

Integrated County Planning Project

*State Agency
Survey Results*

Contents

Introduction 1
Summary Findings of "Similar" Responses 3
State Agency Survey Results 9

Appendix A:
Grids for Responses to 25 Questions

Appendix B:
Integrated County Planning Project:
Planning Survey

Integrated County Planning Project

State Agency Survey Results

September 2001

Submitted by:

Welfare Research, Inc.
112 State Street
Albany, NY 12207

Virginia H. Sibbison, PhD

Submitted to:

New York State Office
of Children and Family Services
52 Washington Street
Rensselaer, NY 12144

Introduction

The Integrated County Planning (ICP) Project

The ICP initiative is a five-year demonstration project under way in New York intended to develop "an integrated planning process to improve outcomes for all children, youth, and families...and to demonstrate the benefits of establishing an integrated, county-level planning process to build healthy communities, healthy families, and healthy children" (Office of Children and Family Services Request for Proposals, January 1998). The project is completing its third year.


Fifteen counties and New York City are receiving funding for the full five years while an additional 15 counties received funding for the first year and remain involved through participation in ICP training events. At the State level the ICP project involves a partnership with a number of State Agencies. For the purposes of developing this Report, ICP Planning Surveys were received from the Office of Children and Family Services (OCFS), the Office of Mental Health (OMH), the Office of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities (OMRDD), the Department of Health (DOH), the State Office for the Aging (SOFA), the Division of Probation and Correctional Alternatives (DPCA), the Office of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse Services (OASAS), the Department of Labor (DOL), the State Education Department (SED), and the Office of Temporary and Disability Assistance (OTDA). ICP Planning Survey responses from each of these Agencies are included in this Report.

Development of the ICP Planning Survey

The ICP Planning Survey is a comprehensive instrument designed to collect information from the 10 State Agencies referenced above. The survey asks for a wide range of information regarding Local Service Plans including the basis of required plans; nature of support provided to counties in the development of their Local Service Plans; and required components of Local Service Plans. Agencies also provided information on their own internal use of local service plans and on their own participation in interagency collaborations. A copy of the ICP Planning Survey is included in this Report as Appendix B.

The ICP Planning Survey was developed after reviewing materials generated by the ICP counties (e.g., Broome) and comments received from attendees of the October 13, 1999 ICP Conference, and after several discussions with senior OCFS staff. The resultant draft was disseminated in February 2000 for review and comment to all State Agency members of the ICP Planning Project. Several members commented, and their responses were incorporated into the final version of the ICP Planning Survey. Data were collected during 2000 and 2001 from the 10 participating State Agencies and are presented in this Report.

NOTE: Grids containing responses of the 10 participating State Agencies to 25 questions from the Planning Survey are provided in Appendix A. These responses are presented in a grid format to provide the reader with a snapshot of the responses by agency.

The symbol  next to the questions in this Report indicate that the responses to those questions are provided in the grid format.

ICP Summary Findings of “Similar” Responses

All 10 participating State Agencies report the following:

- ✓ They require the submission of Local Service Plans.
- ✓ They require written reports. Written Annual Reports are required by OCFS, OMRDD (for the coming two years), OASAS, and SOFA. SED elaborates that updates of the SED CSPD for special education are required annually and that districts must also update their AIS and PDP plans and have them on file in the district. Written Quarterly Reports are required by OMH, OTDA, and DPCA. Written DOH Community Health Assessment Reports are due every six years, with biennial updates; written DOH Municipal Public Health Services Plan Reports are due every two years. DOL reports that the frequency of written reports varies as policies change.
- ✓ They provide their local entities with a format or written guidelines for the Local Service Plan.
- ✓ They provide their local entities with other information to assist them in the development of their Local Service Plan. Technical assistance/training is specifically reported by OCFS, OTDA, DOH, DPCA, DOL (through field staff), and SOFA. Instructions/guidelines are specifically reported by OCFS, OASAS, OMH, OTDA, and SED. Data and data analyses are specifically reported by OCFS, OASAS, OMH, OMRDD, DOH, and OTDA. Uniquely reported are a County Resource Book, a system overview, and updates on major Agency initiatives and policy directions (OASAS); performance and outcomes management guidelines (OMH); data on people registered on service waiting lists (OMRDD); and suggested best practices, information about successful programs, and conferences to highlight successful Plan models (OTDA).
- ✓ Their Local Service Plans identify the target population(s) to be served. OCFS, OMH, OMRDD, DOH, DPCA, and SOFA additionally report age and level of need criteria, and OMH, OMRDD, DOH, and DPCA additionally report service criteria. OASAS does not report age, level of need, or services criteria but rather reports that counties must identify target populations in their needs assessments (as well as specific service needs, barriers to accessing services, and strategies to assure access). OTDA reports family composition, citizenship status, and income limit (below 200% of the federal poverty level) as target population criteria. SOFA further reports targeted populations include individuals with low incomes, minority elderly, the frail/disabled, aged 75+ years, veterans, and minority group members. SED reports that their Local Service Plans identify their target population by level of need. DOL reports that their Local Service Plans identify their target population by level of need and by service.
- ✓ The counties are monitored for compliance with Agency-approved Local Service Plans.
- ✓ Their Local Service Plans are *not* aggregated into their State Agency Plan.
- ✓ They have staff who provide planning support (training and technical assistance) to their local entities. SED qualifies their response by reporting that they do *not* provide planning support to *all* School Districts.
- ✓ They have a Mission Statement. The Mission Statements of OCFS, OMH, OMRDD, SED, and SOFA include a specific reference to services for children, youth, and families. DOL reports that

its Mission Statement is a general document for the NYS DOL, but local districts are required by State law to coordinate/cooperate with public and private education institutions, child care providers, child care resources and referral agencies (if available), labor unions, public and private employers, employment and training agencies, and Workforce Investment Boards (WIBs) when developing their local plans. DOL elaborates that the local plans require a planning effort and that families' supportive needs must be addressed. OTDA's Mission Statement includes a specific reference to local social services districts and greater self-sufficiency for the State's residents. The Mission Statements of OASAS, DOH, and DPCA do *not* include a specific reference to services for children, youth, and families.

Nine of the 10 participating State Agencies report the following:

- ✓ State Statute(s) are the basis of the required submission of Local Service Plans. OCFS, DOH, and SOFA also report Regulations as the basis of the required submission of Local Service Plans. SED does *not* report either State Statute or federal Statute but rather reports Regulations that require the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) and Professional Development Plans (PDP). Other SED requirements include the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (SED CSPD) Plan required with the application for federal funds for special education.
- ✓ The Director/Commissioner of their local entity is responsible for submitting the Local Service Plan. DOL elaborates that county Social Services Commissioners are responsible for submitting the Local Service Plan. SED reports that local School Superintendents are responsible for submitting the Local Service Plan.
- ✓ They provide their local entities with a checklist of what they want included in the Local Service Plan. OCFS notes, however, that although such

material is included for OCFS CSP, it is not so included for OCFS CCP/Runaway and Homeless Youth (RHYA). DOH responds that while there is no checklist per se, the items necessary to complete the Local Service Plan are included in their format.

- ✓ Local input is required for the Local Service Plan. OTDA reports that local input is *not* required for their Local Service Plans.
- ✓ Goals and objectives are required in their Local Service Plans. DOH reports "yes/no" because of current, ongoing collaborative efforts between the State Agency and county health departments to improve the Local Service Plans. DOL reports that goals and objectives are *not* required in their Local Service Plan.
- ✓ There is a relationship between their Local Service Plans and resource allocation. DOL reports that there is *no* such relationship.
- ✓ They (or their Regional Offices or Field Offices) provide technical assistance to their local entities. OCFS adds that they provide some locally-relevant data, some funding for group meetings, some small planning grants, and some consultant services. Some OCFS local agencies also are able to leverage local resources. OMRDD adds that there are no specific federal or State funding streams or foundation options dedicated for local government planning of MR/DD planning; however, they report it is likely that specific planning projects could be funded through the field-initiated grant program offered annually by the NYS Developmental Disabilities Planning Council. OTDA adds that some counties have chosen to contract out the planning process using TANF Services funds to pay for contracts; and in some instances contract staff from SUNY Buffalo also have been assisting counties. DOH adds that technical assistance is provided through the Community Health Assessment. DOL reports that the Agency shares task force meetings, supports the New York Public Welfare Association, provides guidance by Welfare-to-Work staff and policy, and conducts regional

meetings. SOFA reports that technical assistance is available to AAA planning personnel upon request. OASAS reports the provision of technical assistance and data resources to counties. OMH provides technical assistance through its field offices. DPCA reports technical assistance. SED reports that they do *not* provide technical assistance to all School Districts, but rather only to low-performing School Districts and to others, on request, if staffing and time allow it. Special education provides technical assistance to all School Districts through regional Department staff and the Office of Vocational and Education Services for Individuals with Disabilities (VESID) funded Special Education Training and Resource Center network.

- ✓ They send back Local Service Plans. OASAS indicates that they do *not* send back Plans but elaborates that they follow up with the counties on missing items from the Plans.
- ✓ They have participated in previous efforts to work cooperatively in planning for clients and/or for communities. DOL reports it has *not*.

Eight of the 10 participating State Agencies report the following:

- ✓ They consider the counties as their local entities, as reported by OASAS, OMH, OTDA, OMRDD, DOH, DPCA, DOL ("county Social Services agencies"), and OCFS ("primarily"). OTDA and OASAS add that they consider the five counties of New York City a single entity. OCFS clarifies that municipalities (towns and cities) with Youth Bureaus also have some planning requirements. SOFA reports 59 local Area Agencies on Aging (AAAs) as their local entities, of which 53 are sponsored by county government, four are sponsored by nonprofit organizations, and two are sponsored by Indian Nations. SED reports that School Districts are considered their "local" entities.
- ✓ Their planning processes are responsive to State-identified *and* federally-identified *and* locally-identified priorities/goals. DOL adds that their planning process is responsive to local priorities to the extent that local flexibility is afforded. DOL elaborates that districts are given instructions and a format for the submission of the local Plan that encompasses employment programs operated under Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), Safety Net, and Food Stamps. When finalized, the Plan will become the local district's policy manual describing public assistance/food stamp employment programs and requirements, including definitions of work activities, policy for the approval of training programs, and the supportive services provided by the district for individuals assigned to work activities. Districts have some flexibility in developing their employment programs but minimum State and federal requirements must be met. For example, districts must provide supportive services (including child care) where necessary to enable an individual to participate in work activities. Districts are required to describe their supportive services policy, including the supportive services they will provide and under what circumstances such services will be provided. OMRDD reports that their planning process is responsive only to State priorities and local priorities (based on Mental Health Law Section 5.07). DPCA also reports that their planning process is responsive only to State and local priorities (reflective of interagency planning and multidisciplinary assessment).
- ✓ Their local Director/Commissioner is responsible for signing the Local Service Plan. DOL elaborates that county Social Services Commissioners are responsible for signing the Local Service Plan. OMH reports that the Local Service Plan is signed by the Chairperson of the Mental Health Subcommittee of the Community Services Board. SED reports that School Superintendents are responsible for signing the Local Service Plan.
- ✓ They receive local input from advisory/policy making boards and/or from local community agencies. DOL did *not* report either of these input methods. OCFS, OMH, OMRDD, DOH, and SOFA additionally report local input

through public hearings; OCFS, OASAS, DOL, and OMH additionally report input from other forms of public participation (including the establishment of public comment periods).

- ✓ Their Local Service Plans include a service inventory. OMH and SED report that their Local Service Plans do *not* include a service inventory.
- ✓ Rewards or sanctions can be imposed for non-compliance with Agency-approved Local Service Plans. OCFS elaborates that if the county has received notice for non-compliance, and if the non-compliance issue remains uncorrected, a fiscal sanction can be imposed. DOH adds that it can impose sanctions through the non-payment of vouchers; it does not provide rewards. OASAS elaborates that sanctions for non-compliance are “generally *not*” imposed. DOL reports that rewards or sanctions are *not* imposed. However, DOL adds that the district compliance is ensured in part through fair hearing decisions.
- ✓ They do *not* use consultants to provide planning support or training and technical assistance. DOH reports that, at times, consultants have been used to identify gaps in counties’ abilities to conduct needs assessment, to assist counties in the development of Local Service Plans, and to provide relevant training. SED reports that it has used consultants to provide training in data analyses, root cause identification, facilitation skills, and team building skills.
- ✓ They currently work closely with other State Agencies. DOH and DOL report that they do *not*. Although OTDA and SOFA report working with DOL, DOL clarifies that they do not work closely with other State agencies regarding local district employment plans. However, the local entities (social service districts) submitting the plans must coordinate with OTDA to maximize services and minimize duplication of effort.

Seven of the 10 participating State Agencies report the following:

- ✓ A needs assessment is required in the Local Service Plan with the data generated by both the State Agency and the local entity. OMRDD adds that “local” includes local service providers.
- ✓ Their needs assessment is tied to priority setting. OASAS adds that their Local Services Plan Guidelines instruct counties to develop priorities based on unmet needs identified through their needs assessment efforts involving local service providers. OMRDD reports that although their needs assessment is “not directly” tied to priority setting, waiting list data are key to the monitoring of prominent development initiatives such as NYS-CARES.
- ✓ Their needs assessment identifies unmet needs.
- ✓ Their needs assessment does *not* require a population survey. DPCA elaborates that although the current Persons in Need of Supervision (PINS) Update process does not require a population survey, many elements of a survey required by the 1985 PINS Law have been incorporated in the PINS Quarterly Report which each participating PINS county submits to DPCA.
- ✓ There is a fiscal component to their Local Service Plans. OMRDD, DOL, and DPCA report that there is *no* fiscal component to their Local Service Plan.
- ✓ Their service inventories do include services not funded by their local entities. DOL elaborates that their service inventories may include provider services that are funded through alternative funding streams (e.g., SED funds). OTDA reports that their service inventories do *not* include services not funded by their local entities.

State Agency Survey Results

Part I, Question # 1:

What do you consider your "local" entity?

Eight of the 10 participating State Agencies indicate that they consider the counties as their local entities, as reported by OASAS, OMH, OTDA, OMRDD, DOH, DPCA, DOL ("county Social Services agencies"), and OCFS ("primarily"). OTDA and OASAS add that they consider the five counties of New York City a single entity. OCFS clarifies that municipalities (towns and cities) with Youth Bureaus also have some planning requirements. SOFA reports 59 Local Area Agencies on Aging (AAAs) as their local entities, of which 53 are sponsored by county government, four are sponsored by non-for-profit organizations, and two are sponsored by Indian Nations. SED reports that School Districts are considered their "local" entities.

Part I, Question # 2:

Do you require the submission of Local Service Plans?

All 10 participating State Agencies report that they require the submission of Local Service Plans.

Part I, Question # 3:

What is the basis of this requirement(s)?

Nine of the 10 participating State Agencies report State Statute(s) as the basis of the required submission of Local Service Plans. OCFS, DOH, and SOFA also report Regulations as the basis of the required submission of Local Service Plans. SED does not report either State Statute or federal Statute, but rather reports Regulations that require the Academic Intervention Services (AIS) and Professional Development Plans (PDP). Other SED requirements include the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (SED CSPD) Plan required with the application for federal funds for special education. There appears to be no overlapping of either Statutes or Regulations among the State Agencies.


Part I, Question # 4:

What is the planning cycle, when are plans submitted, and what is the duration of the plan?

Planning cycles, submission dates, and durations vary widely among the 10 participating State Agencies. OASAS, OMH, DPCA, OTDA, and SED report annual planning cycles, with OASAS elaborating that Local Service Planning is a year-round process. OTDA elaborates that its Local Service Plans were due for the first time on August 31, 2000. It was expected that approvals would be out by October 15, 2001 with an expected implementation on January 1, 2001. Two-year planning cycles are reported by OMRDD and DOL, and by DOH for Municipal Public Health Services Plans. OCFS reports that the OCFS County Comprehensive Plan (OCFS CCP) planning cycle is three years, including annual updates. For the OCFS Consolidated Services Plan (OCFS CSP), the State defines parameters for multi-year plans with annual updates required. The lengthiest period between submissions of Local Service Plans is reported by DOH for Community Health Assessments (six years with biennial updates); and by SOFA (four years with annual implementation Plan updates).


The 10 participating State Agencies were asked which month in the year their Local Service Plans are due. OMRDD reports May or June (depending on the date the guidelines were sent from the central office); plans are to cover the State fiscal year beginning in April. July is reported by DPCA; by SED "although SED is very flexible with this"; and by OASAS (changing next year to have guidelines out by February 15, with Plans to be returned by May 15). Effective January 1, OCFS CSP and OCFS CCP Local Service Plans are due November 1, and OCFS ICP counties' Local Service Plans are due December 1. DOL Local Service Plans are due by December 1 of the year preceding the biennial period. OTDA reports "no specific time frame" and elaborates that this is "because the plans will depend on the appropriations in the state budget and the timing of the state budget."

OMH reports that there is no specific legally mandated date for return of county plans; however, they are generally due sometime in the fall. The date of return depends on when the guidelines are sent to them.

 Part I, Question # 5:

Are written reports (i.e., updates) required?

All 10 participating State Agencies report that they require written reports. Written Annual Reports are required by OCFS, OMRDD (for the coming two years), OASAS, and SOFA. SED elaborates that updates of the SED CSPD for special education are required annually, and that districts must also update their AIS and PDP plans and have them on file in the district. Written Quarterly Reports are required by OMH, OTDA, and DPCA. Written DOH Community Health Assessment Reports are due every six years, with biennial updates; written DOH Municipal Public Health Services Plan Reports are due every two years. DOL reports that the frequency of written reports varies as policies change.

 Part I, Question # 6:

Is the planning process a response to State-identified, federal-identified, and/or local-identified priorities/goals?


Eight of the 10 participating State Agencies report that their planning processes are responsive to State-identified *and* federally-identified *and* locally-identified priorities/goals.

DOL adds that their planning process is responsive to local priorities to the extent that local flexibility is afforded. DOL elaborates that districts are given instructions and a format for the submission of the local Plan that encompasses employment programs operated under Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), Safety Net, and Food Stamps. When finalized, the Plan will become the local district's policy manual describing public assistance/food stamp employment programs and requirements, including definitions of work activities, policy for the approval of training programs, and the supportive services provided by the district for individuals assigned to work activities. Districts

have some flexibility in developing their employment programs, but minimum State and federal requirements must be met. For example, districts must provide supportive services (including child care) where necessary to enable an individual to participate in work activities. Districts are required to describe their supportive services policy, including the supportive services they will provide and under what circumstances such services will be provided.


OMRDD reports that their planning process is responsive only to State priorities and local priorities (based on Mental Health Law Section 5.07). DPCA also reports that their planning process is responsive only to State and local priorities (reflective of interagency planning and multidisciplinary assessment).

In further explanation, most of the State Agencies report the perception that local goals and priorities are developed to meet local conditions and needs (however, with recognition of, and within the context of, known federal and State goals and priorities).

 Part I, Question # 7a:

At the local level, who is responsible for submitting the Local Service Plan?


Nine of the 10 participating State Agencies report that the Director/Commissioner of their local entity is responsible for submitting the Local Service Plan. DOL elaborates that county Social Services Commissioners are responsible for submitting the Local Service Plan. SED reports that local School Superintendents are responsible for submitting the Local Service Plan.

 Part I, Question # 7b:

At the local level, who is responsible for approving the Local Service Plan?

In addition to local Directors/Commissioners' approval of Local Service Plans (inherent in the requirement that they are responsible for submitting the Local Service Plans), approval sometimes is additionally required by the local County Executive or County Legislature (OCFS and OMH); by a Community Services Board


(OASAS) and the County's or City's Director of Community Services (OMRDD); by a State Agency Commissioner's designee (DOH and OTDA); or an outside entity (OCFS Youth Board and SOFA four participating nonprofit organizations and two participating Indian Nations). SED reports that School Boards are responsible for approving the Local Service Plan. DOL elaborates that county Social Services Commissioners are responsible for approving the Local Service Plan. DPCA reports that their Local Service Plans must be approved by the Probation Director, the DSS Commissioner, and the Youth Bureau Director.

 Part I, Question # 7c:

At the local level, who is responsible for signing the Local Service Plan?

Eight of the 10 participating State Agencies report that their local Director/Commissioner is responsible for signing the Local Service Plan. DOL elaborates that county Social Services Commissioners are responsible for signing the Local Service Plan. OMH reports that the Local Service Plan is signed by the Chairperson of the Mental Health Subcommittee of the Community Services Board. SED reports that School Superintendents are responsible for signing the Local Service Plan.

In addition, signatures are sometimes required by the local County Executive or County Legislature (OCFS, DOH, and DPCA); by a Community Services Board (OASAS) and the County's or City's Director of Community Services (OMRDD); or an outside entity (OCFS Youth Board Chair and SOFA four participating nonprofit organizations and two participating Indian Nations).

 Part I, Question # 8:


Do you provide the (counties) with a format or written guidelines for the Local Service Plan?

All 10 participating State Agencies report that they provide their local entities with a format or written guidelines for the Local Service Plan.

Four State Agencies (OCFS, OMH, OTDA, and SOFA) report that there are service-specific fiscal formulas or specific dollar amounts in their format

or written guidelines. Among the six State Agencies that do not provide such formulas or specific dollar amounts, DOH elaborates that it does not do so because this information is included in legislation.


Nine of the 10 participating State Agencies report that they provide their local entities with a checklist of what they want included in the Local Service Plan. OCFS notes, however, that although such material is included for OCFS CSP, it is not so included for OCFS CCP/Runaway and Homeless Youth (RHYA). DOH responds that although there is no checklist per se, the items necessary to complete the Local Service Plan are included in their format.

 Part I, Question # 9:

Do you provide any other information to assist the (counties) with Local Service Plan development?

All 10 participating State Agencies report that they provide their local entities with other information to assist them in the development of their Local Service Plan. Technical assistance/training is specifically reported by OCFS, OTDA, DOH, DPCA, DOL (through field staff), and SOFA. Instructions/guidelines are specifically reported by OCFS, OASAS, OMH, OTDA, and SED. Data and data analyses are specifically reported by OCFS, OASAS, OMH, OMRDD, DOH, and OTDA.

Uniquely reported are a County Resource Book, a system overview, and updates on major Agency initiatives and policy directions (OASAS); performance and outcomes management guidelines (OMH); data on people registered on service waiting lists (OMRDD); and suggested best practices, information about successful programs, and conferences to highlight successful Plan models (OTDA).

 Part I, Question # 10:

Is the conduct of a needs assessment required in the Local Service Plan?

Seven of the 10 participating State Agencies report that a needs assessment is required in the Local Service Plan. OASAS elaborates that counties are required to conduct a local needs assessment, but the Agency does not prescribe a

Integrated County Planning Project: State Agency Survey Results

particular method or format for reporting on needs assessment activities. OTDA, DOL, and OMH report that they do *not* require a need assessment.

If yes, what methods are used to collect information?

OCFS, OMRDD, DOH, and DPCA emphasize local involvement; OCFS, OASAS, and DOH indicate that they provide their local entity with information and data. SED reports that each School District collects and reports data on student performance, attendance, special education, etc. A response to this question was not provided by SOFA.

If yes, who generates the data?

All seven State Agencies that report the requirement of a needs assessment additionally report that the data are generated by both the State Agency and the local entity. OMRDD adds that "local" includes local service providers.

If yes, is needs assessment tied to priority setting?

All seven State Agencies that report the requirement of a needs assessment additionally report that the needs assessment is tied to priority setting. OASAS adds that their Local Service Plan Guidelines instruct counties to develop priorities based on unmet needs identified through their needs assessment efforts involving local service providers. OMRDD reports that although their needs assessment is "not directly" tied to priority setting, waiting list data are key to the monitoring of prominent development initiatives such as NYS-CARES.

If yes, is needs assessment tied to resource allocation?

Four (OCFS, DPCA, SOFA, and SED) of the seven State Agencies that report the requirement of a needs assessment additionally report that needs assessment is tied to resource allocation. OASAS and DOH report that needs assessment is *not* tied to resource allocation, as does OMRDD with the caveat that, within its District Offices, funding is allocated to counties based on documented need (wait lists), provider capability, and willingness to

serve people in most immediate need of various types of services.

If yes, are sub-county data available/used?

Six of the seven State Agencies that report the requirement of a needs assessment additionally report that sub-county data are available/used. OASAS elaborates that sub-county data are used "where available." OMRDD reports that sub-county data are *not* available/used.

If yes, does the needs assessment identify unmet needs?

All seven State Agencies that report the requirement of a needs assessment additionally report that the needs assessment identifies unmet needs.

If yes, does the needs assessment require a population survey?

All seven of the State Agencies that report the requirement of a needs assessment additionally report that the needs assessment does not require a population survey. DPCA elaborates that although the current Persons in Need of Supervision (PINS) Update process does not require a population survey, many elements of a survey required by the 1985 PINS Law have been incorporated in the PINS Quarterly Report which each participating PINS county submits to DPCA.



Part I, Question # 11:

Is local input required for the Local Service Plan?

Nine of the 10 participating State Agencies report that local input is required for the Local Service Plan. OTDA reports that local input is *not* required for their Local Service Plans.

If yes, by whom/what?

Eight of the nine State Agencies that report the requirement of local input additionally report local input from advisory/policy making boards and/or from local community agencies. DOL did not report either of these input methods. OCFS, OMH, OMRDD, DOH, and SOFA additionally report local input through public hearings; OCFS, OASAS, DOL, and OMH additionally report input from

other forms of public participation (including the establishment of public comment periods).

If yes, please provide detail.

OCFS — For OCFS CSP, documentation of public hearings and consultations is proscribed by regulatory requirements, as is how such input is used; for OCFS CCP, input and use are not proscribed by OCFS and are locally determined.

OASAS — State Mental Hygiene Law requires a broad-based planning process involving provider agencies, local government agencies, consumers, and consumer groups. The process is not proscribed by OASAS.

OMH — Local input varies by county; there is no proscribed method in law.

OMRDD — Community Service Boards, through their MR/DD subcommittees, develop the Local Service Plan. The subcommittees include membership of voluntary providers, local government, consumers, and advocates, as well as ex-officio membership of State Agency staff. The subcommittees, as part of the process of developing the Local Service Plan, are required to hold some form of public hearing in broad terms, and may hold several hearing or collect public feedback on the proposed Plan in a number of ways.


DOH — Local input varies by county.

DPCA — Local input is gathered through meetings, formal and informal agreements, and surveys. Local input is used for planning and implementation, in collaboration with probation, social services, youth bureaus, local mental health and education agencies, and other interested public and private organizations.

SOFA — Public hearings are to occur no later than 30 days prior to the submission of the Local Service Plan. In addition, AAAs are required to coordinate with other community agencies on the development of new or expanded services for older persons.


SED — Local input is obtained through School Board Open Meetings.

DOL — How local input is collected and used is left to district discretion; however, the review and comment period must be at least 30 days.

 Part I, Question # 12:

Does the required Local Service Plan identify the target population(s) to be served?

All 10 participating State Agencies report that their Local Service Plans identify the target population(s) to be served. OCFS, OMH, OMRDD, DOH, DPCA, and SOFA additionally report age and level of need criteria, and OMH, OMRDD, DOH, and DPCA additionally report service criteria. OASAS does not report age, level of need, or service criteria but rather reports that counties must identify target populations in their needs assessments (as well as specific service needs, barriers to accessing services, and strategies to assure access). OTDA reports family composition, citizenship status, and income limit (below 200% of the federal poverty level) as target population criteria. SOFA further reports targeted populations include individuals with low incomes, minority elderly, the frail/disabled, aged 75+ years, veterans, and minority group members. SED reports that their Local Service Plans identify their target population by level of need. DOL reports that their Local Service Plans identify their target population by level of need and by service.

 Part I, Question # 13:

Are goals and objectives required in the Local Service Plan?

Nine of the 10 participating State Agencies report that goals and objectives are required in their Local Service Plans. DOH reports “yes/no” because of current, ongoing collaborative efforts between the State Agency and county health departments to improve the Local Service Plans. DOL reports that goals and objectives are *not* required in their Local Service Plan.

If yes, who develops them?

Collaborative (State Agency and local entity) efforts to develop goals and objectives in the Local Service Plan are reported by OCFS (OCFS CSP only), DOH, and SOFA. Local entity-only efforts to develop goals and objectives are reported by OCFS (OCFS CCP-RHYA only), OASAS, OMH, OMRDD, OTDA, DPCA, and SED. OASAS elaborates that counties are instructed to develop long-range goals

and objectives, based on the results of their needs assessment efforts that identify special client populations and service needs. Goals and objectives often address those populations and specific program services, although they are not necessarily based on them. (For example, goals and objectives may include such things as the development of collaborative efforts with other systems that may lead to better service delivery for clients). SOFA additionally reports required federal goals and objectives.


If yes, do they address State-defined elements such as “State-identified needs”?

OCFS (OCFS CSP for Adult Services only), DPCA, SOFA, and SED report that State-defined goals and objectives are addressed in the Local Service Plans. OMH reports that local goals must be consistent with State-identified goals, and DOH reports “probably, to some degree.” OASAS reports that counties are provided guidance on addressing State defined goals and objectives but must also develop goals and objectives that address local needs. OMRDD reports that its five-year comprehensive Plan indicates State priorities and categories that reflect common State and local concerns, and hence local goals and objectives typically do fit well within OMRDD goals and objectives. OTDA reports that State-defined goals and objectives are *not* required in their Local Service Plans.

If yes, are they based on client population or units of services/programs?


OMH, OASAS, OTDA, and DOH report goals and objectives in their Local Service Plans are based on both their client population and on units of services/program. OCFS (OCFS CSP-only), OMRDD, and SED report only client population as the basis of Local Service Plan goals and objectives, with OMRDD elaborating that their goals and objectives are based on known individuals who have sought specific types of services and who are registered in the needs assessment data base (or who are included at the discretion of the county, based on local fact finding). DPCA reports only units of services/programs as the basis of Local

Service Plan goals and objectives. A response to this question was not provided by SOFA.

 Part I, Question # 14:

Are the goals and objectives measurable?

Six of the 10 participating State Agencies report that goals and objectives are included in their Local Service Plans. OCFS (OCFS CSP) reports that goals and objectives are locally determined; identified in their Multi-year Plan; and reported upon in the Annual Update reports. Some programs (e.g., adoption) identify baseline and self-identified target goals and objectives. OCFS (OCFS CCP) reports that measurable goals and objectives are determined at the local level. OMRDD reports that implementation of objectives which involve program or service establishment or expansion is directly monitored by the related District Office. SOFA reports that there are general goals and objectives, as well as measurable objectives such as levels of service and number of individuals to be served. DPCA and OTDA also report measurable goals and objectives, with OTDA indicating that measurable goals and objectives vary by project. OASAS guidelines direct counties to develop measurable goals and objectives but do not set standards that must be met. OMH and DOH report that measurable goals and objectives “will probably be” in their Local Service Plans. SED reports that measurable goals and objectives “may be” in Local Service Plans, as determined by each School District. The question is not applicable to DOL.

 Part I, Question # 15:

Does the Local Service Plan include a description of how the local (county) determines progress toward goals and objectives?

OCFS (OCFS CCP) — The counties self-report their measurable objectives and how their Local Service Plan and planning process are monitored.

OMRDD — Because goals and objectives are concrete and specific, and reflect responses to needs assessment data, and are directly amenable to review in the next year’s Plan, progress (or lack of such) in a specific goal area is inherently evident.

OTDA — The process by which progress is determined depends on the specific project.

DPCA — Progress is determined through timelines, development and implementation of strategies that are consistent with goals and objectives, and review of quarterly reports which detail statistics and the status of PINS adjustment services implementation (e.g., Designated Assessment Service completion dates and preparation of service plans).

SOFA — The process varies in each Planning and Service Area, but must be consistent with the AAAs' established procedures for evaluating programs.

SED — Progress toward goals and objectives is determined through test scores that reveal student performance (improvement or decline).

OASAS — Progress on meeting goals and objectives is reported in the subsequent Local Services Plan.


OMH, and DOH report that their Local Service Plans do not include a description of how the local entity determines progress toward goals and objectives. The question is not applicable to DOL

Part I, Question # 16:

How does the State determine progress toward goals and objectives?

Review of quarterly reports as a means for determining progress toward goals and objectives is reported by OMH; OTDA (in addition to discussing projects with local social services districts and through limited State monitoring); DPCA (in addition to the State PINS Interagency Team review and PINS Plan Updates); and SOFA (in addition to reviewing annual reports, conducting routine monitoring, and reviewing annual evaluations). Review of Annual Update Reports is reported by OCFA (as well as Regional Office monitoring, on-site visiting and contact, review of some data bases, and some sampling); by DOH; and by OASAS (through counties' programming priorities and descriptions of service needs and current gaps in service). OMRDD reports that it determines local progress toward goals and objectives through direct monitoring by the related Developmental Disabilities Services

District Offices (DDSOs). SED reports that it determines local progress toward goals and objectives through direct monitoring of low-performing School Districts. The question is not applicable to DOL

 Part I, Question # 17:

Is there a fiscal component to the Local Service Plan?

Seven of the 10 participating State Agencies report that there is a fiscal component to their Local Service Plans. OMRDD, DOL, and DPCA report that there is *no* fiscal component to their Local Service Plan.

If yes, how is it used by the State Agency and what does it consist of?

OCFS (OCFS CSP) — The fiscal component is used to determine how State aid is allocated; to set income eligibility standards; to develop a matrix of services proved and income eligibility standards; and to assess thresholds for eligibility.

OCFS (OCFS CCP) — The Resource Allocation Plan describes the process by which counties allocate State aid to programs. The fiscal component consists of application budget forms; and a narrative description, by service program, of how the county uses State aid.

OASAS — The fiscal component of the Local Service Plan, released as a Plan Supplement, is used to request funding for new programs and program expansions.

OMH — The fiscal component of the Local Service Plan is used to determine appropriate allocation of funds at the local level pursuant to State and federal law and priorities. The fiscal component consists of an allocation methodology, county allocation, cost guidelines/fiscal models, funding sources, and reporting requirements.


OTDA — The local social services districts are given specific monetary allocations for programs; and the fiscal component is used as the basis for reimbursements to the districts for expended funds.

DOH — The fiscal component consists of a document called the State Aid Application, which is used as a budget and forms the basis for the reimbursement process. The fiscal component

consists of a format that translates the approved municipal budget into figures that correspond to the municipal public health services plan.

SOFA — The fiscal component is used as an application for funding and as the basis for Notification of Grant Awards. The fiscal component consists of Service Delivery & Resource Allocation Plans and funding applications, a Personnel Roster, and a roster of subcontractors.

SED — Although there is a fiscal component in Local Service Plans, it is not monitored by the State. Each School District allocates resources to its own priorities. Special education specifically requires that dollars be assigned after a review of data, needs assessments, and local priorities.

 Part I, Question # 18:


Is there a relationship between the Local Service Plan and resource allocation?

Nine of the 10 participating State Agencies report that there is a relationship between their Local Service Plans and resource allocation. DOL reports that there is *no* such relationship.

If yes, what is the relationship and how are they submitted (together or separately)?

OCFS (OCFS CSP) reports that service needs assessment must be linked to program and fiscal plans, and they are submitted together. OCFS (OCFS CCP) reports that local resource allocation must be linked to local goals and objectives, and they are submitted separately. OMH reports that State aid cannot be distributed unless the expenditure item is included in the approved Local Service Plan, and they are submitted together. DOH also reports that reimbursement can only occur for those items contained in the Local Service Plan, but they are submitted separately. OTDA reports that expenditures cannot exceed the amounts in the allocations, and they are submitted together. SOFA reports that resource allocations are part of their Local Service Plan, and they are submitted together. DPCA reports that funding sources are identified for each initiative in Local Service Plans, and they are submitted together. DPCA further reports that localities are expected to allocate local resources to meet the needs of this

population (there have been no State funds set aside for PINS Planning since approximately 1990). OASAS reports that there is a relationship between their Local Service Plans and resource allocation for new and expanding programs but not for base budgeting. The OASAS fiscal component is submitted separately from the Local Service Plan component through a Plan Supplement process that is tied to specific funding initiatives. SED reports that resource allocation is based on priorities identified in the Local Service Plans and that Local Service Plans and resource allocations must be submitted together. OMRDD reports that District Offices work together with counties and localities during the planning process to indicate the extent to which funding for various types of services is expected to be forthcoming during the next Plan cycle; plans and allocations are submitted separately.

 Part I, Question # 19:


Does the Local Service Plan include a service inventory and, if yes, by what?

Eight of the 10 participating State Agencies report that their Local Service Plans include a service inventory. OASAS and OMRDD report that service inventories are organized by service type and by provider; DPCA reports that its service inventory is organized by provider; and SOFA reports that its service inventory is organized by service type. OCFS reports that its service inventory is organized by target population, service type, provider, and "other." OCFS further elaborates that the Local Service Plan inventory is currently captured in an Appendix that lists the various services offered, method of provision, category of clients served, and income eligibility standards; it is a service inventory only to the extent that it indicates which of the Title XX (Social Service Block Grants) services a county will offer. It is not a resource inventory. DOH reports that its service inventory is organized by "other" and explains that DOH has adopted the 10 Essential Public Health Services as a method of organizing and describing their public health activities. OTDA reports that its service inventory is organized by specific project. DOL reports that social services

districts may contract with other agencies and providers for basic Welfare-to-Work (WtW) and Food Stamp, Employment, and Training (FSET) services and activities. The DOL service inventory is organized by provider; providers may include State Agencies, School Districts, and local employers, among others. DOL elaborates that districts may not contract for a service or activity that would otherwise be available at no cost. OMH reports that their Local Service Plans do *not* include a service inventory. SED does *not* require a service inventory in either the regular or the special education planning processes. Services are tailored to the needs of the individual children.

If yes, does the inventory include services not funded by the local entity?


Seven of the eight State Agencies that report service inventories in their Local Service Plans report that their service inventories do include services not funded by their local entities. DOL elaborates that their service inventories may include provider services that are funded through alternative funding streams (e.g., SED funds). OTDA reports that their service inventories do *not* include services not funded by their local entities.

 Part I, Question # 20:

Does the required Local Service Plan indicate which services are provided directly and which services are purchased?

OCFS, OMH, OTDA, DOH, DOL, and SOFA report that their Local Service Plans indicate which services are provided directly and which services are purchased. DOL elaborates that districts must list their contracts with agencies that provide Welfare-to-Work activities. OMRDD reports that virtually all local services for people with MR/DD associated with OMRDD are purchased or directly provided by OMRDD. SED reports that School Districts determine which services are provided directly and which services are purchased. The contracts list includes the provider Agency, the specific activities to be provided, effective dates, and dollar amounts. OASAS and DPCA report that their Local Service Plans do *not* indicate which

services are provided directly and which services are purchased.

 Part I, Question # 21:

Do you have any planning requirements for Memorandums of Understandings (MOUs) or cooperative agreements with other agencies?

OCFS, OMRDD, OTDA, and DPCA report having MOUs or cooperative agreements with other agencies.

OCFS — Cooperative arrangements are established with District Attorneys in domestic violence cases, child protective services cases, and violence against the elderly cases.

OMRDD — Each county and the City of New York are legislatively mandated to have an MOU that stipulates procedures and processes to reconcile service responsibility for persons with conjoint developmental disability and mental disorder. The County Directors of Community Services, Mental Hygiene Directors, and related State Psychiatric Center and District Office Directors are expected to be active participants in the development of these MOUs.

OTDA — Will have MOUs with all of the other State agencies with allocated TANF services funds.

DPCA — Maintains a list of interagency agreements for agencies that participated in the development and/or implementation of the PINS Plan Update. This list is evidenced by formal agreements or understandings, or through informal agreements to support planning and implementation activities as noted in the goals, objectives, and strategies.

Part I, Question # 22:

What other information must be included in the Local Service Plan?

OCFS — For OCFS CCP, counties are required to detail their plans for monitoring and evaluating the programs they fund, and they must identify their strategies for achieving goals; they may also articulate their technical assistance needs. For OCFS CSP, counties are required to detail issues around staffing; plans must include legal assurances.

Integrated County Planning Project: State Agency Survey Results

OCFS (RHYA) — Article 19, S420(2) requires a description of the duties of the RHYA Coordinator, the coordination of RHYA resources, and how education and transportation to education will be provided.

OASAS — Local Service Plans are used as a means to conduct county and provider surveys on a variety of issues of importance to OASAS. Survey analyses returned to the counties inform them of issues from a Statewide perspective. Counties must also sign assurances of compliance with State laws and procedures related to local planning requirements.

OMH — Local Service Plans must include a Statement of local goals and objectives that are consistent with OMH goals, descriptions of how new funds will be used, the target population, the identity of the service provider, and fiscal information. Additionally, the Local Service Plan must include signed assurances that the Mental Health Subcommittee of the Community Services Board has reviewed the Plan as well as assurances that the county Plan shows fiscal maintenance-of-effort and does not supplant local funds with State funds. Services that are to be funded with federal funds must also demonstrate that they meet federal criteria.

OMRDD — Estimates of program costs for establishing planned services (with goals and objectives) must be included in the Local Service Plan. All other content is “recommended.” Both recommended content and additional local content may be included in the local plan.

OTDA — TANF Local Service Plan projects must contain the following elements: whether or not a contractor will be used for the project; a description of the project’s goals; the target population; the service delivery model; the data to be collected and outcome measures; necessary personnel and non-personnel resources; and a project work Plan with key milestones and target dates.

DOH — The Local Service Plan contains the Community Health Assessment and the Municipal Public Health Services plan. The Plan uses a checklist based on the 10 essential public health services used by local health departments to describe their activities in public health. Guidance for completing both documents is available.

DPCA — The Local Service Plan must include the First and Second Quarterly PINS reports for the current year.

SOFA — The Local Service Plan must include demographic data, identification of designated focal points in the community, policies for client contributions, and information on case priorities in the Legal Services for the Elderly Program.

SED — The Local Service Plan includes information about how the district will address the needs of all students in both regular and special education classes.

DOL — Local plans must include a description of internal local district WtW administration; must identify contracts with external agencies; and must report coordination and consultation activities with other agencies. They also describe orientation activities; assessment and employability plans; available work activities; activity enrollment policies; supportive services for applicants and recipients; transitional supportive services; transportation policy; supportive services for FSET participants; conciliation and dispute resolution processes; a description of the district’s disability procedures; and assurances of the district’s commitment to administer a WtW program with all the necessary provisions and components.



Part I, Question # 23:

Is submission of Local Service Plans connected to your State Agency budget and/or the federal budget?

OASAS, OMH, and OTDA report that their Local Service Plans are connected to both their Agency budget and their federal budget.



Part I, Question # 24:

Are the (counties) monitored for compliance with the Agency-approved Local Service Plan?

All of the 10 participating State Agencies report that the counties are monitored for compliance with Agency-approved Local Service Plans.

If yes, how and by whom?

OCFS — OCFS Regional Offices monitor the counties through routine communication, periodic and (as indicated) on-site visits, and through

review of the required Annual Progress Reports. County Youth Bureaus and RHYA programs are monitored by the OCFS Bureau of Program Monitoring and Training. OCFS Central Office staff monitor Adult Services.

OASAS — The OASAS Planning and Policy Analysis Unit monitors compliance with guidelines and follows up with counties on missing items. OASAS encourages the full cooperation and participation of counties and providers in the planning process.

OMH — OMH Operations and Community Budget staff monitor different aspects of the Local Service Plan.

OMRDD — OMRDD District Office Directors and their designees monitor and provide technical support in program development.

OTDA — OTDA reports that these procedures are under development.

DOH — Central Office and/or Regional Office staff associated with individual programs conduct monitoring site visits, and review data or reports for program performance.

DPCA — Local Service Plans are monitored by a State PINS Interagency Team consisting of representatives from SED, OCFS, OASAS, OMH, and DPCA.

SOFA — SOFA program and fiscal staff review reported information and monitor programs.


SED — School Districts are monitored for compliance with Agency-approved Local Service Plans by BOCES, SED, and Regional School Support Centers.

DOL — Counties are expected to follow stated policies. Failure to do so is noted through State staff field presence, client fair hearings, and other means.

If yes, can rewards or sanctions be imposed?

Eight of the 10 participating State Agencies report that rewards or sanctions can be imposed for non-compliance with Agency-approved Local Service Plans. OCFS elaborates that if the county has received notice for non-compliance, and if the non-compliance issue remains uncorrected, a fiscal sanction can be imposed. DOH adds that it can impose sanctions through the non-payment of vouchers; it does not provide rewards. OASAS

elaborates that sanctions for non-compliance are “generally not” imposed. DOL reports that rewards or sanctions are *not* imposed. However, DOL adds that district compliance is ensured in part through fair hearing process and decisions.

 Part I, Question # 25:

Are the Local Service Plans’ outcomes evaluated?

Six of the 10 participating State Agencies report that their Local Service Plans’ outcomes are evaluated. OCFS CSP reports that some counties evaluate their Local Service Plans. OMRDD reports that programs and services are directly monitored by the related District Office Director, the CSB Director, and the MR/DD subcommittee of the CSB. DOH reports that their Local Service Plans are reviewed by regional and central office staff. DPCA reports that their Local Service Plans are evaluated by the State PINS Interagency Team. SED reports that it evaluates the School District’s Local Service Plans. DOL reports no but then elaborates that the Agency does evaluate whether districts meet participation rate requirements. OTDA reports that a Local Service Plan evaluation process is “under development.” OCFS CCP reports no, that counties need to have a process to evaluate outcomes. OMH, OASAS, and SOFA report that Local Service Plans’ outcomes are *not* evaluated.

Part I, Question # 26:

What would improve the current capacity of your (county) agencies to conduct planning activities?

OCFS — more technical assistance and training; improved access to information and information systems; increased technical expertise; more detailed (sub-county) data; more staff; more dedicated staff; and clearer directives from OCFS.

OASAS — identified by counties, funding for planning as their greatest need to fully comply with the OASAS planning requirements, followed by the need for additional technical assistance and information resources. OASAS elaborates that regardless of the level of support from OASAS, the capacity to conduct planning activities varies greatly from county to county.

OMH — development of local data systems with individual data elements. Additional local staff and infrastructure are also needed.

OMRDD — no recommendations at this time, as Local Service Plans submitted over the past 10 years have been streamlined and increasingly are in substantial compliance with requirements and submitted in a timely manner. The Agency attributes this progress to the close working relationship between OMRDD and the counties.

OTDA — standardization, by State Agencies, of the time frames and methodologies of Local Service Plans.


DOH — strengthened State infrastructure to support more training and technical assistance; more staff at the local level to complete Local Service Plans, including the Community Health Assessments; and specific training on use of data.

DPCA — integration of planning for the PINS population with other required youth and family services planning activities.

SOFA — additional funding and resources to enhance planning efforts; and opportunities for AAAs to contract with research organizations to conduct scientifically valid surveys of unmet needs.

SED — additional staff.

DOL — no need for help in conducting planning activities beyond the assistance currently available, as the counties are currently meeting local Plan requirements.

 Part I, Question # 27:

What specific supports (federal, State, foundations, etc.) are available to counties to develop Local Service Plans?

Nine of the 10 participating State Agencies report that they (or their Regional Offices or Field Offices) provide technical assistance to their local entities. OCFS adds that they provide some locally-relevant data, some funding for group meetings, some small planning grants, and some consultant services. Some OCFS local agencies also are able to leverage local resources. OMRDD adds that there are no specific federal or State funding streams or foundation options dedicated for local government planning of MR/DD planning; however, they report it is likely that specific

planning projects could be funded through the field-initiated grant program offered annually by the NYS Developmental Disabilities Planning Council (DDPC). OTDA adds that some counties have chosen to contract out the planning process using TANF Services funds to pay for contracts; and in some instances contract staff from SUNY Buffalo also have been assisting counties. DOH adds that technical assistance is provided through the Community Health Assessment. DOL reports that the Agency shares task force meetings, supports the New York Public Welfare Association, provides guidance by Welfare-to-Work staff and policy, and conducts regional meetings. SOFA reports that technical assistance is available to AAA planning personnel upon request. OASAS reports the provision of technical assistance and data resources to counties. OMH provides technical assistance through its field offices. DPCA reports technical assistance.

SED reports that they do *not* provide technical assistance to *all* School Districts, but rather only to low-performing School Districts and to others, on request, if staffing and time allow it. Special education provides technical assistance to all School Districts through regional Department staff and the Office of Vocational and Education Services for Individuals with Disabilities (VESID) funded Special Education Training and Resource Center network.

Part II, Question # 1:

How are Local Service Plans used at your Agency at both the central and regional level?

OCFS — At the Central Office level, the Local Service Plans are used for funding decisions; identifying technical assistance needs; ongoing development of the ICP agenda; data input for developing or responding to RFPs; and responding to federal requests for information. Local Service Plans are individually reviewed for approval and not aggregated, except to respond to specific issues. At the Regional Office level, OCFS CSP and OCFS CCP/RHYA Plans are used to identify technical assistance needs, and for developing or responding to RFPs.

OASAS — Local Service Plans are used for identifying local needs, goals and objectives, and programming priorities; soliciting funding requests for new and expanded programming through a Local Service Plan Supplement process; and surveying counties and providers on current important issues.

OMH — Counties must first submit Local Service Plans to the Office of Mental Health to receive State aid. OMH reviews these plans on both a Field Office level and Central Office level to assure that they conform with Mental Hygiene Law and Regulation, reflect OMH priorities, and are fiscally sound. The Local Service Plans also offer the opportunity for OMH Field Offices and Central Office to understand issues of needs and priorities for each county.

OMRDD — Local Service Plans are used to register concurrence in program and service development between the District Offices and the counties. Data from the plans are loaded into an Access database and are provided on request to senior management in OMRDD.

OTDA — Local Service Plans detail the provision of services necessary to facilitate the exit of “hard to serve” and other special populations from public assistance. To this end, Plans are used to monitor what local districts are doing and to share ideas within and outside of New York State to help further the objectives of welfare reform.

DOH — Local Service Plans provide some basic information about the counties in a centralized fashion and are used as the basis for reimbursement for the Article 6 Program.

DPCA — Local Service Plans are used to determine Plan relevancy; assess local progress toward goals and objectives; and enhance understanding of local PINS service delivery.

SOFA — Local Service Plans are used to assist NYSOFA in developing the Four Year Plan that is submitted to the Federal Administration on Aging and as the basis for monitoring and technical assistance efforts.

SED — Local Service Plans are used to identify and assist low-performing School Districts.

DOL — Local Service Plans are used for general information; to determine that local policy is legal; and by fair hearing staff to determine whether or not client complaints are valid.

Part II, Question # 2:

What is your Agency’s process for approving Local Service Plans, including who approves the plans?

OCFS — OCFS Regional Offices review the Local Service Plans and recommend their approvals to the Central Office; Child Care Services and Adult Services are specifically reviewed by Central Office staff. The OCFS Commissioner provides final approval for the Local Service Plans.

OASAS — Local Service Plans are reviewed for compliance with the guidelines and are accepted as complete after all Plan components are submitted. A separate review process is undertaken for approving proposals submitted through Plan Supplements that solicit requests for funding for specific initiatives. Goals and priorities included in the Local Service Plans are used in the OASAS long-range planning process.

OMH — Field Office staff and Central Office staff provide fiscal and programmatic review of Local Service Plans. The OMH Commissioner approves Local Service Plans based on program and fiscal staff recommendations.

OMRDD — Bureau of Planning and Service Design (BPSD) staff review the Local Service Plans. Upon review, either a recommendation for approval is made to Senior Management or, if the Plan is incomplete, a request is made for further information. The Plan is approved by the OMRDD Commissioner, his or her designee within Senior Management, or the Director of BPSD.

OTDA — Local Service Plans are reviewed to assure that all of the mandated elements are included. Separate projects are reviewed to be sure that the descriptions reflect services that can be approved; that the target population is correct; that the funds are not being used to “supplant” any other funds; and that all other elements of the project meet the established guidelines. The Plans are then reviewed by the OTDA Budget Office and finally by the State Division of the Budget (DOB). State DOB reviews the Plans of the 10 largest agencies (including New York City) in their entirety; a summary is used for the other 48 Plans. After DOB approval, a letter is sent to the local Commissioner of Social Services informing him/her of the Plan’s approval.

DOH — based on Article 6, Local Service Plans are reviewed by Regional and Central Office staff.

DPCA — a State PINS Interagency Team conducts in-depth reviews of each Local Service Plan, and provides feedback to the local PINS planning body. The Plan is approved by the locality before submission to the State Director of Probation and Correctional Alternatives. The State DPCA Director approves the Plan.

SOFA — Local Service Plans are reviewed and approved by designated program, fiscal, legal, and executive personnel, using well-defined review checklists.

SED — Local Service Plans are reviewed and approved by the School Districts and by BOSES representatives and staff. Regional School Support Centers and SED staff may review Local Service Plans developed by low-performing districts in order to help the district improve. Special education provides technical assistance for work on the SED CSPD plan. These plans may be reviewed by the BOCES Directors and the Unit Manager for Staff Development if the districts are identified as needing special assistance.

DOL — The process for approving Local Service Plans includes internal review by the Welfare-to-Work Division staff and by Counsel's office. Final approval is provided by the Welfare-to-Work Division Director.

Part II, Question # 3:

What criteria are used to determine the acceptability of Local Service Plans?

OCFS — The acceptability of the Local Service Plans is determined by OCFS Central and Regional Office staff, based on their technical and substantive adequacy, their completeness (all components are included), and the existence of negative or positive public comment (OCFS CSP only). OCFS CSP Regulation 407.7 contains four general acceptability criteria: compliance with requirements of process; inclusion of all required information and signatures; internal consistency (objectives, activities, and expenditures must all relate to identified needs); and inclusion of issues identified by the State in its analysis of economic/social indicators.

OASAS — Criteria used to determine acceptability of the Local Service Plans are the inclusion of required documents and the completeness of planning exercises by both the county and the service providers within the county.

OMH — The Local Service Plans must meet published fiscal and programmatic guidelines, as well as New York State and federal law.

OMRDD — Criteria used to determine the acceptability of Local Service Plans include the completeness of goals and objectives targeted to the time frame of the Plan (two years), and the completeness of all elements (e.g., target group) required for description of the goal activity.

OTDA — The acceptability of the Local Service Plan is determined through several questions. Does the Plan meet the guidelines? Are the projects targeted to the correct populations? Do we understand the project description? Does the budget amount match the allocation? Is the budget reasonable for the population served and the service being provided? Could or should these services be provided under another program? Other related issues, as needed, may be reviewed.


DOH — The acceptability of the Local Service Plan is determined through a review of responses to the Plans' checklist (questions that when answered in the negative must be explained). Explanations, if reasonable, are accepted. Acceptance also is based on knowledge of the county's situation, program policies, and relevant regulations/laws.

DPCA — Criteria for the acceptability of the Local Service Plan are determined through a review of the demonstrated local planning (which must include all relevant agencies' participation), and the presentation of meaningful Statements of goals, objectives, and strategies.

SOFA — Criteria for the acceptability of the Local Service Plan include compliance with a variety of New York State and federal requirements and staff assessments (based on the county's past performance) of the reasonableness of project expenditures and service levels.

SED — Local Service Plans are reviewed using a rubric, which sets forth the criteria for acceptability of the plan. The SED CSPD has a set of quality indicators that are used in reviewing these plans.

DOL — Criteria are based on answers to the questions: Is the policy legal and consistent with federal/State statutes and regulations? Is the policy fair and equitable?

 Part II, Question # 4:

Are Local Service Plans ever sent back for modifications?

Nine of the 10 participating State Agencies report that they send back Local Service Plans. OASAS indicates that they do *not* send back Plans but elaborates that they follow up with the counties on missing items from the Plans.

If yes, under what circumstances?

OCFS returns Plans to the Regional Office if they are incomplete or if they do not meet an acceptable level of adequacy. OMH returns Plans that do not meet programmatic or fiscal guidelines. OMRDD returns Plans if they are incomplete with respect to the presentation of goals and objectives targeted to the time frame of the Plan (two years) or if any element (e.g., target group) required for description of the goal activity is incomplete. OTDA reports that Plans are not returned in their entirety; rather, the local districts are requested to make amendments as necessary and resubmit these revised sections. DOH reports that unacceptable responses are questioned until an approval is received. DPCA returns Plans for failure to complete forms and checklist requirements and for inadequate goals, objectives, and strategy Statements. SOFA returns Plans for failure to comply with requirements, missing data, unreasonable projects, and lack of required signatures. SED returns Plans if low-performing students' needs are not addressed; districts are expected to revise them. SED CSPD Plans are not approved if they are not based on hard data, student progress, and student outcomes. DOL returns Plans when requirements are not met or when the Plan is not clear.

Part II, Question # 5:

Are Local Service Plans aggregated into your State Agency plan?

None of the 10 participating State Agencies report that Local Service Plans are aggregated into their State Agency Plan. However three participating State Agencies report other forms of incorporation of Local Service Plans. OASAS reports that information submitted in their Local Service Plans inform the OASAS long-range planning process and are an important resource in the development of long-range goals, objectives, and programming priorities. OMRDD reports that they do not aggregate their Local Service Plans; however, the Agency further comments that county-derived goals and objectives (consistently emphasizing the development of increased program and service capacity) are summarized in their five-year Plan. SED also reports that they do not aggregate their Local Service Plans and SED CSPD plans but further elaborates that the SED CSPD plans are reviewed on a regional basis to determine if there are regional training opportunities that the Special Education Training and Resource Centers (SETRC) can provide to a group of districts.

Part II, Question # 6:

Do you use the Local Service Plans for the allocation of State Agency funds?

Four (OMRDD, DOH, OTDA, and OASAS) of the 10 participating State Agencies report that they use Local Service Plans for the allocation of their State Agency funds. OMRDD reports that there is no one-to-one correspondence of county plans and allocated resources (because some counties may aspire to provide services or undertake activities for which sufficient or appropriate State or federal funds are not available). However, OMRDD continues, there is a close relationship generally between the service development mix (among types of services) in the county Plan and the mix of services that are subsequently funded. DOH reports that Local Service Plans are *not* directly used in the allocation of their funds, but they are sometimes used to try to explain variations in expenditure levels from year to year. OTDA reports use of the Local Service Plans based on the

legislative allocation for the programs. This legislative allocation is then sub-allocated to the local social services districts based primarily on the size of their temporary assistance caseloads. Often local districts with similar sized temporary assistance caseloads are grouped together. OASAS reports that proposals submitted through the Local Service Plan Supplement process must be consistent with the identified OASAS programming priorities. SED elaborates that allocation of State aid to School Districts is *not* based on the Local Service Plans but further explains that certain federal aid to School Districts is allocated on the basis of a local plan, as are all federal funds for special education.

Part III, Question # 1:

Do you have staff who provide planning support (training and technical assistance) to the local level?

All of the 10 participating State Agencies report that they have staff who provide planning support (training and technical assistance) to their local entities. SED qualifies their response by reporting that they do *not* provide planning support to *all* School Districts.

If yes, how and by and what type of planning support?

OCFS — Both Regional staff and Central Office staff provide planning support (training and technical assistance) in needs assessment; use of data; collaboration; setting, measuring, supporting, and monitoring of goals and outcomes; and developing strategies for resource allocation.

OASAS — Both Regional staff and Central Office staff provide planning support (training and technical assistance) in needs assessment, use of data, and service development.

OMH — Both Regional staff and Central Office staff provide planning support (training and technical assistance) in the use of data; field staff provide assistance in interpreting guidelines and resolving questions.

OMRDD — Developmental Disabilities Service Office (DDSO) staff are assigned in each of the 12 OMRDD district offices, by the DDSO Directors, as liaisons with specific, defined responsibilities to

work directly with counties in the development of their Local Service Plans. Planning support (training and technical assistance) includes needs assessment; use of data; and information on funding allocation options.

OTDA — Central Office staff provide planning support (training and technical assistance) in needs assessment, use of data, and developing and implementing Local Service Plans.

DOH — Both Regional staff and Central Office staff provide planning support (training and technical assistance) in needs assessment, use of data, and support in the correction of Local Service Plans.

DPCA — One DPCA staff person reviews Local Service Plans and is available to answer questions received from the counties. Another staff person is responsible for coordinating Juvenile Justice services Statewide.

SOFA — Central Office staff provide planning support (training and technical assistance) in issues such as needs assessment; use of data; clarification of compliance matters; and clarification of Local Service Plan guidelines.

DOL — Both Regional staff and Central Office staff provide planning support (training and technical assistance) in use of data (WMS) and in addressing required Plan elements and time frames.

SED — Planning support is provided to low-performing districts and to others on request. Support includes root cause analysis, data analysis, and professional development. Regional special education staff and the VESID-sponsored SETRC staff provide support for special education planning.



Part III, Question # 2:

Do you use consultants to provide planning support or training and technical assistance?

Eight of the 10 participating State Agencies report that they do not use consultants to provide planning support or training and technical assistance. DOH reports that, at times, consultants have been used to identify gaps in counties' abilities to conduct needs assessment, to assist counties in the development of Local Service Plans,

and to provide relevant training. SED reports that it has used consultants to provide training in data analyses, root cause identification, facilitation skills, and team building skills.



Part III, Question # 3:

Do you currently work closely with any other State Agency in the area of planning?

Eight of the 10 participating State Agencies report that they currently work closely with other State Agencies. DOH and DOL report that they do not. Although OTDA and SOFA report working with DOL, DOL clarifies that they do *not* work closely with other State agencies regarding local district employment plans. However, the local entities (social service districts) submitting the plans must coordinate with OTDA to maximize services and minimize duplication of effort.

If yes, which agencies and at what level?

OCFS — Agency staff work collaboratively with all of the agencies represented in the ICP initiative, TOUCHSTONES, Partners for Children, OTDA, OMH (at Regional meetings) and OASAS. Current planning collaborations are conducted at the Bureau Director level.

OMH — Staff work collaboratively, usually in both fiscal and program areas, with DOH, OCFS, SED and DOCS (Department of Correctional Services). Current planning collaborations are conducted at the Executive and senior staff level.

OMRDD — Personnel charged with working on children's services issues within the Upstate Regional Office in Albany collaborate frequently with SED planning at the policy level and with the DDPC at the level of policy, priorities, and pragmatics. OMRDD staff at the Bureau Director and Senior Management Levels collaborate with SED; and staff at technical, Bureau Director, and Senior Management levels collaborate with DDPC on a wide range of concerns.

OTDA — Staff work collaboratively with DOL, DOH, OCFS, OASAS, and SED. Current planning collaborations are conducted at the Commissioner's level and staff level.

OASAS — Central Office Planning staff and Program Bureau staff participate in State-level collaborative planning activities with OCFS and on

specific initiatives with other agencies such as OTDA, DPCS, and OMH.

DPCA — Staff work collaboratively with SED, OCFS, OMH, and OASAS. Central Office staff conduct current planning collaborations.

SOFA — Typically, collaborations occur on a case-by-case basis. An example would be a county proposal to consolidate a variety of human services, including aging services. SOFA has worked with DOL, DOH, and OCFS. Collaborations occur around Statewide policy and program implementation.

SED — SED collaborates with OCFS, OMH, OMRDD, OTDA, OASAS, and DPCA at various management and staff levels to address the needs of children.

Part III, Question # 4:

Has your Agency participated in any previous efforts to work cooperatively in planning for clients and/or for communities?

Nine of the 10 participating State Agencies report that they have participated in previous efforts to work cooperatively in planning for clients and/or for communities. DOL reports it has not done so.

If yes, what efforts and what outcomes?

OCFS — efforts with PINS, CCSI, NBA, and Integrated Planning 1992 – 1994.

OASAS — efforts with ADAC, TANF, Medicaid Managed Care, and previous integrated planning efforts related to youth.

OMH — efforts for specific population groups (children).

OMRDD — several efforts involving comprehensive children and youth services across service sectors. These efforts, which have constituted OMRDD's primary opportunities for such involvement, floundered on the futility of child and youth sector planning without participation of the local educational agencies, and in the absence of concrete linkages between counties and local educational agencies (LEAs).

OTDA — previous efforts to work

cooperatively “too numerous to mention.”

DOH — efforts to promote collaborative community health assessments and service plans by local Health Departments and hospitals.

DPCA — participation in the initial development of the 1985 State’s PINS Adjustment Services Act and program development; involvement in the CCSI initiative as a co-lead Agency on the Tier III Interagency group; and participation at the local level in the development of alternatives to incarceration for adults age 16 years and older (based on the Classification/ Alternatives Act/Chapter 907 Laws of 1984).

SOFA — collaborations typically on a case-by-case basis.

SED — efforts to address specific educational and social needs of students.

Part III, Question # 5:

What concerns (if any) do you have about interagency planning or any other interagency activities?

OCFS — Concerns include the long-term resource viability of the maintenance of effort associated with collaborative initiatives; the difficulty of maintaining a focused agenda; and the need of individual agencies to retain individual flexibility.

OMH — Concerns include the need to assure adequate and legal availability of resources for children with diagnoses of Severe Emotional Disturbance, and for adults with diagnoses of Severe and Persistent Mental Illness, that adhere to established principles, e.g. least restrictive services and assurance of the role of the family.

OMRDD — Concern is that there are some areas of service activity where joint planning would be helpful, but relevant State Statutes present conflicting time frames, purposes, and requirements for planning within the various Statewide and local health and human services agencies.

DOH — Concerns include the extent to which such planning will affect the quality and amount of information requested from the counties, which in turn affects the Article 6 Program and the Department’s ability to assure the public health.

The redundancy of planning activities, and the need to eliminate those redundancies without losing the specific focus of any one Agency’s planning requirements, are also reported as concerns by DOH.

DPCA — Concerns include the need to eliminate duplication of local and State planning efforts while integrating PINS planning efforts with planning for other youth populations.

SOFA — Major concern is having adequate staffing resources to devote to planning activities, to respond to the needs of individual AAAs and the Aging Network and to participate in interagency efforts.

OASAS — Concern is that certain Statutory and regulatory requirements, different stakeholders and constituencies, and different State and local organizational structures present limitations to integrated planning. However, there are areas of interagency planning that present opportunities for cooperation and collaboration, such as consistent planning cycles, data sharing and resource development, and the provision of technical assistance related to planning and needs assessment.

SED — Concerns include lack of staff to devote to planning; conflicting due dates, time frames, and requirements; and Statutory and regulatory requirements. In addition, there are very specific federal requirements that special education must address to ensure funding. Any joint planning efforts must continue to allow SED to meet those requirements. There are issues at the local level caused by the lack of consistency between geographic planning areas, specifically county vs. School District. The spirit of this ICP planning effort is to find ways to promote collaboration and joint planning to benefit all children within a community despite these differences.

DOL — Interagency planning is kept to a minimum at the State level with regard to local district employment plans in order to allow the local districts as much flexibility as possible in their development of local employment policy.

OTDA — There is no concern at present since they are relatively new to this area.

Part III, Question #6:

Does your Agency have a Mission Statement?

All 10 participating State Agencies report that they have a Mission Statement. The Mission Statements of OCFS, OMH, OMRDD, SED, and SOFA include a specific reference to services for children, youth, and families. DOL reports that, although its Mission Statement is a general document for the NYS DOL, local districts are required by State law to coordinate/cooperate with public and private education institutions, child care providers, child care resources and referral agencies (if available), labor unions, public and private employers, employment and training agencies, and Workforce Investment Boards (WIBs) when developing their local plans. DOL elaborates that the local plans require a planning effort and that families' supportive needs must be addressed. OTDA's Mission Statement includes a specific reference to local social services districts and greater self-sufficiency for the State's residents. The Mission Statements of OASAS, DOH, and DPCA do not include a specific reference to services for children, youth, and families.

