

**Notes from Coordinated System of Care Planning Group Meeting
Wednesday, April 14, 2010**

Planning Group members present:

Michael Dailey, Chair
Nell Hahn, Co-chair
Chris Berzas
Pam Brown
Joe Bruno
Mike Coburn
Tavia Crumpler
Dennis Dillon
Rochelle Dunham
Rhenda Hodnett
Jim Hussey
Jennifer Jantz
Calvin Johnson
Kathy Kliebert
Jennifer Kopke
Gerard Melancon
Michelle Smith
Suzy Sonnier
Don Short
Matt Thornton
Angela Tyrone

Ex-officio members:

Vee Boyd
Sharon Dufrene

Guests:

Darrell Montgomery
Gwen Jackson
Rhett Covington
John Ragsdale
Olivia Watkins
Krystal Schexnayder
Bernadine Barber

Staff

Shannon Robshaw
John Croft
Stephanie Inks

Opening

Michael Dailey opened the meeting and welcomed the new members in attendance: Chris Berzas, Don Short and Jennifer Jantz. The additional new members, Cindy Arceneaux, Brenda Swanigan and Mark Thomas, will be joining future meetings.

The notes from the last meeting were reviewed and language stating that the parents not selected to serve on the Planning Group were asked to join a workgroup was added. Notes were then accepted.

Report on Leadership Team meeting

Shannon Robshaw reported that the Leadership Team would like an interim progress report from the Administrative Design and Ideal Services Array workgroups on May 7. Jim Hussey agreed to attend the Leadership Team meeting and give the report.

Shannon also reported that the Leadership Team is going to outreach to judicial stakeholders in order to try to achieve greater participation in the CSoc planning process. Angela Tyrone commented that DOE would like to have more local school system involvement in the workgroups and will follow up with Shannon on contact information on who they would like to invite.

Workgroup reports

Family Engagement

Pam Brown reported that the in-person discussion group meetings occurred over the week of April 6-10, 2010: Baton Rouge – 8 parents, New Orleans - 2 parents and follow up meeting -10 parents, Shreveport – 8 parents, Monroe - 5 parents, Lafayette – 5 parents.

Strong common themes that emerged from the focus groups:

- In home services are great – tutoring, homebound services, respite, counseling
- OCS services are good, consistent, and workers help and follow up to make sure you get what you need – IF they are offered or not cut with budget.
- Diagnosis problems – not diagnosed early enough (parents know early), frequent change in diagnosis
- Medication problems – overmedicated, too many medications, change in medication with every new doctor or service
- Family counseling is better than individual counseling. Parents want to participate and know what their children are talking about and talk with their children.
- Parent job loss because of time commitment, i.e. always being called to school, court hearings, etc.
- Parent blamed for child's problems
- School systems don't work with parents and tend to “bully” them

Other common themes:

- Crisis intervention
- Community based services
- Medicaid issues such as need for referrals
- Lack of sensitivity and flexibility to individual situation
- Need for advocates

The workgroup is in the process of compiling the information from the parent surveys, which should be completed next week - over 400 surveys were received. The workgroup will provide a written report on the focus groups and surveys.

The family engagement workgroup stated it can offer 3 services to workgroups and the Planning Group: discussion and feedback among the workgroup which is family advocate heavy, written surveys which can be done quickly and parent discussion groups which need about 5 to 6 weeks preparation time.

Administrative Design and Service Array

Jim Hussey reported for both workgroups that they are utilizing Mercer and HSC consultants and a “straw man” proposal will be developed for each for reaction by workgroup members.

The Administrative Design workgroup has been examining the functions needed for CSoC implementation to be sure all the members have a common understanding of the

functions. They are also talking about members' "top ten lists" about what they like and don't like about how those functions are currently administered by the state agencies. Next step is to use a decision tree approach to decide how the functions should be organized in the new system.

In the Ideal Services Array workgroup, Mercer began working with the workgroup last week. Previously, workgroup members have been gathering lists of services and supports for consideration. The agencies "wish lists" for services are due 4-15 and will be compiled along with the leading practices from other states and the information from the parent surveys into a categorical framework based on Sheila Pires services list. This "straw man" will then be circulated to the agencies and families for feedback and reaction.

Data Collection and Analysis

Shannon Robshaw reported that Mercer is on track with their work to meet their timeline.

Communications

Calvin Johnson presented the revised workgroup action plan, which was discussed by the Planning Group regarding the need for agency staff to be actively engaged in the workgroup and be accountable for agency implementation of workgroup strategies. It was also noted that the action plan includes working the Family Engagement committee to develop and implement a strategy for parent and family education. The Planning Group accepted the action plan.

Mapping

Michael Daily reported that an addition to the Map would be forthcoming that would indicate the size of the initial population of focus. He also stated that Sharon Dufrene and others were working to gather information to be added regarding special education rights and services.

Advocate and family participation

Nell Hahn raised the issue of how to ensure meaningful participation by advocates and family members throughout the process. Discussion followed regarding the need for consultant advice on how family members and advocates might be most effective in their role as partners in the system design process. It was acknowledged by Planning Group members that the CSoC design process is very complex, and that concrete recommendations on the design and services array have not yet been developed. Members expressed feeling challenged to understand "where to jump in" in the design process. Members noted that the challenges being faced are inherent in the planning work, and that the expectations for production of an actionable system design and implementation approach are high. It was agreed that consultants be utilized to help provide initial guidance to the Planning Group for advocate and stakeholder support, and that the long term goal of establishing mechanisms for ongoing and expanded partnerships with families/youth organizations at policy, management and service levels would be a priority.

Discussion of infrastructure needs

Shannon Robshaw presented areas of infrastructure that would need to be developed as identified on the overall Project Workplan. Planning Group members discussed which of these areas could begin to be addressed and decide on the following areas: provider training and capacity building; quality measurement and improvement processes; mechanisms for ongoing and expanded partnerships with families/youth organizations at policy, management and service levels, and information technology capacity. It was decided that Planning Group members would identify questions that would need to be addressed in each area, potential individuals with expertise and other resources that may contribute to the infrastructure needs assessment. John Ragsdale agreed to assist with the information technology work.

Recommendations for Leadership Team

Michael Dailey asked for recommendations for the agenda for Stakeholder Committee meeting to be held April 29. The Planning Group discussed and decided to recommend that the Family Engagement workgroup present information on its activities. Additionally, if the Ideal Service list draft has been developed, that would be presented for comment.

The meeting was then adjourned.

Next meeting will be April 28th from 1:00-3:00 in DHH room 671/673.