

From: [Sunset Advisory Commission](#)
To: [Janet Wood](#)
Subject: FW: Form submission from: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)
Date: Monday, June 30, 2014 4:47:40 PM

-----Original Message-----

From: sundrupal@capitol.local [<mailto:sundrupal@capitol.local>]
Sent: Monday, June 30, 2014 11:51 AM
To: Sunset Advisory Commission
Subject: Form submission from: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)

Submitted on Monday, June 30, 2014 - 11:50

Agency: DEPARTMENT FAMILY AND PROTECTIVE SERVICES DFPS

First Name: Mary

Last Name: McRoberts

Title: Executive Director

Organization you are affiliated with: Texas Alliance of Boys & Girls Clubs

City: Austin

State: Texas

Your Comments About the Staff Report, Including Recommendations Supported or Opposed:

The Texas Alliance of Boys & Girls Clubs has partnered with the DFPS Prevention and Early Intervention Program (PEI) since June 2008 when the 80th Legislature created the Statewide Youth Services Network (SYSN). Funding level at the time was \$4.5M/biennium then cut to \$3M in 2009 and remains at \$3M/biennium. This funding is split equally with Big Brothers Big Sisters resulting in \$762,500 annually for Boys & Girls Clubs. To date, BGCs have served 14,000 youth and not one has had contact with the juvenile probation system, according to DFPS' own numbers.

My remarks will address findings and recommendations for Issue 6: DFPS Should Elevate the Importance of Its Prevention and Early Intervention Efforts and Better Use Existing Data to Evaluate Program Effectiveness

6.1 Require DFPS to develop a comprehensive strategic plan for its prevention and early intervention programs.

Comment: Is DFPS the proper home for juvenile delinquency prevention programs? While the agency may be the right place for home-based, more clinical in nature services, it has been a struggle implementing a community-based, juvenile delinquency program within DFPS. There is a large chasm between case management/child protection and juvenile delinquency prevention. These juvenile delinquency programs may be better suited with a contracting agency that specializes in juvenile justice issues.

Comment: The new \$26.8M provide this biennium does not take advantage of existing, effective statewide networks and does not address the needs of school age children. The Alliance was disappointed about the direction the new prevention programs took, targeting a select handful of counties, but more specifically ignoring the enormous needs of school age children.

Existing, proven effective statewide networks such as The Alliance are an economical and efficient way to reach

hundreds of thousands of at-risk families with school age children and children 5 and under. The Alliance attempted to link Clubs with the community efforts, but no Boys and Girls Club is subcontracted for services in this new program.

Comment: The Alliance is concerned about the recommendation that DFPS develop PEI programs addressing specific geographic areas as it does not take advantage of the effective organizations around the state currently serving at-risk youth. While specific needs may vary around the state, all communities currently served by BGCs have enormous needs due to poverty, substance abuse, and gang activity.

I encourage the Commission and DFPS to rely on statewide networks such as Texas Boys & Girls Clubs to develop and implement effective PEI programs and spend their resources providing valuable data to the legislature and work with the programs to ensure impact and compliance.

We are in agreement with the Commissioner to move PEI under the Commissioner's direction and out from CPS.

6.5 Direct DFPS to develop a strategy to use existing data to better focus its prevention efforts and report the outcomes of its programs.

DFPS PEI does not adequately use data it already collects.

Over the past seven years, we have given the Protective Factor Survey pretest and the posttest annually to some 14,000 youth, had our Clubs mail the surveys to us, and we have entered all of them in to the PEI database. To date, we have no idea as to the outcomes of that data. All but one report in the PEI database related to pre/posttests are blank. This includes reports for all previous FYs. (Database Report Names: "Aggregate Increase per Protective Factor" and "Aggregate Increase per Question"). The "Number of Individual Increase per Protective Factor Report" for previous FYs provides some information; although the filter only allows for clients who have exited the program and have a closed registration to be included in the report information. Most of our clients are with us until they are 18 years old. We do not know if our program is increasing protective factors.

The "Client Frequency Report" provides good information in regards to County Served, Gender, Race, and Ethnicity.

Three reports that pertain to services provided are still in beta testing (Service Dosage Aggregate, Service Dosage Client Detail, and Service Provider Output Outcomes Target Measures), so we have no data.

It should be noted that the majority of the time, reports do not generate. We must request the report multiple times and it often takes several minutes (often 20+) for several of the reports to generate.

Appendix E:

The Number Served in FYs 2013-2014 for SYSN is listed at 4,384. TX BGCs served 2,210 unduplicated youth in FY13 and thus far in FY14, we have served

2,023 unduplicated youth. The PEI database is unable to demonstrate unduplicated youth across FYs, but it appears TX BGCs provided services to the majority of SYSN youth.

Any Alternative or New Recommendations on This Agency:

Concern: Excessive administrative and paperwork burden. While this issue is not directly addressed in the sunset report it addresses efficiency that is lacking at PEI.

Each month, we are required to submit billing paperwork (three single page forms) as well as a "Services Provided Report" for the month being billed. When billing is submitted, it is 40-60 pages of paper and must be mailed to DFPS. Electronic versions are not accepted.

In addition each month, we are required to print three reports from the PEI database and MAIL them to DFPS:

"Average Monthly Served (1 page)", "Output and Outcomes Target Measures Report (3 pages)", and the "Services Provided Report (average 45 pages)" for the prior month (note:

this report is also printed and mailed to DFPS monthly at the time of billing, so we print & mail for a second time).

Quarterly, we are required to print the "Client Frequency Report (4 pages)" and the "PFS # of Individual Increase per Protective Factor Report (1 page)." All of these reports are required to be mailed to DFPS when the quarterly

report is submitted to DFPS, despite these reports and all our data being housed in their database for which they have access.

We currently have state contracts with two other agencies and all billing and reporting is 100% electronic. DFPS PEI needs the technology to make our work, and theirs, more cost efficient and less administrative personnel demanding.

My Comment Will Be Made Public: I agree