

**Families, Agencies, and Communities Together  
For Children and Youth at Risk (FACT)**

**An Evaluation of Effectiveness  
and  
Funding Options**

**November 19, 2002**

**Report to the Executive Appropriations Committee  
Of the Utah State Legislature**

**Prepared by  
The Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst**

**Jonathan Ball, Lead Analyst  
Thor Nilsen  
Spencer Pratt  
Bill Greer  
Stan Eckersley  
Ben Leishman**

**Tim Osterstock, Legislative Auditor General**



## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	i
Introduction.....	1
FACT’s Statutory Purpose and Structure .....	2
FACT’s Legislative and Funding History.....	4
What FACT structures, if any, continue despite the loss of earmarked funding for FACT, and how has the elimination of FACT funding impacted collaboration and coordination of social service provision?.....	8
How has the elimination of FACT funding impacted families already receiving services? .....	10
What models of improved service delivery has FACT generated that can be applied statewide? .....	11
Should a single state department be made responsible for FACT? .....	13
Is it necessary to continue FACT as an independent program and, if so, in what form? .....	14
Should every social service program be a ‘FACT’ program? .....	16
Recommendations.....	17



## **Executive Summary: Families, Agencies, and Communities Together for Children and Youth at Risk (FACT) – An Evaluation of Effectiveness and Funding Options**

Utah’s 2002 Master Study Resolution includes a report on “FACT Evaluation and Funding – to study the Families, Agencies, and Communities Together for Children and Youth At Risk Program, its funding levels, the effectiveness of the program in delivering services to those with special needs, and determine whether one state department should be made responsible for the program”<sup>1</sup> The Legislature and Governor eliminated funding for FACT during the 2002 General Session and Fifth Special Session,<sup>2</sup> but did not repeal the statute pertaining to FACT.

In performing the requested study, Legislative staff asked: “What FACT structures, if any, continue despite the loss of earmarked funding for FACT, and how has the elimination of FACT funding impacted collaboration and coordination of social service<sup>3</sup> provision?”; “How has the elimination of FACT funding impacted families already receiving services?”; “What models of improved service delivery has FACT generated that can be applied statewide?”; “Should a single state department be made responsible for FACT?”; “Is it necessary to continue FACT as an independent program and, if so, in what form?”; and “Should every social service program be a ‘FACT’ program?”.

We found that, in areas where the philosophy of collaboration and coordination permeates institutions, it continues without earmarked funds. Seventy-five percent of Local Interagency Councils continue to function without state funds, but site-based programs no longer operate in their previous form.

Where FACT focused on client management, traditional service is still available, but more difficult to access. Services provided with “flexible funds” have been discontinued. Direct services funded through FACT, like FACT school nurses, are in large part no longer available.

Prevention and early intervention “site-based programs” funded through FACT provided valuable resources to the families and individuals they served. They also proved to state government some limited innovations, like privacy protection for the purposes of data sharing. These programs served as models of innovative service provision at the local level, but were not emulated in larger social service programs and/or structures.

---

<sup>1</sup> Utah State Legislature. *Master Study Resolution* (SJR 15, 2002 General Session). Item 6.

<sup>2</sup> Utah State Legislature. *Appropriations Act* (SB 1, 2002 General Session) and *Supplemental Appropriations Act IV* (HB 5009, 2002 Fifth Special Session).

<sup>3</sup> For the purposes of this report, the term “social service” is not limited to social work or the Department of Human Services, but refers more broadly to services provided by the State Office of Education and local schools, the Judiciary, the Departments of Health, Human Services, and Workforce Services, as well as local and private entities.

Should FACT be reinstated as a separate program, assigning it to one state agency would be counterintuitive to its focus on cross-agency collaboration and coordination. Yet, some contend that a single point of contact for the State will aid in administration and accountability. Clearly defined and regularly collected outcome measures are a better tool for accountability. But, if FACT is to be reinstated and assigned to a single agency, it should be assigned to a statewide oversight entity.

Staff concludes that a collaborative and coordinated approach to individual cases requiring service from multiple agencies streamlines service provision in those cases. Yet targeted assistance is more efficient in single-need cases. All social service providers in the state should have access to both mechanisms, and should refer clients to the mechanism that best fits the individual case.

To address these findings, staff recommends that the Legislature insert cross-agency collaboration and coordination into the statutory missions of appropriate state agencies, and that agencies in-turn include collaboration and coordination in employee job descriptions. Staff encourages the Judicial Branch to include a similar philosophy in its mission statements for programs related to child welfare. Staff further recommends that state agencies direct base resources toward improving coordination and collaboration in a FACT-like manner. Staff finally recommends that the Legislature review FACT and its enabling legislation again prior to the 2004 General Session.

## **Introduction: Families, Agencies, and Communities Together for Children and Youth at Risk (FACT) – An Evaluation of Effectiveness and Funding Options**

During the 2002 General Session and Fifth Special Session, Utah Governor Mike Leavitt and Utah Legislators eliminated funding associated with the *Families, Agencies, and Communities Together (FACT) for Children and Youth at Risk Act*. The Governor and Legislature did not repeal the act itself. Instead, Legislators instructed legislative staff to study FACT.

The Legislature’s Master Study Resolution directed a review of “FACT Evaluation and Funding – to study the Families, Agencies, and Communities Together for Children and Youth at Risk Program, its funding levels, the effectiveness of the program in delivering services to those with special needs, and determine whether one state department should be made responsible for the program”<sup>4</sup>

Legislators also passed intent language stating:

*“It is the intent of the Legislature that the Fiscal Analyst Office shall continue with their proposed study of the FACT Program despite the elimination of this program via FY 2003 budget cuts. Along with the outlined study already proposed, the Fiscal Analyst Office shall include an evaluation of what structures, if any, continue despite the loss of funding. The Fiscal Analyst Office shall also compile a report of the impact of the loss of FACT funding on families already receiving services, and the impact on the collaboration and coordination of services across the various agencies involved.”*<sup>5</sup>

In studying FACT, a team of legislative staffers, including experts in health, human services, workforce services, courts, and education, asked the following questions:

1. What FACT structures, if any, continue despite the loss of earmarked funding for FACT, and how has the elimination of FACT funding impacted collaboration and coordination of social service<sup>6</sup> provision?
2. How has the elimination of FACT funding impacted families already receiving services?

---

<sup>4</sup> Utah State Legislature. *Master Study Resolution* (SJR 15, 2002 General Session). Item 6.

<sup>5</sup> Utah State Legislature. *Supplemental Appropriations Act IV* (HB 5009, 2002 Fifth Special Session). Page 11, Item 70.

<sup>6</sup> For the purposes of this report, the term “social service” is not limited to social work or the Department of Human Services, but refers more broadly to services provided by the State Office of Education and local schools, the Judiciary, the Departments of Health, Human Services, and Workforce Services, as well as local and private entities.

3. What models of improved service delivery has FACT generated that can be applied statewide?
4. Should a single state department be made responsible for FACT?
5. Is it necessary to continue FACT as an independent program and, if so, in what form?
6. Should every social service program be a 'FACT' program?

The answers to these questions, as well as recommendations to address the issues they underscore, follow a synopsis of FACT's enabling legislation and a review of FACT's history.

### **FACT's Statutory Purpose and Structure**

FACT was established in 1989 to address the needs of at-risk families through the joint efforts of applicable health, education and social service agencies as well as community organizations. It was implemented statewide through community councils and school-based programs intended to address a full range of problems faced by children and families. It attempts to bring together multiple social service providers to aid families in correcting interrelated problems rather than addressing one problem at a time, one agency at a time.

*Utah's policy is to unite social service providers, communities, and those in need*

The statutory purpose of FACT is to improve collaboration and cooperation among governmental entities, communities, families, and children that require government assistance. The *Families, Agencies, and Communities Together for Children and Youth at Risk Act* declares that "the policy of the state (of Utah) is to unite the Department of Human Services, the State Office of Education, the Department of Health, the Office of the Court Administrator, and the Department of Workforce Services, community-based service organizations, and parents to develop and implement comprehensive systems of services and supports for children and youth at risk and their families".<sup>7</sup>

*FACT service delivery shall be collaborative and community based*

Statute further states that, in creating FACT, the Legislature intended that FACT's "service delivery systems...shall require collaboration between existing state and local agencies and between public, private, and voluntary agencies to enhance their capacity to meet community needs."<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Utah State Legislature. *Families, Agencies, and Communities Together for Children and Youth at Risk Act*. Utah Code Annotated 63-75-2.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*



Policy makers vested the control of FACT in the FACT State Council. They "...created within state government the Families, Agencies, and Communities Together State Council composed of:

*FACT State Council established to enable innovative service delivery systems, communicate innovations to other communities, and apply new methods of collaboration to existing state programs*

- i. the state superintendent of public instruction;
- ii. the Executive Director of the Department of Health;
- iii. the Executive Director of the Department of Human Services;
- iv. the state court administrator; and
- v. the Executive Director of the Department of Workforce Services.”<sup>9</sup>

Legislators directed that these voting members would also appoint to the FACT State Council three non-voting members representing community based service organizations, urban parents, and rural parents.

The duties of the State Council, as directed by law, are to:

- o provide leadership to improve service delivery;
- o compile and disseminate information;
- o receive and act upon Steering Committee recommendations;
- o approve site-based programs and allocate funds;
- o recommend base budget and building block amounts to be directed toward collaborative programs;
- o develop models of governance to be followed by communities; and
- o report to the Legislature.<sup>10</sup>

*Steering Committee, established to assist the State Council, grew from 19 to 42 members by 2001*

To advise and assist the FACT State Council, lawmakers established the FACT Steering Committee. They assigned it at least 19 voting members to include state division directors, local representatives, advocates, parents and at-large members. They stated simply that “the committee shall:

- a) assist the council in fulfilling its duties as set out in Section 63-75-4;
- b) monitor, solicit input for policy changes, and provide technical assistance to local collaborative programs; and
- c) report any formal recommendations to the council.”<sup>11</sup>

As of September, 2001 the Steering Committee’s membership numbered 42. The Steering Committee had also established a variety of *ad hoc* subcommittees and assigned part-time staff (technical assistants) to interact with, advise, and evaluate funding applications from FACT entities throughout the state.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Utah State Legislature. *Families, Agencies, and Communities Together for Children and Youth at Risk Act*. Utah Code Annotated 63-75-4.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.* 63-75-5.

<sup>12</sup> Johnson, Terry. *FACT Council and Steering Committee Members, 2001-2002*. September 10, 2001.

*Cross-agency LICs mandated to address multiple-need cases*

Legislators also mandated the creation of “Local Interagency Councils” (LIC) consisting of local advocates for child welfare, developmental disabilities, education, health, juvenile justice, mental health, parents, substance abuse prevention, and youth corrections. Lawmakers directed LICs to staff at-risk cases that require service from more than one agency; provide existing or create new services to meet the needs of individuals; develop coordinated service plans for each case; and establish a process to implement each plan.<sup>13</sup>

In May, 2001 there were twenty-eight LICs in twenty-nine counties across Utah. Four LICs served Salt Lake County, while Uintah and Daggett shared an LIC, as did Weber and Morgan as well as Cache, Box Elder, and Rich.<sup>14</sup>

*Site-based demonstration projects authorized within available funds*

Policy makers authorized the FACT Council to award grants for prevention and early intervention “site-based” programs. They directed that “within appropriations from the Legislature,” the Council would implement programs that included at least parents, an educator, a principal, a public health nurse, a mental health authority, a Child and Family Services worker, and an Employment Development representative.<sup>15</sup>

Prior to July 1, 2002 over one-hundred site-based programs in public elementary schools served clients across the state. The majority of FACT funding (over \$4 million annually) was directed toward site-based service delivery programs.

## **FACT’s Legislative and Funding History**

What we now know as the FACT initiative began in 1989 when the Legislature passed *Early Intervention Services for Ensuring Student Success* (HB 234, 1989 General Session). It created Utah Code Annotated Title 63, Chapter 74 (later recodified as Chapter 75) known as the *Coordinated Services for At-Risk Children and Youth Act*.

---

<sup>13</sup> Utah State Legislature. *Families, Agencies, and Communities Together for Children and Youth at Risk Act*. Utah Code Annotated 63-75-5.5.

<sup>14</sup> Thompson, Barbara. *FACT Local Interagency Councils*. May, 2001.

<sup>15</sup> Utah State Legislature. *Families, Agencies, and Communities Together for Children and Youth at Risk Act*. Utah Code Annotated 63-75-6.

*1989 acts provide \$300,000 and direct coordination among Health, Human Services, and Education*

This act set up the “State Council for At Risk Children and Youth” whose purpose was to “unite the Department of Social Services (renamed the Department of Human Services in 1990), the State Office of Education, and the Department of Health to develop and implement comprehensive school-based systems of services for each at-risk student in grades kindergarten through three and the student’s family in order to help prevent academic failure and social misbehavior.”<sup>16</sup> The Legislature appropriated \$100,000 each for FY 1990 to the three departments identified in the bill. This amount was tripled to \$300,000 for each department in FY 1992.

During the 1993 General Session, the Legislature extended its earlier initiative by passing *Coordinated Services for Children at Risk Amendments* (HB 39, 1993 General Session). This legislation expanded the composition, powers and duties of the State Council and created a new Steering Committee for Children and Youth at Risk. It also provided for the establishment of local interagency councils.

*1993 Legislature expands FACT participation and increases funding to more than \$3.8 million*

The same Legislature passed the *Minimum School Program Act Amendments* (SB 267, 1993 General Session) in which the “FACT” appropriation to Public Education was increased to over \$3.2 million and designated in the School Finance Act as follows:

*“53A-17a-131.9. State contribution to agencies coming together for children and youth at risk:*

*“(1) There is appropriated \$3,215,460 to the State Board of Education to implement Title 63, Chapter 75, Agencies Coming Together for Children and Youth At-Risk Act.*

*“(2) Of the amount appropriated under Subsection (1), the state board shall use \$215,460 to continue funding the coordinated services for at risk children and youth pilot programs.*

*“(3) (a) Of the amount appropriated under Subsection (1), the board shall distribute to the Department of Human Services, the Department of Health, and the Office of the Court Administrator amounts sufficient to fund their respective participation in the at risk programs authorized in H.B. 39, enacted during the 1993 General Session.*

*“(b) The board shall establish a distribution formula in consultation with the state superintendent of public instruction, the executive director of the Department of Human Services, the executive director of the Department of Health, and the state court administrator.”<sup>17</sup>*

---

<sup>16</sup> Utah State Legislature. *Coordinated Services for At-Risk Children and Youth Act.*

<sup>17</sup> Utah State Legislature. *Minimum School Program Act Amendments* (SB 267, 1993 General Session).

*1996 and 1999 legislation further refines FACT and creates a pseudo-subcommittee for FACT appropriations*

During the 1996 and 1999 General Sessions, the Legislature further defined collaborative service delivery systems, amended the makeup and duties of FACT oversight entities, and authorized the FACT Council to propose budget recommendations to the Governor.

Also in 1996, the Legislature passed *A Joint Resolution of the Legislature Revising Joint Rules; Establishing an 18 Member Group to Meet and Recommend Appropriations for Collaborative Programs for Children and Youth at Risk . . .* (H.J.R. 10, 1996 General Session). The 18 member group established by this resolution consisted of legislators from the various appropriations subcommittees involved in funding FACT programs. The group met during the regular legislative sessions of 1997, 1998, and 1999. Joint Rules were revised prior to the 2000 General Session discontinuing this FACT “appropriations subcommittee.”

*1996 Audit Credits FACT for service delivery, but criticizes FACT’s impact on mainstream social service programs*

In December, 1996 the Legislative Auditor General completed *A Performance Audit of the FACT Initiative and at Risk Programs*. The report stated that the two FACT programs audited (Site Based Programs and LICs) “both follow legislative intent and address their targeted populations” and allowed a great deal of interaction between agencies.<sup>18</sup>

The Auditor General also expressed some concerns. Referring to the FACT process, the auditors indicated that it was somewhat cumbersome, had resulted in some confusion and concern, and used resources for which participating agencies may have higher priorities.

*“Participation of member agencies is compromised because each of these agencies has other duties and other priorities that take precedent over FACT. Since FACT relies on participating agencies for services, FACT agencies have . . . felt forced to rearrange existing agency programs and program funding to address new clients introduced by FACT. Agencies are concerned with the level of FACT demands placed on them because they have existing programs and existing goals obligated by other legislation”<sup>19</sup>*

*Audit suggests rural LICs are less effective due to geographical separation*

Referring largely to rural areas of the State, the audit report also questions why LICs are community based and not in local schools.

---

<sup>18</sup> Legislative Auditor General. *A Performance Audit of the FACT Initiative and At Risk Programs* (Report # 96-10).

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.* Page 15.

*“...[participating] staff must cover a number of sites, as FACT is a meeting-driven program that intends to frequently gather caseworkers from each organization to comprehensively address a single client’s needs. This level of staff coverage is very possible for school staff (Site-based programs) working at the site but extremely difficult for the agencies with staff working on a regional basis [and will] ...place greater demands on agency staff and take them from existing agency workloads.*

*“The situation is made worse for the other agencies because not only do they have to accept the cost of making staff available for the case meetings, but they have to forgo the revenue they depend on from their everyday operations. Having a local mental health worker in a FACT meeting means an hourly expense to their agency as well as the loss of billable hours. Much of this time is spent in the rural districts in travel.”<sup>20</sup>*

Overall, auditors suggested that collaboration and cooperation would be beneficial in mainstream social service programs.

*“There are benefits for all of the involved agencies in the form of reduced number of future clients and problems addressed before they become unmanageable.”<sup>21</sup>*

*2002 Revenue shortfalls force reconsideration of FACT*

In the 2002 General Session, appropriators reduced FACT funding by 60 percent, from over \$5.0 million in state funds to \$2.0 million. They provided the entire \$2.0 million to the Department of Human Services with the following intent language:

*“It is the intent of the Legislature that funds appropriated to the Department of Human Services for FACT programs be used, consistent with Section 63-75-4, for the most critical services as determined by the FACT Council representing the Departments of Human Services, Health, Workforce Services, the Office of Court Administrator, and the State Office of Education.”<sup>22</sup>*

In response to this intent, the FACT State Council prepared new RFP's and formed new criteria to revamp FACT so that grants were made more competitively. In anticipation of FACT funds’ elimination, the Council later postponed review of applications from local FACT entities.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Legislative Auditor General. *A Performance Audit of the FACT Initiative and At Risk Programs* (Report # 96-10). Page 16.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>22</sup> Utah State Legislature. *Supplemental Appropriations Act II* (HB 3, 2002 General Session). Item 52.

<sup>23</sup> Thompson, Barbara. *Re: FACT Study Draft*. Email to Jonathan Ball. November 15, 2002.

*FACT funding eliminated, but mandate maintained*

During the 2002 Fifth Special Session, the Legislature and Executive eliminated the remaining \$2.0 million FACT appropriation for FY 2003. Legislation to remove FACT’s statutory mandate, however, did not pass. The Legislature instead included intent language instructing the Legislative Fiscal Analyst to continue with a previously authorized interim study of the FACT initiative (see page 1).

A history of FACT appropriations is included at Appendix A.

**What FACT structures, if any, continue despite the loss of earmarked funding for FACT, and how has the elimination of FACT funding impacted collaboration and coordination of social service provision?**

Of the FACT structures established in law and described above, the State Council, Steering Committee, and several Local Interagency Councils continue to function post June, 30, 2002 – the last day state funding was available.

*Council has met three times since July 1, 2002*

The FACT State Council met on July 19, 2002, October 9, 2002 and again on November 6, 2002. In its July meeting, the Council “determined that, with or without funding, FACT’s intent to assist children and families in need should remain in tact.”<sup>24</sup> Outgoing FACT Council Chair Daniel J. Becker issued a memorandum to this effect on August 14, 2002. In it, he, on behalf of the entire Council, “encourages all parties involved to continue to look for...additional opportunities to collaborate.”<sup>25</sup>

*Steering Committee met in November, 2002*

The FACT Steering Committee met jointly with the Council on November 6, 2002. Members discussed lessons learned from FACT, FACT’s most recent output data, options for the future, and near-term next steps. No formal action was taken to recommend future action or next steps.

While funding for Local Interagency Councils ended on July 1, 2002, statute still requires establishment of LICs. Of the twenty-seven LICs we contacted, twenty had met or were planning to meet after July 1, 2002.

*Three-quarters of LICs contacted continue to operate post FACT funding*

Salt Lake County’s Local Interagency Councils – by far the largest in terms of population served – have not met since state funding was rescinded. At the time this report was published, no plans existed for a future meeting. Salt Lake’s “FACT Policy Committee” – a sort of “super-LIC” designed to oversee the county’s four targeted LICs – continues in a diminished capacity, meeting five times during the academic year.<sup>26</sup>

A matrix of LICs and their status for fiscal year 2003 is included at Table 1.

---

<sup>24</sup> Becker, Daniel J. Memorandum to FACT Steering Committee members. August 14, 2002.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>26</sup> Nilsen, Thor. Telephone interview with Anne Foster, Valley Mental Health. November 13, 2002.

**Table 1**  
**LICs Functioning Since Elimination of State Funding for FACT**

LIC Name	Yes	No	Comments
Beaver	X		Once a month
Bear River (Cache/Box Elder/Rich)	X		Meeting but not with LIC criteria
Carbon	X		Once a month with Emery and Grand Counties
Davis	X		
Duchesne	X		Once a month
Emery	X		Once a month with Carbon and Grand Counties
Garfield	X		Once a month
Grand	X		Once a month with Emery and Carbon Counties
Iron	X		
Juab	X		Once a month
Kane	X		Team meetings not with LIC criteria
Millard	X		Once a month
Piute	X		Once a month
Salt Lake		X	
Granite		X	
Murray-Jordan		X	
SLC Preschool		X	
San Juan		X	Does not meet, but would like to do so
Sanpete	X		Once a month
Sevier			Did not respond
Summit	X		Once a month
Tooele	X		Once a month
Uintah/Daggett		X	
Utah	X		
Wasatch		X	
Washington	X		Once a month
Wayne	X		Once a month
Weber/Morgan	X		Multi-agency meeting as needed

*Site-based programs do not operate per se, but some communities collaborate without state agency involvement*

As stated earlier, the FACT State Council may authorize site-based programs “within appropriations from the Legislature.”<sup>27</sup> Of the site-based programs contacted by Legislative staff in preparing this report, none were functioning as they did prior to rescission of state funds.

In some areas, collaborative service structures continue to operate, but often without participation from state agencies or local health departments.

Salt Lake School District, for example, continues to operate its Project Link. Link paraprofessionals, assigned part-time to each school, provide service to families in need. But, they must make multiple referrals to multiple state agencies on behalf of a client, rather than making one referral to members of a FACT site-based team or LIC.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>27</sup> Utah State Legislature. *Families, Agencies, and Communities Together for Children and Youth at Risk Act*. Utah Code Annotated 63-75-6.

<sup>28</sup> Leishman, Ben. Interview with Nano Podolsky, Salt Lake School District. November 8, 2002.

Similarly, members of the Midvale Community Building Community and Carbon County LIC continue to meet, but complain of nonparticipation by state agencies and a resulting sense of futility in addressing cases.<sup>29</sup>

*Other demands make FACT-like coordination a lower priority for state workers*

While the FACT State Council reaffirmed its commitment to FACT in its August 14 memo, it appeared anecdotally that this message was not received by state agency workers. Middle managers at some state agencies considered sending memos to line workers directing them not to attend future FACT meetings.<sup>30</sup> Caseworkers formerly involved in FACT were assigned regular case loads in lieu of their FACT responsibilities.<sup>31</sup>

Generally, it appears that a commitment to collaboration exists at senior levels in state government. A similar commitment to coordinated service exists with service providers. However, individual state employees no longer feel empowered to attend and contribute to FACT-like meetings.

### **How has the elimination of FACT funding impacted families already receiving services?**

Statewide, FACT served 2,575 families and 6,188 children in fiscal year 2002.<sup>32</sup> The impact of the elimination of FACT funding on these families varies based upon how communities organized FACT.

*Where FACT focused on case management, clients can still get government services, but it is more difficult to do so.*

In some areas, FACT site-based programs and LICs acted primarily as case review entities. Under this approach, a social service professional, often a teacher, would identify a child in need of assistance and refer that child to a FACT site-based team. The site-based team would evaluate the child's needs, prepare a service plan for the child, and refer, or often enroll, the child and family in traditional support systems (e.g.: Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Children's Health Insurance Program, etc.). The site-based program might also refer a severe case to the appropriate LIC for its consideration. This model would use flexible funds to fill timing or coverage gaps, but allocation of flexible funds was not a first priority.<sup>33</sup>

Under this case review model, many of the families already receiving FACT services continue to receive traditional government services, but in an uncoordinated manner. Should the family require future assistance, it would have to acquire such services through established mechanisms and without the "navigational" help of a FACT team.

---

<sup>29</sup> Ball, Jonathan. Interview with Dr. Jayne Wolfe, Family Support Center of Utah. November 8, 2002; and Hardy, Roberta, Comments before the FACT Steering Committee Meeting, November 6, 2002.

<sup>30</sup> Eckersley, Stan. Telephone conversation with Blaine Crawford, Utah Department of Workforce Services. November 12, 2002.

<sup>31</sup> Nilsen, Thor. Interview with Christine Noel, *et al*, Wasatch County FACT. November 7, 2002.

<sup>32</sup> Delavan, George. Presentation to the FACT Council and Steering Committee. November 6, 2002.

<sup>33</sup> Nilsen, Thor. Interview with Christine Noel, *et al*, Wasatch County FACT. November 7, 2002; and Leishman, Ben. Interview with Nano Podolsky, Salt Lake School District. November 8, 2002.



According to the Department of Human Services, since July 1, 2002, 68 families that would previously have been served by FACT are receiving direct service from the Division of Child and Family Services.<sup>34</sup>

*Where FACT focused on funds allocation, “flexible fund” services are no longer provided, but focus may have shifted toward collaboration*

In other areas, FACT served primarily as a funding mechanism for needs that are not met by traditional social service entities. In this scenario, site-based programs and/or Local Interagency Councils would accept requests for flexible funding from social service or education professionals to address a child’s specific need. The FACT entity would then prioritize all requests and allocate flexible funds accordingly.<sup>35</sup>

In areas where FACT was primarily a financial mechanism, families and children will no longer receive assistance in the form of flexible funds. However, anecdotal evidence suggests that, without flexible funds, LICs formerly focused on funds allocation have shifted their attention to collaboration and coordination of traditional agency services.

For example, in Southwest Utah, three separate LICs existed prior to July 1, 2002. Members of the LICs were primarily “line” workers who did not feel empowered to commit agency resources. Instead, the LIC focused upon flexible funds allocation. Since the elimination of earmarked FACT funds, the three LICs have been consolidated, are now constituted of agency supervisors, and focus upon collaboration.<sup>36</sup>

*Some direct governmental services have been discontinued*

FACT funding also provided limited direct governmental services. The Department of Health, for example, funded a full-time dental hygienist with FACT funds. The hygienist traveled to schools in the state and performed dental screenings that were not eligible under the Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP) or other subsidies. This employee has been reassigned to other duties in the wake of FACT funding elimination.<sup>37</sup>

Local Health Departments provided 25 school nurses through the FACT program. These nurses provided services to all school children, and often also served on FACT site-based teams and LICs. They, too, have been largely reassigned since the end of FACT funding.<sup>38</sup>

**What models of improved service delivery has FACT generated that can be applied statewide?**

FACT’s proponents point to four solid examples of FACT innovations that have been applied to government on a larger scale.

---

<sup>34</sup> Nilsen, Thor. Telephone interview with Jack Green, Utah Division of Child and Family Services. November 12, 2002.

<sup>35</sup> Nilsen, Thor. Interview with Christine Noel, *et al*, Wasatch County FACT. November 7 2002; and Telephone Interview with Matt Denhalter, Southwest Mental Health Center, November 12, 2002.

<sup>36</sup> Nilsen, Thor. Telephone Interview with Matt Denhalter, Southwest Mental Health Center, November 12, 2002.

<sup>37</sup> Pratt, Spencer. Interview with Rod Betit, *et al*, Utah Department of Health. November 1, 2002.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*

*Developed privacy policy to allow shared data across governmental entities*

First, FACT developed a nondisclosure agreement that allowed agencies to share data about a client and thus eliminate duplicative administration. The agreement developed through FACT to facilitate such data sharing serves as an example for other government programs (see Appendix B).<sup>39</sup>

*Coordinated services for youth in custody*

Second, state agencies and the Courts developed an agreement on how to handle judicial custody of youth. Under FACT, local interagency councils recommended cross-cutting service plans and a case manager to the courts for individuals placed in state custody. This approach led to an agreement under which the Courts could place youth qualifying for services from more than one division of the Department of Human Services in the Department's custody rather than a single division's. Doing so facilitated coordinated service delivery.<sup>40</sup>

*Tested concept of coordination*

Third, FACT allowed agencies to observe the benefits, and deficits, of coordinated service provision. It cut through bureaucracy and helped agencies focus upon children rather than policy or turf. In his 1996 audit of FACT, the Legislative Auditor General cited the following example:

*“The Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) was initially a detractor of the FACT initiative and offered marginal support. In the last year, however, DCFS has had a turnaround and now believes in the effectiveness of community-based service models. DCFS is now experimenting with a FACT-like model in Salt Lake County and credits FACT with its change in service delivery.”<sup>41</sup>*

The benefits of collaboration included not only more efficient services to the client, but, in some cases, improved productivity by state employees. In areas where FACT used case management plans to prescribe services, case workers had clearly defined tasks and objectives. Accomplishment of these tasks and objectives was reviewed by the FACT team on a regular basis, providing “follow-up” and often motivating action by individual professionals.<sup>42</sup>

*Changed the public face of government*

Finally, FACT's community-based approach made government friendlier to its constituents. Service recipients participated in FACT site-based programs willingly, signing statements to that effect. Recipients also perceived FACT as part of “schools” rather than part of “government” and all of the psychological hurdles associated with the latter term.

---

<sup>39</sup> Nilsen, Thor. Interview with Robyn Arnold-Williams, *et al*, Utah Department of Human Services. August 12, 2002.

<sup>40</sup> Greer, William. Interview with Dan Becker *et al*, Administrative Office of the Courts. September 4, 2002.

<sup>41</sup> Legislative Auditor General. *A Performance Audit of the FACT Initiative and At Risk Programs* (Report # 96-10). Page 16.

<sup>42</sup> Leishman, Ben. Interview with Nano Podolsky, Salt Lake School District. November 8, 2002, and Ball, Jonathan, Interview with Dr. Jayne Wolfe, Family Support Center. November 8, 2002.

*Expectation of collaboration was not realized in sweeping change to traditional structures*

While FACT created an expectation that collaboration was the rule and not the exception in state social service delivery, FACT did not succeed in transferring models by which this concept could permeate traditional social services programs.

Statute directs the FACT State Council to “increase and enhance efficient and effective services to children and youth at risk by...recommending legislative, executive, and judicial policy and procedural changes.”<sup>43</sup> The steering committee was directed to assist the council in this effort.

Legislative staff identified no examples of large-scale service structures that originated in FACT site-based programs or LICs that progressed through the steering committee to the council for implementation statewide.

For example, various FACT entities contemplated recommending a “single point of entry” for social service programs. The “single point of entry” would be a common application for assistance used by all service providers, the data from which would be shared among agencies. While this concept was repeatedly debated in FACT meetings, it was never proposed to the Legislature nor implemented in state agencies.<sup>44</sup>

All those involved in FACT, from service providers to council members, appear committed to collaborative, coordinated services, but the FACT structure did not facilitate comprehensive changes to state government.

### **Should a single state department be made responsible for FACT?**

FACT is rooted in the concepts of collaboration and cooperation among disparate state, local, and private entities. As such, assigning responsibility for FACT to a single state department seems counterintuitive.

At the same time, FACT stakeholders – from the Legislature and local oversight bodies, to taxpayers, to service providers, to recipients themselves – demand accountability. Assigning a single state department responsibility for FACT may facilitate such accountability.

*Assure accountability through outcome-based performance measures*

A better way to assure accountability for FACT, should it be reinstated, is through performance measures that are outcome-based, meaningful, achievable, and uniformly applied across the state.

---

<sup>43</sup> Utah State Legislature. *Families, Agencies, and Communities Together for Children and Youth at Risk Act*. Utah Code Annotated 63-75-4.

<sup>44</sup> Nilsen, Thor. Telephone interview with Barbara Thompson, Utah Department of Human Services, November 14, 2002.

Statewide data collected under FACT were output and not outcome based. They measured volumes and demographics, but not impacts. They were not collected consistently. For instance, no statewide data exists for fiscal year 2001.<sup>45</sup>

While the output data collected under FACT are useful in analyzing trends, they do not provide accountability.

Outcome studies commissioned by the FACT Council and performed by Utah State University in 1996 and 1997 began to provide the kind of accountability demanded by FACT's stakeholders. The studies examined how and to what extent FACT made a difference in the lives of children and families. They measured family resources, stress, and health, but did so using a small sample size, thus limiting the extent to which findings could be generalized.<sup>46</sup> These studies were discontinued following 1997.

*Salt Lake County's experience may serve as an example for statewide accountability*

One example from which future efforts might draw is Salt Lake County's FACT program. Salt Lake regularly collected demographic information (including data for FY 2001), but also measured, through surveys, utilization of service, attendance and truancy, health insurance coverage, immunizations, and behavioral functioning. The county attempted to collect this data for the entire population of its FACT program, thus avoiding problems in generalizing a statistical sample.<sup>47</sup>

An approach similar to that of Salt Lake County, consistently applied to the state as a whole, will likely assure greater accountability in any future FACT-like initiative.

If a single state department is to be made responsible for FACT in any case, that agency should be one with oversight authority, and not any single FACT participating agency.

### **Is it necessary to continue FACT as an independent program and, if so, in what form?**

In our opinion, it is not necessary to continue FACT as an independent program. Perhaps one of the negative aspects of FACT is that it was perceived as a program in the first place, resulting in turf battles and bureaucratic inertia. FACT is better understood as an initiative or philosophy.

---

<sup>45</sup> Delavan, George. Presentation to the FACT State Council and Steering Committee. November 6, 2002.

<sup>46</sup> Utah State University. *Outcome measures of FACT Projects FY 1997*.

<sup>47</sup> Podolsky, Nano *et al.* *Salt Lake County FACT – Individual Outcomes – Evaluation Report 2002*. July, 2002.

*FACT is better defined as a philosophy underlying the culture and resources of existing state programs*

There are various aspects of FACT that must be replicated elsewhere in order for the concepts of collaboration and coordination to permeate existing structures.

First, coordination and collaboration among agencies must be included in each social service agency's mission. While these concepts were clearly goals of FACT, state workers are most familiar with their own agency's goals and objectives, and may not have understood their relationship to FACT.

Second, collaboration and coordination should be included in various job descriptions and performance measures for state employees. It may even be necessary to assign certain employees responsibilities as "coordinators" – a function integral to successful FACT initiatives.

*FACT funding represented less than two-tenths of one percent of FACT agency "children's" programs*

Third, agencies may need to identify existing programs that allow funds to be used in a responsible yet flexible manner to meet immediate needs – as did FACT's flexible funds.

These aspects need not require additional resources. The FACT statute requires the FACT council to "recommend to the governor for each fiscal year funds contained in an agency's base budget...that can be identified for collaborative service delivery systems."<sup>48</sup>

In Table 2, one can see that FACT's \$5 million budget was a very small portion of the nearly \$3 billion Utah FACT agencies spend on social services and education for children.

*Steering Committee may be too cumbersome*

If FACT is to be reinstated as a separate state program, policy makers may wish to revisit the FACT Steering Committee. As mentioned earlier in this report, the steering committee more than doubled in size during FACT's tenure. It also formed separate management and administration subcommittees whose purposes are not defined in statute. In preparing the report, Staff regularly heard that the committee had become too large and complex.

While input from FACT stakeholders is valuable, a more streamlined approach to the steering committee – perhaps a FACT coordinators' committee and an annual stakeholders' conference – may more efficiently communicate concepts and needs to senior decision makers.

---

<sup>48</sup> Utah State Legislature. *Families, Agencies, and Communities Together for Children and Youth at Risk Act*. Utah Code Annotated 63-75-4.

**Table 2  
Base Funding for Children's Programs in the State of Utah's FACT Agencies  
FY 2003**

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Program</b>	<b>State Funds</b>	<b>Other Funds</b>	<b>Total Funds</b>
CRT	Juvenile Courts	\$25,476,900	\$2,156,200	\$27,633,100
CRT	Guardian Ad Litem	\$2,971,200	\$682,500	\$3,653,700
DOH	CHIP	5,400,000	21,600,000	27,000,000
DOH	Medicaid *	51,800,000	120,700,000	172,500,000
DOH	Community and Family Health Services	*	*	*
DOH	Health Promotion Programs *	210,000	1,598,300	1,808,300
DOH	Maternal & Child Health Programs	86,300	50,769,500	50,855,800
DOH	Children w/ Special Health Care Needs	5,614,100	14,574,700	20,188,800
DHS	Division of Child & Family Services	62,145,200	64,436,300	126,581,500
DHS	Childrens' Ombudsmen Services	235,100	113,700	348,800
DHS	Foster Care Citizens' Review Board	665,000	564,400	1,229,400
DHS	Division of Mental Health*	8,276,100	7,860,000	16,136,100
DHS	Div. of Services for People w/ Disabilities*	3,800,000	8,800,000	12,600,000
DHS	Division of Youth Corrections	69,362,800	18,511,500	87,874,300
DWS	Office of Child Care	846,900	6,922,300	7,769,200
DWS	Temporary Assistance for Needy Families*	13,371,200	53,348,800	66,720,000
USOE	State Board of Education	67,996,600	264,810,700	332,807,300
	Minimum School Program	1,586,582,800	369,419,000	1,956,001,800
	School Building Program	28,358,000	0	28,358,000
<b>TOTAL OF ALL AGENCIES</b>		<b>\$1,933,198,200</b>	<b>\$1,006,867,900</b>	<b>\$2,940,066,100</b>

\* Pro-rated based on proportion of clients under age 18.

<b>KEY:</b>	
CRT - Courts	DWS - Department of Workforce Services
DOH - Department of Health	USOE - Utah State Office of Education
DHS - Department of Human Services	(Note: These are also the state agencies involved with FACT.)

**Should every social service program be a ‘FACT’ program?**

Clearly, not every social service program should be a “FACT” program. There are numerous cases in which focused attention on a single issue more efficiently addresses that issue.

For example, one child demonstrating behavioral trouble may only need mentoring. Subjecting this hypothetical child’s family to a review team of nine adults would waste the team’s time, as well as perhaps intimidate the family.

*Social service professionals should have access to both targeted and collaborative delivery methods and refer clients to the option that is most appropriate*

Another child, however, may exhibit the behavioral trouble due to poor nutrition, an abscessed tooth, and lack of regular adult supervision. This child and his or her family may need the services of the Department of Workforce Services, the Department of Health or local health department, and the public education system.

The key to serving these children efficiently is recognizing the difference between the two and knowing the available remedies. Every social service worker should have access to collaborative programs as well as targeted assistance. And every social service worker should know when one or the other would be more effective and efficient.

## **Recommendations**

1. Legislative staff recommends that the Legislature consider revising enabling legislation for the State Office of Education and Departments of Health, Human Services, Workforce Services, as well as their associated operating entities, to include the philosophy of collaboration and coordination.
2. Staff further recommends that the Judicial Branch consider revising its mission statements to include such concepts if they do not already exist.
3. Staff recommends collaboration and coordination be included in various job descriptions and performance measures for state social service employees.
4. Staff recommends enforcing statutory requirements on the FACT council to identify base resources that can be directed toward collaborative and coordinated service provision.
5. Staff recommends that, for the next year, the Legislature retain the *Families, Agencies, and Communities Together for Children and Youth at Risk Act* as it is currently drafted.
6. Staff recommends that, in the coming year, the FACT council and steering committee continue to meet to formulate recommendations for comprehensive collaboration and coordination using existing state resources and reflected in attainable outcome measures.
7. Staff finally recommends that the Legislature reconsider FACT, its enabling legislation, and any recommendations from the FACT Council in the 2004 Legislative General Session.

**Appendix A**

<b>History of FACT Funding State Funds Only, FY 1996 - FY 2002</b>										
		Dept of Health	Youth Corrections	DHS Exec Dir	Dept of Workforce	Div of Child & Fam Svc	Div of Mental Health	Education	Total	Flex Fund (part of total)
<b>FY2002</b>	Site-Based	833,249			444,119	799,717	777,064	1,161,718	4,015,867	124,812
	LICs	12,630			-	13,855	567,911	160,169	754,565	553,300
	Training								-	
	Tech Asst.	101,620						42,818	144,438	
	DHS Exec Dir			50,000					50,000	
Youth Corr		49,500						49,500		
<b>Total</b>		<b>947,499</b>	<b>49,500</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>444,119</b>	<b>813,572</b>	<b>1,344,975</b>	<b>1,364,705</b>	<b>5,014,370</b>	<b>678,112</b>
<b>FY2001</b>	Site-Based	844,972			438,102	773,305	733,980	1,225,508	4,015,867	130,607
	LICs	-			12,630	13,855	567,911	160,169	754,565	570,280
	Training	10,000							10,000	
	Tech Asst.	91,620						42,818	134,438	
	DHS Exec Dir			50,000					50,000	
Youth Corr		49,500						49,500		
<b>Total</b>		<b>946,592</b>	<b>49,500</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>450,732</b>	<b>787,160</b>	<b>1,301,891</b>	<b>1,428,495</b>	<b>5,014,370</b>	<b>700,887</b>
<b>FY2000</b>	Site-Based	832,986			423,344	826,908	704,039	1,219,648	4,006,925	126,007
	LICs				12,630	13,855	572,038	164,984	763,507	574,571
	Training	10,000							10,000	
	Tech Asst.	91,620						42,818	134,438	
	DHS Exec Dir			50,000					50,000	
Youth Corr		49,500						49,500		
<b>Total</b>		<b>934,606</b>	<b>49,500</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>435,974</b>	<b>840,763</b>	<b>1,276,077</b>	<b>1,427,450</b>	<b>5,014,370</b>	<b>700,578</b>
<b>FY1999</b>	Site-Based	844,909			437,098	861,951	717,565	1,126,652	3,988,175	-
	LICs				-	154,536	546,407	81,314	782,257	547,094
	Training	10,000							10,000	
	Tech Asst.	91,620						44,261	135,881	
	DHS Exec Dir			50,000					50,000	
Youth Corr		49,500						49,500		
<b>Total</b>		<b>946,529</b>	<b>49,500</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>437,098</b>	<b>1,016,487</b>	<b>1,263,972</b>	<b>1,252,227</b>	<b>5,015,813</b>	<b>547,094</b>
<b>FY1998</b>	Site-Based	843,630			414,857	907,396	706,283	1,122,612	3,994,778	
	LICs	5,083					761,660	16,532	783,275	588,617
	Training	10,000							10,000	
	Tech Asst.	92,500						44,261	136,761	
	DHS Exec Dir			50,000					50,000	
Youth Corr		24,353						24,353		
<b>Total</b>		<b>951,213</b>	<b>24,353</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>414,857</b>	<b>907,396</b>	<b>1,467,943</b>	<b>1,183,405</b>	<b>4,999,167</b>	<b>588,617</b>
<b>FY1997</b>	Site-Based	830,089			376,295	877,653	740,652	1,169,680	3,994,369	
	LICs						764,143		764,143	584,364
	Training	10,000							10,000	
	Tech Asst.	91,620						44,261	135,881	
	DHS Exec Dir			67,660					67,660	
Youth Corr								-		
<b>Total</b>		<b>931,709</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>67,660</b>	<b>376,295</b>	<b>877,653</b>	<b>1,504,795</b>	<b>1,213,941</b>	<b>4,972,053</b>	<b>584,364</b>
<b>FY1996</b>	Site-Based	836,820			390,672	883,525	648,286	1,198,555	3,957,858	
	LICs	36,000					803,414		839,414	583,920
	Training	10,000							10,000	
	Tech Asst.	55,620						44,261	99,881	
	DHS Exec Dir			67,660					67,660	
Youth Corr		49,500						49,500		
<b>Total</b>		<b>938,440</b>	<b>49,500</b>	<b>67,660</b>	<b>390,672</b>	<b>883,525</b>	<b>1,451,700</b>	<b>1,242,816</b>	<b>5,024,313</b>	<b>583,920</b>



<b>History of FACT Funding State Funds Only, FY 1990 - FY 1995</b>										
		Dept of <u>Health</u>	Youth <u>Corrections</u>	DHS <u>Exec Dir</u>	Dept of <u>Workforce</u>	Div of Child <u>&amp; Fam Svc</u>	Div of <u>Mental Health</u>	<u>Education</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Flex Fund</u> <u>(part of total)</u>
<b>FY1995</b>	<b>Site-Based</b>	804,039			249,625	918,401	337,827	1,337,270	3,647,162	
	<b>LICs</b>	36,000					484,514		520,514	324,704
	<b>Training</b>	10,000							10,000	
	<b>Tech Asst.</b>	55,620		17,000				44,261	116,881	
	<b>DHS Exec Dir</b>			69,800					69,800	
	<b>Youth Corr</b>		49,500						49,500	
	<b>Total</b>	905,659	49,500	86,800	249,625	918,401	822,341	1,381,531	4,413,857	324,704
<b>FY1994</b>	<b>Site-Based</b>	822,997		2,412	233,525	1,056,362	260,185	1,167,739	3,543,220	
	<b>LICs</b>	36,000					320,000		356,000	320,000
	<b>Tech Asst.</b>	55,620		17,000				43,620	116,240	
	<b>DHS Exec Dir</b>								-	
	<b>Total</b>	914,617	-	19,412	233,525	1,056,362	580,185	1,211,359	4,015,460	320,000
<b>FY1993</b>	<b>Site-Based</b>	100,000					600,000	200,000	900,000	
	<b>LICs</b>					100,000			100,000	100,000
	<b>Total</b>	100,000			-	100,000	600,000	200,000	1,000,000	100,000
<b>FY1992</b>	<b>Site-Based</b>	100,000					600,000	200,000	900,000	
	<b>LICs</b>					100,000			100,000	100,000
	<b>Total</b>	100,000			-	100,000	600,000	200,000	1,000,000	100,000
<b>FY1991</b>	<b>Site-Based</b>	100,000				100,000		100,000	300,000	
	<b>LICs</b>								-	
	<b>Total</b>	100,000			-	100,000	-	100,000	300,000	-
<b>FY1990</b>	<b>Site-Based</b>	100,000				100,000		100,000	300,000	
	<b>LICs</b>								-	
	<b>Total</b>	100,000			-	100,000	-	100,000	300,000	-

## Appendix B