

The Governor's Mental Health Services Planning Council
Transformation Subcommittee
July 11, 2006

In attendance: Wes Cole, Mike Hammond, Jane Adams, Rick Cagan, Roy Menninger, Mary Ellen Conlee, Jayme Collins, Susan Crain Lewis, Cherie Bledsoe, Wes Jones, Scott Jackson, and Michelle Ponce.

Via Televideo: Bobbie Rine.

Via Telephone: Brad Grinage

Executive Summary

The group reviewed the TSC concept paper to pare down and prioritize tasks. Utilizing a multi-vote method it was determined that the top three priorities under each of the process and scope of content sections are:

Process

2. Assure Consumer and family leadership in the planning process so that they represent and report to a consumer/family constituency group.
4. Develop a format and forum for relaying work and receiving work to/from the Subcommittees. *It was noted that 4 is connected to 3: Develop a technology capacity to hold and share information for planning among the Subcommittees, and as such, both items will be worked on simultaneously.
6. Assess membership of each Subcommittee of the GMHSPC to assure adequate representation of a wide and diverse group of individuals, including consumers and families.

Scope of Content

1. Identify qualities and characteristics indicative of transforming behavior among individuals, agencies, and systems.
 4. Pursue and/or coordinate funding initiatives to expand and support systems transformation in Kansas and to encourage mental health system partners to coordinate any grant seeking activity with the TSC to ensure future efforts are consistent with Kansas' transformation values.
 5. Develop indicators and identify baseline information upon which to build recommendations to effect change along with the respective charge to guide Subcommittee work in developing recommendations.
- * Because 1 and 5 are very closely related, work on 5 will begin following a report on 1.

Workgroups were assigned as follows to begin working on these tasks and report back to the TSC at the next meeting:

Process

2. Cherie, Gary (absent, but nominated by Cherie), Rick, Jane
4. Mike, Roy, Michelle – this group still needs a Subcommittee chairperson as a member and will be working with Sarah from Keys to develop a website.

6. Michelle and Wes Cole; will also be working with Becky Rinehart who has membership lists for the other Subcommittees. It was noted that at the July 7 meeting of the Subcommittee chairs they agreed to change the term “adequate” to “maximize” in terms of consumer involvement. Michelle, Wes, and Becky will write an initial report on membership to present to the TSC. If the TSC does not believe consumer involvement has been maximized, a workgroup will be convened to work on achieving maximization of consumer involvement.

Scope of Content

1. Jane, Rick, Cherie, Mike, Nancy Trout (absent, but nominated by Jayme); Susan will also be peripherally involved with this group so that she can work on item 5.
4. Michelle and Wes Cole will work with Becky to gather information into a “status check” report of grant activities of the Subcommittees. Following that report Mary Ellen and Subcommittee chairs (yet to be named) will continue working on this item.
5. Susan

In correlation with process item 4, the TSC is making plans to develop a website. Mike suggested working with Sarah from Keys to help with development. The website will facilitate communication amongst Subcommittees, be a place to post documents and maintain a master calendar, and will have an interactive component to facilitate work between meetings.

Mike met with SRS about the issue of funding to support consumer involvement. He was told that the funding issue has been resolved. Funding will be allocated through a contract with a university in order to maximize funding, as universities can draw down matching Title IV-E funds. Both Mike and Wes Cole believe the amount of funding is going to be \$100,000.

The group discussed definitions of “consumer.” It will be necessary to adopt a shared definition of the term in order to create a reimbursement/payment procedure. The group did not settle on a definition, but referred the issue to the workgroup for process item 2. The workgroup will study the issue and make recommendations to the full TSC.

Subcommittee chairs (or their designees) presented reports. This will be a standing agenda item for future TSC meetings.

The issue of the NAMI report card has been referred to the TSC by the GMHSPC. There are 39 criteria in the report upon which Kansas was graded. Wes Cole, Jane, and Mike will convene a meeting of the Subcommittee chairs to determine how to divide the 39 criteria amongst the Subcommittees. Any criterion which does not fall under the purview of a Subcommittee will be addressed by the TSC. The NAMI report card will also be a standing agenda item for future TSC meetings.

Upcoming Transformation Subcommittee meeting dates are as follows:

- August 7, 10:00 – 3:00
- September 13, 1:00 – 4:00
- October 11, 1:00 – 4:00
- No meeting dates in November or December, TSC will reconvene in January

Identified Tasks/Action Items

- Workgroups will begin working on assigned tasks and report back to TSC at the next meeting.
- Michelle will email TSC members not present on July 11 and ask that they choose a workgroup to join.
- Jane and Mike will talk to Sarah about helping TSC develop a website.
- Michelle will create a membership roster with email addresses and send to members.
- Michelle will work on content for TSC brochure.
- Mike will send copies of the proposal and budget for consumer involvement submitted to SRS to TSC members.
- Mike, Jane, and Wes will convene a meeting of the Subcommittee Chairs to divide the 39 criteria in the NAMI report to be examined, amongst the Subcommittees.
- In the future, the TSC will work on developing a glossary of shared language/terminology for all Subcommittees to refer to.

Full Report

The April 24 minutes were reviewed and approved.

Mike summarized the meeting held on July 7 with the Council Subcommittee chairs in attendance. At the July 7 meeting questions arose as to whether the Transformation Subcommittee (TSC) has lost focus. The original TSC concept paper was reviewed and the group agreed that the ideas/goals presented in the paper are still in line with the intent for the TSC, yet very broad. It was decided that the TSC should review the concept paper and develop it further into an action plan/prioritized task order.

The concept paper was distributed to all TSC committee members. Rick suggested utilizing a multi-voting system as a mechanism to prioritize tasks. Everyone in attendance chose their top two priorities under the “process” and the “scope of content” sections of the concept paper. The votes were broken down as follows:

Process	Scope of Content
1. 3 votes	1. 7 votes
2. 10 votes	2. 3 votes
3. 2 votes	3. 1 vote
4. 4 votes	4. 7 votes
5. 2 votes	5. 4 votes
6. 4 votes	6. 2 votes
7. 1 vote	7. 2 votes

Thus, the top three priorities in each category were identified as follows:

Process

2. Assure Consumer and family leadership in the planning process so that they represent and report to a consumer/family constituency group.
4. Develop a format and forum for relaying work and receiving work to/from the Subcommittees. *It was noted that 4 is connected to 3: Develop a technology capacity to hold and share information for planning among the Subcommittees, and as such, both items will be worked on simultaneously.
6. Assess membership of each Subcommittee of the GMHSPC to assure adequate representation of a wide and diverse group of individuals, including consumers and families.

Scope of Content

1. Identify qualities and characteristics indicative of transforming behavior among individuals, agencies, and systems.
4. Pursue and/or coordinate funding initiatives to expand and support systems transformation in Kansas and to encourage mental health system partners to coordinate

any grant seeking activity with the TSC to ensure future efforts are consistent with Kansas' transformation values.

5. Develop indicators and identify baseline information upon which to build recommendations to effect change along with the respective charge to guide Subcommittee work in developing recommendations.

* Because 1 and 5 are very closely related, work on 5 will begin following a report on 1.

Roy was concerned that by prioritizing tasks in this manner the lower priority tasks may get ignored and suggested creating small workgroups for each task rather than having all TSC members work on each task. Wes Jones reiterated that the intent of the voting was simply to prioritize tasks, which would then be given a timeline ensuring all tasks are eventually addressed. Jane voiced support for Roy's idea of creating small workgroups assigned to specific tasks. Mike agreed that this would be a good way to proceed, and added that these work groups will report back to the full TSC as they complete their assigned tasks.

The members present were assigned to workgroups as follows:

Process

2. Cherie, Gary (absent, but nominated by Cherie), Rick, Jane
4. Mike, Roy, Michelle – this group still needs a Subcommittee chairperson as a member and will be working with Sarah from Keys to develop a website.
6. Michelle and Wes Cole; will also be working with Becky Rinehart who has membership lists for the other Subcommittees. It was noted that at the July 7 meeting of the Subcommittee chairs they agreed to change the term “adequate” to “maximize” in terms of consumer involvement. Michelle, Wes, and Becky will write an initial report on membership to present to the TSC. If the TSC does not believe consumer involvement has been maximized, a workgroup will be convened to work on achieving maximization of consumer involvement.

Scope of Content

1. Jane, Rick, Cherie, Mike, Nancy Trout (absent, but nominated by Jayme); Susan will also be peripherally involved with this group so that she can work on item 5.
4. Michelle and Wes Cole will work with Becky to gather information into a “status check” report of grant activities of the Subcommittees. Following that report Mary Ellen and Subcommittee chairs (yet to be named) will continue working on this item.
5. Susan

In addition, Michelle will send an email to other TSC members who were not in attendance, asking them to join a workgroup.

In reference to Process item 4, it was noted at the July 7 Subcommittee Chairs' meeting that the Subcommittees want a vehicle to share information. TSC will be looking into creating a website to facilitate communication. The website would be a place to post

documents, maintain a master calendar, and facilitate communication. Roy suggested creating an interactive segment which would allow for work to occur between TSC meetings. Mike suggested working with Sarah from Keys to develop a site.

One aspect of process item 2, Assure Consumer and family leadership in the planning process so that they represent and report to a consumer/family constituency group, is already under way. Mike had a meeting with SRS in which he was told that the funding issue (the \$100,000 the Secretary of SRS has agreed to grant to the TSC to support consumer involvement) has been resolved. Mike was told that SRS plans to maximize the funding through a contract with a state university which is eligible to draw down Title IV-E funds. Wes Cole said it was his understanding that the contract would probably be with Wichita State University for \$100,000. Mike said the budget proposal submitted to SRS totaled \$109,000. Rick suggested that Mike and Wes request SRS give them a firm dollar amount. Mike will send copies of the proposal and budget to TSC members.

Concerns were raised about contracting with Wichita State University. In the past there have been issues of delayed reimbursement to consumers, who have often had to wait 6-8 weeks to receive a check from WSU. This is a real issue for some consumers who need the help with travel costs up front in order to attend meetings. Jane also noted that it is important to work within established payment procedures which consumers are already familiar with. The CAC has an established payment process for consumers and Keys has one for families. Usually when a consumer is paid by an advocacy group they are able to receive their funding up front; this is how the CAC payment process is set up.

The next item of discussion was defining the term consumer. At the July 7 Subcommittee Chairs meeting it was decided that we should craft a single definition of the term consumer for all Subcommittees to use. Copies of the CAC position statement regarding the definition of consumer-driven and the Federation of Families for Children's Mental Health definition of family-driven care were distributed to TSC members.

The CAC paper defines primary consumers as "persons who are receiving or have received mental health services either voluntarily or involuntarily. In this context, "consumer," individuals with severe and persistent mental illness (SPMI), is intended to include people who refer to themselves as survivors, ex-patients, ex-inmates, clients, users of mental health services or other similar terms," and secondary consumer as "family members of a person with SPMI...mean[ing] people who are non-recipients of mental health services and who are not SPMI including organizations that provide services to individuals with SPMI.

Roy asked Cherie if the CAC definition of consumer would apply to individuals who receive mental health services, but do not have SPMI. Cherie said it does not. Roy was concerned by the fact that he has patients who receive mental health services, but under this definition would not be considered consumers. Mary Ellen pointed out that SPMI is a public mental health term. Wes Jones said the term SPMI defines the level of services an individual may receive from a CMHC. Mike said that the group has struggled with the term consumer and the question of whether it was fair to have someone that may have received services twice in their life at the table making decisions, compared to a

consumer that continually receives services. Mary Ellen noted that, especially in the Suicide Prevention Subcommittee, we are also attempting to reach individuals who may not yet have entered the system or accessed services and questioned whether the CAC definition limits the scope of what we are trying to do with transformation.

Jane replied that SRS funding is public money, which is tied to a narrow definition. Mike added that transformation goes beyond the public mental health system so that definition may need to change over time. Scott said that if the more narrow definition is required for funding/reimbursement he does not mind, but if the definition is being used to determine who should be included in TSC meetings or activities he would not support a narrow definition.

Mike suggested that for the purpose of transformation we could define consumer as a recipient of mental health services and a secondary consumer as a family member or primary caregiver.

Scott said that the state requires CMHC boards to only include consumers who are diagnosed as SPMI and are willing to give up confidentiality in order to declare that status (SPMI) publicly. Mary Ellen stated that this is an issue that the TSC should take on and address with SRS.

Jane pointed out that the Federation of Family's definition of family-driven care does not use labels.

Scott again stated that for the purpose of funding, he does not have a problem with narrowly defining a target population, but that anyone that walks in their door (CMHC) or receives services is a consumer.

Rick maintained that it is critically important to have a definition of consumer, but does not think it is constructive to define a family member as a "secondary consumer," because he does not believe a person representing a child with SED should be considered secondary.

While the group did not ultimately decide on an operational definition of consumer, it was decided that the workgroup for Process item 2 (Cherie, Gary, Rick, and Jane) would examine the issue and make recommendations to the full TSC.

Mike asked for reports from Subcommittee chairs (or their representatives) and noted that this would be a standing agenda item for all future TSC meetings.

Wes Jones, Children's Subcommittee –

The Children's Subcommittee has 36 members and 3 sub-task force groups, each working on its own goal: 1. service equity to minorities and in rural areas, group has requested a data report from SRS; 2. promotion of early intervention and prevention, developing a toolkit for children returning to home/school settings from hospital settings, have developed questionnaires to gather data; 3. researching evidence based practices.

Brad Grinage, Housing Subcommittee –

The Housing Subcommittee wants to create a vision for Kansas based on need and fact. They are currently working on expanding membership, researching solutions for identified gaps, marketing and advocacy issues, and development

of a common language. *Jane suggested that the TSC begin developing a glossary of shared terminology to be used by all Subcommittees.

Scott Jackson, Service Delivery Subcommittee –

Next week the Service Delivery Subcommittee will have its first meeting since presenting their annual report to the Secretary of SRS. They are working on ways to maximize consumer involvement; at this point they feel they have good consumer representation, but would like guidance from the TSC on this issue. They are also examining the Medicaid State Plan Rewrite, reviewing the PNFC goals, and developing a work plan for this year's goals.

Jayne Collins, Aging Subcommittee –

Jayne distributed the Aging Subcommittee's brochure.

Susan Crain Lewis, Suicide Prevention Subcommittee–

The primary work of the Suicide Prevention Subcommittee has been applying for Garret Lee Smith funds from SAMSHA. They have also been cataloguing suicide prevention practices that have been successful in local communities and are working on the state suicide prevention plan.

Wes Cole, Forensics Subcommittee –

The Forensics Subcommittee helped to pass legislation which established a new position of Director of Forensics within SRS. Leslie Huss has been appointed to this position. The Subcommittee is finalizing a two day presentation which will be given at Larned State Hospital.

Wes Cole also noted that the Childrens Subcommittee is very interested in the work of the Suicide Prevention Subcommittee. Jayme said that she thinks it would be a good idea to have an Aging representative included in the Suicide Prevention Subcommittee.

The GMHSPC recommended that the issue of the NAMI report card be referred to the TSC. Wes Cole would like to examine areas in which Kansas was graded poorly and refer them to the appropriate Subcommittees, and any criterion which does not fit into the scope of a Subcommittee will be addressed by the TSC.

Rick said that NAMI has wanted the opportunity to open up a dialogue with this group. The report card lists 39 criteria upon which Kansas was graded. From NAMI's point of view, they want states to look at these criteria to examine the issues and compare them to transformation goals, allowing the report to become a constructive tool for transformation.

Mike, Jane, and Wes will convene a meeting of the Subcommittee chairs to determine how to divide the 39 criteria amongst the Subcommittees.

Mike stated that the NAMI report card would be a standing agenda item of the TSC.

Upcoming Transformation Subcommittee meeting dates are as follows:

- August 7, 10:00 – 3:00
- September 13, 1:00 – 4:00
- October 11, 1:00 – 4:00
- No meeting dates in November or December, TSC will reconvene in January