*** NOTE: TO RETURN TO THIS PAGE, CLICK ON THE COUNTY SEAL ***

CLICK HERE FORTHE CEO's REPORT DATED OCTOBER 1, 2008

CLICK HERE FOR THE CEO's REPORT DATED NOVEMBER 20, 2008

CLICK HERE FOR THE CEO's REPORT DATED JUNE 12, 2009

County of Los Angeles
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 974-1101
http://ceo.lacounty.gov

WILLIAM T FUJIOKA
Chief Executive Officer

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

YVONNE B. BURKE
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

October 1, 2008

To: Supervisor Yvonne B. Burke, Chair
Supervisor Gloria Molina
Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky
Supervisor Don Knabe
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From: William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

JUNE 24, 2008 BOARD MOTION FOR ESTABLISHING AN AUTOMATED SYSTEM FOR SHARING CLIENT INFORMATION BETWEEN DEPARTMENTS AND OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES TO PREVENT CHILD ABUSE AND MALTREATMENT – REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

On June 24, 2008, on the heels of a case in which a five year-old child was ritualistically tortured for over a year by his mother and another woman residing in their home, your Board instructed the Chief Executive Office (CEO), in conjunction with the County Departments of Children and Family Services (DCFS), Health Services, Mental Health, Probation, Public Health - Alcohol and Drug Services, Public Social Services (DPSS), and local and state law enforcement agencies, including the California Department of Corrections, as well as any other relevant governmental agencies to report back prior to supplemental budget deliberations with:

1. A proposal to automate information-sharing about clients served within County departments and other government agencies;

2. Recommendations for legislative changes to address prohibitions against necessary information sharing between agencies; and

3. Protocols for case management that include identification of the agency staff responsible for the information.

On July 8, 2008, the CEO convened an interdepartmental Work Group consisting of 12 departments spanning each of the five clusters to develop a set of recommendations to address your Board's directive. An aggressive pace was set over the summer months that culminated at the beginning of September.

The Work Group, consisting of approximately 65 department representatives was organized into five Task Groups: (1) *Inventory of Data Sharing Activities,* (2) *Target Populations,* (3) *Legal Issues,* (4) *Technology, and* (5) *Fiscal.* Members were asked to develop a set of recommendations for their respective Task Groups that would be integrated into a cohesive report consisting of phased (short-, mid-, and long-term) recommendations for reducing the potential of child abuse and neglect.

Preliminary efforts have been completed by the Work Group, including:

- Organizing, with the generous support of Casey Family Programs, a site visit to Allegheny County's (Pennsylvania) Department of Human Services (DHS). Allegheny's DHS' system is one of the few local government systems that has a number of useful functions that can help the County meet its objectives, such as counting unduplicated clients and importing client data from both internal and external sources. A County delegation representing two Board Offices, the CEO, DCFS, and DPSS will meet with Allegheny's DHS Director and staff on October 30th and 31st to discuss the overall vision, lessons learned, and functionalities of the system. Input received will help shape the Work Group's final recommendations.

- Developing a baseline document of existing County systems/programs/activities that facilitates the exchange of client information among departments and non County jurisdictions. This document captured 70 County activities from nine departments. It is organized using the County's Five Outcome Areas for Children and Families and four separate business functional areas. For example: 54 percent of activities were designed to support Good Health outcomes; while 44 percent targeted the Economic Well-Being of clients. The most frequently reported business function was Service Coordination (74 percent) followed by administrative functions (69 percent). This type of information was used by Task Groups to help inform their deliberations and formulate their recommendations.

- Designing *LA County Cares* as a system/approach to reduce the possibility of child abuse and neglect by proactively identifing families with unmet service needs and supports, assisting families to obtain needed services and/or supports, and taking any protective actions that may be deemed as appropriate.

- Identifying technical enhancements/legal changes related to the County's *Family Children's Index* (FCI). FCI is a computerized interagency data system supported by legislation that allows specified agencies to share basic identifying information of families "at-risk" of child abuse or neglect among specified agencies. The existing legislation allows the sharing of information and the formation of Multidisciplinary Disciplinary Teams for the purposes of identifying, preventing or treating child abuse and neglect.

- Drafting a set of preliminary legal/legislative recommendations to enhance the County's ability to proactively serve families with unmet needs and supports, which can negatively impact children and families and possibly increase children being placed at risk of child abuse and neglect.

Given the scope of the Work Group's efforts, additional time is needed to hone the recommendations more accurately define the associated costs and complete the Board letter. We anticipate filing the Board letter in time for your Board's November 12, 2008 meeting.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please let me know, or your staff may contact Deputy Chief Executive Officer Miguel Santana at (213) 974-4530, or via e-mail at msantana@ceo.lacounty.gov.

WTF:MS:KH
CP:hn

c: Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel
Centralized Case Management Work Group Department Heads
Centralized Case Management Work Group Members

County of Los Angeles
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 974-1101
http://ceo.lacounty.gov

WILLIAM T FUJIOKA
Chief Executive Officer

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

YVONNE B. BURKE
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

November 20, 2008

To: Supervisor Yvonne B. Burke, Chair
Supervisor Gloria Molina
Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky
Supervisor Don Knabe
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From: William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

JUNE 24, 2008 BOARD MOTION FOR ESTABLISHING AN AUTOMATED SYSTEM FOR SHARING CLIENT INFORMATION BETWEEN DEPARTMENTS AND OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES TO PREVENT CHILD ABUSE AND MALTREATMENT – REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide a status report and request an extension until January 13, 2009, for submission of the final report to your Board in response to the June 24, 2008 motion by Supervisors Molina and Antonovich. The motion instructed the Chief Executive Office (CEO), in conjunction with the County Departments of Children and Family Services (DCFS), Health Services, Mental Health, Probation, Public Health – Alcohol and Drug Services, Public Social Services, and local and state law enforcement agencies, including the California Department of Corrections, as well as any other relevant governmental agencies to report back prior to supplemental budget deliberations with:

1. A proposal to automate information-sharing about clients served within County departments and other government agencies;

2. Recommendations for legislative changes to address prohibitions against necessary information sharing between agencies; and

3. Protocols for case management that include identification of the agency staff responsible for the information.

In our October 1, 2008 status report to your Board, an eight-week process was outlined in which the CEO convened a 12-department Centralized Case Management Work Group (Work Group) to develop recommendations to address your Board's directives. Recommendations were designed to be implemented using a phased approach and progressively build on County resources and address legal restrictions limiting the sharing of client information. Preliminary recommendations described in the memo included:

1. Creating a baseline document of County systems/programs that facilitate the exchange of client information;

2. Establishing *LA County Cares* as a computerized tool to anonymously identify and facilitate the delivery of integrated services and supports to shared County families with high levels of need;

3. Implementing technical enhancements/seeking legal changes to the County's *Family Children's Index* – a computerized interagency data system supported by state legislation that allows specified agencies to share basic identifying information of families "at-risk" of child abuse or neglect; and

4. Drafting a set of preliminary legal/legislative recommendations to enhance the County's ability to proactively serve families with unmet needs and supports.

In addition, the memo described a site visit in late October by County delegates representing three Board Offices, the CEO, the Chief Information Office, County Counsel, and DCFS to Allegheny County's (Pennsylvania) Department of Human Services (DHS). It was anticipated that the meeting with Allegheny County's DHS Director and staff to discuss their shared client information systems would help shape the Work Group's final recommendations.

Based on feedback received and lessons learned from our site visit, the CEO will convene a meeting with key delegation and Work Group members, as well as County stakeholders to further refine the proposed recommendations. This process will be completed in time to file the letter for your Board's January 13, 2009 meeting.

If you have any questions or need additional information please let me know, or your staff may contact Deputy Chief Executive Officer Miguel Santana at (213) 974-4530, or via e-mail at msantana@ceo.lacounty.gov.

WTF:MS:KH
CP:hn

c: Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel
Centralized Case Management Work Group Department Heads
Centralized Case Management Work Group Members

County of Los Angeles
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE
Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street, Room 713, Los Angeles, California 90012
(213) 974-1101
http://ceo.lacounty.gov

WILLIAM T FUJIOKA
Chief Executive Officer

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

Mark Ridley-Thomas
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

June 12, 2009

To: Supervisor Don Knabe, Chairman
Supervisor Gloria Molina
Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas
Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From: William T Fujioka
Chief Executive Officer

INFORMATION SHARING TO PREVENT CHILD ABUSE AND UTILIZATION OF THE COUNTY'S FAMILY AND CHILDREN'S INDEX

On May 26, 2009, on motion by Supervisors Antonovich and Yaroslavsky, your Board directed the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), in conjunction with the Interagency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect (ICAN) and affected County agencies, to report back regarding the:

1. Current use of Family and Children's Index (FCI) by each of its participating public agencies;

2. Training and instruction necessary for participating agencies to increase and maximize their utilization of FCI; and

3. Planned enhancements to both FCI's membership and application, including those requiring legislative changes to implement.

The response prepared below and the recommendations that follow are based largely on efforts conducted by the CEO to address Supervisors Antonovich's and Molina's data sharing motion of June 24, 2008.

I. Background

The County's FCI is an existing interagency system whose creation was authorized by Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) section 18961.5 which was written by ICAN and enacted in 1992. Essentially, the statute allows children services, health services, law enforcement, mental health services, probation, schools, and social services agencies

within counties to have the ability to share specific identifying information of families at-risk for child abuse or neglect for the purposes of forming a multi-disciplinary team (MDT). Specifically, the designated provider agencies can share: the name, address, telephone number, and date/place of birth of family members; the number assigned to the case by each agency; name and telephone number of each employee assigned to the case from each agency; and, date(s) of contact between each agency and family member(s).

Family and Children's Index accumulates this basic family and case-level information by downloading, from participating agency databases, records that match certain "at-risk" definition thresholds. WIC section 18961.5 requires each county to develop its own standards for defining "at-risk" before utilizing this system. Los Angeles County's participating provider agencies have entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) (Attachment A) which sets forth the County's "at-risk" standards based on the following parameters:

1. All "substantiated" and "inconclusive" allegations of child abuse reported to a child protection agency;

2. Whenever a child is allegedly the victim of a crime; and

3. An event or fact involving a child or family member that, in and of itself, would not meet the Child Abuse and Neglect Reporting Act (CANRA) definition of child abuse, nor trigger a mandated report, but which would, when combined with additional events or facts, raise a reasonable cause for concern that the family is in need of intervention or services to prevent the occurrence of child abuse and neglect as defined in CANRA.

Pursuant to the MOU, information contained in FCI can only be accessed by department heads, their designated representatives, and members of MDTs.

Serving as a "pointer" system authorized end-users can use FCI to identify participating agencies that have information about an incident involving a child at-risk. Once participants are pointed to the correct agency(ies) the statute mandates the convening of MDTs where confidential, substantive information about the family can be shared. MDTs must consist of at least three individuals trained in the prevention, identification and treatment of child abuse and neglect and who are qualified to provide services related to child abuse. The sharing of information by MDT members is discretionary pursuant to WIC sections 830 and 18951. Members of the team may disclose and exchange information relating to any incident(s) of child abuse that may be part of a juvenile court record or are otherwise confidential under State law. Any information shared must be subsequently kept confidential.

II. FCI Membership And Use

Following the execution of the November 2001 FCI MOU, the following Departments have served as members of the FCI system:

▪ Children and Family Services (DCFS)	▪ District Attorney (DA)	▪ Health Services (DHS)[1] (Public Health, DPH)
▪ Mental Health (DMH)	▪ Probation	▪ Public Social Services (DPSS)
▪ Sheriff		

With few exceptions, overall FCI usage by participating agencies, as measured by distinct queries of the almost two million records of unique records of "incidents" or "events" reported by the agencies, has steadily risen. Starting with a record low of 14 queries during January 2003 and increasing over time to a record high of 12,281 queries during the month of March 2009. Since May 2003 through the beginning of June 2009, approximately 364,472 queries have been conducted by the participating agencies. However, upon closer analysis, usage of FCI since February 2003 has varied significantly among the participating agencies, as follows:

1. DCFS: 325,817
2. Sheriff: 32,089
3. DA: 3,166
4. Probation: 2,229
5. DPH: 962
6. DPSS: 172
7. DMH: 37

Likewise, an analysis of FCI usage by participating agencies during the period spanning January 2008 through May 2009 reinforces the previous finding that the top three users of FCI are DCFS, Sheriff, and the DA, as summarized below:

1. DCFS: 141,683
2. Sheriff: 10,632
3. DA: 1,657
4. DPH: 251
5. DPSS: 128

Notably, both DMH and Probation did not use/query the FCI system during this period of time. In fact, DMH's last query of the system was conducted in December 2006; while

[1] DHS is the participating agency in the FCI MOU executed in 2001, but it is DPH that downloads data into and uses the FCI system.

Probation's last query was conducted in May 2007. Please see Attachment B for a summary of total monthly FCI usage for January 2003 through June 1, 2009.

III. Planned FCI Enhancements

A number of proposed technical enhancements intended to enhance the welfare and safety of children by increasing the number of participants and the robustness of data have been proposed by participating FCI agencies, end-users, and ICAN. The proposed enhancements summarized in Attachment C are designed to greatly increase the decision making ability of DCFS' Children's Social Workers (CSWs) when investigating alleged cases of child abuse/neglect; and will help clarify the roles that agencies play in the identification, prevention, and treatment of child abuse and neglect.

IV. Training and Instruction Needed To Maximize Agency Use of FCI

Attachment C also contains input received from participating FCI County agencies that is based on an analysis of their current use of FCI; recommendations regarding the type/scope of training that would be required if the proposed enhancements were realized; and the importance of enhanced participation by existing and new members. Attachment C also contains feedback and recommendations received from ICAN.

Recommendations

Attachment C contains a summary of recommendations designed to: 1) increase the safety for children and families known to DCFS and other County and non-County agencies; 2) enhance child and family assessments through the use of proactive and comprehensive information; 3) increase coordination of information among departments to provide better supports and services to families to help them improve their overall well-being; 4) help DCFS meet its three outcomes of increased safety, expedited permanency, and decreased reliance of out-of-home care; and, 5) establish clarity around the roles of the participating agencies to meet the County's charge of preventing child abuse and neglect.

The recommendations contained in Attachment C are organized into short-, mid-, and long-term categories, for example:

Short-Term (6 months)

1. Ensuring the active participation of existing FCI member agencies and expanding, to the fullest extent allowed under the current statute, the participation of County and non-County agencies in FCI (e.g., County hospitals or local police departments).

2. Drafting a new MOU with a revised set of complementary "at-risk" definitions that are based on research and emerging best practices to prevent child abuse and neglect;

and, which reflects the complementary roles of member agencies to identify, prevent, and treat child abuse and neglect.

3. Creating mandatory interagency training/evaluation opportunities and modalities for key agency staff that builds on existing ICAN and FCI trainings/materials.

4. Developing a set of measures/outcomes, such as a shared set of Management Appraisal Performance Plan (MAPP) goals to ensure fuller utilization of FCI; as well as enhanced resource allocation by participating agencies.

Mid-Term (6 months to 12 months)

1. Determining the technical and legal feasibility of implementing FCI enhancements such as: 1) adding a "watch list" function for end-users that would flag any matches for a case that they are currently working on; and, 2) acquiring additional data from new participating agencies, such as: pediatric trauma centers; children's hospitals; and, private hospitals (e.g., Kaiser, etc.).

2. Exploring changes to the current FCI statute to enhance inclusion of additional agencies and data, such as the Courts.

3. Conducting a Request for Proposal process to leverage the latest private sector technology/products available to support currently envisioned and any foreseeable technological enhancements to FCI.

Long-term (12 months to 18 months)

Exploring amendments to State law that would allow FCI to assume expanded functions, such as:

1. Acquiring information from school districts.

2. Permitting the use of an "agency contact person(s)" versus a currently required "case worker."

3. Re-defining MDTs as at least two professionals versus the currently required three to expedite information sharing; and,

4. Allowing for broader categories of information to be entered into FCI.

The CEO will convene a work group that includes County Counsel to determine the feasibility and fiscal impact on the County of implementing the recommendations outlined in Attachment C. We expect to return to your Board within 90 days with our findings and with

any modifications, if needed, to the recommendations and enhancements being proposed to enhance the FCI system.

Once this project is approved by your Board, the CEO, in conjunction with DCFS, ICAN, and other County and non-County FCI member agencies will coordinate the implementation of the recommendations. County Counsel will be consulted to ensure that all enhancement recommendations comply with state and federal confidentiality statutes and regulations.

The proposed technical enhancements coupled with increased participation of County and non-County agencies will greatly enhance the welfare and safety of children. The decision making ability of CSWs will increase exponentially when investigating alleged cases of child abuse/neglect as they will have access to the most comprehensive information available to them via the FCI system and any MDTs convened as a result.

If you have any questions or need further assistance, please let me know or your staff may contact Miguel Santana, Deputy Chief Executive Officer at (213) 974-4530, or via e-mail at msantana@ceo.lacounty.gov.

WTF:MS:KH
CP:hn

Attachments (3)

c: Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel
District Attorney
Sheriff
Department of Children and Family Services
Department of Public Health
Department of Public Social Services
Interagency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect

ATTACHMENT A

Family and Children's Index

Steering Committee

Memorandum of Understanding

County of Los Angeles
Interagency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect

November 27, 2001

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
FOR THE INTERAGENCY COUNCIL ON CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT
FAMILY AND CHILDREN'S INDEX
BETWEEN:

THE LOS ANGELES SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT
THE DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES
THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SOCIAL SERVICES
THE PROBATION DEPARTMENT
THE DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH
THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
AND THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES

PURPOSE

The purpose of this Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is to describe the framework for the use of the Interagency Council on Child Abuse and Neglect (ICAN) Family and Children's Index (FCI), outline each agency's risk indicators, ensure that confidentiality requirements are maintained, and affirm each agency's commitment to participate in the FCI network.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The FCI is a computerized interagency data information system which is designed to better identify children and families who are at-risk of child abuse and neglect. FCI is a centralized database which ties together basic data about families and children that have had relevant contacts with public agencies and have been identified as at-risk for abuse or neglect. It provides authorized ICAN agency personnel with minimal information regarding other ICAN agencies' contacts with a family or child or an agency contact for pursuing additional information. The data is gathered from existing computer systems from within the agencies. It allows professionals to know when other agencies may have pertinent information about a child or family with whom they are involved.

ENABLING LEGISLATION

In 1992, Assembly Bill 3491 (Gotch) was adopted by the State Legislature and signed by the Governor, which added Section 18961.5 to the Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC). This Section authorizes counties to establish a computerized database system within the county to allow specified provider agencies to share certain identifying information regarding families at-risk for child abuse or neglect for the purpose of forming multi-disciplinary personnel teams.

Provider agencies are defined as governmental or other agencies which have as one of their purposes the prevention, identification, management, or treatment of child abuse or neglect. The provider agencies serving children and their families which may share certain identifying information under Section 18961.5 WIC include, but are not limited

to: 1) social services; 2) children's services; 3) health services; 4) mental health services; 5) probation; 6) law enforcement; and 7) schools.

Section 18961.5 WIC allows only the following information to be entered into the system: 1) the name, address, telephone number, and date and place of birth of family members; 2) the number assigned to the case by each provider agency; 3) the name and telephone number of each employee assigned to the case from each provider agency; 4) the date or dates of contact between each provider agency and a family member or family members.

Section 18961.5 WIC requires each county to develop its own standards for defining "at-risk" before joining this system. Only information about children and families of children at-risk for child abuse or neglect may be entered into such a system.

The information may only be entered into the system by, or disclosed to, provider agency employees designated by the Director of each participating provider agency. Members of multi-disciplinary personnel teams shall be drawn from these designated employees, or other persons, as specified in Section 18961.5 WIC. The heads of provider agencies shall establish a system by which unauthorized personnel cannot access the data contained in the system.

The information obtained pursuant to Section 18961.5 WIC shall be kept confidential and shall be used solely for the prevention, identification, management, or treatment of child abuse, child neglect, or both.

AT-RISK FACTOR DEFINITION

Agencies participating in the ICAN FCI agree that an ***at-risk indicator*** is:

1. All substantiated or inconclusive allegations of child abuse to a child protective agency not including unfounded allegations;

2. When a child is a victim of an alleged crime; or

3. An event or fact involving a child or family member which in and of itself would not meet the definition of "Child Abuse" in the Child Abuse and Neglect Reporting Act Penal Code Section 11164 et seq., nor trigger a report pursuant to that Act, but which would, when combined with additional events or facts, raise reasonable cause for concern that the family is in need of intervention or services to prevent the occurrence of child abuse as defined in the Act.

IDENTIFIED DEPARTMENTAL "AT-RISK" INDICATOR CRITERIA

Agencies participating in the ICAN FCI agree to provide identifying information on families where the following criteria are present:

Los Angeles Sheriff's Department (LASD)

LASD information will be made available to FCI under the following circumstance: A child or a child's sibling has been named in a suspected child abuse report.

Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS)

DCFS information will be made available for all children for whom a report of child abuse or neglect has been received and for whom an investigation has been completed, except insofar as DCFS will not make available information where the investigation concluded that the allegations were unfounded. Incident information will be provided at the time of completion of the Emergency Response (ER) referral episode.

Department of Public Social Services (DPSS)

Pregnant/Parenting Minors: Pregnant minors 12 years and under, and minor mothers under 14 years old.

Probation Department

Juvenile Probation data will be made available for the following circumstances:

1. Those referred under the age of 14.
2. Those with a sustained charge of "rape of minor under 14."
3. Those with cases filed directly in adult court for serious sex offenses.
4. Those with a sustained charge of drug possession, use, or sales.
5. Those with a sustained charge as listed by the District Attorney in this document.
6. Those with a sustained firearm possession charge.

Adult Probation data will be made available for the following circumstances:

1. Probationers convicted of offenses requiring registration under 290 P.C.
2. Probationers convicted of 273.5 P.C.
3. Probationers supervised on Child Threat caseloads.
4. Female probationers supervised on Narcotic Testing caseloads.

Department of Mental Health (DMH)

DMH will provide information for children who are:

1. Suspected to be at-risk for abuse/neglect and a concomitant report has been filed with DCFS.
2. Referred for mental health services by DCFS with abuse/neglect already substantiated.

District Attorney (DA)

The DA will provide information relative to the following:

At the time of filing a criminal case, an entry will be made into FCI and PIMS concurrently when the following violations of the Penal Code are alleged in the Complaint:

1. 187PC- when the victim of the murder is a child;
2. 273abPC;
3. 269(a)(1)PC;
4. 269(a)(2)PC;
5. 269(a)(3)PC;
6. 269(a)(4)PC;
7. 269(a)(5)PC;
8. 664/187PC- when the victim of the attempted murder is a child;
9. 207(b)PC;
10. 208(b)PC;
11. 288.5(a)PC;
12. 286(c)(1)PC;
13. 288(b)(1)PC;
14. 288(b)(2)PC;
15. 288(a)PC;
16. 288a(c)(1)PC
17. 289(j)PC;
18. 289(l)PC;
19. 289(h)PC;
20. 273a(a)PC;
21. 273d(a)PC;
22. 278PC;
23. 278.5PC;
24. 288(c)(1)PC;
25. 288a(c)(1)PC;
26. 288a(c)(2)PC;
27. 286(b)(2)PC;
28. 286(b)(1)PC;
29. 288a(b)(1)PC;
30. 266jPC;
31. 266h(b)PC;
32. 266l(b)PC;
33. 288a(b)(2)PC;
34. 311.4(b)PC;
35. 311.2(b)PC;
36. 311.10PC;
37. 311.11(b)PC;
38. 261.5(c)PC;
39. 261.5(d)PC;

40. 311.1(a)PC;
41. 311.4(c)PC;
42. 271aPC;
43. 267PC;
44. 647.6(b)PC;
45. 647.6(a)PC;
46. 261.5(a)PC;
47. 261.5(b)PC;
48. 273a(b)PC;
49. 273gPC;
50. 311.4(a)PC;
51. 311.11(a)PC.

The above list is comprehensive in scope as to violations of the Penal Code involving children as victims and will include information regarding child abduction investigations presented by law enforcement agencies to the District Attorney's Office where criminal charges were filed.

The District Attorney's Office will continue to use the philosophy of original point of entry for all data entry. Most of the data requested for the FCI database is input into the Prosecutor's Information Management System (PIMS) when a case is filed. In order to participate in FCI and maintain a mangeable workload for support staff, the Systems staff of the District Attorney's Office and the Systems staff for FCI will work together to formulate a plan to electronically send a datagram from PIMS to FCI by using either PIX or Cloverleaf to write conversion rules that can be used to change the data entered into PIMS to meet the requirements of the FCI database.

Department of Health Services (DHS)

DHS will provide information regarding:

1. Children born to mothers 14 years of age or younger.
2. Children under 12 years old with sexually transmitted diseases.

INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED BY AGENCIES

Agencies participating in the ICAN FCI agree to provide the following identifying information to the Index when one of the at-risk indicator criteria have been met:

1. Name of individual and/or family members.
2. Address of individual and/or family members.
3. Telephone number of individual and/or family members.
4. Date of birth of individual and/or family members.
5. Place of birth of individual and/or family members.
6. Case number assigned by the agency providing the data.
7. Name and telephone number of employee(s) assigned to provide further information on the case to multi-disciplinary personnel team.

8. Date or dates of contact between the agency providing data and a family member or members.

CONFIDENTIALITY AND USE OF INFORMATION ON FCI

Agencies participating in the ICAN Family and Children's Index agree that information may only be entered into FCI by, or disclosed to, agency employees designated by the Director of the participating agency. Members of multi-disciplinary personnel teams shall be drawn from these designated employees, or other persons, as specified in Section 18951 (d) WIC. Participating agencies shall establish a system by which unauthorized personnel cannot access the data contained in the system.

The information contained in FCI shall be kept confidential and shall be used solely for the prevention, identification, management, or treatment of child abuse, child neglect, or both. Every employee with access to FCI will have taken an oath of confidentiality and have a confidentiality statement on file with their employer agency.

Any statistical information/reports should be approved by a committee made up of departmental members of the multi-disciplinary team as identified in the MOU.

This MOU shall be effective upon the signature date below. Should this MOU require modification, such modification shall be added by mutual agreement by all parties shown below.

This MOU may be terminated by any of the below listed parties by issuing a notice which includes the reason for termination.

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

Sheriff Leroy D. Baca — Date: 11-28-01

Anita Bock, Director
Department of Children and Family Services — Date: 11-27-01

Steven J. Golightly, Interim Director
Department of Public Social Services — Date: 11-28-01

Richard Shumsky
Chief Probation Officer — Date: 11-28-01

Marvin J. Southard, DSW, Director
Department of Mental Health — Date: 11-27-01

Steve L. Cooley
District Attorney — Date: 11/27/01

Fred Leaf, Interim Director
Department of Health Services — Date: 11/27/01

FCI USAGE HISTORY

By Monthly Distinct Queries as of JUNE 1, 2009

2003

Jan.	14
Feb.	19
Mar.	362
Apr.	52
May	38
Jun.	79
Jul.	21
Aug.	46
Sep.	59
Oct.	449
Nov.	367
Dec.	399

2004

Jan.	458
Feb.	552
Mar.	985
Apr.	755
May	1,075
Jun.	949
Jul.	769
Aug.	731
Sep.	796
Oct.	572
Nov.	720
Dec.	835

2005

Jan.	1,418
Feb.	1,541
Mar.	3,441
Apr.	3,493
May	3,673
Jun.	3,489
Jul.	3,178
Aug.	3,906
Sep.	4,028
Oct.	4,534
Nov.	5,111
Dec.	5,164

2006

Jan.	4,876
Feb.	5,197
Mar.	6,821
Apr.	5,853
May	7,537
Jun.	7,507
Jul.	6,257
Aug.	6,644
Sep.	6,214
Oct.	6,891
Nov.	6,555
Dec.	5,731

2007

Jan.*	2,782
Feb.	6,615
Mar.	7,649
Apr.	6,842
May	8,290
Jun.	6,294
Jul.	6,373
Aug.	7,234
Sep.	6,896
Oct.	8,718
Nov.	7,300
Dec.	6,044

2008

Jan.	7,433
Feb.	7,217
Mar.	7,372
Apr.	7,710
May	7,756
Jun.	6,770
Jul.	6,344
Aug.	8,329
Sep.	10,314
Oct.	9,479
Nov.	6,591
Dec.	8,077

2009

Jan.	9,180
Feb.	10,154
Mar.	12,281
Apr.	11,547
May	12,274
Jun.*	614
Jul.	
Aug.	
Sep.	
Oct.	
Nov.	
Dec.	

* As of 06/01/09

ATTACHMENT C

SUMMARY OF FCI RECOMMENDATIONS

Short-Term (6 months)	Mid-Term (6 months to 12 months)	Long-term (12 months to 18 months)
Ensure the active participation of existing FCI member agencies; and expand, to the fullest extent allowed under the current statute, County and non-County participation in FCI. 1. Active participation by County departments and non-County government agencies is essential if a comprehensive safety net for the prevention of child abuse and neglect is to be created. Desired new/enhanced membership includes: a. County and non-County Hospitals: ▪ Children's Hospital; ▪ Harbor-UCLA Medical Center; ▪ LAC+USC Healthcare Network; ▪ Valley Care Olive View-UCLA Medical Center and Health Centers; ▪ Rancho Los Amigos National Rehabilitation Center; ▪ Martin Luther King, Jr. Multi-Service Ambulatory Care Center; and, ▪ High Desert Health System. b. County Departments: ▪ Coroner (new member) ▪ Health Services (approximately 155 clinics are rich potential data sources); ▪ Mental Health; ▪ Probation; and, ▪ Public Health (Nurse Family Partnership, Prenatal Care Guidance Program, and Maternal Child and Adolescent Health Division). c. City of Los Angeles Police Department and at least four other local police departments; and, d. At least two prosecutorial agencies of	Determine the technical and legal feasibility of implementing FCI enhancements such as: 1. Adding a "watch list" function for end-users that would flag any matches for a case that they are currently working on; and, 2. Acquiring additional data from new participants, such as: a. Pediatric trauma centers; b. Children's Hospital Orange County; and, c. Private hospitals (e.g., Kaiser, etc.). Explore changes to the current FCI statute to enhance inclusion of additional agencies and data, such as: 1. All of Probation's child-related data; 2. Children's Court; 3. Juvenile Court; 4. Delinquency Court; 5. Dependency Court; 6. Family Court; and, 7. State of California District Attorney's Sex Offender database. Conduct a Request for Proposal process to leverage the latest private sector technology/products available to support currently envisioned and any foreseeable technological enhancements to FCI.	Explore amendments to State law that would allow FCI to assume expanded functions, such as: 1. Acquiring information from at least seven school districts; 2. Adding data about non-relative members living in the home; 3. Permitting the use of an "agency contact person(s)" versus a currently required "case worker;" 4. Allowing FCI agencies that are already permitted to share information with one another without convening a MDT to do so without being required to convene MDTs; 5. Re-defining MDTs as at least two professionals versus the currently required three so as to expedite information sharing; 6. Permitting for more direct access to other agency information than what is currently allowed; 7. Allowing for broader categories of information to be entered into FCI; and, 8. Ensuring that information about adults can be shared.

SUMMARY OF FCI RECOMMENDATIONS

independent cities. 2. Draft a new MOU with a revised set of complementary "at-risk" definitions that are based on research and emerging best practices to prevent child abuse and neglect. The at-risk definitions will also reflect the complementary roles of member agencies to identify, prevent, and treat child abuse and neglect. 3. Explore clearer legal definitions of "at-risk" and establish guidelines as to how broadly "at-risk" can legally be defined (the broader the allowed definition, the broader the population of cases that can be input into the FCI system). 4. Develop a set of measures/outcomes, such as a shared set of Management Appraisal Performance Plan (MAPP) goals to ensure fuller utilization of FCI; as well as enhanced resource allocation by participating agencies. 5. Establish clear usage policies for each department outlining when and how frequently FCI will be consulted during the course of an investigation into an alleged case of child abuse and neglect; and how MDTs will be convened. 6. Ensure the development of protocols to support the integrity of data downloaded from participating agencies into FCI.		
Create mandatory interagency training/evaluation opportunities and modalities for key agency staff that build on existing FCI trainings/materials. Participating agencies will: 1. Better understand how and what type of information can be downloaded into FCI;		

SUMMARY OF FCI RECOMMENDATIONS

2. Improve their awareness as to when and how to access information contained in FCI; 3. Increase their ability to follow-up with member agencies using the information contained in FCI; 4. Enhance their understanding of the breadth and scope of information sharing that is possible in the context of MDTs; 5. Increase their knowledge of child abuse/neglect, its underlying causes, and means of preventing it; 6. Have a shared understanding of their respective roles in identifying, preventing, and treating child abuse/neglect; and, 7. Reinforce DCFS' primary role of keeping children safe from abuse and neglect.		