

2001 DRAFTING REQUEST

Bill

Received: **01/09/2001**

Received By: **nelsorp1**

Wanted: **Soon**

Identical to LRB:

For: **Administration-Budget 6-3420**

By/Representing: **Johnston**

This file may be shown to any legislator: **NO**

Drafter: **nelsorp1**

May Contact:

Alt. Drafters:

Subject: **Health - social services
Justice - civil
Courts - miscellaneous
Public Assistance - misc**

Extra Copies: **ISR**

Pre Topic:

DOA:.....Johnston -

Topic:

Legislative review of Kettl Commission report regarding justice services and human services and recommendations

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/1	nelsorp1 01/09/2001	wjackson 01/09/2001	haugeca 01/10/2001	_____	lrb_docadmin 01/10/2001		
				_____	lrb_docadmin 01/10/2001		

/2	nelsorp1 01/10/2001	wjackson 01/10/2001	martykr 01/10/2001	_____	lrb_docadmin 01/11/2001		

FE Sent For:

2001 DRAFTING REQUEST

Bill

Received: 01/09/2001

Received By: nelsorp1

Wanted: Soon

Identical to LRB:

For: Administration-Budget 6-3420

By/Representing: Johnston

This file may be shown to any legislator: NO

Drafter: nelsorp1

May Contact:

Alt. Drafters:

Subject: Health - social services
Justice - civil
Courts - miscellaneous
Public Assistance - misc

Extra Copies: ISR

Pre Topic:

DOA:.....Johnston -

Topic:

Legislative review of Kettl Commission report regarding justice services and human services and recommendations

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/1	nelsorp1 01/09/2001	wjackson 01/09/2001	lrb_wpo				
		1/2 1/10 WLj	Km/10	Hjt Km/10			

FE Sent For:

<END>

2001 DRAFTING REQUEST

Bill

Received: 01/09/2001

Received By: nelsorp1

Wanted: Soon

Identical to LRB:

For: Administration-Budget 6-3420

By/Representing: Johnston

This file may be shown to any legislator: NO

Drafter: nelsorp1

May Contact:

Alt. Drafters:

Subject: Health - social services
Justice - civil
Courts - miscellaneous
Public Assistance - misc

Extra Copies: ISR
6MM

Pre Topic:

DOA:.....Johnston -

Topic:

Legislative review of Kettl Commission report regarding justice and human services and recommendations

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
1/?	nelsorp1	1 wly 1/9	ch 1-a	ch KV 1-a			

FE Sent For:

<END>

Date: January 6, 2001

To: Steven Miller
Legislative Reference Bureau

From: Jennifer Kraus/Jim Johnston
State Budget Office

6-3420

Subject: Drafting request- Kettl Commission - Justice and Human Services

We need a non-statutory provision that would have the legislature determine which human service and justice programs should become a state responsibility and the timetable for state assumption of selected programs, consider what performance outcomes should be required, what entity should deliver the services and how the state would pay for these programs from within the current state shared revenue funding provided to counties. In addition, the legislature should examine if any of these programs can be privatized.

If the drafter has any questions, please have them call either Jim or Jenny. Thank you

Jim J:
Just legislators
Leadership review to report related to J & H.S.
& make recommendations
as to what parts of
the J & H.S. areas now done
by counties should become
state.
No limit on
time to review
& report.

This is a *draft* prepared for discussion among Commission members. The views contained here do not necessarily represent recommendations that the Commission has taken or will take.

D R A F T Version A.1

4. Badger Basics: State aids for counties

Wisconsin's counties have long had a special role in the state-local partnership. Since the state's creation, counties have been administrative arms of the state government. Wisconsin has relied on counties to help keep the peace, provide human service programs, and plan. Counties are the extension of state government. They are the administrative partners in the state's policies.

Among local governments, therefore, counties might be expected to have the smoothest relationships with the state government. In fact, however, tensions have grown, especially in human services programs. Counties are charged with administering state programs. The state funds the programs and requires counties to provide a local match. Counties have long complained that the level of state support is not sufficient to fund its commitments and that they have to dig deep into their taxpayers' pockets to make up the difference. State officials have long complained that county programs are insufficiently accountable. As a result, state-county relationships have become more difficult, and the human services partnership has become one of the most difficult.

The role of counties

The Commission has carefully assessed the role of counties in Wisconsin's state-local governmental system. The Commission believes the following principles ought to guide the role of counties in the 21st century state-local partnership:

- The primary and traditional role of county government in Wisconsin has been to serve as the administrative arm of state government. This role was dictated by the public policy principle that certain revenue should be raised at the state level where there is the greatest ability to equalize taxes. However, some services should be delivered at the local level where there is the greatest accountability and managerial flexibility.

This is a *draft* prepared for discussion among Commission members. The views contained here do not necessarily represent recommendations that the Commission has taken or will take.

D R A F T Version A.1

- Over time, Wisconsin residents have come to expect additional services from counties above those required by the state, particularly in large counties such as Milwaukee County and particularly in the area of quality of life. Such services are regional in nature and include parks, emergency government, economic development and various forms of transportation.
- Under the principles outlined in this report, these county roles will grow in the future. Counties will continue to be an important mechanism for providing local responsiveness for programs of statewide interest. They will undoubtedly play an enhanced role in organizing regional service delivery and functional consolidation.
- Changes in the role of counties will be subtle but important. Through performance-based contracts with the state, counties will be held accountable for every dollar they spend on the state's behalf, and they will therefore have to place even greater priority on innovation, consolidation and managing for results.
- Because of the emphasis placed on regional service delivery and functional consolidation, counties will be required to play an enhanced role in area-wide planning and area-wide service coordination. Counties ought to work hard with their municipal partners in pursuing service integration and functional consolidation.

The Commission believes that these principles ought to apply, in particular, to human services and justice services programs. The Commission has examined these issues, and

66. The Commission has determined that both human services and the state justice services programs should be state responsibilities. Statewide functions, the Commission concludes, should not be funded by the property tax. Hence, as a general principle, the Commission believes that Wisconsin ought to move, as soon as possible, to state funding for these functions.

The plan for doing so follows.

Human services

Human services programs account for a substantial share of the state budget. They form a substantial part of the system that the people of Wisconsin have built to provide for the needs of the state's most needy citizens.

Human services are one of the major functions of state government. Human service programs provide supports, social services, care and treatment for a number of in-

This is a *draft* prepared for discussion among Commission members. The views contained here do not necessarily represent recommendations that the Commission has taken or will take.

D R A F T Version A.1

need populations, which include children and families, disabled, elderly, low income, and those who have mental, alcohol and other drug abuse problems. Many of the programs are truly intergovernmental, involving funding, policy, and service delivery from a multiplicity of federal, state, and local agencies—including at least five state agencies. Among the human service programs the state and counties now administer are: abused and neglected children, children and families programs, delinquent and status offenders programs, child support, income support, W2 job training, long term care for the elderly, physically disabled, and developmentally disabled, drug and alcohol addiction treatment and prevention, and mental health services and treatment.

While the state provides much of the funding for human services, it also requires counties to match state aids. The state's level of investment combined with the counties' contributions very often does not provide the necessary resources to meet client demand. In addition, state courts independently impose their own requirements, especially for juveniles, for those who pass through that system. The result is a human services system that lacks a coherent and consistent set of principles to guide the delicate interplay between expectations, funding, and results.

Principles for human services

The Commission concludes that the system ought to be strengthened to make it more citizen-centered; to make clear the lines of responsibility for effective service delivery; and to improve the system's results. In particular, the Commission lays out the following principles for the state's human service system:

- *Citizen-centered service.* Citizens and consumers must have a voice in the structure and shape of those human services that affect the quality of their lives and their obligations as taxpayers. Decisions on the types and levels of human services that will be funded, administered and provided by government must involve the citizens who receive those services and recognize fiscal constraints facing the state's taxpayers.
- *State-centered responsibility.* State government is responsible for ensuring that the system in fact operates like a *system*. The state ought to frame policy for the state, fund the programs, and ensure effective results. The state also ought to lead a broad debate about the level of service provided—and what level of service is appropriate given the state's ability to pay.
- *Performance-guided management.* Performance, not mandates, ought to guide the system. The existing mandates ought to be removed and replaced with a process that focuses on results. The state ought to purchase *outputs* and *outcomes* instead of focusing on inputs. The state needs to

This is a *draft* prepared for discussion among Commission members. The views contained here do not necessarily represent recommendations that the Commission has taken or will take.

D R A F T Version A.1

measure results to ensure that results, not spending, become the core of the system.

- *Counties as "general contractors."* The Commission believes that the counties can play an important role in strengthening regional governance and service coordination. That role is essential in human services. Moreover, it is important that there be continuity in the service delivery system so that the lives of service recipients are not disrupted by shifts in service providers. Counties can play an important role as "general contractors" and "planning partners," to ensure efficient management and effective coordination of services. Counties ought to be free to subcontract with whatever service providers they believe can do the best job.
- *Cost-effective strategies.* The system ought to promote cost-effective *strategies of care*. In many cases, prevention is both cheaper and more effective than institutionalization. The system ought not have a bias about *who* provides services *how*. On the other hand, the system needs to be focused laser-like on results and how best to serve citizens.
- *Seamless links across the system.* The human services system is not self-contained. It needs to be linked seamlessly to the corrections system and to the judicial branch of government.
- *Information technology to promote seamless services.* An effective system will require a performance-based information system that integrates consumer registration, participation and outcomes. The system must recognize that successful outcomes for individuals and families using human services are intimately linked to their experiences with other government services, such as health, judicial, and employment. Effective information technology will link service providers and make the system more seamless to service recipients.
- *Conflict resolution.* Policy makers and program managers need to develop aggressive strategies for conflict resolution. Creating a truly citizen-centered system requires finding effective ways to resolve disputes between the state and county governments; among neighboring government units; between government and nongovernmental service providers; and between the service system and citizens.

Building a framework for human services

The Commission has viewed with great concern the stress between the state and county governments in human services. The problem grows in part from the mismatch of

This is a *draft* prepared for discussion among Commission members. The views contained here do not necessarily represent recommendations that the Commission has taken or will take.

D R A F T Version A.1

roles inherent in the current funding system. The state has historically relied on counties as its administrative arm to delivery human services. State courts impose their own requirements, especially for juveniles, for those who pass through that system. The state provides much of the funding. It requires counties to match state aids. Counties add their own funding—an “overmatch”—to pay for additional services. Needy individuals contend that the state-county system leaves too many individuals without services. Taxpayers contend that they aren’t sure what good the money buys. It’s a system, in short, straining under heavy demands, deeply rooted conflicts, and a mismatch of responsibilities and funding, of policy decisions and policy execution.

Over the years, this has worsened conflict in the system. State officials worry that they are unsure of what results the counties produce with the state money they spend. County officials argue that they are required to provide state-mandated services without adequate state support.

The Commission’s work is only the first step in improving Wisconsin’s state-local partnership. To get the relationship moving in the right direction requires that a forum or process to bring the local, state, and stakeholder communities together. There is a missing yet fundamental need to come to agreement on the human services system’s overall direction, mission, goals, and strategies. Therefore, the Commission concludes that the state ought to align policy decisions with budget decisions. The state human services system ought to become a genuine *system*, with citizens at the center. In particular, the Commission recommends:

- 67. Starting in 2001, the state ought to create a strategic planning process to determine those human services outcomes the state wishes to produce. This process ought to examine: which outcomes the state seeks; the desired level of these outcomes; who ought to have responsibility for delivering outcomes and how this process ought to work; who ought to pay for which outcomes; and how to hold the process accountable, including how to assess performance. This process ought to be completed by June 30, 2003. It ought to establish a date certain by which the system envisioned by the strategic planning process will be put into place.**

There are several compelling reasons for launching this process:

- Responsibility and accountability are clear and consistent.
- All major tasks are integrated—service delivery standards, policy development, and funding.
- The system would promote consistent treatment and services statewide.

This is a *draft* prepared for discussion among Commission members. The views contained here do not necessarily represent recommendations that the Commission has taken or will take.

D R A F T Version A.1

- Most federal laws hold states primarily responsible for federal human service programs.
- It would align funding with responsibility: property taxes for locally oriented services, state taxes for statewide services.

For this process to be effective, it must involve the governments with the most experience and background in human services. In particular, the state's counties can play a very valuable role in this process. Therefore, the Commission concludes:

- 68. The state and county governments ought to join collaboratively in the statewide strategic planning process. These governments ought to work together to define the outcomes to be sought and the measures by which success in achieving these outcomes will be assessed.**

Justice services

The public expects a high quality of life. Public safety and safe streets are fundamental to the quality of life. Wisconsin's justice system is essential to achieving that goal. The Commission found that the \$2.5 billion state-local justice system, in general, does a good job.

However, the Commission is concerned that overlapping responsibilities create significant inefficiencies in the system. At the state level six agencies and two branches of government have prominent responsibilities. At the local level 72 counties support the system. Within each county, several enforcement agencies contribute as well. Clearly there is overlap in responsibility.

The current roles and responsibilities are generally clear. The state is prescriptive. The counties are administrative. But the Commission believes that aligning responsibilities and funding could significantly improve the system's functioning. The system's finances come from general tax revenues (at both the state and county levels), court fees, and aids provided by the state.

It is important to the integrity of the justice system—and the constitutional right of citizens to equal protection under the law—that the system be applied uniformly throughout the state. Therefore,

- 69. The Commission recognizes that justice is a state function. The justice system ought to treat all citizens in Wisconsin the same. Therefore, the Commission concludes that the state government**

This is a *draft* prepared for discussion among Commission members. The views contained here do not necessarily represent recommendations that the Commission has taken or will take.

D R A F T Version A.1

ought to move, as soon as practical, to full funding of the justice system. The same principles that the Commission has recommended for human services ought to be applied to the justice system: The state ought to purchase outcomes from counties through performance contracts.

Building a performance-based system

The Commission recommends that Wisconsin move to create performance-driven human services and justice services systems. The system ought to focus on outcomes and results, not inputs and formulas.

Staging the transition

The Commission therefore believes that the transition to the new human services and justice systems should be launched in stages. In general,

- 70. The Commission recommends that state expenditures for the county shared revenue program fund the first phase of the transition to state funding for human services and the justice system. The Commission believes quite firmly that no reduction in any part of the county shared revenue program should occur for any purpose but state assumption of the costs of the human services and justice system transition. Moreover, no reduction in any part of the county shared revenue program should occur until the transition to state assumption of these costs.**

In the course of its deliberations, some county officials have expressed the concern that the county shared revenue might end, in whole or part, before the state assumes the cost of programs funded by shared revenue. As a way of strengthening the partnership between the state and county governments, the Commission believes that the shift in funding should occur in good faith, with reductions in county shared revenue occurring only as the state picks up equivalent costs in the human services and justice programs.

Based on the best estimates obtained by the Commission, it appears that the current county costs of these programs exceed the amount of shared revenue now provided the counties. Therefore,

- 71. The Commission proposes that priorities be set to guide the state's transition from a mixed state-county funded system to one that is state-funded and state-led. The Commission suggests that the state assume the costs of programs in the following priority order: circuit court operations; juvenile justice programs that include delinquent**

This is a *draft* prepared for discussion among Commission members. The views contained here do not necessarily represent recommendations that the Commission has taken or will take.

D R A F T Version A.1

and status offenders, including all out-of-home care costs; child welfare programs, including the abused and neglected children program; other justice programs, including the costs of district attorneys and the state's public defender program for indigent defendants; and, finally, other human service programs, as determined in the strategic planning process.

The Commission recommends several initial timelines to guide the transition process:

- 72. The state ought to assume the cost and leadership of circuit court operations on January 1, 2002. Counties are on a calendar-year budget and the Commission believes that this would make the transition more workable.**

Moreover,

- 73. The state ought to assume the cost and leadership of juvenile justice programs on January 1, 2002.**

In human service programs,

- 74. The state ought to assume the cost and leadership of child welfare programs, including the abused and neglected children program, on July 1, 2003.**

Implementing these changes will require carefully planning to minimize adverse effects on state and county revenues and budgets. The Commission proposes the transition to occur over several fiscal years. Managing the transition will require detailed state-county implementation planning. This planning will need to be based on audits of costs and plans for the phase-out of county shared revenue to state funding. Due diligence will be required to ensure that adequate shared revenue is transferred to properly administer the new service delivery system. The Commission reiterates its recommendation that this transition be managed to ensure that all reductions in county shared revenue go immediately into state assumption of these costs.

Managing for performance

The people of Wisconsin deserve a smooth-running, well-coordinated human service system. This system ought to deliver genuine value for the money invested. As a decade of policy innovation in the state has proven, effective human service delivery does not require the government that pays for a program to deliver it. Rather, the government's responsibility is to ensure that whoever can do the job best does the job: to set clear goals and to hold its service partners accountable for results.

This is a *draft* prepared for discussion among Commission members. The views contained here do not necessarily represent recommendations that the Commission has taken or will take.

D R A F T Version A.1

Effective human services depend not only on managing individual programs well. They also depend on the ability of front-line managers to weave together related programs, ranging from day care and transportation to job training and juvenile justice, into a coherent whole. An effective human services system depends on building a citizen-centered system, with a case-management approach that shapes service coordination.

Counties do not need to provide the services themselves. Indeed, in W2 and in many human services programs, counties have contracted out the administration of these programs to nonprofit organizations and for-profit companies. Some counties have chosen to opt out of these programs; in those cases the state has found other “general contractors.” The Commission believes that counties ought to continue to have the right to opt out of the “general contractor” role. The Commission also believes that the broad system of county contracting for human service program delivery ought to continue. In general, however, the Commission concludes that the state ought to shape policy and provide funding; counties ought in general to serve as “general contractor” for their citizens; and that services ought to be provided by whoever can do the job best. This strategy will ensure effective services and ultimately hold elected officials, at both the state and county levels, responsible for results. Therefore, the Commission believes that:

- 75. The state ought to choose the county as the “general contractor” if the county is willing to deliver the outputs defined by the state’s strategic human services plan, at a price mutually agreeable. The principle is that statewide outcomes ought to seek statewide goals and receive state funding; the general contractor’s primary responsibility is to create the network to deliver the services. If any county is uninterested or unwilling to play this role, the state ought to be free to find a different general contractor—another county, a multi-county agency, a nonprofit organization, or a private company. All general contractors ought to be responsible for promoting the integration of related services and for ensuring effective service delivery.**

If one level of government—the state—defines programs and raises money, while another level of government—the counties—takes responsibility for managing programs, how should accountability work? The Commission believes that effective programs depend on building a straightforward connection between policy and management:

- 76. The basic accountability relationship ought to be defined by performance contracts between the state and its county partners. In these annual performance contracts, the state ought to define the outcomes it wishes to purchase. The state and counties ought to negotiate a mutually agreeable price for these services. The**

This is a *draft* prepared for discussion among Commission members. The views contained here do not necessarily represent recommendations that the Commission has taken or will take.

D R A F T Version A.1

counties ought to have flexibility in determining how best to deliver these services, subject to reporting to the state on performance in achieving the state-defined outcomes. Both the price and service expectations ought to be defined by best practices in the Wisconsin human services system.

The performance contracts ought to secure the state's investment and to maximize local discretion:

- 77. The Wisconsin human services system ought to create strong incentives to manage children in the most local, least restrictive, most effective approach. In particular, the state ought to focus, as much as possible, on devoting resources to prevention-based programs at the front end of the process instead of problem-reducing programs on the back end. The state ought to consider a capitation-based model, which would focus on allocating funds to service recipients and then allowing service providers to determine how most effectively to serve them.**

The cornerstone of this system is providing the general contractor with operating flexibility, with accountability secured through an effective performance system.

- 78. If the general contractor can deliver the services at less than the negotiated price, the general contractor ought to keep the balance. If the general contractor spends more money than the negotiated price in delivering the service, it is responsible for paying the balance.**

This performance contract system shifts *who pays* for services: the state government, for services where statewide access to a consistent level of services is a statewide goal. It shifts *how* the system is held accountable to both service recipients and taxpayers: clear contracts will define what outputs the state is buying from the general contractors, how much the services will cost, and how the general contractors will report on the results they produce.

The Commission believes that such a system would both improve the system's results and reduce the tension in the system. Nevertheless, the Commission clearly recognizes the challenges that such a system presents. No state in the nation has gone as far in creating such a clear performance contracting system based on best practices.

To make the system work, the Commission understands that it will require strong information systems and effective managers. In particular,

This is a *draft* prepared for discussion among Commission members. The views contained here do not necessarily represent recommendations that the Commission has taken or will take.

D R A F T Version A.1

- 79. The state Department of Health and Family Services should create a statewide human services information system. This system should collect the basic information needed to secure effective performance-based program management.**

Without such a system, it will be hard to determine what services the state should purchase, what they should cost, and how to assess who benefits. Wisconsin fortunately does not have to build from scratch. Over the years, the state and county governments have gradually been building the elements of such a system. However, the Commission believes that the last elements of the system ought to be put into place. Effective service delivery depends on it.

Making this system work will require building new capacity. The system will create new challenges for state and county officials alike. To meet these challenges, the Commission believes that the state will need to develop an aggressive support system. Many of the pieces of this system already exist, but key elements need further development and broader implementation. In particular,

- 80. The state should encourage the development of a system that: identifies best practices in the delivery of high-performing human service and justice services programs; provides training to state and local officials in creating and managing performance-based systems; and works with both state and local officials to reduce conflict in the system.**

The Commission believes that the last point is especially important. In the course of its work, the Commission has discovered substantial, ongoing conflict among members of the service system. Most of these conflicts can be resolved. But doing so will require strong commitment by all parties to strengthening the state-local partnership. Focusing more on performance than on formulas, the Commission believes, will prove an important first step. However, the Commission also believes that all parties should work diligently to develop new strategies for identifying sources of conflict—and for resolving it.

Summary

Through these recommendations, the Commission believes that the state-local partnership will become stronger. The respective roles of both the state and county governments will be clearer. Funding will be aligned with policy decisions. Programs with true statewide impact will be delivered on a more uniform basis. Performance contracts will hold program managers responsible for the outcomes they produce while giving them far greater flexibility in determining how best to meet them.

This is a ***draft*** prepared for discussion among Commission members.
The views contained here do not necessarily represent recommendations
that the Commission has taken or will take.

D R A F T Version A.1

As a result, the Commission concludes, Wisconsin's citizens—especially the state's most needy and vulnerable citizens—will receive far better services. Wisconsin's taxpayers will get a better deal. And the state-local partnership will be far more effective in delivering services that enhance the state's quality of life, for all citizens.



500N (1/9)
State of Wisconsin
2001 - 2002 LEGISLATURE

LRB-1895/1
RPN.../...
WJ

services

DOA:.....Johnston - Legislative review of Kettl Commission report regarding justice and human services and recommendations

FOR 2001-03 BUDGET - NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION

DO NOT GEN

1 AN ACT ...; relating to: ~~222~~ the budget

Analysis by the Legislative Reference Bureau

COURTS AND PROCEDURE ✓

CIRCUIT COURTS ✓

This bill requests that the Joint Committee on Legislative Organization review the report issued by the Commission on State-Local Partnerships for the 21st Century (Kettl Commission) as it relates to the state aid to counties for human services and justice services. The bill further requests that the committee makes recommendations to the legislature regarding the provision and funding of human services and justice services based on its review of the Kettl Commission report.

The people of the state of Wisconsin, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

2 SECTION 9109. ✓ Nonstatutory provisions; circuit courts.

3 (1) REVIEW OF KETTL COMMISSION REPORT. The Joint Committee on Legislative
4 Organization is requested to review the report issued by the Commission on

1 State-Local Partnerships for the 21st Century as it relates to the state aid to counties
2 for human services and justice services. The committee is requested to make
3 recommendations to the legislature based on that review, including
4 recommendations regarding all of the following issues:

5 (a) Which, if any, human services and justice services should become the state's
6 responsibility.

7 (b) What should be the timetable for any state takeover of any human services
8 and justice services.

9 (c) What performance outcomes should be established for any human services
10 and justice services assumed by the state.

11 (d) What state or local agency or department or other entity should deliver the
12 human services and justice services assumed by the state.

13 (e) How ~~the state~~ would fund any human services and justice services assumed
14 by the state, considering the funds currently available to the counties for these
15 services under the ~~state~~ shared revenue program.

16 (f) Whether any of these human services and justice services should be provided
17 by a private agency or business.

18 (END)



State of Wisconsin
2001 - 2002 LEGISLATURE

LRB-1895/1

RPN:wlj:ch

DOA:.....Johnston - Legislative review of Kettl Commission report regarding justice services and human services and recommendations

FOR 2001-03 BUDGET — NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION

1 AN ACT ...; relating to: the budget.

why circuit courts?

Analysis by the Legislative Reference Bureau

COURTS AND PROCEDURE

CIRCUIT COURTS

This bill requests that the Joint Committee on Legislative Organization review the report issued by the Commission on State-Local Partnerships for the 21st Century (Kettl Commission) as it relates to the state aid to counties for human services and justice services. The bill further requests that the committee make recommendations to the legislature regarding the provision and funding of human services and justice services based on its review of the Kettl Commission report.

The people of the state of Wisconsin, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

2 SECTION 9109. Nonstatutory provisions; circuit courts.

3 (1) REVIEW OF KETTL COMMISSION REPORT. The Joint Committee on Legislative

4 Organization is requested to review the report issued by the Commission on

Do we now cap? Is this a log. ed agency?

1 State-Local Partnerships for the 21st Century as it relates to the state aid to counties
2 for human services and justice services. The committee is requested to make
3 recommendations to the legislature based on that review, including
4 recommendations regarding all of the following issues:

5 (a) Which, if any, human services and justice services should become the state's
6 responsibility.

7 (b) What should be the timetable for any state takeover of any human services
8 and justice services.

9 (c) What performance outcomes should be established for any human services
10 and justice services assumed by the state.

11 (d) What state or local agency or department or other entity should deliver the
12 human services and justice services assumed by the state.

13 (e) How would the state fund any human services and justice services assumed
14 by the state, considering the funds currently available to the counties for these
15 services under the shared revenue program.

16 (f) Whether any of these human services and justice services should be provided
17 by a private agency or business.

18

(END)



D-Note

DOA:.....Johnston - Legislative review of Kettl Commission report regarding justice services and human services and recommendations

FOR 2001-03 BUDGET - NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION

D-Note - I changed the ^{CS}SECTION title to "legislature" instead of "circuit courts"
RPN

DO NOT GEN

1 AN ACT ...; relating to: the budget.

Analysis by the Legislative Reference Bureau head

COURTS AND PROCEDURE STATE GOVERNMENT

~~WIAA~~ CIRCUIT COURTS OTHER STATE GOVERNMENT
SUBHEAD

This bill requests that the Joint Committee on Legislative Organization review the report issued by the Commission on State-Local Partnerships for the 21st Century (Kettl Commission) as it relates to the state aid to counties for human services and justice services. The bill further requests that the committee make recommendations to the legislature regarding the provision and funding of human services and justice services based on its review of the Kettl Commission report.

The people of the state of Wisconsin, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

32

Legislature

2 SECTION 9100. Nonstatutory provisions; circuit courts.

3 (1) REVIEW OF KETTL COMMISSION REPORT. The Joint Committee on Legislative
4 Organization is requested to review the report issued by the Commission on

1 State-Local Partnerships for the 21st Century as it relates to the state aid to counties
2 for human services and justice services. The committee is requested to make
3 recommendations to the legislature based on that review, including
4 recommendations regarding all of the following issues:

5 (a) Which, if any, human services and justice services should become the state's
6 responsibility.

7 (b) What should be the timetable for any state takeover of any human services
8 and justice services.

9 (c) What performance outcomes should be established for any human services
10 and justice services assumed by the state.

11 (d) What state or local agency or department or other entity should deliver the
12 human services and justice services assumed by the state.

13 (e) How would the state fund any human services and justice services assumed
14 by the state, considering the funds currently available to the counties for these
15 services under the shared revenue program.

16 (f) Whether any of these human services and justice services should be provided
17 by a private agency or business.

18 (END)



State of Wisconsin
2001 - 2002 LEGISLATURE

LRB-1895/2

RPN:wlj:km

DOA:.....Johnston - Legislative review of Kettl Commission report regarding justice services and human services and recommendations

FOR 2001-03 BUDGET — NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION

1 **AN ACT ...; relating to:** the budget.

Analysis by the Legislative Reference Bureau

STATE GOVERNMENT

OTHER STATE GOVERNMENT

This bill requests that the Joint Committee on Legislative Organization review the report issued by the Commission on State-Local Partnerships for the 21st Century (Kettl Commission) as it relates to the state aid to counties for human services and justice services. The bill further requests that the committee make recommendations to the legislature regarding the provision and funding of human services and justice services based on its review of the Kettl Commission report.

The people of the state of Wisconsin, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

2 **SECTION 9132. Nonstatutory provisions; legislature.**

3 (1) REVIEW OF KETTL COMMISSION REPORT. The joint committee on legislative
4 organization is requested to review the report issued by the Commission on

1 State-Local Partnerships for the 21st Century as it relates to the state aid to counties
2 for human services and justice services. The committee is requested to make
3 recommendations to the legislature based on that review, including
4 recommendations regarding all of the following issues:

5 (a) Which, if any, human services and justice services should become the state's
6 responsibility.

7 (b) What should be the timetable for any state takeover of any human services
8 and justice services.

9 (c) What performance outcomes should be established for any human services
10 and justice services assumed by the state.

11 (d) What state or local agency or department or other entity should deliver the
12 human services and justice services assumed by the state.

13 (e) How would the state fund any human services and justice services assumed
14 by the state, considering the funds currently available to the counties for these
15 services under the shared revenue program.

16 (f) Whether any of these human services and justice services should be provided
17 by a private agency or business.

18 (END)