



The University of Texas at Austin Dell Medical School

MINUTES

ASH Redesign Peer & Family Work Group

Thursday, July 2, 2020 ▪ 8:00-9:00am ▪ Conference Call

Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Work Group Summaries
3. Management and collection email list
4. Suggestions for Hospital Clinical Strategies survey
5. Q&A on guardianship and 46B with Judge Hohengarten

Attendees

Francela Brazil Williams, Colleen Horton, Parker LaCombe, Greg Hansch, Jason Johnson, Jody Schultz, Nancy Hohengarten, Sonja Burns, Debbie Cohen, Rachel Samsel

Minutes

Welcome

Chair welcomed the group to the call and reviewed the agenda.

Work Group Summaries

The [Work Group Summaries](#) document was reviewed by the appropriate peer and family representatives.

[Hospital Clinical Strategies](#) – a member asked what the discussion around length of stay sounded like and what information was provided to discuss that. The representative member clarified that the discussion was around length of stay data. Another member added that the initial conversation was only based on immediate information available to the hospital. Additional work is being done to analyze length of stay data. The member who asked this question emphasized the importance of obtaining this data and looking at additional information.

[Competency Restoration](#) – Chair of this workgroup provided the update. A member suggested adding an additional peer member as the currently assigned peer member has not attended any of the peer and family work group meetings. Confirmed that recommendations have not been finalized. There will also be a meeting to focus exclusively on IDD. A member asked if there would also be a meeting to address TBI, at this time there is not a plan for a specific breakout.

[Campus and Continuum Clinical Strategies](#) – A representing member was frustrated and shocked with the conversation and felt that there was an either/or mentality. They do not feel this group will make much progress, especially with the July meeting being skipped. Another representing member agreed that they were disappointed with the depth of the group. They expressed deep concern for the state supported living centers and feel that the concerns expressed by the other representing member via email are exponentially worse in the state supported living center. Member expressed they did not feel that the work groups are doing enough or working interconnectedly enough, they would like to see more collaboration.

[History of ASH](#) – A member expressed that this group is highly knowledgeable and engaging and has made progress on how to share the history with the community. Shared that they are working with the Cultural Consultant for ASH. A representing member expressed their approval of how the group is highly focused on peer and family view point. A member asked what attention is being brought to provide an authentic viewpoint while not overdoing it. A representing member clarified that they are looking at space as well as virtual tours and verbal histories. There was agreement that it should be true to the history and express the good, bad, and the ugly. A member suggested that current experiences also be included.

[Campus Planning-Partnerships](#) – The group is waiting on the final revised version of the RFI, but expect it soon. Next meeting has been cancelled for July. The RFI has been submitted to the Steering Committee for final review and feedback. A member asked if there was an update for what rent would look like. There has not been a discussion of rent in the group or in the document, but it will have to be paid. Another member specified that there are state requirements to charge market rates for rent.

Management and collection email list

The group ran out of time and could not discuss this item. It will be followed up via email.

Suggestions for Hospital Clinical Strategies survey

The group ran out of time and could not discuss this item. It will be followed up via email.

Q&A on guardianship and 46B with Judge Hohengarten

The group viewed the [barriers to discharge PowerPoint](#). The guest speaker clarified that the misdemeanor cases do not use civil commitment but the felony courts do often use it. Explained the main differences between criminal and civil commitment, which are based on the findings that need to be made based on the individual. A member asked if the competency restoration group has been able to look at the specific charges in relation to these barriers – specifically if there is information on felony assault. The guest speaker offered to speak with the member on a separate call so that they can focus on the 46B statute specifically. The guest speaker walked through what the process for being found incompetency looks like and what happens once someone has been found incompetent. There has been legislative discussion around competency restoration length and whether they should be shortened. They provided some clarification around the different barriers in regards to 46B and explained what a civil commitment with charges pending looks like. Travis county does not generally utilize the civil commitment with charges pending due to laws around custody lengths. The guest speaker is available to answer any subsequent questions and provided their [contact information](#) for the group.

Teams Meeting Non-Verbal Comments:

There were no comments via the chat function related to the conversation.