

**VSH Employee Futures Work Group Meeting
Friday, April 28, 2006, 2:00 – 4:00 p.m.
AHS Secretary’s Conference Room**

MINUTES

(draft for work group review)

Gail Rushford convened the meeting at 1:15 PM.

Present: John O’Brien, Annie Noonan, Gail Rushford, Laura DeForge, Conor Casey, Tom Ball, Goldie Watson, Keith Goslant, Terry Rowe and Michael Sabourin

Absent: John Berard

Futures Staff: Beth Tanzman and Judy Rosenstreich

PROPOSED AGENDA

Brief Introductions

Project Director – Planning Process

 Purpose / Process for WorkGroup

→ public comment

Business Items – Minutes

 Scheduling

Review Brainstormed Options

 Observations, questions, clarifications

 Assumptions in relation to options

Proposed summary of options for next steps

→ public comment

Pros and Cons

Capture Decisions / Agreements, if any

→ public comment

Wrap Up

PROJECT DIRECTOR BETH TANZMAN

Beth gave an overview of the Futures planning process, highlighting the composition and role of the VSH Advisory Committee, the committee’s established work groups, and the statutory framework for planning, policy development, and implementation. The statute requires the Advisory Committee to be broadly constituted, ensuring that all perspectives are taken into account. Its membership includes VSH staff, the state employees’ union, consumers of mental health services, advocates, family members, community service

providers, hospitals, and clinical leadership in addition to other groups and individuals. The Advisory Committee has commissioned several work groups in areas that require specific expertise and/or more focused time and thought than can occur at their regular meetings. Presently, there are six active work groups. Their role is to develop recommendations for the full Advisory Committee within the context of the Futures Plan.

Beth discussed the value to the Secretary of a range of opinions, including the usefulness of dissenting opinions. Beth identified the inpatient component of the Futures Plan as most germane to the VSH Employees Futures Work Group. The Advisory Committee recommended a primary inpatient facility at or near Fletcher Allen, the sole academic medical center in Vermont, and the Secretary accepted the recommendation. The broad Futures Plan has been endorsed by the Advisory Committee and both the Mental Health Joint Legislative Oversight Committee and the Joint Fiscal Committee. The charge to the VSH Employees Futures Work Group is...

- Identify the whole range of options for the future of VSH staff to enable the transition of the psychiatric care services that are currently provided at the Vermont State Hospital to a new facility.
- Analyze the pros and cons of each option in terms of strengths and weaknesses.
- Rank order the options.
- Describe the requirements for each preferred option to succeed.
- Develop a report to the Futures Advisory Group.

The schedule is to present this work group's recommendations to the Advisory Committee in August.

Following Beth's presentation, discussion touched on a number of topics, including:

1. The role of the current work force at VSH in providing all types of mental health services. Beth stated that the work group should focus first on inpatient and then, if time permits, community residential recovery (CRR).
2. Clinical, policy and fiscal reasons for a primary inpatient facility (preponderance of beds in a single place) over multiple, small sites. The reason for the strongest policy preference, to establish the new facility close to FAHC, was integration and feasibility of staffing.
3. IMD (Institute for Medical Disease) status --- the fact that Medicare and Medicaid do not participate in reimbursement for IMDs. Although Global Commitment is silent on this issue, whatever we create in Vermont should not be classified as an IMD because the terms and conditions of the state's Global Commitment plan will likely change over time.

4. Minutes --- Beth advised that Advisory Committee and its work groups meet under Vermont's open meeting law. Meetings are noticed, minutes are available within 5 days, and public comment is taken. Hereafter, minutes of this work group should be more of a summary of what was covered, including any motions and reducing the level of detail and specificity of the minutes. Work group members requested the opportunity to review the minutes prior to publication.
5. Operating guidelines --- The practice of the Advisory Committee is that any member may join a work group at any time, preferably attending consistently and accepting work assignments. Annie expressed concern about this practice given the potential of Advisory Committee members joining work groups, impacting voting, and skewing the balance of labor and management representation. Beth validated the concern and Conor will bring it to the Advisory Committee.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

→Annie moved/Conor seconded that the corrections on page 2 of the April 21 draft minutes be instituted in the April 14 minutes and when so amended the minutes of April 14 be approved. PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

→Annie moved/Keith seconded to approve the minutes of April 21. MOTION PASSED WITH 2 ABSTENTIONS.

→Annie moved/Goldie seconded...

The work group will be provided the minutes of each meeting within the statutory five (5) days limit and shall be provided at least twenty-four (24) hours to review and provide edits to the minutes before the minutes are posted. MOTION PASSED WITH AFFIRMATIVES, NO NEGATIVES, 2 ABSTENTIONS.

PARTICIPATION BY SPEAKER PHONE

Gail will provide a speaker phone at future meetings for members who may not be able to attend in person.

OUR WORK PRODUCT FROM THE APRIL 28, 2006 MEETING

Staffing Transition Models (summary of “options brainstorm”)

- **Privatize**
 - With preference/protected status
 - With preference only
 - Straightforward
 - Employee Bid

- **Public/Private Partnership**
 - Public facility/ Private management (such as CEO, CFO, Administrators)
 - Public facility/ Private (contractual) functions (examples include: current VSH model, New Hampshire state hospital, Corrections)
 - Public management/ Private workforce
 - Private facility/ Public subsidy

- **Public**

- **Unknown**

One lens for analysis – perpetual approach vs. transition approach

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 PM.

SUBMITTED BY: Judy Rosenstreich
jrosen@vdh.state.vt.us