METRO REGIONAL QUALITY COUNCIL AGENDA
Friday December 14, 2018
9 am – 11am
The Arc Minnesota
2446 University Ave West, Suite 110
St. Paul, Minnesota
Hennepin/Ramsey Conference Room

In attendance: Rod Carlson, Erin Paredes, Robert Morneau, John Estrem, Katie Elleraas, Ann Cirelli, Chelsea Lorenz, Felicia Thomsen, Joe Cuoco, Diane Sjolander, Tim Sullivan, Georgann Rumsey, Angie Guenther
Interns: Justine Lindholm, Caitlin Curtis

Purpose Statement: The purpose of the Regional Quality Council is to promote and connect communities so people have services and supports to live a life based on their hopes and dreams. The council will work together to continually monitor and improve the quality of services and supports for people with disabilities. The council seeks to improve person centered outcomes, quality of life indicators, and to drive overall systems change.

1. Introductions/What's Happening?

2. Project Manager Introduction Meetings

Angie reported about meetings with council members to get a better understanding of their experience with the council and where they see the council going in the future. The following points were recurring themes in these meetings:

- **What was going well:**
  - Broad representation from different stakeholders allows for a well-rounded and robust conversation
  - Building relationships between different agencies, service providers, and advocates that might not otherwise be possible. Helps broaden point of view and expand network.
  - Small groups that are flexible rather than set workgroups
  - Started making progress with reviews
  - Cooperation from the 3 Regional Quality Councils (RQCs) – in the past RQCs and SQC worked closely in tool and procedural development and the RQCs continue to work together to update these materials. The RQCs have started discussing how the councils can lean on each other and leverage each other's strengths to better

the RQCs as a whole. For example, Angie may go assist Arrowhead RQC with focus groups so that they can expand upon the results of their listening sessions.

- **What can be changed/improved:**
  - **Less talk, more action**
    - Members want to get to the meat of the problems rather than just talk about them.
    - More efficient/effective: Too much "spinning the wheels" during meeting time. Members want less "word smithing" (which means focusing on minor details of written documents) and more work around planning and taking steps towards action.
  - **Find the direction and/or focus:**
    - The council works on the macro-level, but what does that look like? It could be programming, identifying best practices, making recommendations, or meeting with legislature/congress to establish relationships. The work the council does depends largely on the capacity of the council (i.e. time commitment, work load, abilities, etc.)
  - **Meeting attendance, consistency**
    - The council's charter and letter of commitment both require that members attend at least 75% of the meetings (can be by phone or video chat if necessary). With the same group of people showing up consistently, there will be less time spent catching people up, allowing the council to get right to work.
  - **Relationship with State Quality Council (SQC) and other RQCs:** The RQCs will continue to look for opportunities for guidance and assistance from the experiences of the other RQCs and SQCs.
    - Clarify SQC involvement: The MRQC has to deliver quality review results to the SQC in the form of the annual report. Quarterly verbal updates are also given. The SQC can be used as a reference and for guidance but does not have to approve quality improvement projects that the MRQC pursues.
  - **Increase community involvement**
    - How can the council increase understanding the work being done and increase awareness across the community? The council always looking for more self-advocates and family members to sit on our council. Their opinions and thoughts should inform (in addition to the interview results) the work the council does. Angie has invited a family member and self-advocate to join the council, their applications will be discussed at the next MRQC meeting.

- **Council structure**
  - The majority of the council members voiced that a steering/advisory committee of 3-4 people (as discussed in the MRQC meeting before the break) was not necessary at this time. This is because the council is not big enough to need a steering committee of that size. The council can revisit this topic if the need presents itself in the future. The majority of council members wanted to have a co-chair to assist the project manager with the council. Specific responsibilities of the co-chair can be

found in the charter. The council is taking volunteers to be co-chair, please reach out to Angie if you would like to volunteer before our next meeting on January 11th.
    - Most members requested that meetings follow the agenda as closely as possible so that the council can use its time wisely and in a productive manner. Friday mornings continue to work for the large majority of the group so our meeting time, date, and location will not change at this point.

- **Possible focus areas that were voiced in the 1:1 meetings**
    - **Guardian consent:** this is an ongoing conversation between the RQCs, SQCs, and Department of Human Services (DHS). All parties are working to find a compromise but it will continue to be a topic of conversation.
    - **Interviews:** Get interviews up and running again and using those results to inform council action.
    - Use relationships and networks to increase knowledge of council as well as to encourage members to join, especially self-advocates and family members.

3. Metro Regional Quality Council Organizational Documents

- **Letter of Commitment**: The council reviewed the changes made to the letter of commitment at the previous MRQC meeting. No problems or changes were voiced.
    - It was decided that members will serve on the council in alignment with the contract year (starts July 1st and runs through June 30th) – council members were asked to consider how long they can serve. Discussion encouraged that the council only have half of the members end their term at the end of the contract year in 2019 and the other half at the end of the contract year in 2020. Note: members can elect to continue to serve on the council for another two-year term after this term ends. By creating staggered membership the council will create sustainability (as outlined in the charter).

- **Charter:**
    - Charter can be revisited yearly with changes made as the council sees fit.
    - **Purpose statement:** Council reviewed the charter and recommended updates to the statement. The updated statement is "the purpose of the Regional Quality Council is to promote and connect with all communities of people with disabilities so that the services and supports help them to live a life based on their hopes and dreams." Discussion around what does "promote" mean here? Several members shared the meaning of promote is the council will learn and think outside the box with how to support the communities. Additionally, the council will take that information back to the organizations, agencies, and other stakeholders to impact services and supports.

    - **Vision:** No notes on vision

    - **Values**: The council specified what "quality" means in this situation and changed it to: "We value quality of life." The council also condensed diversity and inclusion to say, "We value diversity and inclusion."

- **Goals:**
  - Goal 1: Changed to, “Bring together persons with disabilities, family members, staff from providers, lead agencies and state agencies.”
  - Goal 3: Discussed what “stakeholders” means in this context and how that is a broad term. For the sake of the RQC, stakeholders include lead agencies, individuals using services, family members, and advocates. The council changed the sentence to, “Collaborate and build relationships with people using services, agencies and other stakeholders interested in quality improvement initiatives.”
  - Council members discussed if Goal 1 and 3 were the same or should be separate. Discussion resulted that goal 1 and 3 are similar but should be kept separate because they have different outcomes: for the council to be able to collaborate and build relationships, people with disabilities, family members, staff from providers, lead agencies and state agencies need to first come together.

- **Regional Quality Council Responsibilities:**
  - Bullets 3 and 5 had overlap in discussing deliverables. Council discussion resulted with, “Work collaboratively within the council to achieve and implement contract deliverables” Deliverables for this contract is completing the quality reviews, analyzing the data, and informing the SQC of the results in verbal quarterly reports and written annual reports.
  - Co-chair responsibilities were added:
    - Facilitate meetings
    - Provide support to council members as needed
    - Facilitate conflict resolution between council and individual members as needed

- **Decision Making:**
  - The council discussed potential barriers to consensus voting, specifically as it relates to accessibility for all and allowing for marginalized groups to have their voices heard equally. Georgann suggested using alternative ways to vote such as doodle polls, post it notes, etc. and would be happy to share voting options that have been successful in other groups in an upcoming MRQC meeting.

4. Review and Discuss Annual Report

- Reminder that the reviewers are trained to answer the questions based off of the interviewee’s perception, not what the reviewer thinks. There is discussion among the RQCs about adding an additional question to compare reviewee perception to the interviewee’s perception.
- **Response rates**
  - Response rate: 8.7% for all names received from Department of Human Services (compared to 13.7% in Arrowhead RQC and 26.4% in Region 10). Of all of the names randomly selected, 19% had no phone number and 23% had incorrect contact information.

- Response rate: 15.4% for those contacted (compared to 18.9% in Arrowhead RQC and 35.9% in Region 10).
  - Note that Region 10 has been doing quality reviews, Value of Individual Choices and Experiences (VOICE), since 1998 so they are better known in their region. This might contribute to the higher response rates seen in Region 10.
  - Jason Flint (DHS) is drafting a letter to send out with our RQC that shows DHS supports the efforts of the RQC. The hope is that this letter would help ease confusion and encourage participation.

- **Data**
  - **Who you live with:** how much control you have vs. how much control you would like to have – 52% say they have full or most control while 82% want full or most control. This tells us 30% of the individuals surveyed want full or most control but only have some or no control over who they live with.
  - **Daily routine:** how much control you have vs. how much control you would like to have – 62% say they have full or most control while 87% want full or most control. This tells us 25% of the individuals surveyed want full or most control but only have some or no control over their daily routine.
  - **Things you enjoy doing outside of the home:** how much control you have vs. how much control you would like to have – 46% say they have full or most control while 88% want full or most control. This tells us 42% of the individuals surveyed want full or most control but only have some or no control over things they enjoy doing outside of the home.
  - **Time you spend with people you care about:** how much control you have vs. how much control you would like to have – 60% say they have full or most control while 73% want full or most control. This tells us 13% of the individuals surveyed want full or most control but only have some or no control over spending time with people they care about.
  - **Life planning:** how much control you have vs. how much control you would like to have – 55% say they have full or most control while 84% want full or most control. This tells us 29% of the individuals surveyed want full or most control but only have some or no control over life planning.
  - **Having a job you like:** how much control you have vs. how much control you would like to have – 35% say they have full or most control while 88% want full or most control. This That tells us 53% of the individuals surveyed want full or most control but only have some or no control over having a job they like.
  - **To what degree are the services and supports helping you in the ways you would like/need?** - Only 24% of people interviewed reported that their services and supports help them in ways they like/need.

  - **Data in focus: Housing –** There was some confusion in this section on page 30 of the annual report. To clarify:
    - Of the 34 individuals who reported having **full control** of their living situation, 6 reported having a negative experience (17.6%)
    - Of the 11 individuals who reported having **most control** of their living situation, 4 reported having a negative experience (36.4%)

- Of the 22 individuals who reported having **some control** of their living situation, 7 reported having a negative experience (31.8%)
- Of the 12 individuals who reported having **no control** of their living situation, 9 reported having a negative experience (58.3%)
  - 27 people had a more negative experience than positive (32%)
    - Main reasons for discontent: management issues, problems with roommate/didn't get to choose them, health/hygiene, accessibility, wants to move but doesn't have proper supports, previously lived independently and desires to again
    - Positives: Living with or near family, good community (housemates/neighbors), independent living/living alone

- **Data in focus: Employment** There was some confusion in this section on page 31 of the annual report. To clarify:
  - Of the 15 individuals who reported having full control of their employment situation, 0 reported having a negative experience (0%)
  - Of the 15 individuals who reported having most control of their employment situation, 3 reported having a negative experience (5%)
  - Of the 19 individuals who reported having some control of their employment situation, 8 reported having a negative experience (42%)
  - Of the 17 individuals who reported having no control of their employment situation, 13 reported having a negative experience (76.5%)
    - 28 people had a more negative experience than positive (33%)
      - Main reasons for discontent: cannot work due to health or pain but wants to, would like to but concerned about losing benefits, doesn't get along with co-workers/doesn't make connections a work
      - Positives: likes job (general), retired

These results indicate that individuals with full choice are able to make the employment decisions they need to ensure quality of life.

- **Recommendations:**
  - **Improve data quality:** The RQCs and SQC are currently working with DHS on how to improve contact information. One step that is being taken is to include provider information in the random sample contact information to provide another avenue to contact the individual and their guardian (as needed). This will begin in the new year.
  - **Continue to work on the topic of guardian consent:** This is an ongoing conversation with DHS and the RQCs/SQC in order to come to a compromise that is acceptable to both parties.
  - **Continue to collect and analyze data**: Angie is currently training the two RQC interns and is in the process of hiring an administrative assistant. These will be integral team members to get the interviews up and going again. Angie is also in the process of recruiting new reviewers and has three confirmed at this time. If you know of anyone who would like to be a Quality of Life Reviewer, please encourage them to reach out to Angie.
  - **Identify trends in gaps and barriers to services/supports:** The council will do this as more interviews are completed.

    - **Develop regional response**: The response is up to the council based off of the results of this report and the capacity of the council. The council discussed focusing on employment and developing educational and training materials to assist individuals and their case managers with navigating employment while maintaining their benefits.
- **Possible focus areas based off of report:**
    - **Employment:** How does the council work to increase choice in employment?
    - **Activities outside of the house:** How does the council work to increase choice in activities outside of the house?
    - **Only 24% of people interviewed reported that their services and supports fully help them in ways they like/need:** How does the council learn more information about how services and supports are not meeting needs/desires? Once the council knows more specifics about how the services/supports are not meeting their wants/needs, then recommendations can be made. The council can also see who reported their services and supports fully support them in ways they like/need to develop best practices.

5. Discussion:

- The purpose of the council's work was discussed – there are a lot of barriers and challenges that have been brought up that need systems change outside of the potential authority of this council. The results of our reports will go to the SQC to inform legislation and systems change. In addition to the reports and recommendations the council can determine projects to pilot.
- There was discussion around diving deeper into the qualitative data to better understand the themes in the report. This would be important to better address the problem recognized in the report by identifying where the trends are happening to better focus our efforts.
- Employment was determined to be a focus area for the council. One potential task tor the council is to educate individuals and support personnel, such as case managers, on how to navigate the workforce while maintaining benefits. There was also discussion around how the council could make recommendations to expand and/or improve case managers' knowledge of services and how they interface with employment.

6. Action Items for Next Meeting:

- Council members will bring project ideas regarding employment
  Discussion questions:
    - What results surprised you in the report about employment?
    - What initiatives or key outcomes do you think the council should take on?
    - What would you like to learn from this initiative?
    - What information do you need to know more about?
    - What methods do you recommend to gain this information?
    - What are the key actions to be successful?
    - What are your recommendations for council member involvement in this effort?

Next Meeting- January 11, 2019, 9am-11am