METRO REGIONAL QUALITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
Friday January 20, 2017
9 am – 11 am
The Arc Greater Twin Cities
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.

Present: *Rod Carlson (Living Well Disability Services), Ali Brown (Scott County), Ann Cirelli, Joe Cuoco (Living Solutions), Betty DeWitt (CIP), John Estrem (Hammer), Chelsea Lorenz (Dakota County), Kayla Nance (The Arc Greater Twin Cities), Erin Paredes (Dakota County), Trina Simons, Rebecca St. Martin, Jolene Thibedeau Boyd (CIP), Andrea Werlinger (Department of Human Services)*

Guests*: Vicki Gerrits and Renata Ticha*

Minutes*: Barb Thompson*

1. **Introductions- Vicki Gerrits and Renata Ticha**

2. **Vicki and Renata will present on the review tool development process**
   Vicki and Renata went through the review tool development process. The ultimate goal was to get at quality lives for people. The National Quality Forum is the framework to guide the process of developing the short and long tools. They used 12 different criteria when picking each question that they were going to use. Next Friday they have a meeting where they hope to finalize the short and long tools. The purpose is to start with the person – what can be better for this person, how is the quality of their life?

   Why are we not focusing on making it an app? Or something that is easier to manage? For some people that would be easier to give them the tool and some it will be better to have a conversation. Eventually they will build something on a national level, but for the purpose of the Regional Quality Council we don't have the resources.

   Will the training be with ICI in developing that? The training will be a collaboration.

   It has become apparent that there are a lot of the same initiatives going on, but they don't communicate as would be useful. Have been trying as they talk to the different groups, that they share some of the trends.

   The Center is willing to help out with technical assistance.

   The tool will need to go through the Institutional Review Process per a meeting with DHS, how long will that process take? The process through the U of M takes about two months.

3. **Updates from 12/16 Meeting**
   a. **Meeting with DHS**
      There was a two hour meeting. Talked to the gentleman who put together the numbers as to why they need 42 people each month per council for statistical significance. He had a simpler understanding of how long these tools were going to take (he thought it would be maybe 5 minutes). Per person it could be a two hour process including scheduling, etc. They talked about what they would need for the sample size (2-3 times the size). It will be DHS that is pulling the information for us. They are still waiting for clarification about what the County process will be. He thought the counties might come in to verify guardianship status. The county could fill in gaps. They are still working on compiling the list of what information that they want pulled. We are looking at different surveys that have already gone out or are going out so we don't have to reinvent the wheel. We are trying to figure out how to collaborate with DHS. It will be important for us to stress that this is a review so that we stand out from the other surveys that are happening. The training process for that tool is still in development. The initial training will most likely be Kayla and the people from the two other Regional Quality Councils. Who is responsible for follow up if people do need further help? That is part of the development process – creating a follow up process. Any kind of legislative change we want to propose we would go through Steve Larson who is our liaison to the governance body. We are part of the State Quality Council which is a mandated legislative body. All the funding we receive flow through the Health and Human Services committees in both the House and Senate. We were hoping to create a website separate from DHS. State Quality Council does fall under DHS and we are trying to figure out where the Regional Quality Councils fall.
   b. **Follow Up on MOU's**
      Kayla is talking with Dan to see if we need to get something more formal from DHS for counties.
   c. **Update on Admin Assistant position**
      Had a phone interview on Monday and has another one today. It may take a month or so to get someone hired.

4. **Update from State Quality Council and other Regional Quality Councils**
   a. **Michael Smull Strategic Planning event**
      Did not have a planning meeting, instead attended this event. Michael Smull goes all around the country doing various trainings. Members of the State Quality and Regional Quality councils, people from DHS, providers and family members attended this. What have we done in the last 20 years – what has been working, what hasn't and what do we do going forward?
   b. **Website**

   c. **Update on RQC collaborative efforts**
      Has been working with the other two coordinators on communication plans, etc.

5. **Review Marketing**
   a. **Break into small groups to review logo proposals and discuss name options**
      There was discussion about the logos. There was discussion about adding Disability to the name somehow. Or changing the names to Disability Quality Council vs Regional Quality Council. There was also discussion about what image says quality. Highlight the region in the state for each different logo. It was decided to vote on what we are

leaning towards. Moving Forward – 6; MN Logo – 6. It was suggested to change the font to something more hip, particularly for the logo with the state. For the state logo also possibly have the Quality in script. It was mentioned that if we did use the state logo and we added a council that were in the western half of the state, it will be more difficult to do with the logo. Everyone is good with Metro.

6. **What's Working/What's Not**

<u>What Worked</u>

Liked the logo conversation/including every in discussion
Helpful to have additional info regarding the tool
Guest speakers (could have had more detail in presentation)
Stayed on task per agenda
Council participants w/disabilities
A lot of interaction and input from members (2)

<u>What Didn't Work</u>

The space felt too small/hot (3)
Logo – hard to sit through that part
Talking too fast
Still cannot open word documents from Arc
Frustrating to just find out about IRB requirement and related delays
This is going to be a long process

7. **Next Meeting**
   a. **Friday, February 10, 9-11 am**