Interim Delivery Child Youth and Family Services

by and for the Innu Communities of Labrador

Cost Estimates Discussion Paper

DRAFT ONE December 2002

Prepared for: The Program Sub-Committee
of the Maintable on Registration and Reserve Creation
for the Innu of Labrador

PART ONE BACKGROUND

1. Program Committee Mandate

In an effort to achieve equivalency with other First Nations, with particular reference to locally controlled programs and services, the Innu of Labrador requested registration under the Indian Act and creation of Indian Act Band Councils and Indian Act reserves for the two communities. To expedite the registration and reserve creation process the Innu, provincial and federal governments established a Maintable of senior representatives. The Innu subsequently requested that a Programs and Services Sub-Committee be struck to examine the details of program delivery after the Indian Act is in effect.

A Program Committee was established and asked to deal with Child & Family Services as a first issue. The federal and provincial governments confirmed that they were engaged in bilateral talks on funding continuing provincial delivery of C&FS. Those in attendance exchanged views on why CY&FS was important and what was hindering delivery. On the latter there was a consensus that there were three main reasons: 1) allow time for provincial law to be amended to allow delegation to an Innu C&FS Board; 2) recognition that social workers felt compromised working for the province rather than the community; 3) that various other factors also contributed to making recruitment and retention very difficult. It was also noted that the federal government asserted that it would not agree to Innu control until it was satisfied that there was sufficient Innu C&FS capacity to manage it. The Innu offered to table an outline of an Interim approach to CY&FS program delivery that recognized these conditions.

That outline was well recieved and a working group struck to sort out an agreement between the Innu, the province, and Health Labrador Corporation. The Province and Innu reps reached agreement on an MOU for interim delivery of Child & Family Service through a "shadow" Innu organization. On November 6 2002, the MOU was tabled with the Program Committee at a meeting in Goose Bay.

2. November Meeting Summary

The working group had notified the Program Committee that it had produced an MOU for Interim Delivery of Child Youth and Family Services and was prepared to table it with the Program Committee. A meeting was set for November 6, 2002 in Goose Bay, Labrador with a two part agenda–tabling of the MOU and resourcing the MOU. The latter point was split into part a) estimating needs and b) considering sources.

<u>Other business.</u> Prior to entering the agenda, the Program Committee briefly discussed "safe houses"and several copies of the signed federal-provincial Child and Family Services Agreement were provided but not discussed.

<u>Interim Delivery MOU</u>. The MOU was tabled for consideration of the parties. Tabling included noting the consensus of the working group that the MOU must be accompanied by commitments to resources adequate to carry it out. The working group was not privy to the details of federal-provincial talks on C&FS funding, but had general knowledge of its eligibility rules, and was

concerned that it would be insufficient. Accordingly, the working group felt that all parties had to explore the resources necessary to implement the MOU, create estimates based on best practices, and be open to stitching together a range of resources into a commitment package. It was stressed that Interim Delivery should be defined by what is needed to deliver services in the two communities. It should not be defined by making it fit predetermined formulas. The working group's presentation also noted that no party was prepared to recommend the MOU without adequate and secure resource commitments.

Most had been provided a copy before the meeting but there were few questions.

The meting moved to item two, discussion of the resources needed to fulfil the MOU. Part two below provides much of the information tabled at the session. In anticipation of further detailed work, the information is formatted in ways that estimates and scenarios can be continually developed and added.

The next steps were to include more detail on cost estimates which would then be followed by analysis of possible sources for resources. As the working group stressed this included but was not to be limited to, an analysis of what would be eligible under the federal-provincial funding agreement for C&FS. This raised the issue of what other sources may be feasible. Responses included: HLC savings on Innu C&FS expenditures; other provincial "Leave on the Table funding"; capacity development funding; various training funds; and capital programs.

PART TWO Estimating MOU Resource Needs.

2.1 Case load data.

Figure one. HLC data on existing CY&FS cases in the two communities.

Case Type	**Number of active cases in Two Innu Communities**
Protective intervention	324
Community Corrections	43
Family & Rehabilitation	05
Total Cases	**372**
Total covered by MOU	***324***

HLC explained that they would expect that in the short term the number of cases in Davis Inlet/Natuashish will increase as present services in the community are very limited.

To estimate human resources some form of case load per social worker is needed. HLC staff advised that The Child Welfare League of Canada recommends that for an average set of mixed risk (a combination of low, medium and high risk) cases 25 to 30 cases per social team is optimal.
PLEASE NOTE FOLLOW-UP INFORMATION:
Joan Gloade of Mi'maq C&FS in Nova Scotia confirms that "provincial regulations" permit only 20 mixed risk cases per social worker.
The Child Welfare League of Canada does publish standards in a varierty of fields including case loads. I have them in table form that can be provided to interested parties.
A person at CWLA herself said that its standards were based on 1993 information and were not strictly followed any longer. She noted ...."some provinces - Alberta for example - have standards in this area see "Child Welfare Caseload Growth in Alberta. Connecting the Dots". I think Ontario also has been working on this. "
A reply from BC is similar to others contacted --Child Welfare League is the general standard... provinces consider it...then practices diverge.... employees complain... and efforts made to get back to a reasonable one based on characteristics of the particular load....

The cases in the two communities are mostly rated as medium to high risk and so would not be reflective of the usual case load mix.

HLC explained that it was their experience that social workers could not function in the Innu communities without front line workers who understood the language, culture, traditions, family structures, and historical events. This meant that case loads had to be considered on the basis of two person teams, rather than single social workers.

2.2 Intervention human resource estimates. The existing HLC teams consist of 4 social workers and five front line workers; two at Davis and 3 at Sheshatshiu. While two social workers are assigned to Davis Inlet they actually operate out of the Sheshatshiu office. Distributed across 4 intervention teams the existing case loads are substantially higher than recommended levels. For all active cases-- 93 per team; For cases covered by the MOU-- 81 per team.

Figure Two. Human Resource scenarios for Interim Delivery of social work functions based on case load data and HLC experiences.

Scenario	**Teams required**	**PY needs**	**HLC Comparable salaries & benefits**
Lowest need; 30 cases per team; no increase from 324	10.8 teams	assume 10 SW's & 11 FLW's	(10 @ 60K) (11@ 40K) = $1,040,000
Medium need; 28 cases per team; minimal increase to 330	11.8 teams	assume 11 SW's & 12 FLW's	(11 @ 60K) (12 @ 40K) = $1,140,000

Highest need; 25 cases per team load increase to 335	13.4 teams	assume 13 SW's and 14 FLW's	(13 @ 60K) 14 @ 40K) = $1,340,000

2.3 Supervision, Administration, and Management.

Case load data is based on direct social work. Supervision of teams, coordination and overall direction, and administration will also be required to deliver the MOU. This was estimated as one supervisor for each community, one Director, and at least one administrative support staff. (Clerical support was discussed but no consensus emerged).

Figure three - Management Estimates

Position	**HLC comparable salary & benefits**
Director	$ 75,000
Manager (2)	2 @ 70,000
Admin Assistant	$ 45,000 (est only)
Sub-total	*$260,000*
Clerical Support	$ 30,000 (est. only)
Total salaries & benefits	***$290,000***

2.4 Other resource needs. Standard practice at HLC and with employers recruiting to Labrador, other benefits and incentives are also provided.

2.4.1 Accommodations. Social workers in both communities are afforded housing assistance. Using the medium scenario in figure two, and assuming front line workers are ineligible for housing assistance, that would mean 5 social workers and families would need housing in Natuashish, and 6 for Sheshatshiu. At Sheshathiu this will mean a monthly rental grant as accommodations can be found in North West River and Happy Valley. In Natuashish, accommodation must be provided in the community. Characteristics of the final recruits will determine this need which could range from one house shared among five adults to five separate houses for families.

Figure Four - Housing Assistance Estimates

	Capital cost estimates	Operating costs estimates
High need scenario		
Natuashish five houses	5@ 150,000 = $750,000	monthly rents @ $750 = $3,750 x 12 = $ 45,000/yr
Sheshastshiu six rentals	0	monthly rents @ $1,000 = $6,000 x 12 = $72,000/yr
Low need scenario		
Natuashish one house	$150,000	monthly rents @ $750 = $3,750 x 12 = $ 45,000/yr
Sheshastshiu six rentals	0	monthly rents @ $1,000 = $6,000 x 12 = $72,000/yr

2.4.2 Retention bonus. Social workers in Davis Inlet are offered a $5,000 bonus at the end of each year of service. The operating budget will need annual retention bonuses of:
5 x $5,000 = $ 25,000 per year.

2.4.3 Remote allowance. To be determined. (It is unclear if the salaries & benefits include remote living allowances or the usual cost-of-one-trip-out also common in remote locations.)

2.4.4 Vacation cost. To be determined

2.4.5 Office space. Each community will require substantial office space for protective intervention to function. The space needs are noted below. They will need to be compared to existing facilities and plans to determine what can be provided and what will capital investments will be needed.

Figure Five – Office Space Needs - medium scenario

	Office space	Other space needs
Natuashish - five teams, one supervisor,	five double offices, one private office	reception; one staff room; one bathroom; one interview area; secure file room; equipment & supplies area
Sheshatshiu - six teams, one supervisor	six double offices, one private office	reception; one staff room; one bathroom; one interview area; secure file room; equipment & supplies area

Main Office - Director, Administrator, clerical	three offices	reception; bathroom; secure file room; Board room; equipment & supplies area

Note as well that standard Band policy is that rent is charged to provide a fund to make up O&M shortfalls where such facilities are eligible, and to provide for O&M where they are not eligible at all. So depending on the resolution there will be corresponding operational budget needs.

2.4.6 Technology.
HLC is in the midst of a moving from a paper-based system to an electronic one. At a minium each team, manager, administrator and clerical support will need a computer. As Interim Delivery relies on consistent monitoring and good reporting, each computer should also be equipped with high speed communication capability. The operating budget must also include quick access to troubleshooting and repairs, software upgrades, training, and replacements.

Medium scenario computer investment:
Capital. 16 computers x $2,000 each = $32,000
16 software packages @ ?????
Installation costs @ ??????

Operational.
High speed charges ???????
Service contract ?????????
Training ???????
Upgrades & replacement fund ??????

2.4.7 Temporary Placement.
To be determined (uncertain scope of needs and relation to ILA's)

2.4.8 Independent Living Arrangements
To be determined (Indications are that these are in the order of $3 million last year)
PLEASE NOTE FOLLOW-UP INFORMATION RECEIVED : ...the cost of ILA's for 2001/2002 was 2.1 million. The primary cost of ILA's involved salaries, rent for apartments, groceries, transportation, recreational activities, clothing for children, and initial costs to furnish the apartments, etc.

2.4.9 Training.
To be determined

Summary of Cost Estimates for Analysis Purposes

As of November 28th

Item	**Notes**	**Capital**	**Operating**
Staff @ medium need scenario	11 SW's & 12 FLW's	n/a	$1,140,000
Director		n/a	$ 75,000
Manager (2)		n/a	$ 140,000
Admin Assistant		n/a	$ 45,000
Clerical Support		n/a	$ 30,000
Accommodation High need		$750,000	$ 117,000
Retention Bonus		n/a	$ 25,000 per year
Office Space		TBD	TBD
Technology		$32,000	TBD
Temporary Placement.		TBD	TBD
Independent Living Arrangements		TBD	TBD
Training.		n/a	TBD
Preliminary sub-totals of Estimates		*$ 782,000*	*$ 1,572,000*
Figures in fed-prov C&FS agreement	*Operations $ 789,715*	*Maintenance $5,389,715*	