

Human Service Model Feasibility Task Force

November 20, 2013 12:00 pm
North Central Health Care, Board Room

Meeting Minutes

Present:

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Marathon County: | Brad Karger, Gary Gisselman, Vicki Tylka, Ken Day, Joanne Leonard, John Robinson |
| Lincoln County: | Nancy Bergstrom, Randy Scholz, Bob Weaver, Mike Nelson, Bruce Giese |
| Langlade County: | Robin Stowe, Kim Van Hoof, Ron Nye, Holly Matucheski, Dick Hurlbert, Bob Lussow |
| State of Wisconsin Reps: | Teresa Steinmetz, Gail Chapman |
| North Central Health Care: | Gary Bezucha, Becky Schultz, Toni Simonson, Paula Hawkins, Brenda Glodowski |
| Facilitators: | Gail Nordheim, Gerry Born |

Minutes

- Correction to page 2 of the 10/28/13 minutes, under Timeline/Process, 2nd bullet point; it should read: “On the Timeline process flowchart, DHS/DCF think numbers 9 and 10 should be reversed so that all county boards have to authorize establishing a multi-county DHS prior to the State agencies approving the Implementation Plan”.
- **Motion** Nye, 2nd Lussow, to approve the minutes of the 10/28/13 meeting with the above correction. Motion carried.

Decision Tree

- An implementation process would take most of 2014 if it is approved by the counties to proceed.
- Any “no” on the tree would stop the process.

Feasibility Study

- Part 1: Purpose of the feasibility study
 - Income maintenance must be a part of the Human Service Department. All areas of the Social Services Department will be addressed in the planning process, as to how the services would be provided.
- Part 2: Why is reorganization being considered?
 - “Achieve improved quality” – how will that be done or measured? Wording will be changed to the potential, not that it is a guarantee.
 - Statute 46.23 purpose – state has pre-determined that a human service system is most efficient. 61 of 72 counties are single county human service departments. The state is looking for regional departments.
 - Change “sophisticated” business platform wording. Perhaps “established”.

- Why specifically a multi-county department, rather than a single human service department? Needs to be addressed, because if one county wanted to go to a single department, the three county agency would need to be dissolved.
- Part 3: What do the counties hope to accomplish through the Multi-County HSD?
 - Concern expressed regarding elimination of a local director. There would be a supervisor in each county.
 - Goal was not to cut services, but to eliminate some of the administrative overhead and use those funds to enhance or develop services.
 - Leadership in the state would help in getting grants.
 - Implementation plan would determine the exact makeup of the human service board, consistent with state statute. At least one third, but not more than two thirds of the board would need to be county board of supervisor representation.
 - Add a point about funding by the counties. It is an effective measure of budget local control.
 - Need to expand section on shared services compared to direct care services to specialized services by county.
 - Include outcomes for smooth transition and continued good customer outcomes for Income Maintenance and Child Support and other Social Service programs, in addition to Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice.
 - Consumers have improved access, outcomes and higher level of satisfaction.
 - Add reduction in out of home placements, including social cost to family disruption.
- Part 4: How would the Multi-County HSD organize to help ensure that the above outcomes are met?
 - Add sentence re: key indicators dashboard for board, and corrective plans required on items not being met on dashboard.
- Part 5: Potential advantages and disadvantages of a single comprehensive agency
 - Planning of liability issues should be talked about in the implementation phase.
- Part 6: Addressing quality issues
 - Quality is never “done”; there should always be continuous quality improvement.
 - Acknowledge that in response to issues identified in focus group NCHC is putting special emphasis on areas identified, which is part of their ongoing quality improvement program.
 - Add better ability to identify service gaps.
- Part 7: What problems may be created by development of the multi-county HSD and how will these be dealt with?
 - Include allowing for higher level in some areas, taking into account differences in geographic areas.
 - Salary and staffing will be in compliance with the law.
 - Not every problem will be addressed in this process. For example resolving issues over integration of services with neighboring counties. There will still always be resource limitations and priority settings.
- Part 8: Who is likely to be opposed to the multi-county HSD?

- Part 9: What groups will be included in the reorganization study?
 - Social Service Committees should be added.
- Part 10: What specific changes would the counties like to see made in the way the agencies are organized and programs are operated?
 - Add statement about possible variation in outcomes.
 - The plan needs to be for a multi-county agency, and not specify different services in different counties.
- Part 11: What effect will the reorganization have on staff, programs and budget?
 - Need uniform salary at the outset, rather than transition. The implementation plan will address salary and benefit levels.
- Part 12: Study process

Report on Staffing Levels & Organizational Structure

- Brenda Glodowski, Social Services Directors, and county Finance Directors met to discuss budget assumptions in a multi-county Human Services Department.
- There would be a potential reduction of ten positions. That funding could be re-directed back into services and programs.
- Direct service positions would remain fairly consistent. Administrative positions would be reduced in a combined NCHC and three county organization. For example, accounts payable, material management, payroll, human resources, health information, etc.
- Tax levy support would not change by combining tax levy to social services departments and NCHC. The goal is no increase in tax levy.
- Governance would be by the new human service department board.
- There are wide differentials currently in what the counties are putting into the current 51 system.
- Was there discussion on creating a regional human services organization without the nursing home? It is a stand alone Marathon County facility. Perhaps have the NHOC contract with the HSD to run it.

Next Meeting Agenda

- Revised plan
- Outline of what needs to be included in an implementation plan and how it could be organized. (Gail/Gerry to do)
- Determine whether to adopt or approve the feasibility study and forward to counties. Also determine how and when it would be presented to the county boards for their action.
- Gail/Gerry will draft a resolution in conjunction with the three corp counsels.
- Basic topic areas to be included in an implementation plan, and timeline.

Add to the narrative section of the feasibility study report something about next steps and timeline.

Motion Hurlbert, 2nd Matucheski, to adjourn at 2:54 p.m. Motion carried.

Pdh