

Exhibit 3: Alternative Methods for Administering Social and Human Services in North Carolina

Alternative Method	Description	Applicable Statutes	Governance	Counties Implementing	Benefits	Challenges	Other States
1. Contracting for Social Services Administration Report Exhibits 4.1 & 4.2	One county DSS contracts with another county DSS to administer social services	160A-461	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This method does not change how the governance structure. Each county's DSS director is responsible that the contract is properly executed 	Avery, Camden, Chowan, Hyde, Perquimans, Pasquotank, Tyrrell, Washington, Watauga	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensures access to services in county Improve quality of services to consumers Cost effective use of resources Maintains county control 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negotiating contract terms to benefit all counties involved 	MN, PA, VA, WI
2. Regional Approach – Multi-County Social Services Agency Report Exhibits 5.1 & 5.2	Two or more county DSS boards form a single DSS agency to administer social services	108A-12(b) 160A-462 through 160A-466	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two or more county DSS boards provide oversight to DSS director DSS director administers services for a single agency 	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced administrative costs Increased efficiency in allocating resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complicated oversight structure requiring social services director to report to multiple social services boards 	CA, CO, MN, ND, NY, PA, VA
3. Regional Approach – Public Health District as a Model for Social Services Report Exhibits 6.1 & 6.2	County commissioners and local public health boards in two or more counties agree to form a health department district	130A-36 through 130A-38	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One board with representation from each county One DSS director for district 	Alleghany, Ashe, Avery, Bertie, Camden, Chowan, Currituck, Gates, Granville, Martin, McDowell, Mitchell, Pasquotank, Perquimans, Polk, Rutherford, Tyrrell, Vance, Washington, Watauga, Yancey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simplified governance structures Cost savings Improved efficiency Improved service delivery Maintains access to services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Counties can choose to leave the district 	CA, CO, MN, ND, NY, PA, VA
4. Consolidated Governance – County Commissioners Serving as the Social Services Board Report Exhibits 7.1 & 7.2	<p>County commissioners abolish the social services board and other human services boards and assumes all policy-making responsibilities of the social services board and other human services boards</p> <p>This option is limited to counties meeting the 425,000 population threshold</p>	153A-77(a) & (f)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County commissioners serve as the board for social services, public health and mental health services Social services, public health, and mental health provided by separate agencies 	Mecklenburg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One board overseeing agencies Efficiency gains from not having separate boards Enhanced role for county commissioners and manager Reduced administrative costs because functions are conducted centrally 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No involvement from community-at-large in the oversight of human services agencies Increased workload for county commissioners Eliminates political buffer between social services director and county commissioners 	CA, CO, MN, NJ, PA, VA, WI
5. Consolidated Governance and Administration – Human Services Agency Report Exhibits 8.1 & 8.2	<p>County commissioners appoint human services board and consolidate social services, public health, and mental health services into one agency</p> <p>This option is limited to counties meeting the 425,000 population threshold</p>	153-77(b-f) 108A-15.1 (c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consolidated board for social services, public health and mental health services One director for human services Social services, public health, and mental health provided by one agency 	Wake	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One board overseeing agencies Reduced administrative costs Increased efficiency in allocating resources Flexibility in how services are best integrated to meet county needs Increased service access Maintains county control Opportunities for holistic service delivery 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Takes time and continual effort to maintain an consolidated agency Increased workload for human services board members 	CA, CO, MN, NJ, PA, VA, WI

Source: Program Evaluation Division based on interviews with participating counties, review of general statutes, and surveys of other states.