

State-County Results Accountability Council

Wednesday, September 29, 2010

DRAFT Meeting Notes

Present:

Members: John Thorson, Commissioner Jan Callison, Commissioner Kevin Vickerman, Brian Mendes, Kelly Harder, Representative Dianne Loeffler, Senator Linda Berglin, Representative Jim Abeler, Erin Sullivan-Sutton, Lynne Singelmann, Jay Kieft, Commissioner Chuck Amunrud (alternate)

Staff: Kate Lerner, Eric Ratzmann, Patricia Coldwell

1. Call to Order

Co-chair Erin Sullivan-Sutton called the meeting to order and members introduced themselves. Minutes from the August meeting were approved as presented. Correction to the AFSCME name plate (acronym) noted.

2. Charter *[operating procedures for the Council]*

Patricia noted the roles for the Council, as agreed to at the last meeting, were incorporated into the Council Charter. She walked through the rest of the charter for members' comments.

The chair raised the outstanding issue of county representation on the council. The statute authorizing the performance steering committee and the redesign council requires county cross representation on the two committees to ensure coordination and information sharing. Because of the time commitment involved in serving on these committees, the county associations were unable to find representatives able to serve on both. This issue was addressed as part of proposed amendments to the statute in the 2010 legislative session, but no changes to the original statute were adopted. The council discussed the intent of the language, the importance of the connection between the committees, and existing ways information is being shared. County association staff are attending meetings and working on both committees, and county representatives from the steering committee have presented updates to the council on the work. There may also be opportunity to revisit this again after the election when there may be membership changes with county elected officials. The difficulty of finding county representatives able to serve on both committees was acknowledged and the council will establish a more formal way to ensure the requirements in law of coordination and information sharing continue to be met.

The Charter also references the need to develop a timeline to respond to county proposals, as none is specified in statute. Also discussed was frequency of meetings—at least once per year, but chairs may call additional meetings as needed.

On a motion by Jan Callison, seconded by Jay Kieft, the Charter was approved.

3. Phases Document

Kate Lerner reviewed the draft *Phases of Development for Service Delivery Authorities*. She added questions to consider for each phase ranging from Identification to Implementation.

Comments from members:

- Include evaluation results in recommendations for how to move forward
- In Exploration phase, clarify first question to refer to “what governance structure is appropriate?” rather than options for governance
- Emphasize outcome of improved services for clients
- Should specify how to ‘decertify’ SDA if that is deemed necessary
- Add bargaining units to be involved in Negotiation phase
- Generally favorable comments about the format as helpful

Kate asked if the questions to consider for the phases contained enough detail. Members agreed the document should not be too all-inclusive because it may stifle creativity. It was agreed to add a column on Roles and Responsibilities for the Redesign Council, and circulate for feedback prior to the next meeting.

4. Discuss Plan to Publicize Options for Multicounty Collaboration and Waiver from Statute and Rule

Patricia asked if members were comfortable with posting the Phases document on the AMC web site so that counties can see what direction the proposals should take. It was agreed it would be helpful to post this as a work in progress to provide some guidance. Members requested that AMC post examples of options for multicounty structures/waivers on the web site (e.g. joint powers arrangements). Also clarified that an SDA need not be a JPA/JPE if population exceeds 50,000 population. Also clarified that if a solution is proposed that will work statewide, perhaps the statute should be changed to allow all counties to do it.

Erin, Kelly, and Chuck Amunrud shared information about the public meetings on the Southeast Minnesota Transformation Contract. The first of three ‘public conversations’ was held last week in Rochester and was attended by over 90 providers, clients, commissioners, union representatives, and members of the public. The project has received funding from the Bush Foundation and counties have also contributed approximately \$200,000 in county cash and in-kind. They are forming ‘design labs’ with assistance from the Public Strategies Group.

5. Update on Performance Steering Committee

Kate and Patricia updated on the Steering Committee and recent Listening Session. The Children's subgroup has begun meeting to develop performance measures in the areas of children's services. DHS, county, and non-profit organizations are represented on this group. A Listening Session was held last week at DHS, attended by over 80 people from various backgrounds. Participants were asked to identify what results they would like to see in each key program area (e.g, child welfare, children's mental health, adoption, etc) and how they will know if they have achieved them. Key points included: need for statewide consistency, unification of families, inclusion of tribal issues, and focus on prevention. This input will be summarized and available on the DHS and AMC websites in the next few weeks. Kate noted that the project has received word that they have been selected for a Capstone Project from the University of Minnesota for the fall semester. Graduate students will be assisting with research on performance measures.

The Steering Committee is also soliciting representatives to serve on the Adult Services Committee, which will begin meeting in January.

6. Other

Patricia gave a brief synopsis of the Council on Local Results and Innovation, which had met earlier that week. This Council is charged in statute with developing ten performance measures for city and county government by February, 2011. It is unclear whether these measures are to include human services. Comments from Council members:

- This Council was authorized to look at accountability for use of county program aid/local government aid
- Difficult to meet measures if funds are cut or eliminated; CPA/LGA are inequitably distributed (due to outdated funding formulas) so it's difficult to expect equal accountability across counties/cities
- Focus on outcomes helps decide what to prioritize; can't do it all
- Identified areas of intersect between cities and counties (e.g. housing, zoning ordinances)

7. Next meeting:

It was agreed that a meeting of the Council will be scheduled in the next month to complete work on the Phases Document. The meeting adjourned at 11:00.