**Best Beginnings Committee Action Summary**

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) PRESENTING ACTION: Erin Deahn

CONTACT: Erin Deahn

Summary of Recommended Committee Action

ISSUE:

* ELD has been monitoring contracts based on Family Service Units (FSU) or “slots”. This contradicts how HFA requires that we monitor caseloads (point system, not # of families)
* HFA has set a maximum limit for case load points per home visitor (24 points)
* Oregon has chosen to also set a minimum limit for case load points per home visitor (18 points)
* Points are assigned according to the level/intensity of services a family is receiving
* The minimum to maximum range is important because there is significant variation across HFO programs depending on community context (geography, cultural and linguistic diversity, demand for home visiting services, etc.) while also holding programs accountable and not keeping caseloads too low.
* Starting October 1, 2017 HFO will begin to track case load points as part of contract monitoring (instead of FSUs). This has created an opportunity to take a step back and examine:
  1. Is the current minimum (18 points) reasonable?
  2. Should there be guidance and/or requirements for how new home visitors build their caseloads?

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

* Keep current minimum (18 points)
* Allow programs to add on a ‘differential’ of 0.5 or 1 case load point for when factors such as transportation, interpretation, etc. are impacting the amount of time a home visitor spends with a family. This will be clearly defined in the PPPM, outlining what circumstances fall into a “differential” category, and which ones receive a 0.5 vs. 1.0
* Introduce new requirements for how a new home visitor should build their caseload:
  1. At 3 months, a home visitor should have 4 caseload points
  2. At 6 months, a home visitor should have 10 caseload points
  3. At 12 months, a home visitor should have a full case load (18-24 case load points)
     + Reminder: these are minimum requirements and programs could choose to build caseloads faster than this if they felt the home visitor was ready.

BACKGROUND:

* Erin held group and one-on-one conversations in March to allow every HFO Program Manager an opportunity provide their input on this issue. Findings included:
  1. About ½ the PMs wanted a caseload minimum set at 16 points, and the other half wanted it set at 18points.
  2. Those who wanted 16 points, were comfortable moving to 18 points if we could add a “point differential” of .5 -1.0 when certain instances required significantly more time (travel, translation, etc.)
  3. Most PMs were excited to have guidance on how to reasonably build a new HVrs caseload, while some wanted complete flexibility. Most were ultimately comfortable with the following: 4pts by 3 months of hire, 8pts by 6 months of hire & 18pts by 12 months of hire.
  4. All PMs were very happy with the shift away from FSUs, and monitoring contracts based on caseload points.
* The HFO Subcommittee members met in April to discuss feedback and potential recommendations. Discussion included:
  1. Erin provided a report on the group and individual conversations
  2. Back and forth conversation about 16 vs. 18 minimum points
  3. Discussion of the progression of building a new caseload for new staff