

Part II, Section VI. Developing Work Plans with Timeframes and Budgets/Staffing

**1) Please complete Exhibits 1, 2, and 3, providing summary information related to the detailed work plans contained in the Program and Expenditure Plan.**

See Exhibit 1

See Exhibit 2.

See Exhibit 3

**2) The majority of a county's total three-year CSS funding must be for Full Service Partnerships. If individuals proposed for Full Service Partnerships also receive funds under System Development or Outreach and Engagement Funding, please estimate the portion of those funds that apply toward the requirement for the majority of funds during the three-year period.**

Table 12. Budget Summary by Type of Funding

Type of Funding	FY 05/06	FY 0607	FY 07/08	Totals	% of Total
Full Service Partnerships	\$ 497,065	\$ 3,670,853	\$ 3,942,265	\$ 8,110,183	53.95 %
General System Development	\$ 1,628,650	\$ 1,523,041	\$ 1,597,336	\$ 4,749,027	31.59 %
Outreach & Engagement	*				
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>\$ 2,125,715</b>	<b>\$ 5,193,894</b>	<b>\$ 5,539,601</b>	<b>\$12,859,210</b>	<b>85.53 %</b>
One-Time Non-Program Specific	**				
Administration	\$ 1,285,740	\$ 451,776	\$ 437,921	\$ 2,175,437	14.47%
<b>Total Budget</b>	<b>\$ 3,411,455</b>	<b>\$ 5,645,670</b>	<b>\$ 5,977,522</b>	<b>\$15,034,647</b>	<b>100 %</b>

\*Each program included the required component of Outreach and Engagement. Those costs are reflected in the Full Services Partnership costs.

\*\* All One Time Costs are Program Specific

**3. Please provide the estimated number of individuals expected to receive services through System Development Funds for each of the three fiscal years and how many of those individuals are expected to have Full Service Partnerships each year.**

Table 13. System Development Fund Consumers by Year

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Total Individuals</b>	<b>Full Service Individuals</b>
2005/06	0	0
2006/07	600	100
2007/08	1,385	165
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,985</b>	<b>265</b>

**4. Please provide the estimated unduplicated count of individuals expected to be reached through Outreach and Engagement strategies for each of the three fiscal years and how many of those individuals are expected to have Full Service Partnerships each year.**

Table 14. Outreach and Engagement Consumers by Year

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Total Individuals</b>	<b>Full Service Individuals</b>
2005/06	0	0
2006/07	750	40
2007/08	1,675	105
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,425</b>	<b>145</b>

**5. For children, youth, and families, the MHSA requires all counties to implement Wraparound services, pursuant to W&I Code Section 18250, or provide substantial evidence that it is not feasible in the county, in which case counties should explore collaborative projects with other counties and /or appropriate alternative strategies. Wraparound projects must be consistent with program requirements found in W&I Code Sections 18250-18252. If Wraparound services already exist in a county, it is not necessary to expand these services. If Wraparound services are under development, the county must complete the implementation within the three-year plan period.**

- SB 163 allows San Joaquin County to participate in providing eligible children with family-based service alternatives to group home care, targeting Wraparound as the service alternative. Wraparound is a family-centered, strength-based, needs-driven planning process for creating

- individualized services. Flexible use of state foster care funds and Adoption Assistance Program funds are utilized.
- Population served: The program works with children and their families when the children are currently in RCL 12-14 group homes and need transition services to a lower level of care in a family home setting, or are at risk of placement in RCL 12-14 group home and are in need of stabilization in their current family home living environment in the San Joaquin County Community, placed by Juvenile Probation, Child Welfare, and Mental Health/Education under Chapter 26.5 of the California Government Code.
  - Point of entry into program: Special Multidisciplinary Assessment and Referral Team (SMART) gives priority to eligible children with parents/caregivers who are committed and aligned with the goals of the program. All referrals are approved by SMART prior to acceptance into the program. A subcommittee of SMART functions as the Cross Operations Team for the Program to oversee and authorized services, flexible funds, and program issues. The larger body receives Quarterly Reports on those children/youth, and their families that SMART has authorized for placement.
  - Kinds of services provided: Individual, collateral, group, family, case management, crisis intervention, and community based services.

**COLLABORATIVE COMMUNITY SUPPORT:**

The Cross-Operations Team oversees the continuous quality improvement of the Family Vision program. They interface with the Youth Policy Council, SMART Committee, Administrative Oversight Team, and the actual Family Vision Team.

**OUTCOMES:**

Data is collected and analyzed through existing System of Care data collection. Additional evaluations tools will be utilized and/or developed as needed to fully evaluate the success of Wraparound. Parents and caregivers are surveyed to determine their level of satisfaction with services and outcomes. Family Partners may also assist with these surveys, ensuring family focused input.