

## **Social Services Regional Supervision and Collaboration Working Group Meeting Minutes – 01.09.2018**

The fifth meeting of the Social Services Regional Supervision and Collaboration Working Group (SSWG) was held at the University of North Carolina School of Government (UNC SOG) on January 9, 2018

### **Working Group Members and School of Government Staff in Attendance**

Sen. Tamara Barringer, co-chair

Rep. Sarah Stevens, co-chair

Michael Becketts, Assistant Secretary for Human Services, DHHS

Lisa Cauley, Chief, Child Welfare Section of the Division of Social Services, DHHS

Hon. Robert Stiehl, Chief District Court Judge, Cumberland County

Hon. Kevin Austin, Commissioner, Yadkin County

Hon. Page Lemel, Commissioner, Transylvania County

Chris Dobbins, Consolidated Human Services Director, Gaston County

Glenn Osborne, Social Services Director, Wilson County

Angie Stephenson, Orange and Chatham Counties

Sen. Kathy Harrington

Susan Osborne, Social Services Director, Alamance County

Sen. Joyce Krawiec

### **Working Group Members Attending Remotely**

Hon. Bob Woodard, Commissioner Dare County

Susan Perry-Manning, Deputy Secretary for Human Services, DHHS

### **Working Group Members Not in Attendance**

Rep. Jonathan Jordan

Rep. David Lewis

Hon. Brenda Howerton, Commissioner, Durham County

### **Convene**

- Welcoming Remarks by SSWG Co-chairs
  - Sen. Barringer convened the Working Group with opening remarks;
  - Rep. Stephens followed with additional opening remarks.
- Introductions by attendees
- A. Sachs reviewed the meeting's purposes and agenda; the Working Group adopted these without change.
- Minutes from the December 12, 2017 meeting were approved with a single edit.
  - Angie Stephenson was moved to the list of working group members not in attendance at the December 14, 2017 meeting.

- Updates by SSWG group members
  - Update by Michael Becketts on the progress of other reform efforts that relate to the charge of the SSWG.
- A. Wall provided the SSWG with an update on information generated/acquired by SOG since last meeting.
  - SSWG charge and timeline reviewed
  - Take-away points from 12/14/17 meeting: Child Fatality Review System, Medicaid Reform, and Oklahoma Sen. A.J. Griffin
    - Sen. Barringer noted that the relationship between SSWG plan for regional supervision and child fatality review system should be flagged for future discussion and consideration.
    - Clarification was provided on the relationship between SSWG’s charge and Medicaid reform efforts.
    - SSWG members noted that items not specifically within the charge of SSWG should be flagged and included in the final report where appropriate.
    - M. Becketts noted the importance of autonomous system reform as highlighted in the presentation by Oklahoma Sen. A.J. Griffin.
    - Judge Stiehl expressed concern that progress made by the SSWG may be set back due to budgetary limitation.
  - Review of Virginia Fact Sheet and discussion of important take-away points
  - Presentation accompanied by PowerPoint Presentation. Slides can be found at <https://www.sog.unc.edu/resources/microsites/social-services/meetings>

## **Supervisory Functions**

- Presentation on updated Supervisory Functions by A. Wall. Presentation accompanied by PowerPoint Presentation. Slides can be found at <https://www.sog.unc.edu/resources/microsites/social-services/meetings>
  - Review of changes made to Supervisory Functions Table
    - M. Becketts expressed concern over the renaming of “Best Practice Dissemination” to “Evidence-Based Practice”. SSWG agreed to revert back to “Best Practice Dissemination”
    - Consensus on items eliminated from Supervisory Functions Table
  - Clarification on “normal course of business” operations versus operations related to intensive support or supervision
    - “Requested” versus “directed” support
    - A discussion of Intensive Support teams was flagged for consideration when BOCC are discussed.

- M. Becketts proposed an additional Supervisory Function – Emergency Management and Business Continuity
  - Sen. Barringer noted that redundancies in personnel or responsibilities across counties may be a way to ensure business continuity.
  - Topic was flagged for additional discussion
- M. Henderson introduced SSWG members to the Supervisory Functions discussion activity.
  - SSWG were provided time for small table discussions on the most recent version of the Supervisory Functions Table.
  - Following table discussions, SSWG members shared their thoughts from their small table discussion with the entire group.
    - Compliance monitoring
      - Definitions of terms should be formalized in the final draft of the report to ensure a shared understanding (i.e. Corrective Action Plans)
      - Compliance monitoring based on contractual terms
    - Fiscal monitoring
      - No additional comments
    - Policy guidance and technical assistance
      - If concerns regarding policy or practice are expressed and/or addressed at either the regional or state level, that information should be shared state-wide.
      - Both directed (by the region/central office) and requested (by the county) support- Directive and Requested Support Team (DRAT)
      - Development of a Working Group whose primary responsibility is to continuously assess policy and its implementation
    - Integrated data systems and recordkeeping
      - Cyber security
      - User friendly
      - “Secure” added to title of supervisory function
    - Evidence-based practice dissemination
      - Change back to “best practice dissemination” to better capture the nature of the supervisory function
      - Customization of practices to a community’s specific needs
      - Central should maintain a “best-practices” clearinghouse to ensure the practices are founded in research and positive results.
      - On-going work group to monitor policies and practices
    - Workforce development

- “Maintain an adequate number of competent personnel to provide quality and timely services” – Too vague, needs to be re-worked, needs to encompass both quantity and quality
- Conduit to legislative bodies to make request regarding workforce development.
- Training
  - No additional comments
- Conflict of interest management
  - Flag intensive support teams and their potential relationship to conflict of interest management
  - Regional offices can maintain “banks” of other resources – like emergency plans

## Lunch

### Parameters for Regional Staffing and Accountability

- A. Wall reviewed take-away points from previous presentations and discussions related to design factors.
- A. Sachs and A. Wall led the SSWG in Testing Assumptions discussion and exercise. Presentation and exercise accompanied by PowerPoint Presentation. Slides can be found at <https://www.sog.unc.edu/resources/microsites/social-services/meetings>
- Results from the Testing Assumptions discussion and activity are as follows:

Physical Space Assumptions	Reactions/Comments by SSWG
There will be some physical space located in each region to support the regional office operations.	All agreed.
It will include the regional administrator’s office and administrative support.	It doesn’t have to, but it could. May add additional bureaucracy.
It will include meeting and/or training space.	Using county space on a rotating basis might foster regional identity and cohesion; using existing space saves money.
It will include flexible office space to allow program staff to work in the regional space on a regular or flexible basis, depending on management needs of administrator	All agreed.

**Additional Comments regarding Physical Space:** Requirements on physical presence may limit potential applicants; contracts regarding shared spaces may be necessary to ensure there are no conflicts.

<b>Management Assumptions</b>	<b>Reactions/Comments by SSWG</b>
Central office will have a person or team assigned to oversee regions.	All agreed.
There will be a regional administrator for each region. The regional administrator will be hired by central office.	All agreed.
Regional staff will report to the regional administrator for coordination and management but to central office for policy.	Needs further consideration; not enough clarity regional administrator should have knowledge of policy and should be able to provide appropriate guidance; specify that regional staff reports to central for policy <i>clarifications</i> ; confusion over who has final authority if central and regional have different interpretations.
Regional administrator will hire regional staff with input from central office.	Clarification on “input”, job specs vs. approval/review

<b>Staffing Assumptions</b>	<b>Reactions/Comments by SSWG</b>
Regional staff will include expertise to support all direct service programs offered by DSS (i.e., the whole enchilada).	Concerns over budgetary limitations; perhaps sharing experts across regions; having program specialists in each region creates an entire layer of bureaucracy – regional staff should be limited to a coordination/conduit role, should facilitate the connection of county offices to experts at the central office when necessary
Regional staff will not rotate to work in other regions in the normal course of business. They may be asked to assist in other regions periodically (i.e., intensive support).	Vacancies may necessitate rotation; shared staff across regions; may depend on whether or not experts are being shared; rotating out from central versus rotating between regional offices; job rotation in fiscal monitoring
DHHS will have the flexibility to decide whether regional staff will have blended or divided responsibilities (monitoring + tech assistance).	Administrator should determine staffing decisions because they have the more intimate knowledge of available talent; allowing flexibility at the regional level may decrease consistency across the regions

**Additional Comments regarding Staffing:** Job rotation might be more appropriate for fiscal monitoring but not for other functions; could create tension if the previous holder of position was doing something inappropriate/neglectful when they held the position; state is too large

**Suggested Edit:** Regional staff will have access to expertise to support all direct service programs offered by DSS

## **Preliminary Mapping Discussion**

- Presentation on mapping by A. Wall accompanied by PowerPoint presentation. Slides can be found at <https://www.sog.unc.edu/resources/microsites/social-services/meetings>.
  - Review of design factors influencing regional map decisions
  - Review of survey results from previous meeting
  - Design factor considerations suggested by Judge Stiehl
  - Existing communities flagged for consideration– Military and American Indian communities
  - Results from Informal Networks survey reviewed
  - Which information should be filtered out, which information should be used to inform the mapping process?
- Introduction to mapping discussion led by M. Henderson.
  - Judicial Districts most closely align with the map of five regions
  - Judicial Districts are in transition
  - Vocational Rehabilitation has existing infrastructure
  - County lines must be top priority when considering regional divides
  - 10 regions, preferable – but maybe not enough talent to staff 10 regional offices
  - Population equity across regions
  - Additional demographic information that influences social service provision; what are identifiable trends that can be used
  - Identify future trends, identify potential hotspots, avoid overwhelming one region with too many hotspots
  - May want to begin with fewer regions and then increase down the road
  - On-going work group could address changes
- Additional comments from SSWG members
  - How will the central staff change when regional staffs are established
  - What are existing resources at the central level
  - Clarification on when specifics are needed and when more general recommendations are more appropriate
  - Coordination efforts with outside partners/outside reform efforts; specifically coordination efforts with outside contractor
    - Formalize relationships with contractor in writing to be incorporated into draft report.

## **Wrap Up**

- Closing remarks by SSWG members
  - Progress has been good
  - Hopeful that the final product will benefit both service providers and the vulnerable populations they serve
  - Level of specificity is good
  - Patience with the drafting process – the many discussions being had among SSWG and other interested parties are important to the final product in will continue to inform reform efforts in the future