

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

FINAL MINUTES

September 9, 2008

LaQuinta Hotel

10:00 – 3:00 p.m.

Madison WI

Chairperson: Liz Hecht

Members Present: Keith Keller, Sally Mather, Beth Wroblewski, Julie Turkoske, John Shaw, Hugh Davis, Sue Gilbertson, Lynn Breedlove, Julie Bryda, Barb Katz, Melanie Fralick, Glen Johnson, Amy Whitehead, Jodi Pelishek

DHS Staff Member: Katie Sepnieski

Guests Present: Chris Boyce and Shannon Guibord from Milwaukee Center for Independence, Joyce Binder from I-Care

- I. Welcome and Introductions-Liz Hecht
 - a. Members and guests introduced themselves
 - b. Amy Whitehead announced the DHS Division of Public Health received a three year grant, Wisconsin Medical Home ASD Connections Initiative. The purpose of the grant is to work on the infrastructure of autism services within the State of Wisconsin
 - c. Hugh Davis announced the Children's Come First conference for this fall, November 9-11. There is a youth track and adult track. The conference is for professionals and parents that deal with children with behavior issues. It has practical information that will assist in serving children.
 - d. Liz announced the plan for the day is to focus on the budget proposal that were presented to Fredi Bove and Secretary Timberlake. The later part of the afternoon will focus on updates from the Department.
- II. Minute approvals
 - a. John motioned to accept minutes from last meeting
 - b. Sue seconded
 - c. Addition to the minutes, Amy Whitehead attended the meeting for Sharon Fleishfresser.
 - d. All approved
- III. Update on Budget Initiative Subgroup
 - a. Liz handed out the paper that was discussed with the Department. The budget that is attached to the letter is a rough estimate of cost. There is continued work on this piece.

- b. Response from Department meeting with Fredi Bove, Division Deputy Administrator, the Council will need to address why children's services cannot be rolled into the ADRC (Aging and Disability Resource Centers). The paper addresses the need to have a resource center but did not particularly address what type.
- c. The Secretary wanted there to be a discussion with the Department of Children and Family regarding their budget initiatives. The budget recommendation would be a Governor's proposal.
 - i. Concerns from the Council are by adding ADRC to the paper than it will be an expectation that children's services will be rolled into the ADRC model. Some members thought the part about the resource centers was to be taken out. The minutes from the last meeting reflected this discussion but no final consensus was made.
 - ii. There is not consensus from the Council that the ADRC may or may not be appropriate.
 - iii. Many of the ADRCs are currently focusing on the aging population and have not begun to work with adults with disabilities. Some ADRCs have offered to take on the responsibility of children but may not have the capacity or expertise.
 - iv. The ADRCs may not be the appropriate fit because it is not a duplication of services, children with long-term support needs may fit with the Department of Children and Families. To work with the DCF on information and access may be the best fit.
 - v. What are the outcomes that the Council wants from a resource center? This will assist the Council with determining what entity will be able to do the job.
 - vi. Members are recommending a small workgroup to flush out the issues for a resource center. The RFP has to prove that there is a relationship with agencies that serve children and families. Statewide access piece is necessary; this access needs to be regional and local. These layers are necessary to assure there is statewide consistency with issues but can also work on local issues.
 - vii. If an RFP is completed for this project who determines what agencies receives the contract? There is a procurement process which includes an evaluation and a panel of people that review the proposals. This can include people from outside the Department. The Secretary is the ultimate decision maker.
 - viii. The subcommittee from the meeting to discuss what the purpose and outcomes of a resource center will include:
 - 1. Hugh Davis, Lynn Breedlove, Amy Whitehead, Sue Gilbertson, Jo Pelishek, Keith Keller, Julie Turkoske, Barb Katz, John Shaw, and Liz Hecht

- ix. The Department can begin working on what the previous work of the Council has been regarding this issue. This will assist the Council with moving the issue forward.
 - 1. What are the values, characteristics, outcomes, and key criteria for the center? How does this fit into a multi-layer system? This could be one conference call including staff from the Department. The write up would then include this discussion and the information that has already been done.
 - 2. What has been done with the six pilots that counties did several years ago? Have these lessons been reviewed by the Department?
 - a. The write-up that was done for the pilots should be shared with the Council
- x. This process needs to be moved forward. Department staff could gather this information into a report for the Council and then a final discussion with the Council can occur. The Council can determine if this information is still accurate, do things need to be added, deleted, and edited? The final product would be a recommendation of an RFP to the Department. There would need to be a very specific recommendation by the December Council meeting.
- xi. What is the intent of the proposal? Is it for the entire state or for part of the state? The paper addresses a demonstration for 20% of eligible children who have significant disabilities and their families. The numbers the Department pulled regarding how many children in the state have severe disabilities is 12,000 to 15,000 children but in the northern region this would be very dense which makes it difficult to be regional. (Kids 0-18 that have KB, children on the CLTS Waivers, children registered on state wait list for autism, and the wait list for HSRS, and then removed duplication from those numbers, there is one final overlay is children that are receiving Family Support, 11,005 non-duplicated. However some children are not on waitlists due to the long wait.) Kids with MH were included for those children that are currently in the system based on the programs reviewed. CCS was not included in the numbers. The number of children is $\frac{1}{4}$ the number of adults in the LTS programs. There is the possibility of using the Katie Beckett Program model to figure out the cost involved in rural areas. However there may need to be a drop-in place for families, does it need to be in every county, and does it need to be open all the time?
- d. New funding for Services. This addresses children currently on waiting lists and those that may be underserved. All matchable services would be through the waiver to allow for the most cost-effective approach to serving all children.

- i. In the last budget there was only service dollars provided to address waiting lists. This proposal will address the infrastructure that needs to occur to address all needs for children and families. The budget information provided in the paper
 - 1. Dedicated fiscal person, project manager, and coordinator for this managed care project. There would also be the need for an actuarial firm and other partners and IT person. The MMIS system needs to get set-up because CMS is concerned with how WI currently pays counties for services to people. Currently the Department has four staff dedicated to the Children's Section. Counties are also struggling to have staff to work 100% for children's long-term support programs.
- e. Coordinated Services
 - i. The Department and local entities would need to provide funding for the coordinated services. At this point it would be 50/50. There would need to be a structure set-up which would take time.
 - 1. The budget information will continue to get refined as the pieces fall into place.

IV. Stage of the Budget Process-Lynn Breedlove

- a. DHS formal budget (09/15)
 - i. The Governor gave guidelines that there will not be an increase in spending. The Secretary can not recommend an increase for Waivers but can for FamilyCare and MA services because they are entitlement services
- b. DHS/DCF/DOA/Governor's office
 - i. Internal discussions to determine if there are issues or concerns with any budget proposals.
 - ii. DHS is working closely with DCF to determine if the two proposals regarding information/access can be coordinated together or if certain issues need to be separate.
 - iii. Council could meet with staff from the different departments and the Governor's office to explain what the proposal is.
- c. Governor's budget-introduced in late January
- d. Legislative Fiscal Bureau work on a paper that addresses the Governor's budget. It is intended to be neutral regarding the budget proposals.
 - i. The paper may not have everything the Council asked for. It may or may not include anything. The Council will need to ask for champions in the legislature to advocate for this proposal.
 - ii. It could be useful to meet with the LFB to explain the proposal.
- e. Legislature formulate their plans
 - i. Again it would be useful for Council members to meet with their legislators to advocate for the proposals
 - ii. This conversation should begin now.
- f. Joint Finance Committee (JFC) Hearings

- i. This typically occurs in end of March beginning of April
- ii. Having parents and their children attend these meetings would be beneficial. This can be difficult because it could be a long day. A visible presence could make the difference. Not all parents need to speak but they can stand behind them. Others provide written comments.
- iii. Identifying parents right now in different areas of the state that can then be prepared to attend the hearings.
- iv. It is important for families to understand the redesign so there is funding available for infrastructure change and not just service dollars.
- g. JFC Executive Sessions
 - i. These occur end of May beginning of June.
- h. Each House changes JFC Budget
 - i. Conference Committee and Governor
- j. Vetoes and possible overrides
 - i. Governor doesn't typically veto his own budget recommendations. It is uncommon but it has occurred. Governor Doyle has never vetoed an increase in funding for Long-Term Support services.

LUNCH

- V. Role of the CLTS Council in the Next Budget Cycle
 - a. Who would be available in Madison for DCF?
 - i. Barb, John, Liz, Lynn, Sue
 - b. Who would be available in November or October prior to the election or post-election for legislative contact?
 - i. Julie Turkoske in Waukesha, Glenn Johnson, and Melanie Fralick, Jo Pelishek, and John Shaw
 - c. Who would be available for the JFC to attend, speak, submit, written, find other families to attend, or all of it?
 - i. Could each council member call five people and ask if they would be interested in attending a JFC hearing? This could be entered in the DR-W database and start working on getting people to attend.
 - ii. Barb Katz would be willing to coordinate the effort.
 - iii. Not all families will need to speak; sometimes attending the hearings may be enough. The written testimony telling their story would be beneficial.
 - d. The Council needs to refine the proposal. The information/access and managed care section need to be clear. Both Liz and Lynn would be involved with some assistance with Sally Mather on Managed Care. The Secretary did not ask tough questions about the implementation but the LFB will ask those questions. The numbers piece will need to be flushed out and this will need to be backed up with some research.
 - e. A compelling one-page write up for legislators and parents with key talking points. They need something they can skim in simple language. It

should have the key elements and can be explained at the meeting. It needs to be explained in a way that it is obvious the proposal is not asking for the same old things.

- i. Sue Gilbertson, Julie Turkoske, Liz Hecht, Lynn Breedlove and John Shaw
- f. Stories of what has worked and hasn't worked for families; lack of information and coordinated help. Stories that illustrate the three prong approach and why it is necessary. Families that are now off the waiting list in this biennium.
 - i. Jo Pelishek,
 - ii. Parents in Partnership trainings are starting this fall. John would be willing to speak with the facilitators about having families writing a story about their situations.
 - iii. Barb Katz and Keith Keller would work on collecting stories.
 - iv. The stories should incorporate the three prongs, if it worked, didn't work, what were the issues.
 - v. Council members may need to work with families on what is needed. Having names, photos and locations would be helpful.
 - vi. Send regional meetings dates to council members
 1. Southeastern Region November 3, 2008 from 9:30 -12:00
 2. Southern Region November 20, 2008 from 10:00-12:30
 3. Western Region November 11, 2008 from 10:00-12:00
 4. Northern Region October 23, 2008 from 10:00 -12:30
 5. Northeastern Region October 22, 2008 from 9:30-12:00
 - vii. The Advance CLTS Waiver training on October 27th at Chula Vista there is a possibility of a listening session for county workers after the first day of training. Family Voices will host the session from 5:00 to 6:30 and provide appetizers.
- g. By the end of November the Department will have the 2008 numbers available for how many children are being served in CLTS Waivers by each county. This does not include Family Support data, counties maintain this information.
- h. The initiative does not have a name. Kelli Betsinger who attended the last meeting did submit a few names but the names did not fit the purpose of the work that Council has done. Sally has continued to work on the name by talking to different people. The main word would be a Compass, with the tagline: Families Guiding, Guiding Families. The Council liked the word Compass. Using the term "special" separates families from the rest of the families in WI. The Council should email taglines to Sally by September 17, 2008. (Mapping a new direction for families, Finding New Paths, Charting a new direction, navigating the waters.) A few names and taglines would be submitted to the Department for final consideration. Beth will begin the discussion with Fredi Bove and Sinikka Santala.
- i. Who are the partners the Council needs to work with?
 - i. The Wisconsin County Human Services Association
 1. Liz spoke with Glen Johnson about getting on the agenda

- ii. FACETS has a mailing list of 5000 families, possibly adding something to their mailing
 - iii. Provider groups
 - iv. Wisconsin Council on Churches
 - v. Media, cultivating relationships
 - 1. Possible families being interviewed by the local newspaper.
 - 2. Press conference by advocacy group
 - vi. People Can't Wait groups
- VI. Standing Agenda items
 - a. DHS updates-Beth Wroblewski
 - i. Julie Bryda
 - ii. Peg Corp
 - iii. Bill Murray
 - iv. Theresa Walske
 - v. New Section in BLTS Policy Initiative and Relocation, new supervisor will be announced next week
 - vi. Mapping of current Department
 - b. Waiver Renewals-Julie Bryda
 - c. Family Support Program
 - i. More counties are using FSP as a match to the waiver for allowable services. Many counties are working on combining Family Support into the CLTS sections
 - ii. Some counties are placing FSP into CPS which can cause some issues. These counties are being monitored to assure the services are for the appropriate purpose.
 - iii. There will be a need for a formal training on the purpose of Family Support Program
 - d. The Autism Council-Julie Bryda
 - i. The Council is working on developing a version of intensive services which would allow parents to provide the hours and have it count towards the hours.
 - ii. The actuary has reviewed what needs to be done to provide this service.
 - iii. The insurance mandate is being moved forward by Senator Kapanke's Autism Task Force. The Task Force will be asking for an additional \$6 million dollars to address the waiting list.
 - 1. Issues are the diagnostic verification and the licensing and regulation of the providers.
 - e. October Training Update-Katie Sepnieski
 - i. October 27th and 28th there will be a two-day training for all county CLTS sections at the Chula Vista in Wisconsin Dells
 - ii. Day One of the Training will be focused on the CLTS Functional Screen. Becky Burns will be leading the all day training. The one day training will be for new certified screeners and or those that want a refresher.

- iii. Day Two of the training will focus on the CLTS Waiver and Family Support Programs. There will be four sessions and everyone will attend each session. The sessions will focus on:
 - 1. Coordinating and integrating services for children across multiple funding sources
 - 2. Responding to changes in functional eligibility, including revised outcomes and plans, denial of services, and the appeals process.
 - 3. Consideration for children's long-term supports programs in an era of changing services systems.
 - 4. Family Support Program: Comprehensive Overview
- f. New Funding-Julie Bryda and Katie Sepnieski
 - i. The Department is currently working with counties to use the funding that was allocated to them in 2008. Many counties have used all of their allocations.
 - ii. A few counties have had difficulty using the allocation due to staff turn over and recruitment efforts. The Children's Services Section is offering technical assistance and training to those counties that need additional assistance.

VII. Next CLTS Council meeting is December 9, 2008