

Special Advisory Board Meeting 12-13-23			
Date December 13	3, 2023	Time 9:30 a.m10:30 a.m.	Location Virtual
Attendees	Maria Gurrol Lee, Dave M Thompson, J Excused: Nat Antonette (T Staff: Andrea Aram Maxwell Day Jennifer Jam Mayer, Mavi Vanessa Rezu Participants: Kate Acosta, Brown, Jenni Calhoun, Sar Connelly, Ch Dussell, Edm Fuentes, Ter Anne Hereno Tracy Kent, N Lawson, Shir Neely McElro Elizabeth Pri Schneider, So James Simor	o, Kari Beuerman, Shelby Boston la, Percy Howard, Celeste Jones, cDowell, Nancy Meyer-Adams, Ja ames Treggiari talie Bolin, Yvonnia Brown, Vida (^c oni) Navarro, Stuart Oppenheim hburu, Christopher Cajski, Hawkin ris, Marjorie Delgadillo, Shifra Ga es, Phyllis Jeroslow, Sheela Jhave is Njoo-Lau, Shay O'Brien, Martin os, Carolyn Shin	Kathryn Kietzman, Peter Allen ennifer Rolls Reutz, Jenell Castaneda, Jennifer Claar, , Kimberly Warmsley n Chan, Xi Chen, Carrie Cuy, E. man, Athena Georganas, eri, Christina Lacey, Kimberly na Parashkevova, Katie Perry, eila Benner, Alison Book, Lourdes lad Caldera-Gammage, Molly Guerrero, Maria Ciriaco, Melissa y Cox, Shahla Craggs, Alana rf, Denise Espinoza, Lucy reen, Lynn Harris-Henderson, elissa Jacobs, Christina Jones, orano, Heather Krystek, Karis ovato, Christian Maldonado, w, Virginia Olivas, Anne Powell, Stephanie Ruiz, Stephanie , Tera Sillett, June Simmons, Kylie Speckens, Tamara Duan Tran, Cindy Vang, Judy
Agenda/Topics	Kim opened	the meeting and introduced Nan	ncy Meyer-Adams Advisory
I. Welcome	Board Presid	ent. Nancy welcomed the Advisc and thanked them for taking tim	bry Board members and
II. Roll call Approval of today's Agenda		The agenda was approved.	
III. Purpose for	UC Berke	eley will not be renewing the 202	24-26 Title IV-E Contract:

1

today's meeting	a. Kim wanted to let everyone know what is happening directly and
today s meeting	a. Kim wanted to let everyone know what is happening directly and some of the impacts. The Title IV-E contract is normally a two-year
	contract. Normally, the 2024-26 Title IV-E contract would now go to
	the state for their processing. There were some difficult and
	challenging decisions that started in July. The Chancellor's Office and
	Berkeley Social Welfare decided not to renew the contract. There
	are multiple impacts, not only on the staff at CalSWEC, but also the
	nine hundred-plus students that are Title IV-E students, all the
	twenty universities and their faculty and staff, students that are
	covered under the program, all the stakeholders with whom we
	work. We want to share the critical reasons why this happened.
	Several Advisory Board members and stakeholders have been at
	other meetings over the last several weeks to discuss the issues.
	Linda Burton, Dean of Berkeley Social Welfare, will discuss the
	reasons for not renewing the contract. Dave McDowell, CDSS, will
	talk about potential hosting institutions and where the work will be
	done elsewhere moving forward. Then we will open it up for
	questions.
	Reasons for this decision, impacts:
	a. Dean Burton said she and Kim have worked very closely, joining
	forces five years ago. She recognized that everyone was numb and
	upset. She will continue to share why the decisions were made and
	underscores that the Title IV-E Program is not going away, but UC
	Berkeley and Berkeley Social Welfare will not hold the contract they
	have held for over thirty years. The events unfolded very quickly.
	b. The decision was made just before Thanksgiving. She asked people
	to keep in mind the fiscal overview. In launching CalSWEC and the
	programs associated with this thirty years ago, the cost was
	\$100,000.00. Now, the entity involves \$135 million dollars without
	changes in the infrastructure relative to the School of Social Welfare
	which is the unit that supports it. CDSS let Berkeley Social Welfare
	know last July that they were not going to renew the In-Service
	Training (RTA) contract as of July 2024. Berkeley Social Welfare was
	caught off guard by this and shared this with staff immediately. This
	action put several other actions into motion, forcing the examination
	of other CalSWEC contracts and their tenability with regard to fiscal
	liability. The current RTA contract funds over half of CalSWEC's 33
	employees. Severance pay cannot be funded from contracts. Funds
	must come directly from Berkeley Social Welfare's reserves. Dean
	Burton took time out to celebrate the entire In-Service Training team
	who were to be laid off but continue to come in to work daily and do
	their jobs so that CalSWEC could continue to be successful. In
	negotiating the Title IV-E contract for 2024-26, Berkeley Social
	Welfare consolidate the Title IV-E Scope of Work with limited
	elements of the In-Service (RTA contract) in the new contract. Their
	concern was that the Scope of Work was not well-defined which
	could lead to vulnerability. Other challenges: CalSWEC and Berkeley
	Social Welfare were named in a discrimination suit filed by a Title
	IV-E student at one of our campuses which brought in our legal

affairs team. There were concerns that Berkeley Social Welfare would be liable for a large financial settlement, the dollars coming not from UC Berkeley but from Berkeley Social Welfare. There were also challenges from several universities about indirect costs in the Title IV-E contract and inequality across the 20 universities in CalSWEC's consortium. Several units at UC Berkeley were looking at all these factors including Employee Labor Relations, the Office of Legal Affairs, Sponsored Projects Office, the Chief Financial Officer, the Vice Provost for Research, and Risk Management. One of their primary concerns on looking at the contract was passthrough funds: Berkeley Social Welfare's Title IV-E contract was 90% passthrough dollars. The policy at Berkeley is 50% passthrough. Berkeley Social Welfare was 40% above that. In addition, the small Berkeley School of Social Welfare does not have the financial capacity to meet the challenges that could arise. Finally, no faculty sponsor was willing to take on the challenge of the contract. Dean Burton was the PI for the last five years but completes her term at the end of June and is unable to continue in the role of PI after that. Again, the 90% passthrough created a loss of consent. Kim was involved with these meetings with the Chancellor and her staff just before Thanksgiving. Everyone acknowledged that this was guite a risk for Berkeley Social Welfare and too much for the School to continue to hold. Again, for over thirty years, CalSWEC has grown from a budget of one hundred thousand dollars to a budget of \$135 million dollars. Berkeley Social Welfare and Kim explained to the Chancellor's staff that they have been the backbone in public Child Welfare training. Berkeley Social Welfare has done a really great job of carrying out this training for over thirty years. Berkeley Social Welfare does not have the capacity to continue to do so with the financial risks that appear in this context. Berkeley Social Welfare will continue to be devoted to public child welfare. This outcome has been a surprise to Kim as much as it is a surprise to Dean Burton. It was not expected. It was not planned. All of this involved in the timeframe of Thanksgiving to now. Berkeley Social Welfare will continue to be available to work with CDSS. Berkeley Social Welfare will collaborate and continue a good working relationship because Berkeley Social Welfare wants to ensure that students are not compromised in the current statewide Title IV-E program. There is a lot to be worked out because there is a lot to absorb in a very short time. Berkeley Social Welfare is committed to doing this while working with Dave McDowell's team and CDSS.

Impacts on other CalSWEC contracts:

a. Questions have come up regarding the other contracts that CalSWEC has. CalSWEC has the HCAI contract and another contract with CDSS to do APS work. They are in discussion now. The IV-E has been the focus right now, but those contracts are also important. Dean Burton said that Berkeley Social Welfare will turn their attention to those contracts and will be making progress in the next week and will keep everyone informed. Kim recognized E. Maxwell Davis's team and

	their efforts to get those contracts up and running.
IV. Transition planning (CalSWEC/CDSS)	 Transitioning the Title IV-E contract a. Dave McDowell said that it is a tight timeline for getting things in place by June 30 for a start date of July 1, but CDSS has opportunities to leverage exemptions and has other ways prioritizing the contract that will be executed. Dave has also had conversations with Kim at CalSWEC to ensure that all the work of paying invoices will continue so schools do not have to worry about disruptions about getting reimbursed for the IV-E Program. They are also working on staffing the final fiscal work post-June 30. Kim wanted to echo some of the things that Dave and Dean Burton covered. This is the backbone of the child welfare training system. Starting last July when CalSWEC knew that the In-Service Training Program was going away, Vanessa Rezos and her team have continued to work very hard in terms of being leaders and partners throughout the state and with CDSS, and appreciate that work. Now with the change in the Title IV-E contract, Carolyn and her team and Chris and his team have been countering into that. CDSS staff came down a week ago to meet for the day in Berkeley to look through and figure out the nuts and bolts of how to transition/wrap up the programs. CalSWEC knows that this is a challenging time. The current contracts continue through June 30, 2024. Although the invoices for Quarter 4 always come after the fiscal year ends, they will continue to be paid as usual. Transitioning the work in the In-Service Training contract:
	a. A lot of the IST work is going to follow the IV-E contract. As had been previously discussed in the 2024-26 Scope of Work, CDSS will be taking part in the work, and some work will be going to the RTAs.
V. CDSS: Update on the Title IV-E contract hosting auspices	Dave discussed the transitioning of the Title IV-E contract: CDSS was told two and a half weeks ago that Berkeley Social Welfare would not be renewing the contract. They have been talking with several universities who have stepped up and are willing to host the program and holding informational sessions with interested parties. They are working with those partners to announce a new home for CalSWEC next week. They are grateful to those partners who have stepped up to ensure the program does not go away. CDSS is eager to support this because nobody wants the program to end. He knows that the staff at CalSWEC, the schools, and the counties do not want it to go away. The good news is that things are progressing very well.
VI. Questions and Answers	 Jim Treggiari: Why is this so urgent that a pivot must be made so quickly and abruptly? Dave: This contract was already set to end at the end of June 2024. When we were informed that Berkeley Social Welfare would not seek the renewal of the contract, CDSS asked for an extension for a year. The Chancellor's Office said that was not going to be an option. Kim: CalSWEC will not have a faculty sponsor at Berkeley Social Welfare, and with no faculty partner, CalSWEC does not have a Principal Investigator (PI). Without a PI, CalSWEC cannot have a contract. Chancellor Carol Christ is also retiring at the end of June

2024. The Chancellor's Office was very involved in 2017 when there was a negotiation of the indirect cost rate for the Title IV-E contract and budget with a new Chancellor in place July 1 that may not carryover.
 Jenell Thompson: My question is about the name CalSWEC. It is highly connected to Berkeley, but also California. Will we still exist as that?
Kim: There is also a question in the chat, who owns CalSWEC? To be clear, CalSWEC is a program of Berkeley Social Welfare at University of California at Berkeley. The only people that govern UC Berkeley are the Board of Regents of the University of California. The name of CalSWEC was designed by the faculty at the time. The program sunsets, but the name is not trademarked.
Dean Burton: The name CalSWEC will go whenever the program goes. There is no issue there. However, Dave and CDSS works it out and how it is configured and named is not an issue for Berkeley as far as trademark goes.
 Are the new entities expected to lift up and employ the whole CalSWEC staff?
Kim: CalSWEC knows that some entities have reached out to our amazing staff. If anyone chooses to do so, no one is going to stop you from doing that. Staff will have to make their own financial and career decisions for themselves and their families. The unit of CalSWEC at Berkeley which consists of 33 people will no longer exist after June 30, 2024.
 What is happening with the Advisory Board given the current circumstances?
Kim: I will continue to convene us through this current fiscal year. We have meetings scheduled in February and May. Dave and I have discussed the Advisory Board, but again, it will be up to CDSS and the new contracting entities to decide.
Dave: We will be making an announcement next week about the new contractors. We will be starting to have negotiations on the Scope of Work and those kinds of things. There will be ongoing work that is happening with CalSWEC. As part of our interest in not having a lapse in the program, there still would be a space for folks who are currently on the Advisory Board to continue to help advise on the
program. Ultimately, in the coming years, it may not look like it does now especially since it appears that all the programs will not be housed in the same place and the Advisory Board will look different. Still, there is a need for all the entities that are represented to continue to be part of the future of this program.
 Jenell Thompson: I want to make sure I heard this correctly. HCAI and APS are going to be worked. For Title IV-E, we are hoping that there will be an announcement next week. From there, there will be a discussion of transition and Scope of Work, which would include
5

whether the new agency would be willing to maintain any of the current administration or people and whether they would keep the CalSWEC name. The In-Service Training contract would be divided between the RTAs and CDSS. Is that right? Dave: With respect to a new entity taking on the program and maintaining the staff and structure of CalSWEC, that is up to the individuals as well as the entities that will be taking this on. To be clear, we are not negotiating with the staff. We are negotiating decisions with whoever comes on board. We are not negotiating individual staff people because people make their own choices depending on location, pay, and benefits and things that are the reality of people's existence. I will not speak about individuals because that is not in my purview to speak about. Of course, we are not going to tell entities, "Don't talk to staff who currently work for CalSWEC who have some level of expertise from working on this project for a number of years." Individual hiring decisions are not part of our contract. It is unlikely that we will end up with the name CalSWEC because programs will likely end up in different houses. I am not sure it will be appropriate given that it started off with the Title IV-E program, but now CalSWEC is known for a lot more than the Title IV-E Program. Those are things we will have conversations about going forward, which is frankly not our highest priority right now. The last thing I wanted to discuss is the IST work. Some of the work will go to CDSS and some will be going to the Regional Training Academies. Some of the work will move to the Title IV-E Stipend work in its new home.

 Anne Powell: I am very concerned about the data that has been built up at CalSWEC, and I want to see it travel with the programs. Our cog in the wheel is very small compared to all your other programs. We are very concerned because there is a long history of public behavioral health, and we want to see that data travel with the programs. I imagine, Dave, you have matching concerns with the data of Title IV-E.

Kim: I just want to point out that the transition processes for contracts are complex. We know that program data is critical to funders and universities. Our student information is in Salesforce, and we are looking into how we share this within the framework of student privacy protections.

Nancy Meyer-Adams: I and other PIs would like an update to the current subaward execution of the Adult Protective Services piece.
 E. Maxwell Daivs: We submitted all the subawards for processing on our regular schedule. We experienced several internal delays. We do not have the same kind of risk issues in the agreement that theoretically exist in Title IV-E because we do not have any students who are or could potentially enter repayment prior to June 30 just because it is a new project. It is also explicitly stated in the prime

6

 award for those projects that the holder of the prime award has absolutely no liability for unrepaid student repayment. We have that explicitly stated because of the current PBH and the old MHSA programs. We wanted to make that very, very clear when we were approaching schools about this project. Tracy Kent: Normally, schools will get a letter or email about the Title IV-E funding process and when to expect receipt. Will that happen so that schools can assure our respective administrations that funding will be received? Kim: 1 think the question is that once there is a new contractor, will there be an "Intent to Fund" documentation prior to the fiscal year? Dave: Yes, once we submit our contract to go through our process here at CDSS which I am sure will go simultaneously through the process whatever institution takes on the program, we will be able to issue an intent to fund at that point because the money is there. It is just a matter of getting it to folks. We may be able to get it in just under the wire. There may be exceptions where people can start work before the contract is signed. Those are processes that need to be determined, but yes, once the contract is signed, we will be able to send letters saying that money will be coning. Celeste Jones: We have been hearing a lot about the liability issue. What could be negotiated to make an institution not liable? Dave: The institutions that we have talked to so far have said that these are not issues for them. It seems to be specific to UC Berkeley. We have explained to other institutions what Berkeley's concerns have been, and they have all said that they believe that those are not concerns for them. Dean Burton: We have to understand if we are talking about a particular school, unit within the university, or the university as a whole taking responsibility for the CalSWEC projects. In our situation, it is the School of Social Welfare that is responsible for CalSWEC. It is not about the weinel being any different.	
-	 absolutely no liability for unrepaid student repayment. We have that explicitly stated because of the current PBH and the old MHSA programs. We wanted to make that very, very clear when we were approaching schools about this project. Tracy Kent: Normally, schools will get a letter or email about the Title IV-E funding process and when to expect receipt. Will that happen so that schools can assure our respective administrations that funding will be received? Kim: I think the question is that once there is a new contractor, will there be an "Intent to Fund" documentation prior to the fiscal year? Dave: Yes, once we submit our contract to go through our process here at CDSS which I am sure will go simultaneously through the process whatever institution takes on the program, we will be able to issue an intent to fund at that point because the money is there. It is just a matter of getting it to folks. We may be able to get it in just under the wire. There may be exceptions where people can start work before the contract is signed. Those are processes that need to be determined, but yes, once the contract is signed, we will be able to send letters saying that money will be coming. Celeste Jones: We have been hearing a lot about the liability issue. What could be negotiated to make an institution not liable? Dave: The institutions that we have talked to so far have said that these are not issues for them. It seems to be specific to UC Berkeley. We have explained to other institutions what Berkeley's concerns have been, and they have all said that they believe that those are not concerns for them. Dean Burton: We have to understand if we are talking about a particular school unit within the university, it is the school. It is the School's budget that has to absorb the liability issues. Nancy Meyer-Adams: Dave, do you anticipate delays for contracts going forward on July 1? Dave: We do not anticipate them being any different. We did get the budgets and thos
-	submitted to CDSS. All the twenty budgets we received from all the
	_

	Maria Gurrola: This year we were given different budgets with
	different IDC rates. Is it going to be clear as to which budget and
	which IDCs are going to be approved? Is there any plan for that
	process because we do not have one budget approved.
	Dave: We are now working off the original IDC rate. We were talking
	about some changes and that discussion is not off the table, but we
	do need to delay it a little bit, recognizing the change here. It is
	something on our radar and is something that we have been talking
	about with the folks who have expressed interest. We realize that it
	is an issue that needs to be resolved. It has not been forgotten, but it
	is not something that we can work on with this current contract.
	 Jim Treggiari: What is the number traditionally of students who have entered repayment?
	Carolyn Shin: For Title IV-E, it is less than 10%.
	E. Maxwell Davis: For IBH and Adult Services it is less than seven
	percent. In addition, it is about .5 percent overall that default on
	repayment.
	Jim: Has that been consistent over time?
	E. Maxwell Davis: It increased during COVID. I can crunch the
	numbers, but it is not significantly different because it was such a
	small number to begin with.
	Dave: During the economic downturn of 2008, we did not have a
	crisis level of students who were unable to be placed or unable to
	meet their obligation. We made some concessions as some county
	welfare agencies were laying off some of their staff so there were no
	options there. But we did open it up to other nonprofit organizations
	and agencies. Even during that time, it did not climb to a number
	that was untenable. I think very few of those folks who needed a
	review or ended up defaulting.
	Carolyn showed some data during peak pandemic.
	Feel free to direct further questions to Kim, Linda, and Dave.
	Next Meetings:
	https://calswec.berkeley.edu/about/people/advisory-board
VII. Adjourn	Schedule of meetings 2023-2024:
	February 15, 2024, virtual via Zoom
	• May 2, 2024, virtual via Zoom