

**DD System Transformation Workgroup
DMH – Conference Room A
November 19, 2013**

Attendance

Dan Haug, Tricia Dusheke, Bernie Simons, Greg Kramer, Erika Leonard, Marilyn Nolan, Etta Mitchell, Mike Rea, Wendy Witcig; Wendy Sullivan, Cindy Clark, Scott Shepherd, Cory McMahon, Terry Combs, Alecia Archer, Jhan Hurn, Kathleen Featherstone, Jake Jacobs, Roger Garlick, Rikki Wright, Andrea Purdome; Vicki McCarrell, Les Wagner, Linda Bowers, Marcy Volner. By Phone: Ann Graff, Peg Capo, Lynn Smith

Review of meeting

1. Update from CSR Workgroup

Dan Haug noted a spreadsheet was put together by Alecia Archer with the help of DD staff. The spreadsheet contains embedded links that will be a great resource for this group to use. Dan indicated he would forward this document to everyone in the group once Alecia receives the DORs and CSRs that also need to be included.

2. Update from Other States Best Practices Workgroup

Scott Shepherd indicated a conference call was held recently and Marcy Volner and Vicki McCarrell discussed contacting Colorado and Pennsylvania to obtain information on how those states run their system. A conference call was also held with Ohio's vice president at AWS about the pros and cons with their system. Tom Long, from Kansas, was also contacted about setting up a conference call about system redesign and a meeting request will go out soon. Bill Bowman, from California, will also be contacted to obtain information from that state. Mary Sullivan asked to be included on any future meetings. Scott Shepherd agreed to be the lead for this group and will contact DMH for help with meeting requests in the future if needed.

3. Core Functions

Eligibility and Intake – Dan Haug stated the core issues will need to be addressed and done in phases to be sure this is done right. Case management is further along than other areas but we need to focus and work toward implementation in all areas. Dan responded to Cory McMahon's question on what selling this to the public would entail. This will include involving the public, provider community, consumers, General Assembly and the SB40 Boards. It was discussed the recent letters from Dan Haug and Bernie Simons that went out to entities on the DD System ReDesign process was helpful but many still had questions on the overall process. It was explained this is a work in progress and that all the answers will not be available until this group works through them.

Benefits and challenges of Eligibility and Intake:

- Access – Would be best to do at the county level and would make more timely, have better communication with local individuals, and the wait would be shorter.
- Appeals – How would this be handled in the future? Some concern over how the local level would handle the denial to individuals they know well was discussed. Rikki Wright stated how this is set up will impact who represents. Currently, the Attorney General's office oversees the Dept. of Mental Health and it may be possible for them to represent the boards as well. It was agreed that a proper appeal process would need to be in place.
- Intakes – Jeff Richards stated this is difficult at the local levels and currently pass along an 800 number which most never even call. Cindy Clark said a benefit is a holistic approach of resources and doing this affordably. If the system intake goes from the Regional Office to the local level, the funding might not be affordable for the local level. Would need the FTE's in place for this change. Other challenges discussed were how some counties could take on this process well when some cannot. It was agreed that the core items need to be in place for all but flexibility was needed between the Regional Offices and the local offices in certain areas. Marcy Volner stated we need perimeters on what's not working currently and how to make those better and not keep the same as we move forward.
- Eligibility – Jake Jacobs noted that entities may do this differently in different locations but all would need to follow the same guidelines. The overall eligibility piece would be the same for all. Dan Haug agreed with Ann Graff that training state wide on intake and eligibility would be a good idea and that the department would be responsible for that process.
- Allocation – The financial resources and how this is handled was of concern. Dan Haug and Bernie Simons stated this would be done by allocation. Service dollars, by county, could be allocated for local control. Funds are needed at the local level and the budget needs to be governed by the state. Some areas of concern were the current process of how the 12's are handled. Les Wagner stated we should get rid of the 12 process and that this hasn't worked well. Rikki Wright noted we already set up a state plan and utilization plan by access. Jhan Hurn asked about the funding by appropriation at the Regional Offices and how it's handled. Dan Haug said the flexibility of moving approp funds between Equipment and Expenses and Personal Services is not that flexible anymore. Dan stated he could talk with Budget and Planning about being flexible if moved into a co-op with the local entities on system redesign. Dan also clarified this would be discussed with them before moving into the next budget cycle so we don't have to wait a whole year to begin this process

Other Items

- It was asked if this moves forward, if all 11 Regional Offices would be needed. Bernie Simons stated this needs to be evaluated and Alecia Archer stated there is a need for Regional Offices.
- Mike Rea – asked what legal issues we might encounter and what to look at. Rikki Wright would prefer the functions be in place before we look into this.

Outcome

Dan Haug indicated that before the next meeting the Department of Mental Health will define the functions and what that would entail of the four items below:

- a. Eligibility and Intake
- b. Assess Level of Need
- c. Case Management
- d. Full Budget Responsibility

What the department comes up with will be open for discussion among all in the workgroup. The department will also include things we think need to stay at the state level vs. the local level. This should guide the conversation at the next meeting and provide some clarity.

Next Meeting: Will be scheduled for the middle of December or once the department gathers the necessary information needed.