

Conflict-Free Access and Planning Workgroup Meeting Notes

Meeting Details

Meeting Name:	Conflict-Free Access and Planning
Meeting Date & Location:	November 16, 2022 @ 8:30a.m. – 10:00a.m.
Call in Number:	Teams Meeting
Leader/Facilitator:	Belinda Hawks / Remi Romanowski-Pfeiffer
Next Meeting:	January 30, 2022 @ 10:30a-12:00p.

Key Discussion Points

Review Sequence of Frame

- The workgroup was reminded of the “Inform, Frame, Feedback” approach used to facilitate the decision-support it will provide to the State. The workgroup is in the “Frame” phase.
- All past materials and references to requirements can be found on the State’s website. If members have questions about requirements or need additional context, they can visit the website and find those references in the January and February materials.
- BPHASA will consider portions of the “Frame” and “Feedback” phases concurrently with the workgroup. BPHASA is also meeting internally with MDHHS teams including Bureau of Children's Coordinated Health Policy & Supports, CCBHC Leadership, Federal Compliance, and legal.
- The activities in “Frame” include:
 - Define Problem
 - Define Criteria
 - Develop Options
 - Evaluate Options

Review Definitions of Options, Criteria, and Prioritization

- Options are the approaches to address Conflict-Free Access and Planning that will be considered by the State. Options still need to be developed. The State has not chosen an option.
- As a reminder, Options will be more detailed than the initial “Families” discussed at the beginning of the workgroup. Initial “Families” were simplified for discussions. Once the state has more information about Option development, they will share it with the workgroup.
- Criteria are areas that may be impacted by Conflict-Free Access and Planning, positively or negatively. Criteria can be considered the “rubric” that each option is graded. Criteria have several sub-criteria.
- Each Option will be evaluated using the Criteria to develop feedback for the State. Each option will have pros and cons.
- The State will decide on one option for state-wide implementation across all populations.
- Workgroup member question: How is the state going to define financial conflict-of-interest? Will the definition be beyond what the federal code defines?

- The state will need to identify which steps of the process are potentially conflicted per what is defined by CMS. The scope of application of CFA&P in Michigan will be broader than HCBS services to avoid duplication or bifurcation in service planning. The state is working with leadership in December and meeting with its legal team to discuss scope of implementation.
- The project's timeline is under review with MDHHS Leadership. The workgroup will be provided an update to the timeline as soon as it is finalized.

Brief Review of Priority Survey

- The workgroup's priority survey results were reviewed in the October workgroup meeting. The workgroup was reminded the priority survey indicated Access, Continuity, and Autonomy were most important to workgroup members. Minimal System Changes had the most disagreement based on inter-quartile range.
- Workgroup member question: Has any advocacy group or listening session indicated what change they would like to see?
 - From feedback received, it seems that people see certain components of the system have conflict and they would like to see the conflict resolved. Some detail can be found in the initial listening session feedback.

Initial Review of Listening Session Summary

- The summary provided in this meeting are initial findings. Visuals can be found in November meeting materials. Final summaries will be reviewed by advocates to ensure it aligned with what they heard in listening sessions.
- Eliciting Participation: The group was reminded the history of the listening sessions. The original charter of the CFA&P workgroup includes people served. Workgroup members were elicited from various groups including PISC and DDPIT. Workgroup members have mentioned there is a need for more representation from people served. As a part of this workgroup, advocates formed listening sessions and solicited participation from various venues including flier distribution through the workgroup and CMHAM.
- Process: Listening sessions were framed in a similar way as the CFA&P workgroup. They were informed conflict needed to be mitigated and were various follow-up questions (e.g., What is most important to them? What should the state consider in this process?). Listening session participants had the opportunity to reach out to facilitators after the session to provide any additional insights.
- Participants: There were 36 listening session participants. Of all participants, 24 identified with I/DD, 9 with MI, and 3 with SED.
- Initial Findings: Listening session members prioritized Access, Continuity, and Autonomy with additional considerations for Continuity. Prioritization was based on an in-session poll, facilitator debrief discussion, and review of meeting notes.
- Workgroup member question: Will there be additional listening session opportunities?
 - The state will revisit the best method to keep listening session members plugged in and will keep the workgroup informed.

- Workgroup member question: Were listening session statistically significant?
 - No. The listening session did not represent a statistically significant portion of the Michigan Medicaid population, but that does not diminish peoples' experiences that were shared in the listening sessions.
- Workgroup member comment: Is there different messaging that could take place to capture the perspectives of people with MI and SUD? The systems should be conflict free no matter who's entering the door.
 - This mimics the discussion that occurred with person-centered planning, self-determination. It is intended for the entire population and the state will keep that in mind with messaging moving forward.
- Workgroup member comment: The state should consider working with NAMI groups.
 - The state will note NAMI for potential future discussions.
- Listening Session Initial Summary: Much of the feedback provided in notes were echoed in workgroup discussions. In general, listening session participants did not want the weight of deconflicting the system to be placed on them.
- Workgroup member question: Has the state considered existing professional and ethical standards and how the CFA&P implementation may impact those?
 - Workgroup members were encouraged to look within their organization to understand how it is free of conflict.
- Workgroup member comment: The current lack of professionals limits who is available to make decisions within their professional requirements and guidelines.
 - The state is considering the employment environment and challenges faced by the system. There is a real possibility the Public Health Emergency will be extended beyond the January time frame.
- The final listening session summary will be included in the feedback package that is provided to the state to support its decision.

Discuss Next Steps

- Leadership is reviewing the project timeline and the workgroup will be notified via email of any changes.

Next Meeting

- The December CFA&P meeting is cancelled.
- The next meeting is January 30th from 10:30a-12:00p. Workgroup members are invited to reach out to Belinda, Dana, Josh, and Remi if they have any questions or need access to the January invite.
- Ongoing meetings into 2023 will be scheduled.