



# Oregon

John A. Kitzhaber, MD, Governor

Department of Human Services

Office of the Director

500 Summer St. NE, E-62

Salem, OR 97301

Voice: 503-945-5600

Fax: 503-581-6198

April 26, 2013



The Honorable Alan Bates, Co-Chair  
The Honorable Nancy Nathanson, Co-Chair  
Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Services  
900 Court Street NE  
Salem, OR 97301

Dear Co-Chairs:

During the April 18<sup>th</sup> Department of Human Services (DHS) Policy Options Review, you asked the following questions for follow up.

**1. Question: Supervision for new case managers**

**Answer**

Supervisors in Self Sufficiency are earned at 1:15 staff. The staff is currently a combination of Eligibility Workers (HSS3's), Case Managers (CMs), Lead Workers (HSS4s), Community Resource Coordinators (PA1s) or Support Staff (HSS1s, PSR3s, OS2s, OS1s, OA2s) depending on the size of the office. With the reinvestment of Eligibility Worker (HSS3) vacancies to the Case Manager (CM) classification, no additional supervisors are needed as the supervisors will still be earned and allocated at 1 supervisor for 15 workers.

**2. Question: In talking about family stability, please provide a list/information on what you mean by family stability.**

**Answer**

In the TANF program, family stability is a focus on impacting the well-being of children as well as a means of providing a foundation (which includes supports) to improve employment and economic self-sufficiency for families. Factors that impact family stability include things like: economic insecurity, lack of work experience and skills, low wages without benefits, housing insecurity, health

problems, domestic violence, lack of education, lack of child care, and lack of transportation.

DHS' TANF and JOBS program helps families improve their family stability by:

- Helping adults obtain the skills needed for employment
- Helping adults and teen parents with high school completion and other vocational training
- Helping people become employed
- Addressing domestic violence safety concerns
- Help to avoid child welfare involvement for families at risk
- Help with finding and paying for quality child care while preparing for work
- Help with transportation needs while preparing for work
- Connecting families to community resources that help overcome challenges such as:
  - Poor credit/rental histories
  - Lack of affordable housing
  - Being homeless or at risk of homelessness
  - Having substance abuse issues
  - Having mental health problems or disabilities that are preventing a person from accessing employment or making it more difficult to find a job
  - Domestic violence safety concerns

**3. Question: Regarding continued caseload increase, is there national data to see if there has been leveling off in other places, is this (continued increase) unique to Oregon?**

**Answer**

The TANF program is funded through a block grant and each state has flexibility on how the program is designed. As a result, programs vary from state to state in both program design and in the criteria that make a family eligible for the program. During the great recession, there was wide variation in states' caseloads. A recent caseload report by the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities found that:

- **Changes in states' caseloads varied widely.** From December 2007 to December 2011, the caseload changes ranged from a high in Oregon (an 81% increase) to a 54% caseload decline in Arizona.

- **Variations in unemployment do not fully explain the variation in state caseload changes.** There is no overlap between the ten states with the largest percentage increases in the number of unemployed workers and the ten states with the largest percentage increases in TANF caseloads. The three states with the largest TANF caseload increases – Oregon, Colorado and Illinois – ranked 28, 14, and 30, respectively in the percentage increase in the number of unemployed. Meanwhile, the three states with the largest TANF caseload decreases – Arizona, Indiana, and Rhode Island – ranked 5, 16, and 23, respectively in the increase in unemployed workers.
- **State actions had a significant impact on TANF caseloads.** In response to budget pressures, several states cut TANF benefit levels, shortened or tightened time limits, or made other cutbacks during the recession, contributing to substantial caseload declines. One exception is the state of Illinois, which made an explicit choice to improve access to the program.

The Oregon Legislative Assemblies from 2009 to 2012 have prioritized maintaining access to the TANF program for very vulnerable families in need. However, there were substantial cuts made in the program in order to balance the budgets during this period. The actions include cuts to benefits (through the elimination of the Cooperation Incentive and the reduction to the State Pre-SSI/SSDI grants), and substantial cuts to the Job Opportunity and Basic Skills (JOBS) Program.

The DHS case management staff have not grown with the increase in the caseload which also limits how many families they are able to work with. The cuts in the TANF program, particularly to the JOBS program coupled with the staffing limitations and the slow economic recovery, impact the department's ability to help people leave TANF through employment. The department plans to positively impact this through the Governor's Recommended Budget's plan to repurpose certain frozen DHS positions into case management positions in 2013-15 to help more families on TANF prepare for and obtain employment.

- 4. Question: Please provide an executive summary of the University of Boston annual report regarding how our programs compare to other states in terms of employment.**

**Answer**

The Institute for Community Inclusion at the University of Massachusetts Boston produces an annual report on employment outcomes for individuals

with intellectual and other developmental disabilities. This report provides information on critical topics such as issues and trends as well as providing individual and comparative outcome information on all reporting states.

The 2012 report, which is based on 2011 data, was just distributed in the past few weeks. In regard to Oregon's comparison with other states, please see the following table:

Reporting Category	# State's Reporting	Oregon ranking in category	Oregon	Highest State	Lowest State
Total Adults with I/DD Reported	44	16	10,791	75,450 (California)	1,367 (Wyoming)
Percent in Community Integrated Employment	44	9	34%	88% (Washington)	5% (Alabama, Nebraska, Texas)
Percent in Community-Based Non-Work	35	13	41%	100% (Georgia)	0% (8 states reporting)
Percent in Facility-Based Work	37	16	23.5%	88.5% (Minnesota)	0% (8 states reporting)
Percent in Facility-Based Non-Work	35	27	26%	96% (Kentucky)	0% (5 states reporting)

The definitions used for reporting the above information are as follows:

Type of Setting/Service	Work	Non-Work
Community	Integrated employment services are provided in a community setting and involve paid employment of the participant. Specifically, integrated employment includes competitive employment, individual supported employment, group supported employment, and self-employment supports.	Community-based non-work includes all services that are focused on supporting people with disabilities to access community activities in settings where most people do not have disabilities. It does not include paid employment.
Facility	Facility-based work includes all employment services that occur in a setting where the majority of employees have a disability. These activities occur in settings where continuous job-related supports and supervision are provided to all workers with disabilities. This service category is typically referred to as a sheltered workshop, work activity center, or extended employment program.	Facility-based non-work includes all services that are located in a setting where the majority of participants have a disability and does not involve paid employment of the participant.

The total report of 368 pages can be viewed or downloaded at:  
[http://www.statedata.info/statedatabook/bluebook2012\\_final.pdf](http://www.statedata.info/statedatabook/bluebook2012_final.pdf)

The summary of the data displayed is on page 20 of the report in Table 5: Participation in Day and Employment Services in FY2011. The definitions are on page 15 in Table 1: IDD Survey Service Definitions.

**5. Question: Provide a breakdown of the stakeholders/providers who we are partnering with on this initiative (DD employment POP)**

**Answer**

At present there are 3 stakeholder groups directly working on the Employment First initiative for individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities. From a structural standpoint, most work is under the auspices of the Sustainability and Innovation Group (SIG). The SIG is a broad-based stakeholder group charged with implementation oversight of the DHS Office of Developmental Disability Services (ODDS) long-range sustainability plan. Effectively implementing the Employment First policy is part of that sustainability plan. Current membership of the SIG is comprised of the following:

- DHS staff – 8
- County Gov/Case Management – 4
- Support Service Brokerages – 5
- Service Provider Entities – 9
- Advocacy Agencies – 7
- Family/Self-Advocates – 5
- Other – 3

The advocacy entities represented include the Oregon Council on Developmental Disabilities, State and Local Arc, Disability Rights Oregon. It should be noted that some of the representative in advocacy agencies or other categories are also family members or parents of individuals with developmental disabilities and are not in the specific count of that category above. The “other” category includes training and technical assistance providers and a SEIU representative.

The SIG has several working subgroups, one of which is focused on the Employment First initiative. The membership of that group includes:

DHS staff – 2  
County Gov/Case Management – 3  
Support Service Brokerages – 1  
Service Provider Entities – 4  
Advocacy Agencies – 3  
Other – 4

In addition to the SIG, there is a school to work transition subcommittee as part of the Oregon Commission on Autism Spectrum Disorder. This subcommittee has been tied into the Employment First policy related to this critical high school transition process. Membership of this group includes:

DHS staff – 3  
Support Service Brokerages – 1  
Advocacy Agencies – 2  
Department of Education - 2

The Executive Order calls for the development and implementation of a Policy Group that includes involvement of stakeholders, including legislators. This group is to be formed by July 1, 2013 so the exact membership is yet to be defined.

**6. Question: Is there data on stability (placement stability)?**

**Answer**

Yes we do have data regarding placement stability. We are required to report to the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) and do so quarterly. We just received our Adoption and Foster Care Reporting System (AFCARS) data back from ACF. Our placement stability rate is:

**Permanency Composite 4: Placement Stability (national standard: 101.5 or higher): 104.5**

We are currently above the national standard for placement stability, which is defined by the number of moves a child has during their foster care episode. It is a composite of three things: percent of children who are in care less than 12 months with two placements or less; percent of children who are in care more than 12 but less than 24 months with 2 placements or less; and the percent of children who are in care 24 or more months with 2 placements or less.

- 7. Question: When was the last time there was a comprehensive review of dependency cases – whether they are working well or not? There are lots of agencies (DHS, Judicial). Is there a duplication of efforts, coordination of overarching goals (based on a conversation with Judge Waller)?**

**Answer**

There are multiple efforts on performance including Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA), Citizen's Review Board (CRB), and Oregon Judicial Department through their Juvenile Court Judges and dependency system. In addition there are system oversights of both Child Welfare and the Juvenile Court. Below we provided a list with brief explanations of each.

- **Case Oversight** - Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) – Provides a case by case approach to oversight from a child advocate perspective.

CRB – Provides an Administrative review, through the use of trained volunteers, of compliance in relationship to agency expectations, rules, and court ordered activities as it relates PL 96-272 which requires Court or Administrative Review at least every 6 months a child is in Foster Care.

Oregon Judicial Department – Juvenile Courts make determination of appropriateness of Child Welfare involvement and monitors ongoing progress in relationship to Oregon Revised Statute, agency expectations, Oregon Administrative Rules, and existing court ordered activities

- **System Oversight** - Juvenile Court Improvement Project (JCIP) – is a federally funded project to improve court practice in child abuse and neglect cases. The Chief Justice appoints an advisory committee to help the project define priority areas for improvement.

Federal Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) - The CFRS is the Federal Government's program for assessing the performance of State child welfare agencies with regard to achieving positive outcomes for children and families.

- 8. Question: More Information is needed on the DD/APD Case Management POPS. Please provide a White Paper.**

**Answer**

See Attachment A – Aging and People with Disabilities (APD) Case Management System/Infrastructure 3.0

Thank you.

Sincerely,



Eric Luther Moore  
Chief Financial Officer  
503-884-4701  
[eric.luther.moore@dhsosha.state.or.us](mailto:eric.luther.moore@dhsosha.state.or.us)

Enclosure

ELM/cw

cc: Laurie Byerly



### **Aging and People with Disabilities (APD) Case Management System/ Infrastructure 3.0**

APD is currently using an obsolete case management system referred to as Oregon ACCESS. APD is proposing replacement of this system with a state of the art assessment, service planning and case management system. This proposal leverages the Department's investment in the Oracle infrastructure, which is how the Department was able to keep costs low.

The timing of this request coincides perfectly with the long term care planning directives anticipated from Senate Bill 21 passage. If passed, one of the first tasks of the stakeholder workgroup will be to drive basic requirements such as the following:

- Data sharing with partners, including CCOs.
- Data access requirements
- Assessment improvement opportunities
- Assessment output, e.g. whether or not to continue using the existing service priority level assignment system.

This information, which is anticipated to be gathered in the summer and fall of 2013, will be used to begin developing the system. Once implemented, the entire APD delivery system will use it.

### **Developmental Disabilities Case Management System**

The Developmental Disabilities program does not currently have an integrated case management system. Local Community Developmental Disability Programs (CDDPs) and Support Service Brokerages have separate systems that they have developed to meet their needs. These systems do not integrate with state systems, nor do they integrate with each other. This makes data sharing across the system and with critical partners (e.g. CCOs) difficult at best. It also makes state level monitoring, data gathering and reporting difficult for state staff.

The goal of the DD case management system project is to develop an application that will begin to bridge the multiple systems together and integrate them into the state payment and data systems. The agency has begun some very preliminary gathering of business requirements, the next step being to expand the small agency group to include our county and brokerage partners. The ultimate solution will be one that will deliver the necessary functionality to meet program needs and the needs of our critical partners and provider network, as well as a solution that

integrates with key systems at the agency. We anticipate bringing stakeholders together for the business requirements development within the next 60 days, with the desire to have a solution implemented by July 2014.

### **Cost of Development in the Oracle Framework**

The Oracle framework creates an environment and set of tools that allows applications to be developed in modules that, for common functions, can be shared and modified across applications as needed. We already own the framework and will incur no additional licensing expense but will gain the efficiencies of being on a single platform across the agencies. The environment permits easy sharing of data across applications. It reduces costs by:

- Allowing an iterative approach to development. Programs can see the results at stages in the development rather than only at the end, allowing earlier adjustments for problems.
- Allowing new applications to build on the work of other applications rather than duplicating functions.
- Facilitating the exchange of information between applications. Building interfaces between applications is one of the largest costs of development in old systems.
- Allowing more of the work to be done by business analysts rather than computer coding experts.