

## Summary of Hearing at Booneville Human Development Center August 15, 2016

**Task Force Representatives Present: Sen. Jason Rapert and Rep. Kim Hammer**

**Non Task Force Representatives: Senator Gary Stubblefield and Rep. John Eubanks**

### **Summary of Testimony from The Stephen Group**

#### ***Transitions of persons moving from state-operated facilities to community-based programs:***

- Transitions in Oklahoma, Georgia, Alabama, and Tennessee were successful generally and when adverse outcomes occurred, they could not be attributed to the transfer. The committee had asked TSG to verify whether Massachusetts struggled with the reporting of abuse and neglect in group homes; TSG verified that this was an issue of concern.
- Arkansas uses transition coordinators at each HDC, who work with persons months prior to transfers and for two years post-transfer. The agency has a low occurrence of problems with this process, with few readmissions. TSG identified some recommendations, including collecting parent/guardian/resident satisfaction with the transition process using a survey and publishing data on licensing violations and confirmed allegations of maltreatment across settings online.

#### ***Cost analysis, with focus on facility costs:***

- DHS provided cost comparison data for the HDCs and for persons who transitioned from HDCs to the community. TSG is working to create a more “apples-to-apples” cost comparison.
- TSG conducted a cost analysis of each HDC. Differences in unit costs exist across facilities. TSG suggests conducting further analysis to identify efficiencies for replication across the system.
- The HDCs have requested a total of \$4.2 million in projects for the upcoming year, though funding does not allow all to be addressed. The agency does not have a five-year plan of the cost of preventive maintenance and the costs to address system failures expected in that time.
- DHS has used a variety of cost containment strategies including energy efficiency initiatives, reducing staff/contracting, and using bundled contracts/comparative shopping for commodities.
- Turnover of direct care staff was identified by HDC staff as a key cost driver (see Appendix A).
- DHS has used a number of strategies to improve recruitment and retention including use of special hourly rates in certain markets and a pilot to improve hiring, among other strategies.
- TSG recommends focusing on supervisor development and retention to stabilize the workforce.

#### ***Long-term planning:***

- TSG recommends that DHS develop a long-range plan for the legislature that considers forecasted demand, an analysis of the most effective and efficient way to meet these needs through existing HDCs or changes to the system, and a related cost estimate.

### **Summary of DHS Testimony**

DHS staff provided remarks about the Booneville HDC and the HDC system generally. Sub-committee members, particularly Senator Rapert focused questions on facility needs, particularly at Booneville where DHS has been unable to raze buildings no longer in use due to the cost of asbestos abatement and administrative challenges.

### **Summary of Public Comments**

Three persons provided public comment including two parents of HDC residents (one had a child at Booneville with behavioral challenges, who stressed her support for the center as the first place her daughter has done well) and a Booneville resident who stated the community's support for the center.

Apepndix A

**Total Turnover, by Facility**

Arkadelphia

<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
29.8%	45.8%	51.9%

Booneville

<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
19.3%	34.2%	34.2%

Conway

<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
20.2%	41.7%	47.5%

Jonesboro

<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
52.1%	107.9%	77.6%

Warren

<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>	<u>2015</u>
33.5%	26.0%	45.7%

**FY 2015 Turnover of Key Direct Staff Positions**

	<b>Conway</b>	<b>Jonesboro</b>	<b>Warren</b>	<b>Booneville</b>	<b>Arkadelphia</b>	<b>Total</b>
Residential Care Assistant	165.0%	198.0%	158.0%	88.0%	200.0%	161.0%
Residential Care Technician	39.0%	55.0%	37.0%	16.0%	32.0%	35.0%
Shift Supervisor	29.0%	65.0%	40.0%	24.0%	33.0%	37.0%
Residential Care Supervisor	9.0%	20.0%	83.0%	0.0%	32.0%	20.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>68.0%</b>	<b>105.0%</b>	<b>85.0%</b>	<b>33.0%</b>	<b>66.0%</b>	<b>69.0%</b>