


<b>Date/Time of Meeting</b>	June 8, 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: <a href="https://idhw.webex.com/idhw/j.php?MTID=m9ddb300283ce3b1efeb1c87aff9c3672">https://idhw.webex.com/idhw/j.php?MTID=m9ddb300283ce3b1efeb1c87aff9c3672</a> In-person Location: PTC, 450 W State Street, Boise, ID 83702, 3 <sup>rd</sup> Floor, Conference Room 3A
<b>Meeting Purpose</b>	Interagency Governance Team (IGT)
<b>Host</b>	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	Chad Cardwell - FACS	X	KayT Garrett - DHW DAG	X
Janet Hoeke - Parent Leader	X	Monty Prow - IDJC	X	Kim Stretch - DHW DAG	X
David Welsh - Medicaid	O	Laura Scuri - Provider	X	Joy Jansen - School District	X
Patrick Gardner - Child Advocate	X	<b>Proxy Voting Members</b>	<b>Att'd</b>	Georganne Benjamin - Optum	X
Howard Belodoff - Child Advocate	X	Candace Falsetti - DBH	X	Joyce Broadsword - DHW Regional Director	X
Jessica Barawed - County Juvenile Justice	X	Michelle Weir - FACS	O	Dora Axtell - Nimiipuu Health	O
Laura Treat - DBH CMH Representative	X	Ruth York - Family Advocacy Agency	X	Candice Jimenez - NPAIHB	O
Marquette Hendrickx - Tribal Representative	O	<b>Recorder</b>	<b>Att'd</b>	Caroline Merritt - Association of Providers	X
Pat Martelle - Family Advocacy Agency	O	Megan Schuelke - DBH	X	Michelle Batten - FYIdaho	X
Kim Hokanson - Parent Leader	X	<b>Ex-officio Members</b>	<b>Att'd</b>	Emily Brown - YES Project Manager	X
Madeline Titelbaum - Youth Leader	X	Shane Duty - DBH	X	Jana Kemp - Facilitator	X
Juliet Charron - Medicaid	O	Jon Meyer - DBH	X	Clay Lord - Medicaid	X
Alex Childers-Scott - Medicaid	X	Jenna Tetrault - Medicaid	X	Ellyn Wilhelm - Provider	X
Sara Bennett - Parent Leader	X	Mallory Kotze - Medicaid	X	Matt Johansen - Optum	X
Eric Studebaker - SDE	X	Francesca Barbaro - Medicaid	X	Dennis Baughman - Optum	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"> <li><a href="#">Sponsor's Status Report</a></li> <li><a href="#">Communications Strategic Planning Workgroup Monthly Report from May 2022</a></li> </ul> <p>Ross Edmunds motioned to approve the IGT Meeting notes from May 2022 and Dr. Eric Studebaker seconded this motion.</p> <p>Ross Edmunds motioned for the agenda to be amended to reflect the vote for Marquette Hendrick's membership as the tribal representative and Chad Cardwell seconded this motion.</p>	<p><b>Vote:</b> The IGT voting members voted unanimously to approve the IGT Meeting notes from May 2022.</p>

#	Time	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
2	10:05am	10 mins	Vote on IGT Executive Committee Membership & Voting Members	IGT Voting Members	<p>Ruth York shared that she will be acting as Pat Martelle's proxy voted as Pat Martelle will be out for the summer.</p> <p>Vote on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. IGT Executive Committee membership</li> </ol> <p>Janet Hoeke explained that this vote will be for the extension of the memberships for the IGT Executive Committee. Ross Edmunds added that the IGT bylaws state that the Administrators of DBH and Medicaid will permanently hold these positions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Laura Treat as the DBH CMH representative</li> <li>3. Director Monty Prow as the IDJC representative</li> <li>4. Marquette Hendrickx as the tribal representative</li> </ol> <p>Laura Treat motioned to approve the above listed membership and representatives as IGT voting members and Kim Hokanson seconded this motion.</p>	<p><b>Vote:</b> The IGT voting members voted unanimously to approve the IGT Executive Committee membership as well as the listed representatives as IGT voting members.</p>
3	10:15am	5 mins	Update on Face-to-Face IGT Meeting	IGT Executive Committee	<p>Janet Hoeke reviewed the below survey results concerning a possible all-day in-person IGT meeting for Wednesday, July 13.</p> <p>1. Are you planning to attend the all-day IGT Meeting on Wednesday, July 13 in-person?</p> <p><a href="#">More Details</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, I will be attending in-pers... 11</li> <li>No, I will be attending virtuall... 1</li> <li>No, I am unable to attend this... 0</li> <li>I am unsure at this time. 9</li> </ul>  <p>Janet Hoeke explained that it is the most valuable when we have most of the members attend in person and the next regularly scheduled IGT meeting would happen in July. It would be helpful to hear voices about why or why not people will attend in person. Ross Edmunds clarified that this would be a blended approach where we would have some online and some in person attendees. An all-day meeting would be the best use of that time, or we could have two half-day meetings. It can be hard to sit on one virtual call for eight hours. Director Monty Prow shared that, due to additional travel, he may be unable to attend in person. However, he likes the idea of a hybrid set up or two shorter days. Dr. Eric Studebaker agreed that it is difficult to block out a full day for one meeting and Ruth York agreed with this as well. Joyce Broadsword shared that, due to the rise in COVID cases, she will not be attending any in person meetings and a full day meeting does not work for her.</p> <p>Janet Hoeke shared that, given that 11 people would be willing to attend a half day meeting and we only identified one day, which</p>	<p><b>Next Steps:</b> Megan Schuelke will work to secure conference rooms for two four-hour IGT meetings in July and August.</p>

#	Time	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
					would be July 13, we will need to find another day for a half day meeting. Would August work for an additional half day meeting? Ross Edmunds suggested that we use the next two IGT meetings with each being four hours and offered in-person. Laura Treat noted that she would only be able to attend once in-person. Ruth York shared that she liked the idea of spreading out the in-person meetings over the next two months and she will have a decent shot at attending one meeting in person that way. Kim Hokanson shared that two half days sounds like a great idea and Francesca Barbaro, Director Monty Prow, and Madeline Titelbaum all agreed. Janet Hoeke asked if the members had a preference on the times of these meetings, such as 9am - 1pm or 10am - 2pm. Ross Edmunds suggested 9am - 1pm as that would give all of the members a chance to get lunch within a reasonable time and all of the IGT members agreed. Janet Hoeke added that at the conclusion of the IGT meeting in July, we will determine if the half day IGT meeting in August is needed.	
4	10:20am	20 mins	Review Sponsor's Report	DBH & Medicaid	<p>Ross Edmunds began by reviewing the <a href="#">Sponsor's Status Report</a>, including Project 1: Implementation Assurance Plan (IAP) and Project 2: Implementation Assurance Plan Project Plan. We are planning to have the Implementation Assurance Plan Project Plan available next month. Shane Duty provided an update on Project 3: House Bill 233. DHW was able to review some feedback provided by the YES Communications Strategic Planning workgroup concerning the family-facing material that has been developed and that is ready to go. We also had some internal trainings with CMH regional staff members so that they know how to access to Quick Reaction Team (QRT). Next, we will look at the hospital communication to make sure that it is pertinent information that the hospitals need to then communicate with state agencies for access to the QRT. Jon Meyer added that, as of yesterday, they have started the design of the family-facing material. Candace Falsetti provided an update regarding Project 4: QMIA Council Quarterly Report Recommendations and Project 5: Quality Review Process. They have been working on the QMIA Quarterly Report and plan to work on updating the QMIA Draft Plan this week. Candace Falsetti met with Patrick Gardner and Howard Belodoff yesterday to go through the quality review process. They need to formalize the document and then provide it back to Patrick Gardner and Howard Belodoff. We are on track to complete this by the end of the month.</p> <p>Patrick Gardner asked about the process for review for the quality review process. KayT Garrett explained that the IAP states that the department will consult with the IWG and the final plan will be</p>	

#	Time	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
					<p>presented to the IWG by August. We also need buy-in from all of the defendants and that is taking place this week. Patrick Gardner asked how this will be presented to the IGT members. Is the department going to wait until after the plaintiffs and the defendants meet or is the intention to wait until the document is completed to present it to the IGT? KayT Garrett explained that her understanding of the process is that the department has to consult with the IWG. Patrick Gardner then asked if the plan is that the IGT will see this document in September. KayT Garrett confirmed and shared that this will occur unless the IWG has issues. Patrick Gardner confirmed that this is his understanding as well. It is important to provide the IGT members with an understanding on when they will see this information.</p> <p>Ross Edmunds provided an update on Project 6: Jeff D. Implementation Compliance Task Force. We are planning to send out the exit matrix to the IWG by early next week. As a reminder, we are looking at compliance in two categories; one being data utilization and two being the deliverables, such as those included in the QMIA Quarterly Reports. Alex Childers-Scott provided an update on Project 7: IBHP Invitation to Negotiate (ITN). The IBHP is still in the evaluation phase and the goal is to be in the negotiation phase by mid-July.</p>	
5	10:40am	45 mins	Review Draft Guiding Principles & Discuss How to Achieve	Jana Kemp & IGT Executive Committee	<p>Jana Kemp reviewed the draft <a href="#">IGT Guiding Principles</a>, which includes all of the input that was gathered from the last IGT meeting. The IGT Executive Committee met and went through all of the revisions. The purpose of this review is to wrap-up this conversation and determine the collaborative principles of governance that will be used as guidance moving forward. Jana Kemp then requested feedback on the IGT Guiding Principles from the IGT members. Patrick Gardner asked about item #3 and how we will know the work referenced is completed. What is the process and how will clear expectations be identified? Jana Kemp explained that she was going to suggestion that a workgroup be formed in order to determine that work and track those items. We still need to determine the 'how' for these guiding principles. Jana Kemp reviewed item #4 and asked if that captures the discussion about respect that took place during the last meeting. All of the present IGT members confirmed. Upon review of the document, Jana Kemp asked if the group is ready to make a motion and accept these principles so that the agreed upon date can be added to this document. We can then discuss forming a workgroup. Janet Hoeke noted that we do not need to take a vote in order to establish a workgroup. We could draft a document about the</p>	

#	Time	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
					<p>'how' and bring that to the July IGT meeting. We need to determine who would like to be a part of this workgroup.</p> <p>Jana Kemp shared the draft IGT Roles and Responsibilities grid, which lists the various entities, decision-making, authority, who will complete the work, how the work will get done, how it will work and the recommendations that will be used, and how clear expectations will be identified. The workgroup could complete this grid and then bring it back to all of the IGT members. If you are interested in participating, please email Megan Schuelke. Ruth York asked if the workgroup was open to voting members and non-voting members and Janet Hoeke confirmed that it is open to all IGT members. Ruth York also asked if it was accurate that we cannot vote on these IGT Guiding Principles today as it was not listed on the IGT agenda. KayT Garrett confirmed that we need to postpone the vote since it was not listed as an action item on the agenda. Jana Kemp noted that voting on the IGT Guiding Principles should be added as an agenda item for the IGT meeting in July.</p> <p>Janet Hoeke asked if there was anyone who was interested in joining the workgroup. Ruth York asked for the timeframe and if this work would start right away. Janet Hoeke shared that she would like to meet once before the next IGT meeting so that we have a decent understanding of the scope and how long this work will take. Jana Kemp suggested meeting for only one hour and then reporting out to all of the IGT members in July. Ruth York shared that she would like to be a part of the workgroup. Ross Edmunds shared that DHW will have an internal conversation and determine representation. Dr. Eric Studebaker shared that he is always willing to help.</p>	
6	11:25am	20 mins	Discuss CANS Areas of Opportunity	IGT Executive Committee	<p>Patrick Gardner shared the CANS Oversight Issues document. We want to do some issue-spotting, so we have laid out some information that we gathered from stakeholders to talk about the CANS. The CANS is critical to YES and warrants a careful review of what is working and what is not. The purpose is to review these items with all of the IGT members and gather feedback on the next steps. It should also be noted that the ICANS workgroup has already done some of this work.</p> <p>Patrick Gardner then reviewed the CANS Oversight Issues document beginning with item #1. Joy Jansen agreed with the items listed and added that what we hear from providers in the north of Idaho is that one reason that we have therapist that won't take Medicaid is because of the CANS requirement and all of the paperwork. Janet</p>	<p><b>Action Item:</b> Based on the CANS Oversight Issues document from Patrick Gardner and the following item, "10. Do MCO policies undermine CANS? Are there unintentional financial incentives that cause some of the</p>

#	Time	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
					<p>Hoeke asked if this is partly because of the ICANS system and having to transfer data or is the additional paperwork related to something different. Joy Jansen explained that when we talk about the amount of paperwork required, the part of ICANS that comes up is that for a lot of providers it takes about 45 minutes or more to complete the CANS and there is a lot of redundancy. When we moved to having therapist using the CANS, we had a lot of therapists in the north give the feedback that it was cumbersome. Janet Hoeke shared that they heard the same in the Treasure Valley as well. Joyce Broadsword shared that the tribes have also expressed an issue related to when the parents refuse to sign the paperwork to allow a facility to give the CANS and they can't give teens the assessment without parental permission. Ellyn Wilhelm agreed with the feedback that Joyce Broadsword provided and added that it would also be helpful if it did not have to be updated every 90 days. In Washington they only update the CANS at six months or a year. Ross Edmunds shared that it would be helpful to have a follow-up conversation with Joy Jansen regarding the burdensome requirements for providers. Laura Scuri noted that the issue related to the additional paperwork is not new. Providers do not get paid for everything on the CANS and this is a serious issue around the state. We cannot attract counselors because of the significant amount of paperwork, follow-ups, and meetings. It may be reimbursed but it is not at a rate where providers are willing to do it.</p> <p>Janet Hoeke asked if it would be educational to have a provider walk us through what it looks like when they have to do a CANS assessment, including how long it takes and what kind of paperwork has to be completed. This could eliminate several issues that we are not aware of. Joy Jansen shared that this is something that she can help with if needed. Patrick Gardner noted that the goal right now is not to solve the issues. We want to review the issues and then start talking about the next steps, such as gathering more information. However, Janet Hoeke's idea is a great one. Patrick Gardner then reviewed item #2 and item #3 in the CANS Oversight Issues document and noted that the burden of the paperwork should be added to the list. As it relates to parents and youth not being able to be full collaborators and sign off on the completed CANS, Ruth York shared that the Idaho Federation of Families (IFF) hears this a lot from families. There is no chance for input, a final conversation about the CANS, or a final copy provided to the family and youth either. Jana Kemp shared that she experienced this with her stepchild as well. Once she turned 14 years old, she was excluded and yet she was the</p>	<p>problems identified above?", Dennis Baughman will work with his Optum team to provide information on undermining versus fostering the use of the CANS.</p> <p><b>Next Steps:</b> Based on the CANS Oversight Issues document, Megan Schuelke will send information out to all of the IGT members and request that they provide their priorities and feedback prior to the next IGT meeting in July.</p>

#	Time	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
					<p>one serving as her full-time caregiver and, therefore, seeing her behaviors and struggles.</p> <p>Michelle Batten shared that, as it relates to item #4, for brief intervention groups, the providers are saying that they are not able to provide the brief intervention services with Medicaid children. Ruth York clarified that providers try to bill for these services but because the child has not had a CANS then they are not being reimbursed for these services. Michelle Batten added that the model is quick and from their understanding, this is not possible with the CANS. The Idaho Integrated Behavioral Health Network has reported this issue repeatedly as well. Dennis Baughman shared that he has also heard this feedback. Different Optum staff members have had to remind providers about what they can and can't do. Ruth York asked what the providers should be experiencing and if they should be able to bill for these services. When they have talked with Optum, they have not been able to get approval on the billing. Dennis Baughman clarified that they can be reimbursed for these services as there are a couple of billing codes that allow this without the process of doing the CANS. The specific billing code or the clinics may be the issue. This can be the challenge with multiple facets. Patrick Gardner stated that we do not want this to be a fundamental problem for accessing the CANS and these services.</p> <p>Patrick Gardner then reviewed item #5 and added that all agencies are defendants in this case and should be collaborators in the CANS system and the approach. As it relates to item #6, Washington has a shorter screening that gives a strong indication if the youth would be eligible for stronger services, such as YES. Dennis Baughman shared that Optum is consistently hearing about this from providers. A more streamlined approach would be appealing to the provider community. Patrick Gardner reviewed item #7 and explained that there is a fear of the CANS. We need to do a better job of providing information and education around the CANS. Ruth York shared that IFF hears that it can be traumatizing for families to tell their story over and over again and not understand why they are having to tell it again. The annual update takes the family back over whole previous year, and it is difficult to relive the whole thing. Michelle Batten added that sometimes the youth may be asked to leave the room. Ruth York also noted that providers sometimes have a difference of what they say in front of youth. Consistency would be helpful for providers. Patrick Gardner stated that how this gets done is really important in that the process of informing and educating should</p>	

#	Time	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
					<p>include the parents. Doing this the traditional way, such as having a trainer come in once every six months, is not necessarily the best way to teach about the CANS. Jana Kemp shared that she agrees with what Ruth York described about the challenges of the annual review and reliving the experiences. Sometimes the family wants to just remember the good results and not relive the struggles.</p> <p>Patrick Gardner reviewed item #8 related to the 1915i waiver. Child Welfare workers have to do a lot of work to get the CANS done and they are understaffed so it becomes a barrier to getting services for these children. Janet Hoeke noted that this also applies to those who do not qualify for traditional Medicaid. Michelle Batten added that she has talked with Raini Bowles, and a child might score a 0 on the CANS where in fact the trauma is by nature of them being in the system. This creates concerns about getting access to services. Patrick Gardner continued by reviewing item #9. Ruth York shared that some providers are not keeping the CANS data in mind and repeating themselves. Dennis Baughman added that this is an issue, and we know providers and families feel this as an administrative burden. We have added this on our list of things to work on. Janet Hoeke noted that we cannot underestimate that it is an entire culture and mindset change that has to take place to use the CANS effectively. There needs to be an understanding of what the CANS is and how it is intended to be used. Jenna Tetrault shared that as it related to foster care children and enrollment in the 1915i waiver, Medicaid is working on processes to help with this. Patrick Gardner explained that the CANS is done in 36 states now throughout the US. Dr. John Lyons from Praed has stated that the CANS is a method of memorializing a child's journey and is also just the process. Training and education clearly have to be a part of that.</p> <p>Patrick Gardner reviewed item #10 and shared that the reimbursement rate for the CANS is one example of policies that can foster or undermine the effectiveness of the CANS. Dennis Baughman added that they have also run into providers having difficulties having access to a CANS, so they do another one to make sure that they are in compliance. There are other items about the structure that get in the way of effective implementation. Patrick Gardner asked Dennis Baughman if he would be willing to do more research on this issue to help us better understand what undermining versus fostering the use of the CANS could look like. Dennis Baughman agreed and noted that he will talk with the Optum team to see what information they can provide on this.</p>	



#	Time	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
					<p>Patrick Gardner then asked what the best next step would be for the IGT to try to move forward with this productively. We could dig into one or more of these issues, put forth suggestions, and then bring this information back to all of the IGT members to discuss further. Kim Hokanson shared that she is happy to take this back to the One Child One CANS workgroup and then bring some answers back to the IGT. Shane Duty noted that the workgroup has been on a break for a while after coming up with some strategies. To Kim Hokanson's point, we can use the meeting next week to talk in more detail about some of these items. As well, we have had state employees looking at these items over the past couple of weeks. Patrick Gardner shared that April Fernando is an expert that is contracted with Idaho to help solve problems like this. We could send this list around to all of the IGT members and ask that they be prioritized. Then, we could give additional information back to the One Child One CANS workgroup so that they have better input on which items are the most problematic. Kim Hokanson agreed with this suggestion and added that some of these items are already being worked on however, a list of priorities from the IGT would be helpful. Patrick Gardner also noted that it would be helpful for the state to give us some insights before the next IGT meeting. This way we will have a more focused view on the specific issues and the One Child One CANS workgroup could give us some direction. Janet Hoeke shared that Megan Schuelke could send this information out to all of the IGT members and request that they provide their priorities and feedback. This should be added to the IGT meeting agenda for next month. It would also be helpful to hear from the state on what they are doing and have a conversation about the next steps. Ross Edmunds noted that the state would like to express their position on a number of these items. Some of the items are not systemic issues and there are some circumstances where this has happened. The state will put some level of response in writing.</p>	
7	11:45am	5 mins	New Business Items	IGT Members	<p>Patrick Gardner asked if there was an update from the state on the additional resources for IGT as this deliverable has a deadline date on June 30, 2022. Is the state going to inform the IGT as to how that is going to happen? Ross Edmunds shared that the state has decided to meet that deliverable by following Patrick Gardner's suggestion and putting a dedicated full-time position in place to support the IGT and the subcommittees. Patrick Gardner asked when this will happen, and Ross Edmunds explained that we will see if any staff members would want to do an internal transfer. If not, then we will have to hire a new employee. This process will begin by the due date</p>	

#	Time	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
					however, the state hiring process may not allow us to have fully onboarded a new employee by June 30. We will get back to the plaintiff attorneys early next week on which path we are taking and, as needed, determine how to best onboard this new employee. Patrick Gardner shared that they are happy to have some future assistance with some of the tasks that the IGT is working on.	
8	11:50am	5 mins	Public Comments	IGT Members	<i>There were no public comments at this time.</i>	
9	11:55am	5 mins	Review Future Agenda Topics	IGT Executive Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vote on IGT Guiding Principles document - IGT members</li> <li>• Update from IGT Guiding Principles Workgroup - Workgroup members</li> <li>• Review CANS Oversight Issues Survey Feedback &amp; Discuss Next Steps - IGT members</li> </ul>	
10	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.
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 <a href="#">Chad Cardwell</a> .	3/9/22	Chad Cardwell	N/A		3/9, New.
Based on the CANS Oversight Issues document from Patrick Gardner and the following item, "10. Do MCO policies undermine CANS? Are there unintentional financial incentives that cause some of the problems identified above?", Dennis Baughman will work with his Optum team to provide information on undermining versus fostering the use of the CANS.	6/8/22	Dennis Baughman	N/A		6/9, New.