

DCC Representative to SCC Call
Scheduled Call-DCC Guiding Principle's Feedback
Draft Call Notes
May 9, 2012

Present: Jim Davis (Aroostook), Robin Mayo (Penquis), Emilie van Eeghen (Central), Sharon Leahy-Lind (DLPH/York), Connie Putnam (MidCoast) Steve Fox (Cumberland), Katie Woodbury, DLPH.

Absent: Megan Rochelo/Ted Trainer (York District), New Member (DownEast), Lorrie Potvin (Western)

Sharon explained that the purpose of today's meeting was for District Representatives to the Statewide Coordinating Council to provide feedback from the District Executive/Steering Committees and Councils on the SCC's proposed Bylaw/Guiding Principles Document. The SCC requested feedback and input from stakeholders and partners and established venues for this process, i.e., the DCC committees and councils as well as a statewide ad hoc workgroup.

Joanne Joy presented a report yesterday at SCC Ex Committee meeting. The Executive Committee will meet once more on June 12 before the regularly scheduled full SCC meeting on June 14, 2012. All comments, suggestions, and input on the bylaw/guiding principle document are due to the SCC Executive Committee by June 6, 2012. This information will be presented to the SCC Executive Committee for consideration during their June 12th meeting, after which a proposal from the SCC Executive Committee will be submitted to the full SCC during the June 14th meeting.

District Feedback

The information below covers attending Districts' responses to the proposed bylaw/guidance document:

Emilie van Eeghen, Central District

- Want bylaws to be flexible and not too rigid in regards to DCC structure
- Concerns around DCC Size how its structured
- District wants to take the basic concept from the bylaws but craft materials to be district specific
- Don't want to be told how to vote or what size they should be
- Agreed, however, that DCCs and SCC need to follow legislation. We do need bylaws on language to clearly explain role of District Liaison. For instance, are they Ad Hoc Ex Director or what that role is their intended to be?

Connie Putnam, Midcoast

- Comments similar Emily's feedback from Central District.
- Midcoast already has something in place that works very well.
- Would like uniformity across the State but tailored for the Midcoast.
- Want more than 25 voting members on the DCC

Jim Davis, Aroostook

- Comments similar to others
- Would prefer to have less restrictive or prescriptive.
- Prefer Steering Committee as name-Not Executive Committee or Chair
- Section 6 lines 95 – 99 – approval of nominees – it appears that MeCDC Director and Chair of SCC would be the only ones to do this.
- Further clarification in section 7 line 110 & 111 what is the definition “for cause”
- Would like some of the language to be tailored to their District

Question: Are Director of MeCDC and SCC Chair the only 2 people who approve the proposed members to the DCC? And if so are activities of DCC really for naught if they the only ones that may have a vote? Sharon thought SCC Executive Committee makes recommendations to SCC about structure, changes etc.

Action: Sharon will get clarification from Dr. Pinette and Shawn Yardley, Chair.

Steve Fox, Cumberland

- Would like a grandfather clause in bylaws for Cumberland District established and voted on by members. What they currently have in place has been working well and much of the material for the SCC proposal came from Cumberland's document.
- Similar feedback as the others.

Sharon Leahy-Lind, York

- Concern about maximum size (25 – 40).
- Desire to have uniformity across the state.
- Would like to be in a position to be funding vehicle so understand the need for strengthening the guidance.
- Would like some flexibility with District specific items.

Robin Mayo, Penquis

There has been a lot of support from their District Liaison in this effort.

- Same feedback as the others.

Action: Robin sent a written summary to Sharon which she will be incorporate with the feedback from today. Please see below the excerpt related to DCC bylaw discussion from the Penquis DCC meeting notes:

Comments from Penquis on the draft DCC bylaw document for the SCC-Shawn's synopsis: *When the PH infrastructure was being developed it was intended that the DCC would be a formal entity. There was money allocated for the DCC structure but it was pulled before the structure was rolled out. The state had less of an interest in providing guidance on a formal structure when there was no money to support the work. When CTG*

came out it was the first time money was injected into the system and there was a greater need to look at the bylaws. There could be potential for greater issue as money is floated to the DCC. What if there isn't enough money to fund all nine districts, will the funder give preferential treatment to those Districts that are more formal? This bylaw document is a core framework with the ability to have addendums. It would be preferable to have a core document that looks similar in all of the districts including the SCC. Penquis has a very collaborative group and is working well together, but we need to make sure we have a structure that protects all the partners interest equally in case things don't go well.

Robust discussion at SCC – some felt the bylaws document was rigid. Agreement that DCCs need some of these guidelines, but need to tailor this to meet the District needs. Some of the SCC members are forming a subcommittee to decide how it can be more flexible for each district.

Membership Issues: Not more than 25 members / 22 sectors - multiple HMPs, Hospitals, etc. could limit community participation. How will members identified and how are decisions made or votes determined? Need for term limits? What are the council member responsibilities to attend meetings? From a health system perspective, it might be better to have hospitals each have their own voice. Need to maintain the independent voices of members.

Top Down Approach: Top down mandates versus guidance; the SCC doesn't own the DCC - formalizing our relationship. In statute the SCC approves DCC bylaws and membership. Shawn: There comes a point when the coalition work need to morph in a different structure as it grows and develops. Funders ultimately can require the formal structure so being prepared is essential. Shawn appreciates that perspective and says he did not want anyone to think that the top down approach came from the state.

Funding and future funding needs to be addressed: CTG & Money funneling to the districts - firming up of process to make sure we have our bases covered.

Who make decisions regarding funding? In the case of one large organization who should be voting? Maybe add this piece to the document. From a fiscal stand point we need to have a structure before the funding even gets to the table. Decision making needs to be fair and have due process. If there is an opportunity for the district to distribute funds, is there a process to give the money out other partners in the district?

Call ended at 11:01 AM

Next Conference Call Meeting: **August 8, 2012 from 10:30-11:30 a.m.**