

Quality Management Committee
Thursday, September 28, 2006
Central Vermont Home Health and Hospice
Meeting Minutes

Meeting Objectives:
Develop Data Sources and Data Points

Agenda: Welcome and break out into groups; review Data Source and Data Points in groups; regroup to assess progress

Attendance: Joe Carlomagno, Stephen Morabito, Peter Cobb, Dagny Hoff, Don Grabowski, Dixie McFarland, Lynette Shepard, Ryan Whipple, David Horton, Maria Bean, Cindy Smith, Jerry Bernard, Karen Topper, Ellen Malone, Veda Lyon, Jane Culver

Guests: Virginia Renfrew, representing adult day services, Peter Cobb representing Home Health, and Scott West also representing ADS

Preliminary Discussion:

- The data sources and points were drafted by the Quality Management Unit who has experience in reviewing each of the programs. They were asked to come up with the best data sources and points.
- There is a plan to ask a group of consumers to review the Data Point questions to get their feedback on clarity and appropriateness.
- Given that there are limited time and resources we will try to pick the best 1 or 2 Indicators in each category. We want to keep the questions limited but get the best information.
- We hope to streamline the process so that data sources are limited to make interviewing process less time consuming.
- We want to end up looking at all agencies using the same methodologies.
- Stephen will take revisions and edit into a document for QMU to review next Thursday.
- The hope is to have a draft Quality Management Plan by December or January.
- We will have public meetings around the state to get public input (perhaps 4 regional meetings).
- We need to look at outcomes given the limits of time, staff, and money. We will be reviewing 54 agencies with a review team of 10.
- We need to be thinking about how to assess the quality of services using resources we have.

- The committee broke into 3 discussion groups to consider if the Data Sources and Data Points are the best way of getting information for each Indicator.

Regroup at 11:50 to assess progress

Report from group 1 - Joe Carlomagno reporting

Suggested changes to the document:

- 1c.** It was suggested that staff be added as a data source.
- 3a.** It was suggested that case notes be added as documentation of progress of goals.
- 6b.** It was thought that the language needs to be more understandable.

Report from group 2 - Stephen Morabito reporting

- Their discussion was more philosophical.
- They thought the data sources and points were fine.
- Concerns were voiced about the reliability of answers to 'yes' and 'no' questions.
- They hoped the questions could be tailored to the consumer and people with cognitive disabilities.
- There was a concern when a consumer is asked if their family members can be interviewed that this might be perceived as being dismissive of the individual.
- Reviewers need to be aware of respectful ways to ask permission of consumers when asking to speak with others about them.
- It was stressed that reviewers can get different perspectives from different people and that the final report should reflect this. There needs to be a way to include more than one perspective.
- It is important to be sure direct service staff get a chance for input without their supervisor being present.

Report from group 3 - Don Grabowski reporting

Suggested changes to the document:

- 7a.** Data sources need to include the individual.
- 7b.** It was suggested that DS Health and Welfare Guidelines be used.
- 7c.** It was suggested that we should use "Mental Health Standard Review" We need to better define who we're looking at and how.
- 8a.** It was suggested that 'Do they understand you?' be added. It should be a two way communication.
- 8c.** It was suggested that 'Have you been trained in your clients preferred communication method?' be added.
- 8c.** It was suggested that developmental services communication plans be used as a data source.

- 9a.** It was suggested that 'from the agency' be added for clarity.
- 9b.** The source is not clear, it seems redundant. It needs rewording.
- 9b.** It was suggested that 'Why' be added under data point.
- 9c.** It was suggested that the individual be asked if they received services in a timely manner. We want to focus on the individual and not just records. Same with data point in **9d**.
- 9f.** Is this the same as **4c**?
- 10a.** It was suggested that the data sources include staff.
- 10a.** It was suggested that training plans be looked at under data points
- 10b.** It was suggested that staff be asked what they like about their job in order to distinguish between supervision and support.
- 10c.** It was suggested that staff be asked if they know what the quality plan is.
- 10e.** It was suggested that family and consumers on committees be included here. Family satisfaction might also be addressed here.
- 10f.** It was suggested that 'in a User friendly manner and useful' be added.
- 10g.** It was suggested that 'How do you monitor for fraud related issues?' be added.

Next Steps:

- Today's comments and changes will be integrated into a document that will be shared with QMU at their next meeting on October 5th.
- It will then be sent to all committee members so they can share it with their groups and get feedback.
- At the October meeting we will gather feedback on the document.
- At the November committee meeting we hope to finalize the document.
- Not all feedback will get incorporated. Looking for language change ahead of time.

Meeting Dates: Although the meeting date for October remains the same, meeting dates for November and December have changed:

Thursday, October 26th

Thursday, November 16th

Thursday, December 14th