

# CalSAWS | Foster Care Committee (May 2020) MINUTES

Date: 5/26/2020	Location: Call in Meeting Only
Time: 1:30 PM – 3:30 PM	Meeting Called by: Ignacio Lázaro
Attendees: Region 1: Selia Johnson, Julie Stuscavage, Shari Garrity, Maria Pacheco, Maria Torres Region 2: Stacey Jackson, Julie Sato-Ruzich, Rhonda Solus, Holly Hashimoto Region 3: Gabrielle Anderson, Lauren Hall, Cyndi Thomas, Rod Delfer, Brandy Foushee Region 4: Pam Townsend, Amalia Cabadas, Michelle Hernandez, Frank Hernandez, Adam Bacon Region 5: Wendy Marshall, Jose Beltran, Kali Sorrels-Goode, Bridget Salazar, Cathleen Orr Region 6: Ana Adame, Cynthia Spencer, Odet Tahmassian, Kimberly Wilkerson, Stephanie Sandoval CalSAWS: Girish Chakkingal, Srinivasa Meenavalli, Amy Gill, Tiffany Huckaby, Michelle Ramos	

## Meeting Notes: Region 4 is responsible

Topic	Lead
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>SCR (CA-216357)- Discuss Recipient IEVS (add IEVS committee)</b></li> </ul> <p>Background: At migration all counties will inherit R-IEVS logic from LRS today which excludes all CF aide code from loading into the system. C-IV counties will No longer get R-IEVS for FC aid codes.</p> <p>New SCR: The recommendation will include FC aid codes when loading R-IEVS. This will align with what is happening today in C-IV.</p> <p>The question is do we include or exclude recipient IVES moving forward Counties responded that IEVS are needed IEVS committee moving forward with SCR, but counties asked for a little more time to think about how they would like to proceed. As of 6/4/20- Region's 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 have emailed Ignacio and Agreed to INCLUDE R-IEVS with this SCR.</p>	Sarah Cox
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>DDID 2140 Updates to FC, AAP, KG to pay 2 Payees Mockup screens</b></li> </ul> <p>Design Discussion with the counties to share some options and to receive feedback.</p> <p>PowerPoint</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 2 – DDID 2140 description on the need/ability for multiple payee's and aid code for the same time period in a single EDBC</li> <li>Page 3, 4 and 5 examples of scenarios for split payment</li> <li>AAP scenarios from page 3 DCSF stated that the State has previously stated that the splitting of payments cannot be done. Amy stated that the DDID will be review and make decision after review.</li> <li>Reviewing Scenario split payment for THP +FC/ISP/SILP from page 3 for for NMD and question was asked if these are valid scenario? LA county states not a valid payment for them due to not being able to enter information into CMS and all placement information comes from CMS. Is this a valid scenario for any other county? Some interest to keep scenario.</li> </ol>	Amy Gill

5. Reviewing Wrap Around Scenario from page 3, is this a valid scenario? Orange county going to review with their fiscal. Shasta county comments that they are providing intensive service in this scenario.
6. AAP split payment (page 4 scenarios) for married parents are divorcing and need for a split payment, Kings, San Joaquin, SF Counties stated this is a common scenario for their counties
7. AAP GH/STTRP scenario (page 4) for secondary payments, is this a valid scenario was asked and several counties respond that yes, its valid.
8. Kin-Gap split payments (page 5) for divorcing guardians. Counties were asked is this a valid scenario and counties responded no this is not a valid scenario
9. Secondary payment (page 5) for KG Wraparound and counties responded that this was not a valid scenario and Amy moves to remove for KG programs from these scenarios, counties responded yes to remove KG scenarios.

Concern with FC scenarios from Kimberly W so vote is being taken weather to keep FC scenarios.

R#1 Yes, to keep

R#2 Yes

R#3 Yes

R#4 Yes

R#5

R#6 Yes, but if counties do not wish to use new pages, could CalSAWS configure the system to make it NOT available (w/ security rights) or be hidden?

FC and AAP EDBC scenarios are moving forward, and KG will not.

Eligibility Changes page 6

Only one secondary payee will be allowed per month and both examples are approved for moving forward

Online changes page 7

No changes to slides

Secondary payee page 8

No changes to slides

Payment types pages 9, 10 and 11 (mockup slide)

No changes to slides

Rate detail page, page 12 (mockup slide)

No Changes to slides

Kimberly, asks what type of update will performed on RDB?

Basically, secondary payee will be added as a placement type.

Discussion regarding sharing of RDB and its affect if different counties use the same secondary payee.

Response is secondary payee is only specific to case and counties should utilize the "county approved function" in the RDB to identify approved records for each county.

Rhonda ask will adding two payees allow for direct deposit.

Response is if both are set up for direct deposit, then the system will allow direct deposit.

Fiscal Changes O/P rules  
How are we going to handle O/Ps on scenarios? Page 14

Discussion on how to handle scenarios.  
Ignacio suggest sending scenarios out to counties for answers, fiscal to be included.

Page 15 skipped issuances  
No answers for scenarios, questions to be sent out to counties for 6/14/20 response.

Page 16 Correspondence Changes  
Secondary NOA will not be generated by the system and manual NOA will need to be created.

Change will only affect CalSAWS.

- **SCR CA-214441 - Roll Back Absent Parent Validation for Foster Care, AAP, & Kin-Gap** Ignacio Lázaro

Address migration gaps with counties and discuss best way to proceed.

Request to remove soft validation when running EDBC  
Kimberly ask why this is being brought up because it was already rolled back?

Some background information, that this was originally a CW/CF SCR and FC was not included and now we are being asked to vote.

Results of the vote

Region 1	Maria Pacheco "in chat" ( <b>keep as is</b> )
Region 2-	( <b>Remove</b> Soft Validation)
Region 3	Rod Delfer- <b>Remove</b> Soft Validation
Region 4	Frank Hernandez "in chat" ( <b>keep as it</b> )
Region 5	Kali Sorrels-Goode- <b>Remove</b> Soft Validation
Region 6	Kimberly Wilkerson- <b>Remove</b> Soft Validation

Votes are 4-2 to **roll back**

- **FCED Kick Off Meeting Update** Ignacio Lazaro/  
Michelle Ramos

**A separate Meeting on 6/2/20 will be held and information will be sent.**

- **CER CA-215862/CIV-107123 (UPDATED FROM CA-215737) FC EFC Case Listing Reports on ACL 20-45** Ignacio Lázaro

**Counties can expect to see list 5/28/20 (21 yr old list)**

FC Top Ten Prioritization List

#	Discussion Items	Assigned To	Due Date	Status
---	------------------	-------------	----------	--------

---

1

---

# **Decision Made**

**Who Made the Decision**

**Date**

---

1

---

