

**COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
JOINT BUDGET COMMITTEE**



**FY 2016-17 STAFF FIGURE SETTING COMEBACKS**

**DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES  
Division of Child Welfare**

**JBC Working Document - Subject to Change  
Staff Recommendation Does Not Represent Committee Decision**

**Prepared By:  
Robin J. Smart, JBC Staff  
March 16, 2016**

For Further Information Contact:

Joint Budget Committee Staff  
200 E. 14th Avenue, 3rd Floor  
Denver, Colorado 80203  
Telephone: (303) 866-2061  
TDD: (303) 866-3472

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Tabled Decision Items .....	3
➔ R1 County Child Welfare Staff – Phase 2 .....	3
Department Responses to Committee Questions .....	9

## Tabled Decision Items

---

### ➔ R1 County Child Welfare Staff – Phase 2

**Request:** The Department requests \$6,753,852 total funds, including \$5,978,651 General Fund, \$614,959 cash funds, and \$160,242 federal funds, and 2.7 FTE in FY 2016-17 to:

- Increase county staffing in response to a workload study performed by the Colorado Office of the State Auditor (request is for funding equivalent to the cost of 80.0 FTE);
- Increase Department FTE (including funding for salaries and common policy costs);
- Increase funding available for educational stipends; and
- Provide funding to counties to hire auxiliary staff, identified as nurses, housing coordinators, and educational specialists (funding is equivalent to 20.0 FTE).

This request annualizes to \$6,760,069 total funds, including \$5,983,811 General Fund, \$614,959 cash funds, and \$161,299 federal funds, and 3.0 FTE in FY 2017-18.

**Recommendation:** Staff recommends:

1. An appropriation of \$6,064,149, including \$5,428,510 General Fund, \$606,415 cash funds from local sources, and \$29,224 federal funds from Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, and 0.0 Department FTE in FY 2016-17.
  - a. This appropriation is for the purpose of providing a staffing block allocation to counties specifically for hiring county level child welfare case aides, case workers, and supervisors.
  - b. Funding is equivalent to the cost of 100.0 FTE calculated at a State compensation rate.
  - c. This recommendation annualizes to \$5,664,149 total funds, including \$5,068,510 General Fund, \$566,415 cash funds from local sources, and \$29,224 federal funds in FY 2017-18.
2. That the following footnote be added to the County Level Child Welfare Staffing line item:

THESE FUNDS SHALL BE ALLOCATED TO COUNTIES FOR THE PURPOSE OF INCREASING THE NUMBER OF COUNTY LEVEL CHILD WELFARE CASE AIDES, CASE WORKERS, AND SUPERVISORS.
3. Denial of the portion of the Department's request for funding for county level ancillary staff, for Department FTE, and for funding for educational stipends.

**Comparison of Total Cost of Request and Recommendation:**

<b>Department of Human Services R1 Request County Child Welfare Staff, Phase 2 JBC Staff Recommendation Compared with Department Request</b>						
<b>Job Type</b>	<b>Department Request</b>		<b>JBC Staff Recommendation</b>		<b>Variance</b>	
	<b>Number</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>
County Level Child Welfare Staff (cost of FTE)	80.0	\$4,844,897	100.0	\$6,064,149	20.0	\$1,219,252
County Level Ancillary Staff (cost of FTE)	20.0	1,377,640	0.0	0	(20.0)	(1,377,640)
State Department Staff (FTE)	2.7	220,815	0.0	0	(2.7)	(220,815)
Educational Stipends	24.0	310,500	0.0	0	(24.0)	(310,500)
<b>Total</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>\$6,753,852</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>\$6,064,149</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>(\$689,704)</b>

The following table provides a comparison of the fund types (totals) included in the above comparison.

<b>Appropriation Comparison JBC Staff Recommendation to Department Request R1 Totals</b>				
	<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>General Fund</b>	<b>Cash Funds</b>	<b>Federal Funds</b>
<b>JBC Staff Recommendation</b>	\$6,064,149	\$5,428,510	\$606,415	\$29,224
<b>Department Request</b>	6,753,852	5,978,651	614,959	160,242
<b>Variance</b>	<b>(\$689,704)</b>	<b>(\$550,141)</b>	<b>(\$8,544)</b>	<b>(\$131,018)</b>

**Recommendation for legislation:** Based on the analysis of the child welfare funding structure provided at briefing, Staff recommends that the Committee consider sponsoring legislation that directs:

- Stakeholders (including representatives from counties, the Department of Human Services, providers, and the General Assembly) to define the restructuring of the child welfare funding mechanism by January 1, 2017.
- The Child Welfare Allocations Committee to develop an allocation model based on this new mechanism by June 15, 2017, and implement the model beginning July 1, 2017.
- The mechanism contain a funding structure that includes:
  - Funding for county level staff, services, child welfare related operational expenses, and administrative and support functions;
  - A rate setting process for provider compensation;
  - Allocations and rates that support current child welfare practice;
  - Appropriate supervision by the state department; and
  - Evaluation and reporting on the allocation, use, and effectiveness of funding and services funded through line items from which allocations are made to counties, including a report submitted annually to the Joint Budget Committee, the House Public Health Care and

Human Services Committee, and the Senate Health and Human Services Committee by January 1.

***Analysis:***

The Department's R1 request is for \$6.8 million total funds, including \$6.0 million General Fund, and 2.7 FTE in FY 2016-17 with an annualization of \$6.8 million total funds, including \$6.0 million General Fund, and 3.0 FTE in FY 2017-18, to: 1) increase county level staffing by 100.0 FTE, including 80.0 child welfare staff (case workers, case aides and supervisors) and 20.0 ancillary staff (nurses, educational specialists, and housing coordinators); 2) increase Department oversight; and 3) provide educational stipends to attract interested child welfare professional candidates.

**County Level Child Welfare Staff.** In August 2014, the Office of the State Auditor released the Colorado Child Welfare County Workload Study. The purpose of the study was to “establish a comprehensive picture of the state’s county child welfare workload, case management, and staffing levels and identify estimated workload and staffing levels to accomplish child welfare goals.” It focused on actual time spent by case aides, case workers, and supervisors on tasks in order to evaluate efficiencies, develop workload standards, and determine the need for additional resources. The study indicated that county level child welfare staffing needs to increase by 576.0 case worker/aid FTE and 122.0 supervisor FTE. This was based on a 1:10 case worker to case ratio and a 1:5 supervisor to case worker ratio.

For FY 2016-17, the Department requests an additional \$4.8 million total funds, including \$4.3 million General Fund, to provide funding to counties equivalent to the cost of 80.0 FTE (3.0 case aide FTE, 68.0 case worker FTE, and 9.0 supervisor FTE).

The Department's annual funding requests are based on the assumption that it will take five years for counties to increase capacity enough to support the overall staffing increase recommended in the workload study. The majority of Phase 1 of this capacity building plan was accomplished through appropriations made in S.B. 15-242, a Joint Budget Committee sponsored bill that appropriated funding equivalent to 100.0 FTE to a newly created County Level Child Welfare Staffing line item. Though no specific language appears in statute, the appropriations clause for this bill specifically identified funding in the line item to be used to create new county level child welfare case aide, case worker, and supervisor positions. The creation of this line item was intended to provide a means through which to ensure that counties receive additional funding to increase job type FTE specifically identified in the workload study with the intent of supporting the Department's capacity building plan. Because the Phase 1 request in FY 2015-16 was only funded at 76.9 percent, the capacity building plan has already been delayed beyond the five year goal. The Department's FY 2016-17 request is for 61.5 percent of the funding for the number of case worker/aide and supervisor positions identified in the original plan.

In FY 2016-17, Staff recommends that the Committee approve a 100.0 percent increase in the appropriation to the County Level Child Welfare Staffing line item, thus maintaining the FY 2015-16 funding for the equivalent cost of the original 100.0 FTE, and providing funds for the equivalent cost of an additional 100.0 child welfare case aide, case worker, and supervisor FTE

calculated at the compensation rate identified in the Department’s request. The table below provides a comparison of Staff’s recommendation with the Department’s request.

<b>Appropriation Comparison JBC Staff Recommendation to Department Request County Level Child Welfare Staff</b>					
	<b>FTE used in calculation</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>General Fund</b>	<b>Cash Funds</b>	<b>Federal Funds</b>
<b>JBC Staff Recommendation</b>	100.0	\$6,064,149	\$5,428,510	\$606,415	\$29,224
<b>Department Request</b>	80.0	4,844,897	4,344,358	477,195	23,344
<b>Variance</b>	<b>20.0</b>	<b>\$1,219,252</b>	<b>\$1,084,152</b>	<b>\$129,220</b>	<b>\$5,880</b>

**County Level Ancillary Staff.** In addition to the funding requested for child welfare professionals, the Department requests \$1.4 million total funds, including \$1.2 million General Fund, in order to “expand the reach of professionals” by giving the counties the option of hiring nurses, educational liaisons, and housing coordinators. Funding is equivalent to the cost of 10.0 nurses, 5.0 educational specialists, and 5.0 housing coordinators. The Department requested that the appropriation be made in the County Level Child Welfare Staffing line item. This line item includes a 10.0 percent county match pursuant to S.B. 15-242, except for those counties qualifying for tier 1 or tier 2 of County Tax Base Relief, in which case the county match is zero.

Though the Department has provided qualitative information supporting the use of funds for these job types, no quantitative data has been provided by the Department or other stakeholders to support this request. Because of this, Staff’s analysis is based on available data provided in the workload study. These position types are not addressed in the workload study and without data, Staff is unable to recommend funding for this portion of the request. In addition, the intent of the funding appropriated to the County Level Child Welfare Staffing line item through S.B. 15-242 was for the hiring of county level child welfare case aides, case workers, and supervisors as specifically identified in the appropriations clause. This appropriation was intended to support the Department’s five year plan to increase county capacity and staff consistently over a defined period of time. Staff does not believe that funding ancillary positions through the County Level Child Welfare Staffing line item aligns with the workload study or the intended use of funding appropriated in this line item. Pursuant to Sections 26-5-101 through 105, C.R.S., nothing precludes counties from hiring ancillary staff or from using the Child Welfare Block to fund those positions, therefore counties already have the flexibility to hire these types of staff if county leadership so chooses.

The table below provides a comparison of Staff’s recommendation with the Department’s request.

<b>Appropriation Comparison JBC Staff Recommendation to Department Request County Level Ancillary Staff</b>					
	<b>FTE used in calculation</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>General Fund</b>	<b>Cash Funds</b>	<b>Federal Funds</b>
<b>JBC Staff Recommendation</b>	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Department Request</b>	20.0	1,377,640	1,239,876	137,764	0
<b>Variance</b>	<b>(20.0)</b>	<b>(\$1,377,640)</b>	<b>(\$1,239,876)</b>	<b>(\$137,764)</b>	<b>\$0</b>

**Department FTE.** The Department requests 2.7 FTE in FY 2016-17, annualizing to 3.0 FTE in FY 2017-18 and beyond, for the Division of Child Welfare. The positions include two Child Protection Services Specialists and one training Certification Specialist to provide technical assistance and oversight to county child welfare staff. The request is for \$220,815 total funds, including \$183,277 General Fund. The responsibilities of a Child Protective Services Specialist (GP IV) include, but are not limited to: monitoring, supervising, and providing oversight of county department practice; ensuring the successful roll out of the revised Colorado Family Safety and Risk Assessment Tools; ensuring the successful expansion of differential response; and providing training, coaching, and technical assistance to county departments. The responsibilities of the Training Certification Specialist (GP III) include but are not limited to: facilitating courses as assigned by the Training Center Coordinator; setting up classrooms and systems; ensuring learning experiences are culturally inclusive for all learners; executing training logistics before, during, and after training; and participating in continuous quality improvement assessment, feedback, and coaching processes to guarantee best training facilitation practices.

The Department’s request is based on the premise that an increase in the county staffing level will result in the need for additional Department staff to provide technical assistance and oversight, however in response to a hearing question related to this, the Department indicates that there “is not currently a methodology through which the Department determines the ratio of state FTE to county level staff.” Because of this, Staff is unable to determine if the Department’s current workload requires additional FTE and as a result recommends denial of this portion of the request.

The table below provides a comparison of Staff’s recommendation with the Department’s request.

<b>Appropriation Comparison JBC Staff Recommendation to Department Request State Department FTE</b>					
	<b>FTE used in calculation</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>General Fund</b>	<b>Cash Funds</b>	<b>Federal Funds</b>
<b>JBC Staff Recommendation</b>	0.0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Department Request</b>	2.7	220,815	183,277	0	37,538
<b>Variance</b>	<b>(2.7)</b>	<b>(\$220,815)</b>	<b>(\$183,277)</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>(\$37,538)</b>

**Educational Stipends.** The Department’s request includes \$310,500 total funds, including \$211,140 General Fund, for the purpose of increasing the number of accredited educational institutions and/or private universities with available stipends in order to expand the program beyond the Denver Metro area. Currently, stipends are offered by Metropolitan State University (MSU) and the University of Denver (DU) to students pursuing a career in public child welfare. These stipends range from \$8,000 to \$18,000 and support coursework for bachelors or Master’s degree students. Stipends are also offered through MSU in the amount of \$2,000 to support coursework relevant to a case aide certification. These stipends originate as state funds (68.0 percent) appropriated in the Training line item in the Division of Child Welfare and are eligible for a federal Title IV-E draw down (32.0 percent). Stipend recipients enter into a contract to work in Colorado public child welfare for one year for every year the individual received the stipend.

According to the Department, educational stipends for those intending to pursue a career in child welfare may be either a general stipend or a rural stipend. Though the stipends are similar, a student receiving a rural stipend must work in a rural county upon graduation. If at the time of hire, there are no job openings in a rural county, the rural employment requirement is waived. The Department indicates that it currently leads a stipend committee made up of institutions that have an award and that the stipends are funded through State and federal (Title IV-E) funds. Funds for educational stipends are appropriated in the Training line item in the Division of Child Welfare.

The Department’s request does not include data to describe the program’s success. It is unclear how many student successfully complete social work programs or the job placement and retention rates of those graduates. The Department cites projected workforce needs as the reason funding is needed for additional stipends. Staff believes this request is premature and is better addressed in the future when data is available that identifies specific workforce challenges in child welfare. As of the date of this document, counties have created approximately 102 new child welfare case aide, case worker, and supervisor positions with the appropriation made through S.B. 15-242. Though Staff agrees that there may be a shortage of qualified child welfare professionals in the future, especially in rural communities, the information provided by counties and the Department do not indicate difficulty in filling new positions.

The table below provides a comparison of Staff’s recommendation with the Department’s request.

<b>Appropriation Comparison JBC Staff Recommendation to Department Request Educational Stipends</b>					
	<b>Number of stipends</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>General Fund</b>	<b>Cash Funds</b>	<b>Federal Funds</b>
<b>Department Request</b>	24.0	\$310,500	\$211,140	\$0	\$99,360
<b>JBC Staff Recommendation</b>	0.0	0	0	0	0
<b>Variance</b>	<b>(24.0)</b>	<b>(\$310,500)</b>	<b>(\$211,140)</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>(\$99,360)</b>

## **Department Responses to Committee Questions**

---

**1. Why are all the counties not electing to hire additional child welfare caseworkers with the \$6.1M appropriated from SB 15-242?**

The Colorado Child Welfare County Workload Study released by the Colorado Office of the State Auditor in August 2014 recommended increasing the number of county child welfare staff by 574 caseworkers and 122 supervisors. As the first phase of a 5 year incremental approach to this staffing model, in FY 2015-16 the Department received funding for 100 new county child welfare staff.

A Child Welfare Allocation Committee (CWAC) Staffing Survey was sent, through Colorado Counties Incorporated (CCI), to all 64 counties in April 2015 regarding the allocation received for additional county level child welfare staff, as outlined in SB 15-242.

Since it is a multi-year approach, those counties that identified as being ready and able to hire positions quickly were prioritized during the allocation of the FTE and received at least one FTE. The twelve counties that serve the largest child welfare population across the state received more FTE based on their ratio of child welfare assessments.

The following outlines a more specific breakdown of the results of the April 2015 CWAC survey and the allocation of new staff through SB 15-242:

- Forty-one of 64 counties (64.1%) received funding for additional county level Child Welfare staff.
- Twenty-three of 64 counties (35.9%) did not receive funding for additional county level Child Welfare staff. The reasons as indicated by the Child Welfare Allocation Committee Staffing Survey Questions were as follows:
  - Four counties (6.3%) did not respond – (Hinsdale, Kit Carson, Montezuma, and Park)
  - Two counties (3.1%) cited that they could not afford the 10% match – (Cheyenne and Phillips).
    - Additionally, Cheyenne noted that they had recruitment and infrastructure challenges
  - Sixteen of the smaller counties (25%) reported that, as of April 2015, they were adequately staffed and that there was not a need in their county for additional Child Welfare FTE staff – (Custer, Grand, Gunnison, Jackson, Lake, Lincoln, Otero, Ouray, Rio Blanco, Routt, San Juan, San Miguel, Sedgwick, Summit, Teller, and Yuma)
  - One county (1.6%) noted recruitment challenges – (Morgan)

**2. For the counties that did not elect to hire the caseworkers, how will they be affected?**

If additional funding is provided in FY 2016-17, counties that did not accept an allocation for new staff in FY 2015-16 are eligible to receive an allocation in the second year.

- 3. The caseload study does not breakout the staffing needs between the rural and urban areas, but rather provides a state average. Since we are using an average, how do we know we are using the correct distribution for each county when it comes to the amount of funds and FTE appropriated?**

SB 15-242 authorized the Department to contract for an external study concerning the child welfare caseload by county. As a result, the Department has hired ICF International to help develop a staffing model or tool that can be used to allocate a specified number of FTE across counties in the state based on those counties with the greatest case management need. ICF is the same vendor who completed the Colorado Child Welfare County Workload study released by the Colorado Office of State Auditor in August 2014. The Department will provide a copy of the ICF Report Summary and DCW Caseload Study Report if requested. The allocation of potential new FTE derived from the tool in the ICF caseload report will be presented to the Child Welfare Allocation Committee for their consideration.

- 4. If the counties can use the CW Services block line item to hire ancillary staffing, then why did the Department specifically ask for ancillary staff funds? Do the counties know they can use the CW Services block line item to hire ancillary staff?**

Counties are aware that they can use their CW Services block line item to hire other professional staff. While some counties have available CW Services block funds to hire caseworkers, supervisors, case aides and other professional staff, other counties do not have available block funds. Additionally, some counties have available block funds, but do not have the county match to use the CW Services block funds.

Therefore, the Department is asking for flexibility for counties to be able to hire additional and specialized staff that is able to perform some of the job functions currently being conducted solely by caseworkers to improve child welfare practice as a whole. Ancillary positions will afford counties to hire specialized professionals that possess skills that caseworkers are not trained to do, such as education, medication management, and health care. As a result of a more diverse workforce, better outcomes can be achieved for children and families.

- 5. How does this funding impact caseworker job enrichment? They are concerned about caseworker burnout and safety.**

The Colorado Child Welfare County Workload study released by the Colorado Office of the State Auditor in August 2014 addressed issues that caseworkers perceived as affecting their volume of work, employee morale, job satisfaction, and staff retention. A majority of the respondents said that the volume of work had the most significant impact. Below are some of the reasons given that affect the volume of work:

- A perceived increase in required documentation for each case.
- A crisis occurs on one case, which causes work on other cases to build up and makes it difficult to catch up.

- Management of a large number of cases (e.g., 20+ cases per month).
- Increased burden from being on-call after hours.
- High volume of referrals and subsequently opening multiple cases in a week.
- Perceived understaffing in program areas.
- Worker turnover leading to reassignment of cases to other workers.

An increased volume of work can also impact the quality of work and services provided to child welfare clients. There may be a delay in responding to phone calls, late submittal of reports, or other difficulties meeting deadlines. It should be noted that this in turn may have an effect on employee morale and job satisfaction. It may leave caseworkers feeling behind, with the impression that they don't have enough quality time to meet with families, and prioritization concerns. Additionally, when supervisors take on a workload, that may reduce the immediate workload burden but it affects quality supervisory time with caseworkers.

The Colorado Child Welfare County Workload Study released by the Colorado Office of the State Auditor in August 2014 looked at turnover rates in participating counties. The average annual turnover rate was about 10 percent. For specific counties, the turnover rates ranged from 0 to 24 percent. In comparison, turnover is between 23 and 60 percent for child welfare agencies nationally. According to the Workload Study, turnover is an on-going issue, as 18 percent of the statewide child welfare workforce is anticipated to retire in the next 7 years.

**6. Is there a way counties can share best practices, such as a BOCES and public health nurses?**

Counties currently do work collaboratively with other agencies on the local level to share best practices, this includes BOCES and public health nurses. However, these efforts are insufficient to meet the education and health care needs of children in child welfare. This is supported by evidence from a study<sup>1</sup> by Dr. Clemens at the University of Northern Colorado concluded that children in foster care have poor education outcomes and a 2013 report<sup>2</sup> by Psychotropic Medication Steering Committee demonstrated that psychotropic medication is over utilized for children in foster care.

**7. The JBC would like the Department to provide more information on how the education stipend is going to be used. How will it affect the counties?**

The educational stipend dollars would allow more students from more universities to participate in a paid internship program within a county child welfare department. As a condition of the stipend, upon graduation, the student is required to work in a county department for one year for every ten months of the stipend award. This promotes inclusion of more qualified candidates into the child welfare field, with an intended

---

<sup>1</sup> Clemens, E. V. (2014). Graduation and Dropout Rates for Colorado Students in Foster Care: 5-Year Trend Analysis (2007-08 to 2011-12). Greeley, CO: University of Northern Colorado

<sup>2</sup> 2013 Psychotropic Medication Guidelines for Children and Adolescents in Colorado's Child Welfare System

greater rate of retention. If the student does not fulfill the requirement, he or she must pay the stipend money back to the university, which is collected and used to fund additional stipends. The amount of money awarded to the stipend students depends on the contracted agreement between the university and the Department.

Educational stipend dollars have historically been allocated through contracts with University of Denver and Metro State University, as these were the only universities with accredited social worker programs. Today, more Colorado universities have accredited social worker programs and these universities along with the counties have asked the Department if they can participate in the educational stipend program. The Department wishes to increase the stipend program to increase university participation and encourage more students across the state to be future caseworkers and social welfare workers.

- 8. Why is there a lack of communication between the counties? Are they on different computer systems or don't have a way to effectively transfer youth? There was an incident of a child fatality a couple years ago when a child was transferred from the Denver County Human Services to Pueblo County Human Services but the case file was not transferred?**

Volume VII rules provide guidance to counties on the steps required to transfer assessments, cases, and jurisdiction between counties. Attached is a copy of the following Volume VII rules (7.103.11 and 7.304.4) that pertain to the communication and transferring of responsibility.

In addition, all counties are required to use Trails, Colorado's federally approved statewide automated child welfare information system (SACWIS). All information is recorded in Trails except for specific hard copy materials, such as documentation created by outside agencies (i.e., the courts, etc.). It is the goal of the Department, through the Trails Modernization project approved by the General Assembly, that there will be the ability for hard copy materials to be electronically scanned and attached to a case file once this new system is built over the next three years.

- 9. Please describe the oversight mechanism for the prescription of psychotropic drugs to children in foster care. Who is responsible for oversight, who prescribes the medication, who administers the medication?**

Children in foster care who are prescribed psychotropic medications are monitored by the prescribing physician or psychiatrist.

The administration of prescribed psychotropic medications is done by the out-of-home placement provider (i.e., foster care provider, residential child care facility staff, etc.). The Code of Colorado Regulations (Volume VII rules), outlines the requirements for medication administration for a child in out-of-home placement.

As a specific example, the Code of Colorado Regulations 12 CCR 2509-8, 7.708.41-Medical and Health Services, states the following:

“J. Medications shall be administered and stored in the following manner

1. When a foster child first goes into care, the foster care home shall ascertain all medication the foster child is currently taking.
2. All medication must be kept in a clean storage area inaccessible to foster children and stored according to pharmacy instructions.
3. All prescriptive medications shall be administered only upon the written prescription of a physician. The foster care home shall also obtain written authorization from the prescribing physician to administer any non- prescriptive medication.
4. In an emergency situation, non- prescriptive medication may be administered on the verbal authorization of a physician. Written confirmation must then be obtained for the verbal authorization.
5. The foster care home shall maintain for each foster child a cumulative record of all medication, both prescriptive and non-prescriptive dispensed to that foster child, including:
  - a. The name of the foster child.
  - b. The name and dosage of medication.
  - c. The time and date the medication was dispensed.
  - d. The name or initials of the person administering the medication.”

It should be noted that the ability of counties to hire ancillary staff, specifically nurses could specialize support to foster parents providers regarding the administration of psychotropic medication.

**10. Is there a relationship between the number of child welfare case workers and the number of children who are prescribed psychotropic meds?**

There is no relationship between the number of child welfare case workers and the number of children who are prescribed psychotropic medication.

Children in foster care who are prescribed psychotropic medications are monitored by the prescribing physician or psychiatrist and not by a child welfare case worker. However, if counties had the flexibility to hire ancillary staff, such as nurses to provide casework, these nurses will have better training and ongoing management of medication utilization in child welfare as well as providing coordination between the foster parent provider and the medical professional than a caseworker would have.

**11. Out of which line item are psychotropic meds funded when prescribed to a child in foster care?**

Children in foster care receive Medicaid. Medicaid is the payment source for psychotropic medication prescribed to a child in foster care.

**7.103.11 Transfer of Jurisdiction [Eff. 1/1/15]**

- A. If the county department that receives a referral determines that another county department has jurisdiction, the county department that received the referral shall:
  - 1. Gather and document all information as available in Section 7.103.1, A;
  - 2. Gather and document all information necessary to determine jurisdiction; and
  - 3. Contact the county determined to have jurisdiction within the following timeframes:
    - a. If the referral is assigned an immediate response, within four (4) hours of determining jurisdiction.
    - b. If the referral is assigned either a three (3) day or five (5) day response, within one (1) business day of determining jurisdiction.
- B. The county determined to have jurisdiction shall screen the referral.
- C. When the county department that received the referral makes a decision based upon the referral prior to determining jurisdiction, the county department determined to have jurisdiction shall uphold that decision including assignment and response time, unless:
  - 1. Additional or new information is gathered by the county department determined to have jurisdiction.
  - 2. The additional or new information shall relate to the safety of the child.
  - 3. The child welfare or county department director of the county department determined to have jurisdiction overrides the decision.
  - 4. The authorization, information, and justification for any change shall be documented in the referral notes.
- D. If an immediate response is necessary, the county department where the child is located at the time of the referral is the responsible county department while jurisdiction is determined.

**7.304.4 AGE AND RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS AND PAYMENT RESPONSIBILITY FOR CHILDREN IN OUT-OF-HOME CARE [Rev. eff. 4/1/13]**

- F. Each county shall designate a Change of Venue coordinator.
- G. When a motion for a Change of Venue has been made by the sending county, the sending county shall mail the Change of Venue motion to all parties and attorneys of record in the case and to the county attorney in the receiving county.
- H. Within fifteen (15) calendar days after a court signs an order granting a Change of Venue and transferring jurisdiction, the sending county shall:
  - 1. Provide written case information, if not located in the state automated system, to the designated Change of Venue coordinator in the receiving county which shall include, but need not be limited to:
    - a. Permanency goals;
    - b. Target dates related to the case;
    - c. Evaluations;
    - d. A current Family Services Plan;
    - e. Court reports;
    - f. Dates of placement moves;
    - g. Progress of the child(ren) in placement;

