

STORAGE NAME: h3559z.cfe

****FINAL ACTION****

DATE: May 6, 1998

****SEE FINAL ACTION STATUS SECTION****

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
AS REVISED BY THE COMMITTEE ON
CHILDREN AND FAMILY EMPOWERMENT
FINAL BILL RESEARCH & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT**

BILL # HB 3559 (PCB CFE 98-01A)

RELATING TO: Integrated Children's Information System

SPONSOR(S): Committee on Children and Family Empowerment and Representative Lacasa

COMPANION BILL(S): None

ORIGINATING COMMITTEE(S)/COMMITTEE(S) OF REFERENCE:

- (1) CHILDREN AND FAMILY EMPOWERMENT YEAS 6 NAYS 0
- (2) GOVERNMENTAL OPERATIONS YEAS 5 NAYS 0
- (3)

I. FINAL ACTION STATUS:

05/01/98 Died in Senate Committee on Children, Families and Seniors.

II. SUMMARY:

This bill provides for a feasibility study to be conducted by the State Technology Council regarding the creation of an Integrated Children's Information System [ICIS]. The purpose of ICIS is to give the Department of Children and Family Services, the Department of Juvenile Justice, and the Department of Education access to information which can improve and integrate case management for programs for children and youth. The study is to answer the following questions:

1. What data elements should be considered for sharing and what benefits can be anticipated from sharing this information?
2. What are the barriers to the sharing of this client information between these agencies, including but not limited to, legal barriers such as confidentiality and technical barriers such as the problem of establishing a common identifier?
3. What are the additional barriers to the creation of an on-line real-time system which provides for the sharing of information on all persons receiving services?
4. Are there examples from Florida or other states of these or similar barriers being overcome?
5. What is the feasibility of overcoming each barrier?
6. What is the appropriate state organization to provide planning and coordination for the implementation of an information sharing system as described herein?

The study is to be submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate by November 1, 1998.

This bill does not appear to have a fiscal impact on state or local governments. The State Technology Council will conduct the study within existing funds.

III. SUBSTANTIVE RESEARCH:

A. PRESENT SITUATION:

Several Florida statutes currently require that the Department of Education, the Department of Children and Families, the Department of Juvenile Justice, the Department of Health and the Agency for Health Care Administration establish centralized, integrated information systems for their respective agencies. The intent of these systems is to facilitate the collection and sharing of standardized data among government entities. Examples of such integrated Managed Information Systems (MIS) which are already in operation include the Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program and Juvenile Assessment Centers. Such efforts at data integration are occurring alongside a current national trend to make government more efficient by making use of advances in electronic technology which have been realized by the private sector.¹

Opportunities

The creation of an integrated, standardized information system serves to coordinate decision making within the organizational structure of government. Opportunities appear to exist for improvement in services to at-risk children and youth through applications of information technologies that facilitate program integration. This could result in earlier intervention.

Program Integration

The integration of relevant information can serve to decrease the compartmentalization of complex, multifaceted social phenomena. For example, in a review of programs directed at transferring welfare recipients into stable employment, researcher LaDonna A. Pavetti has found a relationship between employment instability and the convergence of multiple problems on a single family unit.² According to Pavetti, it is common for dependent individuals to be beset by a high incidence of interrelated problems which serves to hinder a successful transition to financial independence. These problems include learning disabilities, substance abuse, depression and physical or mental disabilities, family responsibilities, including the responsibility to care for other family members with disabilities, histories of physical or sexual abuse and domestic violence, social isolation, absent and/or non-supportive mates or significant others, inadequate parenting and discipline skills, and proximity to criminal activity.

¹ A recent study by the Progress and Freedom Foundation and IBM's Institute for Electronic Government rated all 50 states in the use of electronic technology. Overall Florida ranked 1st in the South and 3rd in the nation in this study. Florida's lowest ranking was in the area of social services where the state ranked 7th in the south and 29th in the nation. (See The Digital State, 1997, The Progress and Freedom Foundation.).

² See Hershey, Alan; Pavetti, LaDonna, "Turning Job Finders into Job Keepers," Welfare To Work, Vol. 7, No. 1, Spring 1997.

Program integration is a reform directed at this problem of bureaucratic fragmentation of services. The benefits anticipated from it include both greater efficiency and effectiveness. However, most efforts to date toward service integration have met with marginal success, largely because they have emphasized physical restructuring of organizations.

Recent attention has been directed toward the use of information technology to integrate services. ***“Information technologies of the 1990’s offer a latent capacity to share information across agency and program boundaries, to discover patterns and interactions once hidden in millions of separate paper records, and to make decisions based on more complete data. For example, shared information could help different human services agencies view their common clients as complete individuals or families rather than unrelated sets of problems or needs.”*** (Anderson, Belardo, and Dawes; 1994).

Early Intervention

Early intervention appears to be a second major opportunity offered by information technology. For example, one of the primary underlying causes of welfare dependency, and a major cause of a host of other problems that result in government intervention, is teen pregnancy. A report by the House Committee on Children and Families cites a 1994 FSU study which estimated the public costs resulting from teen pregnancies in Florida.³ Using 1992 teen pregnancies as its basis, the study identified \$1.2 billion⁴ in probable impacts on government agencies over a 15- year period.⁵ Maximizing the use of existing data can improve efforts to identify candidates for early intervention programs as is done by Miami-Dade County public schools and can reduce long-term consequences such as those found in the FSU study.

Problems

A variety of technical issues and two substantive issues have resulted in barriers to the sharing of data and information among agencies. The technical barriers include:

- ▶ Accessibility. Much of the data collected by a department is not in a computer that can be accessed directly by another department. Often data is available in aggregate or in manual form and cannot be recalculated into other variables and factors.
- ▶ Compatibility of data formats. There is considerable variation in how data elements are defined and how they are structurally maintained in a data system.
- ▶ Compatibility of computer systems.

³ See “Developmental Deficits and the Traps for the Next generation,” Ending The Welfare Trap: Welfare Reform in Florida, The House committee on Children and Family Empowerment, February 1998.

⁴ The exact figure is \$1,168,720,000.

⁵ The data is cited to the Florida State University center for Prevention and Early Intervention Policy.

The substantive issues are:

- ▶ Confidentiality. Confidentiality is the most often raised objection to sharing social service data.
- ▶ The risk of "labeling" or "tracking" students which prejudices their treatment and assignment to programs.

Finally the issues of leadership and cooperation have presented major, but often unmentioned barriers to information exchange. The attitudes of agency staff and the degree of cooperation between the agencies are often the most crucial elements in an interdepartmental data sharing effort. Research conducted at the Center for Technology in government at SUNY University at Albany, N.Y. demonstrated that the attitudes of agency managers toward information exchange are more often a reflection of general attitudes toward change and perceived threats from outside involvement in the agency's affairs rather than objective concerns about specific issues.⁶

These problems have prevented prior efforts to improve social services programs through information exchange. In 1987, the Legislature established the Risk Assessment Information System Coordinating Council in s. 282.502, F.S. The purpose of the council was:

1. To develop a list of the information systems and the data elements and their formats which are related to criminal justice and which are maintained by each of the entities represented on the coordinating council.
2. To develop a list of the custodians for the systems and data elements and describe the policies relating to access to each of the respective systems and data elements.
3. To identify the barriers to the access and sharing of information among the entities represented on the council and determine, as to each barrier, whether it exists by virtue of statute, rule, or technological considerations.
4. To establish standard definitions and standard formats to be utilized by all entities represented on the council in order to develop a population-at-risk profile for purposes of identifying at an early age, and tracking for statistical purposes, persons who are probable candidates for entering into the criminal justice system so as to develop educational and human resources to direct such persons away from criminal activities.
5. To coordinate and develop a plan for the sharing of common data elements, as produced in accordance with standard definitions and standard formats, by the entities represented on the council.

The council was sunset in 1996.

New Solutions

⁶ See Partners in State-Local Information Systems: Lessons from the Field, Executive Summary, 1997, Center for Technology in Government, State University of New York at Albany.

Recent improvements in computer technology (hardware and software) and the development of the data warehouse as a strategy for linking data in different databases have largely resolved the technical issues and improved the ability of agencies to link programs and data bases. Progress has also been made in dealing with the confidentiality problems through the development of carefully crafted agreements and protocols for sharing information between agencies. Finally, the issue of "labeling" has been dealt within programs such as the early intervention program run by the Miami-Dade Public School District by using risk factor data to make programs available to students for voluntary participation, rather than to assign students to programs.

The problem of institutional inertia and resistance has been addressed through the creation of interdepartmental councils and committees to plan for and coordinate information sharing efforts. The passage of Committee Substitute for Senate Bill 940 by the 1997 Legislature was particularly significant in this regard. This legislation was based on the recommendations contained in "Information Technology Resources Governance in Florida State Government: A New Framework for Managing the State's Technology Investment," by the Joint Legislative Information Technology Resource Committee. The bill made comprehensive changes to the management of technology resources by repealing the statutes that emphasized hardware comparability, and replacing it with an alternative governance structure for the state's information resources management which is intended to increase agency sharing and compatibility of information technology resources.

Information exchange in at least two specific groups of government programs has been addressed through the creation of the Criminal Justice Information System Council in 1974 (revised and expanded into the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Systems Council in 1995) and the Health Information Systems Council in 1996.

B. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

The bill provides for a feasibility study to be conducted by the State Technology Council regarding the creation of an Integrated Children's Information System [ICIS]. The purpose of ICIS is to give the Department of Children and Family Services, the Department of Juvenile Justice, and the Department of Education access to information which can improve and integrate case management for programs for children and youth. The study is to answer the following questions:

1. What data elements should be considered for sharing and what benefits can be anticipated from sharing this information?
2. What are the barriers to the sharing of this client information between these agencies, including but not limited to legal barriers such as confidentiality, and technical barriers such as the problem of establishing a common identifier?
3. What are the additional barriers to the creation of an on-line real-time system which provides for the sharing of information on all persons receiving services?
4. Are there examples from Florida or other states of these or similar barriers being overcome?

5. What is the feasibility of overcoming each barrier?

6. What is the appropriate state organization to provide planning and coordination for the implementation of an information sharing system as described herein?

The study is to be submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate by November 1, 1998.

C. APPLICATION OF PRINCIPLES:

1. Less Government:

a. Does the bill create, increase or reduce, either directly or indirectly:

(1) any authority to make rules or adjudicate disputes?

No

(2) any new responsibilities, obligations or work for other governmental or private organizations or individuals?

No

(3) any entitlement to a government service or benefit?

No

b. If an agency or program is eliminated or reduced:

No agency or program is eliminated by this bill.

(1) what responsibilities, costs and powers are passed on to another program, agency, level of government, or private entity?

N/A

(2) what is the cost of such responsibility at the new level/agency?

N/A

(3) how is the new agency accountable to the people governed?

N/A

2. Lower Taxes:

a. Does the bill increase anyone's taxes?

No

b. Does the bill require or authorize an increase in any fees?

No

c. Does the bill reduce total taxes, both rates and revenues?

No

d. Does the bill reduce total fees, both rates and revenues?

No

e. Does the bill authorize any fee or tax increase by any local government?

No

3. Personal Responsibility:

a. Does the bill reduce or eliminate an entitlement to government services or subsidy?

No

b. Do the beneficiaries of the legislation directly pay any portion of the cost of implementation and operation?

N/A

4. Individual Freedom:

a. Does the bill increase the allowable options of individuals or private organizations/associations to conduct their own affairs?

No

b. Does the bill prohibit, or create new government interference with, any presently lawful activity?

No

5. Family Empowerment:

- a. If the bill purports to provide services to families or children:

This bill does not purport to provide services for families and children.

- (1) Who evaluates the family's needs?

N/A

- (2) Who makes the decisions?

N/A

- (3) Are private alternatives permitted?

N/A

- (4) Are families required to participate in a program?

N/A

- (5) Are families penalized for not participating in a program?

N/A

- b. Does the bill directly affect the legal rights and obligations between family members?

No

- c. If the bill creates or changes a program providing services to families or children, in which of the following does the bill vest control of the program, either through direct participation or appointment authority:

This bill does not create or change a program providing services to families or children.

- (1) parents and guardians?

N/A

- (2) service providers?

N/A

(3) government employees/agencies?

N/A

D. STATUTE(S) AFFECTED:

None

E. SECTION-BY-SECTION RESEARCH:

Section 1. Subsection (1) expresses legislative intent that an integrated children's information system be established to give the Department of Children and Family Services, the Department of Juvenile Justice, and the Department of Education access to information which can improve and integrate case management for programs for children and youth.

Subsection (2) provides that the State Technology Council submit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate by November 1, 1998, an assessment of the feasibility of creating an integrated children's information system. The purpose of the system is to allow for coordinated case management among programs offered by the Department of Children and Family Services, the Department of Juvenile Justice, and the Department of Education. The study is to answer the following questions:

1. What data elements should be considered for sharing and what benefits can be anticipated from sharing this information?
2. What are the barriers to the sharing of this client information between these agencies, including but not limited to legal barriers such as confidentiality, and technical barriers such as the problem of establishing a common identifier?
3. What are the additional barriers to the creation of an on-line real-time system which provides for the sharing of information on all persons receiving services?
4. Are there examples from Florida or other states of these or similar barriers being overcome?
5. What is the feasibility of overcoming each barrier?
6. What is the appropriate state organization to provide planning and coordination for the implementation of an information sharing system as described herein?

Section 2. Provides that the effective date of the bill is upon becoming law.

IV. FISCAL RESEARCH & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT:

A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE AGENCIES/STATE FUNDS:

1. Non-recurring Effects:

The State Technology Council will conduct the study within existing funds.

2. Recurring Effects:

None

3. Long Run Effects Other Than Normal Growth:

None

4. Total Revenues and Expenditures:

None

B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AS A WHOLE:

1. Non-recurring Effects:

None

2. Recurring Effects:

None

3. Long Run Effects Other Than Normal Growth:

None

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

1. Direct Private Sector Costs:

None

2. Direct Private Sector Benefits:

None

STORAGE NAME: h3559z.cfe

DATE: May 6, 1998

PAGE 11

3. Effects on Competition, Private Enterprise and Employment Markets:

None

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

None

V. CONSEQUENCES OF ARTICLE VII, SECTION 18 OF THE FLORIDA CONSTITUTION:

A. APPLICABILITY OF THE MANDATES PROVISION:

This bill does not require counties or municipalities to expend funds.

B. REDUCTION OF REVENUE RAISING AUTHORITY:

This bill does not reduce the authority of counties or municipalities to raise revenues.

C. REDUCTION OF STATE TAX SHARED WITH COUNTIES AND MUNICIPALITIES:

This bill does not reduce the percentage of a state tax shared with counties or municipalities.

VI. COMMENTS:

02/04/98 H Prefiled

03/02/98 H Referred to Governmental Operations (GRC)

03/03/98 H Introduced, referred to Governmental Operations (GRC) -HJ 00041

03/06/98 H On Committee agenda-- Governmental Operations (GRC), 03/12/98, 1:30 pm, 413C

03/12/98 H Comm. Action:-Unanimously Favorable by Governmental Operations (GRC) -HJ 00245

03/17/98 H Pending Consent Calendar -HJ 00245

03/20/98 H Available for Consent Calendar

03/24/98 H Placed on Consent Calendar

04/16/98 H Read second and third times -HJ 00676

04/16/98 H Passed; YEAS 114 NAYS 2 -HJ 00676

04/16/98 H Immediately certified -HJ 00677

04/16/98 S In Messages

04/21/98 S Received, referred to Children, Families and Seniors; Governmental Reform and Oversight -SJ 00749

05/01/98 S Died in Committee on Children, Families and Seniors

STORAGE NAME: h3559z.cfe

DATE: May 6, 1998

PAGE 12

VII. AMENDMENTS OR COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES:

N/A

VIII. SIGNATURES:

COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND FAMILY EMPOWERMENT:

Prepared by:

Legislative Research Director:

ROBERT S. COX

ROBERT BARRIOS

AS REVISED BY THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL OPERATIONS:

Prepared by:

Legislative Research Director:

Garci Perez

Jimmy O. Helms

FINAL RESEARCH PREPARED BY COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN AND FAMILY EMPOWERMENT:

Prepared by:

Legislative Research Director:

ROBERT S. COX

ROBERT BARRIOS