

State-County Results Accountability and Services Redesign Council

Meeting notes

August 11, 2010

Council Members Present: Brian Aldes, Teamsters Union; Alex Bartolic, DHS; Senator Linda Berglin, Minneapolis; Kelly Harder, Dakota County; Representative Dianne Loeffler, Minneapolis; Mary Sheehan, Chisago County; Erin Sullivan-Sutton, DHS; Lynne Singelmann, DHS; Commissioner Kevin Vickerman (co-chair), Murray County (Lincoln-Lyon-Murray Social Services)

AMC/MACSSA Staff Present: Patricia Coldwell, Kate Lerner, Eric Ratzmann

Guest: Judith Brumfield, Scott County

- I. **Call to order, introductions, minutes:** Commissioner Kevin Vickerman, co-chair, called the meeting to order at 9:05 and asked members to introduce themselves. Kevin asked if there were changes to the minutes; as there were none, he indicated that they would stand as presented.

- II. **Roles for Council:** Kevin said that members had identified several potential roles for the Council at the last meeting. He asked Eric Ratzmann to summarize these from the handout sent with the agenda. Eric reiterated the roles identified, including:
 - Guide human services redesign efforts;
 - Review evidence-based research on optimal population base;
 - Forum to examine appropriate level of government to deliver which services (e.g. county vs. state);
 - Recommend flexibility around process requirements (focus on outcomes), and possibly recommend legislative changes where statewide change is appropriate;
 - Guidance on redesign ideas appropriate for statewide implementation vs. pilots;
 - Review SDA proposals and recommend for certification when statutory authority exists.

Questions posed to members for discussion:

- **Are these the roles articulated at the last meeting?**
- **Of these, which is/are the highest priority?**
- **Which roles most closely reflect statutory language?**
- **Given that resources are limited, where does it make sense to start?**

Comments and discussion as follows:

- Need to add how to garner public input, re: SDAs at the local level and thru the Council (perhaps to be included in template);
- Acknowledge different approaches between metro and urban;
- Legislators welcome this as a unique, more relaxed forum than usually exists to share ideas with counties and state;
- Question whether the discussion of what functions should be administered at the county versus state level was a primary role for this group, or whether another group, such as the Administrative Simplification Committee, should be the forum);
- In home and community based services, some groups exist to work on various redesign efforts, how/are the results of this work channeled to the Council?
- Expectation of developing an evidence-based product may be too resource-intense for this group and staff, perhaps bring forward findings when already available rather than using staff time to research;
- Another question is that of public health/human services consolidation—is that a discussion for this group? Or is that outside the scope of this council? (No resolution to this question but it appeared to not be a high priority)
- Council should advocate for simplicity in human services programs;
- Council could be forum to share information about other human services redesign efforts not resulting in SDAs; ways to encourage innovation, etc.
- If one model is cheaper than but just as effective as another, we should try to expand it.

As an example of the last point, Erin Sullivan Sutton shared information about the Southeastern Minnesota counties 'Transformation Contract, an effort in which DHS is assisting counties to redesign many aspects of human services in twelve counties in southeast Minnesota. This is funded by the Bush Foundation with consultation provided by Public Strategies Group. In response to a question about DHS' role, she said they are involved at the counties' request to consult with them in redesigning various areas of human services. This project uses a 'learning lab' model of people who are not human services experts with which to test out new ideas. Commissioner Ludeman has identified this as a high priority for DHS. The suggestion was made to have an overview of this project at a future Council meeting.

Kevin asked if there is a way to 'rein in' some of the roles identified so the work of the Council is initially not so overwhelming. The suggestion was made that priority roles should be:

- To guide redesign efforts; including guiding redesign efforts that are appropriate for statewide implementation; and
- To review SDA proposals and recommend them (if appropriate) for certification when authority exists.

It was agreed that included within the role should be the task of advising on the public input process in the local service delivery framework, and making recommendations to the commissioner on issues that may lend themselves to statewide implementation. There was

consensus that this was the priority role for the time being. Staff were asked to incorporate this into the draft Council charter for the next meeting.

III. **Presenting Proposals to the Council:** Kate Lerner presented a draft “Service Delivery Authority: Phases of Development” for discussion. She suggested that this could be a way to think about the various phases or steps that a county/ies could go through with the Council in preparing to establish an SDA. These include:

- Identification
- Exploration
- Notification
- Negotiation
- Certification, and
- Implementation.

For each, there is a description, questions to consider, and lessons learned. This is intended to help counties and the Council think through the steps, as opposed to a rigid template or application format.

Member discussion:

- There was considerable support for this approach as intuitive and helpful;
- Questions and discussion regarding the accountability for outcomes and who tracks that—Council or DHS? (primarily DHS but council can oversee as well)
- Comment that this process should not carry greater accountability than currently exists in single county models;
- Discussion that perhaps that should be true if only administrative restructuring is occurring, but if services are done differently outcomes should be clearly identified and tracked;
- Should consider at what phases, and to what extent, council should be most involved versus counties together or with DHS;
- While negotiation phase is with DHS, perhaps Council could help that along if there are snags;
- Should make available options to counties for collaborating and seeking waivers aside from SDA route.

Members agreed this document would be helpful to counties interested in forming SDAs, and directed staff to flesh out questions as well as potential Council roles during each phase, along with a timetable for discussion, to be considered at the next meeting. Kevin suggested that some issues will just bubble up as part of questions or proposals that counties bring to the council, and those things can be sorted as we go forward.

IV. **Performance Steering Committee**—Judith Brumfield, Scott County, presented information regarding the Steering Committee on Performance and Outcomes, of which she is a member.

This group was also formed in response to the legislation that authorized the Results Accountability Council. She distributed a packet that included charter for the group, framework for the remedies process (as required in statute), and scoping document, including timeline, for establishment of performance measures. These are being done through three work groups : children's, adults, and income supports. The children's group has been formed and is to begin meeting in the next week. They plan to meet bimonthly and hope to have their work done by the end of the year. This may be the easiest group to begin with because, while its scope is broad, there many existing federal measures. After this work group is done, the other two groups will meet concurrently. Each group has nine members: three from counties, three from DHS, and three from community organizations. It is envisioned that subgroups will also be needed to work on more specific issues (e.g. children's mental health).

Judith identified the following challenges to the Performance Steering committee's work:

- Staff and work group time
- Resources
- Identifying effective leading measures (which result in improved results)
- Being future-oriented rather than continuously 'looking in the rear mirror'

Judith stressed that this is intended to be a 'living process' as with the goal of improving performance rather than a static one. Council members' discussion focused on getting resources to assist with the work and trying to get federal waivers from some requirements. (Apparently the feds are more interested in this than at some points in the past—e.g. Fostering Connections project.) Comments were also made about the need to make the measures commensurate with resources available. Also noted was that community-based interventions are harder to measure than individual ones.

Members congratulated the committee and Judith on their ground-breaking efforts and expressed desire to be kept informed.

V. **Charter**—Patricia suggested, as requested earlier, the role discussion be incorporated into the draft charter for the Council. It will be revised and brought forward to the next meeting.

VI. **Next meeting:** Staff was directed to find a time in the next month (September) to meet and also try to identify a regular monthly meeting time for the next several months. It was agreed that 2-hour meetings were appropriate.

Deliverables for the next meeting:

- Incorporate agreed-upon roles into the charter with additions suggested
- Add questions, timelines and other detail to the phases document for discussion at next meeting
- Publicize options for multicounty collaboration and waiver from statute and rule;

- Update on the Southeast Transformation Contract (later meeting, not September).

The meeting adjourned at 11:05.