

A Status on the Implementation of the Comprehensive Services

Act Match Rate Incentive for Residential Care

*Prepared by
The Office of Comprehensive Services for
At-Risk Youth and Families*

November 2008

**Status on the Implementation of the Comprehensive Services Act Match Rate
Incentive for Residential Care
November 2008**

Study Mandate:

The 2008 Appropriations Act, Chapter 879, Item 283, C 3.d requires the State Executive Council shall:

“monitor the implementation of the incentives and disincentives included in this item, provide technical assistance, and recommend evidence-based best practices to assist localities in transitioning individuals into community-based care. Beginning November 1, 2008, and each year thereafter, the SEC shall provide an update to the Governor and the Chairmen of the House Appropriations and Senate Finance Committees on the outcomes of this initiative”.

Background:

The statutory purpose of the Comprehensive Services Act (CSA) is to create a system of services and funding for troubled youth and their families that is child centered, family focused and community based. Reducing residential care for children who can appropriately be served in the community is a key CSA performance measure. For the past three years (FY2005 – 07) this ratio has hovered around 41%. The CSA target for FY 2009 is 50% of children serve in the community.

The Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee (JLARC) identified that community based service gaps are the primary obstacle to serve children in the most appropriate, least restrictive setting. In 2007/08, the Casey Strategic Consulting Group provided policy advice to strengthen CSA financial incentives to reduce reliance on residential care, serve children in their homes and invest funds for the development of community based services. Though modified during the 2008 General Assembly session, in short, the policy advice consisted of phasing in a system of financial incentives over the biennium that is consistent with the statutory purposes of the CSA:

- preserve and strengthen families;
- design and provide services that are responsive to the unique and diverse strengths and needs of troubled youth and families and;
- provide appropriate services in the least restrictive environment, while protecting the welfare of children and maintaining the safety of the public.

Appropriations Act Incentive Match Language:

The following are excerpts from the CSA 2008 Appropriations Act, Chapter 879, mandating the establishment of an incentive match rate system for CSA pool fund expenditures:

“Notwithstanding the provisions of C 2 of this Item, beginning July 1, 2008, the Secretary of Health and Human Resources shall oversee the implementation of a system of financial incentives that is consistent with the statutory purposes of the Comprehensive Services Act. The financial incentive system shall use the methodology in place on July 1, 2007, for calculating the base rate for each locality. The Secretary shall establish a work group to implement the changes in state and local match rates for the Comprehensive Services Act (CSA) program. The work group shall include representatives from the Virginia Association of Counties, the Virginia Municipal League, the Virginia League of Social Services Executives, the Virginia Association of Community Service Boards, the Virginia Coalition of Private Providers, the Virginia Association of School Superintendents, the Department of Education, the Department of Juvenile Justice, and the Office of the Executive Secretary of the Supreme Court. The work group shall examine the impact of the match rate changes on local and state administration of the program, reporting requirements, service development and delivery, quality assurance, utilization management, and care coordination to ensure that children continue to receive appropriate and cost-effective services.

Community Based Services. Beginning July 1, 2008, the local match rate for community based services for each locality shall be reduced by 50 percent.

Localities shall review their caseloads for those individuals who can be served appropriately by community-based services and transition those cases to the community for services. Beginning January 1, 2009, the local match rate for residential services for each locality shall be increased by 15 percent above the fiscal year 2007 base rate after a locality has incurred a total of \$100,000 in residential care expenditures for the period of January 1, 2009, through June 30, 2009. Beginning July 1, 2009, the local match rate for residential services for each locality shall be 25 percent above the fiscal year 2007 base rate after a locality has incurred a total of \$200,000 in residential care expenditures”

System Status as of November 2008

Essentially, there are three phases associated with the establishment of the match rate incentive system:

1. Defining the various service categories for both the reduction in community based services and defining the increased service categories for residential services.
2. Modifying reporting systems
3. Local government training

Services Definition

The State Executive Council (SEC) approved the service categories, match rates and definitions for the CSA match rate incentive program at its' June 12, 2008 meeting. Proposed definitions previously were submitted to CSA stakeholders for comment on 2 occasions. In the final review, there were a total of 31 respondents from 28 localities and 4 statewide associations that submitted written public comment. The approved service categories and applicable match rates were disseminated to local government and associations on June 19. The Office of Comprehensive Services continued fine tuning and clarifying the wording of definitions within the parameters approved by the SEC. All modifications were completed and communicated by October 22, 2008; the state office continues to provide guidance and clarification on these definitions and match rates as needed. The final definitions are outlined in Appendix A.

System Modifications

There are 3 web based CSA reporting systems that must be modified to accommodate the match rate incentive program: the CSA Pool Fund Reimbursement Reporting system, the CSA Data Set reporting system and the CSA Supplemental Allocation Request system.

The initial system to be modified was the CSA Pool Fund Reimbursement Reporting system. This system must be modified 3 times to accommodate changing match rate implementation dates. Initially, this system was updated to accommodate the 50% reduction in community based rates. These modifications were completed by June 30, 2008 and placed into production on August 1, 2008 (for July 2008) expenditure reporting. As of November 4, 2008, a total of 303 reports have been received without incident.

Since the increase in residential match rate local share increase of 15% does not commence until January 1, 2009 services, a second 2009 Pool Fund Reimbursement Reporting system is required to accommodate the increased local match. This modification will be completed by December 1, 2008 and will be placed into production on February 1, 2009.

The final reporting update will be to accommodate the second residential local residential match rate increase to 25%, occurring July 1, 2009. This change will be completed by

May 15, 2009 and will be placed into production August 1, 2009. It should be noted that for the months of August and September 2009, localities will be required to isolate three separate child service periods to ensure the correct local match rate is applied:

1. Child services for the period July 1, 2008 through December 31, 2008; containing a 50% reduction to applicable community based match rates
2. Child services for the period January 1, 2009 through June 30, 2009; containing a 50% reduction to applicable community based match rates coupled with a 15% increase to applicable residential services
3. Child services for the period beginning July 1, 2009; containing a 50% reduction to applicable community based match rates coupled with a 25% increase to applicable residential services.

As the SEC requires all program FY09 child services to be reported to the state fiscal agent by September 30, 2009, localities only will be reporting FY10 expenditures beginning October 1, 2009. As such, beginning October 1, 2009 there will be a single Pool Fund Reimbursement reporting system.

Data Set and Supplement Funding Reporting Systems

The Data Set reporting system provides child specific demographic and service information for children funded by the CSA. Local governments utilize various proprietary financial systems to capture and report this information three times annually: Periods ending December 2008, March 2009 and June 2009. The state office also supplies a web based application free of charge to local governments should a proprietary system not be available. These systems must be modified to accommodate the new expenditure reporting categories associated with the incentive financial reporting system. Vendors have been provided the file layout to accommodate the system modifications and the initial data reporting (period ending December 2008) is due to the state office by January 2009.

The FY09 Supplemental Reporting system, used should a locality required additional allocation for sum sufficient children services, went into production November 2008. As of November 2008, one locality had requested additional funding.

Local Government Training

At the June 12, 2008 SEC meeting, final CSA match rate service categories and definitions were approved. Using that information, all CSA reporting systems were either modified or will be modified in accordance with reporting requirements.

To assist local governments with the new match rate incentive system, five regional training sessions were performed across the state in July and August 2008. These sessions were targeted to CSA coordinators, local fiscal management and local CSA data set coordinators. These 5 training sessions were attended by 219 local staff.

Additionally, local governments use various locally administered software systems to assimilate and report CSA expenditures and child demographic information. All local vendors were provided file layouts, service definitions and administrative edits to update their respective software systems. All vendors are to have the data set system modifications in place by January 1, 2009.

Financial Status as of November 2008

As the incentive match rates has only been in place since July 2008, during that time frame only the reduction resulting from the use of community based services as defined by the SEC has been reported.

As of November 4, 2008, there has been a total of 303 pool fund reports submitted, totaling \$38.5M. This represents less than 10% of the anticipated FY09 program year costs. Historically, the aggregate local match rate for CSA pool funded expenditures is 36%. Since inception of the lower match on community based services, this rate has declined to 33.27%, representing a total shift from local to state share of just over \$921k.

To monitor the shift in the effective local match rate, the Office of Comprehensive Services has created an Effective Match Rate report, tracking the shift in match by locality (see attached report). This report provides, by locality, the:

- Local Base Match Rate – representing the base local share as specified in the Appropriations Act, Chapter 879
- # of Expend Reports thru Nov 4 – representing the number of FY09 Pool Fund Reports filed by the local government as of November 4, 2008
- Total Net Expenditures Claimed – representing the total expenditures (gross cost less refunds) reported on the FY09 Pool Fund reports filed as of November 4, 2008
- Actual Local Match – representing the actual local match determined from the filed Pool Fund reports
- Actual State Match – representing the actual state share match to be paid from the filed Pool Fund reports
- Effective Local Match Rate – representing the calculation of the actual local match paid divided by the net expenditures claimed
- Local Base Rate less Effective Rate – representing the difference between the effective local match rate calculation from the local base match rate
- Local Match with No Incentive – representing the calculation of the local base match rate multiplied by the total net expenditures claimed. This would have been the actual local share in absence of the match rate incentives.
- Actual Local Match - representing the actual state share match to be paid from the filed Pool Fund reports
- Local Match Rate (Savings) – representing the difference between the Actual Local Match and the Local Match with No Incentive. The negative amount represents the decline in actual local match on pool fund expenditures

As of the opening of business November 4, 2008, a total of \$921,566 in local share has been reduced as a result of the decline in community based match rates.

Implementation of the Child and Adolescent Needs and Strengths Assessment (CANS)

The implementation of the CANS as the statutorily required uniform assessment instrument for CSA began July 1, 2008. During the implementation year, there will be a gradual change over from the CAFAS© to the CANS, with full implementation of the CANS required by July 1, 2009. A first step was the development of the online training and certification website. Case managers or anyone who uses the CANS may go online and be certified following a training session with practice tests. As of this date, approximately 1,000 staff from CSA partner agencies are trained and certified. As users are certified, they begin using the paper CANS on “new” children and as children already in the system are reassessed, a CANS is completed instead of a CAFAS©.

Many localities have created implementation plans with varying start dates. Some are already operative and others are planning for January 1, 2009. Local governments are required to have all children assessed using the CANS instrument by July 1, 2009 .

OCS has entered into a contract with RCR Technology in Indiana to modify the existing Indiana CANS software to the Virginia version of the CANS. The contractor plans to have the online system, tentatively named CANVaS ready for use the first week of January, 2009. At that time, case managers will begin entering their CANS assessments into the online system.

The Virginia CANS was modified from the Indiana version to capture three specific outcomes identified by the State Executive Council:

- child’s improvement in overall functioning,
- child’s performance in school including academic, behavioral and attendance; and
- parents’ involvement in service planning.

Certain items on the CANS were included to capture the data to measure these outcomes. CANS is different from many currently used psychometric measures in that the rater does not arrive at a total score. Each item is rated on a four point scale (0-3). Items which are rated a “2” or “3” should be addressed in the service plan. John Lyons, Ph.D., the developer of the CANS, has identified specific items in different domains which may be targeted to measure the child’s functioning over time with repeated administrations of the CANS.

Three school items were included to capture the data for the school item. The caregiver strengths and needs section was significantly improved to include items such as “involvement with care” which will gather the data for the third identified outcome.

A child's progress over time may be charted or graphed on any of the three outcomes. The data may also be aggregated to measure improved functioning of a cohort of children, such as all children who received CSA services during a specified time frame, all children in residential programs, etc.

Outcomes may be obtained as soon as data is in the online system. However, it will be limited by the number of children whose ratings have been entered at that time the report is generated. After all children's assessments have been entered (July 1, 2009) more reliable data measuring progress on system-wide outcomes may be obtained.

Over time, sufficient service data is gathered to develop decision models. These decision models, sometimes called algorithms, are written formulas which apply a logic tree analysis to certain pre-determined clinical principles. On the CANS, certain items are identified which indicate that if a child's ratings on items follow this pre-determined pattern or profile of scores, then a specific outcome is indicated. For example, a pre-determined combination of "0" and "1" ratings on specific items, balanced with other ratings (such as strengths), may indicate the child needs will be met by community based services. Or a pre-determined combination of "2" and "3" ratings on specific items (balanced with strengths) indicates the child will benefit from residential placement.

Dr. Lyons' work in other states using decision models has led over time to the identification of appropriate levels of care for youth resulting in more effective treatment. All too often, in other states as well as Virginia, service decisions for children are based on a variety of factors, including the availability of community based or residential services. Dr. Lyons' research has shown that placement of children into a higher level of services than they need is actually harmful to children and will result in a decline in functioning. The research has also shown that length of stay in residential is directly related to the services the child is anticipated to receive at discharge. A review of services in Illinois indicated that if the child is being discharged to an intensive community based services, the length of stay in residential is six months. If the child will be discharged into an environment with minimal services such as supportive case management, the length of stay extends to eighteen months. Such research clearly indicates the need to build strong local community based service continuums.

Current plans are for Dr. Lyons to develop a residential algorithm for Virginia once sufficient service data is gathered. Other decision models may be added as needed. Use of the CANS in this way, to measure system outcomes, has negated the need in other states to explore managed care systems.

With the appropriate matching of services to need, outcomes improve. We anticipate that the application of the CANS will have this same effect in Virginia that it has demonstrated in Illinois and New Jersey.

Timeline for Implementation CSA Program Changes

June 30, 2008	CSA Pool Fund Reimbursement Reporting system modification #1
July 1, 2008	Community-based service match rate for each locality reduced 50%
July –August 2008	CANS training for localities
October 22, 2008	Final category service definitions approved by the State Executive Council (see Appendix A)
December 1, 2008	CSA Pool Fund Reimbursement Reporting system modification #2
January 1, 2009	Residential services match rate for each locality increases 15 percent after first \$100,000 in expenditures
May 15, 2009	CSA Pool Fund Reimbursement Reporting system modification #3
July 1, 2009	Residential services match rate for each locality increases 25 percent after first \$200,000 in expenditures
October 1, 2009	CSA Pool Fund Reimbursement Reporting system changes completed

CSA Reports—FY09
Effective Match Rate - Expenditure Report—By FIPS
4-Nov-08

FIPS	Locality	Local Base Match Rate	# of Expend Reports thru Nov. 4	Total Net Expenditures Claimed	Actual Local Match	Actual State Match	Effective Local Match Rate	Local Base Rate less Effective Rate	Local Match with No Incentive	Actual Local Match	Local Match Rate (Savings)
1	Accomack	0.2332	3	202,228	46,787	155,441	0.2314	-0.0019	47,160	46,787	-372
3	Albemarle	0.4474	3	970,291	421,906	548,385	0.4348	-0.0126	434,108	421,906	-12,202
5	Alleghany	0.1924	3	80,288	15,447	64,841	0.1924	0	15,447	15,447	0
7	Amelia	0.3268	1	16,850	5,507	11,343	0.3268	0	5,507	5,507	0
9	Amherst	0.2722	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	Appomattox	0.2639	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13	Arlington	0.4602	3	421,831	179,372	242,459	0.4252	-0.0349	194,127	179,372	-14,755
15	Augusta	0.3302	4	740,989	216,724	524,266	0.2925	-0.0377	244,675	216,724	-27,951
17	Bath	0.4278	3	6,525	2,572	3,954	0.3941	-0.0337	2,792	2,572	-220
19	Bedford County	0.336	3	232,365	66,686	165,678	0.287	-0.049	78,075	66,686	-11,388
21	Bland	0.2109	3	11,049	2,251	8,798	0.2037	-0.0072	2,330	2,251	-79
23	Botetourt	0.3602	3	207,765	65,801	141,965	0.3167	-0.0435	74,837	65,801	-9,037
25	Brunswick	0.2439	1	92,408	22,423	69,986	0.2426	-0.0013	22,538	22,423	-116
27	Buchanan	0.3156	4	287,722	89,876	197,845	0.3124	-0.0032	90,805	89,876	-929
29	Buckingham	0.2023	3	50,456	7,086	43,371	0.1404	-0.0619	10,207	7,086	-3,122
31	Campbell	0.3107	3	452,101	126,560	325,541	0.2799	-0.0308	140,468	126,560	-13,908
33	Caroline	0.3308	3	173,827	53,063	120,764	0.3053	-0.0255	57,502	53,063	-4,439
35	Carroll	0.291	4	229,973	63,853	166,119	0.2777	-0.0133	66,922	63,853	-3,069
36	Charles City	0.3131	2	66,851	17,959	48,892	0.2686	-0.0444	20,931	17,959	-2,972
37	Charlotte	0.2204	2	74,777	15,938	58,839	0.2131	-0.0073	16,481	15,938	-543
41	Chesterfield	0.3853	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
43	Clarke	0.4797	3	54,171	23,499	30,672	0.4338	-0.0459	25,986	23,499	-2,487
45	Craig	0.2901	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
47	Culpeper	0.3767	1	622,375	216,031	406,344	0.3471	-0.0296	234,449	216,031	-18,418
49	Cumberland	0.304	3	88,524	20,862	67,663	0.2357	-0.0684	26,911	20,862	-6,050
51	Dickenson	0.3042	4	260,715	72,184	188,532	0.2769	-0.0273	79,310	72,184	-7,126
53	Dinwiddie	0.3358	2	41,440	13,752	27,688	0.3319	-0.0039	13,915	13,752	-164
57	Essex	0.3853	3	106,825	41,159	65,665	0.3853	0	41,159	41,159	0
61	Fauquier	0.4584	3	246,598	85,578	161,020	0.347	-0.1113	113,040	85,578	-27,462
63	Floyd	0.2324	3	58,429	13,399	45,030	0.2293	-0.0031	13,579	13,399	-180
65	Fluvanna	0.3811	3	252,118	85,002	167,115	0.3372	-0.044	96,082	85,002	-11,080
67	Franklin County	0.283	3	424,435	111,937	312,498	0.2637	-0.0193	120,115	111,937	-8,178
69	Frederick	0.4348	2	253,702	100,180	153,521	0.3949	-0.04	110,310	100,180	-10,129
71	Giles	0.2898	3	119,875	34,003	85,872	0.2837	-0.0061	34,740	34,003	-737
73	Gloucester	0.3687	4	171,441	61,676	109,765	0.3597	-0.0089	63,210	61,676	-1,534
75	Goochland	0.4871	2	101,125	44,717	56,409	0.4422	-0.0449	49,258	44,717	-4,542
77	Grayson	0.2109	2	100,967	20,520	80,447	0.2032	-0.0076	21,294	20,520	-774
79	Greene	0.3471	2	100,016	33,612	66,404	0.3361	-0.011	34,715	33,612	-1,104

CSA Reports—FY09
Effective Match Rate - Expenditure Report—By FIPS
4-Nov-08

FIPS	Locality	Local Base Match Rate	# of Expend Reports thru Nov. 4	Total Net Expenditures Claimed	Actual Local Match	Actual State Match	Effective Local Match Rate	Local Base Rate less Effective Rate	Local Match with No Incentive	Actual Local Match	Local Match Rate (Savings)
83	Halifax	0.2335	3	146,231	33,179	113,052	0.2269	-0.0066	34,145	33,179	-966
85	Hanover	0.4444	2	612,791	259,582	353,208	0.4236	-0.0208	272,324	259,582	-12,742
87	Henrico	0.3755	3	850,855	316,626	534,229	0.3721	-0.0034	319,496	316,626	-2,870
89	Henry	0.2786	2	21,990	6,126	15,863	0.2786	0	6,126	6,126	0
91	Highland	0.3822	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
93	Isle of Wight	0.3613	1	59,912	21,354	38,558	0.3564	-0.0049	21,646	21,354	-292
95	James City	0.4483	3	25,790	9,835	15,955	0.3813	-0.067	11,562	9,835	-1,727
97	King & Queen	0.3144	3	119,499	37,570	81,928	0.3144	0	37,570	37,570	0
99	King George	0.3627	3	203,712	72,871	130,842	0.3577	-0.005	73,886	72,871	-1,016
101	King William	0.3853	3	115,915	44,040	71,875	0.3799	-0.0054	44,662	44,040	-622
103	Lancaster	0.4391	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
105	Lee	0.2245	3	287,187	63,972	223,214	0.2228	-0.0017	64,473	63,972	-501
107	Loudoun	0.4764	1	919,223	414,687	504,537	0.4511	-0.0252	437,918	414,687	-23,231
109	Louisa	0.4401	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
111	Lunenburg	0.1698	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
113	Madison	0.3355	3	184,784	55,730	129,054	0.3016	-0.0339	61,995	55,730	-6,265
115	Mathews	0.4271	2	9,203	3,930	5,272	0.4271	0	3,930	3,930	0
117	Mecklenburg	0.2286	3	283,966	57,063	226,904	0.2009	-0.0277	64,915	57,063	-7,852
119	Middlesex	0.4333	3	74,936	30,805	44,130	0.4111	-0.0222	32,470	30,805	-1,664
121	Montgomery	0.2834	1	112,748	30,576	82,172	0.2712	-0.0122	31,953	30,576	-1,377
125	Nelson	0.3132	3	104,252	32,491	71,761	0.3117	-0.0016	32,652	32,491	-161
127	New Kent	0.4329	4	212,520	88,697	123,823	0.4174	-0.0155	92,000	88,697	-3,303
131	Northampton	0.1971	3	122,042	23,088	98,954	0.1892	-0.008	24,054	23,088	-966
133	Northumberland	0.3304	3	13,983	4,471	9,512	0.3198	-0.0106	4,620	4,471	-149
135	Nottoway	0.2686	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
137	Orange	0.4083	3	270,351	79,541	190,810	0.2942	-0.1141	110,384	79,541	-30,843
139	Page	0.2865	3	257,146	61,652	195,494	0.2398	-0.0468	73,672	61,652	-12,020
141	Patrick	0.2539	2	16,776	4,177	12,599	0.249	-0.0049	4,259	4,177	-82
143	Pittsylvania	0.2355	3	1,077,617	204,926	872,691	0.1902	-0.0454	253,779	204,926	-48,853
145	Powhatan	0.4342	4	326,783	139,454	187,329	0.4267	-0.0074	141,889	139,454	-2,435
147	Prince Edward	0.2232	2	153,424	30,429	122,995	0.1983	-0.0248	34,244	30,429	-3,815
149	Prince George	0.3716	1	42,888	15,937	26,951	0.3716	0	15,937	15,937	0
153	Prince William	0.3414	1	1,359,002	415,945	943,057	0.3061	-0.0353	463,963	415,945	-48,018
155	Pulaski	0.2923	4	694,954	199,518	495,436	0.2871	-0.0052	203,135	199,518	-3,617
157	Rappahannock	0.4199	3	109,384	42,964	66,420	0.3928	-0.0271	45,931	42,964	-2,966
159	Richmond County	0.3227	1	43,925	14,175	29,751	0.3227	0	14,175	14,175	0
161	Roanoke County	0.4397	2	523,156	198,831	324,325	0.3801	-0.0596	230,031	198,831	-31,201
163	Rockbridge	0.2336	4	407,022	91,437	315,586	0.2246	-0.009	95,080	91,437	-3,644

CSA Reports—FY09
Effective Match Rate - Expenditure Report—By FIPS
4-Nov-08

FIPS	Locality	Local Base Match Rate	# of Expend Reports thru Nov. 4	Total Net Expenditures Claimed	Actual Local Match	Actual State Match	Effective Local Match Rate	Local Base Rate less Effective Rate	Local Match with No Incentive	Actual Local Match	Local Match Rate (Savings)
165	Rockingham	0.3445	3	276,534	84,870	191,664	0.3069	-0.0376	95,266	84,870	-10,396
167	Russell	0.1894	3	176,325	31,467	144,858	0.1785	-0.0109	33,396	31,467	-1,929
169	Scott	0.3154	4	266,378	78,917	187,461	0.2963	-0.0191	84,015	78,917	-5,098
171	Shenandoah	0.3517	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
173	Smyth	0.2337	3	154,360	30,578	123,782	0.1981	-0.0356	36,074	30,578	-5,496
175	Southampton	0.323	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
177	Spotsylvania	0.4588	3	862,554	387,336	475,218	0.4491	-0.0097	395,740	387,336	-8,404
179	Stafford	0.4439	3	538,337	235,824	302,513	0.4381	-0.0059	238,968	235,824	-3,143
181	Surry	0.3979	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
183	Sussex	0.2387	2	70,002	16,544	53,458	0.2363	-0.0024	16,709	16,544	-166
185	Tazewell	0.2455	3	431,479	94,650	336,829	0.2194	-0.0262	105,928	94,650	-11,278
187	Warren	0.3853	2	100,429	33,110	67,318	0.3297	-0.0556	38,695	33,110	-5,585
191	Washington	0.276	1	88,459	21,036	67,423	0.2378	-0.0382	24,415	21,036	-3,379
193	Westmoreland	0.3025	2	89,070	26,563	62,507	0.2982	-0.0043	26,944	26,563	-381
195	Wise	0.2755	2	142,869	38,434	104,435	0.269	-0.0065	39,360	38,434	-926
197	Wythe	0.2708	4	416,864	101,221	315,644	0.2428	-0.028	112,887	101,221	-11,666
199	York	0.3888	3	57,650	19,212	38,438	0.3332	-0.0556	22,414	19,212	-3,203
510	Alexandria	0.5309	3	1,141,556	557,597	583,959	0.4885	-0.0425	606,052	557,597	-48,456
515	Bedford City	0.255	3	97,053	24,141	72,912	0.2487	-0.0063	24,748	24,141	-608
520	Bristol	0.2547	1	77,342	18,152	59,190	0.2347	-0.02	19,699	18,152	-1,547
530	Buena Vista	0.2329	4	112,923	24,571	88,352	0.2176	-0.0153	26,300	24,571	-1,728
540	Charlottesville	0.3068	1	12,064	3,168	8,896	0.2626	-0.0442	3,701	3,168	-533
550	Chesapeake	0.3715	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
570	Colonial Heights	0.4027	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
580	Covington	0.2496	3	98,041	24,471	73,570	0.2496	0	24,471	24,471	0
590	Danville	0.2223	3	446,605	83,710	362,895	0.1874	-0.0348	99,280	83,710	-15,570
620	Franklin City	0.371	1	66,150	22,328	43,822	0.3375	-0.0335	24,542	22,328	-2,214
630	Fredericksburg	0.3441	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
640	Galax	0.3146	2	32,778	8,694	24,084	0.2652	-0.0494	10,312	8,694	-1,618
650	Hampton	0.3223	4	1,603,652	406,185	1,197,467	0.2533	-0.069	516,857	406,185	-110,672
660	Harrisonburg	0.3808	3	344,757	115,057	229,701	0.3337	-0.0471	131,284	115,057	-16,227
670	Hopewell	0.2667	3	340,768	89,631	251,137	0.263	-0.0037	90,883	89,631	-1,252
678	Lexington	0.3302	4	28,575	8,067	20,508	0.2823	-0.0479	9,436	8,067	-1,369
680	Lynchburg	0.2736	3	608,207	157,183	451,025	0.2584	-0.0152	166,406	157,183	-9,223
683	Manassas City	0.4168	2	196,453	80,973	115,480	0.4122	-0.0046	81,882	80,973	-909
685	Manassas Park	0.4273	3	150,973	57,653	93,320	0.3819	-0.0455	64,511	57,653	-6,858
690	Martinsville	0.3321	1	8,063	2,013	6,050	0.2497	-0.0824	2,678	2,013	-664
700	Newport News	0.2773	3	1,060,317	283,557	776,760	0.2674	-0.0099	294,026	283,557	-10,469

CSA Reports—FY09
Effective Match Rate - Expenditure Report—By FIPS
4-Nov-08

FIPS	Locality	Local Base Match Rate	# of Expend Reports thru Nov. 4	Total Net Expenditures Claimed	Actual Local Match	Actual State Match	Effective Local Match Rate	Local Base Rate less Effective Rate	Local Match with No Incentive	Actual Local Match	Local Match Rate (Savings)
710	Norfolk	0.2455	3	101,905	24,479	77,426	0.2402	-0.0053	25,018	24,479	-539
720	Norton	0.3254	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
730	Petersburg	0.3535	3	450,834	157,266	293,568	0.3488	-0.0047	159,370	157,266	-2,104
735	Poquoson	0.2787	1	57,953	13,961	43,992	0.2409	-0.0378	16,151	13,961	-2,190
740	Portsmouth	0.2605	2	1,019,219	242,005	777,213	0.2374	-0.0231	265,506	242,005	-23,501
750	Radford	0.2035	3	86,829	15,959	70,870	0.1838	-0.0197	17,670	15,959	-1,710
760	Richmond City	0.3691	2	811,342	296,845	514,497	0.3659	-0.0032	299,466	296,845	-2,621
770	Roanoke City	0.3072	2	1,703,913	508,735	1,195,178	0.2986	-0.0087	523,442	508,735	-14,707
775	Salem	0.3513	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
790	Staunton	0.2699	4	380,255	96,388	283,867	0.2535	-0.0164	102,631	96,388	-6,243
800	Suffolk	0.2432	3	41,561	10,403	31,159	0.2503	0.0071	10,108	10,403	295
810	Virginia Beach	0.3569	1	1,437,766	505,202	932,564	0.3514	-0.0055	513,139	505,202	-7,937
820	Waynesboro	0.3843	4	357,285	120,488	236,797	0.3372	-0.0471	137,305	120,488	-16,817
830	Williamsburg	0.4553	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
840	Winchester	0.4587	3	421,118	176,533	244,585	0.4192	-0.0395	193,167	176,533	-16,634
1200	Greensville/Emporia	0.2266	2	47,494	10,229	37,265	0.2154	-0.0112	10,762	10,229	-533
1300	Fairfax/Falls Church	0.4611	3	4,394,271	1,959,103	2,435,167	0.4458	-0.0153	2,026,198	1,959,103	-67,095
Totals		-	303	38,494,350	12,808,108	25,686,242	0.3327	-	13,729,674	12,808,108	-921,566

Data Set Definitions and Corresponding Match Rate Categories
Appendix A

Service/Placement Type	Definition	Community Match Rate – Local Match Reduced 50% July 08	Base Match Rate	Residential Match Rate – Local Match Increases 15% Jan 09
Community Services	Services provided to youth and their family, including regular foster families or independent living situation in their home communities.	✓		
Community Transition Services	Services provided to youth in a congregate care setting and their families for the primary purpose of preparing for the youth's return home.	✓		
Intensive in- home services	Services provided to the youth in their home or regular foster home. These services typically include family counseling, crisis intervention, 24 hour emergency response, parenting skills etc.	✓		
Services in the public school	Non-instructional services that permit the youth to remain in the public school setting and prevent placement in a more restrictive educational setting.	✓		
Intensive Care Coordination	Services provided in accordance to the SEC approved Intensive Care Coordinator Guidelines. Must be above and beyond the expected case management services already provided by the primary case manager	✓		
IEP Services – Private Day Placement	Services provided in an accredited Private Day School as designated by the student's IEP. Includes all services provided through the IEP including related services that must be contracted to supplement the student's placement. This excludes transportation costs.		✓	
IEP Services – Residential Placement	Services provided in an accredited Residential School as designated by the student's IEP. Includes all services provided through the IEP including related services that must be contracted		✓	

	to supplement the student's placement. This excludes transportation costs.			
Alternative Day Placement	Educational Services provided in an accredited Day School that is not covered by the student's IEP for to a student living at home or a regular foster home		✓	
Congregate Care Educational Services Medicaid Funded placement	Any educational service cost provided to a youth who is in a residential placement or group home where Medicaid is covering the cost of the placement, except for education.		✓	
Congregate Care Educational Services Non-Medicaid funded placement	Any educational service cost provided to a youth who is in a residential placement or group home where Medicaid <i>is not</i> covering the cost of the placement.		✓	
Family Foster Care Basic Maintenance Payments Only	Families receiving foster care maintenance payments only. These youth do not meet IV E criteria. Other services for these youth would be community based services or educational services as described above.		✓	
Foster Care Basic Maintenance and basic activities	Families receiving foster care maintenance payments and payments for day care and travel costs for the youth to visit family. These youth do not meet IV E criteria. Other services for these youth would be community based services or educational services as described above.		✓	
Specialized Foster Care	Families receiving special needs/specialized payments in addition to the basic Maintenance payments due to a specific need of the youth. All additional services provided to these youth are considered Specialized Foster care services, not community based services. Education costs for these youth would be classified using the education definitions above.		✓	
Therapeutic Foster Care	Payments to families who have had special training as therapeutic foster parents and receive additional payment for added daily supervision required by the youth's behavior or condition. All additional services provided to these youth are considered Therapeutic Foster Care services, not community based services. Education costs for these youth would be classified using the education definitions above.		✓	

Independent Living Stipend	Payment made for the care and support of a youth of at least 16 years. (currently \$644.00 per month) Education costs for these youth would be classified using the education definitions above.		✓	
Independent Living Arrangement	Payment for a youth of at least 16 years who has been placed in a living arrangement where there is no 24-hour daily substitute parental supervision. Education costs for these youth would be classified using the education definitions above.		✓	
Psychiatric Hospital/Residential Crisis Stabilization Unit	Placement of youth in an in acute psychiatric care or a crisis stabilization unit for 24 hours or more for crisis stabilization. Includes all services provided to children while staying in the psychiatric hospital/crisis unit.		✓	
Temporary Care Facilities and Services	Licensed Emergency Shelters. These placements are for not more than 90 days.			✓
Group Home and Services	Home like settings with 24 hour have a capacity for 8 or fewer residents			✓
Residential Facility and Services	These facilities have a capacity for 9 or more residents. This includes “campus style” facilities with multiple homes on the grounds.			✓