METRO REGIONAL QUALITY COUNCIL AGENDA
Friday February 12th, 2017
9 am – 11 am
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 that people have the services and supports to live a life based on their hopes and dreams. Implement a system to continually monitor and improve the quality of services and supports for people with disabilities by improving person centered outcomes, quality of life indicators and to drive overall systems change.

In attendance: Ann Cirelli, Joe Cuoco, Betty DeWitt, Tim Sullivan, Ebere Ozurumba, John Estrem, Erin Paredes, Chelsea Lorenz, Rebecca St. Martin, Isabel Taylor, & Kayla Nance

1. **Introductions/What's Happening?**
    a. New RQC intern, Ebere
    b. Visit Ann's son's restaurant, Just Us!
2. **Update from State Quality Council (SQC)**
    a. **Tim Sullivan's SQC updates**
        i. SQC is in a rebuilding period now that the RQCs are on up and running; they have learned a lot from trial and error and are trying to put things in place to support both SQC and RQCs over time, including looking at how SQC is organized, examining roles, responsibilities, connections with DHS and mutual partners, etc.
        ii. Regional Quality Council Support and Development Workgroup
        iii. RQCs having issues identifying guardians due to faulty information; turns out DHS is puling data that local case managers entered into the system
        iv. IRB told RQCs we didn't need to get guardian permission anymore to interview people—there has been further discussion on that because some SQC members believe we should get guardian permission. Steering Committee decided that we should not move forward without guardian permission until the SQC talks a bit more.

v. Ombudsman office was asked to get involved and make a ruling and they provided a 6 page letter in favor of individuals being able to do interviews without guardian permission

vi. Tim will present a motion this afternoon for RQCs to proceed with interviews without guardian permission; however, as Ombudsman recommended, notify guardian when possible (with correct info) as to interview happening in case of certain situations where the guardian can legally make those choices and there could be a review process. Burden not on RQC; burden on DHS to provide the data. Review process could be as simple as talking about merits of including guardian—not an extreme process

vii. Not person-centered to require guardian permission and involvement, but our practices are built on person-centeredness. DHS practices have been different to this in the past which is why they were unsure. Common belief is that guardians have all control over the person's life—shouldn't be that way. Bigger discussion on that front. However, it would be respectful to notify guardian, allow as bystander if desired, etc.

1. Should keep in mind that the guardian connection might be important to some individuals and we don't want to deprive them of that comfort/safety
2. Statute is about changing the system, perhaps changing how the state approaches guardianship, etc.—not about direct impact on each person's life.
    a. Not an effort to exclude guardians, but an effort to move forward with interviews without barrier

viii. Some individuals don't communicate with words and their parent/guardian/staff proxy will end up doing the talking--- how do we score those answers?

ix. Work group is also looking on how to get the long interviews (DLAST) started, as are Kayla and the other RQC coordinators

1. "Brief" interview is not so brief—requires more work and time than we expected. Most interviews (time spent interviewing the person) have taken 45 minutes-1 hour, not factoring in contacting the person, travel time, etc.

x. Tim wants to get the SQC to trust the process, trust the staff and trained volunteers as we deal with guardians so that we can keep moving forwared—don't want to "do battle" with guardians.

3. Regional Quality Council (RQC) Updates

a. Interviews/Database (discussion)

i. 44% of people pulled we haven't been able to reach due to bad information.

Phone issue is biggest issue, either missing phone number, bad or disconnected number, etc.

1. Database does not currently have case manager information– all they had were county and a possible ID number
2. Providers have to keep current, accurate information—DHS should also

ii. 16% actively declining, 13% say yes (of original data block)

iii. 28 reviews completed, 3 more scheduled for this month, but we make calls about every other day

iv. 5% of total records are people who need interpreters; of the ones we've gone through, about 5 different languages. Most Somali. Dan Zimmer recommended using some funds ($4000 was mentioned, to be split between the 3 RQCs) for translation services, they have approved a certain amount so far and then hopefully more later. Red tape here—must figure out how funds will get to us, and then there is a large list of providers from DHS and we must figure out how/who to pick.

1. RQC coordinators are working on budget for 2019 right now; will be allocating funds towards payment for interpretive services
2. Metro RQC has the most need for interpretive services, followed by Region 10

v. 2 MAARC reports made so far. What should/can we do in situations that are not quite MAARC-level but are nonetheless undesirable?

vi. Tim: ongoing discussion right now about what happens when the interview is over and the reviewer leaves. But the statute is focused on systemic change, not immediate change in an individual's life. Must strike a balance here. For example, Region 10 with VOICE used to do licensing, which could make a material difference—recommending based on interviews that a place not be licensed, etc. RQCs will not be doing this going forward but it was the intent originally. 245D changed a lot. However, still want to make systemic changes.

b. Reviewer Recruitment/Training

i. January 8-9 was first training; we now have 3 interns at the Arc and 7 volunteers who are trained. Students, social worker, parent, provider, and interns—variety of people. Kayla does mentor reviews with these volunteers before they go out on their own. Kayla helped later in January with Arrowhead region training. Volunteer numbers are better than anticipated. Helpful to not have to attend every review ourselves, but managing/scheduling does take some work.

c. Website (discussion)

i. Small group will take a look at the website and address some of Kayla's questions: Rebecca, Betty and Erin

d. Continue discussion of workgroups/council review process

i. John: more ad-hoc, task force type groups, rather than organized workgroup style. Not sure we're at the level of development to do standing work groups. Deciding on website group today worked well.

ii. Kayla would like a group to look at data in the future; a lot of information is stored in the written summaries, but how do we capture that data and share it, make it useful? (Data review group)

1. Trying to work on whose role is what in the process. Internal work group at SQC believes they're there to help support RQCs with the work they need to do. Tim believes a recommendation from RQC could go straight to DHS without having to go through SQC first. Contract is with DHS, not with state. Of course it would be nice to share our thoughts with SQC but we don't need SQC permission.

a. What happens when it moves to DHS? How do we make change on a bigger level?

i. Tim: Some are pushing that it is the SQC's responsibility to recommend things to DHS, directly to co-chairs, minority ranking member on committees, etc. They could provide recommendations in their annual report—this is the ultimate goal. For example, if RQCs were unable to move forward due to guardian issue, SQC could recommend to DHS that changes happen. That's what the statute says.

ii. We don't have to only do things in conjunction with DHS. They are our partners and we should inform them, but do not need agreement for our advocacy efforts.

iii. Statute passed in 2007 to create SQC and RQCs—look how long it took us to get here with the 3 RQCs

iv. Outreach: we're doing that work—connecting with various people through the process. Kayla is involved in

many work groups and committees outside of RQC/SQC. People are starting to recognize it a bit more. Will continue community outreach. Rebecca mentioned how she shares RQC happenings with her community. Right now it's a lot of word of mouth. Tim mentioned they are continually talking about RQC at Hennepin County and training in new employees on what that means for them. SQC has a public relations work group now which will hopefully help get the word out. Tim will share openings in the groups he is in for any interested RQC members.

b. Ann: is anyone looking at Minnesota disability situation versus other states? Tim: there is an Olmstead board that is working with other states on this. MN was one of the last states to start doing anything around Olmstead but we are learning about the best practices elsewhere so we can replicate them here. Our system here in MN is somewhat reactive. Must make report, get feedback, redevelop, etc. Not community represented, but SQC is consulted on things by CMS, provide input, hear about what's going on.

   i. Per this question: RQC members can bring forward our concerns, knowledge etc. and share with the group—such as Ann with other states' progress

   ii. Anchor: very active national association of providers

   iii. We need to do the work on our side, but we also need a receptive audience/person who can make and approve changes

4. What's Working

- **a.** Respect at the table
- **b.** Loved hearing about content (subject matter)
- **c.** Good updates, good discussion
- **d.** Updates from SQC
- **e.** Great conversation!

f. Great discussion about the guardianship fiasco!
g. Updates from the state council

5. What's Not Working

a. Less reporting and more hands-on working
b. Sidetracked from agenda
c. Cold room this week
d. Talk more slowly, hard to track
e. Fragrance still a problem
f. All was well ☺
g. Phone participation, especially for service recipients whose PCA doesn't show

6. Next Meeting- March 9th 2018, 9am-11am