because there is a cap on YES, we were just expanding it. This sounds more like it's just an augmentation or a different set of services. Now would that be under the control of the Council? Would it be under the control of the coordinating agency to develop the case management model? Would it be farmed out to YES? Who has the say as to what the case management system looks like and if it's a contracted RFP, does the Council agree to that, does the coordinating agency agree to that, what kind of parameters are set on the case management portion?

Eric Wright: We have not set any of those parameters because in fact the statute that embodied, or created, the EIPC didn't really tell the EIPC what authority it had, either fiscally or in terms of oversight. And I think the vision probably was, at least originally was, the EIPC would have a lot more authority in terms of oversight and so I think one question which I think goes directly to the City-County Council is that the City-County Council wants to say to the EIPC you have responsibility to this program and then basically it's the EIPC's job to do the hiring and supervision of the program. I think actually that would be the ideal because in fact then the EIPC which presents the major systems stakeholders which is the group they coordinate with, would have to be accountable to the person, this body as well. Part of, if there's nothing else happens out of EIPC, the one cool thing about this group has been it's gotten all the players talking about upstream stuff in a way that I don't think has happened in as long as I can remember. And so I think the idea, the more we can sort of invest authority in the EIPC to do the oversight, the more likely there is to be systematic coordination. And the EIPC could then be accountable to the City-County Council. So I think it may require some amending of the EIPC statutes to clarify that authority. And that's the issue we've been talking about the last year and a half. I don't know if Rhonda or anybody else has any thoughts on that point?

Rhonda Allen: Well I think, just to clarify, I think since EIPC was established a lot has happened in the last few months to kind of change, I think the game, so to speak, which is my agency. Department of Child Services has now become a state funded agency so the typical \$101 million budget that would normally come from the city and county is now shifting over to the state starting January 1st and that'll cover Chris and Brant's folks as well for services. So, I don't know, I guess the clarification from the Council is, I know how this got started and it got started for a concern of the DCS budget. Now that the DCS budget isn't there, is there still the commitment to want to continue this body because kind of relieved that financial burden from the county. I would love to see the commitment still be there because the one thing that the formal institutions like Chris in Juvenile Justice and child welfare can't do, we're doing as good as we can to serve the families that come through our door. We don't have the money or capacity to necessarily develop community wide neighborhood based services to get to those families prior to them coming through our doors. And so I guess that's the only thing I would tag on to that is, I'm curious about the ongoing commitment to EIPC and how we move forward. If we move forward.

Eric Wright: I would just dovetail on that, that that is in fact the choice. Because I do think we, up until now this was a confusing point, who is responsible for what. And I think the one good thing about this change is it clarifies the role of the county, potential role of the county is on the prevention community development side, which is not something the state will probably ever have the capacity to do at a state-wide level. And so I think it really is appropriate function for each county to do individually. I'm not worried about anywhere but Marion County at the moment, but I think the theory is that this is stuff that is part of community development, it's part of neighborhood development and so it's part and parcel to those thing and I think what's nice is it keeps a clean division of labor, if you will, and division of fiscal responsibility in terms of who is doing what. Which is why the case management program, and I think the rule would have to be, is that basically people served in the city funded case management, the early intervention/prevention, if they end up in the state system then they have to be discharged from the county system because then they've reached that threshold, which is an administrative threshold that they're in the system. And I think this is, keeping it loose at the county level is actually really pretty flexible. I mean, one thing about case management services is you have to learn how to be very flexible because families needs are very complicated and each individual family is different and so the nice thing about that is it's harder to do that at a system level than it is at a community level. And I think that's where NACS is actually a very impressive organization in terms of their flexibility, how they serve families and I think the goal would be to build something like that to allow them to have a great reach in the community.

Councilor Pfisterer: My area of expertise is not in organization of courts or mental health or child services, that's way above my pay grade. However, when you are talking about the city commitment, the county commitment, the state commitment, it's all tax dollars and so taxpayers wherever they live are going to be supporting this. And the more efficient and effective we can be with those tax dollars the better off everyone is. One of the benefits that I saw as we discussed this over the past several months was that a child

coming in and needing services currently, I got the impression that they go to this service, well that's not quite what I need I'll go to this service, well that doesn't quite fill the bill either I'll go to this service. So they're kind of bouncing around in the system going by process of elimination until maybe or maybe not they find the services they need. If it's coordinated to one agency and one agency knows what everyone else is providing, when that child comes in they are automatically sent to, or at least this is my vision, automatically sent to the agency they need, that's going to best help them without bouncing around in the system and consuming those provider dollars in the process. Does that make sense?

Rhonda Allen: It's actually replicating what Chris' folks do for probation and what my folks do with child welfare once they come in. They have somebody coordinating their services and coordinating their care.

Counselor Pfisterer: We're wanting to do that before they get to that.

Rhonda Allen: That's right.

Patricia Jones: That's where they're falling through the cracks. That's where we're not addressing children and it's impacting the educational needs greatly. And the mobility of all the children in the city, we can't say IPS and the township schools. The mobility rate is so high that I will see them in a month. I keep the records because they'll return to us. So they have to be our children, we have to address them city wide, state wide, you can't go township. It doesn't work anymore. We can't pit IPS against townships. We're all in this together.

Counselor Pfisterer: I apologize for that comment earlier.

Patricia Jones: That's OK. It's really important and it does impact the needs because we can't educate the kids if they're not healthy. And the families systematically are going to pay one way or another. I would prefer to pay in prevention as to pay at respite. But we can not, we've got to do this together and we've got to do it soon because we're losing a lot of kids and the time spent out of school going to an agency and coming back and then this isn't working, we are losing a lot of days that we could have spent teaching and educating our kids and in the long run we are going to pay for it because we don't have a population now that, the graduation rate that we're looking at, all of the different issues that we're facing, we're all facing. And it's tax dollars, money that's educating kids and we've got to address it. I've got a sense of urgency for the school districts that I represent, all of them, with a sense of urgency. We're looking at prevention, what can we do because we're losing a lot of time with students that's going to come back and haunt us.

Eric Wright: And I think to echo the general idea here, I want to clarify. It's more than simply information and referral. I think the only reason that DSC is able to do what it does, YES is able to do it, because they have people that know how to do assessment of the problem. Because in order to effectively guide someone and avoid the try this, try

this, try this, they have to have more than a little clinical knowledge about how to assess a family and a kid to know what's going on, to appropriately direct. And I think that's how this is a little different from 211 and it's not simply 211. Because 211, even the 211 operator would say, well homeless is the problem or this is the problem but then the family may not fully appreciate the problem. That's where you have to have a clinician do some sort of assessment so our vision is the person who is on the other end of the phone, it may just be a phone contact in some cases or a face to face home visits in some cases, that's why this organization would have to have the flexibility, would be able to ask the questions and probe enough to be able to do an assessment to effectively diagnose. That's a little more than what most of the agencies are capable of doing right now. That is what NACS does and I think that's what YES does although it's a much more limited, targeted population. Limited isn't the right word. Targeted. They've got a large volume. So I know Councilor Pfisterer has to leave by 9:00 and we're getting close to it. Let me pull the spreadsheet stuff out. What we did here was the two year budget, top and bottom, year one, year two. And the first page is from the coordinating agency budget with the professional staff support, so this is a little different than what was in the original plan. The idea here is that this includes the liaison, the web manager, the support staff for the EIPC, so this idea would be this agency, whoever this would be, would do the two functions of the strategic planning development on the community nonprofit side but also the staff support for the EIPC over the long run. And that number you have, and we're not supposed to talk about this on TV because if this is a competitive RFP we don't want to put the numbers out there, but you see it's a range there. The other page is the same structure, the difference is, this is what we estimate to be the range of services to pay for the case management system. I can't remember the number but we actually calculated how many kids could be serviced with this.

Laura Littlepage: I think 5%.

Eric Wright: 5% of the 38,000 we estimated this would be served. And this assumes a range, phone contact in some cases, face to face family contact in other cases. And part of the challenge in budgeting this one is we really don't know what the case mix looks like. And I think the first year experience of this and I think one of the contractual expectations would be for whoever does this be able to document this need because future projection about what we would need to spend would be dependent on understanding that case management a whole lot better. This again is a range and again have low to high there but it does sort of reflect most of that number Counselor Pfisterer had mentioned earlier.

Jason Dudich: Eric, is there any possibility of federal matching on this at all?

Eric Wright: Probably not because I think what the case, there might be some grant opportunities which could be pursued but they'd be short term solutions to this. But generally speaking the federal government has gone more like the state government has gone focusing on the kids on the far downstream spectrum because that's where the greatest need is there and there's not a lot of money available generally for the upstream stuff. And this is a constant conversation you hear across the country about how do we

pay for upstream stuff. So that's one reason I think in a way this might be a nice clear division of labor and a way to explain to the citizenry why the county is investing in this as opposed to investing in what the traditional state and federal government is doing. You have any ideas? I mean, some of these case management programs might be possible, some of the kids might be on Medicaid.

Jason Dudich: That's what I was thinking, if they're Medicaid or if they're currently eligible for a federal program would the services they received through case management, but I don't think in this scenario we're actually paying for the services. We're not paying for someone to go to a mental health service, this is just the coordination of the services, so as our responsibility wouldn't actually be paying for this so I don't know if the administrative cost of the case management, but I do know on the state side some of the case management costs are actually reimbursable by the federal government. Then again, that's developmental disability, that case management services on the Medicaid side, so I don't know if the case management service would qualify.

Eric Wright: Case management costs actually, I think, are less likely to be reimbursable under the new rule change. That's what the mental health centers are already worried about. So I think that's why we were saying this is, the case management even then outside, clearly outside, what I think the current definition, the definition coming down the pike is going to be. In terms of paying for primary care and that kind of stuff we probably could draw down that dollar. And case management might even make them more effective. We know that some places families have not been really effectively asking for, accessing some of those dollars. We're really way behind a lot of other states in doing that. So, in general, I guess in principle do the members of the EIPC accept the consolidation of the proposal? Because I think the point then would be, if you guys are in favor of this consolidated proposal, we can certainly ask the larger membership to make sure we have support for this, I think this is pretty close to where we think we should be.

Rhonda Allen: I'm seeing heads nod yes.

Eric Wright: Any objections? Isn't that Roberts Rules way of getting around a quorum? So I guess this is the proposal, the way it's evolved.

Counselor Cockrum: I don't know if you're aware, after that ordinance was passed a contractual agreement was signed between IUPUI and the city to activate the Council when Steve Talley was President of the Council. It was \$745,000. Originally it was supposed to be completed by the end of last year and we've had two six-month extensions, due to be completed the end of this year. The money was paid up front and as I understand came out of the bond bank. I don't know that for sure, but that's what I've been told. And as it stands now I don't know that there's any money in the budget for next year to do anything. That's a decision we need to make. Are we going to do something.

Eric Wright: I realize there's a gap in getting the budget and when that would be actually allocated, if we do a RFP process it might be hard to get this group on line so I would be

willing to keep us working even into next year outside of the contract to support this until we have this group identified to take over our role.

Counselor Cockrum: Let me ask a question. Is there an organization that already exists in Marion County that would be the most likely organization that we could give them a grant to do this job as opposed to going out on a RFP?

Rhonda Allen: Yes.

Brant Ping: Yes.

Rhonda Allen: John Brandon's group, correct? McCoy, yes.

Counselor Cockrum: That organization was recommended to me but then there was some feeling that maybe some of the minority community had some heartburn with McCoy. And I've got some of that feedback, other people say that's the organization to go to. So I'm not as close to this thing as you people are so I'm struggling with if that's the organization to go to or not. But that seems to be the organization that, just like now, when I ask the question that's the first one people come up with.

Jason Dudich: Is the EIPC the body that has the authority to award that professional services contract?

Eric Wright: No.

Jason Dudich: Who is the authority?

Eric Wright: City-County Council.

Jason Dudich: So it would fall to the Council to make that decision as to who the professional services contract would be. The Council can decide whether or not they award it or do an RFP. That's where we're at.

Rhonda Allen: Yes.

Eric Wright: And one possibility would be to do one professional service to cover both pieces. It might be possible for one agency to do both though I suspect, our thought was, it might be better to do two separate contracts, one for the first goal and one for the second goal.

Jason Dudich: But then would the EIPC then have monitoring authority over that or contract management authority over that?

Eric Wright: Only if it was granted by the Council.

Laura Littlepage: It's not in the ordinance now but it could be amended.

Eric Wright: I think if the City-County Council were to pass an ordinance funding this initiative in the same move it could also say the EIPC is the responsible authority.

Councilor Cockrum: And then you become like a board of directors.

Eric Wright: Exactly, with accountability to the Council.

Councilor Cockrum: Are there other organizations which are not currently represented on your committee that should be added?

Eric Wright: You mean in terms of EIPC representation?

Councilor Cockrum: Yes.

Eric Wright: We had talked about the faith based community as having a representative. I think actually we could expand the membership, I think the biggest issue we have pretty good coverage if we had all the vacancies filled. Oh, and someone from the Mayor's office was the other suggestion and the Controller's office.

Councilor Cockrum: IPS has a vacancy. Who else has a vacancy?

Laura Littlepage: Mental health and then our public finance person.

Councilor Cockrum: It's obvious as we go forward, the Controller's office is going to have to be a party to this discussion. I also invited the Mayor's Chief of Staff.

Eric Wright: Given our conversation that if EIPC is really going to have oversight responsibility as part of this proposal then I think the Controller's office probably ought to have a representative, if only for the fiscal oversight piece of this. That would actually make a lot of sense.

Laura Littlepage: It could be that the person who does the training be accountable.

Eric Wright: Right now the ordinance only says public finance person, it doesn't specify what office. We could get around that and not have to change the structure of the EIPC.

Councilor Cockrum: The Council has two appointments, I believe and the other one didn't get re-elected. Marilyn's been on the board for some time but then King Ro Connely was the other.

Eric Wright: Councilor Oliver has been appointed.

Councilor Cockrum: Oh, has Oliver been appointed?

Laura Littlepage: We met with him.

Eric Wright: So how should we proceed?

Councilor Cockrum: I think we need to get together with the Chief of Staff and the Controller. There's nothing in the budget at this point for next year. This is a timely time to discuss this. I think most likely it probably won't be included in the budget that we pass this month but typically at the end of the calendar year there may be some funds that didn't get spent and that might be an opportune time to see if we could find some money.

Jason Dudich: It does say in there under Section 283-510 that the funding is to be developed in coordination with the Family and Children's Fund budget and that any appropriation would come from the Family and Children's Fund and that fund does not go away, it just is not funded anymore in 2009 because of the state's taking over of that. So if we do something it might be as you said a fund balance in there that we could use.

Councilor Cockrum: And we'd need to redo that.

Jason Dudich: Yes, this would need to be redone because in perpetuity you wouldn't want to have this because this fund eventually runs out of money.

Rhonda Allen: I wouldn't count on the Family and Children's Fund having a balance at the year end. We could be hopeful.

Jason Dudich: One is if budgeted properly the other is the tail payment that is going to have to occur on our side in 2009. We have to have some amount of balance to pay the tail payment but once the tail payment is done, the hope is that if there is a little bit, that's a possibility because you might over budget the tail payment. But the goal is to land the plane at zero, hopefully.

Councilor Cockrum: But there's probably not going to be a half a million dollars in that fund.

Jason Dudich: My pot of gold is getting lower and lower. I would probably agree with President Cockrum. There needs to be a discussion before anything is moving forward, probably with the Mayor's office, the Chief of Staff, as well as our office as to funding opportunities as well as what you talked about Eric, what the true role of EIPC is and the contractor in case management and what powers the EIPC would have.

Eric Wright: Now is that something you wanted me or Rhonda to be involved in, in our roles?

Jason Dudich: I think it's probably more, if I'm speaking out of line Mr. President?, I think it's probably more on our side to figure the support and the financial and then the active role because I think with all due respect, I think this is probably a little outdated. So if anything, one, the ordinance probably needs to be re-reviewed and updated and get

some feedback from this group as well as from the Mayor's office and the financial side, from our office and then probably coming back. If I'm speaking out of turn?

Councilor Cockrum: Do you see any conflict or duplication with what public safety is doing?

Jason Dudich: In all honesty, I thought early intervention was the First Steps Program and that's what I'm used to hearing as early intervention and I wonder if it starts to fold into the courts or starts to fold in the juvenile side of the courts or public safety or Scott Newman's area and I wonder if that can be kind of coordinated within or worked somehow into the public safety budget or public safety policy.

Councilor Cockrum: I had talked to the Prosecutor about maybe having this presentation to brief the Criminal Justice Planning Council on what's been going on here because I don't think they're particularly up to speed on that, just make sure we weren't duplicating or getting into something they've got.

Jason Dudich: You're right, they may have something and just not know about it. Like I didn't even know about this until yesterday so it may be something to just getting the word out to see if there's current services out there or the anticipation services that maybe either fall into possibly this realm or brought in or folded in.

Councilor Cockrum: We've got some homework to do.

Eric Wright: So in terms of our timeline here, because basically it sounds to me, to summarize it, it's now in your court, the ball. And the question then would be between now and say our next meeting, next month, which that would be a time for us to hope you would be able to report out on those conversations?

Councilor Cockrum: Should be able to.

Eric Wright: And then we'd get an update.

Councilor Cockrum: When is your meeting next month?

Eric Wright: We meet the second Wednesday at 8:00.

Councilor Cockrum: It's always here?

Eric Wright: It's either here or 260.

Laura Littlepage: It's always in the City-County Building. They just change rooms on us.

Councilor Cockrum: October the 8th.

Jason Dudich: Our office, the Council will be focusing on those budgets until the 22nd of September but we may be able to do some coordination between then and the 8th to come back and either give you a status update or talk about it. As the President said, we've got 12 days to pass a budget and it's pretty tight right now.

Eric Wright: That was one of the reasons I asked because we had gone to an almost every other month schedule. Because of working on the politics, behind the scenes, would it be better to wait until our November scheduled meeting to give you guys more time?

Councilor Cockrum: Let's go with the October meeting and if we can't get our act together, why we'll let you know.

Eric Wright: So we'll touch base with you the week before so then we can give these folks notice. Because I think at this point we will then distribute the agency survey, keep in mind there's two versions, the agency survey and the program survey, separate things. And that will come out in the next week or so and data collection should be done by the end of the month on the program survey so it'll take us another month or so to write up those results so that probably won't be available until November in our timeline but we'll have everything in place by the end of the year. I think. Thank you and I appreciate your flexibility at the start of the meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 9:15.