

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

Demonstration Site: Sacramento	Reporting Period: Calendar Year 2013
County Contact: Name: Geri Wilson Phone: (916) 337-7222 Email: egwilson@sbcglobal.net	

Instructions: Pursuant to the legislative requirements for implementing RBS, each county participating in the RBS Demonstration 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 by March 1 of the following year to the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) at RBSreform@dss.ca.gov.

Section A - Client Outcomes:

1. 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:
44	15.6 yrs	Male: 21 Female: 23	African-American: 23 Asian: 1 Caucasian: 13 Hispanic: 5 Other: 2	Probation: 15 Child Welfare: 29 Mental Health: 0 Other: 0

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

2. **Complete and attach one 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, beginning with the youth’s initial enrollment in RBS.**
- a. **For those youth who were both active in RBS during the reporting period and enrolled in RBS long enough to meet or exceed the approved placement, what percent exceeded the site target for average length of stay in group home residential placement and by an average of how many days?**

The majority of youth active in RBS during the reporting period and enrolled in RBS long enough to meet or exceed the approved site target for average length of stay in group home residential placement exceeded the target length of stay.

Of the 5 youth enrolled in Martin’s Achievement Place (MAP) during the report period who were active in RBS long enough to meet or exceed the approved site target for average length of stay in residential care, 4 youth (80%) did not exit within the target length of stay in residential care of 270 days. within the approved target site for average length of stay in residential care. The average stay in the residential care component for those youth exceeded the targeted average by 185 days.

Of the 14 youth enrolled in the Children’s Receiving Home (CRH) of Sacramento who were active in RBS long enough to meet or exceed the approved site target for average length of stay in residential care, 9 youth (64%) did not meet the target for the average length of stay in residential care. The average stay in the residential care component for those youth exceeded the target average by 158 days.

Of the 4 youth enrolled in Quality Group Homes (QGH) during the report period who were active in RBS long enough to meet or exceed the approved site target for average lengths of stay in residential care, 100% exceeded the target average. The target was exceeded by an average of 142 days.

In total, 23 youth exceeded the site target for average length of stay in group home residential placement by an average of 134 days.

- b. **For those youth who exited (for any reason) from the RBS program during the reporting period, what percent exceeded the approved site target for average length of stay in the full RBS program (residential plus community) and by an average of how many days?**

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

A total of 27 youth have exited from the RBS program during this report period.

A total of 4 youth exited from Martin's Achievement Place. Of those 4, 3 youth exited within the 540 day targeted total length of stay and 1 youth representing 25% did not exit by the targeted average. The one youth exceeded the target average by 84 days.

A total of 12 youth exited from the Children's Receiving Home of Sacramento. Of those 12, 6 youth, representing 50%, did not exit by the target average of 540 days. The target average was exceeded by 160 days.

A total of 11 youth exited from Quality Group Homes. Of those 11, 2 youth, representing 18%, did not exit by the target average of 540 days. The target average was exceeded by 103 days.

In total, 9 youth who exited the RBS Program during this report period, representing 33%, exceeded the target average stay of 540 days by an average of 166 days.

- c. What number and percent of youth stepped down from group home residential placement to a lower level of care during the reporting period? Of those youth who stepped down, what number and percent returned to group home residential care? For any youth who stepped down to a lower level of care and returned to group home residential care multiple times, describe the number of youth and the reasons for each movement up and down in level of care.**

A total of 44 youth were enrolled in the RBS Program during the report period. Eight youth, representing 18%, stepped down to a lower level of care.

There were no youth at Martin's Achievement Place that stepped down to a lower level of care during this report period.

A total of 6 youth stepped down to a lower level of care at the Children's Receiving Home of Sacramento.

A total of 2 youth stepped down to a lower level of care at Quality Group Homes.

There were no youth during this report period that stepped down and returned to group home residential care.

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

- d. Of those youth active in RBS during the reporting period, what number and percent exited from RBS due to graduation, emancipation, voluntary closure, and other (as defined by “Current Status Code” in the RBS Days of Care Schedule)? Of those exiting as “other”, describe the reasons for disenrollment.**

Of those youth active in RBS during this reporting period, a total of 27 youth exited the program. A breakdown of the exit percentages and reasons is as follows:

Graduation- 12 (44%)

Other- 15 (56%)

The exit reason for the 15 youth who exited for “other” reasons is as follows:

Probation violation and incarceration- 7

The exit of 5 youth in the RBS Program during 2013 was a result in the youth violating the terms of their probation or committing new offenses during their RBS enrollment. These offenses varied and included behaviors such as drug use, auto theft and assault. It is important to note that the majority of the youth were under the supervision of Probation and the tolerance of that system is limited due to the Court’s concern about public safety when youth are engage in criminal offenses. Probation often feels pressure to make a change in placement when a youth has offended, particularly if it has occurred on multiple occasions during the youth’s enrollment.

Extended AWOL- 4

Four youth exited RBS as a result of extended AWOLs. Each of the Sacramento RBS providers is centrally located in a metropolitan area and it is easy for youth to leave the facilities and secure connections outside of the residential settings. RBS does have a tolerance for AWOL behavior and efforts are made to engage youth quickly to discourage the behavior and work with families to re-connect with youth after they have absconded. However, if a youth has absconded from a program without communicating with RBS or county staff for an extended period of time, they will be discharged from RBS.

Severe behavioral acting out creating danger to self or others- 2

Two youth were discharged from the RBS Program as a result of engaging in behaviors that were placing themselves or others at risk. These behaviors included assaults on staff and peers and consistent patterns of AWOL. The youth were enrolled in the RBS Program for a period of several months and were not responsive to interventions to help them redirect their behaviors.

Refused to return to program- 2

Each of the youth who refused to return to the RBS Program initially exited as a result of reporting they had been assaulted in the Program. Although the follow-up investigations did not confirm their reports, they continued to refuse return.

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

- e. Of those youth who exited from RBS since implementation of the RBS program, what number and percent re-enrolled in RBS during this reporting period?**

There were no re-enrollments of youth into the Sacramento RBS Program during this reporting period.

- f. What percent of youth utilized crisis stabilization services during the reporting period? Of those youth, what was the average number of episodes of crisis stabilization per youth? List the reasons why the crisis stabilization episode occurred:**

Crisis Stabilization was not used by any youth during this report period.

It is important to note that Crisis Stabilization services are still not available for RBS youth served in the Juvenile Justice System as the Juvenile Court regards even the temporary nature of the placement as placement commitment which cannot happen without formal Court proceedings.

Section B - Client Involvement:

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

- a. Describe any trends indicated by the CANS data.**

CANS data was not provided by Walter R. McDonald for this report period due to the fact the evaluation by Walter R. McDonald and Associates concluded in February of 2013. At that point, the pilot counties were advised that they needed to continue the evaluation of the pilot. Sacramento County did not initially have the resources in place to assume this responsibility and it took a few months to allocate those resources. In an effort to utilize existing resources, a decision was made to utilize the Mental Health version of the CANS which is in AVATAR, the Mental Health data system. Prior to making that decision, a review of the documents were made, and although the labeling of domains sometimes differed, the content of the domains were found to be comparable, leading to the conclusion that pertinent evaluation data could be gained from the Mental Health version of the CANS and providers began using that document in mid-year. Unfortunately, for 2013, the data from the Child Welfare Version of the CANS cannot be compared to the Mental Health version. That will be possible to do in 2014.

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

The comparison data from the Child Welfare CANS that were completed the first part of the year indicated improvement from Intake to Follow-up in the following domains:

Functional Status
Risk Behaviors
Family/Caregiver Needs and Strengths
Child Safety
Educational Progress

There was no progress noted in the Follow-up in the following domains:

Mental Health
Substance Use Complications
Family Caregiver Needs & Strengths
Relationship Permanence

At Discharge, improvement was noted in all of the domains, which included:

Functional Status
Mental Health
Risk Behaviors Substance Use Complications
Family Caregiver Needs and Strengths
Child Strengths
Child Safety Education Progress
Relationship Permanence

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

Yes No Explain:

As indicated in earlier County Annual Reports, it is understood that the number of youth participating in the evaluation is small and that caution needs to be taken in arriving at decisive conclusions. Further complicating the ability to draw conclusion from this data is the fact that, because of the change in the version of the CANS, only ½ year of data can be compared and analyzed. That being said, there is an indication from review of that data that youth enrolled in RBS do make improvements in significant domains of their lives and that the array of individualized RBS services and the aftercare services to the youth and family are reducing the level of need for the majority of youth and families who are enrolled in the RBS program for an extended period of time.

This data continues to align with the observable and noted progress of the youth and the feedback from the families that are served in the RBS Program.

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

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

Total Number Of Youth:	Total Number Of Youth With At Least One Supportive Adult During Any Part Of The Reporting Period:	Number Of Youth Participating In At Least 90% Of Their Child/Family Team Meetings:	Number Of Youth With At Least One Supportive Adult Participating In At Least 90% Of That Youth's Child/Family Team Meetings:
44	44	44	40

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

All youth enrolled in the Sacramento County RBS Program routinely attended the child/family team meetings during their enrollment. There were occasions when youth would elect not to participate in full meetings or, on occasion, would miss a meeting, but those instances were exceptions. Sacramento RBS continues to emphasize the importance of youth and family participation in care planning and decision making and efforts are made by the RBS throughout the youth's enrollment to encourage and support full participation in both formal and informal activities and services.

Section C - Client Satisfaction:

1. **Using the Youth Services Survey for Youth (YSS) and Youth Services Survey for 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.**

YSS and YSS-F data was not provided by Walter R. McDonald for this report period due to the fact the evaluation by Walter R. McDonald and Associates concluded in February of 2013. As noted in in Section B, 1a., above, when pilot counties were advised that they needed to continue the evaluation of the pilot, Sacramento County did not initially have the resources in place to assume this responsibility and it took a few months to allocate those resources. As a result, the YSS and YSS-F were only administered 1x in 2013.

The data from the Youth Satisfaction Survey (YSS) indicates that, on the average, youth fell in the 4.1 range in the areas of Satisfaction with Services, Child and Family Voice and Choice and Well-Being. This was an increase from the previous range of 3.4-3.5.

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

The baseline data from previous YSS-F surveys fell at 4.5. The current Youth Satisfaction Survey for Families (YSS-F) showed that on the average participating families rated Satisfaction w/Services a 4.2 at baseline with Well-being falling at 3.9.

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

Yes No **Explain:**

Although the number of youth and families participating in the evaluation was relatively small, the data does show a trend in which youth showed a slight increase in each the domain summary scores for 2013 as compared to the previous year.

The families participating in RBS continue to show a high satisfaction with Satisfaction w/Services and Child and Family Voice and Choice. However, the Well-being domain in this report period fell slightly.

This data, however small in numbers, does reflect the feedback that youth and families have provided throughout the operation of the RBS Program. Youth, upon graduation can cite areas of satisfaction with the program, but will also talk about areas where they would have liked to have seen fewer rules, more consistent respect from staff, etc. That feedback is taken into consideration as providers strive to improve their services and inclusion of youth and family throughout a youth's enrollment in the program.

The families of youth enrolled in RBS continue to consistently express appreciation for the openness of the program to families, for the support that the program has provided to the family and the responsiveness of the program staff to youth and family need. Because the Well-being domain score dropped slightly in this report period to 3.9 from a previous 4.1, that is an area that will be given attention in an effort to identify services, supports and engagement efforts that can help to improve the score.

Section D - County and Provider Use of RBS Program:

1. a. **During the reporting period, has the operation of the program significantly changed from the original design described in the approved plan? If yes, describe the change.**

Yes No **Explain:**

The Sacramento County RBS Program continued to use flexibility related to the enrollment criteria for youth during this report period. As previously reported, consensus was reached by county agency and provider partners to modify the eligibility criteria in 2012 to also include youth who did not have a permanency option at the time

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

of enrollment. Previous enrollment criteria required youth to have an adult who was willing to come forward to be a permanency option for the youth and actively participate in the RBS Program. The decision to change the criteria was reached after operational experience revealed that, even when youth entered the program with a viable permanency option, changes in the youth's and family's situation frequently resulted in the permanency option falling away. When that occurred, there was no back-up plan for the youth and often youth experienced a profound setback in their treatment progress. In response to implementing that change, both concurrent planning and family finding efforts have been put in place by providers in an effort to ensure the best possible permanency outcomes for youth enrolled in the program and to help prevent the major setback for youth whose permanency option fell away.

During this report period, Quality Group Homes modified their Community Based Services program for one youth who was turning 18 after only 4 months of transitioning to Community Based Care. The service period was shortened from the average 9 months to 4 months and the plan included incorporating activities that supported college enrollment and strengthening skills for adulthood while concurrently providing Functional Family Therapy and helping the family prepare for his return home.

The other change to note, although unplanned, is that none of the RBS providers had all positions filled throughout the reporting year. Two factors contributed to the reduction in staff. The first is related to the low census and will be discussed further in Section D.4 below. The other is due to the fact that both the Children's Receiving Home and QGH have had a significant turnover in their RBS Teams during the year. The Children's Receiving Home has rebuilt their team and Quality Group Homes is in the process of hiring their last position.

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

During the 2013 reporting period, there have been only 2 youth enrolled in the RBS program who have not had an identified permanency option, so the change in the eligibility criteria has yet to significantly impact the effectiveness of the project. However, again, it is important to note that even when youth have enrolled with a permanency connection, that connections sometimes falls away so it is necessary to always implement concurrent planning for all youth entering RBS. That service, along with family finding and engagement efforts will help to ensure that permanency outcomes for all youth enrolled in RBS. Although RBS census was again low in 2013, It is believed that by continuing with a broadened referral criteria will help to address the referral and census issues that have plagued the Sacramento County RBS Program since its inception.

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

The program adaptation for the youth whose Community Based Services were shortened and included a focus on emancipation had resulted in a positive outcome for that youth. He continues to be enrolled in college and is doing well at home even though his graduation from RBS occurred in May 2013.

The fact that all positions in the RBS Program were not filled for various periods throughout the year has resulted in services sometimes not being offered or being delayed. Understandably, when full staffing is not in place, those staff who are left to cover and provide are stretched thin and cannot be as responsive or do the job as well or as completely. Additionally, when there is turnover, even after the positions are filled, staff do not immediately have the competency. It is difficult to determine the impact of not having fully functioning service teams to specific outcomes, but it is assumed that without full and timely services, outcomes for youth and families are impacted.

- 2. During the reporting period, 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.**

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

As noted in Section D1.a, each Sacramento County RBS provider has implemented Family Finding and Engagement activities and integrated that responsibility into the roles and responsibilities of various agency staff. This function was not originally included in the funding or program model design and includes strategies such as search, engagement and relationship building.

Although not a significant difference from the roles and responsibilities delineated in the approved plan for the county and provider agencies, it is important to note that again in 2013, the Functional Family Therapist (FFT) for Martin's Achievement Place, extended her role during this reporting period to provide FFT to families served by the Children's Receiving Home RBS program when the FFT therapist position was unfilled for an extended period of time.

Also, as noted in Section 1.b, the RBS census for all providers, but particularly Martin's Achievement Place and Quality Group Homes has been much lower than projected. In an effort to work within their budgets each provider has taken various approaches to work within their budgets. Although there was no change in designated roles and responsibilities delineated in the approved plan for the various county agencies and providers, because of staff turnover and some positions remaining unfilled due to low census, it was necessary for some staff to assume activities that would generally be assigned to another position. Such activities included family advocacy and support, educational specialist services and behavior specialist services. There is a commitment on the part of all providers to fully staff their programs as census reaches close to the 90% capacity mark.

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

3. Were RBS enrollments sufficient during the reporting period? If not, why not?

Yes No **Explain:**

The RBS enrollments during this reporting period, as in the previous reporting period, have not been close to sufficient for most of the reporting period. Referrals and enrollments have increased for the Sacramento Children's Receiving Home and it does appear that there is now widespread knowledge among placement social workers that this program exists and offers a permanency program with a full array of individualized services. However, Martin's Achievement Place and Quality Group Homes have not had adequate referrals. As mentioned above, the lack of referrals has made it difficult for those agencies to keep their programs fully staffed and able to provide a full array of services and resources.

An assessment of RBS referrals and placement activity is ongoing by the RBS Local Implementation Team. One of the factors that is believed to impact the flow of referrals to the program is that each program is specialized. For example, Martin's Achievement Place serves only males who are sexually acting out. Quality Group Homes serves only a male Probation population. Likewise, the Children's Receiving Home serves only a female CPS population. The ebb and flow of referrals from each of the county partner agencies can immediately impact the referrals to the RBS Programs.

Efforts continue to be in place to ensure that the RBS providers are treated as preferred providers by CPS and Probation, the referring agencies. Both CPS and Probation rely on their system's gateways to placements to ensure that referrals that meet the criteria do get referred to RBS. The referral criteria were broadened as described in Section D.1a in an effort to increase the population of youth that would meet eligibility criteria. Additionally, agency and provider gatekeepers have acted to identify and track potential referrals and support the referral process in whatever way is needed to remove any referral challenges or barriers.

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

The county has continued to provide a part-time RBS Coordinator to oversee RBS program operations and coordinate implementation activities. Additionally, the county has designated 2 RBS social workers and 1 probation officer to serve the RBS youth and their families and participate as a member of the FST for each youth in their RBS caseload.

Although census has been low, MAP has made every effort to manage program utilization in response to the need of the client. Positions not filled at this time include, Transportation Worker, Behavior Intervention Specialist, and Family Engagement

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

Specialist. The responsibilities of the Family Engagement Specialist have been included in the job duties of the Family Specialist and the Family Advocacy program. The duties of the Transportation Worker have been included in the responsibilities of the Family Specialist. The duties of the Behavior Intervention Specialist continued to be contracted out (TBS) as needed. The Transportation Worker position would be filled if enrollment significantly increased. MAP does not foresee a need for an additional position for the process of family engagement.

Although referrals/placements were significantly low during this reporting period for Martin's Achievement Place, every effort has been made to manage program utilization in response to the need of the client. Two key positions affected by the low census were those of the Comprehensive Care Coordinator and the Family Advocate. MAP incorporated the role of the CCC into the role of the Family Advocate, creating a position entitled Family Care Coordinator. In an effort to ensure that families continued to be fully supported it was agreed that if a family was experiencing an issue with the MAP RBS program that was unable to be resolved using in-house MAP resources, a Family Partner would be solicited from a program such as the Sacramento Advocacy for Family Empowerment (SAFE) program to assist the family in resolving their issues and/or concerns. MAP will bring on a permanent part-time Family Advocate when enrollment in the RBS program increases to 75% of capacity.

Other positions not filled at MAP at this time include: Transportation Worker; Behavior Intervention Specialist; and, Family Engagement Specialist. The responsibilities of the Family Engagement Specialist have been included in the job duties of the Family Specialist and the Family Advocacy program. The duties of the Transportation Worker have been included in the responsibilities of the Family Specialist. The duties of the Behavior Intervention Specialist continued to be contracted out (TBS) as needed. The Transportation Worker position would be filled if enrollment significantly increased.

MAP experienced 3 personnel changes in the residential component of the RBS program this reporting period. Two (2) staff members were replaced as a result of agency led employment decisions and one (1) staff is on maternity leave.

The Children's Receiving Home of Sacramento (CRH) RBS ended the reporting period with a team consisting of; 1 PTE 0.5 Clinical Program Manager, 2 FTE Comprehensive Care Coordinators, 1 PTE 0.5 Family Partner, 1 PTE 0.5 Youth Advocate, 2 FTE Behavioral Intervention Specialist, and 7-8 FTE Residential Counselors (1 to 3 ratio) 1 FTE RBS Residential Supervisor (RS) 1 PTE 0.5 FFT Therapist 1 PTE 0.2 Individual Therapist and 1 FTE Case Manager/Family Finder

Quality Group Homes continues to operate with the following staff members who are essential to the vitality of the RBS program: 1 PTE 0.15 Program Director, 1 PTE 0.25 Clinical Director, 1 FTE Comprehensive Care Coordinator, 1 FTE Behavioral Specialist, 1 PTE 0.5 Family Partner, 1 FTE Residential Supervisor, 1 PTE 0.5 Residential Manager, 7 FTE Residential Counselors, 1 PTE 0.5 Family Functional Therapist, 1 PTE

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

0.15 Individual Therapist, 1 PTE 0.5 Youth/Family Specialist, 1 PTE 0.5 Youth Mentor, 1 FTE Program Aid, 1 PTE 0.1 Psychiatrist and 1 PTE 0.5 Educational Specialist.

Even though census has been low and there has been staff turnover, QGH has continued to operate under the RBS model and has kept the integrity of the program in sight. This year, several factors, including turnover, maternity leave and having consistently low referrals resulted in the need to utilize existing personnel to temporarily cover and assume additional responsibilities of other positions. Positions that became vacant included the Comprehensive Care Coordinator, Behavioral Specialist, Clinical Supervisor, Youth/Family Specialist and Youth Mentor. QGH was able to utilize our Residential Manager to cover the duties of the Comprehensive Care Coordinator. The Behavioral Specialist was rehired. Duties of the Clinical Supervisor were temporarily assumed by the Clinical Director. The duties of the Youth/Family Specialist were transferred to the Family Partner. Positions that continue to be held open are the Community Specialist and the Youth Mentor. The Behavior Specialist and Family Partner have filled several tasks of the Community Specialist and also of the Youth Mentor.

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:**
 - **Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Foster Care (AFDC-FC).** (The amounts reported here should come from the amount reported under H1, amount claimed per fiscal tracking sheet. They will not be equal because H1 is cumulative for the project and F1 is only for the reporting year.)
 - **Early, Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment (EPSDT).**
 - **Mental Health Services Act (MHSA).**
 - **Grants, loans, other. (Itemize any amounts reported by source.)**
 - b. **Provide the Average Months of Stay in Group Care for all children/youth enrolled in group home care during the reporting period.**
 - c. **Provide the Average Months of Stay in Community Care for all children/youth enrolled in community services (not in group home) during the reporting period.**

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

	AFDC-FC	EPSDT	MHSA	Other	Total
Amount Paid for Residential	\$1,212,365.00	\$316,062.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,528,422.00
Amount Paid for Community	\$202,953.00	\$106,309.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$309,262.00
Total Amount Paid	\$1,415,318.00	\$422,371.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,837,689.00
Avg Length of Stay in Residential	4.2 months	-	-	-	4.2 months
Avg Length of Stay in Community	3.4 months	-	-	-	3.4 months
Avg AFDC-FC Payment Per Youth in Residential	\$33,677	\$8,780.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$42,457.00
Avg AFDC-FC Payment per Youth in Community	\$15,612	\$8,178.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$23,790.00

*It is also important to note that these averages are based on youth being in the program and different components of the program for varying periods of time during this report period.

**The reported EPSDT revenue is based on provisional unit rates. When Providers cost settle, the actual amount paid to a Provider can be higher.

- 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.**

Yes No Explain:

There were no changes made to the Funding Model in order to manage payment shortfall/overages, incentives or refunds during the reporting period.

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

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 and SR3 document filed with CDSS.

1. a. For residential costs, complete the table below displaying provider actual costs during the reporting period, 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.

Note: This chart follows the SR-3 financial report. Definitions are listed in the instructions (RBS Letter No. 04-11, dated August 16, 2011).

Actual Costs in RBS Residential:

Expenditures:	Proposed Budget for the Period	Actuals for the Period	Over/(Under) Budget
Total Salaries & Benefits	\$1,765,625.00	\$939,629.00	(\$825,996.00)
Total Operating Costs	\$180,026.00	\$220,635.00	\$40,609.00
Total Child Care & Supervision Costs	\$1,945,651.00	\$1,160,264.00	(\$785,387.00)
Total Mental Health Treatment Services Costs	\$611,205.00	\$468,465.00	(\$142,740.00)
Total Social Work Activity, Treatment & Family Support Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Indirect Costs	\$205,828.00	\$228,830.00	\$23,002.00
Total Expenditures	\$4,708,335.00	\$3,017,823.00	(\$1,690,512.00)

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

Yes No Explain:

In each of the expenditure areas with the exception of Total Indirect Costs, Proposed costs exceed the Actuals due to the fact that all providers were operating at significantly less than 90% capacity and the budget projections were made under the assumption that the programs would be at least 90% capacity. The providers also indicated that even though program census was low, administrative costs remain unchanged and contribute to the Total Indirect Costs rising slightly above budget. These differences are likely to continue during 2014, if census does not increase.

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

2. a. For community costs, complete the table below displaying provider actual costs during the reporting period, 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.

Note: This chart follows the SR-3 financial report. Definitions are listed in the instructions (RBS Letter No. 04-11, dated August 16, 2011).

Actual Costs in RBS Community:

Expenditures:	Proposed Budget for the Period	Actuals for the Period	Over/(Under) Budget
Total Salaries & Benefits	\$481,539.00	\$108,087.00	(\$373,452.00)
Total Operating Costs	\$76,159.00	\$24,331.00	(\$51,828.00)
Total Child Care & Supervision Costs	\$557,698.00	\$132,418.00	(\$425,280.00)
Total Mental Health Treatment Services Costs	\$203,235.00	\$57,622.00	(\$145,613.00)
Total Social Work Activity, Treatment & Family Support Costs	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Indirect Costs	\$45,735.00	\$28,009.00	(\$17,726.00)
Total Expenditures	\$1,364,366.00	\$350,467.00	(\$1,013,899.00)

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

Yes **No** **Explain:** The providers based the Proposed Costs on the assumption that their programs would be at 90% capacity. All of the Sacramento RBS Programs were again significantly below capacity during the reporting period resulting in the Actual costs being much less than the projections in all expenditures areas. The differences are likely to continue if program census remains low.

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

- 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.**

Yes No Explain:

The Children's Receiving Home reported that there were some extraordinary costs for some youth, such as rental support for parents, travel costs for staff and families which included gas cards.

- 4. Has the county performed the fiscal audit required by the memorandum of understanding? 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?**

Yes No Explain: This Fiscal Audit for Quality Group Homes was completed in late 2012 and the audit for Martin's Achievement Place was completed in early 2013. The findings and recommendations of those audits were reported in the 2012 County Annual Report.

The County Auditor completed the fiscal audit for the Children's Receiving Home of Sacramento in 2013. The 3 areas identified as requiring improvement and the corresponding recommendations are as follows:

Issue 1: Written policies and procedures for purchasing and cost allocation and policies and procedures for credit card usage were not properly updated.

Recommendation 1: Management re-evaluates sufficiency and adequacy of current internal control policies and procedures and establishes new policies and procedures or modifies existing ones as necessary.

Issue 2: Non-payroll expenditures included a charge of \$1,618 was an RBS unallowable public relation cost.

Recommendation 2: CRH management establish policies and procedure that indent and separately track unallowable costs and review the RBS cost report to ensure that no unallowable costs are charged to RBS.

Issue 3: CRH did not utilize the RBS Time Study for allocating payroll costs for RBS employees. Payroll costs were based on children' occupancy rate. Although costs were considered questionable, they were allowed for this period with the expectation that the practice change in future budget periods.

Each of the recommendations above was reviewed with the CRH Chief Financial Officer who agreed with the findings and has subsequently implemented the recommendations.

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

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 Payments 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>67</u>	Total:	Federal:	State:	County:
Federal Payments:				
Residential:	\$3,063,178.00	\$1,430,059.00	\$117,216.00	\$1,515,903.00
Community:	\$715,021.00	\$40,419.00	\$0.00	\$674,602.00
Total Federal Payments:	\$3,778,199			
Non-federal Payments:				
Residential:	\$1,098,577.00	\$59,180.00	\$83,614.00	\$955,783.00
Community:	\$203,657.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$203,657.00
Total Non-federal Payments:	\$1,302,234.00			
Total RBS Payments	\$5,080,433.00			

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, dated June 21, 2011.

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

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-FC 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 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 Children Completing RBS: <u>25</u>	Total:	Federal:	State:	County:
Federal Payments:				
Residential:	\$1,675,207.00	\$828,350.00	\$79,038.00	\$767,819.00
Community:	\$662,531.00	\$13,341.00	\$0.00	\$649,190.00
Total Federal Payments:	\$2,337,738.00			
Non-federal Payments:				
Residential:	\$448,950.00	\$0.00	\$42,564.00	\$406,386.00
Community:	\$150,348.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$150,348.00
Total Non-federal Payments:	\$599,298.00			
Total RBS Payments:	\$2,937,036.00			

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

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 Section G3 of the CAR 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 Rate Classification Level (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 percent because all of the RBS Funding Models used the pre-American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) FMAP rate of 50 percent 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 percent. For the months beginning January 2011, the ARRA rate will decline until it reaches 50 percent 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-FC Base for Comparison:					
	Approved Base Rate Per Child:	\$8,031.00			
	Number of Children Completing RBS:	25			(from H2, above)
	Approved Base Months in Regular Foster Care:	24			
	Applicable Federal Funds Rate:	50%			
		Total	Federal	State	County
Base Payment for Target Group:		\$4,818,600.00	\$1,704,102.00	\$1,245,799.00	\$1,868,699.00

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

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

	Total	Federal	State	County
RBS Incremental Cost/(Savings)Based On Program Completion:	(\$1,881,564.00)	(\$862,411.00)	(\$1,124,197.00)	\$105,044.00

***Note: State Fund available through June 2011 only. Since July 2011, 2011 Realignment Fund (labeled as County 2011 on RBS Claims) replaces the State Fund. County Fund includes both County 2011 and actual County Fund. The savings to County Fund are included under State in the above table.

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

The aspects of operating RBS that contributed most to the cost/savings compared to regular foster care is that each RBS Program partners worked together to consistently provide the following array of services outlined in the RBS Program Model:

- A consistent and systemic method of Assessment and Matching
- A Comprehensive plan of Care coordinated across partner agencies
- Intensive Family Involvement supported by Family and Youth Partners
- Parallel, Pre-Discharge Community Based Interventions
- Intensive Environmentally Based Residential Services
- Therapeutic Services
- Follow-up Community Based Services and Support

The RBS partners believe that these services resulted in improved outcomes for youth and families in the area of placement stability, shorter length of stay in group home care and increased permanency. The shorter length of stay and return of youth to permanent connections ultimately resulted in significant Federal and State/County cost 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's different.

Yes No Explain:

The total Medi-cal (EPSDT) funding paid to all RBS providers for the time period 1/1/13-12/31/13 was \$442,371.00

Children's Receiving Home	\$273,793
Martin's Achievement Place	\$65,446
Quality Group Homes	\$103,132

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

The average amount of EPSDT funds spent per youth, per month was \$838. This amount is lower than the previous year (\$1,158) and much lower than the budgeted (funding) amount of \$2,667 per month. This lower draw down amount of EPSDT per youth was due to a decrease in referrals and the associated difficulties of keeping the programs adequately staffed with the budgeted mental health staff. Higher levels of client AWOL behavior also may have played a part in lower levels of billing as well.

The baseline costs for EPSDT for youth in foster care in Sacramento County was determined to be \$1,200 per month. Thus, the EPSDT billing or youth in Sacramento County RBS, for this reporting period, is lower than the typical usage of these funds for foster youth not enrolled in RBS.

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

Yes No **Explain:**

N/A MHSA funds are not used in the Sacramento County RBS funding model.

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Reform Project County Annual Report

Section H - Lessons Learned:

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

The Sacramento RBS Program continues to learn key practice lessons from the operation of the demonstration project. The most significant lessons learned and the best practices that have emerged include:

- As reported in previous annual reports, the strong collaborative partnership that exists among the key RBS stakeholders continues to be important to ensuring the fidelity to RBS values and practices as new challenges and successes emerge in program operation and experience. The partnership continues to be strengthened by the existence of the Local Implementation Team (LIT) meetings and the Care Review process (CRT), each providing a formal structure for working together and to assess, support and grow programmatic and operational quality.
- The ongoing census challenges have plagued the Sacramento RBS Program since the inception of the demonstration project in September 2010. Efforts to ensure that the RBS providers are utilized as “preferred providers” have not been successful in bringing the RBS providers census up to the target 90% capacity. This is one of the factors that has made it difficult for providers to operate fully staffed programs and consistently provide a full array of RBS services to all enrolled youth and their families. It is believed that youth and family outcomes could be improved if providers were able to operate at capacity for extended periods of time.
- The target lengths of stay of 9 months in Residential Care and 9 months in Community Based Care continue to be exceeded for the majority of youth served in the program through graduation. Although family finding and engagement and concurrent planning efforts are now in place and have helped to move youth toward permanency, 3 years of experience is indicating a pattern of longer stays in both the Residential and Community Based Care components of RBS. The primary factors that are believed to contribute to the extended stays include the difficulty some youth have in stabilizing in the residential component and the unplanned disruption of family connections.
- The addition of Family Finding and Engagement to the array of services provided under the RBS arc of care has provided the foundation for developing concurrent permanency plans for youth enrolled in RBS and youth have graduated from RBS during this report period with alternative permanency plans.
- The Sacramento RBS Program continues to have designated RBS social worker and a designated probation officer. As a result, the social workers and probation officer have a full commitment to and understanding of the RBS values and principles and have now acquired extensive experience in the RBS Program. Additionally they have developed strong relationships with the RBS partner agencies which brings cohesiveness and consistency to the coordinated care planning process.

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

- As noted in the 2013 County Annual report, many of the families of youth enrolled in the RBS program have challenges and barriers that stand in the way of their ability to provide for their youth on a long-term basis. Providers continue to find they must take an active role in helping families resolve some of these barriers and obtain the needed services and support concurrently with the development of a permanent plan for the youth.
- A number of youth enrolled in RBS during this report period have had significant substance abuse issues. As a result, RBS providers and the Family Support Teams (FST) are beginning to take steps to ensure that youth who struggle with substance use are enrolled in substance abuse treatment as part of their treatment and care plan.
- Functional Family Therapy continues to work well as a foundational family therapy approach for the RBS Program and families have provided positive feedback about how the approach serves to support the successful transition of the youth back into family care. However, the relationship between a few youth and their families has needed strengthening early in the youth's enrollment. As a result, brief family therapy has been provided prior to FFT to help stabilize the relationship as part of the permanency work.
- As previously reported, the lack of a Crisis Stabilization intervention for youth served by Probation has made it difficult to address the youth's disruption in the Community in productive ways. Juvenile Hall is the only option for "stabilizing" disruptive behavior and that measure can damage the relationship between the provider and the youth and family.
- The Probation youth who were enrolled and entered the Quality Group Home RBS program directly from Juvenile Hall were not as successful as Probation youth who transitioned to RBS from after completing a 30 day assessment period at the Sacramento Assessment and Treatment Center. Probation and QGH RBS will consider requiring all youth to first complete the 30 day assessment process prior to entering RBS.
- The Sacramento RBS Program partners continue to believe that having the flexibility to provide services and support to families in "non-traditional" ways makes it possible to better meet the individualized needs of the youth enrolled in RBS and their families.

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

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

The most significant fiscal lessons learned continue to be:

- The County's automated payment system (CalWIN) cannot accommodate the RBS payment rates for Residential and Community Based Care or payment to the provider when the youth has been returned to Community Based Care and the family has claimed AFDC benefits for the youth. This has resulted in the necessity of developing a cumbersome and resource intensive manually tracking and payment system for youth enrolled in RBS. If RBS is expanded to include additional youth in the future, a permanent solution to these issues would need to be developed.
- The 90% census projected in the Fiscal Model is necessary to ensure the wide array of the RBS program services and supports is consistently available throughout program operations and key to the providers' ability to fully staff their individual RBS program.
- A built in RBS rate COLA is needed to ensure the rate paid to providers is commensurate with the services provided.