

orig: CHR  
cc: Kathi

File: NGA Children's  
Project

## Partnerships for Children

### *Vision Statement*

Children are America's most valuable resource. They are important to society because of their potential now and for the future. Children deserve to be loved and cared for, to feel secure in the present and in reaching for the future. They deserve good health care, adequate nutrition, safe and affordable housing, a safe environment, and a quality education. Children need an understanding of their culture, an affirmation of their self-worth, and a strong and positive sense of their responsibility to themselves and to society.

Families are the fundamental building block of a strong society. Parents are children's first and primary nurturers. They provide the material and emotional necessities for their children. Parents are also their children's first teachers. They provide moral guidance, intellectual stimulation, and continuing encouragement for learning. At times, all families may need support to carry out these functions. This support may come from extended families, friends, religious and cultural institutions, schools, businesses, community institutions, or government.

Communities are environments in which children thrive and families are supported in their efforts to nurture their children. State and local governments support communities as they seek to empower families. The federal government supports states, local governments, and communities in their efforts to enhance the well-being of children and families.

## ***Principles for Reform***

*The following principles are offered to guide policymakers as the nation seeks to achieve this vision. They reflect what we believe all support systems – families, friends, religious and cultural institutions, schools, businesses, community institutions, and government – should strive to achieve for all children. The principles are based on the additional belief that families and communities are in the best position to determine the types of support that are needed and that families should have ready access to that support if and when they need it.*

1. Support for children – whether from family, friends, religious and cultural institutions, schools, businesses, community institutions, or government – should promote physical and emotional security and health, help children reach their full potential, and help them develop and sustain caring relationships with others and participate in learning and social activities within their schools and communities.
2. The role of federal, state, and local government should be to ensure basic health and safety for all children, ensure accountability for public funds, and in collaboration with the private sector, support the development of programs and services that meet the needs of families in communities.
3. The private sector -- businesses and private and non-profit organizations -- should also play an important role in supporting children and families through such initiatives as family leave, flexible working schedules, child care services, recreation and after-school programs, school-to-work programs, mentoring programs, and health and mental health services.

4. Government's primary responsibility -- at the local, state, and federal levels -- should be to foster and sustain family stability and unity. Each level of government should strive to eliminate perverse incentives that place the needs of children and their families in categorical boxes and discourage family unity or financial stability.
5. Communities should play a key role in creating environments where children can grow and develop by building on the strengths of every family and supporting them in meeting their responsibilities.
6. Government support systems for children and families should be built on new partnerships among federal, state, and local policymakers. Each new partnership should be characterized by a shared vision, goals, and objectives. The relationship between federal, state, and local governments should be based on mutual trust and respect and agreement on a common set of specific, positive results for which all parties are held accountable. Accountability should be measured and shared at the community, local, state, and federal levels.
7. Federal, state, and local funding strategies should be designed to promote achievement of these positive results. Funding priorities should support programs and services for children that have demonstrated results, are cost-effective, are easily accessible, and encourage and expedite prevention and early intervention to avoid crisis and more costly assistance later. At the same time, government must recognize the need to support children and families in crisis.
8. Federal, state, and local government strategies should recognize the importance of individual and community responsibility and promote the development of consolidated services that meet the multiple and interrelated needs of children and their families. These strategies should encourage flexible approaches that achieve positive results and recognize the diversity of states and localities through policies, budget processes, and strategic planning.

9. The transition from the current system to a more comprehensive, integrated system must ensure efficiency and enhanced system capacity. Federal, state, and local government should assist in meeting this goal through strategies that include technical assistance, professional development, and the establishment of evaluation systems to track progress toward goals and identify areas of concern.

THE WHITE HOUSE  
OFFICE OF DOMESTIC POLICY

MAR 28 REC'D

**CAROL H. RASCO**  
*Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy*

To: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Draft response for POTUS  
and forward to CHR by: \_\_\_\_\_

Draft response for CHR by: \_\_\_\_\_

Please reply directly to the writer  
(copy to CHR) by: \_\_\_\_\_

Please advise by: \_\_\_\_\_

Let's discuss: \_\_\_\_\_

For your information: \_\_\_\_\_

Reply using form code: \_\_\_\_\_

File: \_\_\_\_\_

Send copy to (original to CHR): \_\_\_\_\_

Schedule ?;       Accept       Pending       Regret

Designee to attend: \_\_\_\_\_

Remarks: Per Email  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

E X E C U T I V E   O F F I C E   O F   T H E   P R E S I D E N T

28-Mar-1994 08:04pm

TO:            Keith W. Mason

FROM:         Carol H. Rasco  
               Economic and Domestic Policy

CC:            William A. Galston  
CC:            Rosalyn A. Miller

SUBJECT:     NGA memo on children's policy

I have received your memo regarding the development of children's policy. I will ask Rosalyn to make a copy to send on to Bill Galston as well. My initial reaction is to ask the reps to go for option 1 as this will certainly "mesh" better with what DPC hopes to do on children's issues in the coming months. Bill upon reviewing the memo should let you know if he has different thoughts. Personally I would be concerned if Carroll Campbell were presiding this summer when a new policy would be considered but I can't be quoted on that! Thanks.

ROZ: Source memo in my outbox to be copied and sent to Galston.  
Original to be filed in NGA Human Resources Comm

✓  
*Lanna*

MAR 28 REC'D

MEMORANDUM

---

TO: CAROL RASCO  
FROM: KEITH MASON,  
DATE: MARCH 28, 1994

---

Please review the four alternative approaches that the NGA Human Resources Committee Children's Policy Working Group is considering for action.

Democratic Governors' representatives would like guidance from the White House as to how to proceed in their upcoming meetings. Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

**NATIONAL GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION**

Carroll A. Campbell Jr.  
Governor of South Carolina  
Chairman

Raymond C. Scheppach  
Executive Director

Howard Dean  
Governor of Vermont  
Vice Chairman

Hall of the States  
444 North Capitol Street  
Washington, D.C. 20001-1512  
Telephone (202) 624-5300



March 21, 1994

**MEMORANDUM**

*To:* Committee on Human Resources SAC  
*From:* Margie Siegel and Kristen Ames  
*Re:* Children's Policy Revisions

To follow up from our meeting of March 9, attached please find a list of options for revisions in our current policies, a summary and the text of the policies for your review.

We would like to meet again the week following the Congressional recess, the week of April 11, and are hoping to schedule a children's policy working group meeting together with a crime policy working group session. In addition, we will try to schedule a SAC meeting for that same day, or shortly thereafter, so that non-DC SAC members may be able to participate in person.

cc: Barry Van Lare

April 13

*Jan*

National Governors' Association  
Committee on Human Resources

CHILDREN'S POLICY WORKING GROUP  
Alternative Policy Options

Discussion Draft  
March 21, 1994

Following are four alternative approaches that might be considered by the members of the Committee on Human Resources staff advisory council as they look at the reauthorization of NGA's policies on children.

Under all options, the Committee would retain the opportunity to develop interim policy should unexpected legislative issues develop that are of concern to the states.

It would be helpful if the SAC members would review these options and determine which approach would be most acceptable to their Governors as soon as possible. Attached to this memo is a sheet briefly describing the existing policy in the children's area, broadly defined, when it was adopted, and when it is scheduled to sunset.

Alternative 1

Sunset current NGA policies regarding children and adopt the "vision statement" being developed by the Intergovernmental Working Group on Children. Postpone the development and adoption of more detailed policy until the 1995 annual meeting to allow time for the working group to complete its work on the development of model federal legislation.

Alternative 2

Same as Alternative 1, and, in addition, develop and adopt a short policy outlining the Governors' position on the appropriate federal role regarding children and supporting federal efforts to increase state flexibility and options and the ability of the Governors to coordinate and integrate children's programs.

Alternative 3

Same as Alternative 2, and in addition, develop and adopt new policy regarding gubernatorial concerns and objectives relative to the reauthorization or modification of federal child care programs scheduled to be considered in 1995. If this alternative is preferred, it would also be helpful to know the specific child care issues that are concern to the individual states. We have been asked to provide recommendations to HHS on child care system improvements as well, and a survey will be going out shortly asking for information on your state's current systems, as well as your recommendations for amendments to the current legislation.

Alternative 4

Sunset current NGA policies regarding children. Develop a "comprehensive" new NGA policy on children that would incorporate the "vision statement" being drafted by the Intergovernmental Working Group on Children as an overarching statement of gubernatorial concerns, as well as new or revised policies in some or all of the areas in current policy. If this alternative is preferred, we need to know which additional issues are priorities for the individual states.

*An Overview of NGA Children's Policies*

**C-12. Children**

Comprehensive overview of children's issues including delineation of federal and state responsibilities and overall principles to guide the continued development and improvement of state services to children in the following areas:

- access to services,
- need for economic security,
- education,
- child welfare and family support.
- child care,
- housing,
- programs for youth, and
- aid to working parents.

For child development programs, the policy discusses the federal role in providing support for preschool child development programs, including Head Start. It stresses the key state role in planning, monitoring and coordinating programs, with coordination role through office of Governor.

Adopted August 1983, revised February 1986 and July 1990.  
Scheduled to sunset February 1995

**C-15. Prevention and Treatment of Child Abuse and Neglect**

After expressing concern about increasing amount of child abuse and neglect, the policy states the belief that federal and state governments should provide adequate resources to fund existing prevention and treatment programs, increased enforcement of existing laws, and appropriate investigation and treatment of complaints of abuse and neglect. It supports the principle that states continue to have primary responsibility for protection of children -- thus federal government should not mandate licensing policies for day care or other juvenile facilities. Urges federal government to continue Title XX funding for training and provide funds under Child Abuse Amendments of 1984.

Adopted August 1985, reaffirmed February 1992.  
Scheduled to sunset February 1995.

**C-24 Child Welfare**

Outlines Governors' concern with problems in child welfare system, and need for the Nation to create a system focused on prevention, early intervention and family preservation. Urges state flexibility to implement targeted programs. Urges nationwide coordination of efforts to confront problems of drug-exposed infants. Urges family preservation activities where appropriate and innovation in cases where foster and adoptive care are necessary. Recommends steps to increase interagency and intergovernmental linkages through

- treatment teams,
- centralized program oversight,
- single access points for services, and
- coordinated information systems.

Supports efforts to establish creative and flexible financing approaches with adequate federal support. Supports use of demonstration programs to target key implementation issues in child welfare and adoption programs. Stresses need for federal leadership in technical assistance for information systems and for information sharing. Reviews a number of steps to be taken to strengthen IVE program effectiveness, including resolving back claims issues, protecting administrative expenditures, retooling staff and reexamining court procedures.

#### **HR -9 School-linked Integrated Children and Youth Support Services**

Recognizes leadership role of states and localities in developing comprehensive integrated service systems for children and youth linked to the school system. Recommends that federal government encourage coordination of federal funds and programs, assist states and localities in efforts to design flexible programs, and establish an incentive grant program to states and localities.

Adopted August 1993

Scheduled to sunset August 1995.

Policy on Head Start reauthorization was adopted at the 1994 Winter meeting, and is scheduled to sunset February 1996.

#### **Relevant sections of Related policies**

##### *C-2 Education, Section 2.2 Early Childhood Development*

Recommends federal government work with states to develop a national early intervention strategy that includes education. Recommends a multi-faceted approach to serve diverse needs of population, a stable funding source, coordination of existing program resources, agencies and appropriate training and technical assistance for professional staff.

Adopted August 1992 (originally adopted February 1982)

Scheduled to sunset February 1995

##### *HR-4 Income Security, The Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children*

Points out important role of WIC in improving prenatal health and prevention of low birth weight babies; recommends increased federal funding and flexibility in spending federal funds, increased program coordination with other health programs, particularly Medicaid and automatic referral of recipients between Medicaid and WIC, as well as making eligibility more consistent.

Adopted February 1993 (first adopted August 1980)  
Scheduled to sunset February 1995

*C-5 Health and Medical Care, Maternal and Child Health Services*

Stresses concern that millions of poor children are not covered by Medicaid or lack access to regular source of health care or adequate income assistance. Recommends increased federal support for maternal and child health services and nutrition programs.

Adopted February 1994 as part of Public Health Services Policy (first adopted August 1980)  
Scheduled to sunset February 1996

The agency has not scheduled a target date for publishing a final rule to implement the provisions. □

### International Trade

#### U.S. TO SEEK 'FAST-TRACK' AUTHORITY FOR 'SUBSTANTIAL' PERIOD OF TIME

The Clinton administration plans to ask Congress to renew "fast-track" negotiating authority for a "substantial length of time" to be able to conclude trade agreements with countries throughout the Western Hemisphere over the next few years, U.S. Trade Representative Mickey Kantor said March 23.

Kantor said that the administration had begun discussions on the issue with key members of Congress.

"We think that a common agreement between the Congress and the administration to obtain 'fast-track' authority would be important... as we proceed forward in opening new markets for U.S. products," he said.

Earlier this month, Ellen L. Frost, counselor for policy planning at the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, said that the administration would be requesting the authority, which requires Congress to approve or reject trade agreements without amendment, as part of legislation it plans to propose later this year to implement the agreement reached last December in the Uruguay Round of multilateral trade talks.

Kantor, testifying before the House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Commerce, Consumer Protection, and Competitiveness, said that the United States was looking at some "important opportunities" in the Western Hemisphere for free trade agreements, whether on a bilateral basis or as countries accede to the North American Free Trade Agreement.

"It is in our interest, of course, to move forward to open up those markets and to protect our interests, whether it's intellectual property or investment, as much as possible," Kantor said.

He said that one of the major issues being discussed was whether to seek "fast-track" authority for specific trade agreements or, more broadly, for the range of agreements likely to be negotiated over the next few years.

"In our view, we need a substantial length of time [for 'fast-track'] in order to follow what we think is an appropriate course of action, which is a building block approach to this hemisphere to creating open trade," Kantor said.

He said that such an approach would mean beginning negotiations with countries like Chile almost immediately, either on a bilateral basis or as it seeks to join NAFTA. But for other countries, he said, with a different level of development and a different level of ability to assume NAFTA-like obligations, "it would take longer."

"So therefore, we'd have to take into account, if you look at a substantial length of time, how long we think it would take to really deal with opening trade in this hemisphere," Kantor said. □

### Health Care

#### CONGRESS SHOULD COMBINE MEDICAID PROPOSALS IN REFORM BILLS, WITNESSES SAY

No single reform plan adequately addresses the problems and structure of the Medicaid program, so Con-

gress should combine provisions of various bills, witnesses told the Senate Finance Committee March 24.

The National Governors' Association generally supports the administration's reform plan (HR 3600, S 1757), but would prefer an approach that uncouples cash assistance programs from Medicaid, said Raymond C. Schepbach, executive director of the organization.

In addition, NGA supports federalization of the Qualified Medicare Beneficiaries program and is concerned about the steep cut in the disproportionate share hospital program, he said.

Governors would support parts of a legislative proposal advanced by Sen. John Chafee (R-RI) (S 1770), including giving states the ability to establish managed care systems under Medicaid without federal waivers and to integrate Medicaid beneficiaries into the health care delivery system used by all others.

However, they do not support Chafee's proposed cap on the federal contribution to Medicaid spending or the elimination of the disproportionate share program, Schepbach said.

The governors also support the managed competition approach (S 1579) of Sen. John B. Breaux (D-La), which establishes a new broad-based, low-income subsidy program and eliminates the complex eligibility categories for acute care. However, governors strongly oppose the financing structure that funds the bill, he said.

### Alliances Equalize Coverage

Stan Dorn, managing attorney at the National Health Law Program Inc., told the committee the regional alliances proposed by the president would be a big step forward for low-income individuals because they would help to equalize the quality of care.

The managed competition approach does not do as good a job of integrating Medicaid beneficiaries into mainstream medical care and the caps in the Chafee bill could cause states to make cutbacks in spending, Dorn said.

To allow health maintenance organizations and other managed care plans to operate efficiently, Congress should eliminate any-willing-provider laws, make point-of-service options voluntary not mandatory, and reconsider a proposal that health plans must contract with essential community providers, said Karen Wintringham, senior vice president of the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York.

### Medicaid Trends

Medicaid spending is projected to reach \$85.8 billion in fiscal year 1994, which would account for 5.9 percent of total federal outlays, according to testimony by Mark Merlis of the Congressional Research Service. By fiscal 1999, federal outlays under current law would reach \$152.2 billion, he said.

Program growth is attributable to increases in program participation and changes in service reimbursement and utilization such as hospital payments, he said. Growth in costs for acute care has been much more rapid than that for long-term care, Merlis said. Long-term care now consumes 36 percent of program spending.

FYI —

—Keith

Carol Rasco