

Date/Time of Meeting	Thursday, November 10, 2022, 9:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m. MT Dial: 415-527-5035 Access code: 2760 720 0386 Meeting password: X5yAvWG3M3c (95928943 from phones and video systems) Webex: https://idhw.webex.com/idhw/j.php?MTID=mb6ad211812b540439659f44c25849f75 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	Monty Prow - IDJC	X	Nicole Gaylin - Medicaid	X
Janet Hoeke - Parent Leader	X	Proxy Voting Members	Att'd	KayT Garrett - DHW DAG	X
David Welsh - Medicaid	X	Candace Falsetti - DBH	X	Kim Stretch - DHW DAG	X
Patrick Gardner - Child Advocate	X	Michelle Weir - FACS	O	Joy Jansen - School District	O
Howard Belodoff - Child Advocate	X	Recorder	Att'd	Georganne Benjamin - Optum	X
Jessica Barawed - County Juvenile Justice	O	Megan Schuelke - DBH	X	Matt Johansen - Optum	X
Laura Treat - DBH CMH Representative	O	Ex-officio Members	Att'd	Dora Axtell - Nimiipuu Health	O
Marquette Hendrickx - Tribal Representative	X	Shane Duty - DBH	X	Candice Jimenez - NPAIHB	O
Ruth York - Family Advocacy Agency	X	Jon Meyer - DBH	X	Caroline Merritt - Association of Providers	X
Kim Hokanson - Parent Leader	X	Scott Rasmussen - DBH	X	Michelle Batten - FYIdaho	X
Madeline Titelbaum - Youth Leader	X	Jenna Tetrault - Medicaid	X	Emily Brown - YES Project Manager	X
Chad Cardwell - FACS	X	Mallory Kotze - Medicaid	X	Raini Bowles - Parent Representative	X
Juliet Charron - Medicaid	X	Francesca Barbaro - Medicaid	X	Val Johnson - DBH CMH Program Manager	X
Alex Childers-Scott - Medicaid	X	Ashley Porter - Medicaid	X	Kyle Hanson - DBH	X
Laura Scuri - Provider	X	Dori Boyle - Medicaid	X	Brittany Shipley - Parent Representative	X
Sara Bennett - Parent Leader	X	Andie Blackwood - FACS	X	Tricia Ellinger - Parent Representative	X
TBD - SDE	O	Cameron Gilliland - FACS	X		

MEETING NOTES

#	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
1	10 mins <i>(All times are aspirational & are subject to change.)</i>	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 YES Communications Strategic Planning Workgroup Monthly Report from November 2022 Family & Advocacy Meeting (FAM) Subcommittee Approved Meeting Notes from October 2022 ICAT Subcommittee Approved Meeting Notes from October 2022 <p>Action Item: Approve IGT Meeting Notes from October 2022. Ross Edmunds motioned to approve the IGT Meeting notes from October 2022 and Ruth York seconded this motion.</p>	Vote: The IGT voting members voted unanimously to approve the IGT Meeting notes from October 2022.

#	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
2	10 mins	Vote for new IGT Voting Member & Discuss new IGT Members	IGT Voting Members	<p>Action Item: Nominate & vote for Val Johnson as the new IGT Voting Member/CMH Representative to take over for Laura Treat.</p> <p>Ross Edmunds shared that Val Johnson is located in DBH Region 1 and has been working for the Department for the last six years. She is also our new CMH Program Manager in the Strategy, Innovation, and Community Development (SICD) Bureau at DBH. Ross Edmunds motioned to approve Val Johnson as the new IGT Voting Member and DBH CMH Representative and Ruth York seconded this motion. Patrick Gardner asked what the CMH Program Manager will do. Val Johnson explained that she will focus on the current system and community development opportunities. She will also work with stakeholders to enhance the system, work with the project coordinators and program specialists, and report their work to the Bureau Chief, Scott Rasmussen. Ross Edmunds added that this is part of the new division structure within DBH for when the new IBHP is in place. There will be a lot of changes that will take place with that implementation and we are doing that work now so that we will be organized once that happens.</p> <p>Ruth York asked if DBH had an updated organizational chart that they could provide to the IGT so that we can see how they look currently and how you imagine it coming together. Ross Edmunds confirmed and shared that DBH can provide this to the IGT.</p>	<p>Vote: The IGT voting members voted unanimously to approve Val Johnson as the new IGT Voting Member/DBH CMH Representative.</p> <p>Next Steps: Ross Edmunds will provide the IGT with an updated DBH organizational chart.</p>
3	20 mins	Discuss Next Project for ICAT Subcommittee	IGT Members	<p>Laura Scuri shared that the ICAT subcommittee is working to bring on a co-chair and they are starting to set the agenda for the year. We want to make sure that we are proactive and responsive to the IGT and any of their requests. Due to this, what should we begin looking into? Ross Edmunds shared that the state would have to take some time to consider it. Laura Scuri shared that she is comfortable with that and will pass this update along to the ICAT subcommittee members and see if they have any specific interests in the future as well.</p> <p>Patrick Gardner shared that there is a process underway regarding the development of the crosswalk for services and supports. This is being done substantially by a consultant with a lot of direction and support from DBH and Medicaid. Whether or not IGT has a role or participates in that process, this could be an opportunity for input. Although the timing on this</p>	

#	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
				<p>project is immediate. Juliet Charron asked Patrick Gardner what level of input he was thinking would come from the IGT. Would this be input on the clinical items, content, formatting, or how items are explained? This will matter as the Department is working towards the deadline to have this completed in alignment with the IBHP. It is also a living document. Patrick Gardner explained that the IGT was participating early on in the development of the descriptions in the service array for the original work that was done on the crosswalk. Based on the governance process, it is the IGT that provides the clinical and workforce feedback and expertise. Juliet Charron shared that the state has not had any recent discussions around bringing it to the IGT. We can talk about this and bring it back to the IGT if there is a desire to have the IGT review it. KayT Garrett explained that when we were negotiating the IAP, we made the collective decision that the Implementation Workgroup (IWG) would be involved in reviewing this document. David Welsh added that we want to be transparent with the IGT. Asking for feedback was not a part of the plan but if the IGT can add content or provide feedback then we are happy to consider that as we develop the document. Ross Edmunds explained that we want the IGT to still be aware of the content and we will be sharing that in the future. It is a fluid and technical document but it would be good to give a presentation on it once it is finalized.</p> <p>Georganne Benjamin shared that she recalled that there have been iterations of this document. Is this a revamp as it has evolved since then? Ross Edmunds explained that the document was previously 90% complete but then it stalled due to disagreement so we need to finalize it. The idea is that it becomes an authoritative document and tells the IBHP provider what a service is and what it looks like through the point of delivery. We are also tracking this to the Settlement Agreement.</p> <p>Patrick Gardner clarified that as it relates to the ICAT subcommittee, we spent a lot of time trying to get clearer guidance and oversight by the IGT of the subcommittees. We do not want the ICAT subcommittee to have the impression that it is open season to go wherever. Rather, that they understand that there are times when there may not be a particular charge for the subcommittee.</p>	

#	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
4	30 mins	Review & Approve of the Proposed One Kid One CANS Workgroup Charter & Membership	IGT Executive Committee	<p>Ross Edmunds shared that there has been a lot of discussion around the CANS and how to move forward with the necessary improvements to the CANS and the CANS process. The IGT Executive Committee has been working to put together the One Kid One CANS Workgroup charter to help direct the workgroup and the membership of the workgroup. Patrick Gardner added that Juliet Charron provided some additional edits yesterday. Juliet Charron clarified that the edits were related to the workgroup membership. Specifically, the membership will include David Garrett or a representative and Tracy Sutton is a representative from Heritage in northern Idaho. There will also be further Department staff involvement to make sure that we are following the state guidance and we will follow the federal guidance as well. Ross Edmunds shared that the charter is complete including the minor edits on membership from Juliet Charron. Janet Hoeke added that they found a parent from northern Idaho, Sara Bennet, who has agreed to participate on this workgroup. This member should be added to the workgroup membership as well. Shane Duty then walked through the proposed One Kid One CANS Workgroup Charter document and noted that we have Kim Hokanson and Kyle Hanson as the co-chairs of this workgroup. Both of these co-chairs have been heavily involved with the CANS implementation historically as well as recently throughout the state of Idaho. Additionally, Kyle Hanson is leading the new CANS program within the Center of Excellence Bureau at DBH.</p> <p>Patrick Gardner shared that we know that the CANS is a valuable and essential tool in YES system of care however, we also know that it has posed some challenges to clinicians, parents, and youth. We want to fix this so that we can achieve the best CANS process. We are hoping that this workgroup works quickly on both of the known and unknown issues so that we can see improvements by the summer of next year. This will require a focused effort, a consensus building process, and capable assistance. One critical item included in the process is a CANS mini-training for all members of the workgroup. We want all of the members to understand what the CANS does, how it works, and why it is important. This is because we have a lot of different perspectives when we have talked to people. As a note, we are also still working to get a youth member for this workgroup. We want to have the right workgroup as well</p>	<p>Vote: The IGT voting members voted unanimously to approve the proposed One Kid One CANS Workgroup Charter including the identified edits.</p>

#	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
				<p>as the right leadership. This would be about three to four hours of training. Then, two hours a month will be needed for the formal meeting and two to five hours a month for homework or preparation to participate in the meeting. It is important that the members schedules are flexible. We want to make the CANS a shorter tool so that it is easier to work with and the process is more efficient. We also need to get all of the clinicians on the same page concerning how it should be done and we need to educate parents about the process itself. This way as the new IBHP ramps up, it will be in line with the new version of the CANS. Janet Hoeke asked, concerning the workgroup membership, do we have any parents that also have foster care experience? It was clarified that Raini Bowles is on the membership list and has foster care experience.</p> <p>Matt Johansen noted that it is good to hear that training is the central focus for this workgroup. Optum already has 80 providers signed up for the CANS Training on Wednesday, which shows how thirsty providers are for more trainings. As it relates to the primary objectives, is there any latitude to not focus solely on the length of the CANS? That is one concern however, there are other concerns around the time that it takes to complete the CANS. Shane Duty explained that it was suggested that the workgroup look at the length of the CANS as a primary focus at this point. We need to have a quality improvement mindset and also look at enhancements. The workgroup will be talking about updates, what is set forth by the Praed Foundation and Dr. Lyons as well as noting other areas as they go through the review. Juliet Charron shared that she does not disagree but would still encourage openness to hearing other ideas. We want to keep an open mind to possible solutions. Patrick Gardner explained that it is best to focus on one objective. First, we should ask if it is the appropriate array for the state of Idaho. We have flexibility to streamline the tool. For the second component, we are talking about the clinicians, families, and youth. There is also an opportunity for issue-spotting that workgroup will do. Both of these concerns are covered in process that we have identified. We are trying to sever from the CANS tool incorporation and focus more on the user experience as that requires input and feedback from participants.</p>	

#	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
				<p>Patrick Gardner shared that the goal today is for the IGT to dissect and approve of the One Kid One CANS Workgroup charter. Are there questions about the proposal or suggested changes to the charter? We are hoping to approve of this charter since we have clear tasks with a workable process to accomplish those tasks. There are also some proposed timelines within this charter. When would that timeline start? We were hoping that the clock would start based on when the workgroup has its first meeting, which would hopefully be before the end of the year. Janet Hoeke agreed that this seems reasonable. Kim Hokanson and Kyle Hanson could send out the meeting invite. They will also need to have an Administrative Assistant assigned to that workgroup. David Welsh noted that it is a large group participating on this workgroup, which will bring a diverse perspective. However, when it comes to scheduling a meeting, what is the best way to move forward while accommodating schedules? Ross Edmunds shared that we will let the workgroup determine that. Juliet Charron added that with enough notice, the members can manage their schedules. Patrick Gardner noted that this is with the caveat that these deadlines are very important. The structure of the Settlement Agreement is built around the process to develop and roll out the new IBHP. A key component was that we would time things in a way where the state implemented the role out of YES such that the necessary information would be included in the IBHP. This would be done timely so that when the new program is in place all of the design elements are also in place. We want the CANS process to be done so that when the new IBHP rolls out, it can incorporate the improvements that this workgroup is going to help us develop. Timing matters because the timeframe is over the next four to six months. We are hopeful that the co-chairs of the workgroup can get this work done. David Welsh provided clarification that the work that the workgroup will be conducting is important. We should not tie recommendations to specific points in time. When we get the recommendations then we will look at when makes the most sense to execute based on the way that we execute the CANS. We are trying to work through this as quickly as possible to determine the enhancements and at a state-level we will determine when would be best to operationalize those changes. Patrick Gardner reminded the state that as a member of the plaintiff's counsel, they are always concerned about delays and timeliness. David</p>	

#	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
				<p>Welsh noted that we may be able to work on some of these items before the new contract.</p> <p>Patrick Gardner pointed out a technical observation that participation by parents is essential and the state of Idaho is using a cutting edge approach for stakeholder inclusion. Parents become workers for the state with these kinds of opportunities. As it relates, who is in charge of ensuring that this happens for this workgroup? This needs to be in place as quickly as possible. Ruth York shared that FYIdaho has a contract with the state to make sure that this occurs. We reach out to state to get work orders to give to the parents for the hours that are needed for this project. Then, we reimburse the parents for their hours on this project. FYIdaho presented this idea at a national conference last week and encouraged other non-profit organizations to do this.</p> <p>Ross Edmunds motioned to accept the One Kid One CANS Workgroup charter with the edits that have been described and captured in the meeting notes. Juliet Charron seconded this motion.</p>	
5	20 mins	BREAK	IGT Members		
6	15 mins	Report from Due Process Workgroup	KayT Garrett	<p>KayT Garrett reviewed the draft Due Process Workgroup Purpose document and shared that the workgroup has been updating the purpose. We incorporated the language from the IAP and the Authoritative Due Process Protocol. The second point of the draft purpose relates to who creates the informational materials. Shane Duty will address this during his update about the Communication Plan as well as whether the Due Process Workgroup has a responsibility in creating or reviewing those informational materials. KayT Garrett then shared that the Due Process Workgroup will also be addressing how individual family concerns about due process should be raised to the workgroup. There may be times when it is appropriate to bring up a general concern that arose out of a family's concern and discussed it within the workgroup. However, we have to be careful with cases that are active. Kim Hokanson is the parent representative on this workgroup and she is great at coordinating with the parents that are going through appeals and have questions. KayT Garrett also explained that she and Kim Stretch talked with the workgroup about when it is the right time to bring issues to the</p>	

#	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
				<p>workgroup. If a case is active, we want to protect the family and class member's confidentiality. In the last meeting, we also talked about developing a template that would be used by the members of the workgroup to evaluate an issue and determine if there is a current active appeal. The template would also help the member bring the issue to the Due Process Workgroup. The other purpose of the template would be to help frame issues within the Authoritative Due Process Protocol. As a general update on the review of the notices done by the Due Process Workgroup members, 27 have been completed and approved and 8 are on pause out of 35 total. None of the notices are being actively reviewed at the moment. We will be looking at the Practice Manual once it has been updated. We also wanted to share that there is a new YES Rights and Resolutions Report that has been posted on the YES website. This report comes out of Candace Falsetti's team and they process the complaints that come through the YES complaints process.</p> <p>Howard Belodoff shared that first, in regard to the Due Process purpose, nothing is mentioned about the YES Rights and Resolutions Report. That should be incorporated into the report. As well, there has been a requested review of the Idaho Medicaid Appeal Rights Form and we have been waiting to hear back. This notice does not meet the Due Process Protocol and federal regulations. This has not been suspended and we would like to have this addressed as soon as possible. We should also note that regarding criticism of the changes to the Due Process Purpose document, the Communications Workgroup has not done anything around due process and the work requirements. We have had numerous conversations about the Due Process Workgroup creating informational materials and we previously reviewed some of these. A parent-friendly informational material on the fair hearing process is critical and it needs to be created. In regard to the template, it is unnecessary and confusing. It would be difficult for any parent to understand the Authoritative Due Process Protocol as that was written by the attorneys. That language is not workable or fair for parents. What was covered in the template is explained in the purpose statement and we can work on clarifying the statement if needed. KayT Garrett clarified that we will be talking about the draft language of the Due Process purpose during the Due Process Workgroup meeting next</p>	

#	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
				<p>Friday. The template referenced was not provided to the full the IGT as we are going to talk about that with the workgroup first. The idea of a template was discussed during the last Due Process Workgroup meeting and one was put together as a concept.</p> <p>Kim Stretch explained that, regarding the Idaho Medicaid Appeal Rights Form, the Department has the comments from Howard Belodoff. This Idaho Medicaid notice was also provided to the KW plaintiff’s counsel for their review and comments since one form has to work for all of the Medicaid programs. We have followed up with the KW attorneys a couple of times but they have not provided their comments. Medicaid cannot finalize this form without the KW attorneys reviewing and approving of it. Howard Belodoff shared that he will send an email to the KW attorneys to try to move the review process along. Janet Hoeke asked for clarification around “KW” and Kim Stretch explained that it is a Medicaid lawsuit, which is KW vs Armstrong about the adult Medicaid program. Howard Belodoff asked if the KW attorneys have seen what changes were proposed as it could be helpful. Kim Stretch shared that she sent the form that was finalized by Due Process Workgroup in 2019, which is the current form that Medicaid is using. Howard Belodoff explained that since the KW attorneys do not have the version with his comments to consider then we are not going to get very far. It would be best if the Department addressed the comments and then provided the form to the KW attorneys. Kim Stretch disagreed as we need all members to give input on the form that is being used. Then, it will be the Department’s job to merge the two and try to come up with something that satisfies both parties.</p>	
7	15 mins	Update on Communication Plan	Shane Duty	<p>Shane Duty shared that as Ross Edmunds explained earlier, there is a transition going on within DBH. Due to this, we are looking at the Communication Plan as a whole. It is an internal deliverable within the IAP and we needed to determine how to best move that forward. We decided that from the Department’s standpoint, DBH will be the ‘owners’ on how that plan is constructed and reevaluated as the current plan needs to be updated. DBH will take on the construction with other stakeholders. Different bureaus within DBH are being formed and that allows the staff subject matter experts (SMEs) to be dedicated to specific pieces of that Communication Plan. The Operational Unit will house the Communication Team and</p>	<p>Vote: The IGT voting members voted unanimously to approve of the amendment to the IGT</p>

#	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
				<p>they will piece those together. It will be paramount in every segment that we make sure that we have the appropriate parent, family, and youth voice incorporated for the communication tools and the overall strategy of YES communications. As these are being developed, we will tie them to the other concerns that have been raised during the Due Process Workgroup meetings and those around the YES website. We want to make sure that we are making those updates in a way that matches the communications strategy moving forward so that it is as effective as possible. Once the team is formed and we have the strategy, then we will be able to put together those specific communications. We are also planning to come up with more specific bulleted plans as we move forward.</p> <p>Juliet Charron motioned to amend the agenda and move up the item "New Business Items" before the review of the FACS Administrative Directive as she has to leave for another meeting. Ross Edmunds seconded this motion.</p>	<p>Meeting agenda to move up the item "New Business Items" before the review of the FACS Administrative Directive.</p>
8	20 mins	Discuss IGT Roles & Responsibilities Grid	IGT Subgroup Members	<p>Janet Hoeke shared that the IGT subgroup went through the authoritative documents with the goal to collaboratively come to an understanding of what the roles and responsibilities are for the IGT, the ICAT subcommittee, and the FAM subcommittee. Originally, we also included the IWG and the QMIA Council. This IGT subgroup went through all of these documents exhaustively to determine the roles and responsibilities for each group and where the authority came from. We also discussed how best to establish a more understood method of communication between the IGT and subcommittees. The issues included a concern about how things were supposed to move between the groups, where the focus was, and how to make sure we are not losing items. We determined that we also needed to make it clear that the IGT is here to advise the parties.</p> <p>Janet Hoeke then reviewed the Executive Summary and the IGT Work Process Description in the IGT Roles & Responsibilities Grid. These are the items that came directly from the Settlement Agreement. Additionally, we wanted it to be clear that none of us can make the state do anything. IGT and subcommittee members can make recommendations of what could or should be done. Then, the state has to make a determination based on the regulations, funding, etc. The</p>	

#	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
				<p>state has an obligation to tell us what they are going to do and why, which is part of the communication piece that we want to establish. This is so that when something is brought forth, there is that communication loop so that there is a full understanding of our commitments and responsibilities. Janet Hoeke reviewed the IGT Issue Management Process in the IGT Roles & Responsibilities Grid and explained that we are going to test the workflow during the IGT meetings. It is important that we do not have items that are lost. We can formalize parts of this process when it is focused on a bigger issue, such as the PRA certification. It should also be noted that we suspended working on the QMIA section of the IGT Roles & Responsibilities Grid as there is a separate group working on this.</p> <p>Ross Edmunds shared that the IGT Issue Management Process is nine steps and seems very transactional. This may take the state away from receiving recommendations from a subcommittee as it puts it all on the IGT. If the state entity agreed with a subcommittee's recommendation and thought that they should start working on it, would they still have to go to the IGT first? Janet Hoeke explained that the IGT subgroup discussed this piece a lot. The IGT is the only body that can make recommendations. All of the members agreed that we want each subcommittee to be collaborative in nature. These steps are for issues that are not being resolved in another way, such as the One Kid One CANS Workgroup. The intent is not to prohibit or prevent collaboration but rather to make sure that when there is a larger issue that has come before the IGT because it has not been resolved somewhere else, it is recognized that the IGT is now responsible to identify and address those barriers.</p> <p>Ross Edmunds shared that this makes sense so that if we cannot informally deal with it then we have a formal way to. The second part is trying to maintain the balance so that if the state starts to work on a recommendation from a subcommittee, the IGT should not get cut out of being informed about that. Janet Hoeke noted that each subcommittee is supposed to provide a report to the IGT every month. We could also ask the subcommittees to give an update to the IGT once a quarter so that they are in the loop on these items. The IGT subgroup was looking for a way to formalize</p>	<p>Decision: The IGT members agreed unanimously to approve of and adopt the IGT Roles & Responsibilities Grid as written with the inclusion of the identified edits.</p>

#	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
				<p>this process to keep an eye on these items without creating more of an administrative burden.</p> <p>Ruth York noted that permissive language is used in the first item. KayT Garrett explained that permissive language is used in the statute as they use the word 'may' instead of 'can'. Janet Hoeke agreed with the suggested update and shared that the members also identified the need for a welcome book for new IGT members so that they understand the commitments and why this group exists. Ross Edmunds asked what the next step is and Janet Hoeke shared that there was an additional question as Jana Kemp was wondering who the annual IGT Report would go to and who would write the report. The IGT Roles & Responsibilities Grid states that it will be delivered to the state, the plaintiffs, and publicly posted on the YES website. For the IGT Roles & Responsibilities Grid document, the next steps would be to make the requested adjustments and then vote on it at the next IGT Meeting.</p> <p>Patrick Gardner shared that he would like to propose a technical amendment to include language that this document is not intended to amend the Jeff D. Settlement Agreement, Implementation Plan, and the IAP. If conflict arises, then those authoritative documents have control. Janet Hoeke agreed with this suggestion. Patrick Gardner added that he also did not feel that we needed to leave an open-ended offer for amendments over the next month. KayT Garrett shared her agreement with Patrick Gardner on the addition of the language around the authoritative documents. KayT Garrett also clarified that the adoption of the IGT Roles & Responsibilities Grid does not require a formal vote from the IGT. Ross Edmunds asked who could provide the language described for the authoritative documents and Patrick Gardner shared that he could send that language to Megan Schuelke to be included in the IGT Roles & Responsibilities Grid.</p> <p>Ross Edmunds shared that he approved of and accepted the IGT Roles & Responsibilities Grid as written with the inclusion of the identified edits as described above. Juliet Charron and all of the present IGT members agreed.</p>	
9	10 mins	New Business Item <i>(Per the approved amendment.)</i>	Juliet Charron	Juliet Charron shared that the Department wants to make a request of the IGT following some internal conversations that we have had with DBH, Medicaid, and FACS to an extent. Based	

#	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
				<p>on the discussions that we have had around how the Department can be successful in meeting the obligations to transform the system of care for those served by the Department and also acknowledging the crisis both in our state and nationally, we need to step back and become more aligned strategically with our work and resources. Therefore, we are requesting a bit of a pause in the Department participation in several meetings. This would take place for the next two months, December through January, as we need to take this time to continue to develop a number of plans. One of the items that we are working on is a shared vision for how we are approaching our work on YES between the three divisions. We want to bring the FACS team to the table in a different way than they are today. We also need to continue our work on the governance structure for new IBHP contract, which has implications on YES. There are huge organizational transitions taking place, especially within DBH and between the three divisions. There is a new bureau that is being created for IBHP contract. We want to develop a more thorough plan to provide services throughout Idaho, which includes looking at initiatives around workforce, robust service arrays, and different budgets and funding opportunities. As well, we are not all on the same page and we need to become more aligned in order to become more successful. We are in agreement that if other members want to meet then we will support that but the Department will pull back all of our staff members so that we can focus in on these efforts. We will continue to engage in some meetings, such as the meetings with the parents. The One Kid One CANS Workgroup will start meeting in the next month but, otherwise, we will pull back to do this internal work. Ross Edmunds added that part of this request is around having the time to do this work. We have not had the time to dedicate to creating this vision. In the midst of all of this change, we want to have our house in order to make sure that we are prepared to respond and ready for this difficult push. We have done a lot of work with YES but there are parts missing, including the service delivery part. We are also preparing for a massive change in DBH. This includes a change in staff and many are trying to do their new jobs and their old jobs. We are also working to create a new bureau that exists between Medicaid and DBH. Juliet Charron added that the plan is to come back and share the shared vision and work plan around service</p>	<p>Decision: The IGT members agreed to pause the IGT meetings for December 2022 and January 2023. The next IGT meeting will take place in February 2023.</p>

#	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
				<p>delivery with the IGT to show what we were working on and where we are going.</p> <p>Janet Hoeke asked for feedback from the IGT members regarding the request to suspend meeting for the next two months. Ross Edmunds shared that Emily Brown, the YES Project Manager, has already blocked out chunks of time dedicated to specific deliverables that we need to accomplish. Juliet Charron added that we are planning to request the same from the IWG. Janet Hoeke asked when the Department announces the new IBHP contract, could someone send out an update to the IGT membership? Juliet Charron and Ross Edmunds both agreed. Juliet Charron shared that on the IWG note, we are planning to have the next IWG meeting and then we will pause for the next two months as well. Work on the deliverables will continue, including the Services and Supports Matrix.</p> <p>Janet Hoeke asked if the IGT is formally required to have a certain number of meetings per year and Patrick Gardner explained that they are not. Patrick Gardner then shared that the plaintiff's counsel had had concerns for a while with the coordination among the agencies tasked with implementation and the need for these agencies to get on the same page. We are happy to see that the parties are acknowledging that it is necessary to take the time to do that. As well, now is not a bad time to take a pause for the IGT because we have completed some important work around the process issues and launched the One Kid One CANS Workgroup. It is also essential to note that, as Juliet Charron said, this is not a request where the substantive deliverables are going to be delayed. For all of those reasons and because it is a holiday season, this seems to be both reasonable and necessary. Janet Hoeke agreed and shared that we would schedule the next IGT meeting in February. Patrick Gardner added that, regarding the idea that the IGT could meet without state membership, this is not a great idea as it is a collaborative meeting and would be counterproductive. Patrick Gardner also asked for clarification around which meetings are cancelled until February. Is that each workgroup and subcommittee of the IGT, the IGT, and the IWG? Janet Hoeke shared that the FAM subcommittee previously made the decision to cancel the December meeting so their next meeting is in January. Ross Edmunds shared that</p>	

#	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
				<p>the Family Coordination meetings will continue. KayT Garrett added that this will be up to the subcommittees and workgroups to decide. Mainly, it would be the IGT meetings and the IGT Executive Committees meetings that would not be occurring. Ross Edmunds noted that we want the One Kid One CANS Workgroup to get started and we will continue to work with the contractors on the Services and Supports Crosswalk. Janet Hoeke shared that it sounds like the ICAT subcommittee is regrouping and reorganizing. If they want to continue to meet then there is no reason to prevent them from doing so. KayT Garrett shared that outside of the IGT meetings, the Department is going to make the same proposal for the IWG meetings and to the Due Process Workgroup. Both of these workgroups have upcoming meetings where the issue will be addressed.</p>	
10	20 mins	Discuss Youth Engagement	Janet Hoeke	<p>Janet Hoeke shared that she was hoping to have this discussion as we have struggled to have genuine youth involvement with the IGT. Janet Hoeke added that she was interested in what others thought we should consider doing to have more youth feedback and participation in ways that feel important and valuable to them while still providing feedback that is important to us as we develop this system of care. Ashley Porter shared that we talked about this in the FAM subcommittee and having groups that are after school was suggested. This was we could get stories and then bring them back to groups like the IGT as the youth members would likely not come to this meeting.</p> <p>KayT Garrett asked about what is happening out in the community now. Ruth York shared that it is hard for FYIdaho to get youth voice on certain subjects. FYIdaho runs an after school program for high school students. It has become a comfortable space for them where we host various activities and work to develop relationships with them. We have created a program where people are in and out of the space a lot and we have many repeat youth members. We should also recognize that the committee asked for a youth member and it turned into Madeline Titelbaum as the youth member. It is hard to ask Madeline Titelbaum to listen to all of this as she does not have all of the background and the information needed to vote on items. Instead, it may work better for this committee not to feel like they have to have a youth member. Rather, we would need to make sure that we provide good</p>	

#	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
				<p>strong youth voice in our team. FYIdaho could help bring the youth voice but also have the FAM subcommittee help find other ways to bring in the youth voice. Madeline Titelbaum has been working to bring in youth voice from across the state but it has been a huge struggle to figure out how to involve the youth. Madeline Titelbaum agreed and explained that it is not realistic to expect to have teens come to this meeting. As a young adult, it does not feel like there is a lot to contribute to these meetings and a teen would likely feel that way too. For teen input, rather than coming to this meeting, it would be much better to request it in the way of a survey. This is something that we could do monthly at FYIdaho. It is always helpful to have an incentive and we have funding that we could tap into. This would be a low effort request but it could get good results to answer the question about what is going on in the community. We would need to consider that we do not structure the program so that we are only in contact with teens that are in the YES system. That may also play into the results that we are wanting to find.</p> <p>Raini Bowles shared that at the NFF Conference last week, she found that agencies were incentivizing youth to come to meetings and programs with up to \$1,500 a month through SOC. Brittany Shipley shared that in Blaine County, we have an MOU with the school district. We go into the schools and do activities to work with the youth each week. Sometimes they are self-referred or referred to by their family, friends, etc. We create an environment that is safe and judgement free so that they can talk about what they may be struggling with. From our experience, not a lot of teens want to complete a survey. They would rather have an interactive board that we can talk through or create funny TikTok videos. If there are specific questions that we need to get at, we could weave them into conversation so that they are naturally occurring. If we need data, partnering with pre-existing programs is a great way to do that. If there is specific data that we are hoping to collect, be that quantitative or qualitative, it would be helpful to know more specifically what the goal is and if there are some parameters are for what we are hoping to collect. That way we can ensure we are collecting and measuring the right information.</p>	

#	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
				<p>Matt Johansen agreed with the suggestion to partner with the community because getting youth feedback can be challenging. We also need to think about if the information being collected is in a form that they are interested in. Often youth tend to be more open to questionnaires when they are provided on an iPad. More importantly is the familiarity and trust, such as when a survey is being given to them by someone that they trust. We often get good input when we partner with existing providers. Matt Johansen shared that he also agrees with the youth not attending these meetings and instead fielding these questions. Georganne Benjamin shared that Optum has been doing a lot of work in this area right now. We are meeting with youth across the US. To have a system that is built for youth, we have to be able, as a system, to make changes that they feel are for them. We are starting those conversations in their space and based on what they are interested in. We, as adults, want to listen to them and make change on their behalf. Optum would be happy to share this preliminary work with the IGT.</p> <p>Val Johnson shared that the DBH regional staff members in the Caldwell area recently went to the schools and were able to talk to the counselors and principals. They are getting ready to do a panel and also had some incentives to offer. We have to speak their language in their environments. Some of this is already happening but we need to utilize what is happening and be more collaborative with it. The efforts also need to be owned so that the information can be fed back to where it can be used toward the transformational change.</p> <p>Patrick Gardner shared that this is never easy. Fundamentally, one of the reasons is because the way that adults work in committees and groups is off-putting. There has to be some return on this. Youth will be more likely to participate if they feel like it serves some value. We also have to underscore that they have to believe that we are listening and that they matter. Other administrations are not good at doing that. You need to show that you are listening and that you are prepared to act on what you share. If we are trying to get an individual youth to attend meetings and participate, we have never seen it been successful. What has been successful is having a group of youth involved because then they support one another. They are coming to these meetings in part because they want to see</p>	

#	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
				<p>their friends. It is hard to have a group of young people do that for our purpose. Instead, it may be best to find a group that already exists that might want to add on. Natural settings is where you are going to get participation. We also know that incentivizing makes a difference. There has to be funding for youth engagement and a Youth Coordinator role for the IGT would be essential. This could be done with the FYIdaho contract. Providing the resources that are necessary to support the engagement of young people is going to be essential. Another way that has been successful is to have the youth come to a meeting to provide a presentation. For example, we could invite a group of young people that have been involved in the Child Welfare system to give a presentation to share their experiences. We could also invite young people who have been involved in YES and do panel. If they can do it as a group and someone supports them to pull together a presentation as a focal point of the meeting, we could have time periodically where we change the meeting schedule to have a meeting in the evening. We have also seen success with engaging college students around mental health issues. A lot of universities are working on developing better policies and students are organizing into wellness groups. Focused groups are easier to manage and in some ways can be more enjoyable and interesting for young people.</p> <p>Ruth York shared a funding question as FYIdaho funds the work that they do with youth through incentives. We also have access to state funds that pay for parents to be at this table. Focus groups are great but they can be intensive and expensive to organize. Would it be possible for the same state funds to come to us for that kind of work? Janet Hoeke shared that, due to time, she will follow-up with Ruth York and Madeline Titelbaum on the items that they are already working on. We also need to think about what we want to know from youth. Patrick Gardner noted that we should not focus on what we want to know but on what they want to tell us.</p>	
11	20 mins	Review Updated FACS Administrative Directive	Cameron Gilliland	Cameron Gilliland joined the meeting at 12pm MT to review the updated proposed FACS Administrative Directive. Cameron Gilliland shared that the requested changes from a previous IGT Meeting were made and the updated document was sent out to all of the IGT members. It is important to remember that this FACS Administrative Directive is about whether or not we substantiate, which is specific to whether or not we would	

#	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
				<p>take a child into care and when we would do that. House Bill 233 is too big for this Administrative Directive as it includes a lot and we do not want to try to solve all of those problems with this document. Rather, we want to solve problems for the FACS staff members. We do not want to violate House Bill 233 and we do not want to substantiate people. We still need to separate out substantiation from the safety of the child as our primary purpose and focus is the safety of the child.</p> <p>Janet Hoeke asked a question about the process. If they take a child into care, can they do that without substantiation? Cameron Gilliland confirmed and explained that it is based on safety. This is in the case of the police or a judge declaring that a child is in imminent danger. Otherwise, there is no right to take a child into care. Janet Hoeke then asked about the process for a child that is in the hospital because they are a danger to themselves. In the case where it is not safe for the family to bring the child home from the hospital, what happens? What is the link between the two? Cameron Gilliland explained that this is when they look at any possible behavioral abuse or neglect by the caretaker. If it is a situation where there is no safe place for the child to go then we complete an investigation. Ruth York asked if the Department can hold onto a child without substantiation and Cameron Gilliland explained that they can as long as the court states that the child is not safe. Andie Blackwood added that safety and substantiation are two separate decisions. House Bill 233 made it so that we no longer had to substantiate a parent and have to do an investigation. Ruth York shared that they continue to see parents that are experiencing gaps in services and are overwhelmed trying to take care of the child. Based off of their experience with CPS, the process still sounds punitive. We need to bring the family voice in and FACS needs embrace their role. Families need their support and we need to help them by providing institutional communications from FACS. Cameron Gilliland shared that FACS has been working to collaborate more on the ideas and themes that are coming forward. We are leery to do this at a case level because it is easy to end up triangulated. Our role is confidential so it is easy to appear in a bad light. We like ideas around how to communicate better. If any members have ideas or examples, we are happy to collect those and work on updating them.</p>	

#	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
				<p>Howard Belodoff shared that this is the first time that he has heard FACS talk about safety and the need to provide services, which House Bill 233 speaks to. Howard Belodoff commended FACS for recognizing this and added that this needs to be clearer in the Administrative Directive. It would be helpful to have a small group meeting to figure out how best to meet this need so that the parents get the services that their children need and they stay out of the court system. The police have one tool on these types of calls and that is to take a child into protective custody. Brittany Shipley shared that she fully supports Howard Belodoff's proposal of a meeting and would be happy to participate as both a parent of a dual-diagnosed child who has been through all processes as well as a professional who supports youth and families and provides all of the law enforcement training in her county. Cameron Gilliland shared that he would not mind hosting a group to talk through this.</p> <p>Patrick Gardner shared that this is also his first time hearing some of this information and he appreciates the flexibility of House Bill 233 between substantiation and safety workers. Are social workers aware of this and if so, have they been trained on how to separate these? We should also be using this when a child is in the ER and the hospital wants to discharge the child however, there are no services in place for when the child returns home. The child is going from receiving the highest level of services to receiving no services in their home. We need to make sure that this problem is solved. As well, when FACS mentions a lack of services, it is important to remember that FACS is called out as a defendant in the Jeff D. lawsuit. We are hoping to see FACS at the table for more of the YES meetings as they are also responsible to figure out how to serve children in Idaho. Cameron Gilliland noted that FACS has been attending all of the IGT meetings. We are also committed to offering more trainings on separating safety versus substantiation. These trainings took place last summer and have continued for staff members.</p>	
12	15 mins	Review Sponsor's Status Report	DBH & Medicaid	Ross Edmunds provided an update that the Sponsor's Status Report has been shared with all of the IGT members. No substantial updates were made this month and, due to time, we will not be reviewing the report during this meeting.	
13	15 mins	Review & Update Open Action Items	IGT Executive Committee	Due to time, one of the below open action items was reviewed and updated accordingly.	
14	5 mins	New Business Items	IGT Members	<i>No new business items were provided at this time.</i>	

#	Length	Topic	Topic Owner	Discussion	Decisions
15	5 mins	Public Comments	IGT Members	<i>No public comments were provided at this time.</i>	
16	10 mins	Review Future Agenda Topics	IGT Executive Committee	Due to the above determination, future agenda topics were not discussed.	
17	--	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 and sent the questions to the CMH subcommittees for feedback.
Gather information from community providers about the decrease in skills-building and the increase in TCC.	2/9/22	Laura Treat	N/A	Update: Understanding that this was rolled into the CBRS questions. Correct? 10/12 Update: This is a separate question, but the request could be sent to ICAT. Discussion will continue at the next IGT meeting.	2/9, New.
Based on the CANS Oversight Issues document from Patrick Gardner and the following item, "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	Update: Understanding that this was rolled into work on the One Kid One CANS Workgroup. Correct? 10/12 Update: Correct, it is recommended that this work be rolled into the One Kid One CANS Workgroup.	6/9, New.
Optum will work with Medicaid to extend the monthly Provider Engagement/Advisory Committee meeting invitations to the IGT members.	7/13/22	Georganne Benjamin	N/A	11/10 Update: Optum shared that this has been completed and the action item can be closed.	11/10, Closed.
IDJC, FACS, and SDE will email Megan Schuelke the representative who will regularly attend the Due Process Workgroup meetings.	9/14/22	IDJC, FACS, and SDE	N/A	Update: Megan Schuelke has not received emails from IDJC, FACS, or SDE. 10/12 Update: Megan Schuelke will reach out to IDJC, FACS, and SDE again.	9/14, New.