

D

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE:

Personnel Specialist (Supreme Court)

CURRENT LAW

The Director of State Courts Office, under the Supreme Court, is responsible for administration of the Wisconsin Court System, including providing personnel services for state court employees. The Office employs 2.0 personnel staff which service 748.75 FTE (including employes of the Appeals, Circuit and Supreme Courts).

GOVERNOR

No provision.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The Department of Employment Relations (DER) is responsible for the employer functions of the executive branch of government. The Department establishes and maintains employment relations policies and practices throughout state service, including rules regarding position classifications, absences, pay schedules, workers compensation, affirmative action and equal opportunity, employe development and training, performance evaluations, grievance procedures, recruitment, promotions, transfers and appointments.

2. The Courts, as a separate branch of government, are not subject to the policies established by DER. Instead, Supreme Court rules direct the Director of State Courts to develop a personnel manual establishing vacation and sick leave, overtime and compensatory time, fringe benefits, promotion and position designation, merit or other performance awards, recruitment and

hiring procedures, employe evaluations, salary determination and pay ranges, grievance procedures and leave policies for judges. In addition, these rules must ensure that court positions, which are substantially equivalent to positions in the classified service, are treated comparably to employes in the civil service.

3. The Director of State Courts office has 2.0 FTE, including 1.0 personnel officer, 0.5 personnel specialist and 0.5 personnel assistant, which are responsible for implementation of the personnel policies and assisting with policy development.

4. In its budget 1997-99 budget submission, the Supreme Court requested \$35,700 GPR in 1997-98 and \$40,400 GPR in 1998-99 for 1.0 personnel specialist to perform personnel duties which the Court does not have staff to attend to including developing an affirmative action program, addressing Americans with Disabilities Act requirements, developing an employe assistance program, providing a comprehensive training program for new managers and supervisors and assisting in personnel policy interpretation, application, performance planning and evaluation.

5. Chief Justice Abrahamson, in her testimony to the Committee, indicated that executive branch agencies, which receive personnel policy development and assistance services from DER, have more personnel staff than the Courts, which are responsible for both personnel policy development and implementation. She indicated that the Courts would require three additional positions to match other executive branch agencies.

6. Agencies of similar size tend to have more personnel staff than the Courts. For example, the Department of Justice has 4.0 personnel staff for 538.9 FTE (a ratio of 1 to 135), the State Public Defender has 3.5 personnel staff for 533.6 FTE (a ratio of 1 to 152) and the Department of Veterans Affairs has 5.0 personnel staff for 799.3 FTE (a ratio of 1 to 160). The ratio of personnel to FTE for the Court System is 1 to 374 FTE. An additional personnel specialist would allow the Courts to have one personnel staff per 250 FTE.

7. It should be noted that comparisons among different agencies and the Courts are difficult, because different positions have different responsibilities which may not be comparable among the agencies and the Courts.

8. Given that the Courts are responsible for providing services to program-revenue funded positions, one option to reduce the GPR cost of the position would be to fund one-half of the position with program revenue from charges to the non-GPR entities, including the Circuit Court Automation Project, the Board of Attorneys Professional Responsibility, the Board of Bar Examiners, the Medical Mediation Panel and the State Law Library services program. Under this alternative, the cost to the bill would be \$17,800 GPR and \$17,900 PR in 1997-98 and \$20,200 GPR and \$20,200 PR in 1998-99.

9. Alternatively, the Committee could provide an additional one-half position and increase the Courts' personnel staff by 25%. Given that two current staff are GPR-funded and provide services to PR-funded court operations, the additional one-half position could be funded from charges to PR court functions.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

1. Provide \$35,700 GPR in 1997-98 and \$40,400 GPR in 1998-99 and 1.0 personnel specialist position annually to provide additional personnel services to the State Court System.

<u>Alternative 1</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$76,100
1998-99 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	1.00

2. Provide \$17,800 GPR and \$17,900 PR in 1997-98 and \$20,200 GPR and \$20,200 PR in 1998-99 and 0.5 GPR position and 0.5 PR position annually for 1.0 personnel specialist to provide additional personnel services to the State Court System.

<u>Alternative 2</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>PR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$38,000	\$38,100	\$76,100
1998-99 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	0.50	0.50	1.00

3. Provide \$17,900 PR in 1997-98 and \$20,200 PR in 1998-99 for a one-half time personnel specialist to provide personnel services to non-GPR court functions.

<u>Alternative 3</u>	<u>PR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$38,100
1998-99 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	0.50

4. Take no action.

Prepared by: Carri Jakel

MO# AK#2 p784

JENSEN	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> A	BURKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> A	DECKER	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> A	GEORGE	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> A	JAUCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> A
GARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> A	WINEKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> A	SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> A	COWLES	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> A	PANZER	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	<input type="radio"/> N	<input type="radio"/> A
				AYE	9	NO	7
				ABS			0

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

District Court Administrative Staff -- Milwaukee County (Supreme Court)

CURRENT LAW

The 69 circuit courts in the state are divided into 10 administrative districts, each supervised by the chief judge. The chief judge appoints a district court administrator (DCA) responsible for managing the nonjudicial business of the district, at the direction of the chief judge. Each DCA has one support position. In addition, Milwaukee County (District 1) has an assistant district court administrator. The 21 district court administrative staff are state employees under the Director of State Courts Office.

GOVERNOR

No provision.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Milwaukee County comprises District 1, with 46 (20%) of the 233 circuit court branches statewide. This compares to an average of 21 court branches for each of the other nine districts in the state. In addition, District 1 handles disproportionately more criminal and total cases than the other judicial districts (30% of misdemeanors, 28% of felonies and 24% of total cases in 1995).

2. The Courts requested \$130,400 GPR and 3.0 positions in 1997-98 and \$307,000 GPR and 6.0 positions in 1998-99 for additional staff for District 1 administration. The request was to address a portion of the recommendations resulting from a 1994 study of the Milwaukee

County justice system conducted by the Policy Studies, Inc. (PSI). PSI is a private consulting group made up of national court management experts. The study was funded through a State Justice Institute grant.

3. The requested positions include one court analyst, four division managers and one administrative support position. The court analyst would provide staff assistance to the chief judge and be responsible for planning, management and budget analysis. The division managers would be assigned to the misdemeanor, civil, juvenile and family divisions and would be responsible for overseeing case management, daily court operations and implementation of judicial policies for specific divisions. Division managers would report to the District Court Administrator. The remaining two court divisions, the felony and probate divisions, currently have coordinators who are county employees. (The Register in Probate is responsible for managing the probate division.)

4. Court officials indicate that the requested positions would address several critical issues noted by PSI including the following: (1) enhancing the court's management structure; (2) increasing performance accountability; (3) improving caseload management; (4) improving coordination with other justice system agencies (District Attorneys, Public Defenders and law enforcement); and (5) improving public understanding and support for the Milwaukee County justice system.

5. Chief Justice Abrahamson, in her address to the Committee, reiterated the need for the six positions, but indicated a willingness to phase in the positions over the next two biennia. Her proposal included \$38,900 GPR and 1.0 court analyst in 1997-98 and \$152,400 GPR and 3.0 positions (the court analyst and two division managers) in 1998-99.

6. The PSI study notes a number of problems with the Milwaukee County justice system, and includes numerous recommendations for improvements. The positions included in the Courts' request are recommended in the study. However, there is a question as to whether these positions should be the responsibility of the state or the county.

7. It could be argued that administrative responsibility for the circuit court divisions is the responsibility of the county. The county clerk of courts office is responsible for administrative and clerical support for the court system. The two existing division coordinators in Milwaukee County are also county employees. In addition, it should be noted that at one time there was a county coordinator for the juvenile division; however, when the employee in that position left the Milwaukee County courts, the position was never filled. Court officials indicate that the County has no intention of filling the position, and therefore, included a manager for the juvenile division in their request.

8. The PSI study notes that the Chief Judge and District Court Administrative staff are extremely limited in resources, given the responsibilities of those offices. However, the study further states that additional resources for the Milwaukee County court system is not necessarily

the sole, or perhaps even the best, response. Instead, changes need to be made in the way Milwaukee County court system operates.

9. Court officials indicate there have been serious efforts to implement the study's recommendations with existing resources. As part of that effort, judges have received training on caseload management, weekly court administration meetings are led by the chief judge and some management responsibility has been delegated to the separate court divisions.

10. The Courts indicate that the court analyst position would assist the Chief Judge and the DCA in management of the 46 judges, 20 court commissioners, 81 court reporters and over 250 clerk of courts staff, and in addressing Milwaukee County court system-wide policy and budget concerns. In addition, the position would be responsible for helping implement many of the recommendations of the PSI study, and identifying changes that need to be made to the system. Therefore, if the Committee wants to direct more state resources to Milwaukee County courts, the court analyst position would be the most beneficial in addressing the problems and recommendations of the PSI study. In addition, the court analyst position would be consistent with the current state policy of providing centralized circuit court management under the Chief Judge and DCA's office.

11. The Courts argue that District 1 is the only one-county judicial district in the state. The other districts are made up of three to 13 counties. Therefore, the other districts can draw on the personnel and funding support from the multiple counties that form the district, and can receive management assistance from court management staff located in the various counties.

12. In addition, the Courts argue that the DCA division managers' responsibilities would be separate from the clerk of courts, in that the managers would be responsible for supervision of judges, court commissioners, caseloads and calendars. The clerk's staff deal more with court papers, case files, keeping court records and preparing files for appellate review.

13. Court officials also indicate that with the delegation of certain responsibilities to the divisions, judges have been forced to take on more management responsibilities. Therefore, if the division managers were provided, judicial resources could be used more appropriately.

14. Since such administrative costs are currently predominantly county costs, the Committee could consider requiring Milwaukee County to provide a 50% match for any additional state funding or position authority.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

1. Provide \$130,400 GPR and 3.0 GPR positions in 1997-98 and \$307,000 GPR and 6.0 GPR positions in 1998-99 to fully fund the Court request for additional court management

staff for Milwaukee County. The positions include 1.0 court analyst, 4.0 division managers and 1.0 administrative support position.

Alternative 1	GPR
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$437,400
1998-99 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	6.00

1a. Provide one-half of the funding and position authority under Alternative 1, and require Milwaukee County to match the state funding and position authority in order to receive the additional state resources.

Alternative 1a	GPR
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$218,700
1998-99 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	3.00

2. Provide \$38,900 GPR and 1.0 GPR court analyst position in 1997-98 and \$152,400 and 3.0 positions (the court analyst and two division managers) in 1998-99 to phase in the Milwaukee County administrative staff over the next two biennia.

Alternative 2	GPR
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$191,300
1998-99 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	3.00

2a. Provide one-half of the funding and position authority under Alternative 2, and require Milwaukee County to match the state funding and position authority in order to receive the additional state resources.

Alternative 2a	GPR
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$95,700
1998-99 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	1.50

3. Provide \$38,900 GPR in 1997-98 and \$45,900 GPR in 1998-99 and 1.0 position annually for a court analyst position for Milwaukee County.

<u>Alternative 3</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$84,800
1998-99 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	1.00

3a. Provide one-half of the funding and position authority under Alternative 3, and require Milwaukee County to match the state funding and position authority in order to receive the additional state resources.

<u>Alternative 3a</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$42,400
1998-99 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	0.50

4. Take no action.

Prepared by: Carri Jakel

MO# AH 3 p 785

1 JENSEN	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
OURADA	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
HARSDORF	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
ALBERS	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
GARD	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
LINTON	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
COGGS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2 BURKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
DECKER	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
GEORGE	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
JAUCH	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
WINEKE	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
SHIBILSKI	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
COWLES	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PANZER	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

AYE 4 NO 12 ABS

SUPREME COURT

Administrative Staff for Chief Justice

Motion:

Move to provide \$19,200 GPR and 1.0 GPR position annually to convert the special assistant to the Chief Justice from LTE to permanent status.

Note:

The position's duties, as prescribed by the Chief Justice, include: (a) staffing special committees, commissions, task forces and programs; (b) coordinating special events such as conferences and symposia; (c) representing the Chief Justice at meetings and other public events; and (d) drafting and editing speeches and other correspondence. The funding would cover additional fringe benefit and supplies and services expenses associated with the permanent position.

[Change to Bill: \$38,400 GPR and 1.0 GPR position]

MO# 402

JENSEN	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A

BURKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A

AYE 13 NO 2 ABS _____

SUPREME COURT

LFB Summary Items for Which No Issue Papers Have Been Prepared

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
1	Standard Budget Adjustments
2	Unspecified Budget Reduction
6	Eliminate Data Processing Appropriation

LFB Summary Item for Introduction as Separate Legislation

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
8	Denial of Law Licenses for Failure to Pay Child Support and Tax Delinquency

Court of Appeals

(LFB Budget Summary Document: Page 204)

LFB Summary Items for Which Issue Papers Have Been Prepared

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
-	Clerk of Court Staff (Paper #340)
3	Information Technology (see Paper #781)

To: Joint Committee on Finance
From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Clerk of Court Staff (Court of Appeals and Supreme Court)

CURRENT LAW

The Clerk of Court's office has 12.0 permanent employees, and provides services for both the Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals. Six positions are funded from the Supreme Court sum sufficient appropriation (the Clerk of Court, chief deputy clerk, first deputy clerk, two support services assistants and one deputy clerk), and six are funded from the Court of Appeals sum sufficient appropriation (two deputy clerks, three assistant deputy clerks and one court records clerk).

GOVERNOR

No provision.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. In their budget submission, the Courts requested \$27,000 GPR in 1997-98 and \$25,000 GPR in 1998-99 to convert to permanent 3.5 limited term employe (LTE) positions in the Clerk's office. The positions include the following: (1) 1.0 support services assistant which receives, reviews and organizes incoming materials, enters filing information and coordinates distribution of materials for oral arguments and public hearings; (2) 2.0 assistant deputy clerks which perform a wide variety of technical and complex legal clerical duties in conjunction with case processing and recordkeeping; and (3) 0.5 photocopy clerk. In addition, the Courts requested \$25,400 in 1997-98 and \$29,600 in 1998-99 for 1.0 new position for a program assistant which would assist in processing the various motions filed in the Courts.

2. The Clerk's office is the repository for all documents filed with the Supreme Court and Court of Appeals. It is the responsibility of the Clerk's office to track all case events and assure compliance with the appropriate statutes, rules and court procedures. In addition to case-related duties, the office is responsible for maintaining Supreme Court Rule files, providing public information regarding cases, procedures, rules and statutes, maintaining admission status of every attorney admitted to the Wisconsin State Bar and scheduling and coordinating Bar admission ceremonies.

3. The Clerk's office has not had an increase in permanent staff since 1988, when three positions were granted under s. 13.10 of the statutes.

4. The Clerk's office workload is generally measured by the number of cases filed. Since 1988, the overall number of Supreme Court and Court of Appeals cases filed increased 47% (a 33% increase in Supreme Court cases and 53% increase in Court of Appeals cases). Further, it is expected that the number of cases filed over the next two years will continue to increase at an average of 5% per year. In addition, Court officials indicate that the number of motions, which are particularly time consuming for staff, is increasing. The number of motions filed in 1988 was 4,500, compared to almost 10,000 motions filed in 1995, an increase of 122%.

5. In September, 1996, the Clerk's office moved from the Capitol to the Tenney Building (the same location as the Director of State Courts Office staff). Prior to the relocation, the Clerk's office faced a space shortage with no work space for new staff. Therefore, despite the office's increased workload and need for additional staff, positions could not be filled.

6. The LTE positions were approved by the Supreme Court when the office moved and space became available.

7. Court officials indicate that the duties of these positions are permanent and should be converted to permanent status. They indicate that these positions are performing the same work as permanent staff, yet are not receiving the same benefits or job security. As a result, the Courts can not attract or keep quality employees. In addition, the Courts have invested in an intensive training process for the two deputy assistant clerks. However, since their position status would remain tenuous under the budget, according to the Courts, the current employees are contemplating leaving the office.

8. Given the workload of the Clerk of Court's office and the fact that this fall the 3.5 LTE positions will have been filled with LTEs for one year, it would seem reasonable that they be made permanent positions.

9. Of the 3.5 LTE positions, one would be funded from the Supreme Court sum sufficient appropriation, and the remaining 2.5 would be funded from the Court of Appeals sum sufficient appropriation.

10. It should be noted that a portion of the funding requested by the Courts is already included in base funding for the LTE positions. Conversion of the LTE positions to permanent would require \$7,600 and 1.0 position annually under the Supreme Court and \$13,700 and 2.5 positions annually under the Court of Appeals.

11. The new program assistant position was also approved by the Court; however, it has not been filled due to current space constraints in the new location. According to Court officials, additional space is expected to open in the Fall of 1997, at which time the Clerk's office expects to fill the position.

12. Court officials indicate that, although it was their lowest priority of the positions requested, the program assistant is needed to address the increased workload resulting from the extraordinary number of motions the Courts are receiving associated with the increase in cases. The cost of the position is \$23,000 in 1997-98 (assuming a November 1, 1997, starting date) and \$29,600 in 1998-99.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

1. Provide \$7,600 GPR and 1.0 position annually, under the Supreme Court, to convert an LTE assistant deputy clerk position to permanent status. In addition, provide \$36,700 GPR in 1997-98 and \$43,300 in 1998-99 and 3.5 positions annually, under the Court of Appeals, to convert 1.0 support services assistant, 1.0 assistant deputy clerk and 0.5 photocopy clerk from LTE to permanent status, and to provide 1.0 new program assistant position, beginning November 1, 1997.

<u>Alternative 1</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$95,200
1998-99 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	4.50

~~1.~~ 2. Provide \$7,600 GPR and 1.0 position annually, under the Supreme Court, to convert an LTE assistant deputy clerk position to permanent status. In addition, provide \$13,700 GPR and 2.5 positions annually, under the Court of Appeals, to convert 1.0 support services assistant, 1.0 assistant deputy clerk and 0.5 photocopy clerk from LTE to permanent status.

<u>Alternative 2</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$42,600
1998-99 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	3.50

3. Maintain current law.

Prepared by: Carri Jakel

MO# AH#2 P340

1 JENSEN	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A

2 BURKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	A

AYE 11 NO 5 ABS

COURT OF APPEALS

LFB Summary Items for Which No Issue Papers Have Been Prepared

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
1	Standard Budget Adjustments
2	Unspecified Budget Reduction

COURT OF APPEALS

Staff Attorney

Motion:

Move to provide \$45,000 GPR in 1997-98 and \$52,900 GPR in 1998-99 and 1.0 GPR position annually for an additional staff attorney for Court of Appeals District IV, located in Madison.

Note:

Under current law, there are 16 appellate judges with four located in Madison. There are 12.85 staff attorneys, with one located in each of the three districts outside of Madison, and the remaining located in Madison where much of the central processing for the Court is performed. Staff attorneys are permanent employees that provide professional assistance to judges and act as house counsel. Duties include drafting opinions and summary disposition orders, and reviewing and drafting motions and petitions filed in the Court.

[Change to Bill: \$97,900 GPR and 1.0 GPR position]

MO# 1008

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

*W. Withdrawn
by Wineke*

Motion #1008

AYE _____ NO _____ ABS _____

Circuit Courts

(LFB Budget Summary Document: Page 101)

LFB Summary Item for Which an Issue Paper Has Been Prepared

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
3	Circuit Court Interpreters (Paper #225)

To: Joint Committee on Finance

**From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau**

ISSUE

Circuit Court Interpreters (Circuit Courts)

[LFB Summary: Page 101, #3]

CURRENT LAW

Persons who are charged with criminal offenses or are subject to protective services or mental health proceedings, or persons who are witnesses to such proceedings, are entitled to a qualified interpreter under certain conditions. An interpreter is required if the court determines that the person is unable to speak or understand English or that the person has a hearing or speech impairment sufficient to prevent the person from: (1) communicating with his or her attorney; (2) reasonably understanding English testimony; or (3) being understood in English. If the court determines that a person cannot afford an interpreter, one is provided at the public's expense. Funding is provided in a separate sum certain, annual appropriation with a base level of \$134,100.

GOVERNOR

Modify the appropriation for interpreter reimbursement from a sum certain appropriation to a sum sufficient appropriation.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. By statute, in circuit court proceedings, the expense of furnishing interpreters for indigent persons is paid by the Director of State Courts. The statutory fee for interpreters is \$35 per half day of in-court interpreter services. In practice, counties pay directly for the services

and the Director of State Courts Office reimburses them from a Circuit Court sum certain, annual appropriation. The appropriation may only be used to fund these interpreter fees.

2. Over the last four years, interpreter reimbursement costs have increased by an average of 18% annually. Because this level of increase has not been expected, the appropriation has frequently been underbudgeted. As a result, the Director of State Courts Office has had to submit requests to the Joint Committee on Finance, under s. 13.10, for additional funding authority. Five funding supplements for interpreter reimbursements have been provided by the Committee since June, 1990.

3. In their 1997-99 budget request, the Courts requested that the appropriation be changed to a sum sufficient appropriation. The Courts argue that the law requires counties to be fully reimbursed for these expenditures, and that the Office has no control over the use of interpreters, which is ordered by judges. Therefore, the sum certain appropriation leads to unnecessary workload for the Courts, and delays payments to counties.

4. Interpreters used in Supreme Court or Court of Appeals proceedings are paid from the Courts' respective sum sufficient operating appropriations, as necessary expenses to carry out the Courts' functions. However, the Circuit Court sum sufficient appropriation allows only for "salaries and expenses of the judges, reporters and assistant reporters of the circuit courts."

5. In considering s.13.10 requests for supplemental funding for circuit court interpreter costs, the Committee has limited options. There are no other Court appropriations which can be reduced to offset a deficit in the court interpreter appropriation since the Circuit Court operations appropriation is a sum sufficient appropriation. In addition, statutes require full reimbursement to counties at the current reimbursement rate of \$35 per half day.

6. It could be argued that since state statutes require the state to fully reimburse counties for interpreter expenses at the statutory level and that the appropriation can only be used for that purpose, a sum sufficient appropriation would be appropriate.

7. On the other hand, if the appropriation is converted to a sum sufficient appropriation, increases in expenditures would be addressed through annual reestimates without a formal review by the Legislature. Therefore, for oversight purposes, the Committee may wish for the appropriation to remain a sum certain appropriation.

8. It should be noted that despite historical increases in expenditure levels, the Courts did not request and the bill would not provide, any adjustment in funding levels for 1997-99. While a sum sufficient appropriation would allow expenditures regardless of the budget authority, for state budget purposes, the budget levels should be adjusted to reflect anticipated expenditures.

9. Over the last five years, bills for county interpreter reimbursement have varied widely, with rather large increases in three of those years, as shown in the table below. The table

reflects expenses based on the fiscal year in which the bills were received, as opposed to actual expenditures, because there have been years where the Courts have held bills until funding becomes available for the next fiscal year. Therefore, the table more accurately represents actual annual costs.

Interpreter Expenses Based on Bills Received

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Expenditures</u>	<u>Percent Change</u>
1991-92	\$70,700	N.A.
1992-93	75,800	7.2%
1993-94	103,100	36.0
1994-95	102,300	-0.8
1995-96	134,100	31.1
1996-97 est.	165,100	23.1

10. As shown above, costs in any particular year have varied greatly, making expenditure levels for 1997-99 difficult to estimate. Through February, \$121,400 of the \$134,100 appropriated in 1996-97 had been expended. Based on the expenditures to date, costs in 1996-97 could be expected to total \$165,100, for an increase of 23% over the prior year. If costs are averaged over the last five years, there has been an overall average increase of 19% per year. If these trends continue over the next two years, expenditures could total \$196,500 in 1997-98 and \$233,800 in 1998-99 (or increases to the bill of \$62,400 in 1997-98 and \$99,700 in 1998-99).

11. In addition, as shown above, expenditures for 1996-97 are expected to exceed the appropriated amounts by \$31,000. Typically, the Courts would request supplemental funds under s. 13.10 to fully fund the 1996-97 expenditures. However, because the budget bill would provide a sum sufficient appropriation, the Courts have indicated that any costs above what is appropriated for 1996-97 will be funded from the 1997-98 sum sufficient appropriation when that authority becomes available.

12. Therefore, under the bill, expenditures in 1997-98 would be expected to be \$93,400 above appropriated amounts (\$31,000 for 1996-97 expenditures and \$62,400 for 1997-98). If the Committee approves the sum sufficient appropriation, the budget levels should be increased to reflect the anticipated expenditure levels.

13. The Committee could, however, adjust the statutory payment level so that current funding levels would be sufficient. Under this alternative, based on expenditure estimates for 1997-99, the statutory fee for interpreters would have to be reduced from \$35 per half day to \$20 per half day, assuming an October 1, 1997, effective date.

14. However, given the difficulty in estimating interpreter expenses, another alternative would be to provide for proration of the available funding if current funds are insufficient. This would ensure that costs do not exceed budgeted levels.

15. It should be noted that counties indicate that the current \$35 payment does not cover their costs of interpreters. Therefore, any reduced payment level or proration provision would shift additional costs to counties.

16. If the Committee maintains current law with respect to the sum certain appropriation and court interpreter payments, the appropriation level under the bill should be adjusted for 1997-99 to reflect higher anticipated expenditures. If the Committee chooses not to include funding for the projected 1996-97 deficit, the Courts would likely submit a request for supplemental funding at the June, s. 13.10 meeting.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation for a sum sufficient appropriation for interpreter reimbursements. In addition, provide \$93,400 in 1997-98 and \$99,700 in 1998-99 to reflect estimated expenditures.

<u>Alternative 1</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$193,100

2. Delete the Governor's recommendation for a sum sufficient appropriation. Provide \$62,400 in 1997-98 and \$99,700 in 1998-99 to reflect estimated expenditures from the sum certain appropriation. In addition, provide \$31,000 in 1997-98 to fund the projected 1996-97 deficit.

<u>Alternative 2</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$193,100

3. Delete the Governor's recommendation for a sum sufficient appropriation. Provide \$62,400 in 1997-98 and \$99,700 in 1998-99 to reflect estimated expenditures from the sum certain appropriation.

<u>Alternative 3</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$162,100

4. Delete the Governor's recommendation for a sum sufficient appropriation. Instead reduce the statutory payment level, effective for costs incurred after October 1, 1997, from \$35 per half day to \$20 per half day.

5. Delete the Governor's recommendation for a sum sufficient appropriation. Instead require the Courts to prorate funding, beginning in 1997-98, if expenditures exceed the authorized levels.

Prepared by: Carri Jakel

MO# AY#2 p225

JENSEN	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
OURADA	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
GARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
LINTON	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
COGGS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

BURKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
DECKER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
COWLES	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PANZER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

AYE 10 NO 6 ABS

*Jauch - Friendly Amendment
 Replace portion of GPR
 w/ \$90,000 of court info fee*

CIRCUIT COURTS

Election of Judges in Milwaukee County

Motion:

Move to require that by the year 2000, judges in Milwaukee County be elected by districts.

MO# 440

JENSEN	Y	<input checked="" type="radio"/> N	A
OURADA	Y	<input checked="" type="radio"/> N	A
HARSDORF	Y	<input checked="" type="radio"/> N	A
ALBERS	Y	<input checked="" type="radio"/> N	A
GARD	Y	<input checked="" type="radio"/> N	A
KAUFERT	Y	<input checked="" type="radio"/> N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	N	A
BURKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	<input checked="" type="radio"/> N	A
PANZER	Y	<input checked="" type="radio"/> N	A

AYE 6 NO 2 ABS

CIRCUIT COURTS

LFB Summary Items for Which No Issue Papers Have Been Prepared

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
1	Standard Budget Adjustments
2	Unspecified Budget Reduction

LFB Summary Item for Introduction as Separate Legislation

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
4	Release of Certain Confidential Records for Child Support Enforcement and Public Assistance Administration

Board on Aging and Long-Term Care

(LFB Budget Summary Document: Page 94)

LFB Summary Item for Which an Issue Paper Has Been Prepared

Item #

Title

4

Ombudsman and Volunteer Coordinator Positions (Paper #)

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Ombudsman and Volunteer Coordinator Positions (BOALTC)

[LFB Summary: Page 95, #4]

CURRENT LAW

Board Responsibilities and Staffing. The mission of the Board on Aging and Long-Term Care (BOALTC) is to serve as an advocate for elderly and disabled long-term care consumers. The Board's ombudsman program investigates and resolves complaints on behalf of persons receiving nursing home and community-based services. The Board has the responsibility, as part of the federally-specified requirements for the ombudsman program, to analyze, comment on, and monitor the development and implementation of laws, regulations, and other governmental policies and actions that pertain to the adequacy of long-term care facilities and services in the state. The Board operates the medigap hotline, which is staffed by three counselors that provide callers with information and counseling, primarily on medigap insurance policies.

In 1996-97, the Board is budgeted, exclusive of the private grant for the volunteer coordinator, \$856,900 (all funds), including \$532,500 is GPR and \$324,400 PR. Program revenue budgeted for the Board includes federal funds the Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS) receives under the federal Older Americans Act and the federal Health Insurance Information, Counseling and Assistance Grant transferred to the Board by DHFS under contract (\$161,400) and insurance industry fees collected by the Office of the Commissioner of Insurance (\$163,000).

Ombudsman Program. The Board administers an ombudsman program that investigates and resolves complaints on behalf of residents of nursing homes and community-based residential facilities (CBRFs) and participants of the community options program (COP). The Board

currently employs 10 full-time positions--one ombudsman supervisor, eight regional ombudsman positions and a volunteer ombudsman coordinator. In addition, \$91,500 GPR is authorized in 1996-97 for the Board to contract for ombudsman services.

The duties of the ombudsman supervisor include providing technical assistance and training to the regional ombudsman staff and interacting with other state agencies in coordinating the activities of the ombudsman program and related programs.

The volunteer ombudsman coordinator position is supported by a private grant from the Helen Bader Foundation, which expires at the end of the 1996-97 fiscal year.

GOVERNOR

Provide 2.0 GPR positions in 1997-98 to increase staff for the regional ombudsman program. Salary and fringe benefit funding to support these positions (\$55,800 GPR in 1997-98 and \$74,300 GPR in 1998-99) would be reallocated from the Board's \$91,500 supplies and services base for contracting for ombudsman services.

DISCUSSION POINTS

Ombudsman Positions

1. In order to receive the state's allotment of federal funds for the ombudsman program, the Older Americans Act requires that the state establish and operate an Office of the State Long-Term Ombudsman that meets a number of requirements, including:

a. The Office must be independent of any agency responsible for licensing or certifying long-term care services in the state or any association of long-term care facilities or any other residential facilities for older individuals;

b. The Office must identify, investigate and resolve complaints made by, or on behalf of, residents of long-term care facilities;

c. The Office must ensure that residents have regular and timely access to the services provided through the Office and that the residents and complainants receive timely responses;

d. The Office must analyze, comment on, and monitor the development and implementation of laws and regulations that pertain to the health, safety, welfare, and rights of residents, with respect to the adequacy of long-term care; and

e. The Office must provide for training representatives of the Office, promote the development of citizen organizations, and provide technical support for the development of resident and family councils.

2. The ombudsman program has the responsibility to provide services to residents of nursing homes, CBRFs and COP participants. Currently, there are 454 nursing homes, 1,304 CBRFs, and approximately 15,000 COP participants. Although the number of residents in nursing homes has been fairly stable in recent years, the number of CBRFs with five or more beds has increased from 942 in 1990 to 1,159 in 1993 and to 1,304 in 1997. The number of persons served under the COP program has increased from 10,464 in 1990 to 13,173 in 1993, and 15,103 in 1995.

3. Table 1 shows several measures of the level of activity under the ombudsman program for federal fiscal year 1987-88 through 1995-96. In federal fiscal year 1994-95, as a result of federal requirements, changes were adopted in the collection of information. First, the definitions of complaints and informational and counseling requests were narrowed. Second, the Board began collecting statistics on the number of unannounced visits and the number of surveys attended. Prior to 1995, the ombudsman program conducted few unannounced visits and attended few surveys.

TABLE 1
Ombudsman Program Activity
Federal Fiscal Years 1987-99 through 1995-96

Federal Fiscal Year	Cases Closed		Complaints		Information and Counseling Requests		Presentations		Unannounced Visits		Surveys Attended	
	Number	Percent Change	Number	Percent Change	Number	Percent Change	Number	Percent Change	Number	Percent Change	Number	Percent Change
1988	567	--	1,017	--	4,718	--	229	--	*	--	*	--
1989	727	28.2%	1,547	52.1%	5,436	15.2%	299	30.6%	*	--	*	--
1990	699	-3.9	1,709	10.5	5,328	-2.0	189	-36.8	*	--	*	--
1991	788	12.7	2,101	22.9	6,753	26.8	329	74.1	*	--	*	--
1992	1,004	27.4	3,115	48.3	8,671	28.4	301	-8.5	*	--	*	--
1993	1,184	17.9	4,330	39.0	8,937	3.1	368	22.3	*	--	*	--
1994	1,130	-4.6	3,894	-12.1	7,117	-20.4	421	14.4	*	--	*	--
1995	1,410	24.8	4,135	6.2	5,277	-25.9	281	-33.3	85	--	38	--
1996	1,407	-0.2	3,339	-19.3	7,822	48.2	394	40.2	109	28.2%	59	55.3%

Note: Beginning in the second quarter of the 1994-95 federal fiscal year, statistics for complaints and information and counseling requests reflect a change in definition that decreased the numbers reported in these categories. Also, the Board began collecting statistics on the number of unannounced visits and surveys attended.

4. From 1988 to 1993 the Board employed six ombudsman positions. The 1993-95 biennial budget act increased the number of regional ombudsman positions from six to eight, beginning in 1994-95. Although 1995 Wisconsin Act 464 authorized \$91,500 GPR in 1996-97

for the Board to contract for ombudsman services, this funding will not be expended. The Board went through the state's required bidding process to seek a contractor to provide ombudsman services. However, only one bid was received, and that bid was found unsatisfactory by the Department of Administration.

5. Based on the number of complaints received by the Board in 1996, each of the eight ombudsman positions, on average, closed 3.5 cases per week, responded to 8.3 complaints and 19.6 requests for information and counseling, made 1.0 presentation per week, made 0.3 unannounced visits per week and attended 0.1 surveys per week.

6. In the most recent state fiscal year, ombudsman staff were unable to visit approximately 27% of the state's licensed nursing facilities and 89% of CBRFs licensed for the elderly and persons with Alzheimer's disease.

7. Most of an ombudsman staff's time (approximately 85%) is spent with nursing homes while the remaining time is primarily spent with CBRFs. Of all complaints received by the ombudsman program, 81% are related to nursing homes, 17% to CBRFs and 2% to COP participants.

8. The current geographic distribution of the Board's ombudsman staff is as follows:

<u>Region</u>	<u>Office Location</u>	<u>Number of Ombudsmen</u>
Northern	Rhineland	1
Western	Eau Claire	1
Central	Stevens Point	1
Eastern	Green Bay	1
Southwest	Madison	1
Southeast	Milwaukee	3

Under the Governor's recommendations, one of the new ombudsman positions would be located in the Southwest region (Madison office) and the second position would be placed in the Southeast region (Milwaukee office).

9. Two additional ombudsman positions would enable program staff to: (a) increase participation in the annual survey of nursing homes (federal law requires that ombudsman be provided a opportunity to participate); (b) visit nursing homes that have not been seen by ombudsman staff in complaint investigations and other activities; (c) improve the response time to complaints; and (d) spend more time addressing complaints with a lower priority. Currently, the ombudsmen staff can respond to all complaints received although with complaints that are deemed to be less serious, the ombudsman will suggest a course of action rather than be directly involved.

10. There is a difference between funding provided in 1995 Act 464 for the Board to contract ombudsman services (\$91,500 GPR annually) and the estimated costs of supporting 2.0 additional ombudsman positions in 1997-98 (\$70,800 GPR). Consequently, all of the alternatives presented in this paper include reestimates of funding required to support these positions.

Volunteer Ombudsman Coordinator Position

11. In its 1997-99 budget submission, the Board requested funding to support 1.0 GPR position, beginning in 1997-98, to maintain support for the volunteer ombudsman program that will no longer be funded from the Helen Bader Foundation. The Helen Bader Foundation provided financial support of \$66,600 in 1995-96 and \$64,500 in 1996-97 for the Board to hire a volunteer director and to support other costs to expand the volunteer program to 80 volunteers visiting 40 nursing homes by the end of the grant period. The grant expires June 30, 1997. Funding of \$2,000 annually was included for evaluation of the volunteer program.

12. The volunteer program began in August, 1994, with six volunteers visiting nursing homes in Monroe County, and in September, 1994, an additional eight volunteers began visiting facilities in Milwaukee County. Currently, four counties (Monroe, Milwaukee, Dane, and Rock) are served by 70 ombudsman volunteers. Table 2 below shows the growth in the volunteer program. The Board plans to expand the volunteer program to Marathon County in May, 1997.

TABLE 2

Volunteer Ombudsman Program Growth

<u>Date</u>	<u>Counties Served</u>	<u>Volunteer Ombudsmen</u>	<u>Nursing Homes Residents With Volunteer Services Available</u>	<u>Nursing Homes Served</u>
8/94	1	6	420	6
7/95	2	18	980	17
8/96	3	40	2,800	26
3/97	4	59	7,672	41
4/97	4	70	--	--

13. The Board expects that every volunteer visit his or her assigned facility at least once a week for a minimum of three hours. The volunteer also agrees to commit to the project for at least six months. The volunteer must file a monthly report indicating any problems that were found or need to be followed-up by a professional ombudsman. Volunteers, on average, resolve 7.1 complaints per month. More involved complaints are forwarded to the professional ombudsman.

14. The eight professional ombudsman staff provide 320 (8 x 40) hours of services per week at a cost of approximately \$36 per hour. In comparison, the current 70 volunteer ombudsman staff will provide 210 hours (3 x 70) of service per week at a current cost of \$5.90 per hour (this cost is primarily a fixed cost that will decline as the number of volunteers increase). Although a volunteer ombudsman cannot perform all the functions of a professional ombudsman staff, the volunteer program currently increases the number of hours that an ombudsman is in a nursing home by at least 55%. The Board's staff estimates that a single volunteer ombudsman coordinator can supervised up to 250 volunteers, which would represent 750 hours of service per week at an hourly cost of \$1.65.

15. Since the beginning of the volunteer program in August, 1994, one volunteer has left the program and one volunteer was dismissed.

16. The Board is currently conducting an evaluation of the volunteer program. As part of that evaluation, volunteers and nursing home administrators have been surveyed on the program. Although the evaluation is not complete, the Board's Executive Director has indicated that the volunteers have expressed satisfaction with the program and that nursing home administrators have been either positive, or at least not negative.

17. One advantage that is cited for the volunteer program is that problems can be identified when they are small, allowing staff to resolve complaints before they develop into more serious situations.

18. Although providing additional staff for the ombudsman program would enable the Board to increase activities as described in Discussion Point 9, denial of the additional positions would generate savings of \$91,500 GPR annually to meet other state needs. Since the Board has not been able to contract for ombudsman services, these savings could be generated without reducing the current level of ombudsman services.

19. The volunteer ombudsman program is more of a complement than a substitute for the professional regional ombudsman program. However, the Committee could consider reallocating one of the ombudsman positions that would be provided in the Governor's bill to serve as the director of the volunteer ombudsman program so that the volunteer program can be maintained. Although it cannot replace the services of professional ombudsman staff, the volunteer program may be a very cost-effective complement to the professional ombudsman activities and providing a permanent director would ensure that the investment in the developing the current volunteer program would not be lost as a result of the volunteer program being phased-out or not further developed due to a lack of a director.

20. In recent months, concerns have been raised over the adequacy of the state's regulation of long-term care providers. A series of articles that appeared in the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel during March, 1997, focused attention on incidents of resident abuse in long-term care facilities. The Department of Health and Family Services is currently developing

recommendations to address inconsistencies in the state's requirements relating to background checks for persons employed in the long-term care industry. However, implementing these and other proposals designed to assure quality of care for persons who use long-term care services, including the provision of additional staff for the Board's ombudsman program, will require additional funding not provided in the Governor's bill.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide 2.0 GPR positions in 1997-98 to increase staff for the regional ombudsman program. In addition, reduce funding by \$22,900 GPR in 1997-98 to reflect reestimates of the costs of supporting these positions.

<u>Alternative 1</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$22,900

2. Delete the Governor's recommendation to provide 2.0 GPR professional ombudsman positions, beginning in 1997-98. In addition, reduce the Board's base funding by \$91,500 GPR in 1997-98 and 1998-99 to maintain the current number of professional ombudsmen staff (8.0 positions) for the Board.

<u>Alternative 2</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$183,000
1998-99 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	- 2.00

3. Modify the Governor's recommendation by deleting 1.0 GPR regional ombudsman position. Delete \$57,200 GPR in 1997-98 and \$45,800 GPR 1998-99.

<u>Alternative 3</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$103,000
1998-99 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	- 1.00

4. Modify the Governor's recommendation by deleting funding for 2.0 ombudsman positions and instead, providing 1.0 GPR position beginning in 1997-98 as a permanent, full-time volunteer director. Delete \$43,100 GPR in both 1997-98 and 1998-99.

<u>Alternative 4</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$86,200
1998-99 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	- 1.00

5. Modify the Governor's recommendation by providing 1.0 GPR position in 1997-98 for the regional ombudsman program and 1.0 GPR position in 1997-98 as a permanent, full-time volunteer director. Reduce funding by \$8,800 GPR in 1997-98 and increase funding by \$2,700 GPR in 1998-99 to reflect the estimated costs of these positions.

<u>Alternative 5</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$6,100

6. Modify the Governor's recommendation by providing \$25,500 GPR in 1997-98 and \$48,400 GPR in 1998-99 to support 1.0 GPR full-time director for the volunteer program beginning in 1997-98.

<u>Alternative 6</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$73,900
1998-99 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	1.00

Prepared by: Richard Megna

MO# _____

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE _____ NO _____ ABS _____

BOARD ON AGING AND LONG-TERM CARE

Ombudsman and Volunteer Coordinator Positions

Motion:

Move to modify the Governor's recommendations relating staff positions for the Board on Aging and Long-Term Care by: (a) providing \$34,300 GPR in 1997-98 and \$45,800 GPR in 1998-99 to support 1.0 GPR additional ombudsman positions for the Stevens Point office; (b) providing \$48,400 GPR annually to support 1.0 GPR volunteer coordinator position, beginning in 1997-98; and (c) reducing funding by \$22,900 GPR in 1997-98 to reflect a reestimate of funding required to support 2.0 GPR ombudsman positions recommended by the Governor.

Note:

This motion would increase the number of professional ombudsman staff recommended by the Governor by 1.0 GPR positions, beginning in 1997-98, so that a total of 3.0 additional professional ombudsman staff would be provided for the Board. The additional position that would be provided under this motion would be placed in the Steven's Point office. In addition, the motion would provide 1.0 GPR volunteer coordinator position for the Board, beginning in 1997-98. Finally, the motion would reduce funding by \$22,900 GPR in 1997-98 to reflect a reestimate of the costs of funding the 2.0 ombudsman positions recommended by the Governor.

[Change to Bill: \$154,000 GPR and 2.0 GPR positions]

MO# 430

JENSEN	Y	N	A
2OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
1 SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 11 NO 5 ABS

BOARD ON AGING AND LONG-TERM CARE

Ombudsman Positions

Motion:

Move to provide \$34,300 PR in 1997-98 and \$91,500 PR in 1998-99 to fund 1.0 PR ombudsman position in 1997-98 and 2.0 PR ombudsman positions in 1998-99 to provide ombudsman services for persons residing in assisted living facilities.

Require all certified and registered assisted living facilities to pay, in addition to any other required fees, an annual fee of up to \$100 per bed, which would first be applicable at the time that 500 assisted living beds have been registered or certified, as determined by the Department of Health and Family Services. Require the Department to set the fee at a rate that would generate sufficient revenues to support the costs of the positions in the Board that would be funded from this source. Specify that all revenue collected from this fee be credited to a new continuing appropriation for the Department and that the Department transfer funds credited to this appropriation to support activities of the Board on Aging on Long-Term Care.

Authorize the Board to expand the ombudsman program to include providing services to persons in assisted living facilities. Also, require all certified or registered assisted living facilities to post in a conspicuous location in each wing or unit and on each floor of the assisted living facility a notice, provided by the Board, of the name, address and telephone number of the Board's long-term care ombudsman program.

Note:

This motion would fund 1.0 PR ombudsman position in 1997-98 and an additional 1.0 PR ombudsman position in 1998-99 (a total of 2.0 PR ombudsman positions in 1998-99), to provide ombudsman services for persons residing in assisted living facilities. These positions would be supported by revenues from a new, \$100 per bed fee that would be paid annually by assisted living facilities certified or registered by DHFS. This fee would be deposited in a new DHFS appropriation, and transferred to support ombudsman activities of the Board. The additional revenue that would be generated from the fee is unknown, since assisted living facilities were first created as a class of providers on March 1, 1997. However, DHFS would be limited to collecting an amount necessary to fund the Board's positions (\$125,900 PR in 1997-99 biennium).

In addition, the motion would authorize the Board to expand the ombudsman program to assisted living facilities and require all certified or registered assisted living facilities to post the name, address and telephone number of the Board's long-term care ombudsman program.

[Change to Bill: \$125,900 PR, \$125,900 PR-REV and 2.0 PR positions]

MO# 1005

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 10 NO 6 ABS

BOARD ON AGING AND LONG-TERM CARE

LFB Summary Items for Which No Issue Papers Have Been Prepared

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
1	Standard Budget Adjustments
2	Miscellaneous Adjustments
3	Information Technology

Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention and Pregnancy Services Board

(LFB Budget Summary Document: Page 72)

LFB Summary Item for Which an Issue Paper Has Been Prepared

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
2	Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention, Pregnancy and Parenting Services (Paper #160)

To: Joint Committee on Finance
From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE**Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention, Pregnancy and Parenting Services (APPPS Board and DHFS -- Children and Family Services and Supportive Living)**

[LFB Summary: Page 72, #2 and Page 317, #15]

CURRENT LAW

The APPPS Board. The Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention and Pregnancy Services (APPPS) Board is a 13-member Board that operates as an independent state agency, although it is attached to the Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS) for administrative purposes. The chairperson of the Board, who serves as a nonvoting member, is the Executive Director of the Women's Council. Six nonvoting members of the Board are state employees who are appointed for membership by the Women's Council. The remaining six members are appointed by the Governor for three-year terms, based on nominations by statewide organizations that together represent an equal balance of points of view on pregnancy prevention and pregnancy services.

The Board distributes grants for adolescent pregnancy prevention programs and pregnancy services projects that include health care, education, counseling and vocational training services. Each project must serve high-risk adolescents between the ages of ten and 18 years old. Grant recipients are required to provide a 20% match to funds received. The Board currently supports nine projects throughout the state, which are funded on a staggered, three-year basis.

Base funding for the Board includes grants to organizations (\$439,300 GPR) and state operations (\$107,600 GPR). State operations funding for the Board includes support for 1.5 GPR positions, including 1.0 administrative officer and 0.5 program assistant position. These staff positions provide administrative services to the Board, administer the grant program, provide

technical assistance for adolescent pregnancy prevention programs and, under the Board's general guidance, promote adolescent pregnancy prevention programs.

DHFS Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention and Parent Programs. DHFS currently administers five adolescent pregnancy prevention and parent programs: (a) adolescent self-sufficiency grant program; (b) adolescent pregnancy prevention services grant program; (c) the adolescent CHOICES project grants; (d) adolescent parent services; and (e) adolescent pregnancy counseling services. These programs, which are administered by the Division of Children and Family Services, are described briefly below.

Adolescent Self-Sufficiency Services. \$582,100 GPR in each fiscal year to provide services in counties or tribes for adolescent parents which emphasize high school graduation, vocational preparation, training, and strengthening the adolescent parent's capacity to fulfill parental responsibilities. In awarding grants, DHFS is required to give priority counties based on the following factors: (a) highest number of births to adolescent mothers; (b) highest rate of births to adolescents; (c) highest rate of participation in the AFDC or Wisconsin Works employment program; (d) highest percentage of births to adolescents. Of the total funding, \$50,100 is earmarked for Native American tribes.

Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Services. \$340,000 GPR annually to provide high-risk adolescents pregnancy and parenthood prevention services to increase development of decision-making and communications skills, promote graduation from high school and expand career and other options. Except with respect to grants to Native American tribes or bands, DHFS is required to rank projects using the same factors it uses to distribute grants for adolescent self-sufficiency services. Of the total funding, \$35,000 is earmarked for tribes.

Adolescent CHOICES Projects. \$210,000 GPR annually to provide information to communities in order to increase community knowledge about problems of adolescents and information to and activities for adolescents, particularly female adolescents in order to: (a) reduce adolescent pregnancy and high school dropout rates; (b) increase economic self-sufficiency and expanding career options for adolescents; (c) enhance self-esteem, interpersonal skills and responsible decision-making; and (d) neutralize sex-role stereotyping and bias. DHFS is required to work closely with the Women's Council and the Department of Public Instruction on a continuing basis concerning the scope and direction of activities funded as CHOICES projects.

By statute, DHFS is required to allocate up to \$65,500 GPR annually to solicit applications from organizations and to provide technical assistance to grantees under this program.

Adolescent Parent Services. \$100,000 GPR annually to provide two \$50,000 grants to organizations that provide adolescent parenting skills development for members of racial minority groups in Milwaukee County.

Adolescent Pregnancy Counseling Services. \$275,000 GPR annually in the Division of Health (DOH) to make grants to individuals and organizations to provide pregnancy counseling services. Of this amount, DOH transfers \$197,400 annually to the Division of Children and Family Services (DCFS) under a memorandum of understanding. DCFS distributes one-third of the funding (\$65,800) to organizations in Milwaukee County to provide primary pregnancy prevention services for youth up to the age of 20. The remaining two-thirds of the funding (\$131,600) is awarded to organizations in Kenosha, Milwaukee, Racine and Rock counties to provide crisis pregnancy and parenting services for high-risk pregnant women under the age of 25, who are single, unemployed and economically disadvantaged. Awards are limited to \$50,000 per agency. Although not required by statute, applicants must provide a 25% cash or kind-kind match to the state funds.

Program requirements for the pregnancy prevention funding under this program is the same as the requirements for the other adolescent pregnancy prevention program administered by DCFS. Criteria for the crisis pregnancy and parenting services are the same as the criteria for the adolescent parent self-sufficiency criteria, except that young parents up to age 25 may be served.

DOH uses the remainder of funds (\$77,600 GPR) to provide grants to two organizations in Milwaukee County for services to address adolescent health issues.

This paper has four attachments. Attachments I and II identify current grant projects funded by the APPPS Board and DHFS, respectively. Attachment III compares state adolescent pregnancy rates for 1992, the most recent year such comparative information is available. Finally Attachment IV provides Wisconsin county data on birth rates to adolescents for calendar year 1995.

GOVERNOR

Transfer all funding and administrative support for the APPPS Board to DHFS and transfer the administrative responsibility for the adolescent self-sufficiency, pregnancy prevention services and CHOICES projects currently administered by DHFS to the APPPS Board, although funding for these programs would remain budgeted within DHFS. Funding and position authority for these transferred positions would be deleted in the 1998-99 fiscal year. Specify that the Board's operating expenses would be paid from a DHFS general program operations appropriation.

In addition, delete the requirement that DHFS allocate not more than \$65,500 annually to provide technical assistance to organizations receiving grants for adolescent services and current statutory references relating to: (a) grants for comprehensive, community-based adolescent demonstration projects, which were previously administered by the Board; (b)

allocations for adolescent pregnancy prevention and pregnancy services administered by the Board in the 1995-97 biennium.

The following table identifies the funding that would be administered by the APPPS Board, but budgeted in DHFS.

Program	Annual Amount
Current APPPS Board projects	\$439,300
Self-sufficiency services	582,100
Pregnancy prevention services	340,000
CHOICES projects	<u>210,000</u>
Total	\$1,571,400

DISCUSSION POINTS

This item involves two primary issues for the Committee to consider: (1) the appropriate role of DHFS and the APPPS Board in administering adolescent pregnancy prevention, pregnancy services and parenting programs; and (2) the extent to which current programs administered by these agencies should be consolidated, either by transferring the administrative responsibilities of similar programs to a single agency, as recommended by the Governor, or by replacing separate grant programs that have similar objectives and project eligibility criteria with a single, broadly-defined program.

Role of DHFS and the APPPS Board in Administering Pregnancy Programs

1. The Governor's recommendation is intended to expand the role of the APPPS Board by increasing the number of programs and funds administered by the Board and achieve administrative efficiencies by drawing upon the staff resources of DHFS to assist the Board in the administration of these programs. This recommendation could be viewed as a first step to improve the administrative coordination between these programs.

2. However, both the Secretary of DHFS and the administrator of the APPPS Board have expressed concerns over the Governor's recommendations and would prefer the current division of responsibilities between the two agencies. DHFS expects that it will be held accountable for the programs that the APPPS Board would administer because funding for these programs would be budgeted in DHFS. Further, transferring administration of prevention programs from DHFS to the APPPS Board may be inconsistent with the administration's efforts to consolidate the state's prevention programs in DHFS.

3. The administrator of the APPPS Board has expressed several concerns over the Governor's recommendations. These concerns include: (a) increased levels of bureaucratic

approvals that would be needed to administer the current APPPS Board program; (b) the role of the APPPS Board would be reduced to approving requests-for-proposals and deciding which projects receiving funding, rather than to provide independent leadership on adolescent pregnancy issues; (c) uncertainty over whether administering staff would be primarily responsible to the Administrator of DCFS or the Chair of the Board (the Executive Director of the Women's Council); and (d) decreased visibility of adolescent pregnancy prevention as an issue.

4. Although the concerns expressed by the affected agencies may have merit, the Committee may wish to consider whether it is desirable to have both DHFS and the Board involved in administering these programs or whether a single agency should assume responsibility for these programs.

5. It is frequently argued that too many state agencies are involved in the administration of numerous, similar state prevention programs, including adolescent pregnancy prevention and substance abuse treatment programs and that it would be desirable to consolidate these programs by: (a) transferring all current programs to a single agency; or (b) replacing these programs with a single, broadly designed program; or (c) both.

6. In its September, 1996, report on the state's prevention programs, the Legislative Audit Bureau (LAB) identified certain advantages and disadvantages of consolidating prevention programs within one agency. Specifically the report indicated that:

- An integrated prevention program could produce a more comprehensive, consistent prevention policy and enhance long-term planning and administrative efficiencies.

- Consolidation of all prevention funds within a larger agency could produce changes in policy as the administration of that agency changes.

- Finally, most state and local staff interviewed for the report indicated that there was some benefit to maintaining multiple administrative agencies in providing prevention services. These staff suggest that having multiple and diverse approaches to prevention is more likely to result in multiple perspectives that lead to useful discussion and debate on prevention policy.

7. Currently, there are two formal structures in place that allow coordination between DHFS and the APPPS Board: (a) a DHFS staff person is a nonvoting member of the APPPS Board; and (b) the administrator of the APPPS Board sits on the DHFS prevention coordination committee which is currently reviewing the delivery of state prevention services.

In addition, DHFS and the APPPS Board have been able to coordinate their respective responsibilities through informal, cooperative efforts. For example, the APPPS Board administrator has participated in the review of DHFS pregnancy prevention program grants and DHFS staff and the APPPS Board administrator have coordinated site visits to grant recipients.

However, establishing formal structures for coordinating activities of the two agencies does not always result in real collaboration, which can only be achieved if both staff and management are committed to it.

8. One argument for retaining the APPPS Board and transferring DHFS programs to the Board is that one agency, with a single focus, would be responsible for administering these programs. Under DHFS administration, adolescent pregnancy prevention and parenting programs may not receive the same focus the Board currently provides for its program. The LAB report indicated that some state and local officials suggested that the consolidation of all prevention funds within one larger agency could result in inadequate attention to issues that may be controversial or exceptionally sensitive, such as adolescent pregnancy prevention.

In addition, the Board's voting members are nominated by statewide organizations that together represent an equal balance of points of view on pregnancy prevention and pregnancy services.

9. One argument that would favor transferring funding and administration of these programs to DHFS is that all prevention services, including adolescent pregnancy prevention, should be delivered in an integrated, community-based system, and that DHFS is the appropriate agency to administer such a system. This approach is based on the belief that a variety of factors influence behaviors in children, and that local communities are best able to assess their needs and target prevention funds towards those needs. Because DHFS serves as the lead state agency for providing services to children and families, it can best administer an integrated community-based prevention program.

10. The APPPS Board, as reviewed by the LAB in April, 1995, has been successful in reducing the number of pregnancies by adolescents participating in programs funded by the Board. The LAB review indicated that 96.8% of participants in APPPS Board-funded projects were able to avoid pregnancy, compared to 91.1% for adolescents in their community for calendar years 1990-1993.

No review has been done of pregnancy prevention programs administered by DHFS. However, in its March 31, 1997, report to the Joint Committee on Audit, DHFS outlined a plan for evaluating DHFS prevention programs. According to that plan, DHFS will be able to report, in 1999, on the effectiveness of its pregnancy prevention programs using data accumulated in 1998.

11. The APPPS Board has targeted its programs to meet needs for pregnancy prevention not served by other programs. For example, the APPPS Board has not targeted its funds to a geographic area based on need, since the programs administered by DHFS are targeted to counties with the greatest need for pregnancy prevention programs. Instead, its funds are available to programs throughout the state.

12. The APPPS Board indicates that an advantage to awarding grants by an independent board is that its award process is open to the public, as required by the open meetings law.

DHFS indicates that its award process is also open to interested parties, because a committee, made up of representatives of interested public and private organizations, reviews applications and makes recommendations to the Administrator of DCFS, who makes the final decision on awards.

13. Finally, there may be administrative cost savings that would result if the APPPS Board program were transferred to DHFS. In its 1997-99 biennial budget submission, DHFS requested that: (a) the APPPS Board funding and staff be transferred to DHFS in 1997-98; (b) administrative funding transferred from the APPPS Board (\$107,000 GPR and 1.50 GPR positions) be deleted in 1998-99; and (c) savings resulting from the elimination of administrative funding be used instead to increase project grants. In its request, DHFS argued that grants for pregnancy prevention and related services can be better coordinated, targeted and administered more efficiently in one agency.

14. If the Committee decides that DHFS should administer the state's pregnancy prevention programs, it could either retain the APPPS Board as an advisory board to DHFS, the Governor and the Legislature, or eliminate the Board entirely.

If the Committee decides that the APPPS Board should administer pregnancy prevention programs, it could either retain the APPPS Board as a separate state agency, attached to DHFS for specific administrative purposes only, or retain the APPPS Board as an independent Board but appropriate funds for grants and administrative support in DHFS, as recommended by the Governor.

Consolidation of Pregnancy Prevention and Pregnancy Services Programs.

15. Under the Governor's bill, two agencies would continue to be involved in the administration of five separate adolescent pregnancy prevention and services programs, each with similar but different purpose and grant eligibility criteria. The Governor's bill would not make changes to these programs other than with respect to the roles of DHFS and the Board in administering them.

16. Under the bill, the adolescent CHOICES projects would be transferred to the APPPS Board. This program addresses adolescent health, sexual assault, substance abuse, career exploration and gender equity issues. These services could encourage avoidance of pregnancy, but the goals of the program are much broader goals than pregnancy prevention. In this way, this program is less similar to the other programs that would be affected under the bill.

In addition, the bill would not transfer the adolescent parent services program and adolescent pregnancy counseling and crisis-pregnancy services to the APPPS Board. These are programs currently administered in DHFS, but have goals and provide services consistent with the programs which would be transferred to the APPPS Board under the Governor's budget recommendations.

Consequently, the Committee could modify the Governor's recommendations by either: (a) retaining DHFS administration of the CHOICES program; or (b) transferring the adolescent parent services and adolescent counseling services program to the APPPS Board.

17. Finally, the Committee could decide to consolidate programs which focus on adolescent pregnancy prevention and adolescent parenting skills development, rather than only transferring the administration of these programs, as recommended by the Governor.

18. These programs could be consolidated by repealing statutory provisions and funding budgeted for the APPPS Board grants, the adolescent pregnancy prevention services grants, and self-sufficiency services into a single grant program. The Committee could require that the administering agency promulgate rules to determine eligibility criteria, but specify that these funds would be provided to public and private agencies to reduce the number of adolescent pregnancies, provide pregnancy counseling and services and adolescent parenting skills development, and require that all grant recipients identify desired outcomes and collect data to determine if those outcomes are achieved during the term of funding.

At its option, the administering agency could be authorized to require grant applicants to provide a match of up to 25% of total project costs, which could be provided as either cash or through in-kind services. Also, the administering agency could be required to stagger the award of grants under the new program to ensure that each year, new projects are funded under the grant cycle. To minimize the effect of these changes on projects that currently receive grants, provisions could be included to enable the administering agency to continue to fund current projects for the specified time periods under the current grant criteria.

Other Considerations

19. *Administrative Staff.* If the Committee chooses to adopt the Governor's recommendations, it could delete the 1.5 GPR positions for the APPPS Board and \$70,200 GPR beginning in 1997-98, rather than 1998-99 as provided in the Governor's budget. However, retaining funding for 1.5 positions in 1997-98 from the APPPS Board would ensure a smoother transition of programs from DHFS to the APPPS Board.

20. *Federal Welfare Legislation -- Incentive Funds.* Under the federal welfare legislation enacted in August, 1996, five states that experience the greatest decline in out-of-wedlock births during the prior two-year period will be eligible for a bonus grant, beginning in fiscal year 1999. The total amount available for these five states is \$20,000,000. States are

eligible for this bonus funding only if the number of abortions performed in the state does not increase above the rate of abortion in federal fiscal year 1994-1995.

21. *Cost Effectiveness of Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Programs.* Providing prevention services to reduce adolescent pregnancies can produce long-term savings of public funds. A recent study by the Robin Hood Foundation indicates that, on average, the public costs of each birth to an adolescent mother is approximately \$3,400, which includes decreased tax revenue, increased costs for public assistance, health care for children, foster care, and criminal justice costs. The study suggests that these costs could be avoided if the mother had waited until she was 20 or 21 years of age before her first child was born.

22. The bill would delete a statutory requirement that DHFS budget \$65,500 annually for technical assistance to organizations that receive grants for adolescent services. This provision was created in legislation that transferred the Choices projects from the Women's Council to the Department, to ensure that DHFS provided technical assistance to providers of adolescent programs following the transfer. DHFS currently budgets 1.0 position and \$43,600 GPR to administer DHFS adolescent pregnancy prevention and parent programs and 0.5 position and \$37,600 GPR to administer the Choices projects and provide technical assistance to providers.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

Administration of Adolescent Pregnancy and Parenting Programs

1. Adopt the Governor's recommendations to: (a) transfer funding and administrative support from the APPPS Board to DHFS and delete \$70,200 GPR and 1.5 GPR positions in 1998-99; (b) authorize the APPPS Board to administer the adolescent self-sufficiency, pregnancy prevention services and CHOICES programs; (c) specify that all incumbent employees holding positions in the APPPS Board be transferred on the bill's general effective date and that these employees would have all the employee rights in DHFS that they enjoyed in the APPPS Board immediately prior to the transfer; and (d) specify that the Board's operating expenses would be paid by a DHFS general program operations appropriation.

2. Modify the Governor's recommendations by adopting any or all of the following:

a. Retain the adolescent CHOICES projects in DHFS.

b. Transfer the adolescent parenting program and the pregnancy counseling, crisis-pregnancy services program from DHFS to the APPPS Board.

c. Delete \$70,200 GPR and 1.5 GPR positions in 1997-98, rather than in 1998-99 as recommended by the Governor.

Alternative 2(c)	GPR
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$70,200

3. *Retain the APPPS Board as an Independent Agency and Transfer DHFS Adolescent Pregnancy and Parenting Programs to the APPPS Board.* Maintain current law as it relates to the status of the APPPS Board as an independent state agency. In addition, transfer the adolescent pregnancy prevention, pregnancy counseling and crisis-pregnancy, self-sufficiency and parent services programs and associated staff and funding (\$43,600 GPR annually and 1.0 GPR position, beginning in 1997-98) from DHFS to the APPPS Board.

Alternative 3	GPR
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$70,200
1998-99 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	1.50

4. *Transfer all Pregnancy Prevention Programs to DHFS and Repeal the APPPS Board.* Adopt the Governor's recommendations to transfer funding from the APPPS Board to DHFS. However, authorize DHFS, rather than the APPPS Board, to administer these programs. Further, repeal the APPPS Board, effective with the bill's general effective date.

5. *Transfer all Pregnancy Prevention Programs to DHFS and Maintain the APPPS Board as an Advisory Board.* Adopt the Governor's recommendations to transfer funding from the APPPS Board to DHFS. However, authorize DHFS, rather than the APPPS Board to administer these programs. Maintain the APPPS Board as an advisory Board to the Secretary of DHFS, the Governor and the Legislature.

6. *Consolidate Grant Programs in DHFS and Repeal the APPPS Board.* Adopt the Governor's recommendations to transfer funding from the APPPS Board to DHFS but authorize DHFS, rather than the APPPS Board, to distribute grants. In addition, consolidate current adolescent pregnancy and parenting programs currently administered by both agencies by: (a) repealing statutory provisions and funding budgeted for the APPPS Board grants (\$439,300 GPR annually), the adolescent pregnancy prevention grant program (\$340,000 GPR annually), self-sufficiency services grants (\$582,100 GPR annually), adolescent parent services (\$100,000 GPR annually), pregnancy counseling and crisis-pregnancy services (\$197,400 GPR annually); (b) providing \$1,658,800 GPR annually in DHFS for an adolescent pregnancy prevention and services and parenting program; (c) require recipients of funding to target high-risk adolescents; (d) require that all grant recipients identify desired outcomes and collect data to report on the achievement of those outcomes during the term of funding provided; (e) require the administering agency to stagger the award of grants over three years to ensure that new funding is available each year; (f) require the administering agency to submit proposed rules by June 1, 1998, to establish the definition of a high-risk adolescent, eligibility criteria, restrictions on use of funds,

MO# Alt 7 p 160

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

2 BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
1 WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS _____

FAIL

MO# Alt #8 p 160

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

2 BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
1 WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 14 NO 2 ABS _____

ADOLESCENT PREGNANCY PREVENTION AND PREGNANCY SERVICES BOARD

Consolidation of Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Programs

Motion:

Move to require the Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS) to submit a plan developed in consultation with the Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention and Pregnancy Services Board, to the Joint Committee on Finance, on specific activities the state will conduct to reduce the state's out-of-wedlock births by federal fiscal year 1998-99 in order to receive federal funds that will be made available to five states that experience the greatest decline in out-of-wedlock births during the two previous years. Require DHFS to submit this plan no later than December 31, 1997.

Note:

Under federal welfare legislation enacted in August, 1996, the five states that experience the greatest decline in out-of-wedlock births during the prior two-year period will be eligible for supplemental federal funds, beginning in federal fiscal year 1998-99. The total amount available for these five states is \$20 million. States are eligible for this supplemental funding if the number of abortions performed in the state does not increase above the rate of abortion in federal fiscal year 1994-95.

[Change to Bill: None]

MO# 1006

JENSEN	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A

2 BURKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS _____

ATTACHMENT I

**The Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention and Pregnancy Services Board
1996-97 Funded Projects**

Hayward Community Schools	Hayward	\$55,770
Lac du Flambeau Public Schools	Lac du Flambeau	55,412
New Opportunities Program c/o Medical College of Wisconsin	Milwaukee	55,770
Community Action, Inc.	Rock and Walworth	67,846
Marshfield Medical Research and Education Foundation	Marshfield	69,193
Silver Spring Neighborhood Center	Milwaukee	69,200
Family Planning Health Services	Wausau	34,228
Family Resource Center	Fond du Lac	27,052
Wisconsin Coulee Region Community Action Program	Westby	<u>7,176</u>
Total		\$441,647

ATTACHMENT II

DHFS Adolescent Pregnancy and Parent Programs 1996-97 Funded Projects

<u>Agency</u>	<u>County or Tribe</u>	<u>Funding</u>
Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention		
New Opportunities Program c/o Milwaukee Medical College	Milwaukee	\$66,116
Milwaukee Indian Health Board	Milwaukee	43,884
Urban League of Racine and Kenosha	Racine	45,000
Menominee Tribe	Menominee	30,000
United Migrant Opportunity Services	Kenosha	45,000
Beloit Health Department	Rock	45,000
Lutheran Social Services of Wisconsin and Upper Michigan	Sawyer	30,000
Tribal Consolidated Family Services		<u>35,000</u>
Total		\$340,000
Adolescent Parent Self-Sufficiency		
Family Services of Milwaukee	Milwaukee	\$100,178
Rosalie Manor	Milwaukee	82,500
Silver Spring Neighborhood Center	Milwaukee	82,728
Seeds of Health	Milwaukee	61,594
Kenosha County Department of Social Services	Kenosha	45,000
Menominee Tribe	Menominee	35,000
City of Racine Health Department	Racine	45,000
Beloit Health Department	Rock	45,000
Lutheran Social Services of Wisconsin and Upper Michigan	Sawyer	35,000
Tribal Consolidated Family Services		<u>50,100</u>
Total		\$582,100
Pregnancy Counseling and Crisis Pregnancy and Parenting		
Kenosha County Department of Social Services	Kenosha	32,904
Sixteenth Street Community Health Center	Milwaukee	32,904
Catholic Social Services	Racine	32,904
Beloit Health Department	Rock	32,904
Rosalie Manor	Milwaukee	36,845
Planned Parenthood	Milwaukee	<u>28,963</u>
Total		\$197,424
Adolescent Parent Services		
Milwaukee Urban League	Milwaukee	50,000
New Concepts	Milwaukee	<u>50,000</u>
Total		\$100,000

ATTACHMENT III

1992 Pregnancies Per 1,000 Adolescent Women By State

<u>State</u>	<u>Women Less Than 15 Years Old</u>	<u>Women Between 15 and 17 Years Old</u>	<u>Women Less Than 18 Years Old</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Women Less Than 15 Years Old</u>	<u>Women Between 15 and 17 Years Old</u>	<u>Women Less Than 18 Years Old</u>
Mississippi	10.9	71.1	82.0	West Virginia	3.2	38.9	42.1
Georgia	10.6	69.6	80.2	Vermont	2.9	38.6	41.5
North Carolina	8.5	68.2	76.7	Wisconsin	3.9	35.3	39.2
New York	8.5	64.8	73.3	Nebraska	3.3	35.4	38.7
Nevada	7.3	65.5	72.8	Minnesota	3.1	31.7	34.8
Texas	6.5	65.7	72.2	Idaho	2.0	32.7	34.7
New Mexico	4.9	66.9	71.8	Maine	2.1	31.9	34.0
Louisiana	8.7	62.1	70.8	Utah	2.5	31.5	34.0
Arizona	5.5	64.5	70.0	Alaska	*	*	*
Alabama	9.1	60.8	69.9	California	*	*	*
Tennessee	7.9	58.8	66.7	Connecticut	*	*	*
South Carolina	7.6	57.7	65.3	Delaware	*	*	*
Arkansas	7.0	56.0	63.0	District of Columbia	30.6	*	*
Hawaii	6.6	56.4	63.0	Florida	*	*	*
Kansas	4.9	53.7	58.6	Illinois	*	*	*
Washington	4.3	54.3	58.6	Iowa	*	*	*
Maryland	7.2	51.3	58.5	New Hampshire	*	*	*
Kentucky	6.0	52.1	58.1	North Dakota	*	26.8	*
Colorado	4.6	52.1	56.7	Oklahoma	*	*	*
Rhode Island	6.2	49.6	55.8	South Dakota	*	36.1	*
Virginia	6.1	49.2	55.3	Wyoming	*	27.0	*
Michigan	5.1	48.1	53.2				
Oregon	4.0	48.8	52.8				
Pennsylvania	6.3	46.5	52.8				
Missouri	4.7	47.0	51.7				
New Jersey	5.8	44.0	49.8				
Ohio	4.5	44.3	48.8				
Massachusetts	4.9	42.4	47.3				
Montana	3.6	43.4	47.0				
Indiana	4.0	42.4	46.4				

*Data Unavailable

Source: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

ATTACHMENT IV

Births to Adolescents, By County, 1995

	Total Births	Births to Mothers Less Than 15 Years old	Births to Mothers Between 15 and 17 Years Old	Births to Mothers Less Than 18 Years Old	Percent of Total Births to Mothers Less Than 18 Years Old
Menominee	92	2	9	11	12.0%
Milwaukee	15,067	111	1,087	1,198	8.0
Langlade	228	-	16	16	7.0
Jackson	189	-	12	12	6.3
Vilas	205	1	12	13	6.3
Racine	2,512	12	135	147	5.9
Sawyer	196	2	9	11	5.6
Kenosha	2,040	4	104	108	5.3
Rusk	192	1	9	10	5.2
Waushara	240	1	11	12	5.0
Barron	550	-	27	27	4.9
Oconto	388	-	19	19	4.9
Juneau	308	-	14	14	4.5
Bayfield	135	-	6	6	4.4
Rock	1,963	8	78	86	4.4
Adams	167	-	7	7	4.2
Kewaunee	218	-	9	9	4.1
Marquette	121	-	5	5	4.1
Richland	196	1	7	8	4.1
Lafayette	176	-	7	7	4.0
Marinette	454	2	16	18	4.0
Douglas	493	-	18	18	3.7
Monroe	529	-	19	19	3.6
Pepin	83	-	3	3	3.6
Polk	470	1	16	17	3.6
Fond du Lac	1,119	-	39	39	3.5
Chippewa	633	1	19	20	3.2
Dodge	947	1	29	30	3.2
Eau Claire	1,118	2	34	36	3.2
Waupaca	619	1	19	20	3.2
Door	254	-	8	8	3.1
Green Lake	192	-	6	6	3.1
Wood	923	-	29	29	3.1
Portage	788	2	22	24	3.0
Brown	2,962	1	85	86	2.9
Dunn	444	-	13	13	2.9%
Forest	137	-	4	4	2.9
Sheboygan	1,336	2	37	39	2.9
Walworth	952	-	28	28	2.9
Florence	36	-	1	1	2.8

ATTACHMENT IV (continued)

Births to Adolescents, By County
1995

	Total Births	Births to Mothers Less Than 15 Years old	Births to Mothers Between 15 and 17 Years Old	Births to Mothers Less Than 18 Years Old	Percent of Total Births to Mothers Less Than 18 Years Old
Marathon	1,585	4	41	45	2.8%
Manitowoc	898	2	21	23	2.6
LaCrosse	1,267	2	30	32	2.5
Lincoln	320	-	8	8	2.5
Shawano	456	-	11	11	2.4
Washburn	168	1	3	4	2.4
Winnebago	1,838	-	44	44	2.4
Burnett	171	1	3	4	2.3
Columbia	607	-	14	14	2.3
Dane	5,023	5	110	115	2.3
Sauk	670	-	15	15	2.2
Ashland	239	1	4	5	2.1
Outagamie	2,056	2	42	44	2.1
Oneida	352	-	7	7	2.0
Pierce	403	-	8	8	2.0
Jefferson	852	-	15	15	1.8
Taylor	221	1	3	4	1.8
Iowa	296	1	4	5	1.7
Vernon	351	1	5	6	1.7
Washington	1,440	-	24	24	1.7
Clark	448	-	7	7	1.6
Waukesha	4,120	2	63	65	1.6
St. Croix	725	3	8	11	1.5
Crawford	215	-	3	3	1.4
Green	390	-	5	5	1.3
Trempealeau	315	-	4	4	1.3
Grant	561	-	7	7	1.2
Calumet	488	-	4	4	0.8
Buffalo	165	-	1	1	0.6
Ozaukee	934	-	6	6	0.6
Price	184	-	1	1	0.5
Iron	63	-	-	0	0.0
Total	67,493	182	2,549	2,731	4.0

Source: Wisconsin Births and Infant Deaths-1995, Center for Health Statistics, DOH.

**ADOLESCENT PREGNANCY PREVENTION
AND PREGNANCY SERVICES BOARD**

LFB Summary Item for Which No Issue Paper Has Been Prepared

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
1	Standard Budget Adjustments