

**DHS/AMC TASK FORCE ON  
MANAGING CHANGE IN HUMAN SERVICES SYSTEMS  
MEETING MINUTES  
MARCH 3, 2006**

These minutes identify by agenda item the nature of the discussion and the decisions the Task Force made and assignments, as appropriate. They are based on extensive raw notes that can be made available by email.

In attendance: Kevin Goodno, Lynne Singlemann, Dennis Erickson, Chuck Johnson, Brian Osberg, Wes Kooistra, Loren Colman, Christine Bronson, Sue Zuidema, John Baerg, Amy Wilde, John Evert, Dennis McCoy, Dave Rooney, Tom Henderson, Dan Papin, Susan Beck, Kathy Johnson, Jim Mulder, Kate Lerner, Mary Fisher, Sue Beck, Patricia Coldwell, staff; Michelle Basham, staff.

Guests: Kay Dickison, Paul Fleissner, Clark Gustafson, Julie Ring

**Expectations for Meeting**

Members identified the following goals

- Re-assess the work of the Task Force in light of passage of the federal deficit reduction act of 2006.
- Determine how experience with previous state-local efforts may affect the current work.
- Clarify the relationship between the Department and counties
- Summarize the outcome of the meeting and define next steps.

**Sponsor Group Report, Discussion and Guidance**

The first half of the meeting was devoted to discussing the progress of the sponsor group and identifying issues that need to be addressed.

- **Market Factors:** The group is no longer working with a “clean slate,” relative to the features or components of a program for persons with disabilities. Several health plans in the state are already applying to do special needs plans (SNP’s) which will define an array of services. In addition, CMS is requiring health plans to address how they will serve dually eligible persons with disabilities. The sponsor group will need to take these market factors and other initiatives (e.g. MHAG work) into account as they identify eligible populations and make recommendations for what services should be provided and through what service delivery mechanisms.

- **Success Criteria:** The Task Force reviewed a list of elements that identified “what is” needed in order to make a potential model of service delivery successful. There were questions as to whether managed care organizations would have the capacity to respond to new obligations (elements) including addressing acute as well as long term needs of clients and linkages to social services.
  - **Assignment:** The sponsor group will address capacity issues at its next meeting and research particularly the capacity of managed care organizations.
- **Baseline Data:** The Department has been working on addressing the initial questions the Task Force posed, starting with gathering baseline data about the current level of service and outcomes for persons with disabilities. The group discussed that the data will necessarily be limited to that generated under the current fee for service system and that outcome data specific to Minnesota and for persons with disabilities is not available. The group suggested that the sponsor group might offer strategies for improving baseline data and data needed to evaluate outcomes.
- **MHAG update:** The recommendations concerning serving people with mental health disorders have been put forward to the legislature with an implementation date of 2008. There was discussion about how counties were involved and how their input was taken into consideration. The group discussed that there were some lessons about the process that might inform how this Task Force functions.

### **Discussion of Impacts of DRA on State/county Relationships and Roles**

The Task Force spent considerable time discussing the environment within which the state and counties must operate and how that environment affects the relationship and respective roles of the Department and counties in designing and implementing new service delivery systems.

- **Representation:** A central concern for both the Department and the counties is whether and to what extent a set of counties can provide input and commit to decisions that will be accepted by all counties whether the issue is immediate or longer-term. When this does not occur, the Department is left vulnerable to criticism that it did not involve the right people or at the appropriate level.
- **Stakeholders:** The concern here is whether county input should count more than that of other stakeholders; that is, whether they should be treated as more than “one among equals” when it comes to designing and implementing major changes. There is agreement that other stakeholders must be at the table as well.

- **Delivery Structure:** The discussion centered on the reality that states and localities are constantly confronted by changing environmental conditions (new law/regulations; reduced revenues, technology advances, etc.) that require finding new ways of doing business, including changes in roles and responsibilities between the state and counties. In addition, this means that processes or mechanisms to respond to the changing environment must themselves be more nimble, fluid and flexible.
- **Role of the Task Force:** The group identified and discussed several different purposes the Task Force could address as it moves forward.
  - **Systemic Structural Changes:** The group would convene to consider major, systemic, structural statewide changes in the overall delivery of human services; e.g. state takeover of child support; change in service delivery boundaries from county to region; use of technology for standardized services (eligibility determination).
  - **Oversight (s):** This option would mean the Task Force would be the body to “scope” out and charter working groups for specific initiatives like the current one considering services to people with disabilities. It would recommend strategies to the Department based on the work of the chartered groups.
  - **Information Sharing/Mechanism:** This option would provide a more structured, on-going communication path between the state and counties. This would provide a way to continue to build trust and afford the opportunity to frame issues consistently and be proactive in communications.

The Department was concerned that there were not enough resources or time within the Governor’s current term to address the first purpose; that is, to look at delivery from a system-wide perspective and make recommendations for major structural changes. The group did believe the current process of chartering and reviewing recommendations seemed to make sense. The only limit was the ability of the Department to staff multiple initiatives.

○ **Assignment/Decisions**

- The Department will form a group to look at Child Welfare Financing issues. The group will seek input and representation from the counties.
- The work of the existing sponsor group (managing services for people with disabilities) will continue as planned. The Task Force will convene when the sponsor group requires action from the Task Force.
- The Task Force will not explore major system wide changes now as a group charge. After the gubernatorial election and depending upon staff resources, the Task Force can re-consider whether to take on this work and/or collaborate with other stakeholder groups.