

Clarke County CPMT Agenda  
May 27, 2023  
2:00 PM  
Clarke County Government Center  
101 Chalmers Court Room AB, Berryville VA 22611

OPEN SESSION

1. Approve minutes from May 23, 2023
2. CSA Local Agency Annual Risk Assessment Survey.
3. Financial – June payment report

CLOSED SESSION

Consent Agenda: 10 cases for vote

Next Meeting: July 25, 2023

# CLARKE COUNTY CPMT MEETING MINUTES

## May 23, 2023

### Attendees

Claire Spaulding	CSA Coordinator
Denise Acker	CSB Representative
Rachael Selman	DSS Representative Alternate
Jerry Stollings	CSU Representative and CPMT Vice Chair
Frank Moore	CCPS Representative and CPMT Chair
Terri Catlett	BOS Representative
Leea Shirley	VDH Representative
Tavan Mair	Private Provider Representative

---

Frank called the meeting to order at 2:06 p.m. The meeting was conducted in person at the Clarke County Government Center.

### Old Business:

Frank made a motion to approve the minutes from April; Jerry seconded the motion. Leea, Terri and Tavan abstained as they were absent at the April meeting.

### New Business:

1. Members went through OCS' Service Gap Survey as a group to identify 3-5 of the most needed services in Clarke County. It was decided that Acute Psychiatric Hospitalization, School Based Mental Health, Multisystemic Therapy, Functional Family Therapy and Short-Term Diagnostics were the most critical service gaps. Claire will take the information provided and complete the survey on behalf of CPMT.
2. Claire shared her recent CSA Coordinator training experience with OCS in Richmond. The three-day training gave a beneficial overview of CSA responsibilities and functions.

### Financial Update:

The payment report from March was reviewed with no questions. Leea suggested that Claire includes visual charts

### Closed Session:

See attachment A for completed form detailing the motion to enter closed session, vote on the items discussed, and certify the discussion in closed session.

### Consent Agenda:

The consent agenda with 6 cases was reviewed. Terri made a motion to leave closed session and Leea seconded.

**Next meeting: June 27, 2023**

**MOTION TO CONDUCT A CLOSED MEETING**

I move that the Clarke County Community Policy and Management Team conduct a closed meeting in accordance with §2.2-3711 A of the Code of Virginia for the purposes of:

2.2-3711.A (4) – The protection of the privacy of individuals in personal matters not related to public business.

The subject matter of the closed meeting will be:

1. Case Review (active and recent).

**RECORD OF VOTE AS TO THE AFORESAID MOTION**

	MOTION BY	SECOND	ABSENT/ ABSTAIN	AYE	NAY
<i>Denise Acker</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Jerry Stollings</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Jennifer Parker</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Terri Catlett</i>				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Leea Shirley</i>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
<i>Frank Moore</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Tavan Mair</i>				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

**CERTIFICATE**

Do each of you certify that to the best of your knowledge only public business matters lawfully exempted from the open meeting requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, and only such public business matters as were identified in the motion by which the closed meeting was convened, were heard, discussed or considered by the Community Policy and Management Team in the closed meeting?

	AYE	NAY	ABSENT	REASON FOR NAY VOTE
<i>Denise Acker</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
<i>Jerry Stollings</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
<i>Jennifer Parker</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<i>Terri Catlett</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
<i>Leea Shirley</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
<i>Frank Moore</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
<i>Tavan Mair</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			

The aforesaid Motion and Certificate were adopted in open meeting at a public meeting held on 5/23/23 of the Clarke County Community Policy and Management Team by roll-call vote as shown above. The Certificate was adopted immediately after the closed meeting at a reconvened open meeting.

*A. Moore*  
Chair

5/23/23  
Date

# Fiscal Year 2024 CSA Local Agency - Annual Risk Assessment Survey

The Program Audit Activity of the Office of Children's Services (OCS) is responsible for evaluating the adequacy and effectiveness of governance, risk management, internal control, and compliance activities of local CSA programs, governed by requirements established in the Code of Virginia, Children's Services Act (§ 2.2-5200) and policies adopted by the State Executive Council (SEC). The basis for audit selections include risk assessment, management and stakeholder input, and the established audit cycle (every three years). The purpose of this survey is to collect information pertaining to local CSA programs that is necessary to complete the risk assessment, and to solicit input from local agency stakeholders that is specific to each of the individual programs. As you complete the survey, please keep in mind that a high risk rating does not guarantee that your program will be subject to an immediate audit. Further, a low risk score does not mean that your program will not be audited in the near future.

Instructions: Survey questions may be discussed with the full Community Policy and Management Team (CPMT). However, the CPMT Chair or designee should complete and submit only one survey per locality. Responses are due by 5:00pm on Friday, July 14, 2023.

Your prompt and thoughtful responses to this risk evaluation are greatly appreciated. If you have any questions about this survey, please contact Stephanie Bacote, Program Audit Manager at (804) 662-7441.

\* Required

## Respondent's Contact Information

(In case follow-up is necessary)

1. Locality Name \*

2. Respondent's Name \*

3. Respondent's Title \*

4. Respondent's Phone Number \*

## Inherent Risk Evaluation

The following risk factors may hinder achievement of objectives, if mitigating actions are not taken. Please rate the degree in which your local CSA program has experienced or have been affected by the situations described below.

(Note: A "high" rating is indicative that the risk exposure described exists and has significantly affected the local program. A "low" rating is indicative that the risk exposure is not present ,or where it exist that there has been little or no affect to the local program.)

5. CHANGES IN OPERATIONS: Extent to which changes in funding, staffing, operating practices/procedures over the past 24 months have affected your local program as the changes are absorbed. \*

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

6. PRESSURE TO MEET OBJECTIVES: Extent to which the local program has been vulnerable to reductions in the quality of service provided, increased operating cost, or lessening of controls/ procedures to achieve federal, state, and local objectives. \*

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

7. ADVERSE PUBLICITY: Extent to which unfavorable exposures (industry and/or public media) over the past 24 months have affected your local program's ability to secure and maintain public trust and confidence. \*

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High



8. SERVICE DELAYS: Over the past 24 months, the extent to which failure to meet stated service levels has seriously affected relations with stakeholders, created serious internal problems, and/or affected the program's reputation. \*

- Low
- Slightly moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

9. CONFIDENTIALITY OF DATA: Extent of loss or embarrassment over the past 24 months that was due to unauthorized or premature disclosure of protected information. \*

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

10. INACCURATE DATA: Extent that incorrect data generated over the past 24 months has affected the integrity and reliability of data reported by the local program, and consequently shared by other state and local stakeholders. \*

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

11. PROCESSING SOPHISTICATION: Extent to which the reliability of manual and/or automated technology processes used in the local program's process flow over the past 24 months has impacted performance of daily operating activities. \*

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

12. HISTORY OF FRAUD: Extent to which actual or alleged incidences fraud occurring with in the past 24 months has impacted the local program. \*

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

## Control Risk Evaluation

The following factors that are established to mitigate risks could potentially lose their effectiveness over time, and thus no longer function as intended. Please rate the degree in which your local CSA program has experienced or has been affected by the situations described below.

(Note: A "low" rating is indicative that the risk control described exists and is functioning as intended. A "high" rating is indicative that the risk control described does not exist, or where it does exist that the control is not working as intended).

13. EXPERIENCE LEVEL OF THE MANAGEMENT TEAM: Collectively, the extent of management's understanding of state and local CSA operations and understanding of management principles (planning, directing, and monitoring). Consider length of CSA experience.

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

14. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SECURITY: Extent that appropriate actions have been taken to protect sensitive/confidential data from unauthorized access, such as the use of restricted areas, passwords, and encryption devices.

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

15. AUDIT COVERAGE: Extent that internal and/or external reviews are of a quality and frequency of which to provide comprehensive evaluations of the local program.

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

16. ABILITY TO OVERRIDE POLICY: Extent of the ease to which management takes actions that supersede the state and local policies/procedures adopted that govern the local program.

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

17. CONTINGENCY PLANNING: Existence of a documented plan to ensure continuation of services in the event of an emergency (e.g. natural disaster) or other short/long-term service disruptions (e.g. extended absence of CSA Coordinator).

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

18. ADEQUACY OF POLICIES AND PROCEDURES: Extent to which local program policies and procedures are written, comprehensive, clear, accessible, aligned w/federal and state laws and policies where applicable, periodically reviewed and updated.

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

19. MEASURABLE GOAL/OBJECTIVES/PERFORMANCE TARGETS: Extent to which the management team has established benchmarks to gauge achievement; that are documented, reviewed/updated periodically, and disseminated.

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

20. MANAGEMENT REVIEW/QUALITY ASSURANCE: Extent to which the management team regularly receives and effectively acts upon formal reports detailing major aspects of the local program to ensure compliance with state and local requirements.

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

21. TRAINING: Extent to which a conscious effort is made to regularly provide training to local program stakeholders; that there is evidence that training needs of key stakeholders are met.

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High



22. SEGREGATION OF DUTIES: Extent to which duties in the local program's processing stream (i.e., service planning recommendations by FAPT and funding authorizations by CPMT) are optimally separate.

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

23. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST: Extent to which local representatives adhere to state and local disclosure requirements (i.e. timely notification; completed disclosure forms; abstain from voting where applicable).

- Low
- Slightly Moderate
- Moderate
- Slightly High
- High

# Stakeholder Feedback

All local programs are scheduled to be audited during the current three year audit cycle (Fiscal Years 2024-2026). Audit selections are based on the evaluation of many factors, including but not limited to risk/severity concerns, availability of resources, and input from OCS management and other state/local CSA stakeholders. Please note that a response to the following questions would NOT automatically result in the local CSA program receiving a higher risk ranking in the scheduling of audit priorities.

24. Please list and briefly describe any best practices, major achievements, and/or concerns that you have regarding your local CSA program.

25. Are there any particular areas of your program that you would like a callback from an auditor to discuss considerations for a more focused review? If yes, please provide a brief description.

---

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Microsoft. The data you submit will be sent to the form owner.