

Wisconsin Council on Children's Long-Term Support Needs  
Council Meeting

Minutes  
September 18, 2007  
LaQuinta Hotel  
10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.  
Madison WI

Chairperson: Liz Hecht

Members Present: Keith Keller, Sue Gilbertson, Julie Turkoske, Deb McLeish, Michelle Sturz, Beth Wroblewski, Barb Katz, Cheryl Berg

Guests: Susan Younger, Waushara Human Services, Joyce Binder, I-Care, Fredi Bove, DHFS

Staff Member: Katie Sepnieski, DHFS

- I. Welcome and Introductions
  - a. Liz Hecht welcomed everyone to the council meeting and introduced the topics on the agenda.
  - b. Introduction of council members and guests
  
- II. Outcomes Workgroup Update – Katie Sepnieski
  - a. An overview of the workgroup objectives and trainings was handed out to the members.
  - b. The workgroup will create written materials, a webcast, and in person training. The goal is to have everything completed by April. The written materials will be created first and the other training materials will be developed after the written.
  - c. Currently Family Support does not have use outcomes however it is important for service coordinators to be discussing outcomes with families to determine their needs and wants.
  - d. Outcomes are required for all waivers; children and adult individual service plans have required this since January 1, 2007.
  
- III. Family Support Program Update – Liz Hecht
  - a. The workgroup developed recommendations to Secretary Hayden regarding the budget bill for First Come First Serve within the Family Support Program.
  - b. A draft of the recommendations was disseminated to the Council for discussion.

- c. The first recommendation would require all counties to have crisis funding. The recommendations give guidelines for crisis funding. County Advisory Committees will need to develop policies that allow them to address crisis situations.
- d. The second recommendation addresses the need for counties to complete an assessment annually with the families currently served by the FSP. The assessment would drive the funding allocated to each family, based on priority of needs. Require not recommend.
- e. The third recommendation would propose that an assessment of needs be completed for families on waiting lists. Counties could complete an annual assessment through surveys or an assessment tool. The assessment would need to be accessible to families that are illiterate, non-English speaking, etc. Also counties need to address how to communicate with families about crisis funds. Checking in with families through out the year would be beneficial to determine if they are in crisis.
- f. The fourth recommendation addresses that needs can be time sensitive based on the child's development.
- g. The fifth recommendation would be to get a response from DHFS as to how this new policy would be implemented. The expectation would be that DHFS would provide technical support to those counties that do not have the crisis policy. The DHFS could provide examples of what other counties are doing which can guide the counties that have not implemented the crisis funding. Best practice techniques would be beneficial.
- h. The final paragraph would be another recommendation instead of a conclusion.
- i. It was reported by a Council member that in one county families have left messages for service coordinators and have been told they can not leave messages more than once a week. Several of the families are on the Advisory Committees and have wanted to know about the waiting lists, and the children getting served. The county did not share any information.
- j. One concern for counties would be the funding for service coordinators to assess families on the waiting list. It is not possible for service coordinators to do assessments on children not getting served. An unfunded mandate would be difficult for counties to complete.
- k. Another suggestion would be to add a statement to the letter regarding the discussion around FSP flexibility and not just for crisis. Families should have a core system statewide that does not shift when crossing a county line. It would be important to empower each County Advisory Board to work with the county human services to develop a relationship that addresses the needs of the family prior to a crisis arising.

- l. Deb made the motion: accept the proposed recommendations as amended by the Council's discussions and the subcommittee will make the final revisions and move it to the Secretary's office.
  - m. Barb Katz seconded motion.
  - n. Passed by Council.
  - o. Liz will add the comments from the meeting and will send it out to the workgroup. The workgroup will review it and then move it to the Secretary's office.
- IV. Liz Hecht announced that Beth Wroblewski has been appointed the Interim Director of the Bureau of Long-Term Supports
- a. Beth explained the reorganization of the Division and Bureau. As Family Care Expansion moves forward it will become the Office of Family Care. The Bureau of Long-Term Supports will include some adult systems and the children's section.

#### LUNCH BREAK

- V. Liz handed out "Possible Concepts regarding the Allocation of new Funding in 2007-2009 Biennium for Children with Disabilities on Waiting Lists"
- a. The handout was developed by the Survival Coalition in response to the possible allocation of new funds in the next budget.
- VI. Beth and Liz discussed the current waiver funding that is in the proposed budget.
- a. \$4.7 million each year all funds over the biennium to be served for children with long-term disabilities waiting for services, the language is currently part of the Family Care Ombudsmen Motion.
  - b. This funding piece of the budget is not contentious. It appears in both parts of the budget by Assembly and Senate. There is legislative intent that the money would be matched to federal funding. It would not be an increase in Family Support. The \$4.7 million is all funds per year for a total of \$9.4 million in the biennium.
  - c. The legislation does not give guidelines regarding how the money should be distributed. This allows the DHFS to determine how the money should be disseminated.
  - d. Currently the money for piloting managed care is in the Senate version of the budget but not the Assembly version.
  - e. The new funding could be used for services and reducing waiting lists but should some of the money be used for piloting managed care? The Council can make recommendations regarding this money.
  - f. Once the budget is passed it will be 6 months into the first part of the biennium and the money that would have been distributed could be used for managed care pilots.
  - g. Beth passed out a draft handout for distributing the potential \$4.7 million over the biennium.

- h. Liz discussed the document that she passed out earlier. The table lists concepts and the implications. Some of the concepts are in competition with each other.
- i. The waiting lists that are being discussed refer to children that are eligible for services based on the functional screen for long-term supports. Some counties have children that are eligible for both the FSP and CLTS programs on the same list, other counties have children that are in different target groups on different waiting lists because they are in different sections in the county.

VII. Discussion of Budget Initiatives and Funding Allocation Methods – Fredi Bove, Deputy Administrator of the Division of Long-Term Care in DHFS

- a. The DHFS would like the Council to begin thinking strategically about how to use the funds for children’s long-term care. In the past, the DHFS has considered various criteria when allocating funds; typically it has been in the adult system.
- b. The draft chart that was distributed did not have all 72 counties due to the difficulty in reviewing all the counties. The chart was broken down into four types of counties.
  - i. Examples of small counties would be Green, Grant, Iowa, Florence
  - ii. Examples of medium counties would be Ashland, Dunn, Calumet
  - iii. Examples of large counties would be Outagamie, Manitowoc, LaCrosse
  - iv. Examples of very large counties would be the urban counties, Racine, Milwaukee, Waukesha, Dane
  - v. The first column labeled “Family Support distribution” is the calculation that is used to distribute family support funds.
  - vi. The second column “Census Distribution” was birth through age 17 and % of all children in each county.
  - vii. The third column “Waitlist Distribution” used the Family Support Program wait list data that was reported in 2006 by counties. Some counties reported zero children waiting.
  - viii. The fourth column “Combination of Census and Wait list Distribution” gives each an equal wait. 50% census, 50% wait list
  - ix. The last column “combination of family support, census, and waitlist” gives each a 1/3 weight.
  - x. The implication of a county reporting zero on wait list and no children underserved would mean no additional funding. Do we assume that those counties report that it is within the context of the funding they have?
- c. It would be important to create a Maintenance of Effort, a county would need to maintain the funding that is currently supporting the children in the system and not give less if they are provided.
- d. The Council discussed possible options for distributing the funds
  - i. Reviewing the number of children served and then figure out a % based on census.

- ii. Rural and urban are weighed and child welfare is also reviewed in order to take into account other factors not just population.
- iii. Using the wait list data but not weighting it strongly and also taking into consideration other data. The community aids calculation is from 1991 and the data that was used is from then.
- iv. Birth to 3 data is reported by county on the Human Services Reporting System (HSRS). Most counties are current on this reporting. B-3 data with DPI data up to age 21 as one way to count children. Apply straight % of population from SLATES. Then a proportion of the number of children served compared to the waiting list.
- v. Katie Beckett and SSI would give data on all children with long-term disabilities. SSI children have a specific code that would be easily sorted. The codes would be able to tease out by county. Children receiving BadgerCare may have a disability but never go through the next step to apply for another service.
- e. CCS is a local match program. What would happen to those children that are waiting for CCS?
- f. Council recommendations for funding the managed care pilots and policies that may affect local funding distribution.
- g. Volunteers for workgroup: Michelle Sturz, Keith Keller, and Cheryl Berg, Susan Younger, Liz Hecht and Lynn Breedlove.
  - i. First week in October for first meeting.
- h. DHFS will begin to look for other data to run and determine if there is a level of confidence in the outcomes. The council recommended multiple measures for a combined data.

VIII. Review of June 26, 2007 meeting minutes

- a. Keith Keller made motion to accept minutes
- b. Barb Katz 2<sup>nd</sup> motion.
- c. Motion passed unanimously.

Standing Agenda Items

IX. Family Support Program – Liz

- a. Creating a subgroup for Family Support to make recommendations to DHFS regarding inconsistency in how FS funding is used or not used for match to CLTS Waivers. Does Council want to make recommendations for a mandate that if it can be matched it should be? Does the Council want to make sure that a percent of funding is used for highly flexible needs that may not be allowable under the waiver?
- b. Addressing consistency statewide would be useful and the Council should have this discussion.

X. Autism Council

- a. The DHFS should share any formal recommendations from the Autism Council with the CLTS Council.
  - b. The Autism Council has a subcommittee reviewing other treatment models for children in the intensive in-home program. This information will be shared at a special October meeting of the Council
- XI. Pilot Counties
- a. Reviewed the August 13<sup>th</sup> meeting