SIM Delivery System Reform Subcommittee
Date: November 6, 2013
Time: 10:00 to Noon
Location: Cohen Center. Maxwell Room

Chair: Lisa Tuttle, Maine Quality Counts ltuttle@mainequalitycounts.org

Core Member Attendance: Christopher Pezzullo, Jud Knox, Kathryn Brandt, Rhonda Selvin, Emilie van Eeghan, Holly Harmon, Robert Downs, David Lawlor, Lydia Richard, Brenda Gallant, Greg Bowers, Andrew Molloy, Vance Brown

Ad-Hoc & Interested Parties: Gerry Quelly, Sandra Parker, Becky Hayes Boober, Bettie St. Hilaire, Ellen Schneiter, Kathryn Vezina, Katie Sendze, Jim Martin, Jeff Brenner, Jim Harner, Ruth Frydman, Joanie Klayman, Jeff Tiner, Kim Fox, Julie Fralick

Topics	Lead	Notes	Action
1. **Welcome! Agenda Review**	**Lisa Tuttle**		**Members Introduced themselves and their organization**
2. **Subcommittee Process** • **Group process** • **Roles** • **Agenda Setting**	**All**	Group accepted the ground rules, agreeing to strike 'what said in the room stays in the room' and 'silence equals agreement' Betty St Hilaire, one of the consumer members asked if we can bring back a discussion of the 'what is said in the room…' to the next meeting. The group wants the membership roles split out : they want a list of the core members, the adhoc members and the interested parties to make it	**Action: Motion to accept ground rules (striking Silence is agreement and Whatever is said in room stays in the room)** **Action: Members asked rules on phone conferencing in.** **Action: Split out Membership Roles listing core members, Ad Hoc members, and interested**

		easier to track who is what.	parties.
		The group would like staff to do a survey of members (particularly ad hoc members) on their skills, expertise and what brings them to the table. This is one step in the work of developing a process to effectively engage ad hoc members for specific content areas.	**Action: Send out survey to members (particularly Ad Hoc) identifying their skills, expertise, and what brings them to the table.**
3. **Review/acceptance of Subcommittee Charter**	Lisa Tuttle	The action session will include acceptance of the charter (after clarifications from the governance structure); approval of the Priority/Framework structure for Initiatives; and the Community Health Worker Pilot – expected action is recommendations made based on the deliberations using the priority/framework document	**Action: For review at 12-4-13 meeting, Acceptance of the charter will be approved after clarifications from the governance structure.**
4. **Education on Content areas**	All	The group liked the idea of pairing education and action sessions in each agenda. The next agenda 12/4 will provide education on Behavioral Health Homes, Patient Centered Medical Homes/Health Homes, Community Care Teams, and the Community Health Worker pilot. The action session will include acceptance of the charter (after clarifications from the governance structure); approval of the Priority/Framework structure for Initiatives; and the Community Health Worker Pilot – expected action is recommendations made based on the deliberations using the priority/framework	**Action: Educational materials listed above will be forwarded to the subcommittee on Wednesday, November 13, 2014** **Action 1A: Determine a process for tracking, documenting, and following through on issues and risks identified by the Subcommittee.** **Action 1B: Provide tracking**

		document.	**results to subcommittee as a living document.**
		Lisa/Lise need to determine the process for tracking, documenting and following through on the issues and risks identified by the Subcommittee. We need to bring back the results of the items we tracked this time, and maintain a living document.	
		A standing item on the agenda should be subcommittee dependencies.	**Action: Add Subcommittee Dependencies and Results of issues/risks/recommendation as standing items on the agenda**
		A standing item should be the results of issues/risks/recommendations according to the process developed above.	
5. Meeting Evaluation	**All**		**Scores ranged from 3 to 8 with the majority of scored between 5-7**
6. Interested Parties Public Comment	**All**		**None**

Next Meeting: Wednesday, December 4, 2013 10am – Noon; Cohen Center, Maxwell Room,
22 Town Farm Rd, Hallowell

Delivery System Reform Subcommittee Risks Tracking			
Risk Definition	**Mitigation Options**	**Pros/Cons**	**Assigned To**
Confusion in language of the Charge: that	1) clarify with the Governance	**Pros: mitigation steps**	**SIM Project**

Subcommittee members may not have sufficient authority to influence the SIM Initiatives, in part because of their advisory role, and in part because of the reality that some of the Initiatives are already in the Implementation stage. Given the substantial expertise and skill among our collective members and the intensity of time required to participate in SIM, addressing this concern is critical to sustain engagement.	Structure the actual ability of the Subcommittees to influence SIM initiatives, 2) define the tracking and feedback mechanisms for their recommendations (for example, what are the results of their recommendations, and how are they documented and responded to), and 3) to structure my agendas and working sessions to be explicit about the stage of each initiative and what expected actions the Subcommittee has.	**will improve meeting process and clarify expected actions for members;** **Cons: mitigation may not be sufficient for all members to feel appropriately empowered based on their expectations**	**Management**
Concerns that ability of the Subcommittee to influence authentic consumer engagement of initiatives under SIM is limited. A specific example was a complaint that the Behavioral Health Home RFA development process did not authentically engage consumers in the design of the BHH. What can be done from the Subcommittee perspective and the larger SIM governance structure to ensure that consumers are adequately involved going forward, and in other initiatives under SIM – even if those are beyond the control (as this one is) of the Subcommittee's scope.	1) ensure that in our review of SIM Initiatives on the Delivery System Reform Subcommittee, we include a focused criteria/framework consideration of authentic consumer engagement, and document any recommendations that result; 2) to bring the concerns to the Governance Structure to be addressed and responded to, and 3) to appropriately track and close the results of the recommendations and what was done with them.	**Pros: mitigation steps will improve meeting process and clarify results of subcommittee actions;** **Cons: mitigation may not sufficiently address consumer engagement concerns across SIM initiatives**	**SIM Project Management**