

AMHI Reform Workgroup: November 10, 2021, Setting weights and Wrap-up

AMHI Reform Project Team: Abbie Franklin, Ashley Warling-Spiegel, Elisabeth Atherly, Helen Ghebre



Agenda

- Housekeeping, review of norms and goals 5 minutes
- Review and finalize combined priority matrix 30 minutes
- Review survey results for scoring and potential percentages/weights 30 minutes
- Testing out weights in the formula model 30 minutes
- Review and confirm decisions and workgroup recommendations 15 minutes
- Wrap up and celebrate 10 minutes

Housekeeping

- Please mute when you are not speaking
- Please participate with video
- Be engaged and present in the workgroup and limit distractions
- We encourage questions, comments, and discussion throughout the meeting
- Use "raise hand" to make sure everyone has an opportunity to speak
- Share your voice and ideas verbally
- Share resources in chat
- Meeting is being recorded for note-taking purposes, recording will not be made public

Group Norms



How we work together



Meeting Structure





Shared Outcomes

- Results
- Minimize disruptions
- Access and resources
- Communication



Review combined priority matrix

- Drafted during workgroup meetings
- Compared to feedback in survey
- Finalize as a group the matrix will be included with the recommendations

Setting percentages

- Methodology for converting priorities to percentages
 - Used 0-5 scale, using priority matrix and 4 attributes
 - 0-5 converted to percentages, out of 25% (to best add up to 100%)
 - Input via survey, compiled and finalized as a full group
- Review of results from survey
- Discuss as a group

Scenarios

- We'll use the percentages that we generated through survey and discussion
- With the model open, we'll plug in sets of percentages to see what the allocations are with those priorities
 - This allows us to see how the percentages operate
 - Can make any last slight adjustments to percentages based on priority matrix
- End goal set final percentage recommendations

Goal of AMHI Reform

| АМНІ | Current: Per Capita | Example formula: Per Capita |
|------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Hennepin | \$5.87 | \$6.69 |
| Ramsey | \$10.57 | \$7.78 |
| Dakota | \$1.49 | \$5.61 |
| Anoka | \$2.81 | \$6.20 |
| Washington | \$3.04 | \$5.08 |
| Scott | \$2.11 | \$5.02 |
| Carver | \$4.13 | \$4.69 |
| CREST | \$6.92 | \$8.35 |
| CommUnity | \$3.83 | \$6.70 |
| ABHI | \$15.41 | \$10.31 |
| SCCBI | \$17.23 | \$9.12 |
| SW18 | \$10.70 | \$10.96 |
| Region 5+ | \$8.67 | \$11.36 |
| Region 7E | \$13.04 | \$8.38 |
| BCOW | \$9.44 | \$9.63 |
| NW8 | \$21.29 | \$11.11 |
| Region 2 | \$9.62 | \$11.97 |
| Region 4S | \$12.37 | \$10.20 |
| Average | \$7.71 | \$7.71 |

Goal of AMHI Reform:

• Develop a funding formula that is transparent, equitable, and defensible

Why do we need a formula?

- Initial funding determinations for AMHIs were not uniform, equitable, or transparent
- Current allocations range from \$1.49 to \$21.29 per capita
- The formula model incorporates many factors to address mental health needs in the state
- Formula-based allocations will decrease the disparities in funding across the state
- Example range: \$4.69 to \$11.97 per capita

Example is based on priority matrix work previously completed by this workgroup and is for illustrative purposes only. These are not the final weights: 30% statewide, 5% Medicaid, 5% Medicare, 30% SDOH, 20% ADI, 10% Rural

Funding formula specific recommendations

- Priority matrix is the summary of the priorities this workgroup set on the variables within the formula
 - Review the completed matrix
 - Do you agree, disagree, or abstain from commenting about the placement of the variables on the priority matrix?
- The percentages we set today are what this workgroup is recommending be used to create the new allocations
 - Review the final versions of percentages
 - Do you agree, disagree, or abstain from commenting about the percentages assigned to each variable?

Other recommendations from workgroup

- These recommendations will be included in our report to the legislature though are outside the scope of the formula development process
 - Funding should be increased for AMHIs
 - For implementing* the formula:
 - · Use a base level of funding that all AMHIs receive and then apply the formula to the remaining funds on top of that base funding
 - Use a phased process to transition from current to new allocations

*an implementation workgroup is being planned

- Other recommendations that you wish to have included?
 - Impact of COVID-19 access to services, intensity of need for services
 - The gaps that these initiatives cover with these funds AMHI as the safety net. Highlight.
 - Parity
 - · Still a need to ensure adequate services for communities of color, and more emphasis on equity
 - Flexibility with the AMHI funds, don't box in with BRASS codes. Expand BRASS or give more wiggle room.
 - More focus within the system and funding for early intervention, prevention.
 - Allowing SMI instead of SPMI for the funds
 - Legislature take this up early in session and give feedback earlier than May 2022, to allow the implementation planning to start sooner than Summer 2022

What comes next?

- DHS will complete the legislative report using the workgroup's recommendations
 - The final funding formula weights will be reviewed and approved by the Behavioral Health Division Director
- The report will be submitted to the legislature February 1, 2022
- DHS will review the feedback from the legislature
- DHS will convene an implementation workgroup Summer 2022 to collaborate on designing the process for switching over from current allocations to new allocations

8. Affirm, Confirm and Celebrate: Reflect on your experience and bring closure

8a. Affirm:

What stands out from our time together creating this plan?

Breakout rooms were a challenge, some good but some technical issues. More productive as a large group, especially last 2 meetings. If the group is spinning wheels, bring the group back (to DHS). Pre-work was helpful too. Some small group work lacked the clarity needed. Had to settle for a 'good-enough' outcome. Barrier to not have the actuarial at the workgroup meetings. Could have also benefited from an AMHI historian for context. A lot of agreement and consensus on the core issues from the group.

What are you looking forward to?

Using this framework in own organization (e.g., priority matrix). Seeing where the implementation goes.

What are you still concerned about?

That workgroup's work is changed by DHS and legislature. The AMHI Reform timeline that keeps changing, need to stick to it so regions can start planning. County budgets are set well in advance, so the more time that changes are known about, the better for planning. Still missing that piece around the impact of race. More focus on that for implementation.

8b. Confirm:

What has been the value or significance of producing this action plan today?

- Getting to an actual tangible result is value added. DHS working with the people at the front line or impacted by the result is also critical.
- Accomplished the goal of the 4 attributes (transparency, flexibility, alignment, equity).
- Value in getting everyone's input and hearing from various counties.

Once we were out of denial, we got our work done.

What is a visual image or slogan for our projects.

Honoring the past to move to the future.

Collegiality

Effort takes no talent.

19 players, 1 heartbeat!



Thank You!

AMHI Team

MN DHS amhi.dhs@state.mn.us