

**Minutes**  
**State Board of Social Services**  
**April 20-21, 2005**  
**Law Enforcement and Judicial Complex**  
**245 S. 4<sup>th</sup> Street**  
**Wytheville, VA**

**Members Present**

Julie Christopher, Chair  
Danny Brown, Vice Chair  
Maggi Luca, Secretary  
Robert Spadaccini  
Carol Ann Coryell  
Nettie Simon-Owens  
William (Billy) Mitchell  
Marilyn Rigby

**Members Absent**

Jean Cobbs

**Call to Order**

The meeting of the VA State Board of Social Services was called to order at 9:05 a.m., Chairman Christopher presiding.

**Welcome & Introductions**

Mike Hall, Wythe County Social Services Director welcomed the Board to Wytheville. Mr. Tony Fritz, Western Operations Director provided members with an overview of the area and introduced the following local directors:

Carl Ayers	Floyd County
Eddie Harrison	Russell County
Rex Tester	Tazewell County
Virgil Miller	Smyth County
Linda Nisbet	Montgomery County
Linda Johnson	Bland County
Jim Wallis	Pulaski County
Susan Clark	City of Galax
Carol Brunty	Shenandoah Area
Martha Hall	Richmond County
Dottie Newcomb	Lunenburg County
Rick Verilla	Campbell County
Truman Mullins	Dickerson County
Tom Stanley	Wise County

**Regulatory Review**

Mr. Martin advised that as of April 19, the Department of Social Services has 62 regulations in place. 22 of the 62 are currently in process.

- Of those 62, 14 are in the process of being repealed
- Of those 62, 8 are in the process of being amended
- Of those 62, 3 are under periodic review
- 9 additional new regulations are in the process of being promulgated

That totals 71 regulations and proposed regulations.

Mr. Martin advised there is one regulatory action currently in public comment:

- 22 VAC 40-880, Child Support Enforcement Program, public comment on Notice of Intended Regulatory Action ends on May 18, 2005.

Mr. Martin advised that two regulations have been placed on a temporary hold in order to coordinate their promulgation with the new Assisted Living Facility regulation. They are

- 22 VAC 40-25, Auxiliary Grant Program
- 22 VAC 40-745, Assessment in Adult Care Residences

**Committee of the Whole**

*Spider Demonstration*

Alex Piven, Division of Information Technology provided members with a live demonstration of Spider (Systems Partnering in a Demographic Repository). Spider assists authorized users in their jobs by allowing systems to talk with each other and share data. Spider is currently being piloted in Lynchburg, Fairfax, and Newport News.

Systems that are now in Spider includes ADAPT, Cool, Heat, OASIS, SDX, and VACIS. Systems that are under development are MMIS, DMV, and Harmony. Systems still on the drawing board include APECS, VDC, Work Number, SOIQ/SVES, WOTC, Medicare Part D, APS, Save, and Eligibility Re-determination.

Discussion:

Mr. Mitchell confirmed with Mr. Piven that this system will reduce double-keying. Workers are able to update client data in one system and have it populate over to other systems in Spider.

Mr. Spadaccini questioned when APECS is planned to be functional in Spider. Mr. Piven advised he was not in a position to decide when a system comes on board.

Ms. Simon-Owens questioned whether Mr. Piven anticipated information technology questions at the local level. Mr. Piven advised there will be LDAP password changes. Strong passwords are currently being converted beginning with "A".

Ms. Rigby confirmed that a report from pilot agencies will be done. Mr. Piven advised that a face-to-face meeting will take place on May 4 to discuss local pilot experiences.

Mr. Piven was congratulated on his presentation. Mr. Piven advised that this system was developed at no additional cost to the state and would be free to local agencies.

*Program Improvement Plan (PIP) Update*

Lynette Isbell, Division of Family Services provided members a handout on the Program Improvement Plan. She advised that in order to strengthen Virginia's child welfare system and improve outcomes for our children and families, Governor Warner and the 2005 General Assembly allocated additional general funds to help implement the PIP. With the required 20 percent local match, \$5,819,056 is available.

In order to receive the allocation, local agencies must agree to submit a plan for improvement identifying the outcomes to be addressed; submit a brief quarterly report on progress toward implementing the strategy to meet the targets; return funds not obligated during a mid-year process; and funds can only be used for direct or purchased services. Funds will be reallocated to local agencies if any funds are returned where the 20 percent match can't be met. (A copy of this presentation is included with the original minutes housed at the home office.)

Discussion:

Ms. Rigby confirmed that local agencies must come up with 20 percent match plus additional funds for foster care that were removed by the feds. She felt given these circumstances and the magnitude of PIP; that local agencies are being put at risk to meet the requirements.

Ms. Vicki Johnson-Scott advised that not all children in foster care are IV-E. Feds cut IV-E funds that will be picked up by the state this year; however, locals must cover the difference next year.

She further advised that the state is looking into better utilization of trainers statewide.

Mr. Brown confirmed that if states don't meet the requirements of PIP that financial consequences will be dealt.

Ms. Simon-Owens referred to the chart distributed to members. She suggested not using -0- percent on the chart but rather n/a as the -0- percent was confusing. Ms. Isbell will speak to staff on this. (A copy of this presentation is attached to the original minutes housed in the home office.)

*Structured Decision Making Presentation (SDM)*

Ms. Isbell and Rick Rebosh provided an overview to Board members. Structured Decision Making is a new approach to child protection. It is a comprehensive case management model that structures critical decisions from intake to reunification. Mr. Rebosh advised the assessment system is research-based and evaluations show the system reduces harm and expedites permanency. Benefits of SDM for workers include methodology; clear expectations; guidance; support; effectiveness; and enhanced professionalism.

Discussion:

Ms. Coryell referred to the "age 8" listed on the handout and asked how this number was decided. Mr. Rebosh advised there was no magical age number used; the age 8 was decided through general consensus.

Ms. Isbell advised that 30 pilot agencies were trained; however, CRC training is very expensive. In the future, staff in Virginia will need to co-train with CRC, mentioning VISSTA as a good avenue to use if this goes statewide.

Mr. Spadaccini questioned the future of statewide implementation. Ms. Isbell advised she would recommend it. The pilot agencies have embraced CPS but have not engaged foster care workers as should have done. She is in hopes that additional funds will be given to implement this statewide.

Mr. Spadaccini questioned the price tag for statewide implementation. Ms. Isbell advised she did not know.

Ms. Coryell stated there is a percentage of human error in the diagnosis of risk cases and asked if Mr. Rebosh knew what that percentage was, he advised he was not able to answer that question.

**Public Comment**

*Linda Nisbet*, Montgomery County Department of Social Services provided the following public comment:

Good Afternoon:

I would like to address you on an issue that has become too near and dear to the hearts of local directors – funding. We would rather concentrate on services, but this is becoming a luxury.

Except for the amount needed to support state determined raises, local social service agencies have had no increase in our administrative budgets for fifteen years.

The funds that would purchase employee benefits, gasoline, office equipment, utilities and paper in 1990 are just not adequate in 2005. In spite of radically rising caseloads (the food stamp caseload has risen 20 percent in 18 months) we have no funds to hire additional staff. Now we have the demands of the child welfare program improvement plan or PIP and have received only 18 percent of the funds we need to address those demands.

We worry that, having allocated approximately \$5 million for the PIP, the General Assembly will feel that they have done their part for us and will be deaf to further pleas for funding. \$5,000,000, if divided equally by 120 agencies, equals approximately \$41,600 per agency. Naturally, it has not been divided equally, because that makes no sense. The amount that the large majority of agencies get will not fund even one part-time employee.

I have been proactive as a member of the state/local team on various work groups and as a member of the League of Social Service Executives, yet I am now in the position of working for mere survival of my agency. We have already cut the number of staff that is allowed to join their state professional organizations at agency expense, we have withdrawn participation in some statewide task groups and we had to refuse participation in the Business Process Re-engineering project because we are struggling to meet daily work schedules. I note that in the Commissioner's monthly report to local directors that came out last week we were told that the Food Stamp error rate has increased and that the state is planning payment accuracy initiatives and "refresher training". We are struggling to meet 120 percent of the demand with not even 100 percent of workers due to turnover that is attributable to stress and low salaries. Refresher training will only take more of the time that we need to work cases. What we need is not more training, but more staff.

We were also invited in that same newsletter to collaborate with community groups in the Governor's early learning blitz. I am a strong advocate of early learning. If I had to choose only one service for communities it would be universal, developmental day care for children. My agency will not be joining in collaborative efforts for early learning. We are spending our efforts meeting Child Protection time lines and coping with the many teen foster children that we get from the courts for lack of other available services for them. We have also seen a rise in Adult Protective Services cases.

Please believe that I am an ardent proponent of best practices. My agency is a pilot agency for concurrent planning for foster children, and PRIDE training for resource/foster homes. We also have a grant to begin an adult foster care program. We would have loved to pilot structured decision making too, but were not allowed to take that on. I am a believer in a great deal of worker training and in the necessity of partnership between state and local staff and the community to address challenges that we face.

But I am now so concerned with squeezing through the year fiscally that I have to weigh everything against that concern. Service to our customers is still my primary concern, but that means sacrificing travel and training and some community collaborative efforts. This year for the first time we are having to consider postponing some services to the least critical Child Protection cases until the next fiscal year. We are out of purchase of service funds and our request for more funds in that line item has not yet been addressed. Service pass-through funding cannot be used for purchase even if my locality were willing to put up the 87.5 percent local match that is needed for service pass-through funding.

I ask for your help. We need for you to address any member of the General Assembly that you are able to reach on the real need for adequate funding of both benefit program staff and service staff.

We need for General Assembly members to be aware that we have had no administrative increase for 15 years and that all caseloads are increasing. Your advocacy would be truly appreciated.

I was asked by Western Regional Directors to address one other issue – though in fact it may also be a funding issue. When the state has given raises over the past several years, it does so by deleting the bottom steps of the reimbursable salary range and adding to the top step. What that means is that although workers get a raise, they remain on step one of the salary range. New workers are hired on step one also. The result is salary compression, with new workers being hired at the same salary that a five-year veteran is making. Without local funding to put workers on a higher pay level, regardless of training, ability, or longevity. I realize that this is an attempt to keep DSS salaries somewhere close to a realistic range, but we need to compensate trained workers if we want to keep them. If we cannot have a study to determine what salaries really should be, we would at least appreciate pay raises that truly allow workers to progress in their pay compared to those hired after them.

Thank you, I will answer your questions.

*Carol Brunty*, Shenandoah Social Services spoke about the Day Care policy change the Board made at the December meeting regarding the previous requirement to make applicants of day care apply for child support enforcement.

She talked about 36 cases with questionable child support. She stated that when people were required to register with child support enforcement, many of them asked that their application be dropped. Follow up showed that men were living in these homes with their wives.

I ask that you consider changing the deletion of this policy requirement to ensure clients pay what they can.

This policy changed without local agencies being made aware of the change. We found out from the Minutes. I ask that you make this a requirement statewide or give localities the option to make clients register for support enforcement.

### **VLSSE Update**

Susan Clark welcomed the Board to Wytheville. She stated that local directors agreed that Commissioner Conyers' remarks were refreshing.

She stated she was pleased that local directors now have a comprehensive HR Manual.

Ms. Clark advised that directors are anxious over the implications of Medicare part D, perceived as under staffing because there is no workload model. The League is working with the departments of social services and medical assistance services on this.

She advised the League is committed to working with the department and Board.

Ms. Coryell thanked Ms. Clark for her letter sent to Board members.

### **Commissioner Comments**

Chairman Christopher introduced and welcomed Commissioner Conyers to the Board meeting. (Ms. Christopher read the Commissioner's bio to members.)

Commissioner Conyers stated it was a pleasure to be at the meeting and participate with the Board.

He said these are exciting, yet challenging times in Virginia. His job is to help provide leadership to the Department of Social Services in Virginia. He remarked that DSS has a strong system mission and pledges his commitment; challenging everyone to live that system and mission.

He commented that in the past, funding issues have had unintended consequences of dividing us. We need to look at getting the fair share of resources at the local and state level to get the job done, reminding us that state and local social services have the same mission. He stated that our goal is to work together, stating that we can address problems more effectively together than separately.

He advised we must find a swift and fair solution to IV-E issues in the Commonwealth, but not at any cost; there are principles involved as well. He also said that we need to address the negative impact Medicare D and rising caseloads will have on local agencies.

We need to continue to lobby for additional funds because family and children needs continue. Business processing is one way to address this need. We need to develop technological changes that support our processes and not drive them.

We must also seek community solutions to community problems because one size does not fit all. He also said that CAP agencies are being under utilized and he pledges to increase their use.

In conclusion, he stated that our legacy will be our mission of People Helping People. That's what we do and how we should be judged.

Members of the Board and local directors applauded his remarks.

#### **Action Items**

Mr. Spadaccini advised he wished to disclose his employment prior to the Child Support Presentation although the Assistant Attorney General Al Wilson did not believe that this was necessary as the action item was not directly related to Mr. Spadaccini's employer. Mr. Spadaccini stated that he is employed with MAXIMUS Incorporated and although his work has no relationship with Virginia as it is outside of the Commonwealth boundaries that MAXIMUS operates full service Child Support offices and Call Centers for states throughout the United States. He has been advised by Mr. Wilson that he can speak to and vote on the Child Support request to privatize customer services.

Nick Young, Deputy Commissioner for Child Support Enforcement provided information on privatizing DSS/DCSE customer services and asked members to approve his request to privatize this area.

#### **Discussion:**

Mr. Spadaccini asked about the history of repeat callers. Mr. Young advised he did not know the percentage; however, 69 percent are first-time callers. The length of some calls keep other calls from being answered in the current operations. He advised that vendors would resolve calls within 4-5 minutes and performance standards will be in place to measure performance. Experts in child support will be hired by the vendor to resolve 90 percent of the problems.

Ms. Christopher asked how the two other privatized agencies are working out. Mr. Young advised they are fairing well.



Mr. Brown said this request has a lot of potential and asked about the contract duration. Mr. Young advised the call center will be in south side or southwest Virginia and will run for 2-3 years with option to renew. He promised to report regularly to the Board on how the call center is operating.

Mr. Mitchell referred to the cost chart and asked how this fee will be covered since Mr. Young will not lose any of the 90 employees. Mr. Young said DCSE has \$10 million in the bank now and feels collections will continue as they are to support this effort. It takes investing dollars to make dollars.

Ms. Luca questioned if an evaluation plan was in place. Mr. Young advised he is writing the proposal now and will provide a copy to members. Adjustments can be made to the contract. He reported that many other states are using call centers with great success giving state staff time to work cases.

Mr. Spadaccini asked if the expectation was to have the Call Center staff taking an enforcement action on the case and Mr. Young confirmed that vendors will handle the calls and refer changes to state staff to update or initiate needed enforcement actions.

Ms. Coryell asked for clarification about day care policy and child support referred to by Ms. Brunty in public comment.

Ms. Simon Owens questioned the timeline associated with privatizing customer services. Mr. Young advised it would be close to one year due to the state procurement guidelines.

***ON MOTION DULY MADE (Mr. Brown) and seconded (Ms. Simon-Owens) moved to privatize DSS/DCSE customer services. Motion carried with all in favor.***

*22 VAC 40-100 Minimum Standards for Licensed Child Care Institutions  
Periodic Review*

Mr. Richard Martin advised this action will complete the periodic review of this regulation as required by Executive Order 21 (2002). The department recommends that this regulation be retained with no change.

Discussion:

Mr. Spadaccini inquired how many institutions fall in this range, who are they, and where are they located. Mr. Martin will provide this information.

***ON MOTION DULY MADE (Mr. Spadaccini) and seconded (Ms. Coryell) moved to approve the Periodic Review Report for submission to the Department of Planning and Budget and the Secretary of Health and Human Resources as required by the provisions of Executive Order Number 21 (2002) (changes are prohibited by law). Motion carried with all in favor.***

*22 VAC 40-160 Fee Requirements for Processing Applications  
Periodic Review*

Mr. Martin advised this action will complete the periodic review of this regulation as required by Executive Order 21 (2002). The department recommends that this regulation be retained with no change.

Discussion:

Mr. Spadaccini asked how the fees charged by other states compare to Virginia's rate. Mr. Martin will have staff share this information with members.

Mr. Spadaccini inquired when the current rate was established. Mr. Martin advised it was in 1992.

Mr. Spadaccini confirmed that training costs have had multiple increases since 1992 and asked why the department did not recommend a raise to the rate. Mr. Martin advised that Virginia was not recommending a rate increase due to the increased requirements on all licensees.

***ON MOTION DULY MADE (Mr. Brown) and seconded (Ms. Simon-Owens) moved to approve the Periodic Review Report for submission to the Department of Planning and Budget and the Secretary of Health and Human Resources as required by the provisions of Executive Order Number 21 (2002). Motion carried with all in favor.***

*22 VAC 40-41 Neighborhood Assistance Tax Credit Program  
Notice of Intended Regulatory Action*

Mr. Martin advised this regulatory action will begin the process to amend this regulation. The purpose of this action is to ensure the availability of tax credits and their equitable distribution among approved projects. Also, amendments are being proposed to ensure fairness in the valuation of certain donated items and to improve the process for determining eligibility of organizations applying to participate in the program.

Discussion:

Mr. Spadaccini referred to page 3 of the Town hall document (2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph-last sentence) and questioned whether the department is considering exceptions prior to approving the regulation.

Mr. Martin advised that the department did not want to lock into 60 percent. This will be done at the final stage of the regulation rather than at the NOIRA stage.

***ON MOTION DULY MADE (Mr. Spadaccini) and seconded (Ms. Simon-Owens) moved to approve the Notice of Intended Regulation Action package to amend 22 VAC 40-41-10 et seq., Neighborhood Assistance Tax Credit Program for publication in the Virginia Register subject to approval under the provisions of Executive Order Number 21 (2002). Motion carried with all in favor.***

*22 VAC 40-80 General Procedures and Information for Licensure  
Notice of Intended Regulatory Action*

Mr. Martin advised this action will begin the process to amend 22 VAC 40-80-10 et seq., General Procedures and Information for Licensure. The purpose of this action is to implement changes included in the assisted living facility legislation adopted by the 2005 General Assembly.

Discussion:

Mr. Spadaccini referred to page 2 of the Town hall mentioning this section appears vague and not detailed as previous regulations. Mr. Martin advised that Secretary Jane Woods has requested in-depth involvement with provider groups. Meetings will take place in August and will have a better idea of areas that are to be changed.

Mr. Al Wilson, Assistant Attorney General advised that vague language is needed at this point as department staff is still conversing over how relationships between courts and the department are to be established.

***ON MOTION DULY MADE (Ms. Coryell) and seconded (Mr. Spadaccini) moved to approve the Notice of Intended Action package to amend 22 VAC 40-80-10 et. seq., General Procedures and Information for Licensure for publication in the Virginia Register subject to approval under the provisions of Executive Order Number 21 (2002). Motion carried with all in favor.***

*22 VAC 40-191, Background Checks for Child Welfare Agencies  
Exempt Final Adoption*

Mr. Martin advised this regulatory action will amend 22 VAC 40-191-40, 50, and 90, Background Checks for Child Welfare Agencies. The amended regulation implements House Bill 2744 that was approved by the 2005 General Assembly. The amendments require child-placing agencies to consider the results of background checks of a birth parent prior to placing that parent's child, who is in a foster care placement, with the birth parent.

Discussion:

None

***ON MOTION DULY MADE (Ms. Simon-Owens) and seconded (Mr. Spadaccini) moved to approve the exempt final regulatory package for publication in the Virginia Register subject to approval under the provisions of Executive Order 21 (2002) and the Administrative Process Act. This regulatory action may become effective 30 days after publication. Motion carried with all in favor.***

*22 VAC 40-771, Local Department Approved Provider Standards, and 22 VAC 40-770, Standards and Regulations for Agency Approved Providers  
Withdraw Proposed Regulation and Repeal*

On October 22, 2003, the Board approved a proposed new regulation, 22 VAC 40-771, Local Department Approved Provider Standards, and the proposed repeal of the existing regulation, 22 VAC 40-770, Standards and Regulations for Agency Approved Providers. Those proposed regulations were published in the Virginia Register on August 9, 2004 and public comment was received until October 8, 2004.

The extensive public comment revealed that individuals had concerns about the regulation in relation to specific areas. The three affected program areas (child care, adult services, and permanency) are drafting separate regulations. Members were asked to withdraw the proposed action to establish 22 VAC 40-771, and to repeal the existing regulation 22 VAC 40-770.

Discussion:

Mr. Spadaccini questioned if the department incorporated public comment. Mr. Martin advised it would be a dramatic change to incorporate all the necessary changes due to public comment received. He further stated that we've lost a year and a half, but thinks this will be the best avenue to create the best public policy.

Mr. Spadaccini confirmed with Mr. Martin that the department's opinion to leave this regulation as is for 12 months is best. Mr. Martin further advised that the local agencies feel it is the best decision.

Ms. Simon-Owens commented that it is important to hear and listen to public comment and appreciated that staff understood this importance.

***ON MOTION DULY MADE (Mr. Brown) and seconded (Ms. Coryell) moved to withdraw the proposed action to establish 22 VAC 40-771, Local Department Approved Provider Standards, and to repeal the existing regulation 22 VAC 40-770, Standards and Regulations for Agency Approved Providers, that was published in the Virginia Register on August 9, 2004. Motion carried with all in favor.***

*22 VAC 40-771, Adult Services Approved Providers and 22 VAC 40-770, Standards and Regulations for Agency Approved Providers  
Notice of Intended Regulatory Action*

Ms. Vicki Johnson-Scott apologized that a year and a half had been lost but felt it was important to re-craft the regulation due to public outcry.

This regulatory action will begin the process to repeal 22 VAC 40-770 and to promulgate a new regulation 22 VAC 40-771. The current regulation includes generic provisions that apply to all providers approved by local departments of social services, including adult services, child care, foster care, and adoptive home providers. Because of the uniqueness of each type of provider, such a format is not longer effective.

The new regulation will address only providers contracted through the adult services program. Separate regulations will be proposed for child care and permanency providers.

Discussion:  
None

***ON MOTION DULY MADE (Mr. Spadaccini) and seconded (Ms. Coryell) moved to approve the Notice of Intended Regulation Action package to repeal 22 VAC 40-770-10 et seq., Standards and Regulations for Agency Approved Providers and to promulgate a new regulation 22 VAC 40-771-10 et seq., Adult Services Approved Providers to publication in the Virginia Register subject to approval under the provisions of Executive Order Number 21 (2002). Motion carried with all in favor.***

*22 VAC 40-211, Resource, Foster and Adoptive Family Home Approval Standards Notice of Intended Regulatory Action*

This regulatory action will begin the process to establish 22 VAC 40-211. The purpose is to adopt a new regulation specific to the approval requirements for resource, foster and adoptive family homes providers approved by local departments of social services. The new regulation will include many of the provisions from 22 FAC 40-770. The new regulation will ensure compliance with changes to federal and state laws and regulations regarding resource, foster, and adoptive family homes.

Discussion:  
Ms. Coryell questioned why they were against training. Ms. Johnson-Scott said this was a staffing issue. Since we did not get the \$26 million we decided to go back and review this area.

***ON MOTION DULY MADE (Mr. Mitchell) and seconded (Ms. Simon-Owens) moved to approve the Notice of Intended Regulation Action package to establish 22 VAC 40-211-10 et seq., Resource, Foster and Adoptive Family Home Approval Standards for publication in the Virginia Register subject to approval under the provisions of Executive Order Number 21 (2002). Motion carried with all in favor.***

*22 VAC 40-90, Regulation for Criminal Record Checks for Assisted Living Facilities and Adult Day Care Centers  
Exempt Final Adoption*

This action will amend 22 VAC 40-90-10 et seq., Regulation for Criminal Record checks for Assisted Living Facilities and Adult Day Care Centers. The amended regulation implements House Bill 2512 and Senate Bill 1183 that were approved by the 2005 General Assembly.

The amendments requires Commissioner to not issue a license to an assisted living facility if the applicant is found to have committed certain offenses as defined in statute.

Discussion:  
None

***ON MOTION DULY MADE (Mr. Spadaccini) and seconded (Ms. Simon-Owens) moved to approve the exempt final regulatory package for publication in the Virginia Register subject to approval under the provisions of Executive Order 21 (2002) and the Administrative Process Act. This regulatory action may become effective 30 days after publication. Motion carried with all in favor.***

**Office Tour**

Mike Hall provided a tour of his office facilities prior to members attending a reception.

Recessed at 3:52 p.m.

**Thursday, April 21, 2005**

Meeting was reconvened by Vice Chair Danny Brown at 9:06 a.m.

*Local Agency Manual*

Phyllis Sisk, Interim HR Director advised that in 2002, the Virginia Department of Social Services' Division of Human Resource management and the Virginia League of Social Services Executives' Personnel Committee embarked on a concerted effort to standardize personnel processes for local Departments of Social Services. The passage of the Regulation in August 2003 by the State Board served as the impetus for the initiation of a total revision of the Human Resource Management Policies and Procedures manual (Vol. 1-A).

Ms. Sisk stated the Manual was developed as a result of the intense collaboration of partners and is a testament to the dedicated commitment to develop a structured, yet flexible, set of human resource polices for local agencies t follow the State's human resource policies and procedures.

The following people were recognized as having partnered on this effort:

DSS HR Staff  
Phyllis Sisk, Acting Director  
Sandra Fox  
William Griffin  
Harold Hobson  
Charles Knighton  
Bonnie Minson

League Personnel Committee  
Martha Hall, Chair  
Susan Clark  
Judy Cole  
Don Driver  
Sharon Fisher  
James Howard  
Lorraine Lemoine  
Dotty Newcomb  
Paul Oswell  
Jan Selbo  
Rick Verilla  
Betty Wells

Phyllis C. Katz, Attorney with Sands Anderson Marks and Miller served as facilitator.

Al Wilson, Assistant Attorney General also provided his expertise.

***ON MOTION DULY MADE (Ms. Coryell) and seconded (Mr. Brown) moved to approve the Manual as presented effective July 1, 2005. (Motion carried after tabled motion below failed.)***

***ON MOTION TO TABLE (Mr. Mitchell) and seconded, moved to table the original motion since many of the members received the information late and had not had time to give it a thorough review. Vote: ayes-Ms. Rigby, Mr. Mitchell, and Ms. Simon-Owens; nay- Mr. Spadaccini, Ms. Coryell, Mr. Brown, Ms. Luca, and Ms. Christopher. Motion to table failed. (Refer back to the original motion.)***

Discussion:

Ms. Luca questioned why this document was mailed so late. Commissioner Conyers advised the agency made the decision due to changes in the cover memo.

***Approval of Local Departments of Social Services Employee Salary and Compensation with Contingency.***

Ms. Sisk advised that the CODE requires the State Board of Social Services to approve employee and salary compensation exceeding the State reimbursable salary range maximum. HR has received Compensation Plans from local departments of social services who have one or more employees whose salaries exceed the State's reimbursable salary range for their respective classifications at some point during the fiscal year.

These include Amherst; Bath; Buchanan; Charles City; Greenville/Emporia; Madison; Montgomery; Rappahannock and Surry County.

Discussion:  
None

***ON MOTION DULY MADE (Mr. Spadaccini) and seconded (Ms. Simon-Owens) moved to approve the requests from Amherst, Bath, Buchanan, Charles City, Greenville/Emporia, Madison, Montgomery, Rappahannock and Surry Count to exceed the State reimbursable salary range maximum with the understanding that the increase shall be paid wholly form the funds of such county or city and any federal funds that are available and appropriate for use. Motion carried with all in favor.***

**POSSESS Resolution**

Secretary Maggi Luca read the following Resolution:

Whereas, Social services Office Service Support Employees in Virginia promote interoffice efficiency, productivity, and continually provide coordination and support in all areas of Administration, Eligibility and social Work; and

Whereas, Office Services Support Employees in Social Services consistently demonstrate the spirit of cooperation, the partnership and teamwork necessary to work together for the common good of serving the diverse population of Virginians in need; and

Whereas, as an integral part of Social Services, office services support employees are the initial contact for the families in Virginia requesting services, utilizing all major systems to effectively provide valuable assistance to their employers, customers and all the people of Virginia; and

Whereas, Office Services Support Employees in Social Services have proven to be a vital component in the technical progress in the use of automation in Social Services; providing technical assistance, support and advice to users; planning, coordinating and implementing the organization's information security; and

Whereas, Office Services Support Employees in Social Services perform their duties admirably with diplomacy and dedication, providing stability and demonstrating a high level of performance and caring in executing policies and procedures under complex circumstances; and

Whereas, Office Services Support Employees in Social Services continually meet the challenges of a constantly changing environment in all areas of Social Services, insuring job functions are handled in an accurate and timely manner.



NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the State Board of Social Services does hereby commend all office services support employees in Social Services across the Commonwealth of Virginia for a job well done and recognizes the week of April 25-29, 2005 as Office Services Support Employee Appreciation Week, calling upon all Virginians to join in acknowledging their public service and contributions this the 20<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2005.

*ON MOTION DULY MADE (Mr. Spaaccini0 and seconded (Ms. Simon-Owens) moved to approve the Resolution recognizing the week of April 25-29, 2005 as Office Services Support Employee Appreciation Week, calling upon all Virginians to join in acknowledging their public service and contributions this the 20<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2005. Motion carried with all in favor.*

**Virginia Caregivers Resolution**

Read by Secretary Maggi Luca for Board approval

Whereas; The majority of personal care provided in Virginia's adult day are centers, assisted living facilities, nursing homes, and private homes is delivered by direct care workers; and

Whereas: These individuals deliver compassionate and quality care to adult Virginians of all ages who need some level of assistance; and

Whereas: These individuals are not always appreciated and rewarded commensurate with their contributions to the health, safety, and well-being of consumers and t the peace of mind to consumers' families, and

Whereas; Each of us may need the assistance of a direct care worker at some point in our lives; and

Whereas; The importance of these caregivers to the quality of life of Virginians, the economy, and other aspects of our society often goes unnoticed; and

Whereas; The Virginia General Assembly has, commencing July 1, 2005, established the second Wednesday of each June to recognize and honor the contributions of direct care workers; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the State Board of Social Services recognizes the contributions of and pays tribute to direct care workers and members of other professions that provide long term care services; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: That, on June 8, 2005, the State Board of Social Services invites consumers, their families, facility owners, and other citizens of the Commonwealth to join the Board in honoring direct care workers and members of other professions that provide dedicated assistance and health care to enhance the quality of life of adults in Virginia who receive long term care services.

*ON MOTION DULY MADE (Ms. Simon-Owens) and seconded (Ms. Rigby) moved to approve the Resolution in honoring direct care workers and members of other professions that provide dedicated assistance and health care to enhance the quality of life of adults in Virginia who receive long term care services. Motion carried with all in favor.*

### **Legislative Report**

Mr. Martin provided a handout to members for their review. A copy of this report is attached to the official minutes housed at the home office.

Mr. Martin advised that copies of this year's legislative studies will be provided to the Board at their meetings as the studies are completed.

Mr. Spadaccini commented on the JLARC Study and asked what the take was on how the department is doing operationally. Mr. Martin advised they have been very open and thinks a good report will be forthcoming.

Mr. Martin advised that the JLARC Legislative Studies should be available at the October or December meeting. He will contact JLARC about providing a presentation on their findings. Mr. Martin advised that Karin Clark, from his office, is managing the studies.

He further stated that the 2006 legislative process begins next month and will be soliciting a shopping list from the department in May. He and the Commissioner, along with other leadership, will meet in June to discuss. If members of the Board have a particular concern on an issue, please let him know before the end of May.

### **Minutes**

February 16 Minutes

Mr. Brown stated his intent to incorporate approval for both minutes. Mr. Spadaccini stated his desire to have them voted on separately as he would be abstaining from voting on the minutes from the March 16<sup>th</sup> workshop as he was unable to attend. Ms. Coryell concurred with the request as she would be abstaining also.

***ON MOTION DULY MADE (Mr. Brown) and seconded (Mr. Spadaccini) moved to approve the Minutes as presented from the February 16, 2005 meeting. Motion carried with all in favor.***

March 16 Minutes

***ON MOTION DULY MADE (Mr. Brown) and seconded (Ms. Simon-Owens) moved to approve the Minutes as presented from the March 16, 2005 meeting (Mr. Spadaccini and Ms. Coryell abstained as they were not present at this meeting). Motion carried.***

Members thanked Ms. Rengnerth for providing comprehensive minutes.

### **Future Meetings**

Board meets in Halifax	June 15-16
Board meets in Portsmouth	August 17-18
Board meets in Warrenton	October 19-20
Board meets in Chesterfield/Col. Heights	December 14-15

Mr. Martin advised that Albemarle County is interested in hosting a Board meeting in 2006.

### **Unfinished Business**

Ms. Christopher advised she had attended the CPS Conference on April 4. This was a very informative conference.

Ms. Christopher reminded members that a copy of the ALF Meeting Matrix was sent out with their packets. She thanked Lynn Williams and Pat Rengnerth for their assistance with development of the matrix and information sharing. She also advised we are moving forward in a collaborative effort, meeting with Secretary Woods and providers.

Mr. Martin advised that Secretary Woods will join the Board at their August Meeting.

Ms. Vicki Johnson-Scott provided the CPS Blue Ribbon Campaign Packet to members.

### **New Business**

Nominating Committee Appointment

Maggi Luca, Marilyn Rigby, and Jean Cobbs will serve as members of this committee.

Ms. Luca will serve as Chair.

### **Committee Reports**

The CPS OOF Committee met in March. A copy of the minutes will be emailed to members.

**Board Comments**

Ms. Coryell thanked Mr. Hall for his hospitality and hosting the meeting. She commented she had seen many problems with their office during the visit and hoped funds could be found to do the necessary repairs. She also thanked local directors for attending the meeting. Ms. Coryell advised that her last meeting will be in June.

Mr. Mitchell thanked Mr. Hall and staff for their hospitality. He welcomed Commissioner Conyers, stating the department faces many challenges. He felt the “ship” was in good hands and will stay afloat under the guidance of Commissioner Conyers.

He further advised that local agencies find themselves in difficulty which requires a special hand to negotiate. This can’t be handled through management alone—resources are needed and requires long term commitment. Perseverance and persistence is needed and the Board needs to play a constructive and affirmative role providing more resources. He pledged to dedicate his remaining time on this Board to assist.

Ms. Simon-Owens thanked Mr. Hall for providing the agency tour, hosting the meeting and reception. She congratulated Commissioner Conyers on his appointment and advised the next meeting will be held in Halifax.

Mr. Spadaccini spoke to the comments provided by Carol Brunty the previous day. He wanted to note that the Board doesn’t make policy—they promulgate regulations. The department makes policy. He further stated that during his tenure on the Board he could not recall any meetings where local directors were not present or have not shared input or concerns on matters that are before the Board. Further, He doesn’t recall anyone expressing concerns over the CSE issue prior to yesterday.

He stated he appreciates her concern but there is already a good process for review of regulations and changing regulations that are in place. He did not believe that a section of the regulation could be changed without starting the process over. He also stated that in speaking with Mr. Wilson from the Attorney General’s Office he was of the same opinion.

He thanked Mr. Hall and local directors for a wonderful reception.

He has enjoyed working with the Board and traveling statewide to hear concerns of the local areas, citizens, and directors. He has always been made to feel welcome in the regions that he has visited but has felt to be a part of the community in the Western Region in particular during his visits. Mr. Spadaccini provided birthday greetings to Ms. Luca and Ms. Rigby.

Ms. Rigby said she was please to be at this meeting and closer to her home. She thanked Mr. Hall and staff for the welcome and hospitality. She also thanked the directors for hosting a lovely reception.

She stated we are very much engaged with each other and local agencies to ensure we hear your voice and fulfilling our mission. She welcomed Commissioner Conyers and stated the Board supports him.

Mr. Brown thanked Mr. Hall and echoed thoughts made in previous Board comments. He thanked Commissioner Conyers for his remarks.

He said he was pleased to have the Board in southwest Virginia and hoped they could come back again soon.

Ms. Luca echoed other member remarks. She thanked Chairman Christopher for an excellent, energizing and informational meeting.

She welcomed Commissioner Conyers and thanked him for bringing his expertise to the department.

Mr. Hall and local directors were thanked for hosting the reception.

She thanked Ms. Sisk, Ms. Johnson-Scott and Mary Ward for their presence at the meeting and for sharing their expertise.

Ms. Christopher thanked Commissioner Conyers for meeting with her and stated the Board wants to be supportive to the department. She is excited about the leadership that Commissioner Conyers brings to the department.

She further stated that each member brings their own uniqueness and expertise to the Board and we should all feel good about the job we do.

***ON MOTION DULY MADE (Ms. Coryell) and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.***

Respectfully submitted by Pat Rengnerth  
Approved June 2005