METRO REGIONAL QUALITY COUNCIL AGENDA
Friday October 27th, 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.

1. **Celebration!**
    a. Metro RQC has been meeting for a little over a year!
2. **Introductions**
    a. Welcome, Diane (family member role) and Andrew (Resource Specialist role)
3. **Regional Quality Council (RQC) Updates**
    a. **The data has been uploaded/prospective reviewee profiles have been pulled**
        i. Still need to fill in some information or update information (such as for guardians); investigating how we might accomplish this
        ii. Isabel and Kayla will soon start sending notice letters to selectees. Letter, then call to set up interview. Will abandon after two failed attempts.
        iii. We have been working with ICI (Institution of Community Integration) at the University of Minnesota to develop the tool and volunteer training
    b. **Training video clips/review style**
        i. Ideally the review will be conversational. Note-taker is there to be accurately recording information while reviewer leads conversation; note-taker can also make sure questions were fully answered/ask follow-up questions as necessary

ii. We'll aim to make a connection first to make the person more comfortable before reviewing
iii. Role of the reviewer is not to "fix"
iv. Prompting questions can help "dig" for the answer to the main question
v. Leave-behind resource sheet to provide options for the reviewee
vi. Interviewees may include guardians/staff/etc. as desired; however, individuals may offer more truthful information without others present

4. **Overall data: SQC will use/gather. After a year or so RQCs will make recommendations/best practices to replicate. Tool is based off of person-centered thinking**
    a. We need data in order to make recommendations to legislators
    b. Follow-ups: finding out if resource list is helpful/if reviewees are using it
    c. Ultimate goal is improving quality of life
    d. We know some good things are happening—finding out how to expand those
    e. Paper copy of review/materials will be destroyed; DHS database is secure. Reviewer training will involve information privacy
5. **Conflict of interest**
    a. **Interviews may involve feedback on providers who are involved with the RQC—how do we deal with that conflict of interest? How should we discuss/share that information?**
        i. Even with leaving names out, situations might be recognizable
        ii. May skew data for data to go directly to providers/telling people that
        iii. Making rating piece available to providers without further detail—therefore anonymous
    b. Involving provider data is important to us so that providers can know how they are doing, even though it might not be statistically relevant (still working with ICI on this)
    c. Waiting until a few months of data gathering have passed
    d. Sharing data with people who were interviewed at the end of the year
6. **Goal is 10 interviews in November**
7. **Reviewer Recruitment/Training**
    a. Starting with small group, will learn from that experience
    b. Currently have a two day training set (6 hours and 4 hours)—may need to modify based on needs of volunteers
    c. How else can we recruit?

i. Students: maybe could count towards volunteer hours, internship or credit hours, etc.
ii. Retirees?

d. Transportation may potentially be an issue since we are meeting people in their homes, though we will try to match geographically
e. Kayla will share job description, Arc Facebook posting of volunteer position, etc. as they come
f. Think of groups that Kayla, for example, could come and speak to
g. DHS email blast about SQC/RQC has gone out
h. We have asked ARRM Association of Residential Resources in Minnesota & MOHR (Minnesota Organization of Habilitation and Rehabilitation) to reach out

8. **Next meeting: December 8th**. November meeting canceled due to Veteran's Day/today's meeting being later on
9. **What's Working/What's Not**
    a. **What's Working**
        - Great treats
        - This meeting was very focused
        - Questions were answered
        - Smaller group leads to better conversation
        - Excited to see the results
        - Group discussions
        - Participation from those in attendance
        - Yummy donuts
        - Survey is starting!
        - Barrier of scent removed
        - Having handout to look at
        - Time to explain acronyms
        - Good catch up on the questionnaire and where it's going. It's good to see the hard work is paying off.
        - Small group was a lot more helpful in tracking the conversation (larger is harder, realize that's not controllable)

- Good idea about how results of survey aggregate will be shared- with individuals, agencies, service providers, county commissioners
- Starting interviews, woohoo!
- Welcome new members
- Great to see training videos and be asked for feedback

b. **What's Not**

- A pitcher of water would be appreciated
- Nothing bad. I hope the sound quality on the training tapes are clearer.
- Hope data will not connect interviewees with providers
- Is there a place to check to find guardianship information online? Probate court records
- Do we have to get guardianship consent if it is a limited guardianship?
- Hope that the data will uncover disparities beyond what providers are doing, i.e. local government barriers, lack of affordable housing, etc.