PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY HUMAN SERVICES BOARD

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wis. Stats, a regular meeting of the **Brown County Human Services Board** was held on Thursday, April 14, 2011 in Board Room A of the Sophie Beaumont Building – 111 North Jefferson Street, Green Bay, WI

Present: Chairman Tom Lund, Paula Laundrie, Alison Draheim, Carole Andrews, Craig Huxford, Helen Smits, Susan Hyland

Maria Zehren (arrival: 5:30pm)

Excused: JoAnn Graschberger, Bill Clancy

Also Present: Brian Shoup, Executive Director Human Services
Tim Schmitt, Budget and Finance Manager
Jim Hermans, Child Protective Services and Juvenile Justice Manager
Kevin Brennan, Foster Care/CPS Ongoing Supervisor
Frances Bass, CPS Intake Supervisor
Mina Teske, Foster Care Coordinator

Call Meeting to Order:

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Lund at 5:15 p.m.

2. Approve/Modify Agenda:

ANDREWS/LAUNDRIE moved to approve the agenda.
The motion was passed unanimously.

3. Approve Minutes of March 10, 2011 Human Services Board Meeting:

ANDREWS/SMITS moved to approve the minutes dated March 10, 2011.
The motion was passed unanimously.

4. Executive Director's Report:

Human Services Day at the Capitol

Wednesday, April 6th was the Human Services Day at the Capitol in Madison and was sponsored by the Wisconsin Human Services Counties Association. Brian brought put together a team to represent Brown County and they all attended this conference.

The team met with all eleven (11) of our legislators (or their senior representative) to discuss issues of importance for Brown County. Together they focused on the following issues:

Child Protection

Shoup and the team reported on our limited capacity for supporting children, although did not make any formal requests. Shoup said that they wanted legislator's to know where Brown County stands among compared to others.

Family Care
In governor's proposed budget, it is unclear where Family Care (FC) stands right now. The proposal says that FC is frozen for about 2 years. Currently there is an administrative audit being conducted to determine if FC would be favorable. The results of the audit were supposed to be released this month (April), however as of today, no results have been published. If the audit proves that FC is favorable, then it should proceed as originally intended. In the end, the governor and legislators will make the ultimate decision.

Shoup said currently there is enough funding to continue with FC through June 2011. After that, there would be no more funding according to the proposed budget. If FC is stalled for two years, there are major concerns/questions. One of which is relating to the FC staff. How we will be able to keep current knowledgeable FC staff on board and continue to move forward if FC does stall for 2 more years? Brian and the team shared these concerns/questions with each legislator. Brown County stressed that we do not want to have to start over 2 years down the road. We cannot afford to lose the time money we have already invested in FC.

Income Maintenance a.k.a. Economic Support
Under the governor's proposed budget, the State would take over Income Maintenance (IM) services, with the exception of Energy Assistance and Day Care. These services are proposed to be taken over by a private vendor headquartered in Milwaukee. This is the same vendor who previously failed to meet expectations and was found unable to meet the standard regulations set and volume of clients. Some additional effects as a result of this proposed change include:

- Each county will be asked to pay a maintenance of effort cost. It will result in a net cost of $250,000 for BC (each year).
- Brown County will lose 45 jobs.
- The proposed vendor has an average performance rate of 16% as opposed to BC's 81%.
- The proposed vendor's cost per case is higher than the average county(s) cost per case.
- Cases will be automated.
- The proposed vendor is currently under corrective action.

A subcommittee consisting of surrounding counties has been formed as a result of the proposed budget. Brown County has been involved every step of the way. This subcommittee is proposing an alternative model which includes regionalization but also keeps a local agency presence. Secretaries of Health Services & DCF have expressed that they would be open to working with the counties. We are asking for our legislators to support this.

Youth Aids/Juvenile Justice
In previous years, the state used to fund children who were placed at Lincoln Hills. About 15 years ago, the state decided rather than funding these children, counties will receive Youth Aids from the state and the counties will have to pay for placements at Lincoln Hills. The state allowed each county to choose if they wanted to use the Youth Aids funds to continue to place children at Lincoln Hills or invest the funds into county base programs.

Based on the proposed budget, there will be a 10% cut in the Youth Aids funds, whiling raising the cost per diem for those children placed in Lincoln Hills.

Q: Board Member Draheim asked if the county has any documents or fact sheets the Board members could have to be used as a reference when speaking with their legislators.

A: Brian said that we can provide the board members with the talking points the team took with them at Human Services Day at the Capitol. Laura will forward the talking points to each Board member.

Q: Board Member Draheim asked what they can do about the proposed budget's changes to the current Income Maintenance / Economic Assistance services.

A: Brian said, they are all certainly able speak with legislators and continue to hit them with facts and numbers, especially detailing the effects the proposed changes will have on counties and clients.

Q: Supervisor Andrews asked, how can we be certain the numbers/data the counties are using are correct versus the numbers/data the governor's is stating in the proposed budget? She also asked do we know where the governor's numbers came from.

A: Brian stated that various Wisconsin Departments constantly rely on data submitted by County government. It is reasonable for us to rely on the same.

Board Member Draheim stated (in her experience) how hard it is for children, parents and caregivers to navigating through automated (computer) systems. She said she has the opportunity and ability to talk to legislators specifically about the impact on children and families if the state chooses to use an automated system. She is aware and concerned of those families and children will not be able to get the help they need and will go unnoticed.

Resolution Honoring Amy Dingeldein
This resolution will be put on the agenda for action next month.

5. Study of Child Protection Services and Policy Development – 4th Session of 4.
Hermans revisited the policies and corresponding recommendations to consider that were presented that month.

Jim said that state is monitoring CPS reports from Brown County BC and we also monitor/track our performance internally as well. Standards are set for all states and counties by the federal government agencies and each county is responsible for meeting those standards and are then used to demonstrate as a state that we are meeting the minimum standards set. Right now, BC is a driver county because of size/population and because of this, the state is very mindful of BC. They have identified that we are in need extra attention and resources to ensure BC will reach the standards set. Currently, the reports show that Brown is below these levels and are not meeting the minimum standards. Jim said that we are striving to improve, but we are not there yet.

Jim said that BC is working with the State and engaging in some areas to improve in our efforts to achieve permanency quicker for children who have been out of the home for lengthy periods of time. One of the initiatives we are involved in is Permanency Roundtables.

The state is piloting this initiative with BC and the purpose is to try and address cases that seem to be limited in their progress; stuck between going home or achieving permanency in another manner.

Other areas where the state is working with BC include:

- Monthly monitoring of permanency activities.
- Offer caseworker contacts technical assistance.
- Conduct final post Quality Service Review (QSR) facilitation meeting.
- Implement post QSR.
- Offer access and initial contact technical assistance.
- Conduct 6-month permanency roundtable reviews.

Jim also reported results from the discussions the state had with us during the QSR process. The state reported:

- Staffing is a major challenge for the agency. There has been no increase in staff over the last 10 years despite growing population and demand for services.
- Agency operations have suffered from turnover in leadership in prior years. Although, the current leadership is committed to improve performance.
- Overall prognosis is that the agency is trying to improve, but performance will continue to struggle if it remains at its current staffing level.

Jim said that CPS would like to utilize more family strengthening or family training programs.

Jim showed money spent in substitute care (out of home placement) declined each year since 2005. This reflects BC's efforts to strengthen children and families so that the need for placements is less.

As part of this direction, BC has expanded its purchase of services intended to strengthen families and lower the need of out of home placements. BC Staff want to avoid removing children from their families by increasing the parents' capacity to care for their own children.

Substitute Care Program Trends

Year	Money Spent in Substitute Care *(out of home placements)*
2005	$3,261,270
2006	$3,009,176
2007	$2,962,990
2008	$2,764,430
2009	$2,593,808
2010	$2,613,213
Change: Decrease $648,057	

Year	Money Spent on Family Strengthening
2005	$0
2006	$0
2007	$113,674
2008	$255,608
2009	$271,319
2010	$292,639
Change: Increase $292,639	

Examples of Family Strengthening:
Family Training Program (out of Neenah, WI) is a vendor that BC uses. After we began using them, we found this program and their services were extremely positive and we were using their services frequently. As a result, Family Training Program was able to open a facility in Green Bay. Some of their services include:

-Assess the family.
-Have the ability to go into homes quickly if the need is there.
-Help to change the dynamics in families.
-Teach hands on parenting.
-Very complete and thorough.
-Provide a very solid report that BC is able to use in court.

Q: Chairman Lund asked how long this process generally takes with Family Training Program involved.

A: Kevin Brannan said the length varies depending on the family and the need. The longest was approximately 14 months and the shortest was approximately 5 months.

Q: Chairman Lund asked when placing a child(ren) with foster parents/foster homes, do you look for compatibility somehow? How is a home chosen?

A: Kevin Brennan said that Mina Teske's (Foster Care Coordinator) job is to match the child to the right home. There is a detailed process to align the correct foster home with the correct foster child. The selection is completed through the assessment process. One part of this process includes evaluating the home and looking at any previous placements.

Q: Citizen Board Member Hyland asked, are there a lot of families that want to be foster parents/foster homes?

A: Brennan said that there continues to be a lot of interest to become a foster parent/foster home. He said that BC is never short of homes to place children. The only time delay is getting licensed.

Q: Chairman Lund asked does the Birth to Three program help prevent some from getting placed? He said he is sure this is going to be a budget item that will be questioned.

A: Jim Hermans said yes, Birth to Three certainly prevents some placements, however, it is difficult to measure precisely.

Q: Citizen Board Member Laundrie asked how many/what percentage of foster care homes are treatment versus non treatment.

A: Kevin said the county only operates regular foster care (non-treatment). We contract with a private agency for treatment foster care. BC does have homes that provide (at least 15 homes) this care, if it is needed. Mina Teske (Foster Care Coordinator) and Brennan are working on trying to support these treatment foster homes through other programs to keep even more children in the county. It is also beneficial to keep the children in the same county where they go to school.

Brian said last week he met with Corinne McFarlane, Area Administrator Department of Children and Families, and she said they are very interested in what happens to BCHS CPS. She said they are concerned (not about management or quality of staff) about our capacity. Secretary Eloise Anderson (Department Health and Families) has requested reports on a monthly basis for BC's performance. Eloise is also interested in seeing BC improve.

Brian said as the Director, his biggest priority is the limited capacity of our Child Protection Services.

Citizen Board Member Draheim expressed that BC is way too busy and understaffed to be utilized as much as the schools would like, in her experience. She mentioned that she used to be able to collaborate more with BC's social workers and together they worked to prevent families/children before they have greater needs arise. More proactive measures were able to be taken when the social workers had more time available.

Citizen Board Member Zehren asked if BC always been understaffed?
Hermans said no. Due to regulations and previous budgets, CPS has been forced to operate understaffed.

Citizen Board Member Huxford said that right now BC is going in the right direction (as opposed to 10 years ago). However, he said that we are not staffed well enough to see the positive results of all of CPS's efforts.

Hermans said that CPS intends to measure their service outcomes and determine the effectiveness of these policy directives, should they be put into practice. They want to make sure these policy directives are producing positive results.

Shoup said what he (and the CPS team) is looking for from the Board is a sense of what they believe. Meaning, he is requesting the Board give feedback or direction on if HS is on the right track with the policy initiatives that were presented and if the Board is entrusting in these initiatives. He also said that if this is the case, HS will develop a budget proposal for the Board's consideration which reflects this sense of the HS Board.

Citizen Board Member Smits said she believes CPS is a priority. She said that priorities must be set in order to figure out how the budget will be split up. She also said that she realizes that there are needs all over the community.

Citizen Board Member Laundrie said that she is in favor of gaining more support staff in CPS. She said (in her opinion) that CPS is not asking for anything out of the ordinary; in fact, she thinks that they could be asking for more. She said that the Board needs to try to do the best they can to support CPS in gaining more money/resources to help this department succeed. She said CPS needs to increase their capacity of social workers and management positions. However, she questions where the money will come from?

Citizen Board Member Huxford said that the staffing issue is a no brainer, but noted that the County Board is going to have to figure out how to make it work in respect to the budget.

Citizen Board Member Laundrie said it was clear to see that the presentations he CPS team were extensive and conducted extremely well; overall doing a great job. She also said it is clear to see how passionate they each are about their positions and the desire to teach what they do and what CPS is all about. Overall, the CPS team did an exceptional job presenting this topic to the Board members.

6. Financial Report:

Community Programs

Community Programs posted an increase in net assets of $1.1 million in 2010. This was primarily due to increased census for all programs along with effective revenue and expense management . We maximized revenue in CP by replacing budgeted levy funds with federal funding in our long-term care and community treatment programs. This resulted in a $600K positive effect on the levy. Second, we generated more case management revenue than we budgeted due to better utilization of our case managers and our personal care professionals. We also realized labor savings by holding positions open per county human resource policy. We continue to see cost increases and increased levy requirements in our mental health program(s) as the census and emergency detention cases rise.

Community Treatment Center

The CTC realized a net excess of $963K of which $543K was comprised of transfer-in from community programs for the 2009 deficit. The CTC net excess (less transfer-in) was $290K which is better than budgeted. This is due to increased hospital revenue where CTP realized 1,583 more Brown County days than budgeted. In addition, revenues from other payers at the hospital were $175K higher due to 658 more client days than budget. Private pay revenues at the nursing home were $80.7K higher than budget due to 356 more private pay days provided.

Expenses at the CTC were lower by $643K primarily due to lower depreciation expense of $400K. We budgeted for a 25 year depreciation schedule and booked depreciation based on a 50 year schedule per instructions from the DOA. In addition, wage expenses where closely controlled and were $74K lower than budget. Also, chargeback's where $118K lower than budget primarily due to facilities costs being $88K lower than budget

7. Community Treatment Center Statistical Update:

Shoup reported that he would like to see fewer emergency detentions. He also said that the out of county admissions are current higher than last year's figures at this point. Shoup said that the average daily census is down from last year, although it has been picking up lately.

Please refer to the packet which includes this information.

8. Bellin Hospital Statistical Update:

Please refer to the packet which includes this information.

9. Contract Update:

Please refer to the packet which includes this information.

10. Other Matters:

Next Meeting: May 12, 2011 (Public Hearing)
5:15 p.m. – Sophie Beaumont Building, Board Room A

ANDREWS/LAUNDRIE moved to receive and place on file Item No. 4 through Item No. 9. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

11. Adjourn Business Meeting:

ANDREWS/ZEHREN moved to adjourn; motion passed unanimously. Chairman Lund adjourned the meeting at 7:29 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Laura L. Chartier
Recording Secretary