

Guardianship Advisory Council
Friday, September 21, 2007
9:00 a.m. ~NM DDPC Conference Room

Present: Doris Husted, Duane Christiansen, Ed Kaul, Gerald McBride, Terri McCaslin, Robert Richards, Christine Wester, Frank Fajardo
Guests: Ann Christiansen, Cynthia Romero, Luciano Garcia, Letticia Garcia, Harry R. Minter
Recorder: Mercy Gonzales-Clay

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION PLAN/ FOLLOW UP	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	STATUS
<i>Introductions and Agenda</i>	Introductions were made around the table. Doris asked if agenda needed adjustments.	Information		Closed
<i>Review of previous meeting's minutes.</i>	<p><i>Doris</i>, asked the council members to review the minutes and if there were any changes or questions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Christine Wester asked Frank about the waiting list. Frank asked Mercy to explain where the Office of Guardianship was in the waiting list. Mercy explained that at this time the letters had gone out for proof of eligibility to approximately 244 proposed guardians. She also explained that although we were receiving responses from newer additions, the people from the early list were slow to respond and the staff was facing the dilemma of assigning the people who responded vs waiting for response from those who had not responded as yet. Frank explained that they were going with an all out push to assign and that the goal was to reduce the waiting list to 30 days. ➤ Duane Christiansen asked how emergency clients affected the list. It was explained to him that this clients were not put on the list. 	Information		Closed
<i>Particularly difficult guardianship cases review of policies and handling of such cases</i>	<p><i>Terri</i>, opened up with a question regarding a woman with TBI and behavioral health issues and her son wanting to become her guardian. Where should she refer the son to? Doris explained the process and Frank informed her to call our office and we could help to put him on the waiting list. Doris also informed the group that we should not focus on individual cases but to try and focus on policies and processes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Frank asked the group for recommendations regarding difficult clients. Option 1 - would be no change. Option 2 – recruit guardians who will only work with difficult clients and reimburse them accordingly. ➤ Ann C. commented that the issues with the difficult ward were that there 	Information		Ongoing

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION PLAN/ FOLLOW UP	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	STATUS
	<p>were no programs, no placement options and no resources available for these clients. A lengthy discussion ensued with guardians voicing their concerns over the non-existent help where these clients were concerned and what needed to be done in the future. One of the problems was that when the guardian calls for information or resources they are referred in another direction. Doris stated there were no places or avenues to even start the process for these clients. Discussion regarding who makes the decision about who is a difficult case and long is this a difficult case. Does a periodic review occur to determine if the case is still difficult? It was suggested that a residential facility where each client had their own room without being afraid of losing it if they had to go to the hospital, a therapist, case managers, etc. should be looked at by the State. Several scenarios and possible solutions were discussed with recommendations being made to approach lobbyists, cabinet secretaries, legislators, etc to bring to light the problem with placement and help with these clients. One suggestion also included education with the people in charge. Gerald states that in general people don't want to see the "ugly" picture and only want to speak about the success stories. Discussion regarding providers who don't follow the rules and their obligations to difficult people who refuse to comply. The idea of a last resort guardian was also brought up. In summary, the immediate issue is resources for this population. Frank stated that for FY09 there would be a request for additional funding for this population.</p>	Information (cont)		Ongoing
<i>Neuropsych evaluations</i>	<p><i>Frank</i>, informed the council that the contract with UNM for neuropsych evaluations expires on 6/30/2008. This was a "pilot" project and the objective was to reduce the guardianship if recommendations. Some recommendations made were to increase the guardianship, or stay the same. This "pilot" was only done locally. It was felt that a bigger issue is if the evaluation recommended more restrictive guardianship, what process should be followed. More restrictive cases will probably require another court hearing. The question asked was before the court hearing what should be done? Do we rely solely on guardian and neuropsych report or, status hearing? Example may be evaluation says client needs more restrictive guardianship, guardian says no, a status hearing first? The general consensus was that this would be extremely rare and should be determined case by case.</p>	Information		Closed
<i>House Joint Memorial Task Force 34 and committees</i>	<p><i>Frank</i>, Review the process by which guardians of adults are appointed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Frank stated that there has been a lot of sharing out there at this point and that he is extremely pleased with the dialogue, participation and the input that is produced from this task force. He is hopeful that this kind of multi-agency cooperation can continue in the future. ➤ 	Information		Ongoing

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION PLAN/ FOLLOW UP	RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)	STATUS
<i>New Guardianship Committee of the DDPC Council</i>	<p>Members include Elizabeth Thomson, Colin Holmes, Terri McCaslin, Dianne Griego and Jim Jackson.</p> <p>➤ Frank stated this committee is trying to get going. Doris stated that it was her understanding that 5 members of the DDPC were to be included and not separated. Frank stated that they are separate that his belief is that Gaurdianship Advisory Council should counsel the Office of Guardianship on how to proceed. The committee should keep the DDPC informed.</p>	Information		Ongoing
NEXT MEETING	October 19, 2007			