

## Conflict Free Access and Planning Workgroup Meeting Notes

### Meeting Details

Meeting Name:	Conflict-Free Access and Planning
Meeting Date & location:	May 25, 2022 @ 8:30a.m. – 10:00a.m. – Teams Meeting
Call in number	Teams Meeting
Leader/Facilitator:	Belinda Hawks / Remi Romanowski-Pfeiffer
Next Meeting:	June 22, 2022 @ 8:30a.m. – 10:00a.m.

## Key Discussion Points

### Self-Assessment

- The workgroup was provided a self-assessment on 5/18/2022 and were invited to ask clarifying questions.
- Workgroup members were invited to complete the self-assessment and add their considerations into the feedback form by 6/8.
- Clarification was provided, that workgroup members are not required to report their answers to the self-assessment. They are invited to share insights they gained from the self-assessment into the feedback form.
- Workgroup members can invite others to complete the self-assessment and contribute collective insights to the feedback form.

### Review Sequence of 'Frame' Phase

- The workgroup is moving through a phased approach to Inform stakeholders, Frame the issue, and solicit Feedback . In the last meeting, the 'inform' phase was completed.
- All past materials and references to requirements can be found on the State's website.
- BPHASA will consider portions of the "frame" and "feedback" phases concurrently with the workgroup.
- Workgroup members were encouraged to continue to bring their questions and insights to the workgroup.
- BPHASA is considering the timeline to ensure there is sufficient time for implementation and monitoring. This group will be informed if there are changes to the timeline.
- The focus of the May and June meeting is on clearly defining criteria. Criteria will be used to evaluate each option.

### Draft Criteria

- The draft criteria were reviewed with the workgroup. Draft criteria are not finalized. Workgroup members were invited to reach out if they identify any major areas missing from the draft criteria. The criteria are meant to define all key issues that should be balanced in selecting an option for implementing conflict free access and planning.

- Draft criteria are divided into four groups for breakout sessions in June. Groups include:
  - Group 1: Autonomy of personal choice, access to services/supports, continuity of service delivery
  - Group 2: Range from status quo and organizational viability
  - Group 3: Administrative efficiency and interorganizational relationships
  - Group 4: Alignment with other state initiatives; Application across funding sources, populations, and services; Application in both urban and rural areas
- For group 1, the workgroup was shown the process for drafting criteria. Their feedback in meeting dialog, meeting chat, and in the feedback form was transcribed and placed into groups. Those groups became draft criteria. The June meeting will allow for workgroup members to discuss and edit “sub-criteria”: those items which were combined to form the draft criteria.
- Workgroup members were invited to reach out to Josh and Remi with their group selection by June 8<sup>th</sup>. Groups may need to be capped based on interest.
- Workgroup Composition: A workgroup member shared that the draft criteria seem slanted towards maintaining the system status quo. They asked how the perspectives of people served and families will be right sized.
  - Part of the frame phase will include prioritization/weighting of criteria.
  - BPHASA will reach out again to the original sources of membership to elicit additional membership and perspective from people served.
  - Another workgroup member shared that people with a system perspective or those that work in the system may also have experiences as a person served or family.
- Weight of Criteria: A workgroup member asked to what extent does the weight of any area address or override the financial interest issue.
  - The weights and priority of each criteria has not been set yet. This group will be invited to prioritize criteria once they are defined.
- Interpretation of Federal Requirements: A workgroup member expressed concern that the federal requirements have been over-interpreted and global changes may be unnecessary.
  - The requirements are documented in the January meeting materials. The workgroup can expect a link to CMS’ guidance on conflict of interest to provide additional context.
  - The scope of implementation was intended to create continuity between systems instead of having different approach for each population/waiver. BPHASA continues to consider the scope of implementation.
- Capacity: A workgroup member said that providing thorough feedback is difficult when there are so many projects happening at the state.
  - Workgroup members were encouraged to review the feedback shared in the feedback form to ensure their insights are at least captured in others’ entries.
- Delegation of attendance: A workgroup member shared they would not be able to attend the next meeting, they asked how should they proceed with delegation of attendance? Another member asked if they can invite others from their organization to attend breakout sessions.
  - Workgroup members will receive an update on the delegation of attendance procedures as they are outlined by the workgroup charter.
  - As for breakout session attendance, the goal is to keep the breakout sessions smaller than the larger workgroup. Workgroup members were invited to provide their feedback in the feedback form or to relay their concerns to other workgroup members to share.