

Date/Time of Meeting	May 11, 2022 10:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m. MT Dial: 415-655-0003 Access code: 2463 487 4727 Meeting password: pHfp8tM9HQ4 (74378869 from phones and video systems) Webex: https://idhw.webex.com/idhw/j.php?MTID=m9ddb300283ce3b1efeb1c87aff9c3672 In-person Location: PTC, 450 W State Street, Boise, ID 83702, 3 rd Floor, Conference Room 3A
Meeting Purpose	Interagency Governance Team (IGT)
Host	Janet Hoeke: Chair, Ross Edmunds: Co-Chair, Vice-Chair: Patrick Gardner, & Co-Vice-Chair: David Welsh

Voting Members	Att'd	Voting Members	Att'd	Ex-officio Members	Att'd
Ross Edmunds - DBH	X	Eric Studebaker - SDE	X	Georganne Benjamin - Optum	X
Janet Hoeke - Parent Leader	X	Laura Scuri - Provider	X	Casey Moyer - Optum	X
David Welsh - Medicaid	X	Proxy Voting Members	Att'd	Joyce Broadsword - DHW Regional Director	X
Patrick Gardner - Child Advocate	X	Candace Falsetti - DBH	O	Ruth York - Family Advocacy Agency	X
Howard Belodoff - Child Advocate	X	Michelle Weir - FACS	O	Dora Axtell - Nimiipuu Health	X
Jessica Barawed - County Juvenile Justice	X	Recorder	Att'd	Candice Jimenez - NPAIHB	O
Laura Treat - DBH CMH Representative	X	Megan Schuelke - DBH	X	Caroline Merritt - Association of Providers	X
Marquette Hendrickx - Tribal Representative	X	Ex-officio Members	Att'd	Michelle Batten - FYIdaho	X
Pat Martelle - Family Advocacy Agency/Chair of ICAT	X	Shane Duty - DBH	X	Emily Brown - YES Project Manager	X
Kim Hokanson - Parent Leader	X	Jon Meyer - DBH	O	Clay Lord - FACS	X
Madeline Titelbaum - Youth Leader	X	Jenna Tetrault - Medicaid	X	Laura Wallis - Parent Leader	X
Juliet Charron - Medicaid	X	Mallory Kotze - Medicaid	X	Andrea Blackwood - FACS	X
Alex Childers-Scott - Medicaid	X	Francesca Barbaro - Medicaid	O	Ellyn Wilhelm - Marimn Health	X
Sara Bennett - Parent Leader	X	KayT Garrett - DHW DAG	X	Matt Johansen - Optum	X
Chad Cardwell - FACS	X	Kim Stretch - DHW DAG	X	Melanie Scott - ICAT member	X
Monty Prow - IDJC	X	Joy Jansen - School District	O	Jana Kemp - Facilitator	X

MEETING NOTES

#	Time	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
1	10:00am	5 mins	Welcome, Roll Call & Approve Minutes	IGT Executive Committee	<p>The following document(s) were shared with the IGT members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sponsor's Status Report Communications Strategic Planning Workgroup Monthly Report from April 2022 and the Strategic Communication Plan: HB 233 & Quick Reaction Team <p>Ross Edmunds motioned to approve the IGT Meeting notes from April 2022 and David Welsh seconded this motion.</p>	Vote: The IGT voting members voted unanimously to approve the IGT Meeting notes from April 2022.
2	10:05am	5 mins	Discuss Future In-person All Day IGT Meeting	IGT Executive Committee	Janet Hoeke explained that we have not had an in-person meeting in over two years and there is a considerable amount of work that needs to be reviewed so there would be a great benefit to having an all-day or partial day in-person	

#	Time	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
					<p>meeting. Ross Edmunds added that with an in-person meeting, we should still make remote access available for those not comfortable attending in person or those who may not be able to travel yet. Janet Hoeke confirmed and added that members encouraged to attend in person. Ross Edmunds further added that DBH will talk to DHW and the Director's Office to make sure that we follow any current safety guidelines. We will also have the necessary safety items available. Janet Hoeke suggested that we host an in-person meeting in June or July. Pat Martelle shared that it is important to note that there are a lot of members who may not know our history of the effectiveness of meeting all day. While it can be costly and not always convenient, we have had several all-day meetings over the last five years, and we can get a lot accomplished. Janet Hoeke agreed and added that all the members would be able to have more robust conversations. Having an all-day meeting is worth the possible inconveniences because of the amount that is achieved. This will be discussed further with the IGT Executive Committee members and Megan Schuelke will work to send out a Doodle Poll so that we can chose a date and time that works best for a majority of the IGT members.</p>	
3	10:10am	20 mins	Review Sponsor's Report	DBH & Medicaid	<p>Ross Edmunds reviewed the Sponsor's Status Report, including Project 1: Implementation Assurance Plan (IAP) and Project 2: Implementation Assurance Plan (IAP) Project Plan. Pat Martelle asked that with the new Enterprise YES Project Manager on board to do the work related to the IAP Project Plan, what is the role and scope of the work that Shane Duty is doing. This would help us to better understand when we would need him at the table. Ross Edmunds clarified that Shane Duty was previously responsible for producing work and tracking the work. The new Enterprise YES Project Manager will free up Shane Duty to produce the work rather than managing the work simultaneously. Shane Duty will still continue to have an ongoing presence during the IGT meetings.</p> <p>Ross Edmunds reviewed Project 3: House Bill 233. Kim Hokanson asked if the Department is planning for the IGT members to review the House Bill 233 brochure before it is finalized. Shane Duty shared that the short answer is yes. We are working to get the brochure close to final and have been utilizing the YES Communications Workgroups to assist with that. Once we are close to having the final brochure, we will share it with the IGT. Patrick Gardner asked if there are parents on the YES Communications Workgroup. Shane Duty confirmed that there are parents and one youth that attend the workgroup meetings.</p> <p>Ross Edmunds briefly reviewed Project 4: QMIA Council Quarterly Report Recommendations and Project 5: Quality Review Process of the Sponsor's Status Report. Candace Falsetti is currently out of the office so an email will be sent to all of the IGT members if there are additional updates. Ross</p>	

#	Time	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
					<p>Edmunds then reviewed Project 6: Jeff D. Implementation Compliance Task Force and shared that the plaintiff attorneys and the state DAGs have taken on this work. KayT Garrett shared that they have been trading versions of the Exit Matrix with Patrick Gardner and Howard Belodoff. They are planning to reach out this week to set up an additional meeting. Patrick Gardner added that while they have been putting together the Exit Matrix, they have also been going through the Settlement Agreement to catalog all of the requirements that are listed in order to complete implementation. The first step is to agree on what those are, and the second step is to identify where we have accomplished those and what needs to be done. The third step is that you have to have measurements for some of these items. The state has the capacity to deliver the services and they have to have some measures for that capacity, so the attorneys need to identify what those are using the Exit Matrix. We are hoping to have a more substantial report including more details at the next IGT meeting.</p> <p>Ross Edmunds also reviewed Project 7: IBHP Invitation to Negotiate (ITN) and shared that the review team is reviewing the proposals and then we will move into the negotiation phase. David Welsh added that the review team specifically reviews for the minimum qualifications. It takes a significant amount of time to review all of the submissions. Patrick Gardner asked what the deadline is for the evaluation and the negotiation phase. David Welsh explained that it is a fluid timeline as it depends on how quickly the evaluations are completed. Juliet Charron added that they can take this question back to the Division of Purchasing to see if they can share more information around the timeline.</p>	
4	10:30am	1 hour 15 mins	Discussion of Guiding Principles & Next Steps for IGT Subcommittees	Jana Kemp & IGT Executive Committee	<p>Jana Kemp began by reviewing the IGT Guiding Principles memo, specifically the key performance issues and the seven collaborative principles of governance. It is important to review and consider who is going to do what by when. Today, our discussion will focus on the “how” and if you think that these seven principles can guide the everyday work of the IGT.</p> <p>The following was reviewed from the IGT Guiding Principles and discussed by all of the IGT members:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Membership roles and responsibilities, including decision-making and priority setting authority, are clear. The IGT members agreed that this item needs to be defined. 2. Tasks and agendas are memorialized; Work is timely and competently completed. Patrick Gardner clarified that these principles are intended to apply to all of the IGT members and committees. These will not only apply to the IGT voting members. This will also apply to how we engage and participate in this 	

#	Time	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
					<p>governance process. It should be noted that the governance process is set out in the Settlement Agreement. The only way that you can have an effective and responsive system of care in the state is to have those beneficiaries and the state directly involved in the design and implementation of the system. These principles are intended to bring the stakeholders into the governance process. The principles can then inform us as to how we interact with one another and how we move forward to successfully implement the YES system of care. Michelle Batten asked what “timely” means and where are the referenced agendas are currently being memorialized. Megan Schuelke shared that the IGT meeting notes and agendas from the last year can be found on the YES website. Patrick Gardner explained that we first need to focus on if the content of the principles is what we want. The next discussion will be on how we achieve these principles and make them happen. Patrick Gardner added that “timely” is based on the time that you set up to accomplish a specific deadline and meet that commitment. Pat Martelle noted that this item does not say “who” will do the work, such as who will document and share these documents with the stakeholders. Patrick Gardner explained that these are collaborative principles for the overall body that works together. We have to identify the membership roles and responsibilities, including the decision-making and priority-setting. This is why you will not see the word “who” in the principles. The first, fourth, and fifth principles are high-level because they are interdependent elements.</p> <p>3. Respect for others’ time, views and work-product is critical; one of the best ways to demonstrate respect for someone’s work or opinion is to positively act on it.</p> <p>Jana Kemp shared that it would be helpful to re-word this sentence. Ruth York added that some of the terms used are confusing and could be subjective to judgement. Dr. Eric Studebaker shared that this relates more to a systemic change. If this is more of a directive, then it needs to be identified as such. Otherwise, being considerate of other’s opinions is how you show respect. Pat Martelle agreed and added that she has a concern about the use of the term “positively act on it”. If we are going to acknowledge that there is expertise then agreement is not what is needed. Janet Hoeke explained that when we are at the meetings and making commitments to take an action, we then show respect by coming to meetings prepared, speaking up when we have an opinion, listening to other’s opinions, and collaboratively working towards decision-making. Dr. Eric Studebaker added that there is no information included on the structural procedures, such as how agendas are created and how the notes are taken. At times, this meeting has not been conducted with this level of civility as well. Jana Kemp shared that it appears that there is a structure in place. However, the expressed frustration is that the members are saying what they wanted done, everyone agrees, and then no further</p>	

#	Time	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
					<p>information was reported out. Dr. Eric Studebaker agreed and added that the level of engagement is shaped by the culture of these meetings. Transparency and effort are at the cornerstone of doing good work.</p> <p>Jana Kemp noted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civility of conduct and interactions, collegial interactions. Use of positive regard when interacting. • Making recommendations to the individual(s) or entity with the authority to decide and/or implement. • Seeking understanding and acknowledging other points of view - whether or not we do or can take action, whether we agree or not. Interacting with a mindset of “tell me more.” • We will encourage and acknowledge successes and successful accomplishments, at the same time as we watch for continuous improvement opportunities. • All of our meetings and workspaces will be safe spaces in which to share your voice. • Not letting conversations become personal, keeping them focused on ideas and tasks. • All members will be aware of their own behavior in meetings and how that behavior and communication is being respectful, or not. <p>4. Issue spotting is a core role in monitoring and assessment; problem solving is an essential and necessary follow-up to issue spotting, just as implementing solutions must follow problem-solving.</p> <p>Janet Hoeke shared that we should define the principles of collaboration, which is not included. Dr. Eric Studebaker added that issue spotting should be used to identify areas for improvement as a model for continuous improvement. Ruth York shared that seeking to understand the issues is also an important piece. The ICAT subcommittee presenting the PRA certification proposal is an example. It makes a huge difference in how one is perceived and whether it feels like a safe place to bring your voice. Laura Scuri noted that it is also important not to make it personal and to keep the conversations focused on the ideas and the tasks. Dr. Eric Studebaker suggested that we include a statement that all of the members of the committees will be aware of their behavior in meetings and communicate in a respectful way. Patrick Gardner explained that we will also need to be aware of issue-creep as all of this is in the Settlement Agreement. A term like “continuous improvement” suggests that you are never done, and you run the risk of violating that principle. It is also important that we stay within the scope of the IGT mission.</p>	

#	Time	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
					<p>Jana Kemp noted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The pursuit of continuous improvement must fall within the scope of the Jeff D. Settlement. • When issues are spotted, view them as opportunities for improvement. • Be proactive. • Monitoring and improvements will occur in support of and maintenance of all the things agreed to in the settlement agreement/ Implementation Plan. <p>5. Adequate staffing is required.</p> <p>Pat Martelle asked if the members are going to be subject to guidance from the IGT Executive Committee regarding what is or is not adequate in terms of membership or assigning tasks so that enough people are working on a project. Patrick Gardner stated that this question relates to principles 1, 2, and 3 rather than principle 5. Jana Kemp added a placeholder for this question as discussions move forward. Pat Martelle added that she is also concerned about the term “adequate”. In the IGT Guidelines, there is a list of recommended members of the IGT. Does this mean that we are striving to keep the membership as currently described in the IGT Charter? Jana Kemp added that she will also capture this question to clarify this in the future.</p> <p>Jana Kemp noted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NOTE: Does this mean fulfilling the LIST of whom IGT members should be? List the Charter examples? YES. <p>6. Consensus-based processes are preferred. Blocking is not.</p> <p>David Welsh shared that this speaks to collaboration and should be incorporated into the principle. Pat Martelle agreed but noted that if there is just one voice in the room addressing an issue then it is not considered collaboration. Patrick Gardner shared that this is addressed by stating that “consensus was preferred”. If we do not have consensus then we do not have collaboration. Pat Martelle explained that we can have a disagreement after collaborating on an issue and then we vote on the issue. This is a clear cut structure that is hard to challenge. Patrick Gardner stated that it is often the case that there is not a lot of stakeholder engagement, which relates to the seventh item.</p> <p>Jana Kemp noted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative decision making by consensus such that all voices “in a room” are invited to. 	

#	Time	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> participate and speak in the discussion process and decision-making process. Consensus may not always be possible, at which point a group can choose to take a vote. <p>7. Effective governance requires continuous, authentic, stakeholder engagement and building sustainable relationships.</p> <p>Pat Martelle shared that one way that we might be able to do this is to establish protocol that each perform represented has a responsibility to speak on the issues that are before the IGT, even to say that they do not know enough to have an opinion. Enough information should be available to the members to understand the issues and provide structure for that process. Jana Kemp noted that this group appears to be good at structures. Where challenges seem to arise are in the details of the “how”. This includes how we show respect and how we accomplish tasks. This also occurs in the appreciation done by the committees, which is what invites people to remain in the collaborative working environment.</p> <p>Patrick Gardner explained that there are two principles going on here; the consensus process as part of the governance approach and the discretionary authority with agencies that the Department has which does their work. We need to clarify what is consensus by this group versus what is an appropriate decision left to the Department in the consensus-building process. This is a piece that we need to do more work on.</p>	
5	11:45am	5 mins	New Business Items	IGT Members	Janet Hoeke suggested that we further discuss the idea of having a face-to-face IGT meeting at the next IGT meeting and Ross Edmunds agreed. Patrick Gardner recommended that the plaintiff’s counsel create a list of what we want to talk about and what we should do about it as a next step. Ross Edmunds explained that if the members would like to use the all-day IGT meeting to have discussions and for the Department to come prepared then it would be helpful to know what they would need to bring.	
6	11:50am	5 mins	Public Comment	IGT Members	<i>There were not public comments at this time.</i>	
7	11:55am	5 mins	Review Future Agenda Topics	IGT Executive Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discuss Next Steps for Face-to-Face IGT Meeting Discuss CANS Areas of Opportunity Update on the Exit Matrix <p>Jana Kemp will attend the IGT meeting next month and the discussion around how to achieve the IGT Guiding Principles will continue.</p>	
8	12:00pm	--	Dismissal	IGT Members		

The IGT will track action items and their status from the meetings here:

Follow-up Items	Opened	Owner	Due Date	Comments	Status
Regional SOC Project and the intention to have one region present at each IGT Meeting.	3/6/20	Ross Edmunds	4/3/20	1/11 Update: Patrick Gardner suggested that we target the CMH subcommittees of the RBHBs to gather information. We could distribute a list of questions that the IGT would like answered by the CMH subcommittees.	3/10, In Progress. Ross Edmunds spoke with the RBHB Leadership members and sent the questions to the CMH subcommittees requesting feedback.
Follow-up with Miren Unsworth to gather more information about implementing the START model for children.	11/10/21	Chad Cardwell	N/A	5/11 Update: Chad Cardwell shared that on April 13, the Crisis System Improvement Project sponsors approved the START certification model as the system that FACS will pursue for Idaho. The Center for START Services offers START Certification in three categories: 1) Adults (age 18 and up); 2) Children (age 6-21); or 3) Lifespan (ages 6 and up). While no final decisions have been made regarding which certification category will be selected, the strong preference among the project team is for the START Lifespan certification which is ages 6 and up. A number of FACS staff are currently taking an introductory year-long course in the START clinical system. Should FACS be approved to invest in the START certification, we plan to prioritize certification of the existing FACSDD Crisis Prevention team, which currently offers services to both adults and children and there are no plans to change the population they serve. FACS hopes to have a final decision on the START model later this calendar year. Director Monty Prow asked what the primary delivery method is for the START model. Chad Cardwell explained that it is a combination approach with certified coordinators in each region of the state. This was implemented through the Crisis Prevention and Support Team. July 2023 would be the beginning of the program.	11/10, New. 5/11, Closed.
Gather information from community providers about the decrease in skills-building and the increase in TCC.	2/9/22	Laura Treat	N/A		2/9, New.
Chad Cardwell and Andrea Blackwood will bring the concerns back to the FACS leadership. All IGT members should put their concerns in writing and send them to Chad Cardwell .	3/9/22	Chad Cardwell	N/A		3/9, New.