

Human Service Model Task Force
February 8, 2013 2:00pm
North Central Health Care, Board Room

Meeting Minutes

Present:

X	Gary Bezucha	X	Toni Simonson	X	John Robinson
X	Gary Gisselman	X	Brad Karger	X	Vicki Tylka
X	Robin Stowe	X	Ron Nye	X	Kim Van Hoof
	Dick Hurlbert	X	Randy Scholz	X	Nancy Bergstrom
X	Bruce Giese	X	Mike Nelson	X	Bob Lussow
	Bob Weaver				

Meeting opened at 2:00PM with an introduction of attendees.

Status of Counties

- Langlade County at their December County Board meeting adopted a resolution to participate in a joint county feasibility task force. Earlier they had adopted their own resolution to do a feasibility study. There were seven dissenters of 21. It is an open ended study; they are not just looking at a human service model.
- Lincoln County passed a resolution in January, with two dissenters.
- Marathon County had a joint meeting with the Social Services Board, Health & Human Services Committee and the NCCSP Board, and developed a resolution. It goes to the County Board in February, and it is anticipated it will pass. An initial resolution was taken to the H&HS Board; they asked for more information/clarification.

Committee Charter

- The primary mission is to conduct a feasibility study to develop a multi county human service system, as outlined by the state; gather information, conduct public hearings, determine advantages/disadvantages, and review organizational charts. Along the way identify other ways to collaborate to have more efficient programs which we deliver to our residents.
- We need to identify what services we are looking at. What is a part of a human service model?
 - Child abuse and neglect and juvenile justice.
 - Income maintenance, energy assistance are probably not part of it, but where do they fit?

- There are no pre-conceived ideas of a structure. Look at all the options.
- Purpose: determine - **Is there a different way that the three counties could collaborate to provide the child abuse/neglect and juvenile justice services to better benefit the residents of all three counties? If so, how would such a collaboration impact other county human services?**
- How will the committee know they have completed their charge? When issues have been identified, options identified, and a recommendation is ready to be presented to the three counties. Include funding expectations, long term benefits and drawbacks; identify baseline, where differences are and why there are differences. When we have enough information to make a decision and be able to articulate the information to others.
- What happens if not all three counties want to participate? The majority of this group must agree before bringing it to their own county to get approval. All three county boards have to approve the recommendation in order to proceed.
- What will be the end product of this committee? To come up with an answer to all the questions and take it to the three boards as a recommendation, or it will be a “done deal”.
- End product: a recommendation arrived at by consensus, to be forwarded to all three counties for approval.
- What is the role of those on the committee? Who is on the committee? The role is to participate, to do “homework”, to provide information back to their respective counties. Marathon County will appoint two more county board supervisors, and Brad and Vicki will be resource people.
- By what mechanism will the committee record and proceed? There will be periodic reports to county boards with updates.
- Each county decides who they want at the table, and how many. It should be the same people throughout the process.
- Consideration would need to be included on what would happen with child support, income maintenance, etc. if they are not included. Would they be affected, and if so, how? We would need to be clear on it because the state will want to know.
- Some areas will still be “owned” by the counties, for example, out of home placement. We need to address the cost of all areas.
- Does the charter need to reference those areas not being considered?

Decision-Making

- Decision-making is consensual and ascertaining whether there is agreement of all three counties. There must be agreement within a county on how they will proceed.
- We will not proceed with a recommendation until all three counties agree.

Information to be collected

- Guidelines from DHS provide information required.
- Where is each county now? Why is it the way it is now? Why should we consider reorganization?
- If we can't improve on service delivery and cost of service delivery, why should we move forward?
- What outcome measures do we currently have in regard to data collection? Include statewide data.
- Placement data is not always available for some juvenile justice, but there is for child welfare.
- Description of what service delivery looks like today; what are the statutes involved?
- Critical acronyms – a simple list. MA, CCS, etc.
- Philosophy/culture of agencies, sponsoring counties of the agencies, and individuals (staff) within the agencies.
- How are we collecting the information?
- Identify all stakeholders and give them the opportunity to provide input, ask questions, share concerns. Do it across all counties in the same manner.
- What do we ask of stakeholders? Different questions at different points in the study. Strengths of existing structure, weaknesses. What works well, what could be improved? Share options, and whether they have any input on them. How far do clients drive for services, how far would they be willing to drive for services?
- Bring suggested baseline categories of information to the next meeting, and an explanation of what we currently do with a focus on child welfare and juvenile justice. At a future meeting share the number of court filings, out of home placements, and other common information.
- The three Social Services Directors will talk together and determine what information to bring.
- Bring WISACWIS reporting information.

Role of State Representatives

- Do we involve them from the beginning? Or do they want us to come up with a recommendation and then propose it to them?
- It would be of benefit to have them in the process with this to make sure we are on the right track. They have requested to be a part of it.
- We should ask of DHS, DCF, and DOC who they think should be included. That person should be a part of it throughout the process. Should we send a letter to the secretary of each agency and ask them to appoint someone to work with us?
- Should local state reps be included? Not included in the process, but they can be kept informed.

- Chris Craggs would take the lead of the three reps from the three agencies. DOC did not want to be a part of it. DCF wanted to take a secondary role to the DHS. The key is to have some state involvement from the beginning. We need to determine how much involvement, and what guidance they are willing to provide.

Leadership of the Task Force

- Each county identifies a leader; those leaders determine who will lead the committee. Chair and two Vice-Chairs. Before the next meeting determine who their lead representative will be. It should be an elected official.

Facilitator

- Consensus of the last meeting was a need for a facilitator.
- We would need to develop a RFP for a facilitator.
- Suggestion to identify a few people to rough out a RFP for a facilitator and bring it to the next meeting. Gary Bezucha, Vicki Tylka, Nancy Bergstrom, and Kim Van Hoof volunteered to do so.
- This would be a facilitator for the study process.

Timeline/Meeting Frequency

- All of 2013
- Can participate via video-conference
- Location – NCHC, Board Room

Follow-Up

- Ask who should be the key state reps, including all three state agencies: DOC, DHS, DCH.
- Share minutes and any decisions with state reps along the way.
- Each county identify a lead elected official.

Motion Lussow, 2nd Giese, to adjourn at 3:37 p.m. Motion carried.

Pdh