

ROCK COUNTY, WISCONSIN



COUNCIL ON AGING
51 South Main Street (mailing)
Janesville, WI 53545
3328 U.S. Highway 51 North (location)
608-757-5472
608-758-8472 (fax)

COUNCIL ON AGING

ADVISORY BOARD AGENDA

Wednesday January 20, 2021, 9:00 a.m.

Council on Aging Office

3328 US Highway 51 North, Janesville, Wisconsin

NOTE: This is a Teleconference

Rock County Council on Aging is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Topic: COA Advisory Board & Nutrition Board Meeting

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84378934198?pwd=RmNieTZlV3FiRTVrRitQVGhkdGRnQT09>

Meeting ID: 843 7893 4198

Passcode: 323758

One tap mobile

+13126266799,,84378934198#,,,,*323758# US (Chicago)

+13017158592,,84378934198#,,,,*323758# US (Washington D.C)

Dial by your location

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

+1 301 715 8592 US (Washington D.C)

+1 929 205 6099 US (New York)

+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

Meeting ID: 843 7893 4198

Passcode: 323758

Find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84378934198>

Join by SIP

84378934198@zoomcrc.com

Join by H.323

162.255.37.11 (US West)
162.255.36.11 (US East)
115.114.131.7 (India Mumbai)
115.114.115.7 (India Hyderabad)
213.19.144.110 (Amsterdam Netherlands)
213.244.140.110 (Germany)
103.122.166.55 (Australia)
209.9.211.110 (Hong Kong SAR)
64.211.144.160 (Brazil)
69.174.57.160 (Canada)
207.226.132.110 (Japan)
Meeting ID: 843 7893 4198
Passcode: 323758
Join by Skype for Business
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84378934198>

If you are interested in providing public comments on items on this agenda, you must submit your comments by noon on Monday, Friday, January 15, 2021. To submit a public comment use the following email: paula.schutt@co.rock.wi.us

- A. Call to Order
- B. Approval of Agenda
- C. Roll Call
- D. Introduction of Visitors
- E. Approval of December 2 and December 16, 2020 Advisory Board Minutes
- F. Citizen Participation, Communications and Announcements
- G. Monthly “This is Good to Know” Report
- H. Staff Report
 - 1. DirectorPaula Schutt
 - 2. Elder Benefit Specialist..... Lachel Fowler
 - 3. Mobility Management.....Jennifer McIlhone
 - 4. Transit..... Ryan Booth

5. Caregiver Specialist.....Julie Seeman

6. Health Promotion Coordinator.....Lisa Messer

I. New Business

J. Old Business

J. Reports

1. County Board of Supervisors, Supervisor Tom Brien

2. ADRC of Rock County, Vicky O'Donnell

K. Adjournment

The County of Rock will provide reasonable accommodations to people with disabilities. Please contact us at 608-757-5510 or e-mail countyadmin@co.rock.wi.us at least 48 hours prior to a public meeting to discuss any accommodations that may be necessary.



COUNCIL ON AGING ADVISORY BOARD MINUTES
Wednesday December 2, 2020, 9:00 a.m.
Special Meeting

Call to Order: The special meeting of the Council on Aging Advisory Board was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Jean Boyle. All present were participating via ZOOM or the telephone.

Approval of Agenda: A motion to approve the agenda was made by Karen Ferguson and seconded by Jack Kooiman.

Roll Call:

Present: Janice Turner, Patricia Burhans, Rena Dewar, Tom Brien, Karen Ferguson, Jean Boyle, Vicky O'Donnell, Debbie Kraus, Sherrill Gilbertson, Jack Kooiman, Sue McGinniss, Vicky Gobel, Mark Richardson, Tom Brien

Excused: none

Unexcused: none

Staff Present: Paula Schutt,

Introduction of Visitors: Randy Terronez, Kate Luster, Jennifer Thompson, Supervisor Shirley Williams

Citizen Participation, Communications and Announcements: none

Statement of Purpose of Meeting Chair Boyle explained since the regular monthly board meeting in November, members have expressed interest in looking into the possible integration and come up with a statement either for or against the integration.

Jack Kooiman asked who the author was of the document entitled "Board Member Comments Regarding Possible Integration". Jean Boyle explained she had received the comments from various board members and had put them together in a document. Jean asked for discussion. Paula suggested that the board review the responses to the statement presented to EVAS Committee by Janet Smith. The responses came from Kate Luster and Administration.

Randy shared the following document and it was discussed:

RESPONSE TO JANET SMITH COA-ADRC INTEGRATION
CORRESPONDENCE

Prepared by Randy Terronez, Assistant to the County Administrator and Kate Luster, Human Services Department Director

I. **Fundamentally different agencies**

- 1) While there are of course differences between the COA and ADRC, those differences are not “fundamental” in a way that would prohibit an effective integration. Indeed there are significant similarities and connections between the COA and ADRC, which is a primary rationale for the state’s recommendations for integration of these agencies and this is also affirmed by the successful integration of these agencies in other communities. Concrete examples of crossover include the services of benefit specialists, dementia related services, community outreach and general community resource linkage for older adults.

When comparing the mission statements below, the crossover among COA, ADRC and the HSD mission as a whole is evident.

COA Mission: This mission of the Rock County COA shall be to *advocate for the independence, self-worth and dignity of residents of Rock County by assisting them to meet their varied health, nutrition, economic and social needs.*

ADRC Mission: The ADRC of Rock County *supports older adults, adults with disabilities, their families and their caregivers, by providing useful information and assistance; connecting people to the services they need:*

HSD Mission: Building upon the strengths of clients to *encourage independence by providing quality services with respect for the dignity of all person served.*

- 2) *Regarding the concerns that ADRC “serves many clients under the age of 60.”*
While the ADRC does serve adults who are developmentally and/or physically disabled, the majority of the ADRC contacts are with frail elders (60+).
*Of the 5400+ calls received in the 3rd quarter, over 3300 of them were from 60+
*Approximately 70% of the people we serve are older adults.

- 3) *Regarding concerns of differences in services offered/delivered: (“COA provides more actual services” while the ADRC is “providing information about public funding” or “information and referral.”)*

The variances in scope and services delivered by the COA and ADRC are actually a primary reason that integration is a positive idea, not a reason that they should not integrate. Integration broadens the service array for the elderly and their families in one agency/department and supports more of a “no wrong door” experience vs. maintaining a structure where clients have to be “re-routed” to a different department depending on the specific need. While co-location resolves some of those barriers in terms of physical location, actual program integration is what lends itself to a coordinated and efficient approach.

- 3) *Regarding the “difference in orientation”* with the HSD:

The fact that the HSD serves a variety of target populations vs. just one does not dilute or weaken the ability to meet unique needs of each population and program area. If that were the case, Human Services Departments across the state would be unable to adequately operate the mandated services for *any* program that we do every day. At the RCHSD, supervisors and staff are considered the subject matter experts in their program areas and HSD Administration relies on their expertise to inform decisions about those programs. In addition, for all program areas/target populations, HSD supports leadership and staff in that area with key resources to promote quality outcomes for that specific area via the HSD quality improvement staff, data analysts,

budget and contract staff and other supports. Staff who are most familiar with the COA programs and goals would be asked to define the priorities and key quality indicators for those programs, not HSD Administrators. Most importantly, HSD considers client satisfaction and outcomes a key measure of success and HSD administration would rely on Aging program staff to measure this and to use that data to develop recommendations and strategic priorities.

II. Flawed process of decision-making

Janet's letter criticized the two methods of comparisons with other counties and holding focus groups.

"Integrated counties were overrepresented in data" – because the fact is that 90% of the counties in the state have an integrated service delivery. The study included data collected from eight comparable counties with only one not integrated.

In regard to focus groups, "more senior-citizen feed-back was needed from more communities." The consultant in consultation with the Integration Review Advisory Committee came up with a goal of 70 participants in six groups/communities. The Advisory Committee and staff used a variety of methods to publicize and even incentivize attendance at focus group sessions. It is indeed unfortunate that after attempts by both COA and ADRC the turnout was significantly less, a total of 22 participants.

III. Reasons to Integrate

Janet's letter cited the "need to be more compelling reasons not to do it." And that the following three reasons were not adequately defined:

1. One-stop shopping – could be resolved by co-location without integrating.
2. Best customer service/best for customer - best was never defined.
3. Would eliminate silos – exactly what these silos were was never defined

The report provided adequate explanations of the reasons that integration was being recommended. For example:

- 1) Re: One Stop Shopping:
*As stated in the report, this idea came out of a focus group and not from the facilitator as a reason to integrate.
- 2) Re: Best Customer Service/Be best for customer-not defined:
*Examples from multiple integrated agencies around the state gave examples of increased customer service provided to customers.
*In addition, Mr. Braatz developed a "Recommendation for Integration" chart in which he identified specific areas to develop for successful integration-one of which was, "Customer Service Metrics." (See section of chart below) Customer service is an area that should never sit latent, but rather continue to be developed and improved-such as what he outlined in the chart.

Recommendations	Key Points	Actions Needed
-----------------	------------	----------------

Establish Customer Service Metrics.	What does excellent customer service mean?	Define what excellent customer service means and use this as a tool to develop a customer service survey. Review survey metrics with staff every 6 weeks.
-------------------------------------	--	---

*The ADRC is also contractually required to perform quality improvement projects, participate in customer satisfaction surveys and develop standards for customer satisfaction.

3) Re: Would eliminate silos; but silos never specified:

*Silos were defined as departments serving their populations separately; with little collaboration and missing opportunities to serve customers fully.

*Mr. Braatz references “silos” in his report multiple times; specifically speaking to counties who have integrated and created *better collaboration* between Aging and ADRC’s and are serving their customers more completely.

“The major problem with all of the above talking points was the lack of definition and specificity... There was speculation that integration would generate more funding (this is reflected in the memo from Josh Smith dated 10/8/20”. “Could is not the same as “will””.

Excerpt from Josh Smith 10/8/20 memo: “Another important benefit is that a combined department could generate more funding that could be used to expand Elder Benefit Specialist services. Specifically, integration would allow the current Elderly Benefits Specialist function in the COA to capture Medicaid (MA) reimbursement. The COA Elder Benefit Specialist position is currently funded by state monies in the amount of \$53,000. In a merged environment, the position would be able to bill the MA program for MA clients it additional Elder Benefit Specialist staff. Currently, this additional revenue cannot be realized as the COA does not have the capability to bill for MA clients.”

In addition, Neal Minogue, Older Americans Act Program Supervisor, State Office on Aging recently shared with Rock County Human Services Department ADRC/APS Division Manager Jennifer Thompson, the following when asked to articulate the rationale for the State’s support of integration of COAs and ADRCs:

“As you are aware the Bureau of Aging and Disability Resources has supported the integration of ADRCs and Aging Units/Offices for many years. With that said the Bureau/ State Department of Health Services has no authority to require integration of these two units of county government. We do believe that customers are served better when the expertise and services are combined to address all people in the community including older adults and people with disabilities.

Today more than 90% of ADRC and Aging units/offices are integrated and have found this to be a successful model to meet the needs of community members. Since 70% of people (a conservative number) served by ADRCs are older adults is has made sense for most counties to integrate ADRCs and Aging unit to enhance the array of services that can be offered to this

growing population in our counties. We are proud of the services offered by aging units and funding of these programs continues regardless of integration. In addition there are both programmatic and financial incentives for bringing the Elderly Benefits staff under the ADRC.

As always our offices supports any and all efforts to gather public input. The voices of older adults must be heard and reasonable efforts must be made to gather their input to changes in services.”

Discussion: Debbie Kraus asked what the organizational structure of the COA would look like. Randy explained that the COA program would be placed as a program within the ADRC, with existing positions in the COA rolled into the HSD. Kate explained that the ADRC has two program supervisors, The ADRC Supervisor and the Adult Protective Services Supervisor. Each oversees that section of the ADRC. Kate asked Randy to confirm that Paula Schutt’s role would remain the same as far as supervising the COA employees and she would be directly reporting to Jennifer Thompson. Randy confirmed this statement.

Debbie Kraus asked what will become of the ADRC Advisory Board. Randy explained that according to Josh’s memo, they would be studying how several other similar Counties handled the issues of boards. He said there are four boards to consider 1) ADRC Advisory Board, 2) COA Advisory Board, 3) Nutrition Advisory Board, 4) Transportation Coordination Committee.

Kate acknowledged the legitimate fear of what will happen to people (clients).

Janet Smith says she still has difficulty in understanding how the integration will benefit the average citizen. Jennifer explained that the ADRC, as an agency, offers options and choices.

Jennifer said the ADRC is potentially looking at expanding the marketing role for the ADRC and making it a full time position. She explained that there is a state proposal to double the funding for marketing for ADRCs in the state in the next few years.

Paula acknowledged how many people in the County do NOT know about either the ADRC or the COA, and feel it comes from peoples reluctance to deal with aging issues until they are forced to by an event.

She commented that the integration issue has been talked about for some time and agrees there is some confusion and uncertainty around it. Paula reported she had a phone conversation with Kate earlier in the week. After that conversation Paula had complete confidence that the integration move will be a positive one. Paula stated she has always been a team player and is impressed with Kate’s leadership style. Paula further stated that unit can only benefit both agencies to work together. She allowed that there will be bumps in the road, but believes they can be overcome. Paula stated that she sees her role as paving a pathway for the COA employees to walk through this change and not let it negatively affect their clients. She is sure that can be done. Paula stated that she believes the ADRC and the COA have many more similarities than differences.

Janet Smith acknowledged the need for integration due to the increased aging population. She believes the emphasis should be on “healthy aging”.

Sue McGinniss said she is looking forward to the increased marketing. Debbie Kraus said we need to be sure we market to the children of the aging as well as the aging.

Janice thanked Janet Smith for helping the board to follow a process of really thinking about this decision rather than just agreeing.

Sue McGinniss asked what the next step would be and Randy replied that the vote would go before both the EVAS Committee and the Human Services Advisory Committee. Following that it would go before the full County Board on Dec 17. He acknowledged that Josh Smith will be writing a resolution to bring before the committees.

Vote on possible creation of Board Statement to be presented to EVAS Committee and HSB
-
none

Presentation of proposed statement if vote requests it - none

Vote on proposed statement none

Adjournment: A motion was made by Debbie Kraus and seconded by Jack Kooyman to adjourn the meeting

Motion carried. *Minutes not official until approved by the Council on Aging Advisory Board.*



COUNCIL ON AGING ADVISORY BOARD MINUTES
Wednesday December 16, 2020, 9:00 a.m.

Call to Order: The meeting of the Council on Aging Advisory Board was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Jean Boyle. All present were participating via ZOOM or the telephone.

Approval of Agenda: A motion was made by Pat Burhans and seconded by Jack Kooyman

Roll Call:

Present: Janice Turner, Patricia Burhans, Rena Dewar, Tom Brien, Karen Ferguson, Jean Boyle, Vicky O'Donnell, Debbie Kraus, Sherrill Gilbertson, Jack Kooyman, Sue McGinniss

Excused: Vicki Gobel, Tom Brien

Unexcused: none

Staff Present: Paula Schutt, Lisa Messer, Ryan Booth, Lachel Fowler, Julie Seeman

Introduction of Visitors: Chuck Wilson, Pam Bostwick

Approval of November 18 Board minutes: A motion was made by Janice Turner and seconded by Karen Ferguson. Motion passed.

Citizen Participation, Communications and Announcements:

Staff Reports:

Caregiver Specialist - This report did not record on the ZOOM software and there are no notes.

Director – Paula reported she just submitted the 85.21 contract for 2021, she is working on preparing the GWAAR budget for 2021 as well as sending out contracts. She is going to work on getting a more complete distribution of the COA newsletter in the coming year. We send out a large number electronically, but physically right now they are going to all the libraries (Arrowhead distributes them for us) and all the home delivered meals as well as the dining center meals. We actually need to get more printed each month because 500 does not cover all the places we want to deliver.

Elder Benefit Specialist – Lachel is preparing for next year and is trying to determine how she is going to do the Homestead Tax Credit applications in 2021. Debbie from Grinnell is working with her to possibly have her see clients at Grinnell. Last year she prepared homestead taxes for 263 clients. Homestead Taxes do not have a deadline like regular taxes and can be done anytime during the year, but clients are hoping to get them done early so they can get their money back.

Mobility Management – Jennifer reported that she is also getting geared up for next year. She is busy setting up various presentations. The Mobility Manager position is very involved with the Transportation Coordinating Committee and they are in the process of electing and replacing members. Traditionally they have had 15 members and they just added an additional member this year. She is also starting to build her itinerary for her 2021 Wednesday Walks. She reported that in her first year of the walks she had 160 participants. This year, in spite of COVID, she had approximately 200 participants. Unlike many programs held indoors, COVID did not affect this activity as much since most of the locations are outside. Janice Turner commented that she felt that this year there was more education built into the walks.

Transportation Supervisor – Ryan Booth reported in November transportation averaged 81 rides per day, using an average of 6 buses each day. Transportation numbers are rising from the low of March when COVID first hit. Transportation staff is preparing to have all driver's transition to being a County employee in 2021. After working with Rock Haven and Corp. Counsel, it has been decided to have our drivers get COVID testing twice a week at Rock Haven. There is no charge for this as it covered by a grant that Rock Haven received. Buses continued to be cycled in and out of the garage according to our repair schedule. Ryan said an issue that came up with the cold weather is the disinfectant freezing overnight in the vans. To solve this problem, transportation has purchased duffel bags that each driver will carry with them. The bags will contain all the "tools" needed by the drivers throughout the day, i.e. forms, sanitizer, tickets, PPE, etc.

Health Promotion Coordinator - Lisa is in the process of determining how all of her programs are going to work in 2021. A silver lining that came with the COVID is it allowed us to expand our programming through ZOOM. We can also cross County lines now, as well as share programs with other Counties.

We have two leaders who will be trained to teach Living Well with Chronic Conditions. We are pairing with Sheboygan County to have a Living Well class. Tina Monk Gerber is joining with another instructor to present Powerful Tools for Caregivers. Stepping o has been approved to teach online. Two of our Mercy leaders are no longer employed by Mercy and Lisa is hoping they may want to continue to teach. In January there is an online training to update current leaders.

Lisa is a part of H.E.A.R, a health equity group and this past month the group were talking about mental health in youth. Lisa had inquired what resources were available for Grandparents Raising Grandchildren. According to the 2010 census there were 58,000 children living with their grandparents in Wisconsin.

Lisa mentioned she is still looking for leaders for various programs. Lighten Up is going to be resubmitted for a grant in 2021 and they will most likely be changing the name.

New Business:

1. Nominations - Debbie Kraus asked how many board member positions were open. Paula reported that four positions were open. Two board members (Vicky O'Donnell and Janice Turner) had first terms expiring and they agreed to continue for a second term. Jean Boyle's second term is ending as of 12/20, Mark Richardson, Janet Smith and Bob Borremans all resigned.

Janice opened nominations. Sue McGinnis nominated Chuck Wilson, seconded by Pat Burhans. Passed.

Pat Burhans noted that Pam Bostwick had some interest in being on the board. Pam confirmed this. Jean Boyle asked Pam to tell the board a bit about herself and why she was interested in running for board membership.

Pam said many years ago a good friend of hers was a transportation dispatcher for COA. Pam is retired 32 year County employee and she is very impressed with the programs the

COA offers and the efforts of all the staff. She would like to be a “voice” in the County for the COA.

Pat Burhans nominated Pam Bostwick, seconded by Janice Turner. Passed.

Paula confirmed with the election of Jeff Didelot last month, this leaves just one open seat for board membership.

Jean opened nominations for Board Chair. Sue McGinniss nominated Janice Turner who declined. Jean Boyle nominated Sue McGinniss, she declined. Pat Burhans nominated Chuck Wilson for chair. There was minor discussion on nominating someone for chair who was not officially on the board as of the current date. It was decided that Chuck would be nominated and voted on for chair, pending approval of board membership by the County Board. Pat’s nomination was seconded by Sherill Gilbertson. Passed.

Jean opened nominations for Vice Chair. Janice Turner nominated Sherrill Gilbertson, seconded by Sue McGinniss. Passed.

Old Business - Evas Committee Report

Paula reported that the EVA’s committee met the previous evening and voted on the integration. It passed with one dissenting vote. It will be going to the County Board on Thursday evening for a final vote. That meeting is open to the public.

Pam Bostwick asked if she could explain her dissenting vote. She felt there were many questions that had been asked by COA Board members that had not been answered and concerns that had not been addressed. She also felt the County was not specific enough on how the plans would be carried out.

Janet thanked Pam for her dissenting vote and she explained that she had felt blindsided by Paula’s decision at the Dec 2 meeting. She said she felt within two years the COA will not have a board and all the people who work for the agency will have their duties diluted. She feels integration is a dis-service to the county residents.

Paula explained that the COA is required to have a nutrition program advisory board. She said she is working closely with GWAAR throughout the transition to ensure all bases are covered.

Janet explained she is concerned about the programs that are currently being offered. She feels Paula has transitioned the COA to something very much needed and utilized.

At this point in the meeting Chair Boyle recognized two guests that had joined the meeting: Supervisor Shirley Williams and Amy Kerris from Nutrition and Health.

Debbie Krause said she listens to radio station 98.1 and she has heard a lot concerning Dane Counties ADRC and “One stop shopping”. Debbie cautioned that as we integrate, we need to take care that ALL of the COA programs continue to be recognized and marketed.

Board Membership Report Reports:

County Board of Supervisors, Tom Brien absent

ADRC of Rock County, Vicky O’Donnell: Vicky gave her appreciation to Lachel for all her work on the Medicare Enrollment process. Clients were calling up to and on the final day and Lachel was always gracious in making sure they all got served.

She also reported that Cori Marsh had created personalized Dementia Specific bags for caregivers. The staff was in the process of distributing them.

Board Member Rena DeWar commented that her mother had gotten an ALEXA from the ADRC and she loved it. It was working out very well.

Adjournment: A motion was made by Sue McGinniss and seconded by Karen Ferguson to adjourn the meeting at 10:07 a.m... Motion carried. *Minutes not official until approved by the Council on Aging Advisory Board.*