

Palliative Care Committee Minutes

Friday, May 6th, 2:00 – 3:30pm
1650 Mission Street, 5th floor, Golden Gate room

Present: Shireen McSpadden, Christine Ritchie, Redwing Keyssar (on the phone), Kevin Langley (on the phone), Cindy Kauffman, Anne Hughes, Dearman, Jeff Newman, Megory Anderson, Ramona Davies, Kathi Lishman, Mark Anchor, Bill Verducci, Terry Hill

DAAS Staff: Valerie Coleman

Introductions.

Update: LTCCC & work groups.

Valerie gave an update

Update: Post-Acute Care task force.

Shireen gave an update – there hasn't been another Post-Acute task force meeting since the last Palliative Care work group, however she gave a reminder of what the collaboration's goal is.

Monique Parrish is the primary contact for this task force, who has worked with this group and is very familiar with the efforts of the Pal Care workgroup. The next task force meeting will be next week and Shireen will report back in June.

Governance.

Shireen talked about the work groups' need to establish more structure – based on the growth of membership and scope of work of upcoming projects. One way to do that is to establish an Executive Committee, which would increase continuity between meetings, ensure that there is a continued focus, and increased leadership in setting the decision making, setting the work group's direction and establishing agendas. Members thought it was a great idea – would allow for efficiency in decision making and will help drive the projects further. Redwing agree – reminded the group of a request of commitment that was made of members last year (to attend 2/3rds of the meetings and actively participate). Additionally, having a constantly rotating influx of members makes continuity a challenge. Also, an executive committee would be more efficient for the anticipated project manager to work with.

Christine mentioned that there's a few ways to nominate/choose executive committee members, asked for the members perspectives on how to select folks: from a criteria perspective and then how to select in terms of deciding on final candidates. Kelly asked what an optimal number would be and to specifically consider the member's availability. Perhaps 3 people would be ideal, in addition of the co-chairs – not too large but allows for a tie-breaking vote. Important that the people chosen are trusted, assuming that other members would talk to them if they get off topic/mission, and perhaps consider members that have been coming and participating consistently. Do members want to consider specific groups that the executive committee represents? Such as, having one member from the LTCCC. Another suggestion was inter-professional diversity, such as a nurse, from the faith-based community, social worker, etc. Time commitment would be about 1-3 hrs additionally a month. After soliciting interest and filtering commitment, then membership is comfortable with the co-chairs making the final position decisions (rather than bringing the decision back to the work group meeting).

Next steps: Valerie will send out summary, solicit interest from members, and review applicants based on meeting attendance (8 out of 12 meetings).

Updates: Gaps Analysis & Resource Directory

Christine just heard that the Stupski's board has approved to fund a gaps analysis (population based of health services utilization) of SF and Santa Clara County end of life data. In addition, there will be a survey of loved ones experience of the end of life care within the Bay Area. An exciting undertaking and a big project that this group has advocated for, this will allow for a more comprehensive view.

Terry Hill also mentioned additional data they have received and shared a handout (see attached document). Is there an abstract or brief explanation that the Stupski Foundation can share with the work group? Christine will get that.

Updates: Outreach & Speakers Bureau

Christine gave an update and overview of IDEO's (Re)Imagine event last year, of which a number of the work group members were involved individually with. This year there has been an interest in partnering with IDEO on (Re)Imagine again in 2017 and an ongoing discussion of the last few Palliative Care work group meetings.

Laying some ground rules, before having this discussion: respectful disagreement, acknowledgement of any conflict of interests, keep in mind the relationship of a future partnership with the work groups' mission, acknowledge that there may be risks (such as failure) and that is ok, focus more on the future (rather than the past).

Shireen offered options, based on the last 4 meetings over the last 3 weeks:

- Full partners: going in as full partners and that all decisions made would need to be done jointly.
- Event Participants: similar to last year, have members as participants in a one-off capacity but not actual event partners.
- Or partnering somewhere in between, to what degree TBD.

Reminder: our target population that we really want to reach is very low income people that would most benefit from these resources and information. This has been shared with the IDEO team, as well as Stupski and that the RFP/funding is contingent on partnering with this work group.

Discussion: what happens with funding if workgroup doesn't partner (unclear)? Member thought it would take another meeting just to fully develop what a shared governance structure would look like – responsibilities, deliverables, target audiences, etc. – that this group could commit to. Another idea is not being full partners and rather focusing on a few key events based on target populations. IDEO's four legs – health/palliative care, design & innovation, arts & culture, faith based – are what is guiding their framework and how we imagine participating within that if not as full partners. A reminder that we always need to stay focused on the mission, including the disadvantaged and most underserved SF population and advancing a holistic vision of palliative care (broader than the health care perspective). Suggestion that the executive committee and co-chairs to sit down with IDEO and draft what a shared partnership, while also connecting with Loren about the funding details (i.e. does it require a full partnership or can it take the shape of a consultant, etc.) to better understand the options. If there's an RFP, can we share it with the group? The group empowers that the co-chairs and Redwing be the decision makers re: if there is a partnership and to continue these discussions, with the priorities established. Also articulating our other values as part of the

partnership and process. Members agreed – this is a highly risky endeavor and can fail, so we need to be prepared for that.

IDEO's values:

Person centered, intergenerational, diverse, safe, evocative, community driven, authentic, celebratory, generative, (one more, indecipherable)

Next Steps:

- **Solicit Executive Committee members** – Valerie will follow up and co-chairs will nominate based on criteria discussed.
- **Having the Executive Committee and co-chairs continue the (Re)Imagine Partnership conversations**, ideally making a final decision.
- **Review job description for project manager** and follow up with Valerie regarding suggestions. Will be part-time for 6-9 months. Co-chairs will move forward with this.

Next meeting date:

Thursday, June 1st, 2017, 2:00 – 3:30pm

1650 Mission Street, 5th floor, Golden Gate room