



New Regional Performance Improvement Committee Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, November 16, 2005
9:00 – 12:00, United Way Bldg., Platt Rd., Ann Arbor

Present: J. Hernandez, L. Newberg, D. Virgo, Gerlyn, D. King, M. Phillips, S. Kapica, K. Gauthier, P. Moise, D. Peoples, S. Reitmeier, L. Hall, N. James-Emerick, P. Cowan, L. Brown

Absent: Gratia Karmes,

Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Action / Outcome	Responsibility
1. Check-In/ Ground Rules	An in depth discussion was held about the communication plans in each County: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Livingston</i> – Concerns included transition, loss of consumer and staff voice. The hope was that there would <i>not</i> be a reduction in those voices, but an increase in identifying and expressing local concerns that might have regional implications. • <i>Monroe</i> – Staff concerned about having a voice and somebody from the front lines being represented in terms of how it affects people’s case loads • <i>Washtenaw/WCHO</i> – Has the same concerns as well as whether their workloads will increase. . 		
2. Approve Minutes & Agenda	Decision Log added (see meeting handouts).	Approved	
3. Review of Ground Rules	Posted on board		
4. Local Transition Plan Updates	S. Reitmeier raised the question of what needs to be done to help move the PI process forward. Comments included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Livingston</i> - The big concern is for staff and consumers to feel empowered and they insist that they not be marginalized; they want their voices 	Staff concerns should be addressed.	All

Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Action / Outcome	Responsibility
	<p>heard. They were also worried about the lack of case management representation at the Regional PI Committee Level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Washtenaw/CSTS</u> - Same as above • <u>Monroe</u> - There are two levels of concern: (1) To make sure staff have a handle on the data flowing to Washtenaw County; i.e. state indicators, QAPIP, DCH indicators, etc. The assigned workgroup will be dismantled so the structure of data will look different. (2) There is continued concern about clean data. It is an Encompass issue. <p>S. Reitmeier commented on connecting the local and regional advisory councils to ensure a clear line of communication and to identify who's responsible for communicating information to and from PI.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Washtenaw/CSTS</u> - One concern is the structure being created in terms of committee and reports, which were designed to relieve some of the work of the Program Management Team (PMT). If it is reversed, they will be back where they started from. Direct staff involvement is a real concern. PI was representative of direct line staff throughout CSTS so the question is how do they continue to get that information; i.e. an ad hoc group? <p>A question was raised about the other staff who were not on the committee, and how to generate interest and involvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Monroe</u> - Part of the vision was communicating a vital view of what PI is about. D. King questioned whether staff had to drive to Washtenaw and sit on a committee. It is a factor in terms of delivering clinical services. Staff would be happy to have a voice and a mechanism for communicating it. • <u>Lenawee</u> - E. Kurtz reported that G. Karmes had presented a draft plan to management. He is hearing the same things in a different way. Management doesn't want to lose staff involvement which goes back to the Learning Organization training. He feels there is a need for direct line staff to be trained. When staff is not challenged, it takes a long time to get them involved. There is a general fear of how the system will work; i.e. management, complex issues, monitoring, tracking data and how it will be reported out prior to an audit. 		

Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Action / Outcome	Responsibility
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Washtenaw</u> - N. James-Emerick was concerned about what the issues would be. She questioned who is responsible for bringing information back to her if they notice an issue. <p>S. Reitmeier directed the conversation to specific details that needed to be addressed to move the PI process forward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff involvement was identified (above). • Direct consumer involvement - After an in depth discussion, D. Virgo voiced her support for consumer involvement and stated how inadequate the work is without them at each and every meeting. She felt a serious gap would continue to exist at every meeting without the consumer at every juncture. She challenged the committee to find a way to deal with transportation and build it into the budget. P. Moise concurred that when the consumer voice is left out, regardless of the reason, it sends a negative message. P. Cowan concurred. <p>The case managers and providers should be given specific opportunities to discuss why they feel disempowered to speak. D. King suggested that a meeting be held to get specific input from around the table by county.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Consumer Involvement</u> - After a number of options were identified, it was the consensus of the group to have five (5) consumer representatives across the affiliation. 	<p>A champion and alternate to address transportation issue were identified. Groups to meet with should be identified.</p> <p>L. Newberg asked that the issue be continually brought to the committee's attention as has been done repeatedly in the past.</p> <p>A mentoring process will be developed to ensure consumers and alternates are on the same page as the committee. Should a consumer rep become ill, alternate coverage will be provided. If a consumer cannot attend a meeting, he/she will be given the option of asking someone to attend in his/her place. If a topic is coming up for discussion at the next meeting, staff and consumers can call or email someone to ensure their voice is heard.</p> <p>The transportation issue will be revisited within a month.</p>	<p>P. Cowan G. Karmes (E. Kurtz to take back)</p> <p>P. Moise</p> <p>P. Cowan/G. Karmes</p>

Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Action / Outcome	Responsibility
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Direct Line Staff Involvement</u> - Theoretically voices that are further away from the work give a different perspective and should be heard and/or given the opportunity to participate which will speak to the issue of trust. P. Cowan sees it as a systemic issue in comparison to other places she's been employed. <p>Washtenaw/PRU and Livingston committees have reviewed their charge. In Monroe ~ The question was never asked in terms of whether the right people at the table. Comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is pivotal to the PI process (S. Reitmeier). • There will be a down side if line staff is not on the Clinical Care Committee when the new case management model is rolled out (L. Newberg). • It will provide a comparison locally of how we will operate in comparison to now. Cultural differences will be seen more clearly (M. Phillips). <p>S. Reitmeier solicited a more provocative conversation to identify systemic issues in getting involvement on PI. Comments and questions included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct line staff doesn't have time to do work and sit on committees. • There is no direct line staff because administratively the counties had to learn how to trust one another. • A discussion ensued about how a natural selection process was used to select people for the PI Committee based on skill sets, and leadership qualities. Differing opinions were expressed. The perception is that direct line staff involvement will not occur because discussions are continually being held without them. The number of line staff from each county, skill sets needed, disciplines to be covered, and to whom a memo should be sent to generate interest was discussed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Provider Involvement</u> – Scott Brown volunteered and Joe Paliwoda might be interested as an ad hoc member when substance abuse related items are presented. Discussion ensued. 	<p>A staff supervisor will be considered. Other direct line staff other than a case manager will also be considered in addition to staff that was on a disbanded PI Committee.</p> <p>Direct Line Staff involvement from DD, MI and Kids will be added to the December 1 agenda. To whom a memo is to be sent needs to be identified.</p> <p>Scott Brown will be invited to attend Regional PI Meetings. Information requesting participation will be announced at the Providers Meeting A memo should be sent describing what Regional PI does and how long it meets.</p>	<p>S. Reitmeier</p> <p>S. Reitmeier K. Gauthier</p>

Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Action / Outcome	Responsibility
<p>V. BREAK **</p>			
<p>VI. Review ACTION Plan</p>	<p>Other systemic issues to deal with detailed items; i.e. DCH indicators; clarity when needed; problems with Encompass aggregating raw data; the two levels of data: DCH and data to be reported regularly were discussed. N. James-Emerick was originally identified to pull the data for everyone with a point person in each county to say whether the benchmark had been met; and if not, to indicate what happened. Issues exist surrounding the detail and a gap exists in terms of the mechanism. A discussion ensued about the people currently pulling data not being the ones who should be doing so in Monroe and Washtenaw.</p> <p>A discussion ensued about whether a workgroup could identify the problems being caused by going from the old system to the new system and to determine why the data hasn't been entered into Encompass, which is causing extra work. Systemic issues included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports being set up differently, • Data being collected differently, • Authorizations not being approved by supervisors on time, • Ensure that indicators can be done through Encompass • To see if the draft cleaning process left by Bob still works, • Data being collected incorrectly • Will everything needed be available <p>Draft Transition Plans will assist with the process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lenawee's draft to be finalized • Washtenaw's draft to be updated • Livingston's PI Meeting is the 3rd Tuesday of the month so it will be a while. <p>The Transition Plan is a living document and the switch occurs within the plan. L Newberg was interested in the plan being set and being able to build on it at each meeting. N. James Emerick felt it was an action for the local committees, but specifically how was not included. She needs to know how it is progressing and felt a network management process was needed. A meeting is needed with Network Management by April to determine how the process works.</p>	<p>Staff should continue to collect data in the right way, and aggregate it in the right way.</p> <p>Follow up will be done with PCE A meeting will be held to discuss problems with the PI Indicator Group.</p> <p>The flow will be laid out next month with supporting documentation by committee and local groups being used to report back.</p>	<p>All</p> <p>S. Reitmeier P. Cowan, L. Brown, E. Kurtz</p> <p>S. Reitmeier</p>

Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Action / Outcome	Responsibility
	Gaps exist; i.e. with Health & Safety it's in the details which need to be identified to determine where it goes. An inventory would assist with the process per E. Kurtz.	Top 10 items are needed by County listing the issues and concerns about the transition, what has been done locally and what is going to be done or worked on by the committee by January, 06. PRU Committee Meeting to review indicators.	All K. Gauthier, N. James Emerick to assist
VII. Review of PI Program Description	The Program Description will help structure the conversation by county; i.e. Regional Committee, locally, etc.. The question was raised in terms of how to get qualitative pieces coming forward to bring to the next meeting and at the same time what process would be taken to get qualitative and quantitative data to counties, Regional PI, AEC, etc. Specific indicators will be determined and discussed.	Indicators from committees should be submitted to G. Petrik, Monroe	All
VIII. Check Out/ Meeting Evaluation	The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.		

Minutes prepared by Doris A. Peoples, November 21, 2005