

# Hennepin County Children's Mental Health Collaborative (CMHC)

## Governance Committee Meeting Notes

Wednesday, May 20, 2020, 2:30 – 4:00 pm

**Voting Governance Committee Members** (Quorum 12): Pat Dale, Liz Gronert, Jenna Mitchler, Krista Phillips, Cindy Slowiak, Liz Franklin, Adesola Jaiyesimi, Aric Jensen, Nita Kumar, Jody Nelson, Mark Sander, Maureen Seiwert, Angela Watts

**CMHC Coordination Team:** Etonde Awaah, Laura LaCroix-Dalluhn, Cheryl Holm-Hanson, Margaret Sullivan

**Guests:** Raven Baker, Sara Benson, Rachel Harris, Anna VonReuden

### 1. Approval of Meeting Minutes & Agenda

*Minutes: Jody motioned to approve, Cindy seconded; all approved.*

*Agenda: Maureen motioned, Nita seconded; all approved.*

### 2. Welcome/Opening Circle

*Everyone shared their name and organization and answered the question: "What do you like about your name?"*

### 3. CMHC System of Care Theory of Change

*Laura shared impetus behind developing Theory of Change and goes over document with Governance Committee:*

- *Goal is to have a shared understanding of how we might work on implementing a system of care model during (and after) this pandemic. Wanted to offer up a theory of change based on what we knew coming in and use it as a guide for us in 2020.*
  - *Vision, mission, and guiding principles – created developed and approved back in 2019.*
  - *Took key goal areas of SoC model; normally we'd name outcomes, but doesn't feel like the right time for planning. Instead we putting forth mechanisms we identified with Liz Manley, and tying that to Current Actions & Activities and Specific Actions & Activities. Also named our Threats and Opportunities.*

*Governance Committee makes any suggestions for changes, and if possible votes to adopt/approve document.*

- *Cindy: What she sees is that we're pivoting our work to embrace SoC values to guide our work. It would be helpful for us to figure out what the specific role that the Collaborative plays in the overall work of SoC in Hennepin County & the state. Laura said she doesn't disagree, it's both/and (what Cindy said + our own internal processes (how we do our work & who gets a say)).*
- *Jody: Took issue with the mechanisms. She didn't fully buy into the NJ model – she thought it was great for NJ, but thinks it is limiting to have wraparound be the primary services. If we're calling out rapid mobile response + wraparound, she'd want to mention SBMH, especially given the role the Collaborative played in getting it off the ground. Laura said she appreciates her bringing it up.*
- *Cindy: Created a graphic at Hennepin County to organize themselves around their work. Liz mentioned 'service pillars' ... an additional one is that an SoC need a continuum of services to compliment mobile response + wraparound.*
- *Laura: Asked if the theory of change is helpful to guide us forward / add intentionality – using it as a living document. Etonde added that we need introductory documents to share with people new to the Collaborative.*

- *Angela: Thinking about the gaps: we're not as culturally responsive as our community demands + not as far upstream as we need to be. There's going to be a greater demand for coordination + culturally responsive supports. Other types of systems will be the first responders for parents.*
- *Liz G.: Looking at this as a working document. Today it's doing its job – allowing for the conversation and helping us identify other things that need to be mentioned. She likes where it is, is comfortable with what it's trying to do.*
- *Liz F.: Appreciates what Angela brought up. So important to improve services it should exist in the goal area ("continuum of services exists for everyone.")*
- *Maureen: Wants to include "children" in #5. Wondering about where the goal areas came from...maybe need more specificity – how do we define improvement (SMART goals)?*
- *Laura: Likes them because they were broad; we didn't have time to have conversation about specifics. We can do as much work-shopping on this as needed to be a place to start. Sounds like we're not ready to say "yes, this is good enough." Asked for 1-2 people to work with us: Jody, Cheryl, Cindy, Mark and Angela said they'd help.*

#### 4. **COVID-19 Relief Fund**

*Etonde state the Governance Team originally requested using CMHC funds to help respond to the needs of providers and families in during this public health emergency. The Executive Committee discussed this request and recommends we allocate \$200,000 for CMH providers and \$50,000 for families. Families, or youth ages 16-20, can apply for up to \$500. There is a limit of one application per family. All children's mental health providers are eligible to apply, with a \$5000 limit, and a limit of one application per agency.*

*Etonde stated the goal of these relief funds was to be inclusive in defining who is eligible for funding and as flexible as possible when considering how the resources might be spent. She reviewed draft eligibility and purpose statements for funds for both COVID-19 Relief funds. She highlighted criteria that had been recommended by Governance Team, Executive Committee and School Based Mental Health Committee members. Etonde said we were trying to keep the application as simple as possible. Etonde suggesting applications would be accepted on a rolling basis. She stated NAMI had agreed to take on this additional work, and the Collaborative would cover these additional costs.*

*Etonde outlined a couple remaining questions for Governance Team:*

1. *Should we require organizations to submit their annual budget to receive funds?*
  - *Angela suggests keeping the agency budget off since budgets are blown. Governance Team members agreed that budgets might be a burden to submit with the application.*
2. *We still need to discuss the review process and timeline and are looking for input and feedback.*

*Other Discussion and Questions:*

1. *Maureen asked if the budget accounted for extra time put in by co-coordinators? Laura responded the budget did not reflect the additional work related to the COVID relief funds. She said they would either limit other activities to complete this work or approach the Executive Team about using other funds within the budget.*
2. *Jody suggestions we may want to make the application available in different languages, not English only as application suggested. She said it would be important to find ways to make this easier for people and organizations to access. She mentioned that a video option being offered to families might be helpful. Etonde stated she decided to make the language explicit for transparency and because it was the primary language of staff and Governance Team. The Governance Team discussed briefly how video submission is easier for some families. When asked about possible platforms there were no specific suggestions.*
3. *Margaret asked if families could work with other families at the school or in the community to prepare the application? Etonde said yes it an option.*

4. *Liz F stated she was concerned about explicitly stating the application had to be submitted in English because it would further alienate some families and doesn't represent that goals around a system of care we discussed during the Theory of Change conversation. Laura asked the Governance Team in what other languages they wanted the application available? Liz provided a summary of predominant language spoken besides English in Hennepin County (Spanish, Amharic and Somali). Laura stated they could translate the application materials but would need to translate them proposals as well. She mentioned this would potentially reduce the funds available to families and providers, but it is definitely something they could look into if the Governance Team wanted to move in that direction.*
5. *Aric asked what is our distribution plan? Laura stated she assumed they would distribute through our existing distribution lists, e.g. Governance Team, provider list, SBMH list, PCLG and make available on the CMHC website. Etonde said she assumed families would likely hear about it through providers or the PCLG.*

*Etonde and Laura will take this input and revise the COVID-19 Relief Fund applications and seek final approval.*

5. **Approve 2020 Scholarship Criteria**

*Laura stated that a small group of Committee members met to review and suggest edits to the 2019 Scholarship Criteria. The Coordinators made the requested changes and brought it to the Governance Committee for final approval. Due to time constraints, Governance Committee was unable to review & discussion, but agreed to continue the approval process online.*

6. **Committee updates (Etonde)**

*Unable to get to this agenda item due to time constraints.*

7. **Adjourn**

**2020 Governance Meeting Schedule: 2:30 – 4:00 pm**

Wednesday, June 17

Wednesday, July 15

Wednesday, August 19

Wednesday, September 16

Wednesday, October 21

Monday, November 16

Wednesday, December 16