METRO REGIONAL QUALITY COUNCIL AGENDA
Friday December 13, 2019
9 am – 11am
The Arc Minnesota
2446 University Ave West, Suite 110
St. Paul, Minnesota
Hennepin/Ramsey Conference Room

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.

In attendance: Angie Guenther, Tayler Guccione, Jeffery Nurick, Erin Paredes, Chelsea Lorenz, Judi Marie Ringe, Katie Elleraas, Ann Cirelli, Rebeca St. Martin, Tim Sullivan, Rhonda Godfrey, Georgann Rumsey, Felicia Thomsen
Interns: Emily Van Krevelen and Kayla Chapman
Guests: Emily Mack, Lorie Moench (Arrowhead RQC)

1. Introductions/What's Happening?

Updates and announcements

- Angie and Tayler have been crafting a focus group script for employers. They are thinking it may be one on one informational interviews. They will bring a draft to the next meeting for feedback and have been utilizing connections at Department of Employment and Economic Development (DEED), Department of Human Service (DHS), and Lifeworks to connect with employers who employ people with disabilities
- Completed an additional focus group with family member supports.
- There was a valuable webinar on Tuesday (12/10) outlining collaboration between DEED, DHS, and SSB (Social Services for the Blind) discussing how to "create a less complex, more consistent and streamlined employment service system for people with disabilities who use home and community-based services (HCBS) waiver programs, as well as the families and caregivers that support them."
- The Arc has been hosting community conversations about the Vulnerable Adults Act (VAA). Angie was able to bring the input collected in these community conversations to the VAA summit hosted by DHS. There were many productive/hard conversations in the first steps of many steps to redesign VAA. Ann noted that there was a recent Star Tribune article that highlighted prevalent issues with VAA: http://www.startribune.com/disabled-minnesota-residents-often-live-in-costly-isolation/565745352/
- The interview team averaged about 4 interviews a week in the month of November.

2. State Quality Council Updates

- Vacancies are still posted on the SQS website for RQC and SQC positions. SQC work is still paused – unsure what the timeline would be for accepting and on-boarding new members
- The RQCs will be meeting with DHS on December 30th to discuss the future of what our work will look like – updates to come.

3. Review RQC Data from ICI

Important points to note:

- Review: interviews cover 10 different topics. A couple questions were changed July 1, 2019. Planning, hopes dreams and goals were removed and employment and case management were added.
- Interviews help to collect both quantitative data about choice and control and qualitative information (stories and narratives).
- There is some variation in data due to the conversational dynamic of interviews; the same questions may not be asked at every interview.
- Largely white population interviewed
- The bulk of people in living in the metro region live independently or semi-independently, resulting in different challenges than those living in group home settings.
    - A barrier for reaching out to individuals in group homes has been actually reaching the individual. A lot of times staff are reluctant to hand the phone off or provide parental phone number. Likewise, guardians tend to refuse on their behalf.
    - Ann shared that Disability Integration Act that was passed at the federal level may influence the state's urgency to create solutions for isolation.

Big picture view of ICI data:

- **Housing**
    - Generally, people want 50% or more control than they have now.
    - About 30% of people feel they have full control over housing
        - Barriers are related to moving, available help finding a place to live, and not receiving consistent and reliable supports.
- **Daily Routine**
    - About 30% of people feel they have full control over their daily routine.
    - Most comments regarding formal supports came from people living in assisted living or group residences. Common complaints were:
        - Lack of staffing
        - Lack of meal choices that were health and/or matched with cultural background or food preferences
        - Transportation to participate in community activities for
        - Managing physical and mental health
- **Employment**

- About 50% of people report their job fully meets their needs. Overall, there seems to be high satisfaction after obtaining employment, but the process of finding a job is difficult.
- ICI is going to dive back in to the data and see why unemployed individuals aren't working.
- Individuals expressed concerns about income having a negative impact on benefits.
- Volunteering provides more flexibility for some with regards to hours worked.
- Most people received some form of employment support or their families chose for them to attend an activity-based program.

- **Community**
  - About 24% of people report having full control over doing things they enjoy outside of the home. About 70% of people want full control.
  - ICI identified common barriers limiting activity in the community as:
    - Money
    - Transportation, especially on weekends, evenings, and last minute
    - Lack of accessibility at community locations such as religious venues and concerts
    - Limited support staff hours
- **Relationships**
  - About 20% of people reported full control over the amount of time they spend time with people they care about and about 60% indicated they want full control.
  - Statistics that stand out: about 10% of people reported that they had no friends or friends they hadn't seen in years. 13.8% reported estrangement or difficult relationships with family members that limited contact.
  - ICI identified common barriers as:
    - Transportation
    - Health or health of loved ones
    - Lack of money
    - Staff schedules
- **Support Staff**
  - About 92% of people feel their staff treats them with most or full respect.
  - For people living in residential settings, such as group homes, most of the issues with poor staff were dealt with. A common complaint is that staff members spend a lot of time on their phones.
  - Cultural barriers were a common theme identified that can be a safety challenge due to lack of effective communication.
  - Additional barriers include:
    - People using PCAs or other in-home supports reported that staff stole things, falsified hours, were late or didn't show up at all, or didn't do much work while they were there.
    - Turnover and staff shortages
    - Enough staff to meet basic needs but frequently not enough to participate in preferred activities outside of the home (for those in residential settings).

        - Poor staff performance of in-home support, forcing individuals to either forego services or put up with it.
    - **Safety**
        - About 90% of people report they mostly or fully feel safe.
        - 90 individuals reported that their communities felt unsafe related to criminal activity or general antisocial behavior.
        - Additional concerns:
            - Traffic related safety
            - Neighbors not respecting building safety, neighbor behavior and general lack of trust with in home support staff.
            - Falls and winter related safety concerns
            - Safety equipment, such as lack of home modifications
            - Sprinkler systems and lack of elevators in apartment buildings
            - Behavior of housemates and/or own behavior
    - **Services and Supports**
        - About 78% of people feel their wants are being met and about 80% of people feel their needs are being met.
        - Case management
            - 75.8% of people feel their case managers explain services in a way that they understand.
            - 40.4% of people reported their case manager did not provide enough information about services in a way they could understand.
            - About half of participants indicated that their case manager was responsive and came to planning meetings or visited them regularly.
            - Barriers include: case manager turnover, systemic challenges and confusing service

4. Small groups: Discuss data analysis

- **Small Group 1 – Housing, Daily Routine, Employment version 1, and Employment version 2**
    - What surprised you about the results?
        - How satisfied people were once they had a job
        - **Not** surprised that 70% of people desire full control over housing and a lot of other areas
        - The lower expectations for level of control in the metro – thought to have more resources but lower expectations.
    - What best practices can we take away?
        - Staff should facilitate choice and participation in meal preparation and planning
        - Embracing all cultural backgrounds – cultural competency training for DSP
    - What recommendations can we make? To who?
        - Asking “What contributes to your lack of control?” in order to identify the main source of lack of control.

        - Disseminating resources that are out there, making individuals aware of services. Particularly DHS and lead agencies could do better in all areas.
        - Report to Office of Ombudsman about experiences with PCA and other staff
        - Present information to Olmsted Implementation Office
        - Pass employment information on to MN APSE
        - End capitalism!
        - Provide more support with finding appropriate housing
        - Case management approval of supports that people need
        - Legislation for new housing developments to have a certain % of low income and accessible units
    - What information are we missing?
        - We would like to see a deeper view into the relationship between housing and employment: how many people satisfied with housing are satisfied with employment and opposite.
        - What specific aspects result in satisfaction with employment
        - How many people were employed

- **Small Group 2 – Community, Relationships, and Transportation**
    - What surprised you about the results?
        - Lack of basic technology and knowledge of resources to obtain it
    - What best practices can we take away?
        - Training around exploring relationships
        - Relationships are what make our lives rich
    - What recommendations can we make? To who?
        - Using more than one transportation services. Learning from the Lyft and Uber pilot in Dakota County.
        - Collaborate with cities about bus stop accessibility
        - Looking into access to technology/wireless Wi-Fi
        - Ability to get married and maintain SS benefits
    - What information are we missing?
        - Money and who's in control of it, especially in group residential settings
        - "What does it mean to be a part of the community?"

- **Small Group 3 – Support Staff, Planning, and Safety**
    - What surprised you about the results?
        - Percentage (>50%) of people who feel they are treated with respect
        - Cultural implications of "respect"
        - Lack of people doing comprehensive planning
        - Only 50% of people feel safe
    - What best practices can we take away?
        - Support the individual person to define health boundaries and professional boundaries with support staff

        - Start conversations about comprehensive future planning (estate, end of life, etc.)
    - What recommendations can we make? To who?
        - PCP- accountability for actions and keeping the plan alive
        - Training and education for person about professional boundaries and how to address them
    - What information are we missing?
        - What are the cultural implications around respect?
        - How is respect defined?
        - How the person sees their relationship with support staff – blurred boundaries
        - What influences response around safety or lack of

- **Small Group 4 – Services and Supports version 1, Services and Supports version 2, Case management, and Hopes, Dreams, Goals**
    - What surprised you about the results?
        - The metro region had more satisfaction with case management
        - Goals, hopes, dreams question had higher numbers than expected
        - 72% of people identified that services meet their wants
    - What best practices can we take away?
        - Ask more specific questions about services (CDCS vs traditional)
        - Case management informing people of new resources right away
        - Consistent case management contract and mutually agreed upon timelines
        - Lower caseloads for case management
        - Avoid acronyms and use plain language (CM and services and supports)
    - What recommendations can we make? To who?
        - More consistent information from counties and DHS for contact info
        - Role definition – Case management redesign
        - Be upfront about timelines
    - What information are we missing?
        - What service model is used? CDCS or traditional?
        - Hopes, dreams, and goals questions are hard to answer as there is a lot of crossover into other areas.
        - Providers outside of HCBS such as doctors and MCO providers.
        - Asking “What is your overall quality of life right now?” and “How can your quality of life improve?”

5. **Share out and group brainstorm**

6. **What’s Working/What’s Not**

What is working?

- Small groups (3)
- Technology (2)

- Slow down and speak up cards
- Lots of valuable information (4)
- Meaningful review to meet goals
- Sharing of resources

What is not working?

- Reviewing results ahead of time to allow for more discussion time
- Breakfast
- Time restraints (5)
- Human dignity as the forefront for a person with disabilities

Next Meeting – January 10th, 2020 from 9:00 – 11:00am