

**Department of Human Services
2015-17 Policy Option Package Tracker**

Program	Policy Option Package Title	Summary Statement	General Fund	Other Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Positions	FTE	POP #
SS	TANF Flexibility in Design	Economic recovery has been uneven in Oregon and has not yet reached most families who participate in TANF. Caseloads remain very high. TANF participants often cannot find jobs that fit their current skills, offer a living wage or offer enough hours for them to exit the TANF program due to employment. At the same time, there are several redesigns of state systems that involve TANF families. DHS proposes a refocusing of the TANF program that fits today's realities. DHS is proposing a package of cost-neutral, targeted investments that will build the capacity of families to increase earnings and transition from TANF through an accountable, flexible and family-centered approach. The investments emphasize alignment with systems that touch or should touch TANF participants, the scaling up of best practice case management, and raising the income limits for TANF exit to create a glide path off of TANF to decrease the number of families who return to the program repeatedly. DHS proposes using savings from projected caseload savings to fund the investments.	\$ 20,000,000	\$ -	\$ (7,983,033)	\$ 12,016,967			101
OEMS	REaL-D	This Policy Option Package supports the establishment of uniform standards and practices for the collection of data on race, ethnicity, preferred spoken or signed language, preferred written language, and disability status by the Oregon Health Authority (OHA) and Department of Human Services (DHS). This POP supports designing, building and implementing a master client data service that supports the long-term strategy of a comprehensive view of the OHA/DHS client. Upon establishment of a re-useable master client service, the agency will have the capability to collect demographic information on the client that will serve multiple program and reporting needs. DHS and OHA have developed administrative rules and policies for collecting, analyzing, and reporting meaningful race, ethnicity, language and disability data (REaL+D) across DHS and OHA based on the foundation of the U.S. Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) Directive 15 (revised 1997), and adds key elements that will improve the quality of the data gathered. This POP addresses both the business and technical changes required to create a unified, sustainable model for collecting client data across both agencies. Planning for the project is occurring during the remainder of the 13-15 biennium; DHS and OHA have put in place a REaL-D Analysis and Assessment Project to inventory and analyze all business processes, systems and reports across DHS/OHA that capture, update or utilize REaL-D data. This project's focus is on a detailed assessment and impact analysis of the changes that will be required across DHS & OHA in support of the implementation of HB 2134 and the related Oregon REaL-D data collection standards. The outcome of the in-depth analysis will include a detailed business case and recommended implementation strategies for REaL-D data standards compliance.	\$ 743,644	\$ 1,000,000	\$ -	\$ 1,743,644	3	2.84	201
APD	DHS Non-MAGI Eligibility Project	At Agency Request Budget, this was a placeholder POP. At the Governor's Budget, the POP was redirected to work on Non-MAGI Eligibility Automation. Department of Human Services (DHS) seeks \$7.5 M TF (\$6.75M FF, \$0.75M GF) to implement a planning effort to prepare for the implementation of an eligibility system for its non-MAGI (Modified Adjusted Gross Income) Medicaid programs. DHS is committed to completing thorough planning to provide a framework for phased delivery of functionality that demonstrates meaningful progress in short increments of time.	\$ 750,000	\$ -	\$ 6,750,000	\$ 7,500,000			103

**Department of Human Services
2015-17 Policy Option Package Tracker**

Program	Policy Option Package Title	Summary Statement	General Fund	Other Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Positions	FTE	POP #
I/DD	Employment Outcomes for People with I/DD	Youth and adults with intellectual and developmental disabilities (I/DD) are significantly underrepresented in Oregon's workforce. With appropriate services and assistance, persons with I/DD are capable of employment. The state is seeking to increase competitive employment of I/DD persons in integrated workplaces through the Department of Human Services' (DHS) Employment First Policy and Governor Kitzhaber's Executive Order 13-04. The order directs state agencies and programs, including DHS' Office of Developmental Disability Services and Vocational Rehabilitation, to take various steps and to achieve specific goals. In order fulfill the policy and order, this POP requests funding for: a. Six Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors, Two Human Services Specialists and 1 Operations and Policy Analyst to serve increasing numbers of youth with intellectual and developmental disabilities and increase engagement with school districts participating in Youth Transition Program (YTP) and with state I/DD system. b. 10.5 contract Benefits Counselors to provide benefits counseling services to persons with disabilities, including those with I/DD; and two Operations and Policy Analysts to train, oversee and support the counselors; and to plan future delivery of these services. c. An Employment First Transformation Fund and Operations and Policy Analyst to identify, research and promote utilization of best and evidence-based practices that facilitate competitive employment of I/DD persons and promote continues improvement of related services.	\$ 4,358,223	\$ -	\$ 841,898	\$ 5,200,121	12	10.80	104
APD	Adult Protective Services I.T. System	This is a POP to develop a streamlined and Integrated Statewide Adult Abuse and Report Writing System. Phase I planning was approved by the Emergency Board in March 2014. This POP assumes the planning is completed and the Phase II development is ready to proceed based on the Phase 1 business case and solicitation documents. It is also planned to keep close connection between program, OIS, DAS and LFO on the gate review processes and progress of this project. The need for a stable, integrated Abuse Data and Report-writing System is critical as Oregon faces an aging population, an annual increase of 5-8% in abuse referrals, and an increased need for services across all demographics. Currently all funding is assumed as GF but DHS is pursuing other avenues of Federal Funds that may or may not become available. Assumes \$2 million of Q-bond available.	\$ 1,437,494	\$ 2,000,000	\$ -	\$ 3,437,494	-	-	107
OPI	Child Welfare Quality Control Reviewer Staff	The position requested in this POP will increase the QC review capacity in the statewide Child Welfare Quality Assurance system to include stakeholder interviews, which are federally required as part of each state's Continuous Quality Improvement in Child Welfare program. This requirement can be found in the federal Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 and the Administration for Children and Families Information Memorandum CB-IM 12-07 dated August 27, 2012. There are currently 3 FTE in the Child Welfare review team. This additional position will enable the state to complete federally mandated Children and Family Services Review (CFSR) as required and mitigate the risk for federal penalties and imposed program improvement plans.	\$ 79,725	\$ -	\$ 79,725	\$ 159,450	1	1.00	108

**Department of Human Services
2015-17 Policy Option Package Tracker**

Program	Policy Option Package Title	Summary Statement	General Fund	Other Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Positions	FTE	POP #
CW	Program Infrastructure	With additional workload associated with CW system transformation, additional infrastructure is needed to assure that the program can meet its aggressive foster care reduction and family stability/child safety targets. This request also creates support for cross-system alignment with the education and health/behavioral health systems to ensure that children experiencing foster care fully benefit from the systems transformation underway in those areas. This POP requests 15 OPA3s, 2 PA2s, 2 PEM Es, one PEM D and 3 AS2s to staff adequately the strategies currently underway. These include additional support for the expansion of Differential Response, implementation of the Title IV-E waiver that will support the service array for DR, Educational Advocacy for children in care, adequate monitoring of psychotropic medication, support for ILP and Youth support services, increased support to address programmatic needs for Commercially Sexually Exploited Children, additional support for Behavioral Rehabilitation Services delivery, contracting, training, and the centralized hotline. Also adds four ORKIDS accountants 1s for payment processing and research and two positions to support Child Welfare work by the Legislative Legal Unit.	\$ 2,183,289	\$ -	\$ 2,176,226	\$ 4,359,515	29	21.75	109
I/DD	Build Capacity for SACU clients in Prov Comm	As Stabilization and Crisis Unit (SACU formerly SOCP) moves toward a crisis resource for residential resources for the most vulnerable adults and children across the State of Oregon, a strong need has emerged to support the current SACU population with enhanced services in community placed settings. To that end, the need for a focused strategic plan to address the "stepping down" of severely disabled, although NOT in crisis, individuals currently served through SACU resources is immediate, cost effective and necessary. Additionally, the expanded supports and services provided to individuals through the "K" Plan are requiring increased provider capacity in all aspects of our service delivery - both agency providers and Personal Support Workers. This POP supports a plan to expand provider capacity with start-up or "grant funds" to provider agencies and others throughout the state who will build residential homes targeted at a specific SACU population each agency agrees to serve if that agency is awarded a grant. It would also provide grant funds for entities interested in developing capacity for serving non-SACU individuals in their own homes or in other community living settings.	\$ 653,730	\$ -	\$ 153,258	\$ 806,988	2	1.76	110
I/DD	Provider Rate Increases	DHS is requesting a 4% increase, effective 1/1/2016, in all non-bargained provider types, residential and non-residential, agency providers. 4% is less than the combined COLAs for the previous three biennia but will allow these agencies to increase direct staff wages and/or benefits for those that serve our I/DD individuals. The Direct Support Professionals that provide services through provider agencies are currently allocated \$10.80 per hour in our budget models. This package will allow an increase of 4% to that model, bringing the base rate to \$11.23.	\$ 8,537,069	\$ -	\$ 18,163,987	\$ 26,701,056	-	-	111
SS	SS - backfill empty OF & restoration of pos.	This combination of policy option packages eliminates all the empty other fund limitation in virtually all Self Sufficiency positions and replacing it with a combination of General and Federal Funds. The empty other fund limitation issue is primarily the result of actions taken prior to the 2003-05 session to hit a GF target at the time, where all positions were provided some other fund limitation. In addition the loss of provider and hospital tax funding for Self Sufficiency positions, to free up GF in 2011-13 and 2013-15, was not permanently backfilled. DHS has been managing to the budget for several biennia through vacancy savings. The Federal Fund backfill is from the TANF flexibility in design POP 101. The remaining backfill is General Funds. This combination of actions will keep the Self Sufficiency workload model at 76.7%.	\$ 10,000,000	\$ (15,049,969)	\$ 7,983,033	\$ 2,933,064	17	17.00	070/ 113
VR	No Cost Position Authority Request	The policy option package is requesting position authority to clear all of the double filled positions within the Vocational Rehabilitation program. These positions currently have the necessary funding to support them. These positions were hired to serve the ever expanding need for rehabilitation services by Oregon residents, as well as meeting required over site of program based on federal reviews and reporting requirements. Vocational Rehabilitation has been able to fund these by reducing contract costs and managing spending related to client services.	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	19	19.00	119

**Department of Human Services
2015-17 Policy Option Package Tracker**

Program	Policy Option Package Title	Summary Statement	General Fund	Other Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds	Positions	FTE	POP #
OFRA	Oregon Enterprise Data Analytics	State agencies increasingly need to analyze data across all agencies serving the same clients/customers to improve their ability to design effective programs, achieve outcomes, minimize risks and find efficiencies. This helps to bring the right resources and services to the right families at the right time by identifying risk levels and strategically targeting services to produce outcomes. Some agencies have already built combined data sets for analysis purposes. This POP extends this work to more agencies and builds the resources to make use of this data. All positions are in shared services Office of Forecasting Research and Analysis (OFRA) as they would answer to multiple agencies.	\$ 946,393	\$ 1,889,626	\$ 943,233	\$ 3,779,252	13	8.45	121
SS	TANF Investigator POP	Currently, Overpayment and Recovery's (OPAR) client fraud investigators have caseloads in excess of 300 cases each. This is excessive and additional resources are needed to properly decrease the backlogged workload. Further, an investigator's work often happens in client homes and in adversarial situations where safety is a concern. These new staff (7 FTE, Investigator 3 classification; 10 FTE, Investigator 2 classification; 2 FTE, Office Specialist 2; 2 FTE, Administrative Specialist 2; 1 FTE, Program Manager C) would provide the additional investigative staffing needed to right-size the investigations unit, reduce existing safety concerns, as well as expand capacity for utilizing new data-mining and GIS fraud-identification techniques. The expected recovery estimate in program budgets can provide some programmatic offset to this POP cost. In addition overall Return on Investment (ROI) including federal funds provides a minimum ROI of \$1:1 in total fund to total fund recovery for taxpayers overall.	\$ 884,248	\$ 1,314,776	\$ 763,687	\$ 2,962,711	22	9.24	123
SS	Early Learning ERDC Investment	Enhanced funding for food programs, which have been transferred from the Oregon Department of Housing and Community Services.	\$ 49,570,687	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 49,570,687	-	-	129
SS	Transfer Food Assistance	Additional investment in Employment Related Day Care in support of the Governor's Early Learning initiative, providing greater access to quality childcare for Oregon's working families.	\$ 1,772,578		\$ 1,786,327	\$ 3,558,905	-	-	301
APD	LTCO	This Package 070 was created to allow the Budget to align with the Long-Term Care Ombudsman.	\$ -	\$ (20,087)	\$ (58,436)	\$ (78,523)	-	-	070
TOTAL DHS POPs			\$ 101,917,080	\$ (8,865,654)	\$ 31,599,905	\$ 124,651,331	118	91.84	

2015-17 Policy Option Package

<u>Agency Name:</u>	Department of Human Services (DHS)
<u>Program Area Name:</u>	Office of Self-Sufficiency
<u>Program Name:</u>	Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Re-design
<u>Policy Option Package Initiative:</u>	N/A
<u>Policy Option Package Title:</u>	TANF Flexibility in Design
<u>Policy Option Package Number:</u>	101
<u>Related Legislation:</u>	N/A
<u>Program Funding Team:</u>	Economy and Jobs

Summary Statement:

The economic recession and slow economic recovery resulted in one of the highest jobless rates in the nation. Demand for public benefits skyrocketed at the same time that social services, education and workforce programs at all levels took deep cuts. As the economy continues to recover, the Department is working with Legislators, partners, advocates and others on a package to re-design the state’s Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and the Job Opportunity and Basic Skills (JOBS) program. This Policy Option Package represents targeted investments that will build the capacity of families to increase earnings and transition from TANF through an accountable, flexible, and person-centered approach. This policy option calls for reinvesting savings from a projected decline in the TANF caseload into nine strategies to improve participant outcomes. The strategies are organized into the following five categories: (1) reducing the number of participants affected by the “fiscal cliff” when they become employed; (2) simplifying eligibility requirements to strengthen family connections and stability for children; (3) expanding family stability services; (4) increasing flexibility in support services to prevent families from entering TANF; and (5) improving program capacity to provide strength-based, customized and outcome-focused case management.

	General Fund	Other Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds
<u>Policy Option</u> <u>Package Pricing:</u>	\$20,000,000	\$0	(\$7,983,033)	\$12,016,967

1. WHAT WOULD THIS POLICY OPTION PACKAGE (POP) DO AND HOW WOULD IT BE IMPLEMENTED?

The Great Recession left a lingering toll on Oregon. The number of jobless Oregonians and applicants for public assistance skyrocketed to some of the highest in the nation. At the same time, social services, education and workforce systems at all levels took deep budget cuts. Organizations lacked the capacity and resources to help all who were in need, especially those with the most barriers to employment. Recovery has not been consistent across the state. Some areas still face double-digit unemployment rates. Many parents work but can't make ends meet due to low wages, insufficient benefits and few prospects for career advancement. Others face steep barriers to employment because of low literacy, health problems, or lack of work experience or education. For DHS, public assistance caseloads remain high compared to pre-recession caseloads, and although staffing levels have improved, the agency knows from best practice research that it must balance family entered case management, support services and flexible, targeted resources to put families on a path to permanent self-reliance.

Oregon recognizes that no single organization or system has the resources or responsibility to reduce poverty. Promising policy initiatives have been launched to move people out of poverty and up the economic ladder through employment. These and other policy decisions, along with economic factors and funding trends in Oregon, point to the need for social services and public agency partners to reduce duplication, increase effectiveness and collaboratively address the intensive need for services with available resources. The TANF Reinvestment Proposal aligns with the statewide initiatives, and strengthens collaborations and family-centered case management to bring better results for the most challenged in Oregon.

As the economy continues to recover, the Department is working with Legislators, partners, advocates and others on a package to reinvest in the state's Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and the Job Opportunity and Basic Skills (JOBS) program. This Policy Option Package represents targeted investments that will build the capacity of families to increase earnings and transition from TANF through an accountable, flexible, and person-centered approach.

The strategies included in this policy option are organized into the following five categories: (1) reducing the number of participants affected by the "fiscal cliff" when they become employed; (2) simplifying eligibility requirements to strengthen family connections and stability for children; (3) expanding family stability services; (4) increasing flexibility in support services to prevent families from entering TANF; and (5) improving program capacity to provide strength-based, customized and outcome-focused case management.

Implementation

Implementation of this policy option will require amendments to Oregon Revised Statutes, Oregon Administrative Rules, Family Services Manual, and TANF core training. This policy option will also require new or expanded performance based interagency and contract agreements.

2. WHY DOES DHS PROPOSE THIS POP?

Currently, with the economy improving and the current forecast showing reduced caseloads in the 2015-17 biennium, the Department feels this is the right time for reinvesting in the TANF program. This package targets investments that will build the capacity of families to increase earnings and transition from TANF through an accountable, flexible and person-centered approach.

Families may need support as they transition off of TANF and into employment. Currently approximately 27% of families who leave the TANF program return within a year. Adding supports to the TANF program at critical parts of the continuum will help families improve their employment outcomes and self-reliance.

Additionally, the Department recognizes that families accessing the program may need additional supports through expanded family stability services before leaving the program.

This package also relies on Policy Option #113 to provide expanded intensive case management capacity in order to provide strength-based, customized and outcome-focused services.

3. HOW DOES THIS FURTHER THE AGENCY’S MISSION OR GOALS? HOW DOES THIS FURTHER THE PROGRAM FUNDING TEAM OUTCOMES OR STRATEGIES?

This policy option package supports the Department’s mission and goals of assisting people to be safe, become independent and support themselves and their families through stable living wage employment.

4. IS THIS POP TIED TO A DHS PERFORMANCE MEASURE? IF YES, IDENTIFY THE PERFORMANCE MEASURE. IF NO, HOW WILL DHS MEASURE THE SUCCESS OF THIS POP?

This policy option package ties to DHS Key Performance Measures of: (1) TANF Family Stability and (2) TANF Re-entry.

In addition, this package will drive toward the following outcomes:

- Increase the number of people going to work
- Decrease the number of people who return to TANF
- Improve customer engagement and mutual accountability through effective application of the family-centered service model
- Support the safety, health and school readiness of children
- Increase the number of customers who meet work participation requirements
- Leverage community partnerships for improved client outcomes
- Streamline and simplify policy, rules and practice to increase accuracy, staff capacity and efficiency.

5. DOES THIS POP REQUIRE A CHANGE(S) TO AN EXISTING STATUTE OR REQUIRE A NEW STATUTE? IF YES, IDENTIFY THE STATUTE AND THE LEGISLATIVE CONCEPT.

Yes. Simplifying eligibility such as eliminating deprivation as an eligibility requirement would necessitate amending ORS 412.001 and 412.114. Also, this policy option package may eventually be linked with LC# 466 in a bill. LC# 466 amends time limit law at ORS 412.079 and also amends Section 8, chapter 604, Oregon Laws 2011, associated to suspensions to the TANF program design reflected in HB 2469 from the 2007 Legislative Session.

6. WHAT ALTERNATIVES WERE CONSIDERED AND WHAT WERE THE REASONS FOR REJECTING THEM?

The Department first identified the total need that would align resources and program structure to enable the TANF and JOBS programs to operate as fully intended by the 2007 Legislative Assembly. However, a more realistic scenario is to target investments in the program that have the highest likelihood to produce the best results for families based on known best practices.

7. WHAT WOULD BE THE ADVERSE EFFECTS OF NOT FUNDING THIS POP?

The current TANF and JOBS program structure is inadequate for supporting families in meeting their goals. If this option is not funded, families leaving the TANF program will continue to experience a cliff effect as they become employed.

8. WHAT OTHER AGENCIES (STATE, TRIBAL AND/OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT) WOULD BE AFFECTED BY THIS POP? HOW WOULD THEY BE AFFECTED?

Members of Oregon Tribes who avail themselves of TANF services will also benefit from the investments in this policy option package.

Changes in TANF caseloads have a direct impact on the Division of Child Support Cases.

Expanding family stabilization services requires continued partnerships and coordination with community-based organizations and other helping agencies.

9. WHAT OTHER AGENCIES, PROGRAMS or STAKEHOLDERS ARE COLLABORATING ON THIS POP?

The TANF Alliance has been collaborating with DHS on this policy option package. The Division of Child Support has been informed of DHS placeholder Legislative Concepts and associated policy option packages.

10. WHAT IS YOUR EQUITY ANALYSIS?

The provisions included in this policy option package are intended to benefit all TANF beneficiaries. Any contracted services procured through this package will be required to provide culturally, linguistically and gender appropriate service delivery.

11. WHAT ASSUMPTIONS AFFECT THE PRICING OF THIS POP?

The current forecast indicates the TANF caseload will be lower in the 2015-17 biennium compared to the 2013-15 biennium. This policy option package assumes \$20 million of the caseload savings projected in the forecast over the current biennium will be reinvested into the TANF program.

Implementation Date(s): October 2015

End Date (if applicable): N/A

a. Will there be new responsibilities for DHS? Specify which Program Area(s) and describe their new responsibilities.

DHS Office of Self-Sufficiency

DHS Budget and Accounting

Office of Contracts and Procurement

Office of Information Technology

Office of Information Security and Privacy

b. Will there be new Shared Services impacts sufficient to require additional funding? Specify which office(s) (i.e., facilities, computer services, etc.) and describe how it will be affected.

No.

c. Will there be changes to client caseloads or services provided to population groups? Specify how many in each relevant program.

Yes. Certain policy changes such as eligibility simplification and reducing the number of participants affected by the fiscal cliff will likely cause an increase in the caseload after implementation. It is anticipated that expanding contracts to focus on family stabilization, increasing amounts and flexibility in the use of support services and the case management system capacity investment in POP #113 will also mean that connections to the right menu of services through DHS and other community partners will be made more effectively and will help families connect to employment or other alternatives faster.

- d. Will it take new staff or will existing positions be modified? For each classification, list the number of positions and the number of months the positions will work in each biennium. Specify if the positions are permanent, limited duration or temporary.**

No.

- e. What are the start-up costs, such as new or significant modifications to computer systems, new materials, outreach and training?**

This package will result in administrative costs associated with amendments to Oregon Statutes, Administrative rules, manuals and training. There are anticipated costs of mailings to customers associated with the changes to the program. There are costs anticipated to modify IT systems in order to implement certain policy changes.

- f. What are the ongoing costs?**

A total of \$20 million in investments funded through General Funds.

- g. What are the potential savings?**

It is anticipated that the investments included in this policy option package will result in savings to other systems such as child welfare but the amount of savings cannot be estimated at this time.

- h. Based on these answers, is there a fiscal impact?**

Yes. This policy Option package has a \$20 million General Fund fiscal impact, however, if it is assumed that this reinvestment will be covered through projected savings in the next biennium based on the current forecast.

TOTAL FOR THIS PACKAGE

<u>Category</u>	<u>GF</u>	<u>OF</u>	<u>FF</u>	<u>TF</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Special Payments	\$20,000,000	\$0	(\$7,983,033)	\$12,016,967		
Total	\$20,000,000	\$0	(\$7,983,033)	\$12,016,967	0	0.00

DHS - Fiscal Impact Summary by Program Area:

	Self Sufficiency Program	Total DHS
General Fund	\$20,000,000	\$20,000,000
Other Fund	\$0	\$0
Federal Funds- Ltd	(\$7,983,033)	(\$7,983,033)
Total Funds	\$12,016,967	\$12,016,967
Positions	0	0
FTE	0.00	0.00

What are the sources of funding and the funding split for each one?

Self Sufficiency Revenue Impact:

<u>Description of Revenue</u>	<u>OF</u>	<u>FF</u>	<u>TF</u>
TANF (Comp Srce 0995)	0	(\$7,983,033)	(\$7,983,033)
Total	\$0	(\$7,983,033)	(\$7,983,033)

2015-17 Policy Option Package

Agency Name: DHS/OHA
Program Area Name: DHS Central Services
Program Name: Office of Equity and Multicultural Services (OEMS) and Office of Equity and Inclusion (OEI)
Policy Option Package Initiative: N/A
Policy Option Package Title: REaL-D
Policy Option Package Number: 201
Related Legislation: N/A
Program Funding Team: Improving Government

Summary Statement:

This Policy Option Package supports the establishment of uniform standards and practices for the collection of data on race, ethnicity, preferred spoken or signed language, preferred written language, and disability status by the Oregon Health Authority (OHA) and Department of Human Services (DHS).

In the current OHA/DHS systems architecture, the agency would be required to modify all systems, duplicate information across multiple systems and will most likely ask the same demographic questions of clients multiple times across the various programs.

This POP supports designing, building and implementing a master client data service that supports the long-term strategy of a comprehensive view of the OHA/DHS client. Upon establishment of a re-useable master client service, the agency will have the capability to collect demographic information on the client that will serve multiple program and reporting needs. One key focus is aligning the data systems used for collection and reporting of race, ethnicity, language and disability data with the new standard to promote health and service equity for all programs and activities within the Department of Human Services (DHS and

Oregon Health Authority (OHA).

DHS and OHA have developed administrative rules and policies for collecting, analyzing, and reporting meaningful race, ethnicity, language and disability data (REAL+D) across DHS and OHA based on the foundation of the U.S. Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) Directive 15 (revised 1997), and adds key elements that will improve the quality of the data gathered. This POP addresses both the business and technical changes required to create a unified, sustainable model for collecting client data across both agencies.

This POP will help establish the base master client service. Programs and systems utilizing this service will need to be determined through the 2014-2015 business analysis and systems assessment for REAL+D. The master client service will be an ongoing resource that supports systems and business processes alignment with HB 2134.

For the remainder of the 13-15 biennium (July 1, 2014-June 30,2015); DHS and OHA have put in place a REAL-D Analysis and Assessment Project to inventory and analyze all business processes, systems and reports across DHS/OHA that capture, update or utilize REAL-D data. This project's focus is on a detailed assessment and impact analysis of the changes that will be required across DHS & OHA in support of the implementation of HB 2134 and the related Oregon REAL-D data collection standards. The outcome of the in-depth analysis will include a detailed business case and recommended implementation strategies for REAL-D data standards compliance.

DHS	General Fund	Other Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds
<u>Policy Option Package Pricing:</u>	\$743,644	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$1,743,644

OHA	General Fund	Other Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds
<u>Policy Option Package Pricing:</u>	\$1,771,152	\$0	\$0	\$1,771,152

1. WHAT WOULD THIS POLICY OPTION PACKAGE (POP) DO AND HOW WOULD IT BE IMPLEMENTED?

This policy option package would leverage recent technology investments that support master data management to support the establishment of a master client service. Funds would be used to architect, design and implement re-useable approaches for systems to utilize a master client service including application interfaces for current systems to leverage the master data repository.

For the remainder of the 13-15 biennium (July 1, 2014-June 30, 2015), DHS and OHA will implement a REAL+D Analysis and Assessment Project to inventory and analyze all business processes, systems and reports across DHS/OHA that capture, update or utilize REAL+D data. This project will focus on a detailed assessment and impact analysis of the changes that will be required across DHS & OHA to support implementation of HB 2134 and the related Oregon REAL+D data collection standards. The outcome of the in-depth analysis will include a detailed business case and recommended implementation strategies for REAL+D data standards compliance.

Funding of this POP would support implementation of a common approach for allowing workers and clients to view, update and maintain their own profile based upon the data collection requirements, including REAL+D. This approach would provide appropriate access to DHS and OHA analytics groups to collect,

analyze and report on services related to various demographics to help reduce health and human services disparities. Better data would support better business functions and policies by increasing understanding of the causes of disparities, supporting the design effective responses, and supporting the evaluation of improvements over time.

2. WHY DO DHS and OHA PROPOSE THIS POP?

The Department of Human Services and the Oregon Health Authority both established equity (service equity and health equity) as part of their core values. However, problems with data prevent both agencies from knowing the full extent of inequity and from measuring the impact of efforts to assure equity. Tremendous inconsistencies exist in the data that different government, health, and human service agencies, and programs within agencies collect. Even definition of the terms “race,” “ethnicity,” or “disability” vary across key government, health, and human service institutions (i.e. Census, Office of Management and Budget, Institute of Medicine, Oregon Health Care Quality Corporation, etc.). Agency and contractor staff often lack training in best practice methods for collecting race, ethnicity, language and disability demographic information in a respectful and non-intrusive manner.

The data collection standards used by state agencies are inconsistent and insufficient to adequately assess the status and needs of Oregon’s communities of color, and immigrant and refugee communities. The inadequate data collection standards make it difficult to analyze how race, ethnicity and language impact individual and community health, making services more expensive and less effective in addressing community needs. Improving data systems is a key component of continuous quality improvement efforts that lead to health and service equity.

DHS and OHA need to implement a more sustainable model to support the current and future needs. The agency needs to implement data standards, data architecture and data governance to address the current requirements and implement business practices to provide flexibility and ensure data quality.

3. HOW DOES THIS FURTHER THE AGENCY’S MISSION OR GOALS? HOW DOES THIS FURTHER THE PROGRAM FUNDING TEAM OUTCOMES OR STRATEGIES?

Both DHS and OHA are focused on equity and inclusion in the service of the citizens of Oregon. Without a unified method of collecting this information, it is not possible for the agencies to effectively review the results of their services and identify ways to improve services to certain populations. The standardized methodology will allow DHS and OHA to demonstrate progress towards reductions in racial and ethnic disparities by increasing transparency in reporting indicators by race and ethnicity. In addition, it will allow DHS and OHA to be consistent with federal reporting expectations and facilitate comparison of Oregon’s progress to address racial and ethnic disparities with national trends.

4. IS THIS POP TIED TO A DHS and OHA PERFORMANCE MEASURE? IF YES, IDENTIFY THE PERFORMANCE MEASURE. IF NO, HOW WILL DHS and OHA MEASURE THE SUCCESS OF THIS POP?

Having client data routinely and accurately collected by race, ethnicity, language and disability will assist DHS and OHA in better understanding disparities in need, access, quality, and outcomes of services. The data will assist both agencies in supporting and developing community partnerships to close gaps, implementing quality improvement and customer satisfaction improvement initiatives, as well as to know how to set diversity goals to achieve parity with the agencies’ client populations.

This POP is directly tied to several outcome measures for the Department of Human Services: 05: Service Equity; 06: Employee Engagement; 04: Customer Satisfaction and 07: Workforce Diversity. It is also directly tied to one of DHS’ Breakthroughs: Improving Service Equity; as well as process measure OP2.3: Ensuring equitable access and inclusivity.

Efforts to improve data collection across OHA directly address the key goals, core and sub-processes defined by the OHA Strategic Plan and operational fundamentals, including the following:

- Ensuring data integrity
- Ensuring equity in policy and program design
- Ensuring equity in program delivery
- Providing or ensuring culturally responsive interventions
- Establishing and implementing quality control mechanisms
- Ensuring health, safety and client rights in publicly-funded programs
- Ensuring civil rights for customers, members, clients and participants
- Assessing quality and return on investment
- Ensuring accountability for results

5. DOES THIS POP REQUIRE A CHANGE(S) TO AN EXISTING STATUTE OR REQUIRE A NEW STATUTE? IF YES, IDENTIFY THE STATUTE AND THE LEGISLATIVE CONCEPT.

No.

6. WHAT ALTERNATIVES WERE CONSIDERED AND WHAT WERE THE REASONS FOR REJECTING THEM?

After the REAL+D Policy came into effect, the Office of Information Services (OIS) within DHS and OHA estimated the cost impacts of modifying 17 of the 40 legacy systems which contain person information to address the data collection requirements. Those estimates did not include organizational change management, training, survey modification, forms modification or analysis of sensitive data systems miscellaneous operational and contractual constraints. The total cost of implementation across all systems, forms and surveys on an ongoing basis will continue to grow especially if there are changes in other client demographic reporting requirements and would still not help either organization in getting a comprehensive view of our clients. Neither agency has been able to prioritize this technical work as compared to the other

operational and high priority projects such as Modernization, Health Insurance Exchange, and Health System Transformation. Even with the technical modifications, there would still be an impact to workers in both agencies as each of their separate systems is modified.

7. WHAT WOULD BE THE ADVERSE EFFECTS OF NOT FUNDING THIS POP?

Without funding for this project DHS and OHA would not have the ability to effectively collect timely and reliable data to assist in identifying racial, ethnic, language and disability disparities. The agency performed preliminary analysis for estimated staff time impacts to modifying over 40 different DHS and OHA legacy systems which are a blend of highly diverse technologies, extremely fragile DHS mainframe systems, on highly complex infrastructure, and involving many transactional interfaces. Even if the agency had the ability to do this work, the agency would still be faced with field operations impacted and the expectation that there would be a similar investment in the future when additional data collection is required.

8. WHAT OTHER AGENCIES (STATE, TRIBAL AND/OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT) WOULD BE AFFECTED BY THIS POP? HOW WOULD THEY BE AFFECTED?

Improvements in data collection will support the dissemination of accurate data to other state, tribal and local governments, as well as Coordinated Care Organizations and community based organizations. The implementation of this POP would make data reporting and analysis more consistent between DHS and OHA and its governmental partners. It would also provide better data to governmental partners who are also assuring equitable access to and outcomes of services.

9. WHAT OTHER AGENCIES, PROGRAMS or STAKEHOLDERS ARE COLLABORATING ON THIS POP?

This POP has been a collaboration between DHS/OHA. As a shared service OIS has also been collaborating with DHS/OHA providing guidance as OIS will be delivering the IT solution. The steering committee that

will implement this POP will include representatives of stakeholders and programs who will be impacted by the system changes.

10. WHAT IS YOUR EQUITY ANALYSIS?

DHA and OHA both established equity (service equity and health equity) as part of their core values. As the Office of Equity and Multicultural Services and the Office of Equity and Inclusion both focus on equity, the equity analysis of this situation is detailed throughout the POP. In short, problems with collecting and analyzing data by race, ethnicity, language and disability prevent both agencies from knowing the full extent of inequity and from measuring the impact of efforts to assure equity. The inadequate data collection standards make it difficult to analyze how race, ethnicity and language and disability impact individual and community health, making services more expensive and less effective in addressing community needs. Agency and contractor staff often lack training in best practice methods for collecting race, ethnicity, language and disability demographic information in a respectful and non-intrusive manner. Improving data systems is a key component of continuous quality improvement efforts that lead to health and service equity. The ability to present disaggregated data adds immeasurable value to quality assurance and quality improvement efforts, promotes stewardship of limited public funding, and promotes responsiveness and transparency in governmental processes.

11. WHAT ASSUMPTIONS AFFECT THE PRICING OF THIS POP?

A core REAL+D analysis team will be performing in depth analysis to facilitate the development of a strategy and implementation plan for compliance and adherence to REAL+D standards. Preliminary estimates predict that there are over 40 systems that use client demographic data that could be impacted by REAL+D. In-depth analysis is required to confirm all systems, business processes, programs and stakeholders that would be impacted by REAL+D standards.

Additional assumptions include the need for redesigned forms on which demographic data are collected, staff training REAL+D data collection and communications to support client awareness of new policy and requests for demographic data.

Both agencies are currently assuming that existing technology investments made supporting master data management capabilities would still be available to be leveraged to support the creation of a master client service.

Current agency work effort surrounding the creation on enterprise definitions of “client” would support the development of a master client service.

Implementation Date(s): July 1, 2015

End Date (if applicable): ongoing – until current systems are modified as much as possible and until new systems build in the standard upon development

a. Will there be new responsibilities for DHS and OHA? Specify which Program Area(s) and describe their new responsibilities.

All DHS program staff that collect person-level information. DHS data analytics staff

all OHA program staff who collect person-level information OHA data analytics staff

- b. **Will there be new Shared Services impacts sufficient to require additional funding? Specify which office(s) (i.e., facilities, computer services, etc.) and describe how it will be affected. See Addendum A - Shared Services LC/POP Impact Questionnaire (at the end of this document).**

Yes, standard office equipment and supplies for new staff listed in the POP.

- c. **Will there be changes to client caseloads or services provided to population groups? Specify how many in each relevant program.**

No

- d. **Will it take new staff or will existing positions be modified? For each classification, list the number of positions and the number of months the positions will work in each biennium. Specify if the positions are permanent, limited duration or temporary.**

Positions	# of months	Type
1- ISS8 Data Architect (OIS)	24 months	Permanent
1- ISS8 Application Integration Architect (OIS)	24 months	Permanent
2- OPA4 Business Architect (1 for DHS and 1 for OHA)	24 months	Permanent
1- PM3 Project Manager (OIS)	22 months	Permanent
4- OPA2 Business Transition Training Specialists (2 OHA, 2 DHS)	22 months	Permanent
2- ISS7 Configuration Specialists (1 for DHS and 1 for OHA)	22 months	Permanent
1 - ISS6 Testing Specialist (OIS)	22 months	Permanent

\$2,870,700 – Personal Services

e. What are the start-up costs, such as new or significant modifications to computer systems, new materials, outreach and training?

Expand DAS Enterprise Architecture Tool Capability to support effort	\$15,000
Technical Training	\$15,000
Technical Consultant for Siebel MDM tool	\$150,000
Technical Consultants/System Integrator MDM implementation and Oracle SOA implementation and Oracle SOA implementation (contracts)	\$650,000
QA (contract, as required)	\$200,000
Subtotal	\$1,075,000

f. What are the ongoing costs?

Enterprise Architecture Tool	\$25,000
Infrastructure for EA Tool	\$20,000
Subtotal	\$45,000

g. What are the potential savings?

Improvements in the data collection systems will streamline data analysis because all systems will collect data in a consistent manner. We anticipate savings in time and staff resources in data analysis and reporting. Additionally, as we are able to unmask health disparities and inequities through the standardized collection of disaggregated data, we anticipate improvements in the way the state and its external partners provide services, resulting in reduced costs for OHA, DHS and external partners.

h. Based on these answers, is there a fiscal impact?

Yes.

TOTAL FOR THIS PACKAGE

<u>Category</u>	<u>GF</u>	<u>OF</u>	<u>FF</u>	<u>TF</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Personal Services	\$469,168	\$0	\$0	\$469,168	3	2.84
Services & Supplies	\$274,476	\$1,000,000	0	\$1,274,476		
Total	\$743,644	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$1,743,644	3	2.84

DHS - Fiscal Impact Summary by Program Area:

	DHS Central	Total DHS
General Fund	\$743,644	\$743,644
Other Fund	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
Federal Funds- Ltd	\$0	\$0
Total Funds	\$1,743,644	\$1,743,644
Positions	3	3
FTE	2.84	2.84

What are the sources of funding and the funding split for each one?

The Other Funds should be Q Bonds. Due to an error of omission in the Agency Request and Governor's Budget, these Other Funds are just Other Funds limitation at this time. It is the expectation that DHS will continue to work with Department of Administrative Services and the Legislative Fiscal Office to change this limitation to Q Bonds by Legislatively Adopted Budget.

2015-17 Policy Option Package

Agency Name: Department of Human Services
Program Area Name: DHS
Program Name: DHS APD
Policy Option Package Initiative: N/A
Policy Option Package Title: DHS Non-MAGI Eligibility Project
Policy Option Package Number: 103
Related Legislation: N/A
Program Funding Team: Improving Government

Summary
Statement:

At Agency Request Budget, this was a placeholder POP. At the Governor’s Budget, the POP was redirected to work on Non-MAGI Eligibility Automation. The summary which follows lays out the high-level plans for the POP at this time.

	General Fund	Other Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds
<u>Policy Option Package Pricing:</u>	\$750,000	\$0	\$6,750,000	\$7,500,000

DHS Non-MAGI Eligibility Automation Project

Department of Human Services (DHS) seeks \$7.5 M TF (\$6.75M FF, \$0.75M GF) to implement a planning effort to prepare for the implementation of an eligibility system for its non-MAGI (Modified Adjusted Gross Income) Medicaid programs. DHS is committed to completing thorough planning to provide a framework for phased delivery of functionality that demonstrates meaningful progress in short increments of time.

The recent decision by the Center for Medicaid and Medicare Services (CMS) to extend 90/10 funding for Medicaid eligibility systems provides substantial resources to help DHS proceed with the planning work. A recent CMS site visit provided Oregon with an understanding of CMS' expectation that it proceed with automation of the eligibility and case management for the non-MAGI Medicaid population as soon as possible after successful completion of the MAGI Medicaid Transition Project.

In initial conversations, DHS, working with the Office of Information Services (OIS), believes that a transfer system solution serves as the likely best alternative to minimize risk and increase likelihood of successful completion.

For transfer system to be successful, it is important to pick a state that most closely models Oregon's non-MAGI programs in order to minimize the amount of customization that must be made to support DHS's business needs. Because Oregon has been on the leading edge of policy waivers in this area, it is unlikely that any transfer system will be a perfect match. However, it is the desire of DHS to choose a system that has a majority match for functionality and then to increment the delivery of additional functionality in small-phased implementations.

To this end, DHS will follow the Stage Gate Process required by the Office of the State CIO and proposes to complete the following activities between July 1, 2015 and June 30, 2017.

Proposed schedule includes:

- By July 2015-Preparatory work using current resources
 - APD approval from CMS
 - Planning vendor RFP for July 2016 execution of SOW
 - QA vendor chosen for July 2015 execution of SOW
- By April 2016 – Stage Gate 1 Activities
 - High level business concept
 - Core Team Defined
 - Project Governance Defined
 - Project Charter
 - Project Plan & High Level Business Requirements
- By October 2016 – Stage Gate 2 Activities
 - Business Case & Information Resource Request
 - Detailed project Plan
 - Transfer system Chosen
 - RFP for System Integrator Released for 2 phases – FIT Gap + Implementation
- By March 2017:
 - System Integrator vendor contract negotiated for FIT Gap Phase
- By June 2017-Stage Gate 3 Endorsement Activities
 - Fit Gap Assessment of Transfer System Solution
 - Fit Gap General System Design
 - Refined Project Plan
 - SI vendor contract negotiated for Implementation (pending approval for 17-19 appropriation)

Rough budget = \$7.5 M TF

- QA-\$750k
- Planning Vendor - \$1.5M
- State Staffing - \$2.25M
- System integrator - \$3M

Note: While the MAGI Medicaid System Transfer Project has chosen to implement the Kentucky KYNECT system, DHS will consider that application but will look at other systems to determine the most appropriate system fit from a program need perspective. Project approach may be updated based on alternatives evaluated.

2015-17 Policy Option Package

<u>Agency Name:</u>	Department of Human Services
<u>Program Area Name:</u>	Office of the Director
<u>Program Name:</u>	Employment First Initiative
<u>Policy Option Package Initiative:</u>	N/A
<u>Policy Option Package Title:</u>	Employment Outcomes for People with I/DD
<u>Policy Option Package Number:</u>	104
<u>Related Legislation:</u>	N/A
<u>Program Funding Team:</u>	Economy and Jobs

Summary Statement:

Youth and adults with intellectual and developmental disabilities (I/DD) are significantly underrepresented in Oregon's workforce. With appropriate services and assistance, persons with I/DD are capable of employment. The state is seeking to increase competitive employment of I/DD persons in integrated workplaces through the Department of Human Services' (DHS) Employment First Policy and Governor Kitzhaber's Executive Order 13-04. The order directs state agencies and programs, including DHS' Office of Developmental Disability Services and Vocational Rehabilitation, to take various steps and to achieve specific goals. In order fulfill the policy and order, this POP requests funding for:

- a. Six Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors, Two Human Services Specialists and 1 Operations and Policy Analyst to serve increasing numbers of youth with intellectual and developmental disabilities and increase engagement with school districts participating in Youth Transition Program (YTP) and with state I/DD system.
- b. 10.5 contract Benefits Counselors to provide benefits counseling services to persons with disabilities, including those with I/DD; and two Operations and Policy Analysts to train, oversee and support the counselors; and to plan future delivery of these services.

- c. An Employment First Transformation Fund and Operations and Policy Analyst to identify, research and promote utilization of best and evidence-based practices that facilitate competitive employment of I/DD persons and promote continues improvement of related services.

	General Fund	Other Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds
<u>Policy Option Package Pricing:</u>	\$4,358,223	\$0	\$841,898	\$5,200,121

1. WHAT WOULD THIS POLICY OPTION PACKAGE (POP) DO AND HOW WOULD IT BE IMPLEMENTED?

This POP is necessary for the Department’s Employment First Unit, the Office of Developmental Disability Services and Vocational Rehabilitation to meet the expectations outlined in the Department’s Employment First Policy and fulfill the Governor’s Executive Order 13-04. The Policy and Executive Order were developed in response to the continuing underemployment and unemployment of Oregonians with disabilities. Few groups of working age youth and adults (ages 16 to 64 years) have higher rates of unemployment and underemployment than those with disabilities. The rates are higher yet for individuals with significant disabilities.

Specifically, this POP will be implemented through administrative and program activities described below.

- a. The Employment First Unit, ODDS and VR are collaborating to increase the number of youth and adults with intellectual and developmental disabilities (I/DD) that achieve integrated, competitive employment.

Last year, VR was provided with funding allowing it to hire 8.0 FTE specialized Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors to serve I/DD individuals. Through this POP, VR seeks funding for the following additional staff positions in order to achieve the Executive Order's goals and objectives, and address the increasing demand and need for vocational rehabilitation services by youth and adults with I/DD:

- i. *6.0 FTE specialized I/DD Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors.* The additional specialized I/DD VRCs will ensure that each of Vocational Rehabilitation 14 branches has a counselor with a caseload dedicated to serving individuals with I/DD. As illustrated below, VR has experienced remarkable growth in the number of persons with I/DD seeking and receiving its services over the past five years. In addition, the program is presently experiencing increases above the Executive Order-forecasted 100-plus clients a month level, as a result of the outreach efforts of the new I/DD counselors. These counselors are providing VR with the expertise and service coordination capacity needed to effectively assist individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities.
- ii. *2.0 FTE Human Service Specialists.* The addition of these positions will allow VR to pilot an alternative service delivery model that increases the program's capacity to serve the increased demand for services from individuals with I/DD, while reducing reliance on VRCs for certain VR services. In a number of other states, VR programs utilize highly trained VR paraprofessionals to augment the work of their professional VR counselors.
- iii. *1.0 Operations and Policy Analyst 2.* The analyst will coordinate delivery of VR's school to work services to I/DD youth, including those provided through VR's Youth Transition Program (YTP), as VR expands its capacity to serve this population. Through YTP, VR and the 85 school districts and 145 high schools presently participating in the program, youth with disabilities are assisted in transitioning from high school work or higher education. (YTP is a nationally and internationally recognized best practice. Just this past year, it was recognized as

one of the world's model programs for youth by the European Association of Service Providers for Persons with Disabilities. Over 25,000 youth with disabilities have been assisted by YTP since it was begun in 1990.)

In addition, the operations and policy analyst will serve as VR's liaison with the Oregon Department of Education and Oregon public schools in relation to youth with I/DD and Autism Spectrum disorders. The I/DD OPA 3 will work closely with VR's existing YTP Coordinator. Together, the two positions will be responsible for providing the necessary leadership and support to:

- Continue existing local YTP sites and engage a new set of school districts and high schools in providing enhanced transition services and strengthening their core transition programs, as VR refines its transition programs to meet the new requirements of the recently enacted Workforce Innovation and Opportunities Act (WIOA).
 - Serve increasing numbers of historically underserved disability populations.
 - Foster greater engagement between high schools and local workforce system programs, in accord with WIOA.
 - Explore with the Department of Education and VR's Executive Team, the possibility of making YTP a statewide program that is present in every high school.
- b.** Provision of benefits counseling services is another key element in the Department's effort to implement the Employment First policy and Executive Order 13-04. Benefits counseling has been identified as an essential service by the Executive Order Stakeholder Policy Committee. Through benefits counseling, consumers are provided with the information and assistance needed to use work incentives to obtain, maintain or increase employment, while continuing to receive critical services and benefits, including health care. Loss and fear of loss of needed benefits and services is a significant barrier to employment of people with disabilities. Research indicates that individuals with

disabilities who receive benefits counseling are more likely to go work and experience an increase in earnings; and those considering going to work find benefits counseling valuable and necessary.

In response to the need for benefits counseling, this POP funds continuation of Vocational Rehabilitation's (VR) Work Incentives Network (WIN) through the 2015-17 biennium; two benefits counseling demonstration projects with local workforce programs (one urban and one rural); and development of a comprehensive plan for future delivery of benefits counseling services statewide. Currently, WIN is funded with federal Basic Rehabilitation funds. As a result, WIN's services are limited to persons in service with VR. This POP would move funding of WIN to state General Funds only, thereby making WIN benefits counseling services available to all Oregonians with disabilities.

In addition, this POP provides for VR and Oregon's workforce system to pilot benefits counseling services through two demonstration projects with local workforce programs, utilizing WIN's training and certification model (see below), as well as best practices identified through WIN and work force and self-sufficiency programs, such as training on financial literacy and use self-sufficiency calculators.

Over the ensuing biennium, VR and allied DHS, OHA and workforce programs would develop a long-term plan for delivering benefits counseling services to Oregonians with disabilities (regardless of what program or programs serve them), and other Oregonians whose efforts to secure or continue to work may be enhanced by receipt of benefits counseling. The results of the workforce demonstration projects would further inform and guide this effort.

In developing WIN, VR modeled the program after other successful benefits counseling programs and has incorporated best practices, including requiring that its contract benefits planners undergo intensive training, and meet the same proficiency standards as Social Security Administration's certified work incentive coordinators. VR strongly encourages consumers to utilize WIN. Research shows that individuals who receive both vocational rehabilitation and benefits counseling have better

employment outcomes than individuals receiving benefits counseling services or vocational rehabilitation alone.

- c. This POP will support targeted efforts and project designed to promote the continuous improvement and transformation of the employment services provided transition and working age individuals with I/DD. These projects may be in the form of pilots or other progressive practices designed to improve desired employment outcomes. A \$1.5M Employment First Transformation fund would be established to support these activities. The special projects would be identified by the Employment First Project Steering Committee and the Statewide Policy Group formed under Executive Order. This POP will also fund a 1.0 FTE Research and Innovation Specialist devoted to researching and identifying other progressive practices that should be incorporated into current employment service practice. This person will coordinate efforts with the DHS and ODE staff assigned to implementing the Employment First policy and will also coordinate efforts with the process for determining use of the Special Project Fund.

2. **WHY DOES DHS PROPOSE THIS POP?**

DHS proposes this POP in order to carry out the Department's Employment First Policy and the Governor's Executive Order 13-04. The Policy and Executive Order facilitate integrated, competitive, integrated employment of persons with intellectual and developmental disabilities.

People with disabilities remain one of the most underemployed and unemployed groups in the nation and in Oregon. As of May, 2011, the national unemployment rate for people with disabilities was 16.9% compared to 9.2% for able-bodied persons.¹ Other data suggests a much greater inequity. In its most recent report on disability and work, the U.S. Census Bureau estimated that 34% of people with disabilities were employed compared with 71.9% of people without a disability.² Unemployment of individuals with significant

¹ U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, June 2011.

² "Disability Among the Working Age Population: 2008 and 2009", American Community Survey Briefs, U.S. Census Bureau, 2010. The estimates given are for the population between the ages of 16 and 64 years.

disabilities is much higher, including those with intellectual and developmental disabilities, is perhaps as much as 70%.³ The negative effects of underemployment and unemployment on persons with disabilities go well beyond low incomes and lost wages. For many, it may also include stigma, social exclusion, the loss of dignity and self-worth, and dreams deferred and denied.

The implementation of the Employment First Policy and Executive Order 13-04 represents an increase in service delivery demand in certain program areas, including Vocational Rehabilitation. Implementation of these initiatives also requires provision or access to complementary services – such as VR’s Youth Transition Program, benefits counseling and continuous improvement activities, as well as cooperative planning and implementation with other service systems. In addition, research into new or promising practices is an important aspect needed to deliver services in the most effective and efficient manner. More specifically:

- a. VR has experienced significant and increasing demand for its services from persons with intellectual and developmental disabilities since July 2009 (see below chart). Over this same period, VR has substantially increased provision of its services and activities to this population (see chart). The increases in demand and services coincide with the adoption and rollout of the Department’s Employment First policy, which was adopted in 2008 and initiated thereafter through a coordinated series of joint DDS-VR activities; and the Governor’s issuing of Executive Order 13-04 and the subsequent efforts to carry it out.

³ 2011 grant solicitation from U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration on Developmental Disabilities, Projects of National Significance: Partnership in Employment Systems Change.

VR Service Milestones –
Increase in Demand for VR Services by I/DD Persons &
VR Service-Related Activities Provided to I/DD Persons

ACTIVITY	STATE FISCAL YEAR							
	2010 (7/09-6/10)	2011 (7/10-6/11)	2012 (7/10-6/11)	2013 (7/10-6/11)	2014 (7/10-6/11)	Increase from 2010 (7/9-6/14)	Projected 2015 (7/14-6/15)	Projected 2015-17 (7/15-6/17)
Applications for Services	687	797	895	935	1,309	622/91%	1,433/9.5%	1,682/17%
Determined Eligible	676	796	815	871	1,180	504/75%	<i>Dependent on legislatively approved budget</i>	
Entered an IPE (Plan)	382	422	526	546	646	264/69%		
Cases Closed	605	794	843	790	841	236/39%		
Successfully Rehabilitated	130	215	259	280	303	173/133%		

Based on the above information, VR anticipates that demand for its services by I/DD youth and adults will continue to increase into the foreseeable future -- by 9.5 percent over the remainder of this biennium; and by an additional 17 percent over the 2015-2017 biennium.

- b. This POP is needed to continue, further plan and develop, and expand the availability of benefits counseling services in Oregon.
 - Loss and fear of loss of needed benefits is a significant barrier to employment of persons with disabilities who depend on benefits to obtain essential health care services, needed housing and transportation supports, and necessary subsistence income. Research indicates that individuals with disabilities who receive benefits counseling are more likely to go to work and experience an increase in earnings; and VRCs and individuals with disabilities who are considering going to work find benefits counseling valuable and necessary.

- WIN’s benefits counseling services are being used to facilitate integrated employment of persons with intellectual and developmental disabilities, as part of the effort to implements the Executive Order 13-04 and Employment First policy. Benefits counseling has been identified as an essential service by the Executive Order Stakeholder Policy Committee. It is also being used to increase employment of persons with mental illness, through delivery of evidence-based supported employment and OHA/AMH and VR’s efforts to expand the availability of these services throughout Oregon.
 - Benefits counseling is available on very limited basis in Oregon. Outside of WIN, benefits counseling is only available through Disability Rights Oregon’s Work Incentives and Planning Assistance program, which is comprised 3.5 FTE benefits counselors and a coordinator and has one office in Portland; and a handful of private benefits counselors. WIN and WIPA benefits counselors undergo intensive training and are required to obtain and maintain Social Security Administration benefits counseling certification or the equivalent. This is not the case with most of the private benefits counselors.
- c. Assuring continuous service quality and consumer satisfaction, as measured by more opportunities for paid employment for individuals with I/DD, is not a static activity. Continuous improvement requires a sustained effort and commitment to enhancing services based on data, consumer feedback, and research into alternate and progressive practices. Resources from this POP are to assure DHS can identify and implement practices that positively evolve the effective delivery of employment related services.

3. HOW DOES THIS FURTHER THE AGENCY’S MISSION OR GOALS? HOW DOES THIS FURTHER THE PROGRAM FUNDING TEAM OUTCOMES OR STRATEGIES?

This POP furthers Department’s vision and mission by facilitating the independence, health and well-being of individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities by assisting and supporting them in obtaining and maintaining competitive employment in integrated workplaces. Through employment, individuals with

disabilities are able to live more independent, productive and rewarding lives, and are likely to experience better health outcomes.

4. IS THIS POP TIED TO A DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES PERFORMANCE MEASURE? IF YES, IDENTIFY THE PERFORMANCE MEASURE. IF NO, HOW WILL DHS MEASURE THE SUCCESS OF THIS POP?

Yes, this POP is tied to two KPMs: KPM #14, which relates to achieving integrated employment settings for individuals with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities; and KPM #1, which reflects the percentage of individuals receiving VR services that enter into an individualized plan for employment who obtain an employment outcome. Success will be measured in terms of the percentage and numbers of individuals with I/DD that achieve an outcome of integrated employment.

In addition, Executive Order 13-04 sets forth the following outcomes for ODDS and VR:

- By July 1, 2015 will provide Employment Services to at least an additional 100 individuals
- By July 1, 2016, will provide Employment Services to at least an additional 200 individuals
- By July 1, 2017, will provide Employment Services to at least an additional 275 individuals
- By July 1, 2018, will provide Employment Services to at least an additional 275 individuals
- By July 1, 2019, will provide Employment Services to at least an additional 275 individuals
- By July 1, 2020, will provide Employment Services to at least an additional 275 individuals
- By July 1, 2021, will provide Employment Services to at least an additional 275 individuals
- By July 1, 2022, will provide Employment Services to at least an additional 275 individuals

5. DOES THIS POP REQUIRE A CHANGE(S) TO AN EXISTING STATUTE OR REQUIRE A NEW STATUTE? IF YES, IDENTIFY THE STATUTE AND THE LEGISLATIVE CONCEPT.

No.

6. WHAT ALTERNATIVES WERE CONSIDERED AND WHAT WERE THE REASONS FOR REJECTING THEM?

Use of federal funds.

- VR is primarily funded by a formula-based, federal grant. With the recent enactment of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunities Act (WIOA), and with its reauthorization of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the federal law that enables and governs VR services, federal funding of VR will be flat for the next five years. Utilizing federal re-allotment dollars was considered but because of its unpredictability this was ruled out.

Specific to WIN/Benefits Counseling:

- Utilizing VR counselors, DHS case managers and AMH counselors to provide benefits counseling services. This was determined impractical given training time needed to become an informed and skilled benefits planner given the significant caseloads of direct service professionals.
- Utilizing private benefits planners. This was rejected because for two reasons. First, provision of incorrect or inappropriate benefits information puts clients at risk. Most of the limited number of fee-for-service benefits counselors in Oregon are not trained and certified counselors. Second, the time and effort required to train, certify and oversee fee-for-service benefits counselors would likely cost as much as it cost to train and contract for WIN's present benefits counselors.

7. WHAT WOULD BE THE ADVERSE EFFECTS OF NOT FUNDING THIS POP?

Funding of this POP will provide significant and needed support to the Department's efforts to fulfill the promise of its Employment First policy and fully implement carry the Governor's Executive Order 13-04. The decision to not fund this POP will or could:

- Lead to imposition of an Order of Selection by Vocational Rehabilitation. If VR continues to experience an increase in demand for its services and it lacks the staff or resources to serve everyone

eligible for its services, it will have to institute the mandatory waiting list process (Order) that federal law requires of it in such circumstances.

- Limit the availability of benefits counseling services statewide and thereby reduce the success of the Governor's Workforce Strategies for Work-ready Communities in increasing employment of Oregonians.
- Hinder VR's ability to meet its federal outcomes and other performance measures if, as result of lack of funding, VR is unable to continue WIN and provide VR consumers with a service

8. WHAT OTHER AGENCIES (STATE, TRIBAL AND/OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT) WOULD BE AFFECTED BY THIS POP? HOW WOULD THEY BE AFFECTED?

This POP will benefit the Department of Education, local education districts and schools, community developmental disability programs and provider service agencies; as well as state and local workforce programs. The former entities have direct responsibility for implementing the Employment First policy and Executive Order. The POP will directly and indirectly assist them in carrying out these responsibilities with the Employment First Unit, the Office of Developmental Disability Services and Vocational Rehabilitation. The workforce programs will also benefit as their DHS partners engage in heightened and focused activities and greater collaboration with the workforce system to increase employment of historically disadvantaged Oregonians.

9. WHAT OTHER AGENCIES, PROGRAMS or STAKEHOLDERS ARE COLLABORATING ON THIS POP?

This POP is a collaborative effort of the Department's Employment First Unit, the Office of Developmental Disability Services and Vocational Rehabilitation. In addition, Temporary Aid to Needy Families, the Oregon Health Authority/Addictions and Mental Health, and a number of Oregon workforce agencies and programs have been consulted about the POP and are in support of it.

10. WHAT IS YOUR EQUITY ANALYSIS?

This POP is an equity initiative. Through it, state agencies and programs and their partners will increase the integrated and competitive employment of people with disabilities, with a particular focus on persons with intellectual and developmental disabilities. Oregonians with disabilities experience unemployment and underemployment at significantly higher rates than other Oregonians; and those with significant disabilities experience unemployment and underemployment yet higher rates. In addition, the incidence of disability is greater among a number of other historically disadvantaged populations, including Latinos and African-Americans.

11. WHAT ASSUMPTIONS AFFECT THE PRICING OF THIS POP?

Implementation Date(s): 7/1/15

End Date (if applicable): N/A

- a. **Will there be new responsibilities for DHS? Specify which Program Area(s) and describe their new responsibilities.**
No.
- b. **Will there be new administrative impacts sufficient to require additional funding? Specify which office(s) (i.e., facilities, computer services, etc.) and describe how it will be affected.**
No.
- c. **Will there be changes to client caseloads or services provided to population groups? Specify how many in each relevant program.**
None over already projected numbers based.

- d. **Will it take new staff or will existing positions be modified? For each classification, list the number of positions and the number of months the positions will work in each biennium. Specify if the positions are permanent, limited duration or temporary.**
 Yes. 1.0 FTE OPA3. Permanent position priced to start 10/1/15. This position will be housed in ODDS.
- e. **What are the start-up costs, such as new or significant modifications to computer systems, new materials, outreach and training?**
 None
- f. **What are the ongoing costs?**
 All of the costs in this POP would be considered ongoing.
- g. **What are the potential savings?**
 None identified.
- h. **Based on these answers, is there a fiscal impact?**
 Yes.

TOTAL FOR THIS PACKAGE

<u>Category</u>	<u>GF</u>	<u>OF</u>	<u>FF</u>	<u>TF</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Personal Services	\$1,588,164	0	\$75,511	\$1,663,675	12	10.80
Services & Supplies	\$2,763,089	0	\$766,085	\$3,529,174		
Special Payments	\$6,970	0	\$302	\$7,272		
Total	\$4,358,223	\$0	\$ 841,898	\$ 5,200,121	12	10.80

DHS- Fiscal Impact Summary by Program Area:

	Office of Developmental Disabilities Services	Vocational Rehabilitatio n Services Design	Total DHS
General Fund	\$ 842,208	\$ 3,516,015	\$ 4,358,223
Other Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0
Federal Funds- Ltd	\$ 841,898	\$0	\$ 841,898
Total Funds	\$ 1,684,106	\$3,516,015	\$ 5,200,121
Positions	1	11	12
FTE	0.88	9.92	10.80

What are the sources of funding and the funding split for each one?

I/DD-VR Revenue Impact:

<u>Description of Revenue</u>	<u>OF</u>	<u>FF</u>	<u>TF</u>
Medicaid (Comp Srce 0995)	0	841,898	841,898
Total	\$0	\$841,898	\$841,898

2015-17 Policy Option Package

<u>Agency Name:</u>	Department of Human Services (DHS)
<u>Program Area Name:</u>	Aging & People with Physical Disabilities (APD)
<u>Program Name:</u>	Office of Adult Abuse Prevention & Investigations (OAAPI)
<u>Policy Option Package Initiative:</u>	N/A
<u>Policy Option Package Title:</u>	New Adult Abuse Data and Report-writing System
<u>Policy Option Package Number:</u>	107
<u>Related Legislation:</u>	HB4151/2014; HB2442/2009; HB2175/2007
<u>Program Funding Team:</u>	Human Services – Improving our Human Services Systems

Summary Statement:

The Office of Adult Abuse Prevention and Investigations (OAAPI) was created in 2012 to centralize the oversight of investigations of reported abuse of vulnerable adults in Oregon, including adults over the age of 65; individuals with physical disabilities, developmental disabilities, and mental illness; and children in certain licensed settings.

Around 85% of the nearly 15,000 investigations conducted under the oversight of OAAPI every year involve the reported abuse of an older adult (over 65) or a younger adult with a physical disability. For this reason, APD is identified as the primary program sponsor of this Policy Option Package.

Although the oversight and responsibility for these investigations has shifted from three distinct program areas to what is now OAAPI, the data systems that are used to track and document these investigations are not consolidated and remain fragmented. OAAPI and the abuse investigators under its oversight currently use nine (9) distinct systems to collect data and generate investigation reports and data reports related to protective services and abuse investigations. These systems run on different hardware and software, collect different data

points, and are unable to share data.

The need for an integrated statewide adult abuse data system has been recognized for many years by external observers, including consultants, auditors and media, and is widely accepted by involved agencies and stakeholders who work with the inadequate and disconnected patchwork of adult abuse data systems currently in use every day.

As an enterprise-wide office and Shared Service of DHS and OHA, OAAPI proposes (under this POP) to:

- 1) Fund a contract with a vendor to develop and implement a new, statewide, comprehensive Adult Abuse Data and Report-Writing System, and
- 2) Fund the ongoing support and maintenance costs of the new system

By improving access to abuse and neglect data, this new system will lead to better outcomes in Key Process Measures and Fundamental DHS Protection & Intervention metrics, as well as better outcomes for all the vulnerable Oregonians that OAAPI serves.

	General Fund	Other Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds
<u>Policy Option</u> <u>Package Pricing:</u>	\$ 1,437,494	\$2,000,000	\$0	\$ 3,437,494

1. WHAT WOULD THIS POLICY OPTION PACKAGE (POP) DO AND HOW WOULD IT BE IMPLEMENTED?

In the second half of 2014, APD and OAPPI are using an initial \$500,000 investment of funds from the Special Allocation for Seniors funds (set aside under HB 5201) to contract an independent Consultant, who will develop a recommended approach and plan for implementation of a technology solution to meet OAAPI's need for an integrated Adult Abuse Data and Report-writing System.

During this initial planning phase (Phase 1) the Consultant will begin the evaluation process and project planning, working as needed with the state team to validate and complete functional and technical requirements; identify alternatives, costs and benefits to meet the business needs defined by the requirements; update the Preliminary Business Case; and develop a recommendation report and presentation for the Legislature in January, 2015.

This POP would allow OAAPI to move forward with Phase 2, i.e. issuing an RFP for the procurement and implementation of the new Adult Abuse Data & Report-writing System. Such a system would move OAAPI and APD toward a future state in which we are able to:

- Monitor abuse referrals in real-time, and oversee screening decisions made in the local offices,
- Provide accurate, reliable and consistent data and reports to internal and external partners,
- Understand the abuse history of clients across programs and document perpetrators, improving the Department's ability to ensure the safety of vulnerable Oregonians,
- Respond to the increased need for services that the aging of Oregon's population will demand,
- Monitor and understand the level and types of abuse occurring in the Oregon quickly and easily, allowing us to respond more effectively and develop proactive strategies to prevent future abuse,
- Mitigate the risks outlined later in this document, and
- Achieve the efficiencies and fiscal savings outlined later in this document

2. WHY DOES THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES (DHS) PROPOSE THIS POP?

Created in 2012, the Office of Adult Abuse Prevention and Investigations (OAAPI) conducts and/or oversees investigations of reported abuse of vulnerable adults in Oregon, including adults over the age of 65; individuals with developmental disabilities, physical disabilities and mental illness; and children in certain licensed settings.

In 2012, over 34,000 referrals of abuse of vulnerable adults (and children in licensed settings) were received by the state and its representatives, and nearly 15,000 of those resulted in an investigation conducted or overseen by OAAPI. Over 84% of those investigations involved the reported abuse of an adult over the age of 65 or a younger adult with a physical disability.

Prior to the creation of OAAPI, abuse referrals and investigations for adults and children in licensed settings were overseen by different program areas or the Office of Investigations & Training (OIT). Each had their own legacy abuse data and report-writing system, which had developed over time and with varying levels of investment.

At this time, OAAPI continues to rely on those disconnected data systems to store abuse-related data and produce reports, even though these legacy systems are often unable to provide the critical information being asked for currently by internal and external partners, including accurate metrics for Quarterly Business Reviews, requests for statewide abuse data from media, and sufficiently granulated data reports for the Legislature.

The absence of an integrated, real-time Adult Abuse Data and Report-writing System also makes it impossible for OAAPI to monitor and prevent abuse effectively by seeing and understanding patterns and histories of abuse, as victims – and perpetrators – move from program to program and region to region. This leads to the very real possibility of substantiated perpetrators in one program, for example, working in

another. It also makes OAAPI unable to gain a holistic view of abuse victims, who are often consumers of services from different programs and whose experiences of abuse may never be tied together.

As Oregon's population ages – and lives longer – OAAPI is seeing an increased interweaving of clients in community and facility settings, with clients of one program often placed in facilities licensed by other programs, or clients transitioning from one system to another as their age, health conditions or behavioral needs change. Because of the lack of integration of abuse data across programs, all too often valuable information in one system is left behind, requiring the new program to re-establish baselines and interventions to help keep clients safe without access to a client's history of abuse.

Finally, the current patchwork of data and report-writing systems lead to multiple inefficiencies and “blind spots,” which confounds quality assurance efforts and leads to timely and expensive re-work. Abuse referrals have “fallen through the cracks” as a result of the current fragmented group of data systems, introducing an unacceptable level of risk.

The shortcomings of the current system are evident not only to individuals within DHS and OAAPI, but have been brought to the attention of the Department by external entities as well, most notably in the following instances:

- DHS consultant Public Knowledge report dated 2005
- McKinsey Study recommendation dated 2008
- Oregonian article dated March 26, 2011
- Adult Safety and Protection Team Report dated August 4, 2011
- Resident Safety Review Council Report to Legislature dated February 2013
- DHS Elder Abuse Prevention Audit (12-013)

This POP would allow OAAPI to move forward with an RFP for the development and implementation of an integrated Adult Abuse Data & Report-writing System.

3. HOW DOES THIS FURTHER THE AGENCY’S MISSION OR GOALS? HOW DOES THIS FURTHER THE PROGRAM FUNDING TEAM OUTCOMES OR STRATEGIES?

In only one year, Oregon has seen an increase of 13% in investigations of abuse and neglect of vulnerable adults – from 12,538 in 2012 to 14,143 in 2013. This growth in the number of abuse referrals and investigations, typical of previous years, is one of the reasons OAAPI was formed, to ensure a coordinated and consistent response to an increasing number of abuse referrals across all vulnerable populations. Abuse is not something that can be undone, and carries with it lifelong impacts to a person’s life in regard to health, emotional well-being, and their ability to benefit from available services.

The need for a stable, integrated Abuse Data and Report-writing System becomes ever more critical as Oregon faces an aging population, a significant annual increase in abuse referrals, and an increased need for services across all demographics. In addition, the Department’s recent emphasis on process and outcome measures to ensure customer service and service equity has highlighted the difficulty of gathering accurate data related to Protection and Intervention from existing data systems.

An improved system for abuse data collection, from the time of screening through report-writing, case closure and referral, is essential to better protect vulnerable Oregonians and to more accurately and efficiently provide meaningful abuse data and outcomes to the Legislature, DHS leadership and the public. To produce this information, this single system must be focused on *abuse across programs*, not simply added on to the various existing, disconnected program databases.

The development of such a system would contribute directly to the DHS Policy Outcome of “Improving our Human Services Systems,” by addressing a long-standing gap in data collection and analysis and leading to a more efficient and effective state response to the reported abuse of vulnerable Oregonians.

4. IS THIS POP TIED TO A DHS PERFORMANCE MEASURE? IF YES, IDENTIFY THE PERFORMANCE MEASURE. IF NO, HOW WILL DHS MEASURE THE SUCCESS OF THIS POP?

Yes, this POP is directly tied to the following process measures and outcome measures outlined on the DHS Enterprise Fundamentals Map:

“Protection and Intervention” (OP1) Process Measures:

- % of completed investigations coded “unable to determine” or “inconclusive”
- % of calls assigned for field contact that meet policy timelines
- % of investigation reports completed within policy timelines

“Safety” (O1) Outcome Measures:

- Re-abuse rate
- Abuse rate

The new system would allow OAAPI and APD to report out on existing measures in a far more accurate and efficient manner. OAAPI would no longer have to rely on inadequate sampling of data to produce ‘Timeliness of Response’ measures. It would also allow OAAPI to more proactively address the issues of Investigation Timeliness/Completion in order to avoid the unforeseen backlogs that have resulted in the current system because they were not able to be detected, thereby improving the metrics. Finally,

investigators would have a more reliable tool in which to document their investigations and interventions, unlike current systems in use that are prone to ‘crashing,’ resulting in data loss and re-work. A stable data system would reduce the actual time needed to complete reports, and thereby improve completion metrics.

5. DOES THIS POP REQUIRE A CHANGE(S) TO AN EXISTING STATUTE OR REQUIRE A NEW STATUTE? IF YES, IDENTIFY THE STATUTE AND THE LEGISLATIVE CONCEPT.

No, there is no statutory impact involved with this POP.

6. WHAT ALTERNATIVES WERE CONSIDERED AND WHAT WERE THE REASONS FOR REJECTING THEM?

One alternative considered was the investment of funds and agency resources in the improvement and integration of the assortment of abuse data systems and report-writing methods currently in use. This option, however, is dependent on the continued availability and functionality of all existing systems, which is not likely. Choosing this option would require a significant dedication of program staff and resources to evaluate the feasibility of updating all of the existing systems and then reconfiguring them to provide the accessibility and information currently needed by OAAPI and its partners. And even if the utility of each individual system could be maximized, the issue of disconnected systems unable to share information would remain unaddressed.

More recently, OAAPI and APD have explored combining the development of a new abuse data system with other ongoing IT development projects. For example, a Case Management data system that APD is planning to develop for APD and DD clients appeared to present opportunities. Adding the abuse data collection, screening and report-writing components to a new APD Case Management system, would add significantly to the scope of the project. In addition, since the proposed new Case Management system will be designed primarily for Medicaid clients, it is questionable whether this new system would be able to address the needs of victims of abuse who are not eligible for Medicaid, or the specific needs of other populations such as

adults with mental illness receiving services through OHA/AMH or children receiving services in licensed settings.

OAAPI also researched a possible partnership with Oregon State Police (OSP) and their new Records Management System, developed by Niche RMS of Canada. Although the OSP work flow is similar to APD/DD/MH investigations, their system was designed specifically to support dispatch and patrol functions, and under the terms of the OSP contract was not able to be modified to meet OAAPI's needs. As a result, partnering with OSP would require OAAPI to change nomenclature and alter workflow to match the OSP model, and the system would not be allowed to integrate or interface with other systems utilized by DHS. Due to security concerns, even though OAAPI could potentially make the OSP Records Management System functional, it would require many workarounds and would not be able to consolidate all information necessary within DHS systems.

Other systems, such as OLRO's ASPEN database and Lane County's Client-Tracking System, have been explored for possible statewide expansion across all investigation types but found unworkable either due to limitations of the systems themselves or of their support and maintenance structures.

7. WHAT WOULD BE THE ADVERSE EFFECTS OF NOT FUNDING THIS POP?

All of the problems and inefficiencies discussed above add to the risks and liabilities associated with continued reliance on the current patchwork of databases and report-writing methods used by staff across programs. As stated previously, significant and avoidable risks are introduced by the current array of abuse data systems because:

- There is no integrated way to track a particular individual's history of abuse. Records for a single victim may exist in several different data systems, with no single entity able to connect episodes of abuse, neglect or violence in a person's life. This inability to see the larger picture results in less effective – or even inappropriate – interventions;

- There is no integrated way to document substantiated perpetrators and search by perpetrator name, allowing for abuse in one system to go undetected in another;
- Current systems are not accessible from the field causing delays in reporting and potentially placing vulnerable individuals at risk due to delay;
- The existing systems do not alert local or OAAPI staff to cases that “fall through the cracks.” OAAPI’s Quality Assurance staff has identified up to 2,000 such cases that exist in the current system, and is working to resolve them.
- The success of recent class action suits should also not be ignored, as examples of expensive and far-reaching litigation that may result from the failure to catch and respond to systemic problems early.
- Major limitations of the current system are intake/screening; protective services; report writing and tracking a case from initiation to closure.

The costs and inefficiencies associated with the current system are extensive. OAAPI frequently encounters the need for manual data mining and collection to respond to public or media inquiries, to perform effective oversight of local offices and investigators, and even to provide basic quality assurance or monitor statutory compliance.

In addition, the reduction in cost and staff time provided by a searchable database would allow quality assurance staff to spend their time identifying abuse trends and developing targeted prevention efforts, instead of reading hundreds of reports just to extract data. These savings would multiply as efficiencies were realized for investigators and their managers in the field, as well as for OAAPI and other Department staff.

In the current state, the Department loses productivity when workers run semi-automated processes to link data between different databases in order to produce metrics. Many hours are lost during the process of exchanging, checking and interpreting data from the various systems. Unfortunately, this is valuable staff time that could be better put to use performing QA and data analysis in order to identify the causes of abuse (in community and facility settings) and work to mitigate them.

8. WHAT OTHER AGENCIES (STATE, TRIBAL AND/OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT) WOULD BE AFFECTED BY THIS POP? HOW WOULD THEY BE AFFECTED?

Other agencies affected by this POP include primary partners with a business need for abuse data or investigation reports, such as:

- Background Check Unit (BCU)
- DHS Case Management (APD and DD)
- Child Welfare
- The Office of Licensing & Regulatory Oversight (OLRO)
- The Oregon Health Authority / AMH Licensing

These agencies would experience a change in how they receive abuse data and reports from OAAPI and from community programs. Their access to abuse data would be based on business need and established using a role-based security protocol.

9. WHAT OTHER AGENCIES, PROGRAMS or STAKEHOLDERS ARE COLLABORATING ON THIS POP?

The primary collaborators at this time are DHS Aging & People with Disabilities (APD) and OAAPI. Other agencies involved in the discussion due to their use of abuse data and reports include the Background Check Unit, DHS Developmental Disabilities, DHS Child Welfare, OLRO and OHA/AMH Licensing.

We have communicated with stakeholders affected by this POP, including APD field staff and staff with Area Agencies on Aging, Community Developmental Disabilities Programs (CDDPs) and Community Mental Health Programs (CMHPs), about the plan to develop a new statewide Adult Abuse Data and Report-

writing System, and they are generally supportive of the concept due the many challenges and difficulties presented by the existing systems in use today.

10. WHAT IS YOUR EQUITY ANALYSIS?

Abuse data and report-writing systems currently in use do not capture the racial and ethnic identifiers needed for an analysis of service equity in the abuse investigation process. As a result, it is currently impossible to analyze the service equity in the provision of abuse response and investigation. The proposed new system would be designed to incorporate such identifiers and allow for in-depth analysis of service equity in the delivery of abuse investigations and protective services.

11. WHAT ASSUMPTIONS AFFECT THE PRICING OF THIS POP?

This POP assumes a relatively simple, stand-alone abuse database with role-based access for data-sharing with partners. A system that is integrated with other existing systems would be expected to cost considerably more; e.g. a new integrated abuse data system being developed in Washington is budgeted at \$5.4M.

Additional assumptions that affect the pricing of this POP include:

- The Phase 1 costs of initial planning and evaluation of alternatives (along with initial QA/QC) are paid for by Special Allocation Funds for Seniors.
- This POP provides funding for Phase 2, i.e. procurement of the new Adult Abuse Data and Report-writing System recommended in Phase 1, as well as Systems Integration and QA/QC services to implement the system and ongoing maintenance and support costs.
- The vendor installs any software needed by end users. For desktop and mobile users, this would involve installing operating programs, support tool and patches/software from Microsoft. For users

that would access software over an internet browser, this would involve working with the user's device to configure their browser to access the servers. Firewalls and VPNs may need to be adjusted also. These adjustments could be performed by OIS or with agency's authorization by vendor personnel.

- Vendor handles the install and configuration tasks related to deployment of server software and desktop applications. Depending on devices and connectivity, vendor personnel may also handle install and configuration for remote users.
- Vendor personnel work with agency staff and contracted system integrators to review the organization's workflow and rules in order to configure the system to match the agency's policies and procedures, communication codes and other operational settings. Configuration rules could include report routing and due dates, communication codes, policies and procedure implementation, etc. This also includes establishing the process for report submission, deadline/extension calculation and approval processes for each division. Other examples may include import/interface/export data to/from external systems, rules related to reports and mailing form letters/emails.
- Vendor personnel work with agency staff and contracted system integrators to implement the agency's configuration parameters. After agency approval, the software would be configured to operate in the agency environment with minimal impact to the agency. This task would be considered as completed after the vendor receives the agency's acceptance.
- The vendor would train up to three (3) agency staff on how to set-up and maintain the software Standard Operating Data Lists along with the software System Admin Training. This process would incorporate meetings with the vendor and key agency staff. All drop-down lists would be managed by the agency, as well as field labels. Other customizations would include populating the tables, and setting up user rights and access rights to manage the workflow. Much of this would take place pre-installation, but it is assumed there would be ongoing changes to the drop-down lists and field labels

due to changes in reporting laws in the state. The DHS systems administrator would have user rights to make these changes.

This estimate also assumes that the computer equipment currently in use statewide by abuse investigators in state, county and AAA offices meets the recommended hardware requirements for this type of abuse database. It is our belief that most local offices currently use equipment that would meet the minimum requirements but, upon approval of an RFP, OAAPI would undertake a statewide survey of current equipment in use to ensure that existing equipment can use the new database, and to address any shortfalls with program and local providers.

Implementation Date(s): Estimated implementation date of June 1, 2017 dependent on multiple assumptions, e.g. RFP timing, decision re: OIS support needed, etc.

End Date (if applicable): N/A

- a. **Will there be new responsibilities for the Department of Human Services? Specify which Program Area(s) and describe their new responsibilities.**

OIS will have new responsibilities in implementing the new system in the first biennium, estimated at a total of 3.0 FTE for the biennium (broken out below in [d]) and \$500,000 for State Data Center costs.

- b. **Will there be new Shared Services impacts sufficient to require additional funding? Specify which office(s) (i.e., facilities, computer services, etc.) and describe how it will be affected.**

As stated in [a], the cost of additional State Data Center services is estimated at **\$500,000**.

- c. **Will there be changes to client caseloads or services provided to population groups? Specify how many in each relevant program.**

No changes to client caseloads.

- d. **Will it take new staff or will existing positions be modified? For each classification, list the number of positions and the number of months the positions will work in each biennium. Specify if the positions are permanent, limited duration or temporary.**

The development of the proposed new system will require coordinated management and oversight by OIS staff to support the implementation of this project, estimated at **\$752,494**.

OIS staffing estimates assume:

1 PM2 24 months

1 PM1 12 months

1 ISS6 12 months

1 ISS7 12 months

1 OPA3 6 months

Accounting and Financial Support

Total estimated FTE for biennium = 3

Total estimated State Staff costs: \$ 752,494

TOTAL Estimated State Staff and Data Center Costs: \$1,252,494

e. **What are the start-up costs, such as new or significant modifications to computer systems, new materials, outreach and training?**

This POP would require an investment in the development and implementation of a new software system. Based on preliminary market research, OAAPI believes a new Adult Abuse Data & Reporting System could be developed and delivered by a contracted vendor for around \$1,150,000, as follows:

Host server software including the following modules: Records Management System, Case Management, Incident Reporting Property and Evidence, Personnel Training & Management, Incident Analysis, Equipment Management, Report Photos, Field Interview, Citizen's Online Reporting (option)	\$ 700,000
Records Management (RMS) Users License	\$ 150,000
Professional Services by Vendor (Includes Workflow Management, Installation, Project Management, Classroom Training and Workplace Coaching, Data Transfer using predesigned datasheets)	\$ 150,000
Transfer legacy data to the new Records Management system (6 databases at estimated \$25,000 per database)	\$ 150,000
Total Vendor Product and Services:	\$ 1,150,000

In addition, an estimated **\$750,000** cost for the biennium is estimated for Systems Integration and QA/QC services (provided by separate contractors).

In summary,

Vendor Product and Services	\$1,150,000
Two years System Integration and QA/QC services	<u>\$ 750,000</u>
Sub-total	\$1,900,000
Plus 15% Estimated Contingency Costs	<u>\$ 285,000</u>
Total Estimated Start-up/Vendor Costs	\$2,185,000
Plus Estimated State Staff and Data Center Costs (from [d])	<u>\$1,252,494</u>
TOTAL Preliminary Estimated Cost	\$3,437,494

f. What are the ongoing costs?

Ongoing maintenance of the system could either be performed by state personnel or by the vendor. If DAS/OIS staff hosted and maintained the system, we estimate that two Information System Specialist 7 (ISS7) and two Application Support Staff (ISS2) positions would be required to support the system on an ongoing basis, at an estimated ongoing cost of approximately \$260,000 per year. Our preliminary market research estimates the ongoing cost of paying a vendor to host and maintain the system at around \$220,000 per year.

Based on this information, we estimate ongoing maintenance costs of **\$250,000/year**, or **\$500,000/biennium**.

g. What are the potential savings?

In one analysis, the use of an integrated Abuse Data and Report-writing System could lead to the potential annual savings of 4,337 person-hours per year, at the level of an OPA3, by reducing the amount of manual data mining. In the current state, workers run semi-automated processes to link data between different databases in order to produce metrics. Many hours are lost during the process of exchanging, checking and interpreting data from the various systems. Unfortunately, this is valuable staff time that could be better put to use performing QA and data analysis in order to identify the causes of abuse (in community and facility settings) and work to mitigate them.

These savings would multiply as efficiencies were realized for investigators and their managers in the field, as well as for OAAPI and other Department staff.

h. Based on these answers, is there a fiscal impact?

Yes

TOTAL FOR THIS PACKAGE

<u>Category</u>	<u>GF</u>	<u>OF</u>	<u>FF</u>	<u>TF</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Services & Supplies	\$1,437,494	\$2,000,000	\$0	\$3,437,494		
Total	\$1,437,494	\$2,000,000	\$0	\$3,437,494	0	0.00

DHS - Fiscal Impact Summary by Program Area:

	Aging and People with Physical Disabilities Program	Total DHS
General Fund	\$1,437,494	\$1,437,494
Other Fund	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000
Federal Funds- Ltd	\$0	\$0
Total Funds	\$3,437,494	\$3,437,494
Positions	0	0
FTE	0.00	0.00

What are the sources of funding and the funding split for each one?

This Policy Option Package is funded with General Funds. The Other Funds should be Q Bonds. Due to an error of omission in the Agency Request and Governor's Budget, these Other Funds are just Other Funds limitation at this time. It is the expectation that DHS will continue to work with Department of Administrative Services and the Legislative Fiscal Office to change this limitation to Q Bonds by Legislatively Adopted Budget.

2015-17 Policy Option Package

Agency Name: Department of Human Services
Program Area Name: Central Services
Program Name: Office of Program Integrity (OPI) Quality Control Child Welfare Review Team (QCCW)
Policy Option Package Initiative: N/A
Policy Option Package Title: Child Welfare Quality Control Reviewer Staff
Policy Option Package Number: 108
Related Legislation: N/A
Program Funding Team: Improving Government

Summary Statement:

The position requested in this POP will increase the QC review capacity in the statewide Child Welfare Quality Assurance system to conduct a statewide qualitative review of the states' child welfare practice in defined areas of child safety, permanency and wellbeing. The position will enable the team to complete stakeholder interviews, which are federally required as part of each state's Continuous Quality Improvement in Child Welfare program. Federal regulations at 45 CFR 1355 require states to maintain substantial conformity with title IV-B and IV-E requirements through CFSR reviews. Other federal requirements can be found in the federal Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 and the Administration for Children and Families Information Memorandum CB-IM 12-07 dated August 27, 2012.

There are currently 3 FTE in the Child Welfare review team. This additional position will enable the state to complete federally mandated Children and Family Services Review (CFSR) as required and mitigate the risk for federal penalties and imposed program improvement plans. This POP has the support of the Child Welfare program area leadership.

	General Fund	Other Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds
<u>Policy Option</u> <u>Package Pricing:</u>	\$79,725	\$0	\$79,725	\$159,450

1. WHAT WOULD THIS POLICY OPTION PACKAGE (POP) DO AND HOW WOULD IT BE IMPLEMENTED?

The Children’s Bureau (CB) reviews state’s conformity with titles IV-B and IV-E of the Social Security Act through the Child and Family Services Reviews (CFSRs). Federal monitoring of our state’s title IV-B and IV-E program requirements includes child welfare case reviews and stakeholder interviews to provide evaluative qualitative data to determine whether the state is in substantial conformity with the CFSR systemic factor federal requirements.

This proposal is to increase the CFSR review team by 1 FTE for a total of 4 FTE to conduct CFSR case reviews and stakeholder interviews to maintain federal requirements. Implementation will consist of hiring and training the additional FTE through one on one training, use of the established training manual, and federal guidance.

2. WHY DOES DHS PROPOSE THIS POP?

This DHS proposal will assist the state in meeting federal CFSR requirements (45 CFR 1355.33) by increasing capacity to conduct stakeholder interviews to inform the Children’s Bureau’s determination of the state’s functioning on the seven systemic factors.

This proposal will increase our state’s capacity to provide a statewide qualitative review of the adequacy and competence of casework and supervisory practice in defined areas of child safety, planning and outcomes for the child’s permanent living situation and the child and family’s well-being for a stratified sample of child

welfare cases. Findings from the CFSR reviews are shared with DHS for purposes of compliance with federal standards; and to provide information to senior management, program managers and community partners for purposes of program improvement and achieving outcomes for children and families.

3. HOW DOES THIS FURTHER THE AGENCY'S MISSION OR GOALS?

The position requested in this POP is directly related to the Agency's mission and goals. Specifically, the agency's goal: "Children and youth are safe, well and connected to their families, communities and cultural identities." The purpose of the CFSR Quality Assurance review is to evaluate the implementation and effectiveness of Child Welfare policies and programs, which include the review area of child safety, and is a critical component to our state's continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) system of Child Welfare.

The Child Welfare Quality Assurance team has recently transitioned to the Quality Control Unit in the Office of Program Integrity (OPI). This newly formed office is part of DHS Central Operations, and provides opportunities for collaboration and support of Child Welfare Quality Assurance while maintaining close connections to the Program Delivery and Design sectors. The CFSR review component in this new structure is a critical review area of the Department to ensure quality Child Welfare services for the best client outcomes.

OPI's mission is to support DHS and Oregon Health Authority (OHA) programs in ensuring compliance with state and federal laws and rules; and to assist with improving program accuracy through high quality and timely accuracy review services and information sharing for select program and program areas.

Our vision for OPI is to be recognized as an indispensable partner in ensuring DHS and OHA program quality and integrity and to have our work product readily incorporated into organizational program integrity discussions and decision making.

We support our mission and vision by:

- Completing accuracy reviews and evaluations of specified program areas and report results to federal agencies, DHS and OHA leadership, programs, other interested parties and stakeholders.
- Providing detailed analysis, technical reports, feedback, recommendations, training for field staff and partners and follow up with each program area subject to review.
- Facilitating collaboration across division lines to establish and strengthen program integrity efforts in programs throughout DHS and OHA.
- Completing selected atypical reviews or reviews on a multi-year review cycle (e.g. PME, PERM, CFSR).

This POP proposal supports this mission and vision by ensuring the federal CFSR compliance to use quantitative and qualitative data to evaluate the state's performance on child welfare outcomes and systemic factors.

4. IS THIS POP TIED TO A DHS OFFICE OF PROGRAM INTEGRITY PERFORMANCE MEASURE? IF YES, IDENTIFY THE PERFORMANCE MEASURE. IF NO, HOW WILL DHS OFFICE OF PROGRAM INTEGRITY MEASURE THE SUCCESS OF THIS POP?

Yes, this POP is tied to the DHS OPI Performance measure of SP 1: Program Integrity (DHS QBR) 1 (b) 6 – Percentage of Child Welfare review areas considered strengths. This measure is currently at 87%. The target goal for this measure is 90%.

This POP is also tied to the Child Welfare QBR, meeting Child Welfare outcomes.

5. DOES THIS POP REQUIRE A CHANGE(S) TO AN EXISTING STATUTE OR REQUIRE A NEW STATUTE? IF YES, IDENTIFY THE STATUTE AND THE LEGISLATIVE CONCEPT.

No

6. WHAT ALTERNATIVES WERE CONSIDERED AND WHAT WERE THE REASONS FOR REJECTING THEM?

No alternatives considered. Status quo would be the alternative.

7. WHAT WOULD BE THE ADVERSE EFFECTS OF NOT FUNDING THIS POP?

Oregon would be unable to maintain compliance with CFSR federal requirements at 45 CFR Part 1355. Further, the State would be unable to adequately assess child welfare practices and related outcomes for children and families through case reviews and stakeholder interviews.

Oregon would be at risk for federal sanctions, which include losing federal match for title IV-B and IV-E funds.

8. WHAT OTHER AGENCIES (STATE, TRIBAL AND/OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT) WOULD BE AFFECTED BY THIS POP? HOW WOULD THEY BE AFFECTED?

Agencies affected include DHS Child Welfare program and field offices; Tribal partners and stakeholders; DHS children and family service providers; and federal partners within the Children Bureau. These staff and partners would benefit from timely and useful CFSR data and findings to achieve continuous improvement of child welfare program and service delivery within the state, attainment of performance objectives, protection from federal sanctions; and transference of best practices amongst DHS units, divisions and federal and state partners.

9. WHAT OTHER AGENCIES, PROGRAMS or STAKEHOLDERS ARE COLLABORATING ON THIS POP?

DHS Child Welfare Program.

10. WHAT IS YOUR EQUITY ANALYSIS?

A known inequity this POP is associated with and addresses is disproportionality of children served by Child Welfare. This position would increase the capacity to conduct a more thorough review and analysis of services provided that prevent and/or provide timely unification of families, which include minority populations. It would also provide the ability to conduct targeted reviews, including ICWA CFSR, to determine if we are meeting the needs and providing culturally appropriate services to children and families affected by disproportionality. It would also ensure we are maintaining compliance with ICWA laws.

11. WHAT ASSUMPTIONS AFFECT THE PRICING OF THIS POP?

Implementation Date(s): 7/1/2015

End Date (if applicable): N/A

a. Will there be new responsibilities for DHS? Specify which Program Area(s) and describe their new responsibilities.

No new responsibilities are anticipated.

b. Will there be new Shared Services impacts sufficient to require additional funding? Specify which office(s) (i.e., facilities, computer services, etc.) and describe how it will be affected.

No.

- c. Will there be changes to client caseloads or services provided to population groups? Specify how many in each relevant program.**

No.

- d. Will it take new staff or will existing positions be modified? For each classification, list the number of positions and the number of months the positions will work in each biennium. Specify if the positions are permanent, limited duration or temporary.**

Yes. 1 CS3 FTE C5248.

- e. What are the start-up costs, such as new or significant modifications to computer systems, new materials, outreach and training?**

No modifications are anticipated for computer systems. Training will be accomplished through our in-house training resources and from on-line federal guidance and review tools.

- f. What are the ongoing costs?**

Ongoing biennial personnel cost for the additional FTE.

- g. What are the potential savings?**

Avoidance of federal sanctions which could result in loss of funding. Achievement of client outcomes will result in decrease in foster care cases and service provider costs. These potential savings are incalculable.

h. Based on these answers, is there a fiscal impact?

Yes.

TOTAL FOR THIS PACKAGE

<u>Category</u>	<u>GF</u>	<u>OF</u>	<u>FF</u>	<u>TF</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Personal Services	\$66,425	\$0	\$66,425	\$132,850	1	1.00
Services & Supplies	\$13,300	\$0	\$13,300	\$26,600		
Total	\$79,725	\$0	\$79,725	\$159,450	1	1.00

DHS – Office of Program Integrity - Fiscal Impact Summary by Program Area:

	Program Design Service - OPI	Total DHS
General Fund	\$ 79,725	\$ 79,725
Other Fund	\$ 0	\$ 0
Federal Funds- Ltd	\$ 79,725	\$ 79,725
Total Funds	\$ 159,450	\$159,450
Positions	1	1
FTE	1.00	1.00

What are the sources of funding and the funding split for each one?

This POP is funded with General Funds matched with Title IV-E Admin Federal Funds.

2015-17 Policy Option Package

Agency Name: Department of Human Services
Program Area Name: Child Welfare
Program Name: Child Welfare Design
Policy Option Package Initiative: N/A
Policy Option Package Title: Program Infrastructure
Policy Option Package Number: 109
Related Legislation: N/A
Program Funding Team: Safety

Summary
Statement:

This POP builds capacity in the Child Welfare design office to support the ongoing efforts currently underway. Those efforts include Differential Response; Safety, Wellbeing and Permanency supports for field workers; development of the statewide hot line;

If this POP is not funded, the fidelity of the field work of Child Welfare will drop and it could threaten the successful implementation of the primary initiative of Child Welfare.

	General Fund	Other Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds
<u>Policy Option Package Pricing:</u>	\$2,183,289	\$0	\$2,176,226	\$4,359,515

1. WHAT WOULD THIS POLICY OPTION PACKAGE (POP) DO AND HOW WOULD IT BE IMPLEMENTED?

The delivery of child welfare services in the field is supported by staff in Central Office that develops and implements policy, practice consultation, quality assurance, contract support and general support and consultation. As staff in the field has grown, the staff available to support the field staff has been static. Because of this, there is not sufficient support for the field workers in their application of the Oregon Safety Model, implementation of Differential Response, consultation on permanency issues and the promulgation of the rules that guide child welfare work. All of these initiatives support the safe and equitable reduction in foster care.

2. WHY DOES DHS PROPOSE THIS POP?

This POP will increase the capacity of Child Welfare Design to support the work in the field, specifically in practicing to fidelity to the Oregon Safety Model, further implementation of Differential Response, Permanency Roundtables, services to children in foster care, and the safe and equitable reduction in the number of children experiencing foster care.

3. HOW DOES THIS FURTHER THE AGENCY'S MISSION OR GOALS?

This POP furthers the efforts that are driving the safe and equitable reduction in foster care. This is directly related to the Safety bid team for Child Welfare.

4. IS THIS POP TIED TO A DHS PERFORMANCE MEASURE? IF YES, IDENTIFY THE PERFORMANCE MEASURE. IF NO, HOW WILL DHS MEASURE THE SUCCESS OF THIS POP?

This POP is tied to the safe and equitable reduction in foster care.

5. DOES THIS POP REQUIRE A CHANGE(S) TO AN EXISTING STATUTE OR REQUIRE A NEW STATUTE? IF YES, IDENTIFY THE STATUTE AND THE LEGISLATIVE CONCEPT.

No.

6. WHAT ALTERNATIVES WERE CONSIDERED AND WHAT WERE THE REASONS FOR REJECTING THEM?

For some time, the field has had allocations from the Legislature to add staff, however, there was not a concurrent addition of staff for Central Office to support the field casework staff and supervisors. We have considered and used job rotations out of the field for more immediate coverage, but this is insufficient to provide the needed support.

7. WHAT WOULD BE THE ADVERSE EFFECTS OF NOT FUNDING THIS POP?

If this POP is not funded, there will be a continued reduction in the support Child Welfare Design can provide to field workers. This will result in decreased fidelity to the practice elements, impacting all families services by child welfare. Reduced fidelity to the practice model could result in children being left in unsafe situations.

8. WHAT OTHER AGENCIES (STATE, TRIBAL AND/OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT) WOULD BE AFFECTED BY THIS POP? HOW WOULD THEY BE AFFECTED?

A reduction in the fidelity of practice to the safety model could impact Native American children and families that come to the attention of the department.

9. WHAT OTHER AGENCIES, PROGRAMS or STAKEHOLDERS ARE COLLABORATING ON THIS POP?

None.

10. WHAT IS YOUR EQUITY ANALYSIS?

These positions will be supporting the field staff in the consistent and equitable provision of services to families. Potentially, with this additional support, we will positively impact the disproportionate representation of children of color in the foster care system by placing fewer children in care, serving more families with children at home.

11. WHAT ASSUMPTIONS AFFECT THE PRICING OF THIS POP?

Implementation Date(s): October, 2015

End Date (if applicable): N/A

a. Will there be new responsibilities for DHS? Specify which Program Area(s) and describe their new responsibilities.

No. This is to staff existing responsibilities.

b. Will there be new Shared Services impacts sufficient to require additional funding? Specify which office(s) (i.e., facilities, computer services, etc.) and describe how it will be affected.

None identified.

- c. **Will there be changes to client caseloads or services provided to population groups? Specify how many in each relevant program.**

No.

- d. **Will it take new staff or will existing positions be modified? For each classification, list the number of positions and the number of months the positions will work in each biennium. Specify if the positions are permanent, limited duration or temporary.**

15 OPA3 – represented, 18 months, permanent

2 PA2s – represented, 18 months, permanent

2 PEM E's – management supervisory, one 18 month permanent, one limited duration, 18 months.

1 PEM D – management supervisory, 18 month, permanent

3 AS 2s – represented, 18 months, permanent

4 Accountant 1 – to support payment processing for ORKids payments.

1 OPA 4 – management, non-supervisory, 18 months, permanent

1 OPA 1 – represented, 18 months, permanent

- e. **What are the start-up costs, such as new or significant modifications to computer systems, new materials, outreach and training?**

N/A

- f. **What are the ongoing costs?**

N/A

g. What are the potential savings?

N/A

h. Based on these answers, is there a fiscal impact?

Yes

TOTAL FOR THIS PACKAGE

<u>Category</u>	<u>GF</u>	<u>OF</u>	<u>FF</u>	<u>TF</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Personal Services	\$1,748,302	\$0	\$1,748,302	\$3,496,604	29	21.75
Services & Supplies	\$ 132,153	\$0	\$ 132,095	\$ 264,248		
Special Payments	\$ 302,834	\$0	\$ 295,829	\$ 598,663		
Total	\$2,183,289	\$0	\$2,176,226	\$4,359,515	29	21.75

Department of Human Services - Fiscal Impact Summary by Program Area:

	CW DESIGN	Total DHS
General Fund	\$2,183,289	\$2,183,289
Other Fund	\$0	\$0
Federal Funds- Ltd	\$2,176,226	\$2,176,226
Total Funds	\$4,359,515	\$4,359,515
Positions	29	29
FTE	21.75	21.75

What are the sources of funding and the funding split for each one?

General Funds matched with Title IV-E Federal Funds.

2015-17 Policy Option Package

Agency Name: Department of Human Services
Program Area Name: Office of Developmental Disability Services (ODDS)
Program Name: Office of Developmental Disabilities Services
Policy Option Package Initiative: N/A
Policy Option Package Title: Build Provider Capacity for individuals with significant, long-term challenges
Policy Option Package Number: 110
Related Legislation: N/A
Program Funding Team: Healthy People

Summary Statement:

A strong need has emerged to support people with long-term challenges with enhanced services in community settings. To that end, the need for a focused strategic plan to address the “stepping down” of people with significant challenges, although NOT in crisis, currently served through the Stabilization and Crisis Unit and in other settings is immediate, cost effective and necessary. This POP supports such a plan with start-up or “grant funds” to provider agencies throughout the state who will build residential homes specifically for people with I/DD who have significant, long-term challenges.

	General Fund	Other Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds
<u>Policy Option Package Pricing:</u>	\$653,730	\$0	\$153,258	\$806,988

1. WHAT WOULD THIS POLICY OPTION PACKAGE (POP) DO AND HOW WOULD IT BE IMPLEMENTED?

This POP would create a funding resource to develop capacity within the community provider agencies for targeted services in a residential setting. Currently there is not enough service capacity for placement of SACU clients who have stabilized and yet, through no fault of their own, their disability requires intensive oversight and staffing. SACU would work directly with interested providers to establish a relationship and agreement for services directed at current clients while placing them in the least restrictive settings to enhance their independence and improve their quality of life.

2. WHY DOES DHS PROPOSE THIS POP?

Over the last year of transition and focus on a crisis oriented service model, it has become apparent that the current 108 beds within the system of care are not fully accessible for those individuals in crisis due to the permanency of many current clients in SACU homes. Through further investigation it has become apparent that many SACU clients have “stabilized” and, but for a lack of community placements, remain in our crisis beds. This is compounded by the fact that there are waiting lists for both the children and adults which further places these individuals at risk during a time of crisis.

3. HOW DOES THIS FURTHER THE AGENCY’S MISSION OR GOALS?

The mission of DHS is to support people to lead independent and healthy lives in the least restrictive way possible. To that end, this proposal supports resource development to move individuals who are currently living in secured and hardened homes when it is no longer required, simply because there are no other community resources to which they could move.

4. IS THIS POP TIED TO A SACU PERFORMANCE MEASURE? IF YES, IDENTIFY THE PERFORMANCE MEASURE. IF NO, HOW WILL SACU MEASURE THE SUCCESS OF THIS POP?

As SACU is just beginning to develop performance measures, this POP will support the measure addressing length of stay in the agency. The metric currently under design for SACU has the general population of 108 beds primarily focused on LENGTH OF STAY within the agency, again with the focus on crisis and stabilization needs. Once those needs are addressed within the SACU service model, the client will be moved into a less restrictive and expensive community placement developed with resources from this POP.

5. DOES THIS POP REQUIRE A CHANGE(S) TO AN EXISTING STATUTE OR REQUIRE A NEW STATUTE? IF YES, IDENTIFY THE STATUTE AND THE LEGISLATIVE CONCEPT.

No, it does not require a change to an existing statute.

6. WHAT ALTERNATIVES WERE CONSIDERED AND WHAT WERE THE REASONS FOR REJECTING THEM?

The need to expand program capacity has been a driver in the system of care for many decades. Current alternatives considered included:

- a. The continuation of the current model which is an expensive service and oversight for a population no longer in need of this level of service;
- b. Using the existing community provider resources but the current shortage of community residential beds as well as the higher acuity of this population did not support this alternative.

7. WHAT WOULD BE THE ADVERSE EFFECTS OF NOT FUNDING THIS POP?

Not investing in community development of a less expensive and more independent resource is twofold. These individuals will need state provided services at a higher rate of expense than a community provider would cost, and the mission of DHS would be undermined in not supporting this investment. Additionally, a crisis bed would continue to be utilized for clients NOT in crisis but simply in our system for lack of additionally community resources. The waiting list will continue to grow.

8. WHAT OTHER AGENCIES (STATE, TRIBAL AND/OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT) WOULD BE AFFECTED BY THIS POP? HOW WOULD THEY BE AFFECTED?

The agencies most impacted by this POP include community based provider agencies of residential services for the most severely Intellectually & Developmentally Disabled (I/DD) clients within the state of Oregon. Those agencies would build capacity for services through this proposal as well as improve their own aptitude and skill set in the service provision to this client population.

9. WHAT OTHER AGENCIES, PROGRAMS or STAKEHOLDERS ARE COLLABORATING ON THIS POP?

None identified.

10. WHAT IS YOUR EQUITY ANALYSIS?

We are working with the Office of Multicultural Services to perform an Equity Analysis. Additional information will be reported at a future date.

11. WHAT ASSUMPTIONS AFFECT THE PRICING OF THIS POP?

The determination of the actual “grants” to each qualified provider would be set through this proposal. The affected cost variance would simply be how far a dollar can be stretched in the development and construction of additional housing resources. An assumption of proper grant management, effective cost allocation, and oversight of managing physical plant construction are all variables in the mix of effective public stewardship of tax dollars. Approximately 25 GF Grants at \$10,000 each.

Implementation Date(s): July 2015

End Date (if applicable): Once capacity met, or June 2017 whichever is earlier

- a. Will there be new responsibilities for DHS? Specify which Program Area(s) and describe their new responsibilities.**

None specified.

- b. Will there be new administrative impacts sufficient to require additional funding? Specify which office(s) (i.e., facilities, computer services, etc.) and describe how it will be affected.**

None specified.

- c. Will there be changes to client caseloads or services provided to population groups? Specify how many in each relevant program.**

More options in service providers. More capacity in the appropriate services.

- d. Will it take new staff or will existing positions be modified? For each classification, list the number of positions and the number of months the positions will work in each biennium. Specify if the positions are permanent, limited duration or temporary. OPA3 FT LD, OS2 FT**

LD, Central office, 50/50, to process grants/contracts.

- e. What are the start-up costs, such as new or significant modifications to computer systems, new materials, outreach and training?**

None

- f. What are the ongoing costs?**

None specified.

- g. What are the potential savings?**

None

- h. Based on these answers, is there a fiscal impact?**

Yes.

TOTAL FOR THIS PACKAGE

<u>Category</u>	<u>GF</u>	<u>OF</u>	<u>FF</u>	<u>TF</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Personal Services	\$120,938	\$0	\$120,484	\$241,422	2	1.76
Services & Supplies	\$ 32,184	\$0	\$ 32,170	\$ 64,354		
Special Payments	\$500,608	\$0	\$604	\$501,212		
Total	\$653,730	\$0	\$153,258	\$806,988	2	1.76

DHS - Fiscal Impact Summary by Program Area:

	I/DD Program Delivery	Total DHS
General Fund	\$653,730	\$653,730
Other Fund	\$0	\$0
Federal Funds- Ltd	\$153,258	\$153,258
Total Funds	\$806,988	\$806,988
Positions	2	2
FTE	1.76	1.76

What are the sources of funding and the funding split for each one?

The Federal Funds is Medicaid match.

2015-17 Policy Option Package

Agency Name: DHS
Program Area Name: ODDS Assessment Unit
Program Name: ODDS
Policy Option Package Initiative: N/A
Policy Option Package Title: Provider Rate Increases
Policy Option Package Number: 111
Related Legislation: N/A
Program Funding Team: Healthy People

Summary
Statement:

Providers in 24 hour Group Homes and Supported Living Agencies have not had a Cost of Living Allowance (COLA) in 3 biennia. We are requesting a 4% rate increase to these provider agencies effective 1/1/2016. 4% is less than the combined COLAs for the previous three biennia but will allow these agencies to increase direct staff wages and/or benefits for those that serve our I/DD individuals.

	General Fund	Other Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds
<u>Policy Option Package Pricing:</u>	\$8,537,069	\$0	\$18,163,987	\$26,701,056

1. WHAT WOULD THIS POLICY OPTION PACKAGE (POP) DO AND HOW WOULD IT BE IMPLEMENTED?

This POP would increase existing provider rates for the 24 Hour Group Home and Supported Living provider agencies. Providers would then be able to increase salaries and/or benefits for their direct care staff. We would propose to implement these rate increases effective 1/1/2016. These increases could be implemented via the eXPRS system.

2. WHY DOES DHS PROPOSE THIS POP?

DHS relies upon community providers to support individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities. These supports allow people to be integrated into their local community with the supports that they need to live full lives. Intellectual and Developmental Disability (I/DD) providers have not received a Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) in the past three biennia. They are finding it difficult to maintain staff due to the ability of staff to obtain higher paying jobs with benefits in other settings. Staff that remain at these agencies are not able to make a living wage. These agencies are crucial to the delivery of services to the I/DD population.

3. HOW DOES THIS FURTHER THE AGENCY'S MISSION OR GOALS?

By allowing providers to increase the wages and/or benefits to their direct care staff they will be better able to maintain long term staff which leads to a more stable living environment for the individuals we serve.

4. IS THIS POP TIED TO A DHS PERFORMANCE MEASURE? IF YES, IDENTIFY THE PERFORMANCE MEASURE. IF NO, HOW WILL DHS MEASURE THE SUCCESS OF THIS POP?

No

5. DOES THIS POP REQUIRE A CHANGE(S) TO AN EXISTING STATUTE OR REQUIRE A NEW STATUTE? IF YES, IDENTIFY THE STATUTE AND THE LEGISLATIVE CONCEPT.

No.

6. WHAT ALTERNATIVES WERE CONSIDERED AND WHAT WERE THE REASONS FOR REJECTING THEM?

If we do increase provider rates they will continue to lose staff to the Personal Support Worker side which does not provide services to the group homes or supported living agencies. This will decrease our seasoned workforce for those that cannot live on their own.

7. WHAT WOULD BE THE ADVERSE EFFECTS OF NOT FUNDING THIS POP?

If we do increase provider rates they will continue to lose staff to the Personal Support Worker side which does not provide services to the group homes or supported living agencies. This will decrease our seasoned workforce for those that cannot live on their own.

8. WHAT OTHER AGENCIES (STATE, TRIBAL AND/OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT) WOULD BE AFFECTED BY THIS POP? HOW WOULD THEY BE AFFECTED?

None.

9. WHAT OTHER AGENCIES, PROGRAMS or STAKEHOLDERS ARE COLLABORATING ON THIS POP?

I/DD stakeholders were involved in the development of this POP. A stakeholder group was developed to advise DHS on priorities for the 2015-17 budget and this concept was one of the highest priorities the group identified.

10. WHAT IS YOUR EQUITY ANALYSIS?

Further work on an equity analysis is required. DHS will be working with the Office of Equity and Multicultural Services to advance this conversation.

11. WHAT ASSUMPTIONS AFFECT THE PRICING OF THIS POP?

Implementation Date(s): 1/1/2016

End Date (if applicable): N/A

a. Will there be new responsibilities for DHS? Specify which Program Area(s) and describe their new responsibilities.

No.

b. Will there be new Shared Services impacts sufficient to require additional funding? Specify which office(s) (i.e., facilities, computer services, etc.) and describe how it will be affected.

No.

- c. Will there be changes to client caseloads or services provided to population groups? Specify how many in each relevant program.**

No.

- d. Will it take new staff or will existing positions be modified? For each classification, list the number of positions and the number of months the positions will work in each biennium. Specify if the positions are permanent, limited duration or temporary.**

No.

- e. What are the start-up costs, such as new or significant modifications to computer systems, new materials, outreach and training?**

No.

- f. What are the ongoing costs?**

None identified.

- g. What are the potential savings?**

None.

h. Based on these answers, is there a fiscal impact?

Yes.

TOTAL FOR THIS PACKAGE

<u>Category</u>	<u>GF</u>	<u>OF</u>	<u>FF</u>	<u>TF</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Special Payments	\$8,537,069	\$0	\$18,163,987	\$26,701,056	0	0.00
Total	\$8,537,069	\$0	\$18,163,987	\$26,701,056	0	0.00

(DHS) - Fiscal Impact Summary by Program Area:

	<u>I/DD</u>	<u>Total DHS</u>
General Fund	\$8,537,069	\$8,537,069
Other Fund	\$0	\$0
Federal Funds- Ltd	\$18,163,987	\$18,163,987
Total Funds	\$26,701,056	\$26,701,056
Positions	0	0
FTE	0.00	0.00

What are the sources of funding and the funding split for each one?

The Federal Funds are Medicaid.

2015-17 Policy Option Package

Agency Name: Department of Human Services
Program Area Name: Self Sufficiency
Program Name: Program Delivery
Policy Option Package Initiative: N/A
Policy Option Package Title: SS – backfill empty OF & restoration of pos.
Policy Option Package Number: 070/113
Related Legislation: N/A
Program Funding Team: Economy and Jobs

Summary
Statement:

This combination of policy option packages eliminates all the empty other fund limitation in virtually all Self Sufficiency positions and replacing it with a combination of General and Federal Funds. The empty other fund limitation issue is primarily the result of actions taken prior to the 2003-05 session to hit a GF target at the time, where all positions were provided some other fund limitation. In addition the loss of provider and hospital tax funding for Self Sufficiency positions, to free up GF in 2011-13 and 2013-15, was not permanently backfilled. DHS has been managing to the budget for several biennia through vacancy savings. The Federal Fund backfill is from the TANF flexibility in design POP 101. The remaining backfill is General Funds. In addition, 17 Case Manager Positions have been added to take the total GF investment to \$10M as agreed upon in the TANF Re-Design.

	General Fund	Other Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds
Policy Option Package Pricing:	\$10,000,000	(\$15,049,969)	\$7,983,033	\$2,933,064

2015-17 Policy Option Package

Agency Name: Department of Human Services
Program Area Name: Vocational Rehabilitation
Program Name: Vocational Rehabilitation
Policy Option Package Initiative: N/A
Policy Option Package Title: No Cost Position Authority Request
Policy Option Package Number: 119
Related Legislation: N/A
Program Funding Team: N/A

Summary
Statement:

The policy option package is requesting position authority to clear all of the double filled positions within the Vocational Rehabilitation program. These positions currently have the necessary funding to support them. These positions were hired to serve the ever expanding need for rehabilitation services by Oregon residents, as well as meeting required over site of program based on federal reviews and reporting requirements. Vocational Rehabilitation has been able to fund these by reducing contract costs and managing spending related to client services.

	General Fund	Other Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds
<u>Policy Option Package Pricing:</u>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

1. WHAT WOULD THIS POLICY OPTION PACKAGE (POP) DO AND HOW WOULD IT BE IMPLEMENTED?

This Policy Option Package would create position authority for the double filled positions within the Vocational Rehabilitation program and move the dollars out of the special payments portion of the budget to the personal services and service and supplies lines where they are being spent.

2. WHY DOES DHS PROPOSE THIS POP?

To better align the budget and provide the appropriate funding related to employee cost.

3. HOW DOES THIS FURTHER THE AGENCY'S MISSION OR GOALS? HOW DOES THIS FURTHER THE PROGRAM FUNDING TEAM OUTCOMES OR STRATEGIES?

This allows the program and the agency to reflect and manage the actual expenditures in the appropriate categories.

4. IS THIS POP TIED TO A DHS PERFORMANCE MEASURE? IF YES, IDENTIFY THE PERFORMANCE MEASURE. IF NO, HOW WILL DHS MEASURE THE SUCCESS OF THIS POP?

No. Proper classification of budgeted and actual expenditures will allow the agency and program to properly manage within the budgeted authority as well as analyze any need to active the Order of Selection based on available funding.

5. DOES THIS POP REQUIRE A CHANGE(S) TO AN EXISTING STATUTE OR REQUIRE A NEW STATUTE? IF YES, IDENTIFY THE STATUTE AND THE LEGISLATIVE CONCEPT.

No.

6. WHAT ALTERNATIVES WERE CONSIDERED AND WHAT WERE THE REASONS FOR REJECTING THEM?

Continuing as currently funded with manual tracking and continued impact of the federal funds used to support personnel.

7. WHAT WOULD BE THE ADVERSE EFFECTS OF NOT FUNDING THIS POP?

The program would continue to fund the positions with all of the state increases each biennium using federal funds that do not increase thereby reducing the amount of money available for client services.

8. WHAT OTHER AGENCIES (STATE, TRIBAL AND/OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT) WOULD BE AFFECTED BY THIS POP? HOW WOULD THEY BE AFFECTED?

No.

9. WHAT OTHER AGENCIES, PROGRAMS or STAKEHOLDERS ARE COLLABORATING ON THIS POP?

N/A

10. WHAT IS YOUR EQUITY ANALYSIS?

N/A

11. WHAT ASSUMPTIONS AFFECT THE PRICING OF THIS POP?

Cost of the actual employees on the double filled positions.

Implementation Date(s): 7/1/2015

End Date (if applicable): N/A

a. Will there be new responsibilities for Department of Human Services Vocational Rehabilitation? Specify which Program Area(s) and describe their new responsibilities.

No.

b. Will there be new Shared Services impacts sufficient to require additional funding? Specify which office(s) (i.e., facilities, computer services, etc.) and describe how it will be affected.

No.

c. Will there be changes to client caseloads or services provided to population groups? Specify how many in each relevant program.

No.

- d. Will it take new staff or will existing positions be modified? For each classification, list the number of positions and the number of months the positions will work in each biennium. Specify if the positions are permanent, limited duration or temporary.**

No.

- e. What are the start-up costs, such as new or significant modifications to computer systems, new materials, outreach and training? No**

No.

- f. What are the ongoing costs?**

The normal cost of positions.

- g. What are the potential savings?**

None.

- h. Based on these answers, is there a fiscal impact?**

No, because the dollars for the personnel and service and supplies will move from the special payments line.

TOTAL FOR THIS PACKAGE

<u>Category</u>	<u>GF</u>	<u>OF</u>	<u>FF</u>	<u>TF</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Personal Services	\$676,088	\$0	\$2,498,063	\$3,174,151	19	19.00
Services & Supplies	\$148,515	\$0	\$ 546,820	\$ 695,335		
Special Payments	(\$824,603)	0	(\$3,044,883)	(\$3,869,486)		
Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	19	19.00

Department of Human Services - Fiscal Impact Summary by Program

Area:

	Vocational Rehabilitation	Total DHS
General Fund	\$0	\$0
Other Fund	\$0	\$0
Federal Funds- Ltd	\$0	\$0
Total Funds	\$0	\$0
Positions	0	0
FTE	0.00	0.00

What are the sources of funding and the funding split for each one?

The funding sources are from the Basic Rehabilitation Grant and are existing revenue that is moving from special payments.

2015-17 Policy Option Package

Agency Name: DHS/OHA
Program Area Name: Program Design Services
Program Name: Office of Business Intelligence
Policy Option Package Initiative: N/A
Policy Option Package Title: Oregon Enterprise Data Research Analytics
Policy Option Package Number: 121
Related Legislation: N/A
Program Funding Team: Improving Government

Summary
Statement:

Understanding data and information from across state Agencies is a need that is being identified by many Agencies and multiple conversations are currently occurring. Analysis of integrated client/customer service information across state services would be a powerful tool to assist in identifying costs, risks, outcomes, and future need level at the state, community, family and individual level. It would also provide an understanding of our state services from client/customer perspective. Several efforts to do this are currently underway. Coordination and consolidation of these efforts, development of governance for data access and use, and resource for maintenance, expansion and analysis are needed for Oregon.

	General Fund	Other Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds
<u>Policy Option Package Pricing:</u>	\$946,393	\$1,889,626	\$943,233	\$3,779,252

1. WHAT WOULD THIS POLICY OPTION PACKAGE (POP) DO AND HOW WOULD IT BE IMPLEMENTED?

Oregon state agencies continue to operate with fewer resources and diminished capacity while simultaneously planning, developing and implementing new ways of doing business. A key component of agency transformation is the ability to leverage advancements in technology and data analysis to support the organization's business objectives towards achieving shared outcomes. Our main enterprise issue is the lack of sufficient data analytic, which involves the collection, synthesis, and analysis of data that can lead to improved decision-making as a result of understanding underlying patterns and trends.

State agencies collect a substantial amount of data about clients/customers and the services they receive. However, they generally do this in isolation from each other, many times using antiquated IT systems. A few states and cities have, or are in the process of, developed integrated systems or data warehouses to support analysis which inform internal and external decision-making. Examples of these include the state of Washington (see <http://www.dshs.wa.gov/rda/mission.shtm>) and the city of New York. This work is being accomplished through a sustained vision and long-term commitment. Oregon has several similar efforts underway including:

- the DHS/OHA Integrated Client Services (ICS) database and DHS Office of Business Intelligence and OHA Office of Health Analytics,
- the DOC data warehouse and the Office of Research and Projects, and
- the Education longitudinal data warehouse and research analysts

This work could be leveraged and expanded to provide a wider wealth of information needed for policy decision-making.

This POP would create and resource an Oregon Enterprise Data Analytics (OEDA) group for program research and evaluation purposes. Analysis would focus on costs, services and clients/customers receiving

social, health, educational, correctional and employment services. Social services would include welfare, food, cash assistance, housing, etc.

Data Analytic staff would be added to make broader use of the data that is being collected. The OEDA group would focus on enhancing analytic capabilities to support agency, system and legislative questions and build risk models and other tools for policy/practice decision-making. They would be able to analyze population-based outcome information and results across programs and systems.

From a data perspective, the current ICS database already brings together client and service information from DHS and OHA as well as information from Vital Statistics, Employment and DOC. The focus over the first biennium would be to expand this data to include Education/Early Learning and OYA. Certain service cost data and health risk/outcome data could also be added.

The OEDA group would be managed out of DHS/OHA shared services and would focus on the following foundational components:

- The creation of an inclusive enterprise governance structure over access and use of the data, to include representation from all areas whose data is included in the data warehouse. This governance would prioritize the analysis and model development performed by the OEDA staff.
- Research and data analytic staff to develop predictive/risk models and use advanced analytical capabilities to do program, policy and cost analysis. (see section 2 for more detail on the proposed focus of the analytic work).
- Completion of new data sharing agreements which adhere to agency, state and federal policies.
- Maintenance, expansion, and enhancement of data sets in the data warehouse, including:
 - development of matching and other business rules for new data,
 - collection/transmission of additional identified program data,
 - any incremental hardware and software costs,

This work would be done in collaboration with Agencies and programs and would not replace the need to have some agency specific data and analysis resources in support of their agency operations.

The vision for accomplishing this work would include having a researcher with expertise in specific services areas [such as health, economics, social services, etc.] that would be partnered with one or more “big data” analytic specialists. For example, WA currently has over 20 research/data analysts working on various projects. They also have 5 staff devoted to performance measurement. This does not include the staff that maintain their various databases or develop their online tools for workers.

As a starting point for this work in Oregon, an additional staff of at least 11 would be needed. This would be composed of:

- 1 manager[PEME]
- 8 research/data analysts [6 RA4, 2 Econ3] to perform data analysis/evaluation and developing risk models and other tools. In addition, they would provide guidance on how the data needs to be organized in the database to support efficient analysis
- 1 database administrator [ISS8],
- 1 database maintenance staff [ISS6],
- Part-time Information Architect (approx. 0.1 FTE)
- Part-time Information Security and Privacy analyst (approx. 0.1 FTE)
- Approximately 60 hours of AAG time to consult on the development of data sharing agreements

In addition to performing analysis and building models, analysts would work with each agency to understand their data and business requirements and to monitor for IT/data system changes that impact the data being pulled into the OEDA.

Also using the approach developed in Washington, opportunities would be actively sought to add staff over time through funding by agencies and/or grants for research.

2. WHY DOES (DHS/OHA) PROPOSE THIS POP?

This POP is being proposed in order to create enterprise analytics capacity to look more broadly and holistically at our clients/customers in order to more effectively serve them and improve their outcomes. For many years agencies and programs worked in silos, not recognizing that individuals and families were interacting and being affected by multiple programs and services at the same time and/or throughout their lives. The largest area of learning that is needed by policy makers today actually occurs outside of the silos. This POP would enhance the infrastructure for better decision-making around the effectiveness of interventions and help improve the efficient allocation of scarce resources. It also would provide better response to the real-time needs of citizens. It would help identify how to bring the right resources at the right time to the right families. It could also provide greater transparency and accountability – allowing for the creation of integrated, cross-system performance and outcome measurement.

Integrating data allows for longitudinal analysis of client/customer experience and needs which helps inform policy, practice and funding decisions. These analyses can help us identify ways to push resources earlier in client/customer's lives to address issues found to put them at risk of escalation of needs, preventing the need for more costly interventions later.

Having large data sets of integrated information and dedicated data analytic staff make it possible to identify complex patterns in the data that may or may not be otherwise expected. This then allows for models and tools to be built to help identify risk levels and strategically target services. For example, complicated relationships such as those discovered in the Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) study could be uncovered by analysis of big longitudinal integrated data sets. The ACE Study found that as the number of adverse childhood experiences (such as abuse/neglect, DV, parental substance abuse, mental illness, divorce, or incarceration) increased, the risk for a number of health problems later in life also increased (health problems included alcoholism, smoking, heart disease to name a few).

In Washington, they have been able to leverage program evaluation and risk modeling work completed by their analytics group to create a Predictive Risk Intelligence System (PRISM) application which is now used to help triage high-risk Medicaid clients for eligibility to intensive, higher cost services. This has reduced inpatient and mortality risks for clients.

The initial focus of the OEDA work this biennium could include:

- Support of Early Learning and Education related questions- Having cross-agency integrated data will assist us with the need to understand early learning in the context of a complex ecosystem, including the system layers and actors that affect the five domains of whole child development. The following are examples of analysis that would be undertaken:
 - describing the relationship between social and behavioral risk factors and educational disabilities for K-12 students using linked DHS/OHA data and educational administrative data
 - determining Risk factors of late high school graduation or drop-out for children in 9th grade and receiving services from DHS/OHA – to focus additional intervention
 - developing child success risk calculations at various educational stages (i.e., kindergarten readiness, 3rd grade, 9th grade) using child and family service and risk factors
- Support of Additional “Feeder System” Analysis, similar to what has been started by DOC, which would provide a better understanding of the way and reasons that Oregonians move through the various state Agencies programs. This information is important in order to develop or target service interventions to where they can be most effective and can assist in better estimating future need for services. Better understanding factors that increase risk of entry to the child welfare system would be the first focus.
- Creation of de-identified data sets available for public research and analysis, as well as some aggregate data reporting for basic information.

3. HOW DOES THIS FURTHER THE AGENCY'S MISSION OR GOALS? HOW DOES THIS FURTHER THE PROGRAM FUNDING TEAM OUTCOMES OR STRATEGIES?

Better information is key to better decision-making. Bringing data together and analyzing it in meaningful ways leads to the expansion of information. Therefore this POP to build structure is an investment in growing the information we need today and in the future to innovate.

Governor Kitzhaber stated, "We can't move Oregon forward if we're operating in silos. We can only move Oregon forward if we can make connections and leverage opportunities." Bringing together and analyzing the vast amount of data we as a state have, is vital to making new kinds of connections.

It will help provide the information needed to address Oregon's top priorities of:

- Education: Delivering better results for students, more resources for teachers and more accountability for taxpayers.
- Health Care: Working with local communities, health care providers, legislators, and federal partners to deliver better care and improved health at lower costs.
- Jobs and Innovation: Getting Oregonians back to work.

4. IS THIS POP TIED TO A (DHS/OHA) PERFORMANCE MEASURE? IF YES, IDENTIFY THE PERFORMANCE MEASURE. IF NO, HOW WILL DHS/OHA MEASURE THE SUCCESS OF THIS POP?

The success of this POP will be measured by the analysis and models produced and by the availability of the de-identified data set.

5. DOES THIS POP REQUIRE A CHANGE(S) TO AN EXISTING STATUTE OR REQUIRE A NEW STATUTE? IF YES, IDENTIFY THE STATUTE AND THE LEGISLATIVE CONCEPT.

No.

6. WHAT ALTERNATIVES WERE CONSIDERED AND WHAT WERE THE REASONS FOR REJECTING THEM?

Several alternatives to this proposal were considered. One alternative was to partner with University researchers to develop the needed analysis. In speaking with staff in Washington, they emphasized that a direct connection to policy makers and implementers had been key to the success of their analytics office. Having that close connection, rather than a more theoretical or academic perspective, was necessary to having meaningful and directly applicable findings. Similarly, having the staff connected to a direct client service agency, rather than an administrative entity like DAS, is seen as preferable and a benefit because of the understanding of implementation and service delivery. The final alternative was to continue the multiple efforts underway and the relatively slow progress that agencies are making by trying to do this work on top of other data and analytic tasks for their programs. With the focus we have today on outcomes for our clients/customers and effectiveness of our services, especially in relation to the significant size of program budgets involved, this was not seen as a prudent alternative.

7. WHAT WOULD BE THE ADVERSE EFFECTS OF NOT FUNDING THIS POP?

Continued policy decision-making without all the relevant information.

8. WHAT OTHER AGENCIES (STATE, TRIBAL AND/OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT) WOULD BE AFFECTED BY THIS POP? HOW WOULD THEY BE AFFECTED?

Education, Early Learning and OYA would be affected. They would need to participate in the development of data sharing agreements and data transfer, understanding of their program data, and review and approval of analysis done using their data. They would also have the ability to access, with appropriate approval, additional analysis using other agencies' data also. The governance structure, which would include representation from all participating agencies, would prioritize the analysis and models developed by the data analytics staff.

9. WHAT OTHER AGENCIES, PROGRAMS or STAKEHOLDERS ARE COLLABORATING ON THIS POP?

In addition to DHS and OHA, the other agencies collaborating on this POP are Education, Early Learning, DOC and OYA.

10. WHAT IS YOUR EQUITY ANALYSIS?

This POP will allow for better analysis of service equity through the collection of demographic data for analysis around access, risks and outcomes.

11. WHAT ASSUMPTIONS AFFECT THE PRICING OF THIS POP?

Implementation Date(s): 10/1/2015

End Date (if applicable): N/A

- a. **Will there be new responsibilities for (DHS/OHA)? Specify which Program Area(s) and describe their new responsibilities.**

None identified.

- b. **Will there be new Shared Services impacts sufficient to require additional funding? Specify which office(s) (i.e., facilities, computer services, etc.) and describe how it will be affected.**

Yes, a new unit would be created in Shared Services for the OEDA under the Office of Forecasting, Research and Analysis. Services which are required whenever incremental employees are hired will also be needed (e.g. HR, Payroll, Facilities, IT, etc.); OIS maintenance and potential expansion of the ICS database; Information Security & Privacy Office role in review of data sharing and security considerations.

- c. **Will there be changes to client caseloads or services provided to population groups? Specify how many in each relevant program.**

No.

- d. **Will it take new staff or will existing positions be modified? For each classification, list the number of positions and the number of months the positions will work in each biennium. Specify if the positions are permanent, limited duration or temporary.**

Yes, see section 1. Staff would be for 21 months. It is assumed that development will be ongoing and never reach a true maintenance phase, due to the ever-changing dynamic of state, federal and local policies around program domains and their data and data systems. As a result, the proposed staffing levels will likely need to be maintained in perpetuity.

- e. **What are the start-up costs, such as new or significant modifications to computer systems, new materials, outreach and training?**

Additional server space may be needed as well as potential modifications to the current ICS data base.

- f. **What are the ongoing costs?**

Maintenance costs for the data warehouse, software license renewals, permanent staffing, Enterprise Technology Services (such as increased storage costs).

- g. **What are the potential savings?**

None identified.

- h. **Based on these answers, is there a fiscal impact?**

Yes.

TOTAL FOR THIS PACKAGE

<u>Category</u>	<u>GF</u>	<u>OF</u>	<u>FF</u>	<u>TF</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Personal Services	\$762,505	\$0	\$762,505	\$1,525,018	13	8.45
Services & Supplies	\$178,128	\$1,889,626	\$174,968	\$2,242,722		
Other-Attorney General	\$ 5,760	\$0	\$ 5,760	\$ 11,520		
Total	\$946,393	\$1,889,626	\$943,233	\$3,779,252	13	8.45

DHS - Fiscal Impact Summary by Program Area:

	Program Design Services - OBI	Total DHS
General Fund	\$946,393	\$946,393
Other Fund	\$1,889,626	\$1,889,626
Federal Funds- Ltd	\$943,233	\$943,233
Total Funds	\$3,779,252	\$3,779,252
Positions	13	13
FTE	8.45	8.45

What are the sources of funding and the funding split for each one?

This POP is funded with General Funds and matching Federal Funds. The Other Funds represents the limitation needed by DHS Shared Services to support the positions and Services & Supplies being requested.

OBI - Revenue Impact:

<u>Description of Revenue</u>	<u>OF</u>	<u>FF</u>	<u>TF</u>
Medicaid (Comp Srce 0995)	0	\$943,233	\$943,233
Shared Services Limitation (Comp Srce 0975)	\$1,889,626	0	\$1,889,626
Total	\$1,889,626	\$943,233	\$2,832,859

2015-17 Policy Option Package

<u>Agency Name:</u>	Department of Human Services
<u>Program Area Name:</u>	Shared Services
<u>Program Name:</u>	Office of Payment Accuracy and Recovery (OPAR) Fraud Investigation Unit (FIU)
<u>Policy Option Package Initiative:</u>	N/A
<u>Policy Option Package Title:</u>	TANF Investigator POP
<u>Policy Option Package Number:</u>	123
<u>Related Legislation:</u>	N/A
<u>Program Funding Team:</u>	Improving Government

Summary Statement:

Currently, OPAR's client fraud investigators have caseloads in excess of 300 cases each. This is excessive and additional resources are needed to properly dispose of the backlogged workload. Further, an investigator's work often happens in client homes and in adversarial situations where safety is a concern.

These new staff (7 FTE, Investigator 3 classification; 10 FTE, Investigator 2 classification; 2 FTE, Office Specialist 2; 2 FTE, Administrative Specialist 2; 1 FTE, Program Manager C) would provide the additional investigative horsepower needed to right-size the investigations unit, reduce existing safety concerns, as well as expand capacity for utilizing new data mining and GIS fraud identification techniques. **This POP has been repriced at the Governor's Budget to reflect a delay of 9 months for implementation.**

	General Fund	Other Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds
<u>Policy Option</u> <u>Package Pricing:</u>	\$884,248	\$1,314,776	\$763,687	\$2,962,711

1. WHAT WOULD THIS POLICY OPTION PACKAGE (POP) DO AND HOW WOULD IT BE IMPLEMENTED?

This package would right-size the Fraud Investigation Unit for both the traditional number of fraud referrals needing investigation and to provide back-up and safety-oriented support for investigators as they go about their hazardous day-to-day activities. This staffing level would also allow the team to steadily reduce their backlog and provide the capability needed to work the new leads generated by the enhanced data analytics capabilities this package would also fund.

Data analytics is proving to be a valuable tool to many states. The capabilities afforded by even the ability to analyze a simple match of recipients to store locations provide many investigative opportunities that would go unnoticed without such capability. A recent pilot project undertaken in concert with the Oregon Audits Division, Food and Nutrition Service – Office of Inspector General (FNS OIG), FBI, DHS SNAP program staff, and our office highlights these capabilities. We are pursuing an FNS grant for specific data analytic capabilities funding, but the resources to work the leads and complete the investigations will need to come from our regular staffing. This package should allow us to ramp up this capability while we simultaneously reduce and eventually eliminate the backlog.

These additional investigative resources would also generate overpayments, cost avoidance, and recoveries. As a total funds investment, these new revenues and cost avoidance opportunities would cover the cost of adding the new staff and capabilities. The package return on investment (ROI) includes several positions that are not revenue / cost avoidance generating per se, which would be lower than an office and program level

ROI. If you consider just the expenses for investigators against recovery / cost avoidance, or with the entire package resources added at the office level, the ROI would be positive.

Program investments will allow FIU the opportunity to improve their effectiveness and efficiency through GIS, significantly improve investigator safety, and expand the deterrent effect that comes with more investigators. Further, these costs will be offset to a great extent by the new recovery and cost avoidance opportunities resulting from more investigators in the field and enhanced analytical capabilities.

2. WHY DOES DHS PROPOSE THIS POP?

For the work referred to the Fraud Investigations Unit, and the type of work they do, increasing staffing to both handle the workload and to help mitigate the hazardous nature of the work is warranted. This POP would do these things as well as the benefits listed in response to question #1.

3. HOW DOES THIS FURTHER THE AGENCY'S MISSION OR GOALS?

It clearly supports the integrity mission by providing resources for reducing fraud attacks.

4. IS THIS POP TIED TO A DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES PERFORMANCE MEASURE? IF YES, IDENTIFY THE PERFORMANCE MEASURE. IF NO, HOW WILL DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES MEASURE THE SUCCESS OF THIS POP?

It is tied to the OPAR performance measures and will be monitored accordingly.

5. DOES THIS POP REQUIRE A CHANGE(S) TO AN EXISTING STATUTE OR REQUIRE A NEW STATUTE? IF YES, IDENTIFY THE STATUTE AND THE LEGISLATIVE CONCEPT.

It does not.

6. WHAT ALTERNATIVES WERE CONSIDERED AND WHAT WERE THE REASONS FOR REJECTING THEM?

Alternatives are limited because of lack of personnel resources. The alternatives considered would only create service delivery gaps in other areas.

7. WHAT WOULD BE THE ADVERSE EFFECTS OF NOT FUNDING THIS POP?

The long range effect would be fraud attacks would continue to increase to the point we would not be able to significantly impact and counter the trend. We would also be missing the opportunity to effectively utilize technology that could have a greater impact on fraud detection.

8. WHAT OTHER AGENCIES (STATE, TRIBAL AND/OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT) WOULD BE AFFECTED BY THIS POP? HOW WOULD THEY BE AFFECTED?

None.

9. WHAT OTHER AGENCIES, PROGRAMS or STAKEHOLDERS ARE COLLABORATING ON THIS POP?

DHS Self Sufficiency is collaborating on this POP.

10. WHAT IS YOUR EQUITY ANALYSIS?

None.

11. WHAT ASSUMPTIONS AFFECT THE PRICING OF THIS POP?

Positions would start at level 1 or 2 of the classification depending on work history.

Implementation Date(s): 10/1/2016 – 7/1/2016

End Date (if applicable): N/A

- a. Will there be new responsibilities for Department of Human Service? Specify which Program Area(s) and describe their new responsibilities.**

None identified.

- b. Will there be new Shared Services impacts sufficient to require additional funding? Specify which office(s) (i.e., facilities, computer services, etc.) and describe how it will be affected. See Addendum A - Shared Services LC/POP Impact Questionnaire (at the end of this document).**

Computers, iPhones, space and cubicles, and leased vehicles.

- c. Will there be changes to client caseloads or services provided to population groups? Specify how many in each relevant program.**

No.

- d. Will it take new staff or will existing positions be modified? For each classification, list the number of positions and the number of months the positions will work in each biennium. Specify if the positions are permanent, limited duration or temporary.**

New position as shown in the Budget spreadsheet (3-9 months)

- e. What are the start-up costs, such as new or significant modifications to computer systems, new materials, outreach and training?**

Graphic Information System software licenses (3).

- f. What are the ongoing costs?**

Biennial funding of new positions, facilities increases, vehicles, and GIS licensing.

- g. What are the potential savings?**

Historically, this number of investigators would generate approximately \$5 million in additional Total Fund revenue and cost avoidance per biennium.

- h. Based on these answers, is there a fiscal impact?**

Yes.

DHS TOTAL FOR THIS PACKAGE*

	<u>GF</u>	<u>OF</u>	<u>FF</u>	<u>TF</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Personal Services	\$ 4,369	\$1,181,862	\$ 0	\$1,186,231	22	9.24
Services & Supplies	\$ 222,491	\$ 132,914	\$106,299	\$ 461,704		
Special Payments	\$657,388	\$0	\$657,388	\$1,314,776		
Total	\$884,248	\$1,314,776	\$763,687	\$2,962,711	22	9.24

DHS Fiscal Impact Summary by Program Area:

	Shared Services Limitation	SAEC	Total DHS
General Fund	\$0	\$884,248	\$884,248
Other Fund	\$1,314,776	\$0	\$1,314,776
Federal Funds- Ltd	\$0	\$763,687	\$763,687
Total Funds	\$1,314,776	\$1,647,935	\$2,962,711
Positions	22	0	22
FTE	9.24	0.00	9.24

**Note: the original calculation for this package assumed some costs to OHA, but due to time constraints, the entire budget has been put into DHS at 2015-17 GB. Should this POP be approved in the Legislatively Adopted Budget, a technical adjustment to move Shared Services Funding into OHA will need to occur at the first 2015-17 Rebalance.*

What are the sources of funding and the funding split for each one?

The final amounts of funding by grant will be determined at the Legislatively Adopted Budget once the final value and determination of start time of staff is approved.

2015-17 Policy Option Package

Agency Name: Department of Human Services
Program Area Name: Office of Self Sufficiency Programs
Program Name: Child Care Program
Policy Option Package Initiative: N/A
Policy Option Package Title: Early Learning ERDC Investment
Policy Option Package Number: POP 129
Related Legislation: N/A
Program Funding Team: Education

Summary
Statement:

Increase the Employment Related Day Care (ERDC) caseload from 7,700 to 10,700 allowing more low-income working families access to safe, stable, quality child care. Families need ERDC to help pay for the child care necessary to maintain employment. Children in care need continuous quality educational experiences which support positive child development. This prepares children for kindergarten and beyond. Research shows having a subsidy affects parental choice. Families can select high quality child care programs, such as those offered through ERDC contracts with Head Start and providers that have achieved the Oregon Program of Quality designation. ERDC funds are paid directly to child care providers who are contributing members to local economies throughout the state.

	General Fund	Other Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds
<u>Policy Option Package Pricing:</u>	\$49,570.687	\$0	\$0	\$49,570.687

2015-17 Policy Option Package

Agency Name: Department of Human Services
Program Area Name: Office of Self Sufficiency Programs
Program Name: SNAP Employment & Training
Policy Option Package Initiative: N/A
Policy Option Package Title: Transfer Food Assistance Programs from OHCS
Policy Option Package Number: POP 301
Related Legislation: N/A
Program Funding Team: Jobs

Summary Statement:

Transferring the administration of the Oregon Hunger Response Fund (OHRF), The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP), and the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP) to DHS from Oregon Housing and Community Services (OHCS) provides for consolidation and streamlining with similar programs. DHS currently administers a variety of programs that help similar populations (e.g., Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), Meals on Wheels, congregate meal sites). The transfer of similarly focused programs avoids duplication of effort and potentially produces better results and increased numbers of Oregonians served.

	General Fund	Other Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds
<u>Policy Option Package Pricing:</u>	\$1,772,578	\$0	\$1,786,327	\$3,558,905

Purpose

The legislatively approved OHCS Transition Plan recommends transferring the administration of OHCS food programs to the Department of Human Services (DHS) and the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR).

Transferring the administration of the Oregon Hunger Response Fund (OHRF), The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP), and the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP) to DHS provides for consolidation and streamlining with similar programs. DHS currently administers a variety of programs that help similar populations (e.g., Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), Meals on Wheels, congregate meal sites). The transfer of similarly focused programs avoids duplication of effort and potentially produces better results and increased numbers of Oregonians served.

How Achieved

OHCS has already consulted with the US Department of Agriculture (USDA) and outlined a planning process and the issues to be addressed as learned from another state's similar program transition. OHCS will convene a workgroup that includes DHS and current OHCS food program grantees to develop a transfer timeline and steps to ensure a thoughtful transition that minimizes disruptions to both grantees and the clients they serve.

The strong partnership between DHS and OHCS will still allow for the coordination of food and housing service delivery but take better advantage of each department's expertise and current delivery systems with potential cost savings and increased integration of like services.

While the specific process and timeline for transfer is still being determined, the goal is to have the food programs transitioned to the Department of Human Services by January 1, 2016. This package reflects 18 months of Special Payments needed to administer the program through DHS in 2015-17.

Quantifying Results

OHCS will continue to track performance measures and subgrantee program recipient information for FY 2014-15 and will work with DHS to determine how best to continue data collection. The stakeholder workgroups will advise OHCS and DHS as to whether changes need to be made to the program data that is currently being collected and/or to performance measures. Current performance measures include: acquisition of food based on a standard of two million pounds of nutritious foods (OHRF); distribution of food based on a standard of 900,000 food boxes (TEFAP); 98% caseload rate (CSFP); and 5% increase in number of qualified households served (FDPIR).

2017-19 Fiscal Impact

The additional 6 months of Special Payments funding for food assistance programs will be phased in during the 2017-19 budget build process.