

Guardianship Council Meeting
Friday, January 18, 2008
9:00 a.m. ~ NMDDPC Conference Room

Present: Duane Christiansen, Frank Fajardo, Dennis Drucker, Ling Faith-Huertz, Ed Kaul, Greg MacKenzie, Gerald McBride, Pat Putnam

Guests: John Acker, Thomas Lopez, Chris Rowland, Luciano Garcia, Leticia Garcia, Becca Bergstrom, Ann Christiansen, Janice Ladiner, Jim Jackson, Harry Minter, Gabrielle Sanchez-Sandoval, Linda Piasecki

Recorder: Mercedes Gonzales-Clay

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION PLAN/ FOLLOW UP	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)
<i>Introductions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Frank</i>, welcomed guests to the meeting and introduced the newest member to the Office of Guardianship – Chris Rowland. Members of the Council and guests all introduced themselves and the roles they play in guardianship issues. 	Information	
<i>Legislative Session and our Budget (DDPC Office of Guardianship)</i>	<p><i>Patrick Putnam</i>, Director, gave an update on the legislative session. He informed the group that the issues that would be brought to the legislature were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Contracts for guardianship services for wards with more difficult issues – Pat asked for funds to contract with additional corporate guardians and an increase in payment for hard to serve wards; ➤ Periodic review (Re-evaluation) of the need and level of guardianship- Pat explained that this contract ends 6/2008 and how the evaluations worked and some of the findings to date. Dennis asked for a summary of the findings; ➤ Education and training. <p>The recommendations for the above referenced items which included a possibility of doubling the reimbursement for clients with more difficult issues. The periodic review (UNM evaluations) would be used as a tool to determine level of guardianship services and the education and training to perhaps include a web based training module.</p>	Information will be forthcoming as the session progresses.	Pat Putnam
<i>Article 5 re: appointment of Officers</i>	After reviewing the by-laws issues were raised regarding the membership. Some of the suggestions included inviting a member of the VA services, moving ARC of NM from under State contracted guardianship providers to Disability Rights Advocacy Organizations, contacting someone from Santa Maria el Mirador. There were also over 15 people on the list so it	Define members	Frank

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION PLAN/ FOLLOW UP	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)
	<p>would need to be amended as well. In regards to the election of officers, there is a need to define who members are before officers are elected. Questions on what the relationship of the council to the Office of Guardianship. Frank explained that he saw this group as his “right arm” and would like to use this group as an advisement council. Jim Jackson’s understanding is that it’s to strengthen the role of the Guardianship Council. As to the exact nature, supervisory vs. advisory, Pat may be able to address this issue. Frank informed the council that he does in fact report back to the council members at the DDPC quarterly meetings.</p>		
<p><i>Reconvening the Subcommittee</i></p>	<p>The subcommittee addresses the need to examine the Role and Duties of a Guardian. Frank asked if there were any other volunteers. Some of the items being looked at are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ What would Office of Guardianship support for this committee? ➤ Look at current position on Office of Guardians and role of guardian. <p>Frank would like to identify what the status quo is. Ed Kaul, Duane & Ann Christensen volunteered to be a part of this subcommittee</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	
<p><i>Should the Office of Guardianship implement the Task Force recommendations re: procedures for appointing a guardian</i></p>	<p><i>Frank</i>, distributed a list of Task Force recommendations with discussion regarding amending the probate code. See attached handout.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ John asked if there is the authority to change the Office of Guardianship practices. ➤ Discussion on the pro forma form. ➤ Suggestion to wait for members, form a subcommittee and then come up with recommendations and practices for Office of Guardianship. 	<p>Ongoing</p>	
<p><i>Wards with more difficult needs – availability of services</i></p>	<p><i>Frank</i> informed the council about the difficulty the Office of Guardianship staff has finding guardians for APS cases and difficult cases. He asked for suggestions about placement for these people. It was stated that APS was not filling out the form completely and that left the professional guardian with a case which was extremely difficult and costly. What should be criteria for refusing a case? Frank suggested that maybe guardians could be hired for these types of cases and doubles the reimbursement for these difficult clients. Dennis is concerned about what information is legal to turn over and what is not legal it provide. There was also a concern with HIPAA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Frank is open to suggestions for difficult to place clients and 	<p>Information</p>	

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION PLAN/ FOLLOW UP	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)
	<p>welcomes input.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Gabrielle will draft a recommendation for APS and also for HIPAA issues. 		
<i>OG Work Load Report</i>	<p><i>Frank</i>, updated the council on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Corporate guardianship clients currently being served – 523; ➤ Assigned to Legal Services this FY – 145; ➤ Additions to the Waiting List this FY – 149; ➤ Waiting List for Legal Services as of 1/04/2008 – 299. 	Information	
NEXT MEETING	February 15, 2008		