Welcome and Announcements

Toni Carter

- Toni Carter called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.

Approval of Nov. 18, 2016 Minutes

Toni Carter

- Linda Bixby moved to approve, seconded by Arnie Anderson, minutes approved.

Decision: Minutes Approved.

Performance Management System Updates

Gary and Deb

- Strategic Plan Update – Gary provided a general update:
  - Mental Health measures – The Performance Management team held a stakeholder meeting in Dec. 2016 to discuss considerations for exploring measures.
    - One point of interest from the conversation: groups wanted to broaden scope to include all citizens of MN. They don’t want to limit people with the restrictive diagnostic parameters of the state’s language.
    - The next steps are to review the suggestions more with scoping teams, narrow down to several suggested measures, go back to stakeholders with the suggestions and bring those suggestions to the Human Services Performance Council to vote on. After approval communications and baseline reporting will begin, followed by annual reporting and the PIP process.
    - The council discussed highlights from the Mental Health Meeting harvest document that came out of the conversation. Additional discussion highlighted the focus on prevention and the need to set measures that are within the control of the counties since they are going to be held accountable. However, part of our role is to highlight what is happening
that affects the people we serve. Our system should highlight the impacts that are not controllable. The Performance Management System must measure the areas of control, but speak to the limits of our system; it is a dual role.

- **Dashboard future**
  - The Performance Management team is using time between reports to plan the building of our future dashboard.

- **Racial equity**
  - The Performance Management team is working on two big racial equity pieces: reaching out to counties to explore using racial equity measures for CSP and evaluate program biases in the system.
  - Deb Anthony spoke about building a pilot program for the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI). She is working with Carver, Blue Earth, St. Louis and Dakota counties initially to frame the program. She will meet with Carver County first and plans to host one meeting per quarter.

- **PIPS/Reports**
  - Child Support and Adult Protection Report went out at the beginning of January. Because the Adult Protection calculations changed, this year served as another baseline year and there were no PIPs.

- **Human Services Performance Management Team**
  - Jessica Cintorino has left our team. Gary has completed the paperwork and will not be making a significant change to the position.

### Discussion and Input from Council

---

**Gary and Charity**

- **Update to Format of Council Meetings:** *Gary Mortensen*
  - Gary wants to create long-term vision and plan for the Performance Management system. He requested feedback about where the council thinks the system should go and how council meetings could be more productive.
  - Gary provided a handout reviewing the council roles and responsibilities and asked the council, “What is the role of the council and is the council engaged in this process?” The council discussion highlights:
    - Meeting time could be used more effectively by providing update information via email and focusing the meeting on council input and action items. Meeting electronically or for a shorter duration was suggested.
    - Use meeting to plan and discuss the future of the system. Discuss what it will look like as tribal governments become more involved and how to better communicate with the tribes about the system and its benefits.
    - The importance of community participation.
    - Identifying and communicating barriers that could be addressed through legislation or other systemic interventions. Perhaps the state and local governments need more training or hiring focused on people good at process analysis.
- How does the council reconcile the need to focus on measures the counties can control and the desire to affect systems outside of DHS that affect human services work?
- The council as spokespeople or advocates for change.
  - Gary will follow-up with suggestions about how the meeting can be organized more efficiently. He suggests having themed meetings with strategic conversations around the theme. Example, Oct. is a time to discuss new or changing measures.

- **Child Safety and Permanency Measures: Gary Mortensen**
  - Gary shared the recommendation that the current Human Services Performance Management Child Welfare measures be aligned with the modified federal measures adopted by the Child Safety and Permanency Division. Greg Rafn was present to help answer questions.
  - The changes were outlined:
    - Maltreatment timeframe changes from 6 months to a year.
    - Reunification with family changes to permanency, expands the definition of what “permanency” means.
    - Relative Placement – Changes from percent of children placed with a relative to the days in placement vs. days in relative care.
  - Discussion of the proposed changes:
    - The Relative Placement measure needs to be looked at, it doesn’t really seem to be the same as the current measure. Guest, Greg explained the measure moves to focusing on percentage of days with relatives because it speaks more to the experience of the child. If a child is placed with a relative for one day, it technically satisfies the first requirement. The new measure tracking of days in out-of-home placement helps reflect the experience better.
    - The second measure was discussed, there was some challenges to the wording. There was conversation about the terms permanency vs. reunification. Additionally, the Federal measure includes all kids in out of home care, placed out of home. The system currently looks at only the foster-care system.
    - The Performance Management team will look at clearer rewording of the measures and will bring clearer wording to the Council.
  - Stacy moved to align the measures with the Federal guild lines, Linda B seconded the motion. Additional discussion clarified that the measures would be reworded, this is a vote to accept realignment, not the exact wording. The motion passed.

  *Decision: The Council voted to approve realigning our Child Safety and Permanency Measures with the modified federal measures adopted by the Child Safety and Permanency Division.*

- **SNAP Timeliness Measures: Charity Friederichs**
  - Discussed the recommendation to remove expedited SNAP from the measure: Percent of SNAP and cash assistance applications processed timely. Charity reviewed the document, the system currently counts expedited SNAP twice. The Performance Management team feels the double assessment is not necessary. The only counties with PIPs on this measure have it because of
expedited SNAP and they already PIPs on the standalone expedited SNAP measure—they are being penalized twice.

- The Council discussed the high percentage of expedited SNAP vs. all cash and food applications.
- Linda B. moved to remove expedited SNAP from the combined cash and food assistance measure, Chuck seconded, and the motion was approved.

**Decision:** The council moved to remove expedited SNAP from the measure, Percent of SNAP and cash assistance applications processed timely.

- The council discussed questions about raising thresholds. What should trigger raising thresholds for measures and when should the Performance Management team explore removing measures? If a threshold creates no PIPs, should the threshold be raised or should something else be measured instead?
  - Measures are not static. They Performance Management system started with the easiest things to measure, not necessarily the most important. Maybe it is better to declare a measure a success and move onto something more important. But, how do we measure some of these important things? There are things we want to measure, but how?
  - The council needs to think about what needs to be done to get to what really matters. We need to bring in innovation and be moving to measure things that really help people.
  - Looking at timelines is important, but there are things that are concerning. Example: breaks in benefits, continuity is important so families have stability. This may require a big change on the front end, but it is important.
  - We don’t want to immediately raise the bar as soon as all the counties meet it. If a county works and finally meets the threshold and we immediately raise it, it is very discouraging. However, continuous improvement is important.
  - We don’t want to draw a line and say we should have at least 10 PIPs on each measure. We want to see is continuous progress. Identify the counties who have room to improve and help them do it.
  - We may want progressive change, every year we raise the threshold a couple percent.
  - We may want to be pushing counties harder. If we want to start identifying systemic barriers, we won’t be flying under the radar. We could have a legislator saying we aren’t pushing very hard.

### Extenuating Circumstances Claims Review

**Gary Mortensen**

- **Recommended Actions for Extenuating Circumstance Claims:** *Gary Mortensen*
  - Gary framed the discussion. Sometimes things happen to counties that are out of their control. These should be one-time issues. Gave examples such as death, natural disaster, industry closing. The HSPM team has come to our own conclusions about recommendations for the Commissioner. We would like the Council to have their own separate conversation and recommendations for the Commissioner. If the claim is denied and the commissioner denies as well, the county gets notified they have to do a PIP and turn it in within 30 days. If accepted the PIP is waived.
  - Chuck recused himself from this discussion.
Council discussed the Extenuating Circumstance claims submitted by the counties.

Decision: The council recommended the following actions for the Extenuating Circumstances claims:

- approving the claim from Roseau,
- denying the claims from Aitkin and Itasca, and
- requesting clarifying information from Itasca and Mille Lacs.

Discussion about the Extenuating Circumstance Process

- The Performance Management team needs to provide additional information about the county and its performance that will help the Council make decisions.
- Hiring in parts of the state it is difficult and getting tougher.
- Current Child Support paid is a sticky threshold measure. The Performance Management team will be looking at how this threshold is set and if there is a better way.

Next Steps and Action Items

- **Upcoming 2017 Council Meetings**
  - May 12
  - Sept. 15
  - Nov. 17
Minutes: Human Services Performance Council Meeting
May 12, 2017
9:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
MCIT Building

Attendance

Present

- Performance Management Team Members: Olufemi Fajolu, Charity Friederichs, Deb Anthony, Marisa Hinnenkamp, Carrie Krueger, and Gary Mortensen
- Others: David Wagner, Hennepin County (sitting in for Jim Baxter) and Dan Stirratt, DHS Agency and County Performance division

Absent

- Council Members: Arnie Anderson and Arnoldo Curiel

Welcome and Announcements

Toni Carter

- Chuck Johnson called the meeting to order at 9:36 a.m.
- Claire Wilson is a new council member. Welcome and attendee introductions.

Approval of Jan. 27, 2017 Minutes

Charles Johnson/Toni Carter

- A motion to approve the minutes was made and seconded. The minutes were approved.

Performance Management System Updates

Gary Mortensen

General Update: Gary Mortensen

- Based on feedback from the January council meeting, an update about the Human Services Performance Management system was sent out before the meeting. Gary asked if anyone had questions about the information in the packet. There were no questions.

Discussion and Input from Council

Gary and Charity

Performance Management Mission, Vision, and Values: Gary Mortensen

- The Performance Management team spent time in early 2017 strategic planning. The team reviewed the Mission, Vision and Values document and proposed several changes. The changes are intended to make the system’s mission and vision clearer and lift up system priorities. The values were reordered to remove perceived prioritization, particularly the impression that equity and cultural responsiveness were afterthoughts, tacked on at the end of the document.
- Council discussion: The council provided feedback on the Mission, Vision and Values changes. There was discussion about the values that were included in both the values list and the vision. Several council members shared concerns that only some of the values were included in the vision statement. Others
felt that the vision and mission statements need to stand alone without the values list and including the most prominent values is okay.
  o  Ben moved to accept as written, Linda seconded, motion approved.
    ▪  Julie would reword the mission to say “in adherence to our values” rather than itemizing some of the values. Either they are equally important or they aren’t.
    ▪  The team will take the suggestion under advisement.

**Assessing Disparities by Race/Ethnicity: Gary Mortensen/Charity Friederichs**

- Gary introduced the work that has been done on the development of measures assessing disparities in race/ethnicity. He provided a history of the work over the last two years and reviewed the language in the statute, various plans explored, and limitations the Performance Management team encountered. Based on the learning, conversations with counties, and models explored the team has developed a plan to move forward
- Charity shared that the team has struggled to tackle performance measures that assess disparities from where we are. The systems within DHS are collecting data on race and ethnicity differently and our current measures do not help us see problems in the system.
  o  Council members shared some thoughts about tackling the problems including: a need for systemic change to lead cultural change; sometimes a measure—a percent—does not capture the message that we need to convey, it is difficult to put a measure to something so important; and we have measures that we are building on, but we are seeing limitations of the systems.
- Gary shared the guiding principles the team has created to address the issues: measures will identify disparities and address disproportionality; measures should not be limited by small sample sizes; measures should be built using both qualitative and quantitative information; measures should be both qualitative and quantitative; the system must apply to all counties in MN; when counties receive a Performance Improvement Plan they have the resources and knowledge available to research, identify, and implement meaningful improvements; and the system needs to be built in partnership with the racial and ethnic communities in Minnesota.
- Charity emphasized the need to address two issues simultaneously: capacity building and measure development. The process for developing new measures is lengthy and the work needs to start as soon as possible. Additionally, capacity building will address the ground-work needed so counties have the tools, knowledge, and resources to address disparities and disproportionalities in a meaningful way.
  o  Council discussed the term “resources” in this context, there are no additional monetary resources. At this time “resources” refer to things our team can do: recommend trainings, create informational materials, and offer assistance/time. As a customer/client of human services would tell you, you shouldn’t need more money to treat me equitably. You are funded, equitable treatment should come along with that funding; this should already be embedded in the work, it is a part of everyone’s job.
  o  Council discussed how to think about equity broadly and collectively. At the root of some of our limitations of how we are structured to deliver human services. We have service delivery lanes, but people using the system cross those lanes. Looking at people holistically will give us a better shot at reducing disparities, poverty, and the major human services issues.
- Gary discussed the first component of the new plan for addressing disparities: building capacity.
  o  Development of the plan for capacity building would begin with developing a framework. This framework would provide examples of what a culture of equity looks like. Frameworks already exist, maybe the Performance Management system would use one that is being used by other organizations, create a hybrid, or build one from scratch. The Performance Management system would need to partner with experts to help us find a framework to use and reach out to the communities we serve. The team would also create an initial self-assessment for counties to
evaluate where they are and if they are ready to move their equity work forward. This work is on the softer side, counties would be expected to create a plan and be held accountable to the plan they put in place.

- Gary shared his vision for how capacity building would be implemented. Once counties develop a plan the Performance Management team can help them assess the plan and how to move forward in the framework. Counties can tap into the resources created by the Performance Management team to move along the continuum. Initially, implementation would begin with a pilot program to make sure our resources are working.

- Council discussion:
  - This work is similar to the work being done by other entities. The team should connect with the Government Alliance on Race and Equity (GARE) and use the resources that are there. The team shared that Charity and Marisa are involved with GARE. The Cultural and Ethnic Communities Leadership Council (CECLC) has also been doing parallel work. The Performance Management team has shared this proposal with the CECLC and have been asking them for suggestions and feedback throughout the process. The team plans to connect and align with the equity work happening across DHS and, true to our value of collaboration, bring this work together.
  - Discussion about the management of the individual plans and PIPs around those plans. How do we ask counties to go from concrete measures to individualized plans? Where is the measurement? There would need to be trust between counties and the Performance Management team. Additionally, the self-assessment and guided questions would be very specific to the framework that would be developed. The framework will outline what the county is going to address based on their self-assessment, that is what the county would look at and measure against.
  - There is a risk associated with this plan, asking counties to create their own action plan has the potential to perpetuate a biased system.
  - Charity shared that the team doesn’t have answer to all these questions yet. The team is looking for feedback from the Council on the plan and if it is the appropriate direction for this work. The team will have to explore these questions if we move forward with this plan.

- Gary shared more about the second component of the new plan for addressing disparities: measure development.
  - We want the Performance Management system to help counties build a culture of equity, but we also want to have measures that identify disparities. We want to locate areas where disparities are happening and create measures with an equity lens. These measures are unique and will need to be implemented differently. The Performance Management team would like to work with outside experts to develop the measures, include individuals using the human services system in the process to understand how they navigate the system and where challenges arise, and do a pilot to see if the measures work as intended.

- Council discussion:
  - The team and Council need to carefully move forward, maybe start with Child Safety and Protection. There are a number of experts, such as the Casey Foundation, that would help us. Child Protection has had a lot of systematic examination; it would be a good place to start.
  - Countires have said that they would like some help from DHS to focus on this. There is a need for this work and there are other agencies working with counties: public health, corrections, etc. What are the other agencies doing with these efforts? Can these
Performance Management Team Strategic Direction: Gary Mortensen

- The Human Services team is at an interesting point where the team has been focused on putting tighter procedures and processes in place. The Human Services team now wants to be a value-add team for the counties, providing something different. How can the Performance Management team help best?
  - Council Discussion:
    - We need a system that champions transformational leadership. Performance Management should look at the intersections of our work, where the different systems converge, function as facilitators.
    - Performance Management should explore a system-wide effort to take individual efforts out of the silos. More experts are not needed, filling a facilitator role and leading system-wide efforts is more important. Counties want to coordinate efforts across the systems, but cannot because of the silos at DHS.
    - This team doesn’t have the authority to centralize Performance Management efforts across DHS. Maybe it is about a framework and creating an example to move forward. How do we synchronize and align the work across divisions?
    - Create a system where PIPs are tied to outcomes. Currently, if we want to get at “are kids getting food?” we can only measure if the paperwork is completed on time. We need to go back and reexamine the system to make sure we are measuring outcomes we want.
    - The Performance Management system has been valuable for counties to see how other counties are doing it, working together on PIPs, and looking at issues. It also gives validity to the work that counties do. There isn’t a county that is routinely failing many measures. Also, counties feel like they have a team that is helping work toward a better quality service. The goals are the same and counties can keep moving down the road to do better work. It has also pushed a lot of the things they want to happen statewide to happen. There is uniformity to it and it is pushed down to the employee level. We picked the low-hanging fruit because they were measurable, but there are a whole lot of other things we need to be measuring.
    - The lack of data has been a real barrier. DHS doesn’t have data around some of the things we want to measure. Generally speaking, we are not authorized to collect data we don’t need for the services. Are there other ways to gather the data we need? It would be helpful to have a collection of the measures collected across the system. Also, we need new measures for Mental Health. These things should be the motivation for the work we are doing.
    - The Human Services Performance Management system is still in the beginning phases. We aren’t seeing a lot of PIPs, but there is a sense for some counties that they cannot meet the measures because they are out of their control.

Extenuating Circumstances (EC) Claims Review

Recommended Actions for EC Claims: Gary Mortensen

- Gary introduced the EC claim we received for expedited SNAP from Wright County.
  - The threshold for the measure is 55% and Wright County missed it by .3%, only 1.65 cases. During the year, there were issues with the ApplyMN system and Wright County had cases that were held up by the system not sending applications through in a timely manner. There didn’t seem to be a way to identify the cases that were held up on our end, so we could not confirm
how many cases may have been affected. Their performance has decreased substantially, but they missed the threshold by only a couple of cases. The Council needs to determine if they are justified in claiming the extenuating circumstance.

- Council discussion: Their performance seems close enough to the threshold to accept the EC claim; it is a reasonable argument.
- Tom moves to approve the EC Claim, Linda H. seconded, motion approved.

**Next Steps and Action Items**

- Upcoming 2017 Council Meetings: Sept. 15 and Nov. 17.
  - Both the upcoming dates are AMC Meetings. We may need to reschedule.
- Meeting closed at noon.
Minutes: Human Services Performance Council Meeting

Aug. 25, 2017
9:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
MCIT Building

Attendance

Present

- Council Members: Ben Bement, Linda Bixby, Toni Carter, Tom Henderson, Stacy Hennen, Linda Higgins (phone), Charles Johnson, and Wendy Underwood
- Performance Management Team Members: Olufemi Fajolu, Charity Friederichs, Deb Anthony, Carrie Krueger, and Gary Mortensen
- Others: David Wagner, Hennepin County (sitting in for Jim) and Stacy Twite (representing Claire Wilson)

Absent

- Council Members: Arnie Anderson, Arnoldo Curiel, Julie Manworren, Genny Reynolds and Claire Wilson
- Performance Management Team Members: Marisa Hinnenkamp and Carol Becker

Welcome and Announcements

Toni Carter

- Toni Carter called the meeting to order at 9:34 a.m.
- Stacy Twite joined us for the first time, round of introductions.

Approval of May 12, 2017 Minutes

Charles Johnson/Toni Carter

- Stacy moved to approve the minutes from the May 12, 2017 meeting, Chuck seconded, minutes approved.

Performance Management System Updates

Gary Mortensen

Topic – Gary provided a general update:

- Gary shared the quarterly Performance Management update via email before the meeting. He highlighted the improvements in the Performance Management team’s work. Performance Management is picking up momentum and looking at improvement of our systems.
- Gary highlighted two items from the update:
  - The Performance Management team is doing integration work within DHS. Charity has been working with the MFIP team to partner on Performance Improvement Plans (PIPs) for the Self-Support Index (S-SI). The MFIP team will be using our PIP process and counties will only need to complete one PIP for the S-SI measure. Additionally, the team began work with Child Support to identify major issues that need to be addressed in their particular area. The team will bring
together the Performance Management team and the Child Support research team and stakeholders to discuss how to improve the work and reduce barriers to Child Support collections.

- Two additional staff members joined the team over the summer: Jared Swanson, a summer intern who assisted with the Child Support collections, and Carol Becker, the team’s new Performance Coordinator.

- Questions about the update.
  
  - The Council discussed the promising integrative work and strong partnerships being built by Performance Management. Discussed the potential to partner with Child Safety and Protection.
  
  - The Council requested an update on Mental Health measures development. Discussed the factors that led to the pause in work on these measures including staff turnover on the Performance Management team and at MMB. Carol will be picking up the work and moving it forward.
  
  - Discussed all the work being done by government agencies to advance racial equity and the hope that this work will come together with the work being done by the Performance Management team.
  
  - Discussed how many of the counties are entering into the second year of their PIP and how we communicate differently with those counties.

Discussion and Input from Council

**Gary Mortensen**

**Child Support Paid Threshold Changes:**  

- The Performance Management team is recommending an update for the Child Support Threshold.
  
  - A historical threshold was used in the past, but Performance Management ran into a few problems with it:
    
    - Large number of PIPs.
    
    - Some counties had positive performance for the year, but still received a PIP. It was demoralizing for the county staff to work hard, see increased performance and still receive a PIP.
    
    - No counties were observed manipulating their scores, but a perverse incentive was built into the system.
  
  - Brought a workgroup together to discuss six options to update the threshold. The group’s preferred option was to create a Regression Adjusted Model for this measure that controls for factors outside of county control.
  
  - The regression model will take a year or two to complete. In the meantime, the workgroup recommended using a five-year year-over-year (YOY) growth threshold. If the average YOY growth for county is positive, no PIP. If there was no growth (0 percentage points) or negative growth, the county receives a PIP. The advantages of this threshold is that it allows for more flexibility in county performance, which could include a one-year decrease due to outside factors without resulting in a PIP.
  
  - Ben moved to approve the threshold change, Linda Bixby seconded.
    
    - The council discussed the benefits of the Regression Adjusted Model including: predictive modeling, controlling for external factors, ability to use knowledge gained on other measures.
- Discussed if changing the threshold temporarily would be confusing or cause challenges for counties, but the benefits outweighed the challenges.
- Motion passed.

**Comprehensive Performance Management System Project Overview:** *Gary Mortensen*

- Gary reviewed the framework he created to begin the creation of a comprehensive Performance Management System. Before the Performance Management System can begin to implement fiscal penalties it needs to have a balanced system of measures.
- The Council shared ideas to improve the framework.

**Legislative Proposals:** *Gary Mortensen*

- Gary shared that Performance Management is looking at what the team needs to be successful and the possibility of bringing forward legislative proposals. He provided an example of the IDI pilot and what additional resources are need to create a sustainable program. The Council discussed the need to be strategic about legislative proposals.

**Extenuating Circumstances (EC) Claims Review** *Gary Mortensen*

**Recommended Actions for EC Claims:** *Gary Mortensen*

- Gary introduced the four EC claims brought forward this time around. All four claims were for Child Safety and Permanency measures.
  - The council discussed Clay County’s EC claim for the Child Repeat Maltreatment measure.
    - Stacy moved to approve the EC claim, Linda B. seconded, and the EC was approved.
  - The council discussed Kandiyohi County’s EC claim for the Child Repeat Maltreatment measure.
    - Stacy B moved to deny claim, Chuck second, and the EC was denied.
  - The council discussed Sherburne County’s EC claim for the Child Repeat Maltreatment measure.
    - Linda B. moved to deny the claim, Stacy seconded, and the EC was denied.
  - The council discussed Pine County’s EC claim for the Permanency measure.
    - Linda B moved to approve, Stacy second, and the EC claim was approved.

**Next Steps and Action Items** *Gary Mortensen*

- The next council meeting will be held on Nov. 17, 2017.
- The meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.
Minutes: Human Services Performance Council Meeting

Nov. 17, 2017
9:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
MCIT Building

Attendance

Present

- Performance Management Team Members: Charity Friederichs, Deb Anthony, Carrie Krueger, and Gary Mortensen, Marisa Hinnenkamp and Carol Becker
- Others: Christopher Orr

Absent

- Council Members: Arnoldo Curiel and Tom Henderson
- Performance Management Team Members: Olufemi Fajolu

Welcome and Announcements

Charles Johnson/Toni Carter

- Chuck called the meeting to order at 9:38 a.m.
- Began with introductions of several new members (Debbie Goettel and Stacy Twite).

Approval of Aug. 25, 2017 Minutes

Charles Johnson/Toni Carter

- Wendy moved to approve the minutes, Linda seconded, minutes approved.

Discussion and Input from Council

Gary Mortensen

2017 Legislative Report Review: Gary Mortensen and Carrie Krueger

- Gary and Carrie presented the draft of the 2017 report. The differences from the 2016 report were highlighted: performance maps moved from the appendix to the body of the report, data tables added to appendix (no additional data supplement), reduced length slightly by removing redundant information, and tables to showcase PIP information added.

- The council discussed the report and suggested several updates for 2017:
  - Review the 2018 Recommendations. Reorder based on priority. Reword to make recommendations clear and measurable.
  - Consider adding Tribes to the language.
  - Consider drawing addition to the need for business analysts / process experts.
  - Call out engagement efforts.
- Add the number of total counties and service delivery areas. The service delivery areas mean the Performance Management system is reporting on 78 counties rather than 87, it can be confusing without that knowledge.

- Gary shared that we are trying to get the report to Commissioner Piper’s office by Friday, Dec. 1. The Council can vote today to approve with changes or we can send a new draft and vote via email.

- Ben made motion to approve with the changes discussed. Julie seconded the motion.
  - Additional Discussion:
    - Performance staff should highlight changes for easy Council review.
    - Motion approved.

2018 Legislative Report Planning: Gary Mortensen and Carrie Krueger

- The Council discussed ideas for the 2018 Legislative Report:
  - The report should include a look at the Performance System and how performance has changed since implementation. Consider benchmarking our work against other states.
  - Include key opportunities and observations that showcase the challenges in the state and drive change.
  - Consider supplementing the long report, which many do not have time to read, with short policy papers that can be provided to the legislature to drive change.
  - Add stories and best practices that highlight the successes of the system and can expand innovation. Highlight the work the counties are doing and investments they have made in order to improve performance.
  - Use more images, graphs and other visual aids.
  - Discussed how best to map state performance. Quartiles/quintiles can be misleading because they do not correspond to whether or not a county has a PIP. Discussed moving to a threshold/high standard based map. The council had mixed feelings about how best to present this information. Performance Management staff will look at how to do this and may update for the 2018 report.
  - Add general descriptions of how to interpret the maps, adds to document accessibility and may add clarity.
  - Discussed the timing of the report, no specific time was more advantageous than another.
  - Discussed aligning with other organizations doing similar work to make the combined effort more powerful: CECLC, MACSSA, DHS Fiscal Analysis and Performance Management, etc.

Approach to Legislative Proposals: Gary Mortensen and Christopher Orr

- Gary introduced Christopher Orr, DHS Legislative Liaison, and opened the discussion about how Performance Management should approach legislative proposals, a question that arose at the last council meeting. Asked the council, “What should be the process to develop recommendations for administrative changes?”

- Council discussion:
  - Performance Management should find other DHS divisions, counties and organizations to learn about their priorities and find where they align with on our legislative priorities.

Human Services Performance Council Meeting Minutes – Nov. 17, 2017
- Performance Management Council not created to be a legislative lobby, instead the system is tasked looking at performance related to outcomes and highlighting things that may be barriers to desired outcomes.
- Performance Management team needs to bring barriers identified by counties to the Council.
- There is power in the data and supplying the same language to the aligned advocacy/lobbying bodies.
- Performance Management system has several years’ worth of data for the team to start building a case for change.

## Performance Management System Update

**Gary Mortensen**

- The Performance Management team moved away from the process of reading what we have done for the last three months to the Council, but with the Legislative Report as the priority for meeting preparation we will share this quarter’s update.

### Measurement Work:

- **Racial Equity Framework**
  - Performance Management worked on a project charter including: goals, guidelines and scope.
  - The Performance Management team has been building out the stakeholder engagement process to ensure stakeholders are engaged early in the planning.
  - Presented at the MACSSA conference and the St. Louis County Health and Human Services conference. Received positive feedback from table conversations, but there were concerns about resources allocation and differences in counties were shared.
- **Comprehensive Measurement Framework** – The team is working with Community Supports to pilot the framework that has been up in place to develop new measures. Following the pilot process we should have a good strategy for measure development.
- **Adult Protection Measures** - Collaborating with the Olmstead Plan and the Adult Protection team to create an aligned measure for Adult Protection. This work caused us to delay reporting on this measure, anticipate a spring release for the report on the updated measure.
- **Child Support Threshold Regression Model** – Held several meetings with Child Support team to discuss how to build the model.
- **Mental Health Measures** - Carol has been working on developing these measures. The stakeholder group collected 16 possible measures, but the measures cannot easily be created with the data available. The Mental Health team is putting together suggestions on what could be done with the data. Will reconvene leadership group and bring proposed measures to the stakeholder group.

### Performance Work

- Partnering with the MFIP team to share the Self-Support Index (S-SI) PIPs so counties no longer need to complete two. The Performance Management team is reviewing both the S-SI and CSP PIPs right now.
- The Child Support report went out in October. It included the updated Child Support Paid threshold for the first time. There were 16 PIPs this year, last year we had 33 originally, and the median qualifier it reduced it to 24.
  - Council discussed the regional variation in this report.
o Council discussion regarding the need to identify what happens when counties have ongoing performance below the threshold. As they enter year three or year four.

- Tableau Server – Has been purchased and installed by DHS. Performance Management has reached out to several counties to pilot the new system. A larger MN.IT system upgrade will allow access to counties using X IDs.
- IDI pilot – Continued with three additional counties receiving the assessment and feedback. Participants in the pilot have provided positive feedback and the Performance Management team has begun working with several DHS internal teams. A proposal was created to expand the program.
- Child Support Joint Research – Facilitating conversations regarding how to create a coordinated effort to improve performance on Child Support measures.
- E-Newsletter – Was sent in October. Planning to send issues quarterly to share case studies, success stories, and system updates.
- Trainings – Individuals participated in GARE, Division IDI Assessment, Tableau, and Collaborative Safety Training.
- Discussed the proposed 2018 Council Meeting dates.

**Extenuating Circumstances Claims Review**

**Recommended Actions for Child Support EC Claims: Gary Mortensen**

- Becker County requested an Extenuating Circumstance waiver based on additional workload due to case transfers to White Earth Nation. Becker is already on a performance improvement plan for this measure.
  - Ben abstained from the vote, but did share information about the case transfer process.
  - Council discussed the claim:
    - The case transfer work does not correspond to a drop in performance in 2017, in fact performance went up that year. Instead the performance seems to be a historical issue.
    - Many counties are doing this work and the circumstance is not unique to them.
    - Becker didn’t make a great case. Additional data could have been useful.
  - The Council voted to recommend denying the EC claim. (Ben abstained from voting.)

- Douglas County requested an Extenuating Circumstance waiver based on staffing issues.
  - The Council discussed the claim:
    - The high turnover rate may indicate a larger problem.
    - The county’s caseload per employee is lower than many other counties.
    - The lag in filling the resigned position was within their control. There was no need for it to take so much time to hold the exam.
    - It may be beneficial for Douglas County to have a PIP, to do work around preparing for planned/unplanned leaves and attrition. Perhaps technical assistance can be offered.
    - It is important to remember that people missed out on Child Support payments because the county couldn’t manage itself / workforce.
  - The Council voted to recommend denying the EC claim.
• Le Sueur County requested an Extenuating Circumstance waiver based on staffing.
  o The Council discussed the claim:
    ▪ They did not make their case well.
  o The Council voted to recommend denying the EC claim.

• Wilkin County requested an Extenuating Circumstance waiver based on staffing.
  o The Council discussed the claim:
    ▪ The supervisor retired three years ago. That may be when performance started to decrease.
    ▪ They did not make the case well. Many of the items highlighted are shared by all counties.
  o The Council voted to recommend denying the EC claim.

Meeting Adjourned 12:24