

MEETING OVERVIEW

The November 14, 2024, BHC Governance Meeting focused on aligning the group around foundational governance structures and planning next steps. Key agenda items included finalizing the [Vision, Mission, and Strategy statements](#), exploring governance structure and voting model options, and reviewing draft member roles and responsibilities. Additionally, attendees were introduced to a primer for developing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Behavioral Health Advisory Committee (BHAC) and discussed metrics development as a pathway to evaluating consortium success. The meeting emphasized clarity, collaboration, and thoughtful preparation for the upcoming December 12 meeting.

Meeting's Resource Documents

[11/14/24 Meeting Packet](#), [Meeting Video](#), [Final Mission Vision & Strategy Statements](#), [Feedback Themes re: Governance Structure & Governance Structure Examples](#), [Feedback Themes re: Voting Models & Model Examples](#), [BHAC-BHC MOU Development Primer](#), [Starter Doc: BHC Member Roles and Contributions](#), [Base for BHC Metrics Development](#)

Attendees/Organizations Present

Rebecca Marriott, [Therapeutic Court](#); Dunia Faulx, Chief Transformation and Government Affairs Officer, [JHC Hospital](#); Apple Martine, Director, [JCPH](#); Gabbie Caudill, [Believe In Recovery/Gateway2Freedom](#); Tom Olson, Chief, [PT Police](#); Brian Richardson, [Dove House/Recovery Café](#). Joe Nole, [JSCO Sheriff](#); Kelli Parcher, [OWL360](#); Jim Novelli, CEO, [DBH](#); David Carlbom, Director, [JeffCo EMS Medical Program](#); Viola Ware, [OlyCAP](#); Lori J. Fleming, Director, BHC.

Voting (or potential voting) Organizations Not Present: [Prosecutor's Office](#); [Defense Office](#); [EJFR](#); [NAMI](#), [SBH-ASO](#); [Quilcene Fire](#); and [Brinnon Fire](#)

MEETING NOTES

ACTION: Vision, Mission, and Strategy Ratification

- During the Vision, Mission, and Strategy discussion, the term "**engagement**" prompted reflections on its broad implications, including funding, collaboration, and communication with both partner and non-partner organizations. While it sparked thoughtful consideration, the group agreed to retain the term as a flexible foundation for future actions, recognizing its potential to evolve with the consortium's needs.
- All BHC Members who were present unanimously adopted the draft Vision, Mission, and Strategy statements as guiding principles.

Governance Structure Discussion

The group explored [three proposed governance models](#) —Collaborative, Lead Agency, and Hybrid—with participants offering a range of perspectives based on their experience, organizational roles, and priorities.

Perspectives Expressed:

Collaborative Model:

- Strong Supporters: Chief Olson, Brian Richardson, Kelli Parcher

Chief Olson valued inclusivity and the opportunity for all voices to be heard, emphasizing that the group generally has time to make thoughtful decisions.

Brian and Kelly noted that the collaborative model reflects how the group has operated successfully so far and aligns with the capacity of smaller organizations.

- Concerns: Some worried that as the group grows, the collaborative model might become inefficient or unwieldy.

Hybrid Model:

Strong Supporters: Dunia Faulx, Viola Ware

- Dunya emphasized the need for efficiency, particularly when time-sensitive decisions are required, citing past challenges with meeting quorum for grant applications.
- Viola agreed with the efficiency of the hybrid model, while acknowledging that collaboration remains important for smaller groups.
- Neutral Leaners: Jim and Apple found merit in both collaborative and hybrid models. Jim noted the hybrid model's balance but stressed the importance of clarity in decision-making.

Lead Agency Model:

Minimal Support:

- Few attendees favored the lead agency model, citing concerns about excluding smaller organizations and losing the collaborative spirit of the BHC.

Next Steps:

The group decided to:

- **Further Reflect:** Members were asked to consider the feedback shared during the discussion and how each model aligns with the consortium's needs and capacity.
- **Prepare for a Decision in December:** The final governance structure will be selected after guided discussion at the December 12 meeting, ensuring all members have time to review and refine their preferences.

- **Consider Long-Term Implications:** Lori highlighted the importance of building flexibility into the chosen model to allow adjustments as the consortium grows and evolves.

Table: Preferences, Concerns, and Needs from Governance Structure Discussion

Participant	Model Preference	Concerns	Specific Needs
Tom Olson	Collaborative	Efficiency risks as group grows	Inclusive decision-making
Brian Richardson	Collaborative	Balancing inclusivity with action	Capacity of smaller organizations considered
Kelli Parcher	Collaborative	Complexity of scaling	Maintaining current collaborative success
Dunia Faulx	Hybrid	Delays in urgent matters under collaborative model	Efficient processes for time-sensitive issues; Clear processes to balance speed and input
Viola Ware	Hybrid	Loss of collaboration in more structured models	Balance of efficiency and inclusivity
Jim Novelli	Collaborative/ Hybrid	Unwieldy group size in collaborative model	Clarity in decision-making processes
Apple Martine	Organizational/ Hybrid	Small size of public health as a "sector"	Representation for single-sector organizations
Rebecca Marriott	Collaborative/ Hybrid	Group dynamics as membership grows	Equitable representation and manageable group size
Joe Nole	Collaborative	Risk of inefficiency	Clear decision-making that reflects all voices
Gabbie Caudill	Collaborative/ Hybrid	Small sectors lacking multiple representatives	Fair representation for small organizations
David Carlbom	Hybrid/ Collaborative	Risk of stagnation under collaborative model	Representation for cross-sector leadership roles

Voting Structure Discussion

The group explored [four proposed voting models](#)—**Organizational, Sector-Based, Hybrid, and Weighted Hybrid**—with participants sharing diverse perspectives informed by their organizational roles and experiences.

Perspectives Expressed

Organizational Model

Supporters: Chief Olson, Gabbie Caudill, Apple Martine

- Chief Olson appreciated that the organizational model allows similar organizations to collaborate on shared concerns.
- Gabbie noted that small counties with limited organizations may not need a sector-based structure.
- Apple found the organizational model more intuitive for representing unique sectors like public health.
 - Concerns: Risks excluding single-representative organizations or sectors from broader decision-making processes.

Sector-Based Model

Supporters: Jim Novelli

- Jim valued how sector-based voting mirrors models used successfully by other boards and ensures representation for distinct community sectors.
 - Concerns: Limited applicability in Jefferson County due to the small number of organizations within each sector.

Hybrid Model

Strong Supporters: Dunya Faulx, Kelly Parcher, Rebecca Marriott

- Dunya emphasized hybrid voting's balance of inclusivity and efficiency, noting that it aligns with the group's current informal voting style.
- Kelly highlighted the hybrid model's flexibility in meeting deadlines while ensuring participation across sectors.
- Rebecca valued hybrid voting for addressing growing group dynamics and balancing sector representation.
 - **Concerns:** Potential for uneven representation or overcomplicating decision-making.

Weighted Hybrid Model

Mixed Feedback:

- Some participants found the concept of weighting votes intriguing but felt it might add unnecessary complexity or exacerbate inequities between larger and smaller organizations.

Next Steps

The group decided to:

- **Further Consider Feedback:** Members will review the advantages and challenges of each model, informed by the discussion.
 - **Align with Governance Model:** Ensure the chosen voting structure complements the governance model selected at the December 12 meeting.
 - **Create Decision Criteria:** Define criteria for evaluating voting models, such as inclusivity, efficiency, and representation, to guide the final decision.
 - **Finalize in December:** Vote on the preferred voting structure at the December 12 meeting.
-

See Table: Preferences, Concerns, and Needs from Voting Structure Discussion on next page.

Table: Preferences, Concerns, and Needs from Voting Structure Discussion

Participant	Model Preference	Concerns	Specific Needs
Tom Olson	Organizational	Risks excluding some smaller organizations/sectors	Collaborative opportunities for shared interests
Brian Richardson	Organizational/ Hybrid	Balancing inclusivity with practicality	Representation without overcomplication
Kelli Parcher	Hybrid	Overcomplicating voting processes	Flexibility for urgent decisions
Dunia Faulx	Hybrid	Lack of clarity in collaborative-only models	Balanced and efficient voting structure
Viola Ware	Hybrid	Concerns about losing sector voices	Simplicity and adaptability
Jim Novelli	Sector-Based	Limited sector representation in small counties	Clear sector-based representation
Apple Martine	Organizational	Single-sector representation challenges	Fair voice for unique sectors like public health
Rebecca Marriott	Hybrid	Group size dynamics complicating voting	Balance between sector and organizational input
Joe Nole	Organizational/ Hybrid	Balancing inclusivity with efficiency	Practical voting that reflects all voices
Gabbie Caudill	Organizational	Limited representation for small sectors	Equitable decision-making for small organizations
David Carlbom	Hybrid	Avoiding inequity in weighting votes	Representation across multiple sectors

Member Roles and Consortium Metrics Discussion

The group explored [the canvas document created for member roles and responsibilities](#) and the proposed metrics development process. The discussion highlighted the importance of defining clear roles to ensure accountability, effective collaboration, and alignment with the consortium's goals. Participants also emphasized the need for meaningful metrics that reflect the unique goals of the BHC while minimizing administrative burden.

Draft Member Roles and Responsibilities:

Lori explained the purpose of the draft roles document, emphasizing that it serves as a starting point for feedback and refinement. She noted that clear role definitions will support leadership transitions and provide a shared understanding of each member's contributions.

- Participants appreciated the detailed groundwork and found the categories logical.
- Participants generally agreed that roles should be flexible enough to evolve with changing needs and priorities.
- **Data Expectations Placeholder:** Lori clarified that placeholders for potential data contributions were intentionally broad, as specific metrics will be determined collaboratively by the group.

Metrics Development Process:

Lori outlined [a potential approach to developing consortium-wide metrics](#), noting the need to focus on actionable, meaningful data that avoids unnecessary complexity. Highlights from the group's discussion:

- **Flexibility in Roles and Metrics:** Multiple participants emphasized the importance of flexibility, allowing roles and metrics to evolve as the BHC grows and an inclusive approach to defining the metrics, especially to ensure smaller organizations have input to defining metrics that are realistic for them to provide
- Metrics should prioritize outcomes over outputs, focusing on community impact rather than data collection for its own sake.
- Want to avoid requiring extensive data collection that yields limited actionable insights
- Consider/Integrate relevant existing data collection efforts within organizations to reduce redundancy

Metrics Development: The group will use the draft metrics document as a foundation to begin defining consortium-wide metrics. Lori encouraged participants to review the document before the next meeting and consider what metrics align with their organization's goals and capacity.



Further Discussion in December: The December 12 meeting will include a focused discussion on member roles and metrics, with the aim of finalizing foundational elements by early 2025.

BHAC-BHC Memorandum of Understanding (MOU):

[This document](#) was introduced as a draft foundational framework for collaboration between the BHC and BHAC. **The goal of this document is to calibrate BHC members to a unified set of content we would proceed with to explore MOU development with the BHAC.**

Goals:

- Define membership participation.
- Facilitate data sharing and strategic planning.
- Optimize funding synergies.

Participants are encouraged to [review the primer](#) for further input – and to provide input to Lori prior to the December 12th Voting Member meeting.

REQUESTED BHC MEMBER FEEDBACK AND NEXT STEPS

- Refinement of Member Roles: Lori will check in individually with participants to gather feedback on their draft roles and responsibilities and update each Member's Role Description. These updated roles will be presented for review at the December 12 meeting.
- Provide any additional input desired on governance and voting models.
- Read the BHAC-BHC MOU primer and suggest improvements.
- Review Approach to Metrics Development and suggest updates and refinements.

At 12/12/24 Meeting (@3-4:30p)

- Finalize governance and voting models.
- Review updated member roles and define next steps on our metrics development process.
- Update/Finalize the BHC-proposed content contained in the primer intended to support the development of a BHAC-BHC MOU.

Stated Meeting Intention

Our work today is guided by clarity, respect, and unity, as we strengthen our shared commitment to a healthier, more connected community.