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OFFICE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

R14 Joint Agency Interoperability

1 With the understanding that the Department does not control all of the entities that enter data into the various health and human services systems maintained by the Department, how will the Department ensure the quality and fidelity of the data entered by their partners? Does the Department have a plan or standard operating procedures for data entry that are shared with their partners?

The Department’s current practice of managing data quality at the source system will continue. The Department provides user guides and required training for users who have the ability to record data in CBMS, ACSES, CHATS and Trails. These guides and standards serve as the basis against which counties are regularly audited by the Department’s Quality Assurance Program.

Because data quality is essential for success, the Joint Agency Interoperability program includes a data governance workstream. When parties begin utilizing the data they also work to improve its quality. The Caseworker View queries data from multiple systems and presents data side-by-side for the first time. Enabling users to easily identify discrepancies between systems, for example different client addresses, will serve to further improve data quality.

Two key principles adopted by the state’s Government Data Advisory Board support this:
   a. “Standardized data governance protects data and improves its quality and utility.”

The data governance workstream of JAI includes an OIT data architect, a CDHS data governance manager, data workgroups with technical and business subject matter experts, and a metadata repository. These resources are helping us enhance our understanding of available data, and work to improve quality and utility beyond what has been possible before.

2 Please address Joint Agency Interoperability system security concerns and provide a description of any plans or standards being developed with regard to system security. Please incorporate in this description a broader discussion on how the Department and OIT will ensure the security of the state’s Enterprise Service Bus as interoperability between various state systems is implemented.

The Joint Agency Interoperability (JAI) program is not a database or an application that stores data. It is a strategy for accessing data with improved efficiency. It is not a data warehouse. It does not actually remove data from any source system, but rather enables an authorized user with a specific role to query information on demand from multiple sources. The results of the query do not persist. No data is actually held in the Caseworker View.

Leaving data in source systems reduces security risk that otherwise would be present if we were storing and linking records from multiple systems. This principle is so important and foundational that the Interoperability Leadership Council formally adopted it as part of the vision and goals.
The JAI program is also providing for additional security on the source systems by adding two-factor authentication to ensure only authorized users are granted access.

The JAI program utilizes the OIT enterprise solution for APIs (application programming interface) and commonly referred to as the enterprise service bus (ESB). The ESB platform OIT has selected is Mulesoft.

- The state’s ESB architecture has been vetted by OIT security and has a robust system security plan also approved by the Chief Information Security Office.
- The API approach that the ESB platform enables is regarded as a best practice for data exchange. It ensures security and granular control of data as well as monitoring of use of the APIs. Legacy interfaces or point-to-point interfaces developed for specific projects or individual purposes rarely have such monitoring and reporting capabilities.
- A fundamental principle in the APIs built for JAI, is that both the business and technical owners of the source systems were integrally involved to ensure only the right data is shared.
- In addition to the monitoring described above, standardizing integrations on the ESB platform is much more secure than legacy methods that include moving flat files that could be intercepted, having users download state data freely into systems that aren’t vetted or monitored or using legacy exchange protocols that aren’t well documented or up to the latest security standards.

The Governor’s Office of Information Technology is delivering and maintaining the JAI environment as the Department’s IT Service Provider. OIT is an essential partner as technical owner of these key systems and services. All the work under the program is subject to OIT’s cyber security policies based in industry best practice following the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) model.

The Department is also accountable to numerous federal agencies including the US Department of Health and Human Services, US Department Agriculture, Social Security Administration and the IRS for data security, privacy and appropriate use. These federal entities regularly audit the Department and OIT for data handling practices. Throughout the JAI development the Department and OIT have consulted with federal partners to affirm the architecture complies with their additional security regulations. In a recent interaction it was noted that OIT security standards are more rigorous than one federal agency’s standards.

OIT, the Chief Information Security Office and the Joint Technology Committee endorse the JAI project as the state standard for data management.

3 Please provide the cost-benefit analysis conducted for this project and discuss the analysis’ methodology. Is this project’s cost justified through reduced operational and programmatic costs, better services, or both? If better services are part of the cost-benefits analysis, how were “better services” quantified?

The program’s annual cost across the population of 1.3 million recipients in the JAI programs is approximately $6 per person. The primary goal is to improve services and outcomes for the one in five Coloradans receiving these services.
Making the right information available to the right person at the right time has benefits to clients, workers, and impacts to the efficacy of our health and human services delivery system. The project planning has included cost-benefit analysis, and these are included in the Capital IT requests.
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Among the numerous benefits are:

a. **Improved customer experience** -- today applicants have to bring documentation to numerous physical locations to enroll in multiple programs. For example, a recently divorced mother who was until now a stay-at-home mom, may go to a county department of human services to establish child support. In a large county she will have to interact with a different worker to apply for food assistance. Yet another worker handles child care assistance so she can have her kids in safe, quality child care while she goes to job training, seeks and finds employment. A workforce center is likely located in a different physical location overseen by the department of labor. Applying for WIC (the nutrition program for women, infants and children) is often handled in a clinic overseen by the health department. Asking a person with limited resources to physically traffic their data around for repeat entry into multiple systems is a barrier to their success. Computers should be doing this work through a secure data exchange network.

b. **Improved caseworker experience** -- It's wasteful of our caseworker’s limited time and energy to type the same information into multiple systems. Additionally, a caseworker has to manually compile the pieces of a family’s situation through multiple sources. Presenting needed information on-demand in a single pane view overcomes this burden saving time.

c. **Increased prevention** -- a child who has both parents contributing financially to their care is more likely to be successful. Food assistance, cash assistance, child support are all tools to prevent child abuse and neglect. The same is true about child care assistance. Parents need a safe place for kids to be while they are working. The idea in cross-program data sharing is that if we can provide the right services early we can prevent entry into child welfare, or involvement with the Division of Youth Services, or Corrections. Those services come at a higher cost in dollars spent as well as the toll on people.

4 Please provide a description of the Joint Technology Committee’s role in authorizing and overseeing this project.

The JTC has approved the state matching funds each of the last five years as a 5-year Capital IT project. The Department has presented project updates in JTC Hearings each year. In September of 2018 the JTC authored a letter to our federal Medicaid partners in support of federal funding (JTC September 2018 Letter of Support)
Please provide a projection of the ultimate cost of incorporating services and programs beyond the traditional health and human services information technology systems. Please provide a discussion on the purpose of such an expansion.

The current budget does not contemplate additional expansion beyond health and human services.

Incorporating additional services and programs to the established interoperability platform becomes increasingly easier because of the extensive planning and technical architecture design that has happened over the past six years. The state will be able to leverage economies of scale due to the foundational investments of JAI.

In general terms, connecting a new data source entails purchasing additional software licenses and professional services to configure the connections. Costs are determined by the number of end users and volume of data to be exchanged.

If new domains are to be added to the infrastructure, costs and funders would need to be identified. Thoughtful and deliberate planning would be necessary. Increased scope that would require additional funding would entail review and approval by the legislature.
In the last several months, the Colorado Benefits Management System (CBMS) has experienced some operational difficulties, including the distribution of erroneous notifications for food and cash assistance reapplications and the system being inoperable for an extended period. Please answer the following:

- What happened and what actions were taken to fix these issues?

Response provided by the Office of Information Technology (OIT):

CBMS Transformation is a two-year project to migrate CBMS’ out-of-state data centers to Amazon Web Service (AWS) in September 2018, and to replace the eligibility worker screens within CBMS with a new Salesforce-based experience, which went live August 26, 2019. The goal has been to transition the 15-year-old system to a new and improved platform as efficiently as possible so counties can continue to meet Coloradans’ needs. The system was not available Monday August 26 or Tuesday August 27 as originally planned and overall performance for the first two weeks was at half the expected level of productivity. Additionally, while ensuring the production environment was performing as expected there were difficulties with the training and practice environments being available and updated as expected which have been resolved. CBMS has been operating and processing cases since August 28, albeit with some system slowness and errors that have impacted workload and the ability to process cases in varying degrees.

With a system upgrade of this magnitude, it is expected that some system slowness and issues will be identified, requiring responsive updates. These issues are being investigated on an ongoing basis and fixes are being implemented as quickly as possible. From go-live on August 26 through December 19 there have been 506 fixes or enhancements implemented in the system—most of which occurred during the evening or weekends. Note, while CBMS is an OIT project, the CBMS executive team consists of CDHS, HCPF, OIT, Counties, C4H, and the Governor’s Office. This collaborative team, working with the support of outside vendors, has worked strategically to complete that work outside of business hours or at times when we could minimize any impact on county workloads and consumers needing benefits. With the upgrade to a new interface, there also is a learning curve for county eligibility workers to adapt to the new look and feel. Despite our best efforts on the system slowness and the commitment of the counties, a backlog does still exist in certain counties.

CBMS performance continues to be monitored closely and averages more than 7,000 eligibility runs and 6,000 benefits authorizations daily, which surpasses the workload pre-Transformation although the Counties report that the new system remains less efficient from a case processing perspective than the previous CBMS system. CBMS partners continue to work with counties to identify and prioritize fixes and enhancements weekly. More than 30 on-site county visits have been conducted in an ongoing effort to identify anything that may be adversely affecting system performance or worker efficiency. The goal is a stable and efficient CBMS ASAP knowing for a large system an update such as this takes time.
Unrelated to Transformation, there was a planned major build on October 20 implementing new functionality in CBMS. Unfortunately, there was a defect associated with the build that resulted in some notifications of reapplication of benefits correspondence to erroneously contain another person’s name and household resources. This new code had been tested but the error only manifested during high system load. The defect was quickly corrected, the system was inspected, and load testing has been improved to prevent any recurrence. All processes to appropriately notify impacted clients and federal partners were followed.

- Have any system backlog issues arisen from these incidents? What has been done to address that backlog?

The recent increase in backlog is due to multiple factors, such as:

- CBMS system issues, as described above.
- Some counties were experiencing backlogs prior to CBMS Transformation.
- Some counties are experiencing staffing problems such as vacancies.
- Normal increase in applications driven by:
  - September: Back to school
  - October: Affordable Care Act (ACA) renewals (Medicaid only)
  - November: Connect for Health Colorado Open Enrollment; Low-income Energy Assistance Program (LEAP).

The key factor in eliminating the backlog is the continued stabilization of CBMS. While system stabilization continues, Department staff are supporting counties in multiple ways, including over the shoulder support, technical assistance for policy and process questions, county office site visits, and assistance working certain CBMS reports.

Additionally, counties are using mandatory and voluntary overtime to work through the case volume and have provided individualized support to their customers facing delayed benefits, including county-funded gift cards, additional referrals and assured assistance from local Food Banks, and direct food assistance provided at the county office.

- What are the anticipated state budgetary impacts of rectifying these issues?

The primary budgetary impact is in county offices, particularly related to the increased staff overtime. The Department is studying the budgetary impacts that CBMS Transformation had on both State agencies and county departments. Those findings will inform any potential future requests submitted to the General Assembly.

**TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES (TANF)**

7 The TANF caseload has declined by 5.6 percent since FY 2013-14, while expenditures have decreased by 1.3 percent in the same period. Please provide a brief description about the apparent disconnect between caseload decline and expenditures.
TANF expenditures are typically within two primary categories: basic cash assistance (BCA) and non-BCA expenditures. BCA expenditures have historically mirrored the trajectory of the Colorado Works caseload. In September 2018, the State enacted a 10% increase in the monthly BCA, as approved by the State Board of Human Services. Overall, this policy change resulted in a 3.6% increase in spending on BCA in FY 2018-19 compared to FY 2017-18. Non-BCA expenditures - which include supportive services, contracts, and administrative expenses - have fluctuated over time, compared to BCA, and are not as closely tied to caseload changes because counties have greater flexibility in non-BCA spending. Overall, these non-BCA costs have been trending downward since FY 2013-14, as presented in Chart 1.

**Chart 1: Colorado Works Expenditures**

![Chart 1: Colorado Works Caseload and Expenditures](image)

Chart 2 depicts monthly caseload (blue) and expenditures (orange) for BCA benefits. Similarly, this chart emphasizes that BCA expenditures have historically mirrored the caseload trajectory. The increase in September 2018 represents the 10% BCA increase, following which the trajectories become correlated again.
8 What are the requirements that a family must meet and maintain in order to qualify for Basic Cash Assistance (BCA) through the Colorado Works program?

To be eligible for Colorado Works Basic Cash Assistance (BCA), a family must have a child in the home (or pregnancy), be lawfully present, and have income below the income threshold for the family size, which is approximately 25% of the Federal Poverty Guidelines (FPG), equating to less than $6,000 for a family of three annually). Additionally, the family must cooperate with Child Support Services and be engaged in the Workforce Development program (unless exempt from the federal work required). Engaging in the Workforce Development program requires a household to enter into a plan outlining the various work activities (e.g. community service or job readiness) in which the adult(s) must participate in to remain eligible.

9 Since the program’s inception, has BCA benefit provided to families kept up with inflation and increases in the cost of living in order to maintain its value to meet families’ basic needs?

No, the value of basic cash assistance (BCA) benefits has eroded over time, as benefits have not been adjusted for inflation or cost of living increases. In September 2018, BCA increased 10% per action by the State Board of Human Services. This increase does not align benefits with inflation since 1997. The purchasing power of BCA benefits remains 13% less than in 1997, when the Colorado Works program was established. It should be noted that Colorado’s federal appropriation to implement the Colorado Works program has also remained stagnant since 1997.
The federal government has proposed a new rule for the work requirements for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), which is expected to take effect April 1, 2020. The new rule affects a state’s ability to seek a waiver for the requirement that able-bodied adults without children work at least 20 hours per week, or else they lose their benefits. SNAP statutes already limit adults to three months of benefits in a three-year period unless they meet the 20 hours per week work requirement. Please provide a detailed discussion on the potential impact of the proposed rule change, including:

- The impact on Colorado recipients of SNAP.

On December 4, 2019, the U.S. Department of Agriculture enacted new rules per Local Area Waivers for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). These rules are scheduled to be implemented on April 1, 2020. This rule will affect approximately 895 Able Bodied Adults Without Dependents (ABAWDs), ages 18-59 with no dependents, in five Colorado counties (Conejos, Fremont, Hinsdale, Huerfano, and Saguache) and the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe. The rule will impact an ABAWD’s ability to continue to receive SNAP benefits without participating in the work component of SNAP after three months. Because the five affected counties are currently waived from this requirement due to their high unemployment rates, it may be difficult for these 895 people to comply with the work component and may become ineligible for SNAP. This proposed rule will not impact initial eligibility determination for these individuals.

- The impact to CMBS from the proposed federal rules changes to SNAP.

The Department does not anticipate any CBMS changes will be required to comply with the recently finalized Local Area Waivers for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP).

- The impact on Departmental and county workloads

Any work required to educate affected customers about the rule change can be absorbed into State and county workloads. The rule will not require any additional work to determine SNAP eligibility. However, if all 895 individuals comply with the work requirement, it could increase the State’s workload. All five counties and the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe opted into a State Operated Employment First (the SNAP Employment and Training program) Program. When these customers enroll in Employment First, they will receive intensive case management services, provided by a State representative, including, but not limited to, developing employment plans and checking in with a case manager at least monthly. Thus, providing intensive case management to 895 individuals will dramatically increase the State workload.

- The experience of other states that have already implemented this type of change.

To date, no state has been required to comply with this type of change. All states will be required to comply with these new regulations in April 2020. In the short period since the rules were adopted on December 4th, the USDA, Food and Nutrition Services (FNS) has already held several technical
assistance calls with states regarding the implementation of these new regulations to address issues and guide implementation of the proposed changes.

**LOW-INCOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (LEAP)**

Please provide a regional breakdown of the LEAP utilization throughout the state, highlighting any significant regional differences.

During the 2018-19 LEAP season, more than 94,000 applications for assistance were received, of which 68,192 were approved and 9,818 were considered emergencies.

Low Income Energy Assistance Program (LEAP) benefits are related to heat costs by fuel type, determined after the household has met the income eligibility criteria. During the 2018-19 heating season, the average LEAP benefit in Colorado was $462.93. In Colorado, the top three heating fuel types are natural gas, electricity, and propane. Among households receiving LEAP benefits in 2018-19, average heating costs by fuel type:

- Natural gas = $341.20
- Electricity = $426.62
- Propane = $831.01

The geographical area along the Front Range (i.e. the I-25 corridor from Larimer County south through Pueblo County) has the highest concentration of LEAP clients with the lowest average heating costs per county (in addition to Garfield and Mesa Counties). This can be attributed to the concentration of natural gas as the primary heating source for these areas. Whereas, areas with smaller county populations and a proportionately higher use of propane as the primary heating source have a higher county average of heat costs than the Statewide average (see figure 1).
Figure 1. 2018-2019 LEAP Household (HH) Count and Average Benefit (AB) by County

Note. A blue highlight indicates the Average Benefit is less than the Statewide Average.
ADULT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS
AID TO THE NEEDY DISABLED (AND)

12 Please provide a brief description explaining the decline in caseload for the Aid to the Needy Disabled program and its relation to waiting times for Social Security Insurance disability determination.

The strong economy and low unemployment rates are potentially decreasing the overall Aid to the Needy Disabled-State Only (AND-SO) caseload numbers. The income limit for the AND-SO program is low ($217/month), and any income received by an AND-SO applicant results in a dollar for dollar decrease, with no disregards applied, which may make individuals ineligible for the program. Furthermore, program policy changes (including changes to the way sponsor income and resources are counted (Jan. 2014) and requiring clients to pursue all other sources of income (March 2014)) have created more stringent eligibility criteria thereby impacting the AND caseload. The Department has not seen any correlation between the AND caseload decline and the wait times for SSI determinations. Staff will continue to monitor this with the implementation of the AND Navigation assistance approved via HB 19-1223.

OLD AGE PENSION (OAP)

R24 OLD AGE PENSION ADJUSTMENT

13 Please provide a detailed table and brief discussion of recent actual Old Age Pension caseload and expenditure trends, breaking out expenditures for cash assistance and other administrative expenditures.

The Old Age Pension (OAP) caseload may be declining due to the strong economy. In general, individuals are choosing to stay in the workforce longer and are not accessing OAP benefits at age 60 at previous rates. (A recent study by the Bell Policy Center “Colorado’s Working Older Adults” https://www.bellpolicy.org/2019/11/13/older-adults-colorado-workforce/ provides some important context to this issue.) Additionally, the Department hypothesizes that the strong economy is enabling families to be able to support their first generation similar to the support provided prior to the Great Recession. Furthermore, program policy changes (including changes to the way sponsor income and resources are counted (Jan. 2014) and requiring clients to pursue all other sources of income (March 2014)) have impacted the OAP caseload.

Decreasing OAP expenditures are directly correlated with declines in OAP caseload and expenditures for cash assistance. Non-cash assistance expenses (e.g. burial reimbursements, state administration, county administration, IT support, or training) have remained relatively stable from year-to-year and comprise a small portion of the total OAP expenses (7.4% of the total in FY 2018-19).
Table 1: Old Age Pension (OAP) Caseload and Expenditure Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Caseload</th>
<th>Cash Assistance</th>
<th>Burial Reimbursements</th>
<th>State Administration</th>
<th>County Administration</th>
<th>Other*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFY 2014-15</td>
<td>23,147</td>
<td>$90,269,540</td>
<td>$1,257,785</td>
<td>$369,069</td>
<td>$2,566,974</td>
<td></td>
<td>$97,030,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFY 2015-16</td>
<td>23,058</td>
<td>$93,355,462</td>
<td>$1,359,074</td>
<td>$391,447</td>
<td>$2,566,974</td>
<td></td>
<td>$98,442,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFY 2016-17</td>
<td>22,462</td>
<td>$81,865,323</td>
<td>$1,434,363</td>
<td>$392,548</td>
<td>$2,566,974</td>
<td></td>
<td>$87,288,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFY 2017-18</td>
<td>21,557</td>
<td>$75,554,525</td>
<td>$1,358,099</td>
<td>$393,619</td>
<td>$2,566,974</td>
<td></td>
<td>$81,284,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFY 2018-19</td>
<td>20,482</td>
<td>$71,409,373</td>
<td>$1,265,086</td>
<td>$393,619</td>
<td>$2,566,974</td>
<td></td>
<td>$76,939,610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*’Other’ includes Adult Assistance Programs Indirect Expenses, OIT-CBMS Expenses, Staff Development Center Expenses, Electronic Benefit Transfer Services, and Systematic Alien Verification for Eligibility.

Chart 3: OAP Caseload

During the 2019 legislative session, the General Assembly passed H.B. 19-1223 (Social Security Application Assistance). How has the enactment and implementation of this bill affected the caseload for the Aid to the Needy Disabled Program?

The purpose of the HB 19-1223 (i.e. Navigator program) is to increase the rate and speed by which Aid to the Needy Disabled-State Only (AND-SO) participants attach to Supplemental Security Income (SSI). This program is intended to decrease the AND-SO caseload as individuals attach to SSI and leave the program at a higher and faster rate than they would have without Navigator services. The Department is currently working with Counties on implementing the program. As this is a new program, it is still too early to determine the exact impact of the program on the overall AND-SO caseload. The first year program evaluation will be released in early 2021.
In the last couple of years, federal funds for community services for the elderly have declined. Are the state and counties required to backfill the difference in funding?

The Department discussed the figures in Appendix A of the JBC Briefing document for Community Services for the Elderly (10D) with the JBC staff analyst and confirmed that the amount of $3,984,019 in Area Agencies on Aging (AAA) Administration Line for Actual in FY 2018-19 was incorrect in the document. The correct amount for this line for that year was roughly $1.8 million. As a result, there was not as drastic a change in federal funding in this line as was originally identified.

In addition, this line is for Informational purposes only. This means that the amount listed of $1,375,384 for the FY 2019-20 appropriation and for the request for FY 2020-21 are for informational purposes only and ultimately they may end up being higher than those figures and more in alignment with federal funding used in the past several years.

In the event that federal funding in the AAA Administration line were to decrease, and the subsequent allocation to each AAA were to be less than in prior years, each AAA could either reduce their administrative costs for that year or choose to use some of the state funding they receive in the State Funding for Senior Services line to supplement their administration budgets for that year. AAAs are permitted to use up to ten percent of their allocation from State Funding for Senior Services for administration expenses.

Senate Bill 15-109 (Mandatory Abuse Report For Adult With A Disability) expanded the mandatory reporting requirement for at-risk adults to cover known or suspected abuse of at-risk adults with intellectual or developmental disabilities. Please provide the following:

- What are the trends in reporting in the years since enactment and implementation of S.B. 15-109?

The increase in number of reports to Adult Protective Services (APS) each year since the enactment of SB15-109 has continued to outpace pre-mandatory reporting increases in the number of reports from year to year. In the three fiscal years prior to mandatory reporting (FY 2011-12 through FY 2013-14), reports to APS increased an average of three percent from year to year. In the most recent three fiscal years since enactment of SB15-109 (FY 2016-17 through FY 2018-19), reports to APS increased an average of 12 percent per year. Overall, since the enactment of SB15-109 in FY 2016-17, there has been a 41 percent increase in reports to APS and a 10 percent increase in cases, which are reports that are screened in for investigation. Further, as the table below shows, since the initial mandatory report bill was enacted in FY 2014-15 (SB13-111 – mandatory reporting for at-risk elders) there has been a 112 percent increase in reports and a 40 percent increase in resulting cases.
Chart 4: APS Reports and Cases FY 2013-14 through FY 2018-19

- Has the State's appropriation for this program kept pace with the reporting trends?

The state appropriation for Adult Protective Services (APS) administration was increased in FY 2016-17 as a result of a recommendation of the SB15-109 Task Group to address the anticipated increased workload at the county departments of human services as a result of the bill. Prior to FY 2018-19, county departments of human services did not use the full amount of the funding available in the APS Administration line for APS. In FY 2018-19, county departments of human services collectively overspent the APS administration allocation by approximately $78,000, resulting in one county department having to use county funds to supplement their APS program for that year. The Department is currently monitoring county department spending in this appropriation and conducting analysis to determine whether additional funding is needed to support county department administration of this program going forward. If the Department determines that additional funding is necessary, the Department will submit a decision item for additional funding in this line item. The Department is working closely with counties on whether the need exists for additional APS staffing and funding.

**R33 OLDER COLORADANS CASH FUND**

17 As Colorado’s population ages, it will have effects on programs and services offered statewide. What planning is the Department currently engaged in to address the forecasted needs of those Coloradans who rely on the services funded by the Older Coloradans Cash Fund? What are the future needs of this population and where are the funding gaps?

While the number of older adults is expected to increase in the coming years in Colorado, it is difficult to forecast exactly what the needs will be as a result of that demographic shift. To help plan
for the future, the Department’s State Unit on Aging has engaged in a number of stakeholder engagement, research and planning activities to try to identify future needs, including:

- The State Unit on Aging completed its four-year State Plan on Aging which was approved by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Community Living in September 2019. The State Plan identifies areas of focus for the next four years, as well as considerations related to the anticipated increase in the older adult population in the state in coming years. Here is a link to the Colorado State Plan on Aging: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1QE053acBijGoI3VZYPdaiy6Cv65hbKEk/view

- The Colorado Area Agency on Aging Association contracted with a vendor to complete the Community Assessment of Older Adults (CASOA) in 2018. The CASOA includes results of a survey of older adults in Colorado that provides a picture of service needs of older adults. The CASOA can be found here: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1jQGi0_XZsgygLZ01PCrtQP-iEjzkjDOr/view

- The State Unit on Aging staff meet regularly with the directors of the sixteen Area Agencies on Aging to engage in discussions about aging services policy and programs. The Department also seeks input from the Colorado Commission on Aging and the Strategic Action Planning Group on Aging (SAPGA) on the challenges facing older Coloradans.

In terms of the future needs of older adults in Colorado, it is important to note that the funding gaps differ from AAA to AAA. The need in the rural areas is not necessarily the same as those in the urban areas. The needs in all regions are impacted by service provider availability, geographic challenges, overall capacity and client preference. As a result, the future needs of older Coloradans are specific to each AAA region.

As the Request for Information submitted to the Joint Budget Committee in November 2019 indicates, the primary funding gap continues to be a need for additional funding to support existing services provided by the Area Agencies on Aging. These services are designed to help older adults remain in their home and community and include services such as home delivered meals, congregate meals, transportation, personal care, etc. The Department submitted a budget request last year that was approved for an increase of $3 million in spending authority from the Older Coloradans Cash Fund each year for five years beginning in FY 2019-20.

Finally, it is important to note that the State Unit on Aging is continuously working collaboratively with the Area Agency on Aging Directors and other aging services stakeholders to ensure that programs and services are relevant and continue to address the needs of the population. Examples of this include the addition of innovative programs and services, funding to build service capacity and addressing capital improvement needs.
Please provide an overview of the various early childhood-related requests within the Governor's budget, including an description of the coordination between the various Executive Departments affected by these requests. Please address the following:

The evidence is clear that quality early childhood education enhances social skills, improves learning outcomes, helps to identify special education needs more quickly, and even leads to higher postsecondary attainment. The Governor’s FY 2020-21 Budget request is focused on building capacity for and increasing access to high-quality early learning and care for children from birth through kindergarten entry through collaborative efforts across multiple Departments. The Governor’s Office convenes regular cross-agency working group meetings to align Executive Departments’ unique roles in increasing access to quality early education, building workforce and facilities capacity, and improving overall child care quality; these sessions have included the Department of Human Services, Department of Education, Department of Labor and Employment, Department of Local Affairs, and Department of Higher Education.

- **How will the Executive Branch ensure these efforts are coordinated across departments and implementing partners?**

The Executive Branch uses a number of tools to increase coordination and alignment between agencies and as part of the overall administration’s agenda. First, the administration holds monthly Education and Workforce Cabinet meetings where Executive Branch leaders are able to share with each other and the Governor’s Office what they are working on and how they are progressing towards their individual and common goals related to early childhood education. The Governor’s Office also provides a coordinating function between the participating agencies at these meetings, sharing with them administration-wide updates and other timely information and strategic direction related to early childhood. The progress towards these goals is also shared publicly through the Governor’s Dashboard, such as performance metrics on the Education and Workforce Wildly Important Priority to “ensure all Coloradans have access to opportunities for quality, life-long education connected to the future of work.” In addition, the administration hosts biweekly meetings between the two agencies most involved in early childhood education: the Colorado Department of Education and the Colorado Department of Human Services. These meetings focus on reducing any areas of overlap and taking advantage of each agency’s expertise in the development and implementation of key early childhood priorities. The Executive Branch will continue to conduct all of these coordinating initiatives on an ongoing basis.

- **How do these efforts interact with the recent full funding of kindergarten?**

The Governor was elected on his promises for big, bold solutions to the challenges facing early childhood and K-12 education, and has been very pleased with the implementation of full-day kindergarten. However, there is still more work to be done to ensure that all children in Colorado enter kindergarten ready to learn and succeed academically and throughout life. The Governor’s FY 2020-21 Budget continues to invest in high-quality early learning experiences that will enable students to succeed throughout their school years.
[Background: JBC Staff Briefing Page 31] The Department request identifies a target of 34.0 percent of the licensed child care providers to be rated as high quality through CO Shines QRIS by FY 2021-22. Please provide/answer the following:

- A justification for the provision of full funding to meet this goal a full fiscal year early.

The process to pursue and improve quality is approximately an 18-month process. Once a provider decides to invest time into assessing and improving their quality, the provider engages in Colorado Shines at a Level 2 by conducting a self-assessment to determine areas in need of improvement, such as family engagement or professional development of staff. Staff are then required to complete Level 2 training courses: a series of free, online courses that expand the staff’s knowledge of quality indicators. After Level 2 has been confirmed by Child Care Licensing, providers may seek out additional supports, such as coaching, professional development or enhanced learning materials. Providers often need financial assistance in attaining these services or materials and may apply for the Department’s quality improvement funds. Those providers enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with their local Early Childhood Council, which then helps connect the provider with the resources and supports needed to be rated as “high-quality” (Levels 3-5). All programs agree to be rated within the specified timeframe (typically 18 months).

Since 2017, quality improvement funding has been restricted to those programs that have at least achieved a Level 2. This request allows for all licensed, eligible programs, including Level 1, to apply for and receive quality dollars to support their goals in improving quality. For instance, a Level 1 program may not have the resources to spare staff time for additional training, so funds would be used to provide substitute care while staff complete training.

- What happens to the requested funding once the goal is achieved?

The 2022 goal the Department set is considered an incremental goal. The Department is requesting ongoing funding to support programs to both improve and maintain quality early care and education settings for the children they serve. According to the 2019 Colorado Birth Through Five Needs Assessment conducted for the Department, which estimated actual demand for licensed child care, the state has only 33% of the infant slots and 60% of the toddler slots desired by parents. As the supply of licensed child care, particularly for children ages 0-3, is woefully low compared with demand, the Department is working on strategies to increase supply and expects the continuation of these quality improvement dollars will be needed to engage and incentivize newly licensed programs to improve their quality. Over time, existing high-quality programs are expected to sustain the changes on their own, but there will constantly be an influx of newly licensed programs that are expected to need quality supports and resources.

- Did the Department consider an incremental approach that would provide verifiable results justifying additional funding? If so, please provide the justification for why this approach was not pursued.

The goals the Department has set are incremental, starting with the goal of 28% by July 2020 and moving to the goal of 34% by 2022. However, because it takes approximately 18 months to work
with providers to truly improve their quality levels, the Department needs the funding to start in FY 2020-21 to meet the goal of 34% by 2022.

- **What is the long-term desired rate of licensed child care providers achieving a CO Shines QRIS rating of high quality?**

All regulated child care providers serving children prior to kindergarten entry are required to participate in the Colorado Shines Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS) at a Level 1, as long as they are in good standing with state regulations. (Programs that have had their licenses revoked, denied, or suspended are not in good standing and are ineligible.) As shown in the table on page 29-30 of the briefing document, as of September 2019, this included 3,800 programs. The remaining 1,170 providers (resident camps, school-aged child care centers, and neighborhood youth organizations) were ineligible for rating because they were serving only school-age children, after kindergarten entry.

As the number of programs reaches a sufficient level in number and geographic dispersion, the Department ultimately plans to pursue a policy change requiring any licensed child care program that accepts the child care subsidy payments from the Colorado Child Care Assistance Program to be rated at a high-quality level (Levels 3-5).

This is a policy other states have adopted to ensure the vulnerable children served in child care subsidy programs are ready for kindergarten and beyond. As an example, Wisconsin has adopted this policy. There are 3,719 licensed child care programs serving children prior to kindergarten in this state and 2,061 (55%) of these programs are rated high-quality (Levels 3-5).

Minimally, the Department is interested in achieving similar rates of high-quality ratings of comparable QRISs in other states. Based on the most recent report from the National Center on Quality Assurance, the percentage of other states' programs at high-quality levels in all similar Quality Rating systems was 45%1 in 2017.

20 Please provide a detailed discussion of the CO Shines Quality Rating and Improvement System (CO Shines QRIS), how it interacts with the licensing of child care providers, and how it is intended to be used by parents in their search for child care providers. Please include an analysis of how the rating system affects the cost of child care.

Child care licensing is the first step in the Colorado Shines, the state's Quality Rating and Improvement System (QRIS). All licensed providers serving children prior to kindergarten entry are rated a Level 1. The Division of Early Care and Learning monitors all licensed providers for compliance with health and safety rules and requirements. The minimum health and safety standards include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Health and safety training that covers 11 broad areas, such as the prevention and control of infectious diseases, building and premises safety, medication administration and disaster preparedness.
- Pre-service and ongoing training requirements for staff members on health and safety topics.

---

• Age-specific standards for group size limits, child-to-provider ratios, learning environment requirements and staff qualifications based on Caring for Our Children: the National Health and Safety Performance Standards; Guidelines for Early Care and Education Programs.
• Criminal background checks on child care providers and staff members that include criminal fingerprint-based background checks (Federal Bureau of Investigation, and Colorado Bureau of Investigation), abuse and neglect records repository checks (Trails), as well as state and national sex offender registry checks.
• Compliance with the child abuse reporting requirements of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act.
• Emergency preparedness drills including shelter-in-place, lockdown, and active shooter. Emergency planning including reuniting families after a disaster, continuity of operations and planning for children with disabilities or access or functional needs.

Level 1 is the first step in a program's quality process under Colorado Shines. Level 2 is the next step in the rating system. Level 2 programs, in addition to being in good standing with child care licensing, must have at least 75% of their staff complete 10 hours of Colorado Shines Level 2 coursework on the Colorado Professional Development Information System (PDIS); complete a simple yes/no quality indicator self-assessment; and create a quality improvement plan.

Quality Levels 3, 4 and 5 are determined by points. Programs earn these levels by meeting quality indicators in and across five categories of standards: workforce and professional development; family partnerships; leadership, management & administration; learning environment and Environment Rating Scale score; and child health. The quality indicators assessed in quality Levels 3-5 are those for which data and research indicate a positive impact on a child’s school readiness and early childhood development. This positive impact on a child’s school readiness and early childhood development is why only Colorado Shines Levels 3-5 are considered high-quality, and why the Department is committed to supporting programs in achieving higher quality levels.

As participation in Levels 2-5 is voluntary, this empowers both the provider and individual consumer choice, which reinforces family options. Not all child care programs will choose to obtain higher quality ratings, and not all families will choose programs with higher quality rating levels. Cost, location and availability are all also important considerations for families in choosing care.

The Office of Early Childhood does not currently collect data on the rates charged (price) by quality rating. The price of child care is primarily market-driven. According to national and state-level surveys, parents want quality care for their children, but most often prioritize cost and location of child care above all other factors. Providers’ cost, not necessarily price, is primarily driven by staff wages, staff benefits and real estate prices -- which in turn are highly correlated with price. But given the variability of price across the child care sector, these costs are not the only factor driving price. Many high-quality providers are non-profits or Early Head Starts and Head Starts that do not charge or highly discount their rates; others are private for-profit providers who determine their rates according to the calculations they need to make as a small business.

Colorado Shines provides valuable information to consumers (i.e. parents and caregivers) to make informed choices about child care by providing information on location, the history of compliance with health and safety (through licensing reports of inspection), and the provider’s level of quality, as rated.
Please provide the citations and source references for the research and data used to justify the classification of this request as “evidence-informed” on the evidence based continuum.

There are several longitudinal studies establishing the efficacy of quality early care and education programs: the Perry Preschool Project, the Abecedarian study, and the Chicago Longitudinal Study.

The Perry Preschool Project, carried out from 1962 to 1967, provided high-quality preschool education to three- and four-year-old children living in poverty and assessed to be at high risk of school failure. This randomized research effort is an ongoing, longitudinal study. Participants in the program continue to be compared to their non-participant peers in terms of educational and various life outcomes. Over the several decades since services were provided, the study has found that participants with high-quality preschool program experiences had better educational outcomes, more economic success in adulthood, fewer criminal arrests, and less reliance on public assistance than their counterparts without high-quality preschool, resulting in public benefits savings of $105,324 per participant. The most recent results have shown that the positive impacts of the program extend to the children of the participants, as they were significantly more likely than children of non-participants to graduate high school without suspension; to never suffer from addiction or be arrested; and to be employed full-time. In short, the results show that the benefits of high-quality early education for vulnerable children are significant and multigenerational. Research by James Heckman, a Nobel Prize winning economist from the University of Chicago, has shown that every dollar invested in high-quality birth to five early childhood education for disadvantaged children delivers a 13% annual return on investment, significantly higher than the 7-10% return delivered by preschool alone. Extensive information regarding the Perry Preschool Project can be found at the Heckman Equation: https://heckmanequation.org/.

The Abecedarian project was a comprehensive early childhood education program for young children at risk for developmental delays and school failure. The program operated at a single site in North Carolina between 1972 and 1985, and underwent numerous assessments of its long-term effects on participants as compared to a control group of non-participants. Results for participants include reduced rates of grade retention; improved reading and math scores; higher rates of college attendance; decreased rates of teenage pregnancy; and decreased rates of depression and marijuana and cigarette use in adulthood. Information regarding the Abecedarian project can be found here: https://abc.fpg.unc.edu/abecedarian-project.

The Chicago Longitudinal Study is a federally-funded research project examining the effects of the Child-Parent Center (CPC) Program in Chicago. The CPC offers quality early education and family support services to low-income, minority families from preschool to third grade. The study has followed participants in the CPCs since 1985-1986. Statistically significant outcomes of participants compared to their non-participant peers include: improved life-time economic well-being; lower delinquency and crime rates; and reduced need for remedial education and child welfare services, among others. More information on the Chicago Longitudinal Study can be found here: https://innovation.umn.edu/cls/.

The Colorado Shines Rating System draws on the findings from the Perry Preschool Project, the Abecedarian study, and the Chicago Longitudinal Study, along with studies on how to improve and
measure the quality of early childhood environments. Between 2015 and 2017, the quality improvement rating system (QRIS) underpinning Colorado Shines, underwent a comprehensive validation study, available at:


Numerous other studies support the effectiveness of high-quality child care; for reference, these include:


OSPB and the Department determined that this request is currently at an evidence Level 4 given the number of longitudinal, randomized studies that demonstrate a link between high-quality early care and learning with positive social and academic outcomes in both the short- and long-term.

22 Please provide a regional breakdown of licensing activities, including inspections, across the state. Are inspectors located around the state or are they centrally based?

In 2014, the department conducted a Lean process improvement exercise. As a result, all licensing specialists are geographically located throughout the state and are assigned caseloads by zip code within their geographic location. This has greatly cut down on travel time and costs and allows licensing specialists the ability to foster relationships within their communities.

The Department’s current staffing caseloads are approximately one licensing specialist for every 83 licensed programs (1:83). Under the Department’s request, licensing caseloads would be allocated geographically throughout the state by decreasing all staffing caseloads to approximately 1:78.

23 Senate Bill 17-110 (Accessibility Of Exempt Family Child Care) exempted certain types of child care providers from licensure. Please provide a discussion of the effects of this statutory change had on licensing caseload and the ratio of inspector to licensed child care providers.

SB17-110 was an effort to recognize that family, friend and neighbor care was already occurring unlicensed, despite the fact that it was not exempt under the law. SB17-110 expanded the exemption to address the discrepancy between what was happening in reality (e.g., “nanny sharing”) and what was expected of the state to enforce. Based on the data the Department has collected, the exemption allowing for the care of up to four unrelated children that was added in SB 17-110 has not had a significant impact on licensed child care capacity since the implementation in August 2017. In addition, SB17-110 has had no effect on child care licensing staff caseloads.

R2 Early intervention caseload
The Department reports that as of August 2019 an average of 9,467 children were enrolled in the Early Intervention Program per month. What is the estimated total population eligible for early intervention services in Colorado?

A conservative estimate is that 7.5% (15,074) of the total 0-3 child population (201,809) would be found eligible each year. This is in comparison to the current percentage identified of 4.5% (9,039). Referral of a child for early intervention (EI) services may be made by anyone who suspects a child may have a delay in development. Additionally, certain diagnoses automatically qualify children for EI services. During FY 2018-19, 18,162 children were referred to EI. Of the referrals received 10,881 (60%) had an evaluation to determine whether a significant delay exists or, if the child has an automatically qualifying diagnosis, an assessment to determine the proper supports and services. Of the children who were evaluated, 9,039 (83%) were determined eligible for services and entered the program. The Department continues to engage in activities to decrease the number of children who do not complete the eligibility process due to inability to contact and/or engage the families. As the state continues to refine its processes, an additional 6,000 children could be reached over time.

How does the Department plan to expand services to the segment of the eligible population that is not currently participating in the Early Intervention Program?

The Department is already increasingly reaching a larger number of the children eligible for EI through increased outreach and enhanced collaboration across a referral network, which includes physicians, Child Welfare, and Level 1 Neonatal Intensive Care Units. This is reflected by EI caseload growth outpacing population growth in this age group.

The Department plans to continue to ensure additional eligible children are reached through leveraging our extensive referral network. While primary care physicians are the number one referral source (31%), children are not required to see their physician to be referred. Other significant sources of referral are: hospitals (23%), parents (self-referral) (21%), and child welfare (11%). The remaining 14% of referrals come from Early Head Start/Head Start, EI service providers, public health, home visiting programs, child care and Early Childhood Councils.

During FY 2018-19, 18,162 children were referred to EI. Of those children, 5,891 were not enrolled in EI services due to difficulty contacting the family or the family declining to participate in the program. Activities to increase engagement of families are ongoing through collaborative efforts with CDHS Child Welfare, Assuring Better Child Development (ABCD), the OEC Division of Early Care and Learning (child care) and other home visiting and preventative programs within the OEC Division of Community and Family Support such as Family Resource Centers. Additionally, HB 18-1333 required the Department to work collaboratively with the Colorado Department of Education and stakeholders to determine the future administration of early intervention evaluations. One intent of the taskforce recommendations was to eliminate some of the confusion experienced during the referral and evaluation process, which may lead to a greater uptake of families engaged in the process.

R3 Colorado Child Care Assistance Program
The Department indicates that Colorado Child Care Assistance Program (CCCAP) funding can only provide assistance to about 9.0 percent of those eligible statewide. Why has the Department not requested an increase in funding to serve more children that are eligible?

The Department is requesting a $6.7 million increase in funding for the Colorado Child Care Assistance Program (CCCAP) to better align reimbursement with private pay models, which is expected to increase the number of high-quality providers participating in the program. Private pay families typically pay in advance for a full month of care, regardless of whether the child is absent due to sickness or family scheduling. However, this is not the case for CCCAP. The additional funding for CCCAP direct services will enable the program to maintain service levels for the approximately 28,000 children currently participating in CCCAP while increasing their access to high-quality care as it begins to mirror private pay models.

The Department prioritized the payment model changes in FY 2020-21 to ensure sustainability of the CCCAP program through a reimbursement method that supports child care providers' investment in maintaining staff and improving quality. The CCCAP program can only expand if there are quality child care providers with the capacity to support the growth. The alignment of reimbursement with private pay models is foundational to increasing the number of CCCAP children in high-quality care.

The Department proposes increasing the county share of CCCAP funding back to 12.4 percent of the total appropriation. What is the source of funding for the county share (e.g., federal funds versus county General Fund)?

County general funds.

How would the proposed increase affect each of the 64 counties in the state?

Of the $2,666,581 cash fund increase proposed in the budget request, $1,929,474 is attributable to the refinance of the county share. Table 2 shows the impact of the proposed increase to county share on each county in the state. Since the FY2020-21 allocation formula has not been finalized, the estimated increases are shown based on the FY 2019-20 county allocation amounts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>FY 2019-20 County Share of Allocation</th>
<th>% of Allocation</th>
<th>Proposed Refinance of County Share</th>
<th>Proposed % of Allocation</th>
<th>Amount of Proposed Increase</th>
<th>Increase to % of Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>$1,492,229</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$1,739,477</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$247,248</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alamosa</td>
<td>$67,215</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$78,352</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$11,137</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe</td>
<td>$1,296,033</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$1,510,773</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$214,740</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archuleta</td>
<td>$24,320</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$28,350</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$4,030</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baca</td>
<td>$10,295</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$12,001</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$1,706</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bent</td>
<td>$12,634</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$14,727</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$2,093</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder</td>
<td>$555,283</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$647,288</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$92,005</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomfield</td>
<td>$74,527</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$86,875</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$12,348</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaffee</td>
<td>$22,554</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$26,291</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$3,737</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheyenne</td>
<td>$3,465</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>$4,039</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$574</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Creek</td>
<td>$8,596</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$10,020</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$1,424</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conejos</td>
<td>$24,022</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$28,002</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$3,980</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costilla</td>
<td>$11,429</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$13,323</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$1,894</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowley</td>
<td>$10,580</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$12,333</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$1,753</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custer</td>
<td>$8,230</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$9,594</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$1,364</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>$62,856</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$73,271</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$10,415</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>$2,023,694</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$2,359,000</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$355,306</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores</td>
<td>$4,207</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$4,904</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$697</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>$197,301</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$229,992</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$32,691</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>$102,373</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$119,335</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$16,962</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elbert</td>
<td>$18,776</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$21,887</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$3,111</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>$1,568,903</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$1,828,855</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$259,952</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>$102,980</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$120,043</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$17,063</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td>$156,331</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$182,233</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$25,902</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilpin</td>
<td>$8,070</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$9,407</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$1,337</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand</td>
<td>$20,504</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$23,901</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$3,397</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunnison</td>
<td>$19,670</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$22,929</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$3,259</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinsdale</td>
<td>$2,390</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$2,786</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$396</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huerfano</td>
<td>$12,362</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$14,410</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$2,048</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>$1,756</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$2,047</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$291</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>$835,421</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$973,842</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$138,421</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiowa</td>
<td>$2,750</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>$3,206</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$456</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kit Carson</td>
<td>$12,355</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$14,402</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$2,047</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>$14,395</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$16,780</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$2,385</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Plata</td>
<td>$78,908</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$91,982</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$13,074</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larimer</td>
<td>$568,999</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$663,277</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$94,278</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Animas</td>
<td>$31,381</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$36,581</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$5,200</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>FY 2019-20 County Share of Allocation</td>
<td>% of Allocation</td>
<td>Proposed Refinance of County Share</td>
<td>% of Allocation</td>
<td>Amount of Proposed Increase</td>
<td>Increase to % of Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>$8,081</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$9,420</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$1,339</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>$55,812</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$65,059</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$9,247</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>$373,499</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$435,384</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$61,885</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral</td>
<td>$480</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$559</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$79</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moffat</td>
<td>$23,640</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$27,557</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$3,917</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montezuma</td>
<td>$79,071</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$92,172</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$13,101</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montrose</td>
<td>$114,682</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$133,684</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$19,002</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>$68,383</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$79,713</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$11,330</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otero</td>
<td>$62,191</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$72,495</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$10,304</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouray</td>
<td>$4,596</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>$5,358</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$762</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>$19,473</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$22,700</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$3,227</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>$9,976</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$11,629</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$1,653</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitkin</td>
<td>$20,140</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$23,477</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$3,337</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prowers</td>
<td>$38,676</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$45,084</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$6,408</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo</td>
<td>$522,241</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$608,771</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$86,530</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Blanco</td>
<td>$10,346</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$12,060</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$1,714</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande</td>
<td>$32,132</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$37,456</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$5,324</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routt</td>
<td>$30,141</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$35,135</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$4,994</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saguache</td>
<td>$17,914</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$20,882</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$2,968</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>$797</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>$929</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$132</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Miguel</td>
<td>$10,404</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$12,128</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$1,724</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedgwick</td>
<td>$5,336</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$6,220</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$884</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit</td>
<td>$39,594</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$46,154</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$6,560</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teller</td>
<td>$34,417</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$40,120</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$5,703</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>$7,922</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$9,235</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$1,313</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weld</td>
<td>$557,530</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$649,907</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$92,377</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuma</td>
<td>$29,803</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>$34,741</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>$4,938</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,645,071</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,574,545</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,929,474</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**R8 Scholarships for Early Childhood Educators**

Please provide a detailed discussion of the merits of loan forgiveness versus scholarships as a tool to encourage individuals to pursue a career in early childhood education. Please indicate why the Department chose to pursue a scholarship program.

The Governor's office has a multi-agency, comprehensive approach to recruit, train, and help retain early childhood professionals. As part of this plan, the Governor's Office utilized loan forgiveness as a tool in its R-10 request through the Department of Higher Education (DHE) to help retain existing early educators and increase their take-home pay through reduced debt burden. However, early childhood professionals typically make very low wages ($14/hour) and may not pursue...
significant college loans in order to enter and remain in the field; so, the Governor’s Office also proposed TEACH scholarships in this budget request as another tool to help existing providers enhance their qualifications without the barriers that student loans pose to many populations, including professionals already in the early childhood workforce. TEACH Scholarships also provide incentives to retention through a salary raise or bonus upon completion of the program. In addition to strong retention outcomes of TEACH in Colorado, this program has more than two decades of positive results nationally, according to the national TEACH website, including 94-96% annual retention rates, 9% annual wage increases, 14-16.7 average annual credit hours earned and a strong diverse participating population with half or more teachers being of color and from families without a college degree (https://teachecnationalcenter.org/t-e-a-c-h-early-childhood/results/).

The Department is requesting 1.0 FTE to further evaluate the effectiveness of these various strategies (scholarships, loan forgiveness, tax credits and other early childhood workforce policies) to ensure the state has a robust and qualified early childhood workforce to meet the demands of families.

The Governor’s Office has developed the following infographic on the continuum of early childhood educator workforce budget requests -- spanning across recruitment to training and retention -- of which the Department’s TEACH scholarships request is one.

**R31 Resource and referral funding reduction**

Would the proposed shift of funding from resource and referral services to offset the cost of quality improvement grants reduce services to any individuals or families?
Families’ access to resource and referral services will continue through the existing centralized state-wide call center, which provides families with referrals to local child care services. The statewide call center will also continue to help coordinate with key local entities, particularly local Early Childhood Councils, throughout the state and will serve as a centralized hub for families, connecting parents to various early childhood services to match their needs, which could include child care and preschool.

Child care resource and referral (CCR&R) agencies are currently housed regionally within local Early Childhood Councils. The councils are already statutorily responsible to increase and sustain the quality, accessibility, capacity and affordability of early childhood services. The Department and the Early Childhood Councils will need to absorb specific responsibilities that currently fall under the CCR&Rs, such as providing face-to-face referrals in an emergency as well as local disaster preparedness planning for child care. As there are now 34 Early Childhood Councils across the state, representing 63 of 64 counties, the Department believes Early Childhood Councils should serve as the local single point of contact for families and providers, and that these duties would best fall under the Early Childhood Councils’ statutory responsibility to develop and implement a comprehensive system of early childhood services with their community. All families will continue to have access to CCR&R services through the state-wide call center, which accommodates families with a range of referrals, as well as offers translation services and more consistent customer service to ensure that the experience of families utilizing this service is positive. In addition to phone calls, families also have access to these services through multiple means of communication, such as chat, email and text.

The Joint Budget Committee recent heard a presentation from Mile High United Way regarding their 2-1-1 program, which is a confidential and multilingual service that refers callers from across the state to non-emergency health and human services resources. Is there overlap between Mile High United Way’s 2-1-1 program and their contract to provide a statewide, centralized Child Care Resource and Referral call center? If so, please provide a brief description.

The Colorado Shines statewide call center was solicited through a competitive Request for Proposal (RFP) process. Mile High United Way was awarded this contract in 2016. The scope of this contract is to support families in their search for child care by delivering high-quality consumer education and local child care referrals to families with young children. Mile High United Way provides services in multiple languages and collects detailed call data for the Department.

Separately, Mile High United Way is part of the 2-1-1 network that supports a much broader array of services for individuals of all ages.

Do all of the 16 service agencies affected by this request agree that they should be centralized? Do they support this request?

Only the call center function is centralized, and it has been since 2016. Other services – awareness of the local child care landscape, coordination of disaster preparedness plans, addressing emergency care situations, and holding pre-licensing training - will remain local under the Early Childhood Councils. The councils are statutorily responsible to increase and sustain the quality, accessibility, capacity and affordability of early childhood services. The Department does not
anticipate the 16 CCR&R agencies support the budget item, but may agree that the role of the Early Childhood Councils should be strengthened.

**Nurse Home Visitor Program**

Based on responses submitted for the Tobacco Master Settlement Agreement (MSA) Request for Information, it appears that the Nurse Home Visitor Program has both underspent its annual allocation and has a significant fund balance. Please explain why the Department did not utilize the full allocation of MSA dollars in FY 2018-19, why the fund balance has accumulated, if the Department suggests an adjustment to their annual allocation of MSA dollars, and if the Department would recommend other statutory changes that would affect the Department's utilization of these funds.

**Why did the Department not utilize the full allocation of MSA dollars in FY 2018-19?**

The Department did not fully utilize the full FY 2018-19 allocation of MSA dollars due to nursing vacancies and underspending of the funds allocated for Medicaid reimbursable services. The Department fully allocates this funding in contracts with approved providers. However, these programs occasionally experience staff turnover and delays in hiring, especially because Colorado is experiencing a public health nursing shortage, which leads to underspending of contracts.

**Why has the fund balance accumulated?**

HB 16-1408 took effect in FY 2016-17. This legislation increased the annual percentage of Tobacco MSA funding allocated to the Nurse Home Visitor Program (NHVP) and allowed the full balance of unspent funds each year to be retained in the Nurse Home Visitor Cash Fund. The legislative intent behind these changes was to account for the declining Tobacco MSA revenue and ensure the annual appropriation was sufficient to support the current program and to extend the solvency of the program by building the fund balance to cover future revenue shortages. The accumulated cash balance in the Nurse Home Visitor Program Fund will ensure the program can maintain the level of services provided by 22 agencies serving families in all 64 counties at least through FY 2023-24.

**Does the Department suggest an adjustment to their annual allocation of MSA dollars?**

The Department did not request an adjustment in the NHVP spending authority, as anticipated cost increases in FY 2020-21 are within the historical percentage of underspending in this line. The Department is working with Invest in Kids, the state intermediary, and the Governor’s Office to identify programmatic impacts in FY 2020-21 and to ensure adequate funding in future years.

**Does the Department recommend other statutory changes that would affect the Department’s utilization of these funds?**

The Department recommends following the legislative intent behind HB 16-1408, and maintaining the fund balance to cover future revenue shortages impacting the Nurse Home Visitor Program. There is a strategic plan to start using this funding starting in FY 21-22.
ADDITIONAL COMMON QUESTIONS

PROVIDER RATES

A request for a 0.5 percent increase for provider rates is essentially a 1.5 percent cut based on the current rate of inflation. How does the Department expect approval of this request to impact:

- Early childhood and refugee assistance service providers’ ability to sustain existing services,
- Access to child care, early intervention services, family support services, child safety, and refugee assistance, and
- Service providers’ ability to recruit and retain staff.

The Governor’s Office understands that providers often perform the most important work on behalf of the State of Colorado. As such, the Governor approved a 0.5% rate increase, including $4.6 million to providers at the Department of Human Services.
Steps to Early Intervention (EI)

1. Referral to Early Intervention
   Someone suspects a child has a developmental delay and refers to EI Program. Anyone can refer: Parent, family member, physician, child care provider, home visitor, etc. Referrals are sent to the local EI Program, at a Community Centered Board (CCB). If a child has an established condition, they will go directly to #4 in this process.

2. Post-referral Screening
   Requires Parent Consent, parent receives written results of screening and can ask for an evaluation regardless of results. Screening tool is usually the Ages and Stages Questionnaire (ASQ) conducted by someone at the CCB.

3. Evaluation
   Determines percent of delay. Requires Parent Consent, is usually conducted by Child Find (Administrative Unit under CO Dept. Of Education) and includes 2 or more professionals with 1 in the area of developmental concern. Evaluation includes child assessment identifying some of the needs of the child based on the delay. Parents receive a written report.

4. Eligibility
   Using evaluation information, the CCB determines eligibility for the EI Program. If there a 25% delay in one or more of the 5 developmental areas, the child is found eligible. If a child has an established condition that is likely to cause a delay in development (list found at eicolorado.org), then the child is automatically eligible and an assessment to identify needs is conducted.

5. IFSP Development for Eligible Children
   An Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) must be completed by the 45th day from referral. Includes child and family assessment to determine how the child's delay/disability is impacting the child’s ability to participate in the life of the family and how EI services could help improve the child and family's day. It also includes discussion of the 3 Global Outcomes that measure child progress and are reported to the Office of Special Education Programs. Participants are the family, a Service Coordinator from the CCB and a provider.

6. Early Intervention Services
   Must begin no later than 28 days from parent consent (which usually happens at the end of the IFSP meeting). Services are provided by independent contractors or CCB employee providers in the family's home. Service coordinators check-in monthly with families.
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Colorado Department of Human Services
FY 2020-21 Budget Requests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Solutions</th>
<th>Economic Security</th>
<th>Community Access &amp; Independence</th>
<th>Early Childhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Joint Agency Interoperability Operations and Maintenance - $6,627,766</td>
<td>• Child Support Pass-through - $800,182</td>
<td>• Respite Care Task Force Funding Adjustments - $374,770</td>
<td>• Comprehensive Approach to Improving Child Care Quality - $5,619,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Replace Phone Systems - $917,525</td>
<td>• Subsidized Employment Continuation - $4,000,000</td>
<td>• Adjust Excess Reserves Older Coloradans Cash Fund - $0</td>
<td>• Early Intervention Caseload Growth - $3,231,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adjust Old Age Pension Funding Based on Caseload - ($22,268,490)</td>
<td>• Records and Reports Fund Adjustments - $648,048</td>
<td>• Colorado Child Care Assistance Program Direct Services - $6,762,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Scholarships for Early Childhood Education Professional - $600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Expansion of Evidence-Based Home Visiting - $521,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Redirect Intra-state Redistribution Funding - ($1,500,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased Efficiency of Resource and Referral Funding - ($630,350)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Office of Information Technology
R-14 Joint Agency
Interoperability Operations

Information Technology
Capital Construction

Operations

$6.6 Million Total Funds

$2.3 Million General Fund
Caseworker View and Infrastructure

- Single view for county caseworker to see a person across systems
- Child Care Assistance
- Medicaid, SNAP, TANF
- Child Welfare
- Child Support
- Enterprise Access + Identity Management
- Enterprise Service Bus
- Identity Resolution
- Views
- Analytics

Colorado Department of Human Services
System Security and Data Integrity

- Encryption
- Two-Factor Authentication
- National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) model
- User guides and required training for users of CBMS, ACSES, CHATS and Trails
- Data Governance Workstream
- Data Value Increases with Use

Encryption + Two-Factor Authentication

Data Entry Standards

Data Governance Workstream

Data Value Increases with Use

JAI
R-19 Replace Phone Systems

- $917,525 General Fund Request
- Five facilities within the Division of Youth Services and the Colorado Mental Health Institute at Pueblo campus
Office of Economic Security
Child Support Pass-through (R-10)

Amount of Child Support Collected & Disbursed Monthly For Families on Temporary Assistance for Needy Families

- Amount of Child Support State Collected
- Amount of Child Support Families Received

- On average families receive $167 more each month because of the policy change
- This reflects a 33% increase over TANF benefits for a single mother with two children

COLORADO
Department of Human Services
Evidence of positive behavioral change:
- Payment rates for non pass-through cases declined by 2.5%.
- Payment rates for pass-through cases increased by 12.4%.
Since January 2018 CW STEP has placed 620 individuals in subsidized employment across the State including:

- urban and rural areas,
- large, medium, and small counties.

Table 1: CW STEP Placements by Local Area Contractors (LAC) in SFY 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAC</th>
<th>SFY 2019 Goal</th>
<th>SFY 2019 Actual</th>
<th>Percentage of Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discover Goodwill</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>203%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Range Alliance</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>128%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilltop</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>129%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>139%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>137%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Office of Economic Security
CW-STEP Program (R-12)

- In FY 18-19, 476 participants exited subsidized employment placements.
- 33% exited to unsubsidized jobs, all of which paid a living wage.
- Median wage earned post CW-STEP is $13.07/hour.
Sept. 2018 - 10% increase to the monthly basic cash assistance grant
At the current rate of expenditures, the LTR is projected to approach the $34 M threshold in 5 years.

The Department and counties recommend not dipping below this threshold, which represents one quarter of funds needed for emergency purposes.
Office of Economic Security
Colorado Works - County Reserves

County TANF Reserve History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Reserve</th>
<th>Statewide cap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>$30,594,888</td>
<td>$61,320,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>$35,552,281</td>
<td>$61,291,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>$45,663,512</td>
<td>$61,279,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>$51,047,416</td>
<td>$61,257,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>$54,782,060</td>
<td>$61,231,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>$57,557,013</td>
<td>$61,238,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>$60,291,956</td>
<td>$61,228,634</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Office of Economic Security
### Federal Food Assistance Rule Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule and Potential Impact</th>
<th>Proposed Rule Released by Feds</th>
<th>Final Rule Released by Feds</th>
<th>Implementation Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Charge</strong></td>
<td>Oct 2018</td>
<td>Aug 2019</td>
<td>October 1, 2019; not implemented due to court order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown as it impacts future applicants; It would likely become a deterrent to apply.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eliminate Local Area Waivers (Able-Bodied Waivers)</strong></td>
<td>Dec 2018</td>
<td>December 4, 2019</td>
<td>April 1, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five counties in CO and the Ute Mountain Tribe will likely lose their current waiver resulting in 895 people being held to work requirements which could result in benefit loss without compliance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revision of Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility</strong></td>
<td>Jul 2019: initial comments</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>None proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90,000 citizens would be eliminated from SNAP in CO annually.</td>
<td>Oct 2019: re-released for additional comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjust and Standardize Standard Utility Allowance</strong></td>
<td>Oct 2019: open for initial comments</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>None proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This would reduce benefits at $32/month for 90,000 households.</td>
<td>Dec 2019: comment period closed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Office of Economic Security
SNAP Outreach

- In FFY20, extended to 21 rural and underserved counties with investment by the JBC.
Office of Economic Security
Low-income Energy Assistance

2018-2019 LEAP Household (HH) count and Average Benefit (AB) by County

Note. A blue highlight indicates the Average Benefit is less than the Statewide Average.
Office of Community Access & Independence
Division of Aging and Adult Services

In FY 2018-19:

- More than 58,000 older adults received services provided through the 16 Area Agencies on Aging across the state.

- 9,479 adults were provided protective services through the state’s Adult Protective Services program administered by county departments of human services.

A Colorado resident celebrates being 100 years old at the 2018 Centenarian celebration in Greeley.
R11 Respite Care Task Force Recommendations Funding Adjustment

Funding Request - $374,770

This increase allows the Department to continue its contract with Easterseals Colorado to complete the implementation of the Respite Care Task Force recommendations and fund the final year of the Task Force.
Respite Care Task Force Recommendation Implementation

Respite Care Task Force Recommendation Implementation

Material from the Colorado Caregiver Marketing Campaign
R33 Adjust Excess Reserves Older Coloradans Cash Fund

- Request to utilize $3 million of the $16 million from the Older Coloradans Cash Fund
- A net zero adjustment is requested to reduce the GF appropriation by $3 million while increasing spending authority.
## Older Americans Act Waitlist for Services - FY 2018-19*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th># of Individuals on Waitlist</th>
<th>Number of AAA’s with a Waitlist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chore</td>
<td>2,130</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Aid</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker/Personal Care</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Delivered Meals</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Counseling/Adult Day)</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respite</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Management</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,654</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: State Unit on Aging data system*
Adult Protective Services

- Established in statute in 1983 (Title 26, Article 3.1 of the CRS)
- Provides protective services for at-risk adults
- State-supervised, county-administered
APS Statutory Changes

July 2014:
Implementation of SB13-111 (criminal mandatory reporting of mistreatment of at-risk elders).

Colorado Adult Protective Services data system (CAPS) went live.

July 2016:
Implementation of SB15-109 (criminal mandatory reporting for at-risk adults with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (IDD)).

May 2017:
HB 17-1284 passed and signed by Governor. Establishes due process for substantiated perpetrators and requires a background check of the CAPS data system for direct care providers.

July 2017:
Formal independent quality assurance unit created and funded to review APS cases.

July 2018:
Due Process for Substantiated Perpetrators in APS implemented

January 2019:
CAPS Background Checks Begin
APS Reports and Cases FY 2013-14 through FY 2018-19

- FY 2013-14: 11,818 Reports, 6,760 Cases
- FY 2014-15: 16,696 Reports, 8,932 Cases
- FY 2015-16: 17,743 Reports, 8,583 Cases
- FY 2016-17: 20,327 Reports, 9,121 Cases
- FY 2017-18: 22,581 Reports, 9,338 Cases
- FY 2018-19: 25,004 Reports, 9,479 Cases
R17 Records and Reports of At-Risk Adults subject to Abuse & Neglect

Funding Request $648,048 ($422,847 GF, $225,201 CF)

Total FTE: 6  FTE OCAI: 3

- Requesting cash fund spending authority to fund 2.0 FTE for the CAPS Check Unit and 1 FTE to help process appeals to ensure due process is provided in a timely manner.
Office of Early Childhood
Early Investments Drive the Greatest Gains

**Increases in:**
- Cognitive and social-emotional development
- Educational performance and graduation rates
- Parental involvement
- Job training, earnings, and productivity

** Reductions in:**
- Juvenile and adult crimes
- Cases of abuse and neglect
- Domestic violence
- Welfare dependency
- Special education

Office of Early Childhood: FY 2020-21 Budget Requests

- **R1: Comprehensive Approach to Improving Child Care Quality** - $5,619,496 total funds, including $2,809,748 General Fund and $2,809,748 federal funds and 7.2 FTE

- **R2: Early Intervention Caseload Growth** - $3,231,940 total funds/General Fund

- **R3: Colorado Child Care Assistance Program Direct Services** - $6,762,446 total funds, including $940,292 General Fund, $2,666,581 cash funds, and $3,155,573 federal funds

- **R8: Scholarships for Early Childhood Education Professionals** - $600,000 total funds including $500,000 General Fund and $100,000 federal funds and 0.9 FTE

- **R9: Expansion of Evidence-Based Home Visiting** - $521,605 total funds/General Fund and 0.9 FTE

- **R17: Records and Reports Fund Adjustments** - $648,048 total funds, including $422,847 General Fund and $225,201 cash funds and 6.0 FTE

- **R27: Redirect Intrastate Redistribution Funding** - A reduction of $1,500,000 total funds/federal funds

- **R31: Increased Efficiency of Resource and Referral Program Funding** - A reduction of $630,350 total funds including reductions of $315,175 General Fund and $315,175 federal funds
Comprehensive Approach to Improving Child Care Quality (R1)

Quality child care is an effective investment.

The benefits are intergenerational...

Source: The Heckman Equation, available at: https://heckmanequation.org/
Comprehensive Approach to Improving Child Care Quality (R1)

Colorado Shines Quality Rating & Improvement System

Level 1
- All eligible licensed providers serving children 0-5

Level 2
- Providers opt into quality self-assessment

Levels 3-5
- Providers opt into ratings process
Comprehensive Approach to Improving Child Care Quality (R1)

25.1% of Providers are High Quality in 2019, up from 14.7% in 2016
Achieving the OEC’s 2022 goal of 34% high quality providers, would increase the number of children served in high quality settings to 81,090.
Success of Early Intervention

- 99% Of children show some progress in development
- 60% Of children show significant progress towards reaching development closer to their same-age peers
- 49% Of children do not need Part B Special Education in Preschool
Early Intervention Caseload Growth (R2)

Reasons for Growth

1) Increased referrals from:
   - Physicians and hospitals including Level 1 Neonatal Intensive Care Units
   - Home visitors
   - Child welfare

2) Increased exposure of infants to developmentally harmful substances

361

FY20-21

3.7%
Colorado Child Care Assistance Program Direct Services (R3)

- Colorado Child Care Assistance Program (CCCAP)
  - Paid through reimbursement
  - Pay based on attendance only

- Private Pay
  - Paid in full, in advance
  - Not based on attendance
TEACH Scholarships for Early Childhood Educators (R8)

**Colorado TEACH Program**

- **Scholarships by Type**
  - FY 17/18
  - Licensing Requirements (22)
  - Associates (37)
  - Bachelors (19)
- **Diversity of Recipients**
  - FY 17/18
  - White/Caucasian (44)
  - Hispanic/Latinx (16)
  - African American (12)
  - Asian American (3)
  - Native American (1)
  - Unknown (2)

**National TEACH Retention Rates**

- 94% for Associates Scholarship Recipients
- 96% for Bachelors Scholarship Recipients

V.

33% National Average

Expansion of Evidence-Based Home Visiting (R9)

Risk factors that help identify if a community needs additional school readiness support include:

- High rates of poverty, child abuse and neglect, and illegal substance use
- Lack of access to quality early education
- Low 3rd grade test scores
- Low rates of high school graduation
Expansion of Evidence-Based Home Visiting (R9): HIPPY

HIPPY Helps Kids Get Ready for School

On average, HIPPY children scored better on the Bracken School Readiness Assessment than 64% of their same aged peers at post-test.*

93% of HIPPY children ended the program year on track for success in school.*

*Percentile and proficiency levels from our state-level evaluation using the Bracken School Readiness Assessment.
Expansion of Evidence-Based Home Visiting (R9): Healthy Steps

**CORE COMPONENTS**

- Child and Family Need Screening
- Developmental/Behavioral Consultations
- Referrals to Needed Services
- Positive Parenting Guidance & Early Learning Resources
Increased Efficiency of Resource and Referral Funding (R31)

Centralized Call Center (CCR&R) since 2016

16 Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies (CCR&Rs)
- Awareness of local child care landscape
- Coordination of disaster preparedness plans
- Addressing emergency care situations
- Holding pre-licensing training

34 Early Childhood Councils