

**North Dakota Comprehensive Employment Systems (CES)
Leadership Council Meeting #2
Monday April 17, 2006**

Draft Meeting Summary

Proposed Meeting Goals:

- To review the elements of consensus-based decision-making and proposed meeting ground rules;
- To review the history of the Medicaid Infrastructure Grant (MIG) funding in North Dakota and the transition being made to a Comprehensive Employment Systems (CES) focus;
- To review the governance structure of CES and available data and resources to assist the initiative;
- To review the regionally-based strategic planning purpose, timeline and roles of Leadership Council members;
- To discuss elements of a mission and vision for CES in North Dakota; and
- To identify a communication flow process and next steps in planning and implementation.

Proposed Meeting Products:

- Agreement on use of consensus as the rule of decision and establishment of meeting ground rules;
- A shared understanding of MIG and CES for North Dakota, from the past to the future;
- A shared base of knowledge of available data and resources;
- A shared understanding of the regional strategic planning process, the vision and mission, timeline and Leadership Council roles;
- A shared understanding of the future CES Leadership Council communication flow process; and
- Agreement on the next steps in planning and implementation.

Meeting Participants: Yvonne Smith, Randy Spitzer* (permanent replacement for Michael Rystedt), Amy Armstrong, Teresa Larsen, Tom Wallner and Gerry Teevens

Contact information for Randy Spitzer: Workforce Solution Leader, Job Service ND, 1000 E Divide Ave., Bismarck, ND, 58506; 701-328-2774, rspitzer@state.nd.us

NDCPD Staff: Tom Alexander and Cassie Artz

Facilitated by: The Consensus Council, Inc.

Welcome, Introductions, Process and Document Review: Tom Alexander welcomed the Leadership Council members to the meeting and self-introductions were given.

Draft for Review
April 17, 2006

Participants agreed to the use of consensus-based decision-making and adopted the following meeting ground rules:

1. It's your show.
2. Everyone is equal.
3. No relevant topic is excluded.
4. No discussion is ended.
5. Respect opinions.
6. Respect the time.
7. Silence is agreement.
8. Non-attribution.
9. Keep the facilitator accurate.
10. Have fun!

Participants reviewed and affirmed the proposed agenda and reviewed the meeting materials provided by the NDCPD staff.

Overview of Medicaid Infrastructure Grant (MIG) and Comprehensive Employment Systems (CES): Tom Alexander presented a Power Point that detailed the transition of the MIG project to one of comprehensive employment systems development. Following the presentation, Leadership Council members reviewed and discussed the initiative. There was discussion regarding the project budget and how the \$500,000 received from the Center for Medicaid and Medicare Services (CMS) would be allocated for the project. Tom indicated that Minot State University will receive indirect costs of 33%, expanded benefits planning will receive 10% and the remainder is divided among staff salaries and benefits and contractors. Contractors include:

- The North Dakota Disabilities Advocacy Consortium
- The Consensus Council
- The National Consortium on Health Systems Development
- Outside consultant

Leadership Council members noted that it is very important to include the following, as the project moves forward:

- Communication with and input into the planning process by consumers and family members;
- Leadership Council members agreed that the final comprehensive planning meeting should include 35% – 40% consumers and family members; and
- A process step should be added to allow a 2-week (minimum) public comment period between the final plan draft development and sending the draft to the funding source.

Leadership Council Requests: Leadership Council members requested the following information prior to the next meeting:

Draft for Review
April 17, 2006

1. A budget report that includes a breakdown of the project categories (staff, contractors, indirect, meeting expenses, etc.) and amount of grant funding allocated.
2. Additional information regarding resource mapping.
3. Select information from other states that currently have a CES grant.
4. A list of which states have which types of grants (MIG, CES, other).
5. The recent New York Times article about North Dakota.
6. A copy of the original grant abstract and selected other grant information to assist the Leadership Council in understanding the project purpose.

Leadership Council members also requested a detailed presentation at the next meeting relative to employment data such as was mentioned in the Power Point presentation. It was agreed that the elements of a project vision and mission would be solicited from stakeholders in the first few regional strategic planning meetings and presented to the Leadership Council at their next meeting. It was agreed that email is the best communication method for CES staff to use with Leadership Council members and that one week prior to each meeting is an optimal time to receive information. Leadership Council members were reminded that they are welcome to any and all of the regional strategic planning sessions.

Leadership Council members agreed to schedule their next two meetings on the following dates from approximately 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.:

1. Wednesday, May 31, 2006
2. Monday, October 9, 2006

Summary Comments: Participants were asked to provide a summary comment regarding the meeting and the comments are as follows:

1. This was a good overview.
2. This can tie in with the regional “transition” committees that are being started.
3. I like the format and being kept on track.
4. I look forward to getting some feedback from the first few regional strategic planning meetings.
5. This was a good start and I’m glad that we identified the need for more information on certain topics and issues.
6. This was a good start with good discussion.
7. This is my first meeting and the information was good and very helpful in my learning curve. I also like staying on track.
8. This project has the potential for drawing together similar and/or parallel projects and better coordinating them.
9. This has been a good meeting with good communication.

The meeting was adjourned by consensus of the group.