

Minutes of Langlade County Social Service Committee Meeting

Call the meeting to order.

The meeting was called to order at the Health Service Center in the board room at 10:30 am on Monday, August 12, 2013 by Richard Hurlbert.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Members present: Richard Hurlbert, Pat McKinney-Rice, Bob Benishek, Vern Cahak, and Holly Matucheski.

Others present: Kim Van Hoof, Carlene Nagel, Patsy Rolo, and Liane Blahnik. Robin Stowe, Drew Kelly, Thiago Souza, Vicki Tylka, Debi McGregor and Christine Shorey attended part of meeting.

Approval of the agenda.

Motion by Cahak to approve agenda as mailed. Motion second by Benishek. All ayes. Motion carried.

Approve minutes from the previous meeting.

Motion by Benishek to approve the minutes from the previous meeting as mailed. Motion second by Cahak. All ayes. Motion carried.

Communications and Public Comment.

None.

Introduce new Economic Support Specialist – Thiago Souza.

Van Hoof introduced Thiago Souza to the committee. The committee welcomed Thiago to Langlade County. Van Hoof reported Thiago was hired to help with the Affordable Care Act program.

Children's Hospital Presentation – Debi McGregor.

Debi McGregor shared information about the Family Resource Center Network. Program information presented is attached to minutes. Debi reported the Family Resource Center will need office space starting in January 2014, and they have begun discussions with Langlade County B & G Club about moving the Play and Learn program there.

WCHSA (Wisconsin Counties Human Services Association) Umbrella Human Services Statute discussion – Marathon County Director Vicki Tylka.

Vicki Tylka shared information on WCHSA as 71 counties are members of this association, and this association has been discussing how to efficiently design human services across the State. The finished product they are looking for legislative support on is the Human Services Umbrella Statute, which enables counties to collaborate in providing a comprehensive range of human services and it provides flexibility with regard to the manner and extent to which counties may collaborate. It also requires

recognition of the collaborative body by state departments. Vicki provided a timeline for statutory revisions set by the Human Services Redesign Committee. Information provided is attached to the minutes.

Approve a credit card for new Social Worker Ashley Yang.

Van Hoof requested approval for an agency credit card for Ashley Yang with the standard \$250 credit limit. Motion by McKinney-Rice to approve an agency credit card for Ashley Yang with the \$250 credit limit. Motion second by Matucheski. All ayes. Motion carried.

Approval to purchase new workstation, task chair and client chairs for Income Maintenance Worker. Approval to purchase client chairs for offices.

Rolo requested approval to purchase a workstation, task chair and client chairs for offices. Rolo reported we need 22 client chairs including 4 for Van Hoof's office. Motion by Matucheski for approval to purchase workstation, desk and client chairs and to forward to Public Property. Motion second by McKinney-Rice. All ayes. Motion carried.

Approve 2014 Budget and 2015 Budget Plan.

The committee reviewed the 2014 Budget and 2015 Budget Plan. Nagel reported that cost savings from positions will be used to offset the current budget year, as she is projected to need about \$163,507 from the Risk Reserve this year to offset the Alternative Care expenses and the overtime for Social Workers. Nagel reported the 2015 came out right to budget as tax levy was frozen, but the Alternative Care budget was cut by 10% to cover the increase in health insurance costs. Motion by Benishek to approve the 2014 Budget and 2015 Budget Plan. Motion second by Matucheski. All ayes. Motion carried.

Update on Community Resource Meeting.

Van Hoof reported there was a Community Resource meeting held on July 9 and the next meeting is scheduled for September 12, 2013 at 1:30 pm. Van Hoof reported with funding tight, this meeting will help make known the resource needs of the agency and community. Community Partner's who put time, money, and resource staff into programs, want to provide evidence based programs that are beneficial and have proven outcomes.

Updates on multi-county human services feasibility study

Van Hoof reported the next meeting will be held on August 22 from 9:00 am to 12:00 pm at North Central Health Care Center in Wausau. Options will be presented at this meeting for discussion: collaborate with everything or collaborate in pieces. Van Hoof reported that Income Maintenance needs to be part of a Social Service organization in a county and cannot stand alone in a county like Juvenile Court and Child Support. Van Hoof will bring options discussed to the next committee meeting.

Review bills.

The committee reviewed the bills.

Review and approve the 2013 Budget Summary Report.

The committee reviewed the 2013 budget summary report. Motion by Benishek to approve the 2013 Budget Summary report. Motion second by McKinney-Rice. All ayes. Motion carried.

Review the Alternative Care Summary Report

The Alternative Care Budget Summary report for July was reviewed by the committee.

Review and approve the Monthly Report for Compensatory Time.

The committee reviewed the monthly compensatory time report. Motion by Benishek to approve the compensatory time report. Motion second by Cahak. All ayes. Motion carried.

Review and approve the Training Report.

The training report was reviewed by the committee. Motion by McKinney-Rice to approve the trainings on the training report. Motion second by Cahak. All ayes. Motion carried.

Director's Report.

Van Hoof reported she attended the Post Reunification Grant meeting. The State put out a memo about an RFP for the grant, and each county will be able to apply for funding for slots for kids that are in post-reunification. Typically the agency provides case management services for up to one year for families to make sure the child returned home is safe. This gives counties an incentive to provide intense case management or up to one year to avoid reentry to out-of-home care. Van Hoof reported the application date to apply for this grant is September 16.

Van Hoof reported there will be one Social Worker on Family Medical Leave starting on September 5, 2013. This leave will last about three months. Van Hoof reported there have been some savings with vacant positions, and she would like to consider hiring an LTE (Limited Term Employee) during this leave, but overtime will be necessary to have those cases covered by other workers.

The Human Services facilitators will be holding focus groups on September 4, 2013 here in the boardroom. They are looking for community input on this study.

Adjourn.

The next meeting is set for September 9, 2013 at 10:30 am. Motion by Cahak to adjourn the meeting at 12:15 p.m. Motion second by McKinney-Rice. All ayes. Motion carried.

Submitted by,
Liane Blahnik, Administrative Assistant

Funding

- 50,000. \$150,000. Children's Trust Fund grant, serving Langlade, Oneida and Vilas Counties with CRP
- 19,100. Unified School District of Antigo to provide Parent Outreach Activities for 4K families
- 12,500. Langlade County to provide parenting programs and support
- 9,000. Unified School District of Antigo to provide Babies First Books
- 2,500. City of Antigo to provide parenting programs and support
- 1,000. United Way to provide parenting programs and support

Programs completed 1/1/2012 through 12/31/2012

37 sessions Play and Learn funded by Langlade County, City of Antigo and United Way

6 sessions of Strengthening Families parenting class funded by Langlade County

7 sessions of Nurturing Skills for Families funded by Children's Trust Fund

82 Family Events for 4K families funded by Unified School District of Antigo

189 Babies First Book parent consultations funded by Unified School District of Antigo

11 Telephone parent consultations funded by Langlade County

6 Ask the Expert programs

- 2/21/12 Cooperative Family Fun (North Elementary School)
- 5/31/12 Protecting Children by Strengthening Families (Antigo Library)
- 8/16/12 Stress Awareness (AVAIL)
- Discipline/Rewards and Consequences (AVAIL)
- Stewards of Children
- Age Appropriate Behaviors (AVAIL)

Participants across all programs:

In 2012, CHW-Community Services served **493** unduplicated adults and **429** unduplicated children through the Family Corner Resource Center, through group based programs and one to one interaction through the Babies First Books program. We also served **11** families in Langlade County through the Community Response program in 2012.

Outcomes:

100% of adult participants who completed Program Satisfaction Surveys either agreed or strongly agreed to the following statements:

- I plan to use the skills I learned about in this program.
- I would recommend this program to a friend or family member.
- I am more knowledgeable as a result of participating in this program.
- I feel more supported knowing I can attend FRC programming or contact FRC staff in the future.
- I know more about community resources as a result of participating in this program.

When responding to the following statements using a five-point Likert Scale, we achieve the following results:

- I plan to use the skills I learned in this program – 100% agreed or strongly agreed.
- I would recommend this program to others - 100% agreed or strongly agreed.
- I am more knowledgeable about parenting as a result of this program – 96% agreed or strongly agreed.
- I feel supported knowing I can connect with the Family Resource Center in the future – 96% agreed or strongly agreed.
- I know more about community resources because I attended this program – 75% agreed or strongly agreed.

CHW/Community Services Updates and Services:

The Northwoods FRCN was established in 9/2011 after receiving two new grants to serve Lincoln, Langlade, Oneida, Forest and Vilas Counties. Our services will be provided through three existing FRCs in Rhinelander, Merrill and Antigo.

Children's Trust Fund is funding Community Response programming in Langlade, Oneida and Vilas Counties through a 5-year renewable grant.

Wisconsin DCF is funding the Northwoods Home Visiting program in Lincoln, Oneida and Forest Counties in a renewable 5-year grant. Through this program we serve at-risk expectant moms with weekly home visits using the PAT curriculum. During the second year of the program, we will serve 50 families in the tri-county area. This program is not available in Langlade County due to funder parameters.

One to One Parent Consultation – our staff are available to meet with parents to provide one to one parenting consultations, either in person or by phone, by appointment only.

Community Collaboration – Our staff is committed to being a strong community partner by being actively involved in community collaborations are aligned with our work and goals to prevent child abuse and neglect.

2014 Plans

- **Space needs** – We are currently located in a classroom in the Antigo Middle School, space which will likely be available for one more school year. We are beginning the process of searching for new space, both for programs and for our offices.
- **Work Plan** – Services will continue to be provided as determined by funder requirements. We look to the Social Services Committee for feedback on the best us funds provided by Langlade County. In 2013, these funds were used to provide Play and Learn programs, parenting classes and parent consultation and support. All of these services are considered core foundational services of the Family Resource Center model and are available to all parents.

Umbrella Human Services Statute

Presented by:
Human Services Redesign Committee

- What is it?



Umbrella Statute???

- Enables counties to collaborate in providing a comprehensive range of human services.
- Provides flexibility with regard to the manner and extent to which counties may collaborate.
- Authorizes the creation of a contract to define the scope of services to be provided on a collaborative basis and provide flexible governance of the collaborative relationship upon creation.
- Requires recognition of the collaborative body by state departments.
- Allows for the development and promotion of performance outcomes by counties that choose to collaborate.

Umbrella Statute – Purpose and Intent

- A collaborative of two or more counties which have entered into an agreement under 66.0301 and perform on behalf of the collaboration of counties any or all county programs under DHS, DCF, DOC and/or DOA.

What is a county collaborative?

- **VOLUNTARY!!!**

How is a collaborative created?

- The county boards of supervisors of two or more counties **may** enter into a contract to establish a county collaborative on a multicounty basis.
 - **At no such time shall a county or group of counties be required to join a county collaborative.**

How is a collaborative created?

- Any or all duties of a county social services department, department of human services, or a department of community programs.
 - Duties of collaborative to be determined by the members of the collaborative.
- May provide for the establishment of outcomes.

Duties and powers of a county collaborative

- Flexibility in administration, governance structure.
- Recognition of collaborative by the state.
 - Single contract, one certification for a group of counties, etc.

Why form a county collaborative?

- Myth: Small, rural counties will lose independence.

- Reality: Counties can **choose** to join a collaborative or remain independent.

Myths v. Realities

- Myth: County boards will lose influence and ability to make decisions in the best interests of their counties.

- Reality: County boards will decide whether or not to join collaborative. Once the decision to join is made, county boards decide the level of county involvement.

Myths v. Realities

- Myth: Counties will lose their autonomy.

- Reality: Joining is discretionary. Counties may tailor agreements relating to a collaborative to best serve the needs of their citizens.

Myths v. Realities

- Myth: My county already collaborates with others so the umbrella statute is pointless.

- Reality: Current statutes lack the ability for counties to control how collaboratives are governed. State agencies would be required to recognize collaborative entities.

Myths v. Realities

- Myth: The umbrella statute will cost jobs.

- Reality: The new statutory framework introduces flexibility in how human services programs are delivered with the intent of providing high quality services. The intent is not to remove a human service presence in any county.

Myths v. Realities

- Myth: Counties will be forced to join a collaborative, just like IM consortia.

- Reality: Joining a collaborative is entirely discretionary. If a county chooses to join a collaborative, collaboration can occur on as many or as few services as the collaborative desires.

Myths v. Realities

- Myth: The umbrella statute is incomplete and vague because it fails to define a county's liability and obligations.

- Reality: The statute is purposely imprecise to provide counties with flexibility to define obligations for their individual collaboratives.

Myths v. Realities

- Myth: Once the legislature gets their hands on this they will force regionalization.

- Reality: The committee's goal is to gain flexibility for counties. While there are no guarantees that the statute will remain unchanged throughout the legislative process, WCA and WCHSA will work tirelessly to achieve the flexibility we desire for counties across the state.

Myths v. Realities

| Date | Activity |
|--------------------------------|---|
| July 2012 – April 2013 | Development of umbrella statute by Human Services Redesign Committee, statutory language subgroup, and WCHSA small group discussions. |
| March 2013 | WCHSA membership vote to continue development of statute. |
| May 2013 | Educate WCHSA membership on umbrella statute at WCHSA conference. WCHSA membership vote. |
| June 2013 – September 2013 | Meetings and outreach with stakeholders to educate on purpose and intent of umbrella statute. |
| August 2013 – September 2013 | WCA Board action. Final vote by WCHSA membership. |
| September 2013 – December 2013 | Continued promotion of umbrella statute. Seek legislative support. |

UMBRELLA HUMAN SERVICES STATUTE - COUNTY COLLABORATIVES

ISSUE: In 2010, the Wisconsin County Human Services Association, in collaboration with the Wisconsin Counties Association, created a Human Services Redesign Committee to discuss potential changes to improve the delivery of human services programs across the state. Over the past three years, the committee has developed, retooled and rewritten several initiatives designed to increase the flexibility afforded to human services departments, as well as improve communication between counties and state agencies.

The first initiative forwarded by the Human Services Redesign Committee centers on the creation of what has been termed the “umbrella human services statute” or the creation of a “county collaborative.” The “umbrella statute” has the following purposes and intents:

- Enables counties to collaborate in providing a comprehensive range of human services.
- Provides flexibility with regard to the manner and extent to which counties may collaborate.
- Authorizes the creation of a contract to define the scope of services to be provided on a collaborative basis and provide flexible governance of the collaborative relationship upon creation.
- Requires recognition of the collaborative body by state departments.
- Allows for the development and promotion of performance outcomes by counties that choose to collaborate.

The proposed statute defines a “county collaborative” as two or more counties that have entered into an agreement under 66.0301 and perform on behalf of the collaboration of counties any or all county programs under the Department of Health Services, the Department of Children and Families, the Department of Corrections, and/or the Department of Administration.

More and more, counties are beginning to collaborate on human services initiatives. The Human Services Redesign Committee is aware of at least three different regional initiatives currently under discussion across the state. However, current state statutes provide these counties with little flexibility with regard to their governance structures should their initiatives move forward in the future.

Wisconsin state statutes take an “all or nothing” approach with regard to human services collaboration. The “umbrella statute” provides the following benefits:

- Allows counties to collaborate on a wide array of human services programs, or on just a single initiative.
- Provides flexibility with regard to program administration and governance structure.

- Requires the state to recognize the collaborative for purposes such as contracting and program certification.

Most importantly, the creation of a “county collaborative” is strictly **VOLUNTARY**. County boards of supervisors of two or more counties **may** enter into a contract to establish a county collaborative on a multi-county basis. At no such time shall a county or group of counties be required to join a county collaborative.

Umbrella Statute

*DRAFT – June 18, 2013**

(1) Purpose and intent. All of the following are the purposes and intent of this section:

(a) To enable counties to collaborate to provide a comprehensive range of human services.

(b) To provide flexibility as to the manner and extent in which counties may collaborate to provide human services.

(c) To authorize the creation of a contract to define the scope of services to be provided on a collaborative basis and to provide flexible governance of the collaborative relationship upon creation.

(d) To require recognition of the collaborative body by state departments.

(e) To allow for the development and promotion of performance outcomes to be achieved by counties that collaborate.

(2) DEFINITION. In this section, “county collaborative” means a collaborative of 2 or more counties which have entered into an agreement under s. 66.0301 and pursuant to this section to perform on behalf of the collaboration of counties, any of the services described in sub. (3).

(3) COUNTY COLLABORATIVE.

(a) Creation. The county boards of supervisors of 2 or more counties, may enter into a contract to establish a county collaborative on a multicounty basis to allow for the administration of any or all county programs under the Department of Health Services, the Department of Children and Families, the Department of Corrections, and the Department of Administration, make appropriations to operate the programs and authorize the county collaborative to apply for certification and grants for any programs the Departments oversee.

(b) Duties and Powers. Consistent with the contract entered into under sub. (3)(a), a county collaborative may perform any or all of the duties, and shall have the powers associated with, a county department of social services under s. 46.22, a county department of human services under s. 46.23 or a department of community programs under s. 51.42,] provided that any powers or duties not specifically transferred to the county collaborative shall be retained by a county.

(c) Other Powers and Duties. Any contract under sub. (2) may provide for the establishment of outcomes, which may include allocation of resources to achieve identified outcomes.

(d) Collaboration Not Required. At no such time shall a county or group of counties be required to join a county collaborative.

(e) Recognition of Statutory and Non-Statutory Collaboratives. Nothing herein shall prevent the recognition by state departments of already existing collaborative entities and state departments shall recognize previously existing agreements providing for the integration of human services.

(4) COUNTY COLLABORATIVE ADMINISTRATION. Any contract under sub. (2) may provide a plan for administration of the county collaborative, which may include but is not limited to provisions as to proration of the expenses involved, assumption of risk and indemnity, deposit and disbursement of funds appropriated, submission and approval of budgets, creation of a governance structure, method of governance and formation and letting of contracts. Nothing prescribed herein shall prevent a county collaborative from designing a flexible governance structure in order to meet the specific needs of the county collaborative. Any contract under sub. (2) shall identify the individual responsible for the administration of the county collaborative.

(5) DUTIES OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES, THE DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES, THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, AND THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION. The departments shall:

(a) Review requests and, if a county collaborative has complied with this section, certify county collaboratives to perform the functions specified in the contract entered into under sub. (3)(a).

(b) Periodically review and evaluate county collaboratives to assure compliance with this section. The review shall include a periodic assessment of need which shall separately identify elements of service required under the contract entered into under sub. (3)(a).

(c) Perform all duties and functions of the Departments specified in ss. 46.22, 46.23 and 51.42.

(6) EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION. Notwithstanding [list statutory subsections for particular service areas which require confidentiality of records], a subunit of a county collaborative acting under this subsection may exchange confidential information about a client, without the informed consent of the client, with any other subunit of the same county collaborative, with any agency for which a collaborative has been established, or An agency that releases information under this paragraph shall document that a request for information was received and what information was provided.

(7) EXPANSION AND DISSOLUTION OF THE COUNTY COLLABORATIVE. At any time after the organization of any such county collaborative, any additional county or counties may join in the support and conduct thereof upon payment of such equitable proportion of the original cost of its establishment, and any joint county may withdraw upon such terms, as may be agreed upon among the county boards of the counties interested; and thereupon the county collaborative administration shall be reorganized, in such manner as may be determined by the county boards of the participating counties, to conform to sub. (4).

(8) CONSTRUCTION.

(a) Any reference in [define specific statutes and chapters to which this section is applicable] to a county department shall be interpreted as an individual county or county collaborative as defined in this section.

(b) This section shall be deemed to provide a complete and supplemental method for exercising the powers authorized by this section, and shall be deemed as being supplemental to the powers conferred by other applicable laws.

Note: The intent of subsection 3(a) is to encompass all programs and services falling under the Department of Health Services, the Department of Children and Families, the Department of Corrections, and the Department of Administration, as well as the ability of counties to collaborate on any part of such programs and services.

* Disclaimer: The language of the umbrella statute constitutes a draft of the concept and recommended language for new legislation. The final language of the umbrella statute is subject to change upon official drafting of the legislation, specifically by the Legislative Reference Bureau, as the bill moves through the legislative process.

Proposed Umbrella Statute vs. Wis. Stat. 66.0301

What's the Difference?

A common misconception that has caused hesitation by many in supporting the proposed umbrella statute is the idea that a good deal of intergovernmental cooperation already exists between counties with respect to human services and programs, so what makes this proposed statutory language different, especially when counties may collaborate under Wis. Stat. §66.0301? Below is a summary of the manner in which the umbrella statute could provide a much needed benefit in the area of human services that is currently lacking when counties cooperate pursuant to a Section 66.0301 agreement.

What Benefit Does Wis. Stat. § 66.0301 Currently Provides to Your County?

- Allows counties to cooperate on a specific project or to provide a specific service. Period. The statute does not provide any additional benefits other than the ability of municipalities to come together to provide a service or jointly exercise power
- Administration of the project is prescribed in the statute
- Lack of specific delegation of authority on programs, requiring counties that enter into Section 66.0301 agreements to remain bound by other, more specific statutory schemes (for example, any program administered under Section 51.42 would continue to be subject to that statutory framework)
- Lack of guidance on how the relationship with the State is defined
- Requires individual counties to still be recognized by State departments
- Not specific to any particular program or service, and so does not account for any nuances with respect to any program or service
- Contractual authority for receiving or furnishing services, or the joint exercise of any power or duty is limited to those services, powers, or duties required or authorized by law
- If the counties to a contract have varying powers or duties, each party may act under the contract only to the extent of the party's lawful powers and duties. In other words, to act under a Section 66.0301 contract, a county must have independent authority (authority conferred outside Section 66.0301) to exercise the power or duty

What Additional Benefits Would the Proposed Umbrella Statute Provide?

- Flexibility in all aspects of collaboration – who will collaborate, on what programs/services, how the entity will function, etc.
- Allows the collaborative to determine the governance structure
- Provides recognition of the collaborative by State departments, which allows the counties that choose to collaborate to be recognized as a single entity
- Specifically drafted to the needs expressed by human services personnel in the state, and specifically addresses the barriers in delivering human services. (For example, programs currently requiring certifications require every county to individually be certified, where the umbrella statute will allow certification of the collaborative entity)
- Provides for the ability of the entity to provide human services collectively that otherwise may not have been allowed under the more rigid Wis. Stat. § 66.0301
- State departments recognize the ability of a collaborative entity to do what only a county may otherwise do under Wis. Stat. § 66.0301.

**Myths and Realities of Human Services Redesign
Statutory Language Revisions Project WCHSA Board
Meeting
April 4, 2013**

Myth #1: As a smaller, rural county, my county will lose its ability to independently deliver services and will be swallowed up by larger counties if statutes allow for greater collaboration.

Reality: The statutory framework will allow counties to choose whether to join a collaborative for the delivery of services, or remain independent in the delivery of services. All counties will have a choice as to whether or not to join a collaborative.

Myth #2: The new statutory construct will result in my county board losing influence and the ability to make decisions in the best interests of my county.

Reality: County boards will maintain their decision making abilities as to whether to join a collaborative and in what capacity the county would be involved. A county board remains the legislative authority for the county for the delivery of services to its citizens – the statutory framework will simply allow a county to choose for services to be delivered through a collaborative.

Myth #3: This new statutory mechanism will cause my county to lose its autonomy.

Reality: Any collaborative formed under the new statutory mechanism would be discretionary. Counties will not be forced into joining a collaborative; nor will counties, once joining a collaborative, lose the ability to make decisions with regard to the delivery of human services. Counties may tailor agreements relating to a collaborative to best serve the needs of the citizens of the county.

Myth #4: My county can already collaborate with other counties in any way we desire, so this new, proposed statutory mechanism is pointless.

Reality: While under current statutes counties are afforded many opportunities for collaboration, what is lacking from current statutory models is the ability for counties to control how such collaboratives are governed. The agreement which forms the collaborative may be tailored by the counties to provide a governance structure that is most beneficial to the participating counties. The statutes currently do not provide for participating counties to create the governance structure for a collaborative; rather once collaborating, the governance structure is dictated by statute. Likewise, current law does not force state recognition of certain collaborative entities. The changes would require state agencies to recognize collaborative entities. The new statutory framework revolutionizes the way counties that choose to collaborate may be governed.

Myth #5: There is no benefit to the new statutory language, rather it will cost me my job!

Reality: The new statutory framework brings flexibility to the manner in which counties may deliver human services to its citizens. The benefits of flexibility in collaboration and governance help to ensure that counties continue to provide the highest quality services in the most efficient and effective manner. While a collaborative may reduce the number of administrative level

positions, all counties recognize the need for people on the ground within each individual county. The intent of the collaborative is not to remove a human service presence within the county.

Myth #6: My county will be forced into a collaborative it does not wish to join – just like Income Maintenance consortia!

Reality: The statutory framework for a human services collaborative is entirely discretionary and provides flexibility for counties to elect to join collaboratives, or to remain as an individual county service provider. The statute will allow for counties to collaborate on the delivery with as many or as few services as the collaborative desires. Counties may elect to enter into a collaborative contract, but there is absolutely no statutory requirement to do so!

Myth #7: This new statutory framework is incomplete and vague because it fails to define a county's liability and obligations.

Reality: The statutory language is purposefully imprecise in order to provide counties with the flexibility to define obligations for their individual collaboratives. Collaborative members may agree to include indemnification clauses, for example, in their collaborative contracts. The collaborative itself does not have a separate existence, but rather liability flows through to its members.

Myth #8: My county can already enter into a Section 46.22 multicounty social services department. This so-called “new” statute is no different!

Reality: While a county may presently enter into a Section 46.22 agreement, such agreements are incredibly narrow in the services that may be provided under such a social services contract. The new statutory framework is broader and allows collaboration for all human and social services.

Myth #9: This is a really great idea, guys, but any collaborative set up under this so-called “new” statute is going to fail just like the Section 51.42 Boards have failed. Nice try!

Reality: It cannot be emphasized enough the flexibility that the statute would provide counties. If issues arise, counties have the power to enter into new or amended contracts that would alleviate or resolve the issues. Section 51.42 Boards are statutorily prescriptive, meaning such Boards must follow a rigid statutory framework. A new statutory collaborative will have the freedom to make decisions and take action as issues arise.

Myth #10: I can tell you how this is going to play out – once this language gets to the legislature, politics will take over, my county will be forced into regionalization, and there goes my county's freedom!

Reality: While the draft language is subject to committee review, revisions, and rewriting as it passes through the legislature, the goal of WCHSA is to reach out to legislators, state departments, county boards, and consumer groups to rally support to maintain flexibility in the decision to collaborate. It is true that there is no guarantee that the legislative process will not entirely change the nature of the language, the redesign group and the statutory language subcommittee group will work tirelessly to achieve the flexibility result.

Human Services Redesign Committee

Timeline for Statutory Revisions

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| July 2012 –April 2013 | To date, the umbrella statute has been developed with input from the Redesign Committee, the statutory language subgroup, and input from WCHSA small group discussions. |
| March 2013 | WCHSA membership has voted to continue the exploration of the development of the umbrella statute. |
| May 2013 | Utilize conference to education WCHSA membership on the statutory language project. WCHSA membership vote to move forward with statutory revisions. |
| June 2013 – September 2013 | Meetings and outreach with stakeholders to educate on purpose and intent of umbrella statute and obtain buy-in from counties (county executives, administrators, boards, Governor and state departments); Begin to explore sponsorship opportunities for purposes of introduction to legislature; Re-draft of umbrella statute based on input. |
| September 2013 | Final vote by WCHSA membership Presentation at WCA Board at conference |
| September 2013 – December 2013 | Continue efforts to promote umbrella statute to stakeholder groups; continue outreach to county boards for buy-in; outreach to legislators for support of bill in Assembly and Senate Actively pursue sponsorship in legislation and engage the Legislative Reference Bureau for legal research and professional bill drafting; introduction to Finance Committee |