

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report (CAR)**

Demonstration Site: Los Angeles County	Reporting Period: Calendar Year <u>2011</u>
County Contact: Name: <u>Dr. Michael J. Rauso, Division Chief</u> Phone: <u>(213) 351-5738</u> Email: <u>rausom@dcfs.lacounty.gov</u>	

Instructions: Pursuant to the legislative requirements for implementing RBS, each county participating in the RBS Reform Project shall prepare and submit an annual report. The report is to be developed in collaboration with the private nonprofit agency (ies) participating in the demonstration project. This County Annual Report (CAR) is to be prepared by the county as a single, comprehensive report for the reporting period. The report is prepared for each calendar year in which the RBS Reform Project is in operation and submitted to the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) by March 1 of the following year. Narrative responses must be provided to Sections A through H, as indicated below and on the following pages. Additional information may be attached as necessary.

Section A - Client Outcomes:

- Complete the table below on the characteristics of the target population served in this reporting period.**

Total Number of Youth:	Average Age of Youth:	Number of Youth who are:	Number of Youth who are:	Number of Youth Placed by:
102	13.2 yrs	Male: 84 Female: 18	African-American: 40 Hispanic: 34 Caucasian: 24 Asian/Pacific Islander: 3 Native American: 1	Child Welfare: 102 DCFS Probation: 0 Mental Health: 0 Other: 0

Note. Due to licensing issues, only one of the three providers (Hillsides) admits both genders while the rest admit only boys.

2. **Using the Child Welfare Services/ Case Management System (CWS/CMS) outcome data provided by CDSS, address the following regarding any disenrollments, step downs to lower levels of care and/or achievements to permanency:**

a. Describe any trends indicated by the data.

Information provided by CDSS confirms that 16 of the 102 Los Angeles County RBS clients exited the program in 2011. Of those 16 clients, 8 exited before graduation, and 5 graduated successfully. The remaining 3 clients were coded as having “exited without any reason given”. However, upon further investigation, it was found that these 3 clients had actually graduated (but no **exit reason** code was entered in CWS/CMS). The fact remains that 50% of the clients that exited the program in 2011 did so due to graduation.

The CDSS data also indicate that based on the types of placement changes, the RBS participants had either no placement change (70%) (n=71), or a lateral placement change (5%) (n=5), which *occurs when a client makes a change in placement but remains in the same level of care*. The remaining participants (25%) (n=26), had a positive placement change, *meaning the clients moved from a higher to a lower level of care*. During 2011, there were no negative placement changes wherein participants moved to a *higher level of care*.

b. Can any conclusions be made from the data? If yes, what are they? If no, why not?

Yes No Explain:

Due to the small sample size and first year start up challenges, it is difficult to make any conclusions. However, the data provides some optimism about the future of RBS. In the coming year we expect to see clearer trends from the data as the RBS providers and the County gain more experience with RBS.

3. **a. Complete one attached excel document titled, “RBS Days of Care Schedule” for each RBS provider listing information for each youth enrolled in RBS since implementation of the Project. This document captures information on the total days in care in residential, community-based bridge care, after-care and crisis stabilization.**

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report (CAR)**

a. Please see attached Excel document of “RBS Days of Care Schedule” for Five Acres, Hathaway-Sycamores and Hillside.

b. For youth in crisis stabilization, what were the reasons for the returns to group home care for crisis stabilization?

Crisis Stabilization is an essential feature of our RBS model. When a team prepares the family and youth for the transition back into the community, the team discusses the available options to help the youth and family know this is a process and not an all or nothing scenario. The team creates a proactive and reactive crisis plan that may include a temporary stay in a crisis bed. By discussing this option with the family, it serves as a reminder that transitioning from residential into the community is difficult and a temporary period of crisis stabilization is not a failure. Examples of crisis stabilization situations include, but are not limited to, anxiety related behaviors, difficulty adjusting to a new school, new rules, new siblings, etc.

c. From the county perspective, is there a need to improve the effectiveness of crisis stabilization? If yes, how will this be accomplished?

Yes **No** **Explain:**

We currently have more than 30 children in the community, but only two Crisis Stabilization beds per RBS provider (six total). We need to explore increasing the number of Crisis Stabilization beds through approval from Community Care Licensing. This would allow the teams to have more flexibility with the children who are now in the community.

Section B - Client Involvement:

1. Using the Child and Adolescence Needs and Strengths (CANS) data provided by Walter R. McDonald & Associates (WRMA), address the following:

a. Describe any trends indicated by the data.

Averaged CANS summary scores were provided by WRMA for baseline, follow-up 1, and follow-up 2 time periods. Based on these data, statistically significant decreases in need (demonstrating a positive outcome) were found in the following CANS domains from baseline to follow-up measurements: Functional Status, Mental Health, Risk Behaviors, and Child Safety.

No statistically significant changes in level of need as measured by the CANS were

found for the following domains: Substance Use Complications, Criminal and Delinquency, Family/Caregiver Needs and Strengths, Child Strength, and Educational Progress.

“Statistically significant” within this context means that average scores did not differ enough to show any improvements beyond chance levels. The observation that certain domains initially appear to show decreases in need (e.g., Family/Caregiver Needs and Strengths from the Follow-up 1 to the Follow-up 2 periods), but are not statistically significant, suggests that there is substantial variability in CANS scores for those domains. Additionally, sample sizes substantially decreased from baseline (n = 57) to second follow-up (n = 35). Low sample sizes may also account for these non-statistically significant results.

Table 1. CANS Domain Summary Scores

CANS Domain	Baseline (n =57)	Follow-up 1 (n = 44)	Follow-up 2 (n = 35)
Functional Status *	5.2	4.7	4.0
Mental Health *	12.9	10.6	9.6
Risk Behaviors *	6.3	5.1	4.2
Substance Use Complications	2.4	2.9	2.5
Criminal and Delinquency	3.6	3.2	3.1
Family/Caregiver Needs and Strengths	6.2	6.8	3.8
Child Strengths	14.3	13.4	12.6
Child Safety *	2.1	1.3	1.1
Educational Progress	9.7	8.2	7.7

Note. Scores range from 0 to 30. Lower score equates to lower level of need. Domains with asterisks (*) represent statistically significant declines based on WRMA analysis.

b. Can any conclusions be made from the data? If yes, what are they? If no, why not?

Yes **No** **Explain:**

The CANS data suggests that overall mental health and functioning is improving (as need is decreasing) in RBS participants. In the Functional Status, Mental Health, Risk Behaviors, and Child Safety domains, improvements were shown in the first and second Follow-ups periods). Taking into consideration the CANS score range from 0-to-30 (with lower scores indicating better outcomes), very low levels of need (rating = 1.1) were observed. This suggests exceptionally good Child Safety outcome at the second CANS follow-up period.

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report (CAR)**

No statistically significant changes were noted in five other CANS domains. However, the domains of Family/Caregiver Needs and Strengths, Child Strengths, and Educational Progress had results in the predicted directions. (Low power and sample size may have affected the statistical significance of the differences). It should be noted that there are some limitations to these data. Sample sizes steadily decrease over the three time periods (i.e., n = 57 at baseline, n = 44 at first follow-up, and n = 35 at second follow-up), which may be a factor that skews results.

No conclusions can be drawn from the other CANS domains (Substance Use Complications, Criminal and Delinquency, Family/Caregiver Needs and Strengths, Child Strength, and Educational Progress since the results were not significant on such-and-such test).

2. a. Complete the table below on family and youth participation in child/family team meetings.

Total Number of Youth:	Total Number of Youth with at least one Supportive Adult:	Number of Youth Participating in at least 90% of their Child/Family Team Meetings:	Number of Youth with Supportive Adult(s) Participating in at least 90% of that Youth's Child/Family Team Meetings:
Total number of Youth for the three RBS provider agencies = 102	86	86	60

b. If youth did not participate, explain why not.

Lack of youth participation in Child and Family Team (CFT) meetings include some unforeseen circumstances such as illness of the youth, doctor's appointments or other obligations and the youth's refusal to participate. Other times, the need for adult focused conversation resulted in the exclusion of the youth due to discussion which might have been difficult for the youth to hear.

Some placement plan changes negatively impacted the participation of prospective adoptive parents and foster parents who had significant ties with the child as these placements were no longer available.

Section C- Client Satisfaction:

1. Using the Youth Satisfaction Survey (YSS) and Youth Satisfaction Survey-Families (YSS-F) data provided by WRMA, specifically satisfaction measured in items 1-15 of the YSS and YSS-F and outcomes measured in items 16-22 of the YSS and YSS-F, address the following:

- a. Describe any trends in the data.

Based on the results provided by WRMA, average YSS ratings show no statistically significant change from baseline measurement to the first follow-up period. The YSS ratings indicate a moderately high level of satisfaction (mean = 4.0; higher scores indicate better outcomes) based on a five-point scale.

Based on the results provided by WRMA, on the average, YSS ratings (see Table 2 below), shows no significant change from baseline measurement to the first follow-up period. Generally, YSS ratings indicate a moderately high level of satisfaction (minimum = 3.9; maximum. = 4.1; mean = 4.0) based on a five-point scale. No trend over time can be ascertained for the YSS-F.

Table 2. YSS and YSS-F Domain Summary Scores

YSS Domain	Baseline (n = 42)	Follow-up 1 (n = 19)
Satisfaction with services	4.2	4.1
Child and family voice and choice	4.0	3.8
Well being	4.0	3.8
YSS-F Domain	Baseline (n = 30)	Follow-up 1 (n = 11)
Satisfaction with services	4.4	4.0
Child and family voice and choice	4.1	3.8
Well being	4.1	3.8

Note: Scores range from 1 to 5. Higher score equates to better outcomes.

Based on the average YSS-F ratings provided by WRMA (presented in Table 2 above), general satisfaction begins (at baseline) with moderately high levels of satisfaction (minimum. = 4.1; maximum = 4.4; mean = 4.2) across each domain, but slightly declines at the follow-up period (minimum. = 3.8; maximum = 4.0; mean = 3.9). With relatively small sample sizes (e.g., n = 11 at follow-up), no statistically significant difference in ratings can likely be concluded.

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report (CAR)**

- b. Can any conclusions be made from the data? If yes, what are they? If no, why not?**

Yes No Explain:

Very limited conclusions can be drawn from this data. Generally, youth completing the YSS, report a moderately high level of satisfaction across all domains of the survey. The satisfaction level does not change over time for youth completing the YSS from baseline to the first follow-up. While the average baseline ratings for family participants (completing the YSS-F) show moderately high levels of satisfaction, the data is very limited without follow-up measurements.

Overall, the data is limited. Reported sample sizes are small, and follow-up measurements are incomplete thereby suggesting cautious interpretations of youth and family-member satisfaction with the RBS program based on this instrument.

Very limited conclusions can be drawn from the data. Generally, youth completing the YSS report a moderately high level of satisfaction across all domains of the survey, but the satisfaction level does not change over time from baseline to the first follow-up.

While the average baseline ratings for family participants (completing the YSS-F) show moderately high levels of satisfaction, the data is very limited without follow-up measurements and no trend over time can be determined.

Section D – County and Provider Use of RBS Program:

1. a. Has the operation of the program significantly changed from the original design described in the approved plan? If yes, describe the change.

Los Angeles County and RBS agencies:

Yes No Explain:

- b. If yes, how has this adaptation impacted the effectiveness of the project?

N/A

- 2. Describe the interactions (such as, collaborative efforts towards placements, exits, services planning, etc.) among and between the county agencies (including Child Welfare Services, Mental Health, Probation, Regional Center, etc.), the provider(s), and other community partners.**

The RBS (Open Doors) Roundtable includes representatives from the three RBS contracted agencies, the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS), the Department of Mental Health (DMH), and additional parties as necessary. The Roundtable is a bi-weekly collaborative held to review the implementation progress, problem-solve, share successes, review evaluation data, and recommend changes to the program during the pilot. The Roundtable continues to be responsible for gathering lessons learned and offering issues and solutions to the RBS (Open Doors) Advisory Group.

In addition to the bi-weekly Roundtable Meeting, DCFS, DMH and the three RBS provider agencies meet once a month in what is known as the local RBS Evaluation meeting, which is intended as a data collection forum. These same entities also collaborate to form the Training and Social Marketing subcommittee, which is tasked with the promotion of RBS and training staff. The Training and Social Marketing subcommittee meets once a month.

The RBS provider agencies coordinate the RBS Foundational training, held every month and participate twice a month in meetings with the Interagency Screening Committee (ISC) to review the Safety Plan and the Plan of Care.

The RBS provider agencies also collaborate with each other to help insure that essential services for each other's clients available, as needed, in their particular areas of placement.

The RBS provider agencies continuously nurture positive relations with community partners such as Kid Save, Kinship Center and Wendy's Wonderful Kids who have been helpful in identifying adoptive homes for RBS youth.

- 3. Have there been any significant differences from the roles and responsibilities delineated in the approved plan for the various county agencies and provider(s)? If yes, describe the differences.**

Los Angeles County and RBS provider agencies:
 Yes No

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report (CAR)**

4. Were RBS enrollments sufficient during the reporting period? If no, why not?

Los Angeles County:

Yes No **Explain:**

Generally, the RBS enrollments were sufficient during the reporting period. However, one of the three RBS provider agencies reported difficulty in keeping their RBS slots full. The main challenge, for that one provider, is the agency specifically serves youth who are classified as RCL 14. The RCL 14 classification limits their ability to move youth from their “group home” side to RBS easily and to enroll youth without going through the State mandated RCL 14 screening.

5. Describe how the county and provider(s) managed RBS staff resources (e.g., filling vacancies, redefining job qualifications, eliminating positions, etc.)

DCFS and DMH allocate needed resources to support RBS and have demonstrated a strong collaboration and desire to see RBS succeed. DCFS and DMH have also developed a strong RBS administration that continues to work closely with the three RBS providers, regional DCFS staff and management to ensure the smooth operation of RBS.

As for filling provider vacancies, the RBS providers post the availability of RBS openings both internally and publicly. RBS agencies have reported that filling the Parent Partner positions has been challenging because most prospective parent partners did not meet the requirements for hiring. One of the RBS provider agency reported experiencing challenges in maintaining an adequate number of Parent Partners.

One of the RBS providers reported that as more and more youth transitioned to the community, the agency experienced challenges having staff members work as a team. The incorporation of Wraparound staff and RBS elements to the existing residential program created internal struggles between residential and Wraparound staff. The agency applied creative solutions to this challenge by forming a Lead Mobile Crisis position to help coordinate and define the roles and responsibilities of residential and Wraparound staff.

Section E –County Payments to Nonprofit Agency(ies):

Note: The payments reported here are from the county records as recorded on a cash basis during the reporting period from January 1 to December 31, for all providers participating in the RBS demonstration project.

1. For Questions a through c, please complete the table below:
 - a. Report the total payments from all fund sources paid to the provider(s) for RBS during the period the report covers under each of the following:
 - AFDC-FC (The amounts reported here should come from the amount reported under G1, amount claimed per fiscal tracking sheet. They will not be equal because G1 is cumulative for the project and E1 is only for the reporting year.)
 - EPSDT
 - MHSA
 - Grants, loans, other (Itemize any amounts reported by source.)
 - b. Provide the average months of stay for all children/youth in residential (group home) care during the reporting period.
 - c. Provide the average months of stay for all children/youth in community services (not in group home) during the reporting period.

	AFDC	EPSDT	MHSA	Other	Total
Amount Paid for Residential	\$3,530,707.00	\$762,239.14	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$4,292,946.10
Amount Paid for Community	\$172,198.00	\$781,580.03	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$953,778.00
Total Amount Paid	\$3,702,905.00	\$1,543,819.17	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,246,724.10
Avg Months of Stay in Residential	6.8	6.8	–	–	
Avg Months of Stay in Community	2.8	2.8	–	–	
Avg AFDC Payment Per Youth in Residential	\$49,037.60	\$10,586.65	–	–	\$59,624.25
Avg AFDC Payment per Youth in Community	\$5,739.93	\$26,052.67	–	–	\$31,792.60

2. Were any changes made to the Funding Model in order to manage payment shortfalls/overages, incentives, refunds during the reporting period? If yes, explain what the changes were and why they were needed.

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Explain:
--

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report (CAR)**

Section F – Actual Costs of Nonprofit Agency(ies):

Note: The amounts reported here should be based on each provider’s accounting records for RBS for the period from January 1 through December 31, and be on a basis consistent with the method used to report costs on the annual A-133 Financial Audit Report (FAR) and SR-3 document filed with CDSS.

1. a. For residential costs, complete the table below displaying provider actual costs compared to the RBS proposed budget included in the approved Funding Model. If there is more than one provider in the demonstration project, combine the individual provider data into one table for the project. The wording in the chart below is consistent with the SR-3 financial report. Definitions are listed in the instructions (RBS Letter No. 04-11).

RBS Residential costs for the three RBS service provider agencies:

Expenditures:	Proposed Budget for the Period	Actuals for the Period	Over/(Under) Budget
Total Salaries & Benefits	\$3,256,663.00	\$3,312,393.00	\$55,730.00
Total Operating Costs	\$909,633.00	\$825,256.00	-\$84,377.00
Total Child Care & Supervision Costs	\$1,027,476.00	\$1,140,736.00	\$113,260.00
Total Mental Health Treatment Services Costs	\$2,229,196.00	\$2,612,686.00	\$383,490.00
Total Social Work Activity, Treatment & Family Support Costs	\$520,455.00	\$221,597.00	-\$298,858.00
Total Indirect Costs	\$757,454.00	\$706,324.00	-\$51,130.00
Total Expenditures	\$7,922,253.00	\$8,817,691.00	\$895,438.00

- b. Does the difference between the actual provider costs and the proposed budget exceed 5% on any line item above? If yes, explain what caused the variance and whether this difference is expected to be temporary or permanent.

<p>[X] Yes [] No Explain:</p> <p>Fiscal figures provided by the three RBS service providers indicate that their actual provider costs exceeded more than 5% of their proposed budget. Two of the three RBS service provider agencies reported that their actual provider costs exceeded more than 5% of the proposed budget. One RBS service provider reported that client referrals were below expected budget projections and the agency’s client population tends to be older with more challenging behavioral problems. Consequently, the clientele requires a higher level of care that includes a longer stay in the program which impacts their transition to community.</p>

Another RBS service provider reported budgeting for youth to transition to the community in 9 months or less. However, youth ended up staying longer than expected in residential care while continuing to receive mental health services.

2. a. For community costs, complete the table below displaying provider actual costs compared to the RBS proposed budget included in the approved Funding Model. If there is more than one provider in the demonstration project, combine the individual provider data into one table for the project. This wording in this chart is consistent with the SR-3 financial report. Definitions are listed in the instructions (RBS N Letter No. 04-11).

RBS Community costs for the three RBS service provider agencies:

Expenditures:	Proposed Budget for the Period	Actuals for the Period	Over/(Under) Budget
Total Salaries & Benefits	\$411,911.00	\$290,816.00	-\$121,175.00
Total Operating Costs	\$828,127.00	\$104,361.00	-\$723,766.00
Total Child Care & Supervision Costs	\$40,000.00	\$12,122.00	-\$27,878.00
Total Mental Health Treatment Services Costs	\$1,239,473.00	\$339,916.00	-\$899,557.00
Total Social Work Activity, Treatment & Family Support Costs	\$923,220.00	\$304,037.00	-\$619,183.00
Total Indirect Costs	\$223,460.00	\$159,804.00	-\$63,656.00
Total Expenditures	\$3,666,271.00	\$761,056.00	-\$2,905,215.00

- b. Does the difference between the actual provider costs and the proposed budget exceed 5% on any line item above? If yes, explain what caused the variance and whether this difference is expected to be temporary or permanent.

Combined RBS service provider Community costs show that the difference between the actual provider costs and the proposed budget DID NOT exceed 5%. However, one of the three agencies reported that the difference between actual provider cost and the proposed budget for "Total Salaries and Benefits" exceeded 5% at 5.4%.

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report (CAR)**

- 3. Were there extraordinary costs associated with any particular child/youth (i.e., outliers as defined in the Funding Model)? If yes, provide the amount of the cost and describe what it purchased.**

Only one of the three RBS providers (Five Acres) incurred significant costs associated with the initial visit (week long) and eventual placement of RBS youth in Tennessee. The visit was a week long and it required the use of flex funds for a behavioral specialist to travel with and be available for the youth for the duration of the visit. Incurred expenses included the cost of car rental, hotel, and meals for the staff. Subsequent travel to Tennessee by the specialist was necessary to help the youth adjust to the new placement. Additionally, Five Acres RBS sub-contracted with a wraparound agency in Tennessee. This amounted to \$6365.

Episodes of RBS youth exceeding the 10 month mark due to failed adoptive placements or failed foster care matches also impacted the same agency financially.

- 4. Has the county performed the fiscal audit required by the MOU? If yes, describe any problems/issues with the provider's operations or implementation of the Funding Model that were disclosed by the fiscal audit performed. If no, when will that audit occur?**

Los Angeles County:
[] Yes [X] No Explain:

In February 2012, the Los Angeles County Auditor Controller started their fiscal audits of the RBS providers.

Section G – Impact on AFDC-FC Costs:

1. This is a cumulative report from the beginning of the project. Amounts reported are based on the amounts included in the claim presented to CDSS. Using the RBS claim fiscal tracking sheets, please complete the information below for all children served by RBS from the start of the project to the end of the reporting period:

RBS Payment for All Children Enrolled in RBS from the Start of the Project Through the End of the Reporting Period:				
Total Children Served In RBS: <u>102</u>	Total	Federal	State	County
Federal Payments:				
Residential:	\$3,530,707.00	\$1,305,290.00	\$272,876.00	\$1,952,541.00
Community:	\$172,198.00	\$11,363.00	\$7,541.00	\$153,294.00
Total Federal Payments:	\$3,702,905.00			
Non-federal Payments:				
Residential:	\$2,292,426.00	\$0.00	\$733,557.00	\$1,558,869.00
Community:	\$180,954.00	\$0.00	\$68,846.00	\$112,108.00
Total Non-federal Payments:	\$2,473,380.00			
Total RBS Payments	\$6,176,285.00			

Note: It is possible to have federal funds used in the Non-federal Payment (i.e., non-federal RBS children) category. These payments would be the federal share of any Emergency Assistance Funding used in the RBS program up to the first 12 months of a child's stay in RBS. The amounts reported would come from the non-federal fiscal tracking sheet, and are based on the instructions provided in RBS Letter No. 03-11.

2. **Of the children reported in G1 above, please complete the information below for all children who successfully entered and exited RBS in 24 months, or remained in RBS for a full 24 months.**

Note: When completing G2, it is important to understand how G2, G3, and G4. work to form the comparison to regular AFDC costs. Section G4 is a comparison of cost for those children who have completed RBS (From G2) to the cost of regular foster care based on the target group base period (G3). In this context, a child "completing RBS" is one who has either entered the program and then exited after successfully completing his/her RBS program goal, or one who has entered the program and remained in the program longer than the base period (24 months). The comparison in Section G4 is done only for those children who have successfully completed the RBS program goal or are still in the program at the 24 month mark. The count of children for Section G2 and the related costs are only for those children who have completed the RBS program or

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report (CAR)**

remained in RBS longer than 24 months. For example, a child entering RBS who remains in the program for only 3 months and then is disenrolled would not be included in G2. A child entering RBS and still in the program at month 26 would be included in G2.

RBS Payments for All Children Entering and Exiting RBS in the 24 Month Period or Remaining in the Program for Longer than 24 Months. (Include all children meeting this condition from the beginning of the project.):

	Total	Federal	State	County
Total Children Completing RBS: <u>8</u>				
Federal Payments:				
Residential:	\$198,255.00	\$79,300.00	\$31,720.00	\$87,235.00
Community:	\$12,552.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$12,552.00
Total Federal Payments:	\$210,807.00			
Non-federal Payments:				
Residential:	\$304,171.00	\$0.00	\$97,332.00	\$206,839.00
Community:	\$10,417.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$10,417.00
Total Non-federal Payments:	\$314,588.00			
Total RBS Payments:	\$525,395.00			

3. Using the approved Attachment A from the Funding Model and the number of children reported in G2 (above), complete the information below regarding the expected base Foster Care costs for RBS target population children that otherwise would have been served in Foster Care.

Note: Since this is used to compare the base AFDC-FC rates had the RBS youth remained in regular foster care, the “Approved Base Rate Per Child” is the weighted average of AFDC-FC payments for RCL 12 and RCL 14 placements as described and approved in the Funding Model. The “Approved Base Months in Regular Foster Care” section is the approved comparison length for the RBS youth had they remained in regular foster care. For all RBS counties, the approved base months in regular foster care is 24 months, based on the demographic for the current length of stay in a group home for the target group. The “Applicable Federal Funds Rate” is the percentage of federal funds rate based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) used in the RBS claim. The CAR template has this FMAP funding rate pre-loaded at 50% because all of the RBS Funding Models used the pre-ARRA FMAP rate of 50% for approval purposes. However, because Section G1 of the CAR instructs counties to use financial costs based on the RBS Fiscal Tracking sheets, counties must use the ARRA rate in effect for that month and quarter. For the months through and including December 2010, the ARRA rate is 56.2%. For the months beginning January 2011, the ARRA rate will decline until it reaches 50% beginning July 2011. Details on the ARRA rates used in the RBS claim are in an RBS claim letter. In order to produce a correct comparison of costs between sections G1, G2 and G3, whatever federal funds rate is used in Section G1 should be the same rate used for G2 and G3.

Note: If zero have completed, enter zero for this reporting period comparison.

AFDC Base for Comparison:					
	Approved Base Rate Per Child:	\$ 10,194	(from H2, above)		
	Number of Children Completing RBS:	8			
	Approved Base Months in Regular Foster Care:	24			
	Applicable Federal Funds Rate:	50%			
		Total	Federal	State	County
Base Payment for Target Group:		\$502,426.00	\$79,300.00	\$129,052.00	\$294,074.00

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report (CAR)**

4. a. For those children who have completed the RBS program, using the information from G2 and G3, subtract G3 from G2 and complete the following information:

	Total	Federal	State	County
RBS Incremental Cost/(Savings)Based On Program Completion:	\$22,969.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$22,969.00

- b. What aspects of operating RBS contributed to the cost/savings compared to regular Foster Care?

For RBS children, the shorter duration of stay in residential care as compared to children who remain in regular Foster Care, contributed to the savings.

5. Has EPSDT usage changed when compared with the typical usage by similar children/youth in traditional foster care? If yes, explain how it is different.

Los Angeles County:
 Yes No Explain:

6. Has MHSA usage changed when compared with the typical usage by similar children/youth in traditional foster care? If yes, explain how it is different.

N/A

Section H – Lessons Learned:

1. Describe the most significant program lessons learned and best practices applied during the reporting period.

- A better screening and referral process is needed. A majority of the referrals come from the offices closest to the three providers. Although there were some referrals from other offices, we are revisiting how to ensure equal utilization across the county. Additionally, the referral process needs to be more responsive. There were situations when a RBS youth successfully transitioned

into the community, but it took time to get an appropriate referral to fill their vacant bed.

- All of the providers experienced challenges with the new RBS staffing model. Having staff follow the youth into the community and maintaining support in the group home requires special skill and training. Each provider took a different path to hiring their staff and each experienced pros and cons.
- The availability of foster homes willing to accept high needs youth is not a problem unique to RBS, but it has a significant impact on the RBS youth, the RBS provider agencies and the RBS model. There are clinical ramifications when youth see others going home quickly while they remain in residential. It also impacts the RBS provider, as the LA RBS fiscal model is based on youth moving into the community within 10 months.
- Although having different contracts with one provider can be helpful for RBS, it is still a challenge. Key components of RBS (residential, wraparound, treatment services) are separate contract programs that may have different managers. The providers have relied on the relationships of these managers to work alongside each other collaboratively and efficiently.
- One of the most valuable program elements identified by all in maintaining community placements is crisis stabilization. However, the need sometimes overwhelms the availability of beds. As the number of RBS youth entering the community grows, the number of crisis stabilization beds needs to reflect the growth.
- Another challenge is consistently getting Child and Family Teams to do concurrent planning. Solid plans may take longer than expected, or may not work, so everyone needs to be thinking about alternative plans.
- There needs to be a universal investment in doing things differently. As one of the agencies observed, incorporation of a new approach requires adaptation of the entire system not just one section. County CSWs and SCSWs need to incorporate the new approach along with therapists and child care staff. The roles of Interagency Screening Committee members should also change to reinforce a changed approach. ISC members can encourage and support CSW efforts to participate differently and help agencies navigate bureaucratic obstacles. Lastly, the subsystems involved with criminal clearances, waivers, and approval processes need to be aligned with the increased sense of urgency and pace that is required for us produce different results.
- The family finding, family outreach and family engagement activities are taking more time and effort than originally anticipated.

**Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project
County Annual Report (CAR)**

2. Describe the most significant fiscal lessons learned and best practices applied during the reporting period.

- Some children will inevitably exceed the 10 month mark. This must be anticipated and reflected in budget projections.
- One RBS provider reported that maintaining the right staffing levels and administration of the program has been challenging due to the lack of referrals and the inability of the agency to self-refer. Learning the right mix of staff needed to appropriately serve youth is a continuous, time consuming process.
- Close collaboration with fiscal, Eligibility, Revenue Enhancement and line staff is imperative for quick detection and resolution of cost control and potential overpayment issues. The RBS special rate is not familiar to many County fiscal staff. Tracking overpayments and underpayments has also proved time consuming.

RBS DAYS OF CARE SCHEDULE
County Annual Report -- Section A, Question 3a

COUNTY OF Los Angeles

List the youth who have been admitted to your RBS program since you began operation and show how they have moved through the various stages of your program thus far (e.g. from the residential group care component, to "bridge" foster care, to reunification or another form of permanency).

Non-Profit Corporation Name: Hillside **Program Number:** 09-021-02 **Contact Person:** Sharon Sharp

Period Covered: Activity through..... 12/31/2011 **Telephone Number:** 323-254-2274 **Date Completed:** 2/8/2012

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T
Youth Enrolled		RBS Residential Group Care				RBS Community-Based "Bridge" Foster Care					RBS Aftercare in Permanent Placement, including Reunification				CURRENT STATUS				
Use Youth's Initials Only; List in order of Date of Admission	Date of Birth	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Group Care, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In "Bridge" Foster Care, Total Days To Date	Number of RBS "Bridge" Foster Care Placements To Date	Did Child Incur Episodes For Crisis Stabilization?	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Aftercare or a Permanent Care Total Days To Date	Use Current Status Codes Below	For CLOSED Cases ONLY, Total Days In RBS	For OPEN Cases ONLY, Total Days In RBS	
1		12/02/10	02/16/11	76	-	02/16/11		-	318		26			-	-	2	-	394	
2		12/02/10	11/11/11	344	-	11/11/11		-	50					-	-	2	-	394	
3		12/02/10	06/23/11	203	-	06/23/11	11/16/11	146	-					-	-	4	349	-	
4		12/02/10	06/20/11	200	-			-	-			06/20/11	07/03/11	13	-	4	213	-	
5		12/02/10		-	394			-	-					-	-	1	-	394	
6		12/02/10		-	394			-	-					-	-	1	-	394	
7		12/02/10		-	394			-	-					-	-	1	-	394	
8		12/02/10	11/03/11	336	-	11/03/11		-	58					-	-	2	-	394	
9		12/02/10	09/22/11	294	-			-	-			09/22/11		-	100	3	-	394	
10		12/02/10		-	394			-	-					-	-	1	-	394	
11		12/02/10	10/20/11	322	-	10/20/11		-	72					-	-	2	-	394	
12		12/02/10		-	394			-	-					-	-	1	-	394	
13		12/02/10	07/14/11	224	-			-	-			07/14/11	07/14/11	-	-	4	224	-	
14		12/02/10	10/26/11	328	-	10/26/11	11/22/11	27	-					-	-	6	355	-	
15		12/02/10	12/20/11	383	-	12/20/11		-	11					-	-	2	-	394	
16		12/02/10	10/10/11	312	-			-	-					-	-	6	312	-	
17		12/02/10	07/21/11	231	-	07/21/11		-	163					-	-	2	-	394	
18		12/02/10	12/07/11	370	-	12/07/11		-	24					-	-	2	-	394	
19		02/17/11	12/07/11	293	-			-	-					-	-	1	-	293	
20		06/19/11	12/20/11	184	-	12/20/11		-	11					-	-	2	-	195	
21		06/21/11		-	193			-	-					-	-	1	-	193	
22		07/20/11	11/15/11	118	-			-	-			11/15/11		-	46	3	-	164	
23		07/28/11		-	156			-	-					-	-	1	-	156	
24		09/28/11		-	94			-	-					-	-	1	-	94	
25		10/17/11		-	75			-	-					-	-	1	-	75	
26		10/24/11		-	68			-	-					-	-	1	-	68	
27		10/26/11		-	66			-	-					-	-	1	-	66	
28		11/04/11		-	57			-	-					-	-	1	-	57	
29		11/16/11		-	45			-	-					-	-	1	-	45	
30		12/01/11		-	30			-	-					-	-	1	-	30	
31		12/09/11		-	22			-	-					-	-	1	-	22	
32		12/20/11		-	11			-	-					-	-	1	-	11	
33		12/20/11		-	11			-	-					-	-	1	-	11	

- Current Status Codes:**
- 1 RBS Case Open with Youth in Residential Group Care
 - 2 RBS Case Open with Youth in "Bridge" Foster Care
 - 3 RBS Case Open with Youth in Permanent Placement with RBS Aftercase Services
 - 4 RBS Case Closed: Graduation
 - 5 RBS Case Closed: Exit before Graduation due to Emancipation
 - 6 RBS Case Closed: Exit before Graduation for Reason other than Emancipation
 - 7 RBS Case Closed: Voluntary Closure
 - 8 RBS Case Closed: AB 3632 Eligibility Ends

COUNTY OF Los Angeles

List the youth who have been admitted to your RBS program since you began operation and show how they have moved through the various stages of your program thus far (e.g. from the residential group care component, to "bridge" foster care, to reunification or another form of permanency).

Non-Profit Corporation Name: Five Acres Program Number: 0339.10.01 Contact Person: Joe Ford
 Period Covered: Activity through..... 12/31/2011 Telephone Number: (626) 794-0778 Date Completed: 2/13/2012

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T
Youth Enrolled			RBS Residential Group Care				RBS Community-Based "Bridge" Foster Care					RBS Aftercare in Permanent Placement, including Reunification				CURRENT STATUS			
Use Youth's Initials Only; List in order of Date of Admission	Date of Birth	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Group Care, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In "Bridge" Foster Care, Total Days To Date	Number of RBS "Bridge" Foster Care Placements To Date	Did Child Incur Episodes For Crisis Stabilization?	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Aftercare or a Permanent Care Total Days To Date	Use Current Status Codes Below	For CLOSED Cases ONLY, Total Days In RBS	For OPEN Cases ONLY, Total Days In RBS	
1		12/2/2010	8/29/2011	270		8/29/2011			124							2	-	394	
2		12/2/2010	7/29/2011	239								7/29/2011	11/9/2011	103		4	342	-	
3		12/2/2010	9/30/2011	302		9/30/2011			92							2	-	394	
4		12/2/2010	5/19/2011	168		5/19/2011	7/4/2011	46			Yes					1	-	214	
*		7/22/2011			162											1	-	162	
5		12/2/2010	10/29/2011	331		10/29/2011					Yes					2	-	394	
6		12/2/2010			394											1	-	394	
7		12/2/2010	6/17/2011	197		6/17/2011			197							2	-	394	
8		12/2/2010	8/9/2011	250		8/9/2011			144							2	-	394	
9		12/2/2010	4/26/2011	145		4/26/2011			249		Yes					2	-	394	
10		12/2/2010	8/18/2011	259							Yes	8/18/2011			135	3	-	394	
11		12/2/2010	2/18/2011	78		2/18/2011	5/14/2011	85	1							4	163	-	
12		10/13/2011			79											1	-	79	
13		12/2/2010	10/28/2011	330		10/28/2011			64							2	-	394	
14		12/2/2010	2/4/2011	64							Yes	2/4/2011	6/8/2011	124		2	-	188	
*		6/22/2011	8/30/2011	69		8/30/2011			123							2	-	192	
15		12/2/2010	11/29/2011	362		11/29/2011			32		Yes					2	-	394	
16		12/2/2010	7/5/2011	215								7/5/2011	10/5/2011	92		4	307	-	
17		12/2/2010	6/22/2011	202								6/22/2011			192	3	-	394	
18		12/2/2010	11/10/2011	343							Yes	11/10/2011			51	3	-	394	
19		12/2/2010	10/7/2011	309		10/7/2011			85							2	-	394	
20		2/15/2011	7/22/2011	157								7/22/2011	12/12/2011	143		4	300	-	
21		2/18/2011			316											1	-	316	
22		4/27/2011	6/22/2011	56								6/22/2011			192	3	-	248	
23		5/20/2011			225											1	-	225	
24		6/18/2011	10/12/2011	116								10/12/2011			80	3	-	196	
25		6/23/2011			191											1	-	191	
26		7/7/2011			177											1	-	177	
27		8/1/2011			152											1	-	152	
28		8/11/2011			142											1	-	142	
29		8/23/2011			130											1	-	130	
30		9/2/2011			120											1	-	120	
31		9/13/2011			109											1	-	109	
32		9/30/2011			92											1	-	92	
33		10/7/2011			85											1	-	85	
34		10/28/2011			64											1	-	64	
35		11/10/2011			51											1	-	51	
36		11/21/2011			40											1	-	40	
37		11/29/2011			32											1	-	32	

RBS DAYS OF CARE SCHEDULE
County Annual Report -- Section A, Question 3a

COUNTY OF Los Angeles

List the youth who have been admitted to your RBS program since you began operation and show how they have moved through the various stages of your program thus far (e.g. from the residential group care component, to "bridge" foster care, to reunification or another form of permanency).

Non-Profit Corporation Name: Hathaway-Sycamores **Program Number:** **Contact Person:** Charity Wang
Period Covered: Activity through..... 12/31/2011 **Telephone Number:** (626) 395-7100 x 3710 **Date Completed:** 2/10/2012

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T
Youth Enrolled		RBS Residential Group Care				RBS Community-Based "Bridge" Foster Care					RBS Aftercare in Permanent Placement, including Reunification			CURRENT STATUS					
Use Youth's Initials Only; List in order of Date of Admission	Date of Birth	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Group Care, Total Days To Date	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In "Bridge" Foster Care, Total Days To Date	Number of RBS "Bridge" Foster Care Placements To Date	Did Child Incur Episodes For Crisis Stabilization?	Date Entered	Date Exited	Total Days Upon Exit	If Still In Aftercare or a Permanent Care Total Days To Date	Use Current Status Codes Below	For CLOSED Cases ONLY, Total Days In RBS	For OPEN Cases ONLY, Total Days In RBS	
1		12/2/2010	5/13/2011	162	-			-	-		Yes	5/13/2011		-	232	3	-	394	
2		12/2/2010	11/4/2011	337	-			-	-		No	11/4/2011		-	57	3	-	394	
3		12/2/2010	9/22/2011	294	-			-	-		Yes	9/22/2011		-	100	3	-	394	
4		12/2/2010	9/16/2011	288	-			-	-		No	9/16/2011		-	106	3	-	394	
5		12/2/2010	7/18/2011	228	-			-	-		No	7/18/2011		-	166	3	-	394	
6		12/2/2010	9/19/2011	291	-			-	-		Yes	9/19/2011		-	103	3	-	394	
7		12/2/2010	6/21/2011	201	-			-	-					-	-	7	201	-	
8		12/2/2010	12/7/2010	5	-			-	-		Yes	12/7/2010	3/2/2011	85	-	2	-	-	
*		3/2/2011	10/20/2011	232	-			-	-					-	-	6	322	-	
9		12/2/2010	12/26/2011	389	-			-	-					-	-	6	389	-	
10		12/2/2010	6/24/2011	204	-			-	-					-	-	7	204	-	
11		12/2/2010	9/13/2011	285	-	9/13/2011		109	-		No			-	-	2		394	
12		12/2/2010	9/16/2011	288	-	9/16/2011	9/29/2011	13	-		No			-	-	5	301	-	
13		12/2/2010	9/2/2011	269	-	9/2/2011	12/27/2011	116	-		Yes			-	-	2	-	-	
*		12/27/2011			4											1		389	
14		12/2/2010	1/26/2011	40	-			-	-					-	-	7	40	-	
15		12/7/2010		-	375			-	-					-	-	1	-	375	
16		12/17/2010	9/22/2011	279	-			-	-		No	9/22/2011		-	100	3	-	379	
17		12/21/2010		-	375			-	-					-	-	1	-	375	
18		5/20/2011		-	225			-	-					-	-	1	-	225	
19		7/7/2011	7/12/2011	5	-			-	-		No	7/12/2011		-	172	3	-	177	
20		7/20/2011		-	164			-	-					-	-	1	-	164	
21		7/15/2011		-	169			-	-					-	-	1	-	169	
22		7/27/2011		-	157			-	-					-	-	1	-	157	
23		9/6/2011	10/21/2011	45	-			-	-					-	-	7		45	
24		9/15/2011		-	107			-	-					-	-	1	-	107	
25		9/29/2011	10/18/2011	19	-			-	-					-	-	7	19	-	
26		10/3/2011			90			-	-					-	-	1		90	
27		10/7/2011			86			-	-					-	-	1		86	
28		10/12/2011			81			-	-					-	-	1		81	
29		10/25/2011			68			-	-					-	-	1		68	
30		11/27/2011			34			-	-					-	-	1		34	
31		11/4/2011			57			-	-					-	-	1		57	
32		11/17/2011			44			-	-					-	-	1		44	
33		12/22/2011			9			-	-					-	-	1		9	

