METRO REGIONAL QUALITY COUNCIL Minutes
Friday February 10, 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: *Ann Cirelli, Joe Cuoco (Supportive Living Solutions), Betty DeWitt (CIP), Alicia Donahue (Ombudsman Office), John Estrem (Hammer), Danielle Fox (Scott County), Kayla Nance (The Arc Greater Twin Cities), Dennis Price (Dakota County), Andrea Werlinger (Department of Human Services)*

Minutes*: Barb Thompson*

1. **Introductions**

2. **Arc Updates**
   a. **Logo**
      The new logo is at the top of the agenda. We now have some consistent branding to communicate with.
   b. **Gaps Analysis Regional Meetings**
      Kayla sent this out to the providers. These are usually done with counties to decide where gaps and barriers are done. This year they will do regional meetings instead. Kayla reached out to the providers to see if they would be interested in being a part of these meetings. If anyone else would like to be provided, let Kayla know. At this point they have no dates set. If you want to give Kayla your name now, let her know and she can let you know when the meeting dates are set. Dennis said that there is no scientific data set for gaps. One of the complaints is that the county just asked who they knew. It's an opinion based analysis. Instead they will get a broader base. This is looking at what comes out of the survey. This is the action planning step.

3. **Update from State Quality Council and other Regional Quality Councils**
   a. **SQC Webpage updated**
      The webpage has been updated so it has more information about the Regional Quality Councils as well as contact information for them. We are still going through the process with DHS about whether we can have an independent website.
   b. **Next monthly meeting 2/24**

c. **Update on RQC collaborative efforts**
The Person Centered Quality Review tool workgroup has broken into another training workgroup. The training workgroup will involve Kayla, the two other coordinators and a few other people. The stuff we work on today will be feedback to that workgroup. We are working with ICI for a potential database option. They had suggested doing it through them because it might move faster than going through DHS. If it's through ICI, the tool could be electronic. We met with the Personal Experience Outcome iNtegrated Interview and Evaluation System (PEONIES) group. Talked with them this week to see what their experience was. They did it for a couple years and had some initial success. They are not doing it currently as when they got a new Governor, they received no more funding.

4. **Tool Follow-Up/Reviewer Needs**
   a. **Break into small groups to work on tool follow-up process and reviewer qualifications**

<u>Interview Follow Up</u>

Should there be a different process for short vs long?

- **No – written for both**
- **Yes – written summary for both, but summary may look different**

Written summary? In person?

- **Written to individual – and whoever they wish**
- **Written summary [with offer for follow-up and clarification if summary not accurate]**

What is the best way for review to be shared with team?

- **Written – individual's choice as to who**
- **All reports shared by "office"**
- **Written summary to team (consent?)**

How do we address major concerns with providers/teams?

- **Clarify boundaries – not individual advocates; there to look for patterns**
- **Encourage sharing but person's choice**
- **Provide resources for reporting**
- **How much do we allow to be shared (privacy & consent)**
- **Who is responsible for follow-up on major issues? RQC? DHS? County?**

<u>Reviewers</u>

Should interviews have 2 reviews? Short vs long?

- **Set up for two, but do not require**
- **Recommend 1 review for most (there may be a need for 2 at times)**
- **Two would be real important for the longer one**

Training requirements?

- **General training on DD, mental illness, etc. Develop an online training. Use council members to do the training. Don't have to pay for it.**
- **Motivational interviewing – record**
- **Person-centered thinking**
- **Practice conversations**

Particular areas of recruitment?

- Interns, family members, advocacy groups – Arc, NAMI, etc., staff county/providers – volunteers, faith-based groups, FISH
- Stipends?
- Mileage?
- Organizations with access to people with disabilities, professionals with disabilities, family/advocates

Qualifications needed?

- Don't limit
- HS/GED, written communication skills, motivated, connect with people, transportation, prefer social service experience, interview skills
- Language, culturally competent, experience in disability related field (2+)

Time commitment?

- 2-4 times a month
- Depends on how many hired – 5-10 hour/week

What are the "must haves?"

- Transportation, ability to take notes, organized process, technological skill, data privacy, paper backup
- Great communication skills, follow-through, minimal training standards, background check, reference check, experience in disability field

How are we going to present this in such a way that the people we are interviewing know that they matter and they aren't just a number. Is it to provide resources or try to link people? Or do we have people within the council who agree to step in to be the linkage piece? A piece of paper with numbers for people to call would be helpful. Have their case manager name and number on that piece of paper as well, along with their supervisor.

b. Review/provide feedback on letter notices

5. What's Working/What's Not

<u>What Worked</u>

Format. Well-prepared. Moved along. Substantive. Ended on time.
Room worked (2)
Ample time for discussion (reasonable agenda) (3)
Small groups (4)
Pre-determined questions to be answered

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

Writing on note pad may not be needed if we have a detailed note taker (more time for discussion)
Can't think of anything!
Still not clear on the tool

6. Next Meeting-
   a. Friday, March 10th, 2017