

Integrated Planning Work Group Minutes

Date: Thursday, 4/23/15, 9:30am to 11:00am. **Location:** HSB, Rm 911, Mpls, Mn

Present: Chrissy Jones, Krissie Guerard, Jonathan Hanft, Carissa Weisdorf, Andy Ansell, Nick Metcalf

Item	Details
Debrief Facilitated Conversation Feedback	<p>Discuss feedback & next steps</p> <p>Per Sirry via email:</p> <p>What surprised me</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No clarity RE: integration process & what it means <p>We have constantly addressed this issue and I am concerned that people may not be following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not everyone is on board to integrate CCCHAP & PC <p>I think both groups are. Certain individuals may have reservations but as two community planning bodies, everyone knows there is consensus about the integration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public perceptions about the group <p>If planning council members are worried about public perceptions of the group, then they are definitely not comfortable with the group....they probably have some perceptions that we may need to address.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential dictatorship <p>Who do they think the dictator(s) will be? It is really concerning, and I want to know more.</p> <p>I was not surprised by the reasons why people were excited about integration. I am glad to see them listed!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Themes present, take aways and next steps <p>Need for transparency. People don't think they know enough about what is going on. There is a lot of confusion. Maybe one way to handle this is to create a well thought out communication plan for each Planning council meeting or have them vote on one PC member and one CCCHAP member to join the workgroup and present reports back to PC and CCCHAP</p> <p>Workgroup feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What surprised you? people thinking they didn't have the information, surprised to see Amy Dusek there, we give them the information on website & monthly reports – how much do they need, disappointing that it's kind of negative, the fact that the planning is taking place with the gov't grantees there's a level of distrust – there's an automatic built in level of distrust. Potential dictatorship – gov't? Or Co-Chairs? What did not surprise you? Not surprised by some of the negative comments. And the amount of comments – folks are vocal & willing to share their opinions. <p>Question regarding facilitation, was everyone speaking or just a few? What was the tone? Amy said she took notes, Michelle Schuft from Business Planning facilitated and it seemed that we were hearing from everyone not just the same few. The tone was emotional (and as I'm typing this up I'd add questioning/confused). There was confusion between the merging of the councils and merging of the plan. There wasn't clarity that these were 2 separate things. At the end feedback was positive in that members said they were happy this conversation happened and wanted more.</p> <p>Per facilitator Michelle: They need information and want to provide input.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What themes are emerging for you? What are the takeaways? Our updates are probably not effective. Personally I think they're effective but not for them. The level of discussion you had with facilitator and with you, as we move forward we've heard that people don't like to be talked to. It's almost what they want to know is more detail, plan, milestones. <p>What are our next steps? Are there actions we can take or decisions to be made? (Workplan update?) Why is the time table so accelerated? Why is January the drop dead date? Is it doable? Andy didn't feel that he had enough information to answer that question when asked at PC meeting. There was discussion that this process started over year and a half ago and at that time the deadline given was January 1, 2016.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Next steps discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Q&A session Share work plan on a monthly basis with Planning Council and CCCHAP Be prepared to communicate who's making final decisions Political liability for us regarding term limit issue? It will be communicated that the term limits have to be consistent with IGA.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Invite members from CCCHAP and Planning Council to our scheduled meetings to discuss Work Plan and Bylaws (membership). The meetings that will be open for members to join us will be extended. Need to have specific end date. Already stated on the timeline that's been presented. Jonathan read through past minutes and said there was agreement to merge at 11.6.14 provider meeting. Past minutes show it was said the planning council will be able to approve the plan but what does that mean? We need to lay out what they're approving, spell out what approval means ○ Should reach out to chief elected officer on the board to make them aware of this effort what we're going to do and be aware of the direction we're going to take. JH & AD will meet with Susan and Jim to delegate ○ Nick added DHS wants to know what is happening and be kept in the loop on this process ○ IGA is the top level, trumps all due to its set by gov't agencies & 7 gov't jurisdictions ○ Are our documents public? Yes ● Decision to above discussion: our next workgroup meeting in May, we will add on 30 minutes to our meeting time and invite CCCHAP & PC members to attend. It will be an open meeting and participants can give feedback. At that meeting bylaws will be created & member feedback solicited. It is important to note, term limits will be communicated. Will need RSVP for room. Carissa & Ruth be point of contact for this, let Amy know numbers by 5/22 ● Every Planning Council meeting members will be updated with workplan by JH ● Per Krissie, CCCHAP is ok and ready to move forward
Updates & Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● IGA update – JH: will post updated draft on Basecamp. Please read through carefully and give feedback ● Bylaws workgroup – Krissie, Chrissy, Sirry, Carissa, (Japhet). Meeting will be set up. ● Naming Contest – Carissa: announcement made at CCCHAP's meeting, both groups will need more details at May meeting ● Visioning session with CCCHAP & PC at CCCHAP 5/28: CCCHAP already been talking about this. Decided ready to move on. ● Facilitated Conversation with CVC – Yes this will happen. Amy will follow up with Sirry to verify details ● Communication plan need update – not covered. Ran out of time. However use timeline posted online (MHSPC website under part A) to mesh with this? ● Idea from end of last meeting 4/9 – Sirry (unable to attend, Amy to cover) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Another committee of 6 members (3 from each) and the workgroup members to create structure of new planning body, subcommittees, duties, etc. Thoughts? Who from wkgp steering this? – not decided <p>Questions from previous agenda: - may need to revisit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What components of new planning body will workgroup decide on? IGA draft, Bylaws draft, member involvement ○ What components of new planning body will members decide on? Where PC & CCCHAP involved in the process? New planning body name; membership selection committee
Work Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● silent work item: Most up to date is always on Basecamp.
Summary Points	<p>What are our accomplishments during our meeting?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Addressed concerns heard from PC ● Good plan to involve planning bodies, good next steps, I think we agree

Parking Lot (to keep in mind and return to in the future)

- Need a conversation about defining co-chair roles in bylaws for new planning body. Needs to be more of a facilitation role and a welcoming presence – added to work plan
- Prevention Co-Chair of new planning body – need to define level of participation. Current Co-Chair is present but leaves leading the group to other Co-Chairs – added to work plan
- ~~Prevention consider increasing new planning body duties in addition to prioritizing populations~~