



Chapter 2955/2965 Advisory Committee 10-8-2024 Meeting Notes

Meeting began around 10:01 a.m. central time

Page-and-line numbers correspond with the online rule draft, dated 8/6/2024.

1. Follow-up from September meeting.

- ATSA is reviewing the rule, and the department will share ATSA's review and recommendations when the review is completed.
- The department will post two charts comparing rule requirements on staff qualifications and training requirements to Minnesota Statutes, chapter 245I, and department-provided training, respectively.
- Staffing ratios in prison was tabled for discussion at a future meeting.

2. Standards for client admission and assessment (2955.0100).

2.1 Generally.

- Various vague and subjective language was discussed and clarified. For example:
 - "Available resources"
 - "Requisite information"
 - "Significant"
 - "Baseline"
 - "Qualified"

Action item: Remove vague language when appropriate or otherwise clarify.



2.2 Assessments.

- Discussion on whether a client intake assessment is different than a more in-depth psychological assessment:
 - There are practical differences between what the department facilities do versus what local correctional facilities do, with department facilities constrained by department policies and other procedures stemming from operating in a prison setting.
 - Generally, a client won't get a new assessment if they have had one conducted in the previous three years.
 - There are differences between adult and juvenile facilities for assessments that a court may order.
 - Department facilities have restrictions for when they can begin to offer treatment compared to when a client can be admitted into the program; the new pretreatment language is seeking to solve this restriction.
 - There was a related discussion on pretreatment and that the new language codifies a practice that has always existed for adult facilities.
 - There was also confusion on who should be conducting these assessments; consensus that the rule shouldn't require specific licensed individuals to perform assessments but instead clarify that the assessments must be conducted according to an individual's licensure.

Action item:

- Continue discussion to clarify the timeline for when a department facility must conduct an assessment and how to amend the rule accordingly.
- If needed for local correctional facilities, try and delineate between an initial intake assessment and psychological assessment and establish standards for an initial intake assessment.

2.3 Subpart 4.

- Discussed why this subpart on reassessments is being repealed; this subpart seems to apply to department facilities only.

Action item: Reinstate the language and determine whether it should apply to all facilities.

3. Standards for individual treatment plans (2955.0110).

- Various vague and subjective language was discussed and clarified. For example:
 - "Appropriate"
 - "Integrate"

- “Related documentation”
- “Problem areas”

Action item: Remove vague language when appropriate or otherwise clarify.

4. Standards for reviewing client progress in treatment (2955.0120).

- Agreed that we should allow therapists and counselors to write weekly progress notes, not just clinical supervisors.
- Discussion on the differences between a weekly review and a quarterly review.
- The proposed language on contacting a client’s family or legal guardian on treatment progress is specific to juvenile programs. Who contacts the family or legal guardian shouldn’t be limited to a clinical supervisor.

Action item: Amend the rule draft to reflect the discussed changes, and research to see if there were recent statutory changes on family notification for treatment.

The meeting ended around 11:22 a.m. central time

Attendees

Ian Lewenstein, Jessica Brueggen, Lauren Bizzotto, Mindy Malm, Holly Hanson, Teresa Knies, Shanna Langston, Jamie Mosley, Michael Gallagher, Tara Osborne Leivian