

CalSAWS | Foster Care Committee (March 2020) **MINUTES by Region 3**

Date: 3/24/2020	Location: Call in Meeting Only
Time: 1:30 PM – 3:30 PM	Meeting Called by: Ignacio Lazaro
Attendees: Region 1: Maria Pacheco, Maria Torres Region 2: Julie Sato-Ruzich, Rhonda Solus, Holly Hashimoto Region 3: Gabrielle Anderson, Rod Delfer Region 4: Amalia Cabadas, Michelle Hernandez, Frank Hernandez, Adam Bacon Region 5: Wendy Marshall, Kali Sorrels-Goode, Bridget Salazar, Cathleen Orr Region 6: Ana Adame, Cynthia Spencer, Odet Tahmassian, Kimberly Wilkerson, Stephanie Sandoval CalSAWS: Girish Chakkingal, Srinivasa Meenavalli,, Laura Ould, Michelle Ramos, Steve Hancock, Tom Lazio, Kristy CDSS, Howard Suksanti, Paul Galloway,	

Meeting Notes: Region 3 is responsible

Topic	Lead
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SCR CA-201036 FC/ARC/KG Changes for Turning 21 Years Old Both went live, but turned off in LA. When we transition, what are the counties expectations? As part of 20.01 implementation the approved design for subject was updated in the last minute to turn off the change NOA and 21 yr. old batch job in LRS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Girish updated the committee and said that the change NOA and batch job was turned off in LRS. Affects LA County only and will not affect other counties after migration LA had concerns and talked about wanting CMS/CWS and LRS matching based on what the social worker (SW) is authorizing and did not want CMS/CWS open and LRS closed. <i>“LA wants the SW to close the CWS case first and then instruct the Eligibility Worker to close the CalSAWS case.”</i> Girish said the EW will need to run EDBC when authorization is received from the SW and then discontinue the case. Notice of action (NOA) will be discussed later LA wanted language on the discontinuance NOA to indicate that the last payment is prorated. Region 6 mentioned they have submitted a CER to modify FC/ARC/KG EDBC logic to not discontinue at the age of 21 to pay county funds (aid code 45) instead. This would allow for these cases to be discontinued based on jurisdiction termination date instead of birthday but would result in an aid code change should the case extend past the 21st birthday. Any payments issued past the day before the 21st birthday would be paid using (aid code 45) county funds. 	Girish Chakkingal
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SCR CIV-106585/CA-214133- Traditional List of 5K cases 	Michelle Ramos

- Based on ACL 19-24 they wanted to create a list that has the time-period in which the traditional EA funding changed from a year (365 days) to 180 days. This SCR was created to determine which cases are using 365 or 180 days. List will come out around April 2, 2020. A CIT will be coming out.
- LA asked about list coming out in unit name and how far back will the list go. Paul said the columns will be the standard columns like on the COLA list. LA suggested to have placement dates on the list. Counties will need to review the list to determine if the correct number of days was used for EA based on the policy at the time and take corrective action as needed. March 13, 2019 is when the EA-FC time limit changed from 365 days to 180 days. *As opposed to EC, which can still go up to 365 days with Good Cause.* Counties will need to decide how they work the list. LA is concerned about the amount of time it will take *to research the list.* At this time, CalSAWS is just putting out a one-time list. There could be another request for another list in the future.
- LA asked about if other counties has developed a process on updating the use of EA-FC? Several counties indicated they had processes in place to help ensure the correct use of EA based on the new rules.
- County asked if-and-when MEDS is going to update the change to the NTE date and how it will affect EC cases that have good cause. Some counties are understanding it differently. Ignacio said it sounds like we need more information. Ignacio will keep counties informed of any changes on the list.

- **SCR CA-214121BTSCA 2019 Re-Issue for LA County**

Michelle Ramos

- Batch for clothing allowance. Michelle was not sure why there is a hold-up on this LA specific SCR, but approval had been given to move forward. Michelle will check where they are at on the approval.

- **SCR CA-200424 Children of FC or KG Recipients Elig to CW Benefits**

Yale Yee

- Right now, LRS allows eligibility for CalWORKs (CW) for a foster care child who is living with their minor or non-minor FC/KG dependent parent. This has been updated in C-IV but needs to be updated in LRS. The child should **not** be eligible for CW in this situation. EAS 82-832.1(a) excludes a child from CalWORKs if he or she is the child of a minor or non-minor parent who receives AFDC-FC or Kin-GAP. The minor or non-minor parent should receive an infant supplement to their Foster Care/Kin-GAP payment instead. A suggestion was to take this to the CW committee first. If no feedback, then it will go back to the FC committee and proceed with the updates as the CW Committee did not have any issues with what was presented to the CW Committee.

- **FCED Update**

Corey Morris

- Corey gave an update on FCED (see power point). FCED has been in the works for years. A recent proposal was given to the CalSAWS Governance team. FCED will be updated to take on more
-

information which includes an interface between CWS-CARES and CalSAWS. Because the CWS-CARES project has taken a different direction in development, CWS-CARES will not be ready to interface with CalSAWS when CalSAWS migration begins in September 2021. Therefore, FCED will need to be released in two stages. Stage 1 FCED will mimic the interface between CWS/CMS and LRS now and leverage the existing LRS functionality to begin building towards a CCWIS compliant eligibility determination process. LA County has a company that is called Data Mart. Data Mart gets a file from CWS/CMS and takes the data that they need for the LRS system and eligibility. This allows the county to process the eligibility case quicker and not have to wait. When LA receives the information from Data Mart, EDBC is automatically ran ["no-touch" system]. LA EWs already work in CWS/CMS. Migrating counties will be allowed to give the EW the option to take the information or not (reject) and process the case.

- Question: How will counties know what information to accept or not to accept the information? Answer: The counties will come up with their processes to decide which information to accept or reject.
- Question: What happens to the information if the EW rejects the information? Answerer: The information goes away but may come back again when there is another change to the case.
- LA made the point that the information is coming from the social worker and should be from a trusted source. Cory indicated it is more of a change for the EW to accept or reject and not necessarily a trust issue. *Riverside County stated from their own experiences, the SW's initial information on the child is often inaccurate—or at least not entered accurately into CWS/CMS. For instance, name spelling and place of birth are frequently in error.*
- LA will automatically accept the data and run EDBC and other counties will be able to accept or reject and then run EDBC.
- LA does not automatically allow the incoming data to update information in their system if it is already verified. Placement changes will be allowed to be changed – so certain information can be changed.
- Question: Will a document form SOC 158A be required with this new system? Answer: Data can come over quickly but the required documents will continue to follow based on present counties practices. The documents will still need to be scanned in.
- Two SCR's will be needed because they added some of the migration elements to the proposal for FCED. One for migration requirements based on the side-by-side that was identified that has a specific relationship to FCED, and another SCR that will deal with what the looks like, how it comes over, and how the counties will see it.
- LA expressed that there are a lot of changes being involved in the SCR's. Girish said that they may be broken down, if needed. Counties

will be given the information and can give some feedback but the SCRs will not necessarily require approval.

- **COLA Notices Discussion**

Ignacio Lázaro

- Is there a need to suppress Kin-Gap age change NOAs generated with COLA NOAs?
 - The committee was asked if there are any changes needed for the age change NOA's that are generated at the same time as the COLA NOAs. A county indicated that there is some confusion by the caregivers if there is an age increase at the same time. The age increase is included with the CNI increase. There should be two different actions in this situation. The NOA should indicate that there is a change due to CNI and an age increase. Girish asked if the automatic batch jobs were turned off or on due to this kind of situation. There was a situation where cases were discontinued so it was turned back on. If turned on, then this situation should rarely happen. A SCR may need to be created in the future to correct this issue. They are looking at CalSAWS for a possible fix. A suggestion was made to run (batch) the age increase on a different day than the COLA. Do we want the age rate NOA to be suppressed if run on the same day? There is not enough time for a fix and SCR to be completed before the next COLA, but they can start working on a SCR if the counties are interested in doing that. Do the counties want it suppressed every year? **This issue will come back later and the counties can think about this.** If nothing happens then both NOAs will go out. A back-up plan is to hold the NOA for a few days – so the counties can review them. It would be nice to fix the issue on an ongoing basis. Girish would like to know what the counties want done.
 - Question: Is this being looked at for both CalSAWS and C-IV? Answer: Just CalSAWS.
 - Riverside asked about when the KG Age Change batch SCR will take place? Girish said it is for LA Co. only. LA County had it suppressed. Girish will find out about it.

- **CER CA-212185 FC Case Assignment Logic Change**

Corey Morris

Ready for Committee Review

- Corey said that this impacts LA only
- Change to the case assignment logic
- LA has a no-touch process with their interface with CMS/CWS (CMS)
- The case is initially assigned to an intake worker. CMS sets their case to run a batch overnight to assign a new worker (continuing worker).
- LA is wanting the assigned worker to remain being the intake worker until they have everything they need and then the intake worker can manually assign a continuing worker.
- LA wanted the automatic batch assignment logic switch to be turned to "no".
- This is set for a July 2020 release.
- Question: will this functionality be extended to other counties?
Answer: No, since other counties do not have a no-touch policy they do not run an automatic batch. The switch will remain "yes".

Topic

Lead

- o LA explained that the no-touch policy is so the EW doesn't have to run EDBC.
- o Future meeting will be planned to give LA a chance to do a demo on their system to help give a better understanding.

• CER CA-214374 COVID-19 Mailer with Foster Care Main Payroll

Ignacio Lazaro

- o Mailer will be stuffed with the checks for LA County only.

• CER CA-208734 Hidden Person(s) ACWDL 18-23

Ignacio Lazaro

- o Discussion about this CER. LRS already has this setting and can't see the child's address. When kids are adopted, they sometimes get a new SS#. For LRS, most of the conversation was in the MEDS committee. ACL came out and did not match what counties wanted. LA creates a new person for the adopted child. It is a MEDS thing that needs to be addressed. LA pointed out that using the same CIN would make the information available and it should remain confidential. Counties wanted to keep information confidential, but state ACL said we had to use the same CIN. Concerns about the address of adopted child showing up on the bio-parent's case. Ignacio was not sure where this CER is going because of counties concerns. Ignacio will seek more information about this.

FC Top Ten Prioritization List

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

1

#	Decision Made	Who Made the Decision	Date
---	---------------	-----------------------	------

1

