

Nebraska Children's Commission
Foster Care Reimbursement Rate Committee

Fourteenth Meeting

July 26, 2016

9:00 AM – 11:00 AM

Airport Country Inn & Suites

1301 West Bond Circle, Lincoln, NE 68521

I. Call to Order

The Foster Care Reimbursement Rate Committee (FCRRC) Co-Chairs, Peg Harriott and Gene Klein, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

II. Roll Call

Committee Members present (14):

Jodie Austin	Dr. Anne Hobbs	Felicia Nelsen
Phillip Burrell (9:02)	Vanessa Humaran	Lana Temple-Plotz
Jude Dean	Gene Klein	Julia Tse
Peg Harriott	Bobby Loud (9:37)	Michaela Young
Susan Henrie (9:10)	Jackie Meyer	

Committee Members absent (4):

Corrie Edwards	Sherry Moore
Leigh Esau	Dave Newell

Ex Officio Members present (4):

Karen Knapp	Nanette Simmons
Stacy Scholten	Sherrie Spilde

Ex Officio Members absent (4):

Michele Anderson	Jerrilyn Crankshaw
Jeanne Brandner	Doug Weinberg

A quorum was established.

Guests in Attendance (4):

Bethany Connor Allen	Nebraska Children's Commission
John Danforth	Administrative Office of Probation
Amanda Felton	Nebraska Children's Commission
Jewel Schiffers	Nebraska Families Collaborative

a. Notice of Publication

Recorder for the meeting, Amanda Felton, indicated that the notice of publication for this meeting was posted on the Nebraska Public Meetings Calendar and Nebraska Children's Commission website on July 7, 2016 in accordance with the Nebraska Open Meetings Act. The publication will be kept as a permanent attachment with the meeting minutes.

b. Announcement of the placement of Open Meetings Act information

A copy of the Open Meetings Act was available for public inspection and was located at the sign-in table at the front of the meeting room.

III. Approval of Agenda

A motion was made by Jodie Austin to approve the agenda with the alteration of John Danforth presenting in the absence of Jeanne Brandner. The motion was seconded by Dr. Anne Hobbs. No further discussion ensued. Roll Call vote as follows:

FOR (11):

Jodie Austin	Vanessa Humaran	Lana Temple-Plotz
Jude Dean	Gene Klein	Julia Tse
Peg Harriott	Jackie Meyer	Michaela Young
Dr. Anne Hobbs	Felicia Nelsen	

AGAINST (0):

ABSTAINED (0):

ABSENT (7):

Phillip Burrell	Susan Henrie	Dave Newell
Corrie Edwards	Bobby Loud	
Leigh Esau	Sherry Moore	

MOTION CARRIED

IV. Approval of Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Jodie Austin moved to approve the February 10, 2016 FCRRRC meeting minutes as presented. Jude Dean seconded the motion. There was no discussion. Roll Call vote as follows:

FOR (12):

Jodie Austin	Dr. Anne Hobbs	Felicia Nelsen
Phillip Burrell	Vanessa Humaran	Lana Temple-Plotz
Jude Dean	Gene Klein	Julia Tse
Peg Harriott	Jackie Meyer	Michaela Young

AGAINST (0):

ABSTAINED (0):

ABSENT (6):

Corrie Edwards	Susan Henrie	Sherry Moore
Leigh Esau	Bobby Loud	Dave Newell

MOTION CARRIED

V. Co-Chair's Report

Co-Chair Klein began the report with a review of the work done at the Children's Commission annual retreat on July 19th. He noted the four areas of focus the Commission identified: Workforce issues, Technology and Data Sharing, System of Care, and Prevention Efforts. Co-Chair Klein indicated that members interested in joining any of the workgroups tackling these issues could contact the Commission Executive Committee or Staff.

VI. Public Comment

Chair Harriott invited any members of the public forward. No public comment was offered.

VII. Group Updates

a. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)

Nanette Simmons and Stacey Scholten, Administrators with the DHHS, Division of Children and Family Services (CFS), provided an update. Ms. Simmons indicated that use of the Nebraska Caregiver (NCR) tool was going well. The only instance where complication had arisen was when a youth transitioned from Probation and foster parents were confused by the rate change. She remarked that work was being done to ensure that caseworkers communicate about the completion of the NCR tool and how it may affect the amount of the reimbursement rate from what they received while the youth was under Probation.

It was noted that DHHS had yet to begin the use of the revised NCR tool that had recently been approved by the Nebraska Children's Commission. With this in mind the focus will be on ensuring that the rollout of the new NCR tool is successful. Ms. Simmons indicated that they would work with the Business Analyst to update the NFOCUS system to work with the updated tool. Future meetings would look at if there were any changes after the implementation of the new tool.

b. Nebraska Families Collaborative (NFC)

Due to scheduling complications, the individuals who worked with the NCR tool were unable to attend the meeting. Jewel Schiffers, Manager of Kinship Care Services with NFC, indicated that she would be willing to take back any questions from the Committee. She indicated that she did not believe that NFC had initiated use of the updated NCR tool and would work with staff to do so.

c. Probation

John Danforth, Funding Specialist with the Administrative Office of Probation, presented in the absence of Jeanne Brandner. Since Probation only works with high risk youth, they utilize the Intensive rate across the board and do not use the NCR tool.

VIII. Treatment Foster Care Workgroup Update

Jodie Austin Chair of the Treatment Foster Care (TFC) Workgroup and President of KVC Nebraska, presented an update on the work of the Workgroup. Ms. Austin remarked that there were a number of definitions, rates, and inclusion/exclusion criteria included in the continuum of care options that the group examined. Lana Temple-Plotz, Chief Program Officer of the Nebraska Children's Home Society, pointed out that no matter the agency or service, there were many commonalities such as completion of the NCR (with the exception of Probation) and use of Structured Decision Making (SDM).

Ms. Austin continued by mentioning that the Workgroup had struggled with determining if it should be the mode or the outcome that should be mandated under TFC. She referred the Committee to the three recommendations of the Workgroup, noting their generality. There would be need for a functional assessment of the treatment of the youth, such as the Child and Adolescent Needs and Strengths (CANS) assessment, to identify the necessary interventions. How the term treatment was defined was another topic of interest.

It was noted that many of the services mentioned were already included in the Intensive Level of Responsibility. Ms. Austin agreed that many of the services discussed were included in current wraparound services, but since they lacked an appropriate definition and criteria, Medicaid dollars were not being utilized. Creating a TFC option, would allow for more structure of services provided to the youth and family. Future work would be to identify a requirement for a functional assessment and treatment diagnosis in order to access Medicaid funds.

The Oregon Model was identified as a potential model, but the cost associated with administering it was a significant barrier. Conversation led to the consensus that there may not be one model that is appropriate for all youth. With this in mind, whatever the treatment provided to the youth it should be offered for a long

enough period to ensure stabilization. Long term goals would be to encourage a push towards prevention and aftercare efforts.

There was group dialogue surrounding the use of treatment teams. There was an identified benefit in having coordinated efforts of medical professionals as well as agency, department, and support staff in creating a unified treatment plan for youth. The Assertive Community Treatment (ACT) model was raised as an item of suggestion. While this may increase initial costs, it could reduce costs overtime if successful.

It was agreed upon that Medicaid needed to play a bigger part in the work of the Workgroup. Stacey Scholten indicated that representatives of Medicaid intended to attend the next TFC Workgroup meeting. An additional question posed for the Workgroup was if each agency would provide TFC, or if only agencies with the necessary resources would.

Conversation transitioned to the current population of foster parents. Co-Chair Harriott reminded the Committee that they were charges with monitoring the impact of the reimbursement rates on the number of foster parents in the state. She mentioned that the Committee may need to partner with the Data, Technology, Accountability, and Reporting (DTAR) Workgroup to gather this information.

Other items of note regarding TFC were voiced by the members. Issues on placement that were mentioned included ensuring that the TFC foster placements are a good fit for the youth so that the placement would cause minimal negative effects on the existing family relationships and having a limitation on the number of TFC youth to one per household with the exception of sibling groups. Another area that would need attention was the promotion of a culture that provided foster parents with the necessary confidence to take on this population of youth. Foster parents present at the meeting noted that they were more likely to turn to other foster parents for help than professionals and that they often felt ostracized at their team meetings by the use of professional language and unfamiliar acronyms.

IX. Review of Assignments/Action Plan

Chair Harriott reviewed the decisions and items to address when moving forward. Below is a list of the final assignments/action plans.

- Reports would be provided at the next FCRRRC meeting from DHHS and NFC regarding the implementation of the updated NCR tool.
- Discuss the potential options for a functional assessment under TFC including but not limited to CANS.
- Connect with the DTAR Workgroup to see if information on foster parent numbers and the correlation to reimbursement rates could be gathered.

X. New Business

There was no New Business to present.

XI. Upcoming Meeting Planning

The next FCRRRC meeting would be scheduled contingent on the progress of the Treatment Foster Care Workgroup progress. A doodle poll would be sent out to determine a date which would most likely fall in October.

XII. Adjourn

Jodi Austin motioned to adjourn. Jude Dean seconded the motion. There was no discussion. Motion carried unanimously by voice vote. The meeting was adjourned at 10:50 a.m.