

AGENDA

Provider Agency Advisory Committee Session 3

CW 20/21 Meeting

July 24, 2018

11:00am – 1:00pm

Commissioner's Conference Room, ACS, 150 William Street

Welcome (<i>Molly Armstrong, Consultant</i>)	11:00am-11:05am
Review Ground Rules, Values, Goals (<i>Molly Armstrong, Consultant</i>)	11:05am-11:10am
Prevention Focus on Organizational Health + Family Well-Being (<i>Presented by Kailey Burger, DFS</i>)	11:10am-11:40am
Foster Care Focus on Permanency and Well-Being in Care (<i>Presented by Loren Gance, FPS</i>)	11:40am-12:10pm
Fiscal Parameters Part 1 (<i>Presented by Jose Mercado, DFS</i>)	12:10pm-12:20pm
Begin Planning Stakeholder Engagement (<i>Facilitated by Molly Armstrong, Consultant</i>)	12:20pm-12:50pm
Wrap Up	12:50pm- 1:00pm

Assignment due 7/31/18:

Considering the list of stakeholder groups that were presented, what groups do you believe your agency is best suited to engage with in August. We would also like to know who your agency's point person of contact will be during the month of August.

Send this to **Jim** by **COB on 7/27/18**.

CHILD WELFARE 20/21

Notes from Advisory Committee Session 3:

Attendees Committee Members: Bill Baccaglini, Phoebe Boyer, Robert Cizma, Jess Dannhauser, Karen Dixon, Anita Gundanna, Sister Paulette LoMonaco, David Mandel, Jim Purcell, Denise Rosario, Eileen Torres, Honorable Ronald Richter, and Dawn Saffayeh

Non-Committee Members: Lisa Gitelson, Sophine Charles, Georgia Boothe, Tim Ross, Molly Armstrong, Ronni Fuchs and Melissa Baker

ACS Attendees: Dr. Jacqueline Martin (DPS), Kailey Burger (DPS), Markus Kessler (DPS), Jose Mercado (Finance), Jane Steinberg (Finance), Julie Farber (FPS), Loren Ganoe (FPS), Andrew White (PPM), Jaime Madden (PPM), Patrick Damoah-Thomas (PPM), Monique Cumberbatch (PPM), Natalie Ekberg (PPM), Rachel Miller (ACCO)

- i. **Overview, Ground Rules, and Goals and Values (Facilitated by Molly Armstrong, Public Catalyst)** See Power-Point, slides 3-5
 - i. The Overview and Ground Rules were shared with no additional feedback from the group.
 - ii. The facilitator reminded the Committee to submit any other feedback they may have on these goals, values, or additional feedback they may have on materials shared.
- ii. **Advisory Committee Expectations (Facilitated by Molly Armstrong, Public Catalyst)** See Power-Point, slide 6
 - i. The set of expectations were reviewed.
- iii. **Next Level Program Focus Areas (Presented by Molly Armstrong)** See Power-Point slide 7
 - I. Department of Prevention covered: Organizational Wellbeing and Family Wellbeing
 - II. Department of Family Permanency Services covered: Permanency and Wellbeing while in care
- I. **Prevention Next Level Focused Area (Presented by Kailey Burger, DPS):** See Power-Point I, slide 8-17.
 - i. Presenter opened her presentation by asking the committee members to consider all the conversations that have been had since the first meeting, and to see today's presentation as a follow up to the themes and the threads that started in meeting one.
 - ii. The Presenter reviewed the community-based services process, reiterating that DPS uses the same process each time. This process includes: literature review on models and best practices; listening to experts and stakeholders; gathering data; co-designing with families, providers/others; and finally, implementation with fidelity and evaluation. (See Power Point slide 9)
 - iii. Presenter reviewed the list of research questions (see Power Point I slide 10).
 - iv. Presenter began to discuss the organizational well-being and health. (See Power Point I slides 11-13.)

- v. When the Presenter completed the overview of the Organizational Health process, the Committee members reviewed the themes that DPS identified as major Organizational Health needs (See Power Point slide 12)
- vi. One of the committee members posited that the largest Organizational Health need and concern is salaries for staff, emphasizing that an increase in salaries of 2-3% won't be enough.
It was also stated that this RFP planning process is a once in a decade opportunity to figure out the salaries and benefits that will address retention issues.
- vii. A committee member shared that the Year 3 of the Model Budget enhancements will increase prevention salaries, with the result that the standard prevention salaries will be higher than standard foster care staff salaries. It was suggested that we try to use the Model Budget work as a template for Foster Care case planners. That member posited that if ACS and its provider agencies not address the gap in pay between programs there was a risk of creating a problem in foster care unless foster care receives comparable pay.
- viii. Another member brought up the point that some agencies are unionized and pride themselves on having no distinction between foster care and prevention workers in terms of salary.
- ix. A member shared that the new NY State overtime rule is going to have a huge impact on salary costs once this legislation goes into effect in January 2019.
- x. Scorecard was mentioned by another member as a driver for staff activity with the suggestion that it might need to be revised.
- xi. The presenter discussed the model budget enhancements: salaries, career ladders, casework support, quality improvement/assurance, and recruitment and retention. (See Power Point Side 13)
- xii. The presenter noted that there was a need for more research and data on the connection between salaries and retention/turnover and encouraged agencies to share that data and research with ACS. The presenter further noted that the Prevention Model Budget implementation provides an opportunity to collect more data on what factors drive retention/turnover and the connection with salaries.
- xiii. One of the committee members shared that the foster care programs are losing huge numbers of staff due to salary differentials.
- xiv. Another Committee member stated that it would benefit the city to think about salaries for both Foster Care and Prevention together. This Committee member shared that his agency had to raise money to avoid salary differentials. The member warned that the City administration cannot allow this differential to continue and evolve.
- xv. The presenter transitioned the conversation to the topic of family and community wellbeing. (See Power Point I Slide 14)
- xvi. The presenter noted that the Brownsville, Brooklyn snapshot is an example of the Community District profiles that have been built for each community district by ACS. (See Power Point I Slide 15)
- xvii. Utilizing the Brownsville example, the presenter noted that there are many complex factors in every community and that ACS is focusing on a place-based orientation for prevention. The Presenter acknowledged that some or all these factors can make things harder for agency staff to do their jobs and achieve the outcomes we all want to accomplish.
- xviii. The presenter reviewed seven existing community and family wellbeing frameworks. (See Power Point I Slide 16) Utilizing those frameworks as a starting point, the presenter

asked the members to consider a shared vision and framework for child and family well-being across city agencies.

- xix. The presenter reviewed the outcomes that were found across all seven frameworks: economic stability, cohesive family systems, healthy and safe relationships, positive community connections, family autonomy, reduction of child maltreatment. (See Power Point I Slide 17)
- xx. The presenter noted that ACS and providers would need to collect and integrate additional key information to assess Prevention progress if these well-being metrics were to be adopted. Examples include: how many families are applying for benefits; how many young people are succeeding in school; and other important long-term outcomes to measure success. Prevention currently focuses on basic information, such as repeat maltreatment and foster care entry.
- xxi. Members discussed the outcomes identified from the existing frameworks. One asked whether the outcome “Healthy Safe Relationships/Positive Community Connections” includes the concept of social capital, noting that child welfare families can struggle with a lack of relationships that they can leverage to arrange child care, get a job or help with other everyday things. This lack of connection can happen because a parent or child has a destroyed relationship or the family moves, but regardless, the families need help.
- xxii. Members endorsed the need for “Positive Community Connections” as an outcome. A committee member mentioned the fact that a child care agency might be working with families that have mental health or substance abuse issues, and the agency must develop trust with the community so that the case planner can be a quarterback to address problems utilizing community-based resources. They also noted that a Prevention agency’s engagement with a family might happen more than once - a family might need or want to come back for a “tune up” and to encourage re-engagement means addressing the stigma of prevention services.
- xxiii. Members noted that there are external factors that can make these relationships hard to manage or create depending on the family/community. For example, progress on economic stability can be hindered by fear about what networking might do to their families. Fear of collateral consequences can also be a barrier to families accessing the services the Family Courts, ACS or the providers are requiring.
- xxiv. Reunifications may move forward slowly because the families have various problems accessing services they need.
- xxv. Systemic oppression and bias also creates systemic barriers.
- xxvi. And families have suffered trauma that may be a challenge in engaging in their ability or willingness to engage in services.
- xxvii. A member noted that the concept of community is more complex than geography. Geographic communities can be important, but these are not the only communities. Many people and families travel far to access religious, cultural and other minority communities to seek comfort and support. These non-geographic types of community are often under-recognized connections, but they need to be factored into our thinking and acknowledged.
- xxviii. Members asked for more information about the outcome “cohesive family systems and autonomy,” and the presenter offered to share the underlying research.
- xxix. An attendee suggested adding two more outcomes to the list: reduction in justice system involvement, and outcomes around adolescent connection to institutions.
- xxx. A member suggested that to focus on these outcomes, providers would need to know how those metrics were being included in the contracts so that additional outcomes

were not just layered on. The suggestion was that the potential metrics/outcomes be shared in advance for discussion.

- xxxi. ACS asked Committee members to think about and send in metrics that agencies are already collecting within the Prevention system.

II. **Department of Family Permanency Services (Presented by Loren Ganoe, FPS):**

See Power-Point II slides 1-15.

- i. The provider noted that the focus for the discussion would be on permanency and well-being in the foster care context. (See Slide 2)
- ii. The presenter walked through the trends on entries, exits and permanency rates. (See Slides 4 and 5).
- iii. ACS staff shared that in earlier years, there were more children and youth exiting after brief stays in care – and that as the population entering care shrank, so did these “short stays” – impacting reunification rates.
- iv. The Facilitator noted that agencies’ Monthly Status Reports include the permanency data and the Committee must be conscious that there is a real range on permanency rates among agencies.
- v. The presenter noted that ACS and the providers have made progress on 12-23-month permanency, but that there is more work to do. (See slide 6)
- vi. ACS and its providers have made progress on KinGAP.
- vii. ACS is encouraging increases in kinship placements, which produce better outcomes for children, including opening up the opportunity for KinGAP as a permanency option.
- viii. FY2018 data is not final but the expectation is fewer KinGAPs for this fiscal year because of the recent change in the law and the delays that it has caused. (See slide 7) But the ultimate impact of the changes in the KinGAP law to recognize “fictive” kin will be positive – and ACS expects to see increases as a result going forward.
- ix. One attendee asked if it was reasonable to expect continued increases in KinGAP or had the early increases been a function of pent up demand – so it was more reasonable to expect a leveling off in numbers going forward? The facilitator noted that it was still reasonable to expect increase for two reasons: the recent expansion in the law opened up more guardianship options in NYS and data from other jurisdictions who adopted permanency guardianship laws earlier than New York State suggested there was room for more of an upside. The facilitator referenced the baseline study commissioned by OCFS showing trends in the impact in guardianship in other jurisdictions.
- x. ACS staff and members then discussed the challenges regarding the time to TPR filings and on resolving TPRs.
- xi. Members discussed the role that TPR attorneys play in timeliness and asked whether compensation for those attorneys was adequate. They discussed different models of attorney representation – some have in-house counsel while others pay for outside counsel. One noted that there had been a time when FCLS was responsible for TPRs.
- xii. ACS noted that there are children and youth with reunification goals for four years, and the RPRs suggested that in half these cases, the goals needed to be changed, a phenomena referred to as “hidden goals.” Member discussed the huge managerial effort required to move these cases ahead. (See Slide 10.)
- xiii. COFCCA noted they did an earlier study and they could not find a connection between attorney payment and timing. But that doesn’t mean it doesn’t exist.

- xiv. The presenter encouraged the members to read the RPR report which includes findings from RPR, including data analysis focused on older youth and the results of the older youth survey. (See Slide 11).
- xv. One member suggested that changing outcomes for older youth should be an area of focus for the RFP with incentives to increase college rates and discourage involvement in the juvenile and criminal justice systems. Connecting outcomes for older youth to the wellbeing framework is important.
- xvi. We also need to know where we can connect these families and children to the mental health system.
- xvii. A member noted that not all older youth can be college-bound and that there are agencies that have older youth who have developmental disabilities who will need a different set of outcomes.
- xviii. Members asked about whether there was data collected on families that keep youth after 21, for how long, and what motivates them?
- xix. ACS currently collects a lot of data at exit.
- xx. A member suggested that providers have the opportunity to collect more data.
- xxi. Two members suggested it might be an opportune time to explore professional foster parents. They suggested it might be worth considering for kids who come in at 15 who are more likely to age out. The question arose whether a professional foster parent could be a permanency resource and how do we think about existing foster parents who serve as caregivers for years for older youth.
- xxii. A member raised the issue of staff safety, and shared that they have started working with the Brooklyn DA to create a greater penalty for people who threaten and harm private agency staff, similar to the laws that protect ACS staff.

III. **Fiscal Parameters Part 1 (Presented by Jose Mercado, DFS):**

See Power Point II Slides 16-18

- i. Our existing funding is compliance driven – and Federal and State laws and regulations will continue to constrain funding in the future – raising the question of how much room there is for innovation and for expansion of child welfare.
- ii. The rate model is the current reality and Families First will not change that reality. In the existing foster care system, when bed days go down, ACS and private agency revenues go down. The IV-E rate is also going down, so we have less federal money. The state block grant continues to decline. On foster care, revenues are driven by bed days. In prevention, revenues are driven by services.
- iii. In our current financial construct, increased use of KinGAP will hurt us financially because those payments are included in the block grant – which means less funding for other block grant services. Advocating for a change in the funding source for KinGAP with the state legislature could help.
- iv. In the Finance Division, we are studying our contracts to see what is left over for new initiatives after we cover all the State and Federal mandates. We are trying to see what our innovation space is financially.
- v. There was discussion that if child welfare wants to expand funding, ultimately OMB want to see the savings in the long term pay back and understand the return on the investment.
- vi. A member asked for future clarity on ACS' plans in terms of the existing Title IV E Wavier.
- vii. The presenter mentioned that ACS has a 600M foster care system and a 300M+ prevention system..

- viii. There was a question posed to the Presenter regarding the Title IV-E rate's decrease with the presenter and members responding by noting that IV-E eligibility is not adjusted for inflation and is going down most places – not just in NYC.
- ix. A member mentioned the complexity of the current billing system, noting that some of the programs have been built around the funding rules. Currently, some providers already treat the Foster Care funding streams like a line item budget, but that is not how it is designed. They noted that it is not as simple as prevention planning.
- x. A member asked whether a line item budget could be on the table for foster care? Or is there an anticipation that we will still have eight different programs? Could there be a consolidation?
- xi. The presenter shared that ACS is looking at fiscal models, but cautioned that there will still be cost centers. ACS wants to make the front end easier for providers, but ACS is stuck on the back end. A Committee member mentioned wanting to see the new fiscal models as those were developed.
- xii. Members also noted that it would be helpful to make the contracts more flexible so that money can be added without a complex amendment process as new needs are identified.
- xiii. There was discussion about the unknowns with respect to Family First which may make this process of preparing for the next round of contracts more complicated.

IV. **Planning for Stakeholder Engagement (Presented by Jaime Madden, PPM and Kailey Burger, DPS): See Power Point II slide 19**

- i. A presenter noted that the Committee members (and others through the website) have seen the ACS agency survey and other CW 20/21 project materials. This next level of stakeholder engagement for CW 20/21 is modeled on Prevention's Community Based Strategies' Model Budget process.
- ii. Expert interviews are drawn from the expert list you provide as well as ones that we identify. Please continue to share other experts that should be interviewed.
- iii. ACS outreach will include city agencies, provider groups, and youth and families
- iv. ACS can continue to engage youth and families for a longer period because they are not applying for the RFP.
- v. As an example, Prevention is currently doing a qualitative scan of 86 experts on DV from around the world. Prevention is looking across domains, looking at implementation science, dosage, etc. Looking at jurisdictions as well. ACS really want feedback on a wide range of experts to interview.
- vi. One member suggested it would be helpful to engage someone early from the Department of Education. Another cautioned that given how small the foster care population was relative to the number of students served, the DOE might not have the bandwidth to focus on child welfare children and youth.
- vii. Another suggested including the entire Children Cabinet in our stakeholder list.
- viii. Another suggested tapping into the FECs.
- ix. Members not that it is powerful to talk to youth and families but encouraged expansion to alumnae who have the benefit of time outside of the system – and so can provide additional valuable insights.
- x. UNH was also mentioned as a stakeholder.
- xi. ACS should talk to advocates who are trying to support positive outcomes for youth for decades. They will give you rich information on the challenges families have had over the decades.

- xii. A member suggested that this process should think about finding funding through HRA and other agencies for services to 18-26. If child welfare can produce savings for HRA, Corrections, etc. that will be persuasive to Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Now would be the time to seek funding from HRA, especially in the out years. OMB wants to save the City money as a whole. The providers can help ACS make that case, but we want to know if there is appetite for this by ACS.
- xiii. A member shared that there is money for building supportive housing, but nothing for family services.
- xiv. ACS shared that they have an ambitious scope for who they will talk to but want to know which stakeholders the committee members can reach out to. ACS would love to support any outreach members can do and will train agency staff. Are member able to reach populations that ACS might not?
- xv. A member suggested community partnership programs could be contacted.
- xvi. ACS emphasized they will be developing a structured interview tool for members to use and a feedback form so that member liaisons can report back to ACS. Committee members will not be doing this on their own.
- xvii. Members noted that some stakeholders might benefit from agencies and ACS jointly reaching out. One suggestion for this joint outreach was young people from foster care who live at Queens College.
- xviii. A Committee member noted that in certain communities ACS will need to be careful about who it brings together. In Harlem for example, the division of the “haves and have nots” is big factor and for this community you would want a local nonprofit to do the outreach because of ACS’s reputation. It was agreed that different groups need to do more specific and different outreach.
- xix. Members suggested the outreach needs to be individualized and favored status needs to be avoided.
- xx. Provider Agency staff and staff meetings are a great resource. They can be asked how they would solve some of the problems that members have identified.
- xxi. Some of the community providers who are not on this committee have reached out to ACS to see how they can participate in this project as well. ACS wants to encourage members to reach out to provider colleagues.
- xxii. ACS asked members to think about the key questions that ACS and providers should answer in this month of engagement.
- xxiii. COFFCA offered to facilitate Committee Member’s convenings.
- xxiv. Members suggested that ACS must be at those conversations with front line and leadership staff.
- xxv. ACS staff noted that they will be doing a lot of outreach. But should there be provider only meetings? ACS asked for a list of meetings ACS can attend.
- xxvi. A member offered to help facilitate meetings between ACS and Federations of Color, Hispanic federation and other organizations of color.
- xxvii. In terms of selecting staff to help liaison the stakeholder engagement, it may be helpful if the ACS staff who work with the Committee members could suggest who they believe would be effective at this stakeholder facilitation. An ED may have some sense, but ACS staff may have good ideas as well.
- xxviii. ACS will share a draft of the questions once they are formed – but they want member input in the drafting.
- xxix. Presenter noted that we want the Committee to weigh in on that planning next week 7/31.

- xxx. One member asked if it is too early to speak with elected officials? And suggested some brisk talking points from ACS would be very helpful.
- xxxi. A member suggested having a conversation with Human Services Committee (HSC).
- xxxii. A member encouraged ACS to be bold in discussions with the other city agencies. They talked about the balance between what DOHMH or DOE could do and what processes can or should be taken in-house at the provider agencies.
- xxxiii. Members emphasized outreach to Family Court, and ACS concurred. Another suggested the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges (NCJFCJ) might be helpful.
- xxxiv. ACS staff noted the Commissioner is very willing to lead the charge with other city agencies on this work.
- xxxv. Members encouraged ACS to engage with ACS staff across divisions.

→ In preparation for the next session, the Facilitator requested that Members consider what stakeholders their agencies are best suited to engage with during August. It was also requested the Members identify a lead from their agency for stakeholder engagement during August.