

Human Service Model Task Force

March 14, 2013 9:00am
North Central Health Care, Board Room

Meeting Minutes

Present:

Marathon County: Brad Karger, John Robinson, Gary Gisselman, Vicki Tylka
Lincoln County: Nancy Bergstrom, Randy Scholz, Bruce Giese, Mike Nelson
Langlade County: Ron Nye, Dick Hurlburt, Robin Stowe, Kim Van Hoof
North Central Health Care: Gary Bezucha, Paula Hawkins

Excused: Bob Lussow & Bob Weaver (Lincoln County); Ken Day & Joanne Leonard (Marathon County); Toni Simonson (NCHC)

Minutes

- **Motion** Bergstrom, 2nd Robinson, to approve the minutes of the 2/8/13 meeting. Motion carried.

Chair/Vice-Chair

- **Motion** Gisselman, Hurlbert 2nd to nominate John Robinson as Chair. Motion carried.
- **Motion** Bergstrom, 2nd Giese, to cast a unanimous ballot for John Robinson. Motion carried.
- **Motion** Hurlbert, 2nd Scholz, to nominate Ron Nye as Vice-Chair. Motion carried.
- **Motion** Bergstrom, 2nd Scholz, to cast a unanimous ballot for Ron Nye as Vice-Chair. Motion carried.

Committee Charter

- A draft charter was presented and discussed.
- There was agreement that it is a multi-county task force, and on the services to be included in discussions.
- References to Marathon County specifically will be removed.
- Wording will be added that we are doing a feasibility study for a joint human services model.
- Resolutions said the three counties will be conducting a feasibility study under Chapter 46, and that the task force will be looking at all other efficiencies under the social services system, as well as looking at what happens to other programs being carved out.
- Suggestion made to have Robin Stowe draft a new charter, incorporating in discussion points.
- There is agreement to have one county/one vote. Members from each county should meet and come up with their vote.
- There will be one key person from each county: Langlade - Nye; Marathon -Robinson. A second vice-chair will be elected at the next meeting from Lincoln County.

Child Welfare System

- Presentation of overview of the Child Welfare System by Tylka, Van Hoof, and Nelson.
- Physical abuse is defined by statute as a serious physical abuse. For example, the question of spanking would not fall under this definition. If the statute definition is changed to include all physical abuse, it would have serious implications for the departments in terms of work load. Currently there is a gray area in that the level of abuse is interpreted differently by individuals and counties. There are areas where you could “educate, not substantiate”.
- Currently appeals begin with an internal investigation by the Director of Social Services. Beginning in 2015 all appeals will be done by the state.
- Sexual abuse – law enforcement handles the non-caregiver reports. Caregiver reports can be done by the county, but can be handed to law enforcement. Law enforcement sometimes will request social services departments to work with them on a case.
- Neglect is also defined as severe that seriously endangers the health of the child. This is also open to interpretation.
- Threat of harm is the trickiest one to interpret reports. There will be clarity on this by the state, and could also have implications on departments.
- Unborn infants (unborn child abuse) is a large concern. A lot of community collaboration is needed in this area. Information from medical providers report to departments.
- After a report, information gathering/assessment must occur within 24 hours. Decisions on screening in/out within 48 hours. Report out must be within 5 days.
- What are consequences if timelines are not met? All data is reported to the state. There are no financial penalties. There are ratings.
- A non-mandated reporting person is not allowed to get reports back (privacy laws). Mandated reporters do get a report back.
- Decisions are not determined by cost. Do we need to include on the charter that services will be provided regardless of cost? Budgets are created long term, so hopefully costs are covered. However, a child’s safety is the decision maker, not the cost.
- There could be a regional screening agency/team, and refer to the appropriate department (physical locations in each county would need to be continued).
- Marathon County does not have an overtime issue because their social workers are salaried. Lincoln and Langlade County’s are not; they are considering moving to salaried workers.
- Collateral contacts for assessments need to include law enforcement, schools, etc.
- A flowchart was requested for what happens to children regardless of whether a report is substantiated or unsubstantiated (in/out) (i.e. if out, do all get community referrals?).
- CQSR review is Federal; QSR is State review.
- Requested data: number of referrals, number per case workers, number screened in/out, number placed or court action. Per case worker to get a feel for number of cases processed by each county and our resources to handle it. Differences in counties with alternate response. Supportive services already are being provided by NCHC in each county. We will begin by providing data per county, and then break down by worker if need be.
- Due to time constraints, the rest of the presentation was tabled to the next meeting.

Facilitator for Study

- A proposed RFP was presented and discussed.
- Gary Bezucha, Vicki Tylka, Kim Van Hoof and Nancy Bergstrom created the RFP draft.
- Should the state review the RFP and agree to the process? A facilitator would begin a process and work plan, which would involve working with the state. Area Administration knows we are working on this and hiring a facilitator.
- **Motion** Nye, 2nd Hurlbert, to approve the Request for Proposals as presented, with the date of submission to be changed if needed. We will include in the RFP the State guide as an addendum to the RFP. Motion carried.
- After discussion, selection process timeline for March 29th identified in the draft RFP was not changed.
- Bureau of regional offices, legal firms, WI Counties Association, were suggested agencies to send the RFP to distribute.
- A sub-group of one appointee from each county to review the submissions, conduct the interviews, and make a decision was formed (Randy Scholz – Lincoln; Kim Van Hoof – Langlade; Gary Gisselman – Marathon). Others can attend if they would like to. A review will be before the next meeting, so a recommendation can be presented at the next meeting.
- **Motion** Bergstrom, 2nd Scholz, to proceed with a 3/29 deadline, review committee will assure compliance with the RFP, and bring a recommendation to the next meeting. Motion carried.
- Each county should forward to Paula Hawkins any suggested names to receive the RFP. A meeting will be set, and then the entire group will be notified of the review meeting.

Participation of State of Wisconsin

- DHS was contacted for an appropriate participant from area administration. Chris Craggs and Teresa Steinmetz want to attend all meetings and offer what they can. An invite will be extended also to the DOC.
- **Motion** to extend invite to all three state agencies by Scholz, 2nd Gisselman. Motion carried.

Next Meeting Agenda

- Finalize and approve charter
- Continue discussion on Child Welfare, including data
- Approve facilitator
- Brief introduction for state reps, and get their input on what they believe their role is in the process
- Look at NCHC as a model for how we can deliver services on a regional basis (future meeting if time constraints)

The next meeting will be at NCHC. We may look at moving to other counties.

Motion to adjourn by Bergstrom, 2nd Van Hoof, at 10:50a.m. Motion carried.

pdh