

Early Intervention Planning Council Meeting
City-County Building Room 224
November 8, 2006

Present

Dan Carmin
Christina Ball
John Brandon
Barbara Gillenwaters
Rhonda Allen
Brant Ping
Patricia Jones
John Kennedy
Judge Marilyn Moores

Support Staff

Eric Wright
Laura Littlepage

Commission members not present

Lonnell Conley, Kent Burrow, Marilyn Pfisterer

Dan Carmin convened the meeting at 8:15 a.m. The minutes of October 18th were unanimously approved.

Eric Wright: First on the agenda is the presentation of the draft of the Evidence Based Practices (EBP) report. This is a comprehensive document that the faculty team put together. Please take a look at it in the next couple of weeks and give us any comments. Dan and I will be presenting it to the Rules and Policy committee November 28 as part of updating the City-County Council on our progress. We asked the faculty team to identify EBPs where evidence is strong and might be adopted or we might have similar programs here. We are trying to match the practices to the programs. Linking with United Way's Information Resource Network. Series of chapters, some overlap, we tried to organize it around domains, if you have comments, send to us as we move to final draft. Any questions or discussion?

Dan Carmin: Good information. Next on the agenda is a discussion of the vision. We included the charge of the EIPC and the vision of the strategic plan.

Eric Wright: Our hope was to turn the focus of the EIPC to implementation of the plan. What do we want to accomplish? We need to put some limiting statements. Every time we meet, the list gets longer. We need to move towards prioritization. We want to move towards a vision.

Dan Carmin: Any questions, comments? Initially it was my impression that the intent was to address the funding issue. How can we stop the bleeding and stop the major funding

problems associated with these programs? On the other hand, we have learned that the investment in prevention is not free. The cost associated with children's programs is an investment in youth and if we don't make that investment there will be greater costs down the line. How can we convince our elected officials that it is an issue of investment, reprioritization of resources? There seems to be a difference of opinion about why we are here.

John Kennedy: What do we agree on? Kids want to stay with parents, want to succeed at school, if that doesn't work out; it is expensive to raise a child in an institution. It is not cost savings, but reallocation of resources.

John Brandon: Clearly, we are trying to invest in prevention, intervention, as well as serving those already damaged. It is not going to be an immediate cost savings, it will cost more in the short-term.

Dan Carmin: We heard a great speaker and I want to share this quote: "if you put the money in the playpen, you won't have to put it in the state pen."

John Kennedy: One thing Rhonda said at another meeting, there is a dual process, there is a learning process and an unlearning process, we are going to have a peak for these services and hopefully over time it will go down.

John Brandon: We have to make sure we are aligning our resources correctly to get the most bang for dollars. I have a problem with people talking about duplication of services because until every child is served, we don't have duplication of services. We do need to be efficient in delivering those services.

Dan Carmin: Whatever we do, we need to convince our elected officials that we are committed to tearing down silos and evaluating how we can utilize resources in the best manner.

Eric Wright: There are two components—expanding early intervention and stopping the hemorrhaging. We need a new mechanism for coordinating care. There are long-term and short-term gains. Our goal is to reduce the number of children in system and reduce the burden on the system. The first goal is early intervention and then diversion. The goal will be to look at this over the years. This is a short-term document for a long-term body.

Brant Ping: There is an immediate expectation from the Council that there will be a decrease in the fiscal impact. Spending more on intervention is not what they are expecting.

John Kennedy: We need to track those who are diverted, make sure they are served. How are you going to convey this information to the City-County Council while they are focused on "save us money, save us money?"

Eric Wright: I think the City-County Council does not have an understanding of the financing of these systems.

John Kennedy: We need to teach them what they don't know.

Eric Wright: In terms of early intervention, I believe there is a growing percentage of the Council that is sympathetic to this. Given the hemorrhaging how can they spend money? I am trying to meet with each City-County Council member this month.

John Brandon: We should also get partners in the community. United Way is focusing on Ready to Learn, Ready to Earn, other folks in the community are aware of the process. Encourage them to be allied with this group.

Eric Wright: There is a good example—looking at goal 2 might be to recommend using United Way's initiative as the vehicle to expand services. Another option is to use Community Centers as the structure to start with.

Dr. Gillenwaters: Ellen Annala convened stakeholders for a project of mine. She told us to identify resources in your community that support your goal and then identify the gaps. As we look at our goals and action steps, there are resources in the community that could align with them. We could do that to find gaps. Last time there were suggestions made for funding that has not been accessed. The City-County Council would appreciate suggestions.

Dan Carmin: Getting tough on crime is not the answer. We incarcerate more people than any other country. Hopefully, we can come to agreement that investment in early intervention is the way to go.

Eric Wright- Goals 1 and goal 2 are purely early intervention, goals 3 and 4, are things to stop the bleeding, and goal 5 is a practical goal that serves both objectives. Until we get a handle on the fiscal issues, it is hard to move ahead. We haven't gotten a lot of feedback and it is hard to read the silence.

John Brandon: When you are making the presentation to the Council, stress that one of the important reasons to reduce risk is to make programs more effective. The more risk factors, the less effective the programs are, because clients they are overwhelmed. If they have one risk, the program will be more effective. Risk reduction, program enhancement goes side by side.

Eric Wright: There are tiers in the system now. Juvenile justice is now the far end of the tier. Kids coming into the school system are at the front end. There is a natural progression, trajectory from kids with problems. How they move through system. Exposing kids to other kids with multiple problems can make them worse.

Patricia Jones: What can we stop? Bringing children to Juvenile Justice Center for fighting in school? What do we abandon as we add? As you look at prevention, you have to drop something.

Brant Ping: Is that because of money?

Christina Ball: JDI initiative is looking at a lot of issues of diverting out of system, different centers. In Portland, they have community based reception centers, most of the kids would go there.

Eric Wright: A subset of each population will proceed to each step. Numbers of kids in the multi-risk categories is relatively small. They get flagged in school, and then they get into Department of Child Services (DCS), then end up in Juvenile Justice (JJ). There are also kids who are fine who end up in JJ.

John Kennedy: Silo question—a lot of our kids interact with law enforcement. Should we get input from that area?

Judge Moores: There are curricula that are designed to help with interacting with at-risk kids. With the merger this is a good time to address that.

John Kennedy: They are used to doing one thing—dropping them off at JJ.

Eric Wright: That is a clear action step—have training of police, etc.

John Kennedy- Are the community police stations staying?

Judge Moores: Yes and there will be a few more. They have roll call and community policing prosecutors. I'm not sure if they are involved in JJ, different track.

Christina Ball: A group went to Portland and they use reception centers.

John Kennedy: Was there one, two, three, four?

Judge Moores: They have a very comprehensive process—they provide case management services at the site. It is a multi-service center. It would expand on what IPS is doing now. It would be interesting to find out how Portland is funding what they are doing.

Judge Moores: IPS is using the back part of the former alternative school as a reception center. Although reception center is a much broader concept. They do so much more diverting . We do first time offenders, shop lifters, parental conference. If we had an additional triage there, we could look at kids and refer them to mental health. Could have jurisdiction of court to make sure they get the help they need.

Eric Wright: This fits with goal 4. Could we connect referral centers with community centers where they are?

John Brandon: It can be also be another youth development organization.

John Kennedy: Looking where kids are coming from by ZIP code, look at community centers to refer somebody.

Dan Carmin: It has to be community based. We need structured assessment tools. In DCS we are moving to Child and Adolescent Needs and Strengths (CANS).

John Kennedy: There are more questions that need to be asked of Portland. We want to know where the challenges were for them. We didn't get to see the process that got them there.

Judge Moores: Maybe when I go back, we can put a team together to look at this.

Dan Carmin: The other thing I am interested in is, what number of children is overlap from DC S? JD/JC has a 30% overlap.

Eric Wright: It comes back to triage.

Dan Carmin: If we merely divert children from our system, we are not serving them. We invested in NAICS—there should be some way to get them some services if they don't come into system. How do you measure prevention? That program costs one million a year. How do I know how much money that program is investing?

Eric Wright: Therein lays the \$100 million question—what would have happened if not for this?

Judge Moores: The way you know is what happened before you had this.

Dan Carmin: We know we are not sending kids to state correctional facilities at the same rate.

Eric Wright: That's a good indicator.

Judge Moores: Human capital as well saving tax dollars would result from prevention.

Eric Wright: It is an economic development issue—the community is more attractive, and there are more people for workforce.

Dan Carmin: Over 50% kids that end up in systems were not A, B, or C felonies

Dr. Gillenwaters: One of the things we might consider is how we can expand mental health services in schools. There is limited funding for social workers, psychologist. We were involved in a study where they were assessed by a psychologist. We are amazed by

the number of kids who were functioning who had underlying issues. Working in the neighborhoods, this would go a long way to reduce problems in the community.

Judge Moores: There is a big chunk of grant money for collaboration with mental health that people are meeting about. We are above the national average for kids with mental health problems.

Dan Carmin: John Brandon, in your comments you mentioned a state legislative study that shot down universal mental health assessment.

John Brandon: Parental responsibility was the issue. There is a state committee that is crafting a social behavioral health plan. You have both ends of the system working against each other. You have one group saying we need to do this and one saying not to do it.

Eric Wright: For the kids who have a risk factor or identified problem, there is supposed to be a screening and a plan. There is a tension and some people have been sensitive to screening for psychiatric needs. Parental rights issues are a tension.

John Brandon: I know that tension exists but we do physical health screening, should we provide the option to parents, they could opt out.

Patricia Jones: Use the term assessment, not screening; it is less offensive.

Dr. Gillenwaters: We have some schools that have more services than others for some reasons. When we have adults kids can talk to, we see fewer problems. If we don't have strong alignments with schools, or community services, we should try to align them so they are in the community.

Eric Wright: Lots of what we have been talking about is reflected in the plan. Perhaps we could get pediatricians to do mental health screening.

Judge Moores: When you think about service providers, we always have these brilliant people at the top and the direct service providers are paid \$7 an hour. We need to have a career path for these care providers, get training for the staff. Establish an associates degree, BA have people trained in residential placements. Trained by a professional educational institution.

John Brandon: There is a start on that, the Indiana youth development credential, which involves a combination of coursework at Ivy Tech and additional 40 hours of training at a community based organization. They have to develop a portfolio, a review of their work in competency areas. They have to demonstrate competencies.

Eric Wright: Goal 3.3 work force development is identifying already existing programs we can build on. For the next iteration if you can give us details, we can flesh this out.

Dan Carmin: Could we make it criteria for our contracting that they have to have this credential?

John Brandon- There is a Nascent effort to start a youth development association to standardize the field.

Judge Moores: It would help if everyone working in detention had this training.

Eric Wright: This would show that we value people who work with kids.

Patricia Jones: After school workers could do this.

Christina Ball: On goal 5, we are missing an opportunity to look at reimbursements with Title IV-E. It is under 3.5 but for mental health. It should be expanded. We only access those funds for 10% of one group, and 50% for another group.

Rhonda Allen: What about the Title IV-E waiver?

Dan Carmin: IV-E reimburses granted our state a waiver do not have to be in placement for reimbursement, service to keep in their home. Up to \$9,000 annually per child. It is vastly under-utilized. We have not utilized all those slots.

Eric Wright: The general issue of maximizing federal dollars was brought up last time.

Dan Carmin: The other underutilized program is Medicaid rehab option. Provides for case management services. In Indiana we can only access mental health centers for this option.

Eric Wright: We will include action steps that require legislation as well as City-County Council actions.

Dan Carmin: We have data about the past trends. The Sequoia consulting group dug up \$8 million dollars by going back.

Judge Moores: If we could go back two years, we might get some placement dollars.

Eric Wright: Identifying eligibility for other services is important.

Brant Ping: We are not getting any reimbursement for Guardian home kids. We are not getting IVB-EA because we don't have a per diem rate.

Dan Carmin: The Guardian home is only \$1.2 million. We are reducing census. That facility could do reception and assessment.

John Brandon: Under goal 5, somehow there needs to vehicle for investigating private foundation dollars.

Judge Moores: There are lots of grant opportunities. We need someone focused on kids; it can be in coordination, comprehensive from this point of view. Write those grants and serve as development for the DC S and JJ.

Eric Wright:- At the risk of sounding self-serving, there is nobody else that could do this. This could be good partnership with IUPUI. That is new money. Maximizing grant proposals, we can crank this out. Whether it us, or somebody else, it should be done.

Judge Moores: A lot of the grants are cross system grants. It needs that big picture look.

Eric Wright - Let's make goal 5, goal 1, and add a generic statement about having someone in the coordinating role.

Judge Moores: There is a national movement in partnering with universities to do these kinds of things. Have people attuned to research and big picture. Miami is doing a great job. National Council of Family Court Judges and the bar association put together a package of performance measures for dependency cases. I will send you the power point presentation. That is something that accountability is not just money—did we help the people we are trying to help. These performance measures will be great. We have gotten asked about that several times.

Dan Carmin: Is it our intent to include performance measures in each contract?

Brant Ping: We have undertaken a structure to make them less process oriented, more outcome focused.

Eric Wright: We need to have a dialogue about common performance measurements. This could be an opportunity to engage community organizations in this discussion.

Judge Moores: There will be grant dollars associated with tracking these as well as implementing them.

Eric Wright: Putting them into contracts is the big stick.

Dan Carmin- This has been a good discussion. Meeting adjourned at 10:05 a.m.