



Performance Improvement Committee Minutes
Friday, September 9, 2005
1:30 – 4:30 p.m., Towner I, Room 228

Present: Larry Newberg, Nicole James-Emerick, Shauna Reitmeier, Jeff Capobianco, Phil Moise, Bob Pattullo, Doris A. Peoples, Sheila Rittondale attended for Tracy Gomez

Absent: Gratia Karmes, Brenda Barry, Steve Sheldon, Tracy Gomez

Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Action / Outcome	Responsibility
1. Check-In/ Ground Rules			
2. Review PI Committee Purpose & Ground Rules			
3. Approve Minutes of 8/25 and Today's Agenda	Approved		
4. PI Redesign Update	S. Reitmeier gave a detailed overview of the 2-day rollout of PI. An overview of the October 14 meeting was also given. J. Capobianco and L. Hall will be providing training on the Learning Organization. Jeff will focus on data review. An instruction sheet will be provided to all new people responsible for data collection. Sheila was concerned about the overall quality of people coming in since the learning curve is long. Provider representation will be discussed at the next meeting. An invitation will be sent. B. Pattullo suggested that the BBA be consulted for clarification.		

Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Action / Outcome	Responsibility
<p>5. Transition To New PI Process – Data Review by PCP/SD Committee (B. Paxton)</p>	<p>Providers will be submitted 4th quarter data at the end of October. The Network Management Committee will be reviewing the data according to the new plan. According to S. Reitmeier, the end of the 1st quarter data is to go to the new process by the end of January. The regional process will be up and running by April 1, 2006. The PI Data Subcommittee will continue to meet on an ad hoc basis if needed.</p> <p>a. PCP Evaluation Data – Q3 ~ L. Newberg gave a detailed overview of the report. An in depth discussion ensued about problems with surveys in Monroe where many of which are going out but not being returned. CSTS is looking at when a PCP needs to be done which might be good information to reference in terms of a full blown PCP as opposed to it being tweaked. The process is relatively consistent across the Board. Areas of opportunity for Monroe and Washtenaw were discussed.</p> <p>b. QAPIP #1 – Natural Supports – Q3 ~ L. Newberg gave a detailed overview of the study. Corrections: There should be an N in the final column. Spenddowns skewed the numbers. L. Newberg and B. Paxton are working to pull the numbers up. Accurate data was not being given for natural supports so B. Paxton was doing them by hand. One item that will always be problematic has to do with clinical judgment which Encompass cannot capture. Staff should be reminded to include specific steps if it is an on-going problem. Although it was fair to conclude that the affiliation is doing well with natural supports, improvement is needed in terms of the steps. A discussion ensued about what is considered a natural support, the MI struggle with it, and staff having to look beyond whether they have it. J. Capobiaco thought Family Ed might assist in this area. It has to be defined on a case by case basis.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assistance will be provided to the Network Management with the first quarter data. • A summary of what needs to be done will be provided. • Information will be provided. • High priority – The Local PI Committee will look at how many are going out. A blank form might be needed to explain the language which should be kept the same across the network. It will be taken back through the process and brought to the next meeting. • The PCP procedure should be updated and placed in the provider packet. • A form will be developed to analyze natural supports. <p>Natural supports will be part of the transition of going through the indicators to see what are in the top 50. Since the study has been on-going for 2 years, the Committee has the option of dropping it.</p>	<p>Nicole</p> <p>Gracia</p> <p>Larry</p> <p>Sheila</p> <p>?</p> <p>Larry</p>

#7 Moved to additions to the agenda:

Agenda Item	Discussion Points	Action / Outcome	Responsibility
6. RCAC News	P. Moise reported that there were so many new members the time was spent with introductions.		
7. Agenda Additions: PCP Evaluation Tool	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B. Paxton and the PCP asked that the box “refused” on new survey be changed to “declined.” • Those present felt demographics on the bottom should be deleted, but some expressed an interest in it down the road. The new form goes into effect October 1. 	Update form for new FY.	Nicole
8. Call Abandonment Data Update	None		
9. Indicator Development Worksheet	<p>L. Newberg distributed the form and explained its use. He reviewed it with an eye on EQR requirements for data collection and analysis in terms of what they would look for in reviewing one of our projects. Most of the additions had to with the EQR standards. Committee input was requested. Suggestions included definitions be added under Quality Domains. See page 3C for new items. Discussion ensued about a half sheet to be used with the data collection protocol for creating a data set. Training should be provided for staff with O&E’s assistance. It was suggested that a binder be created to include every indicator to indicate whether it comes through Encompass. An actual tool is needed with the elements included. J. Nelson and company will be consulted in terms of the source code which EQR references. The committees will be asked to include in their report whether the sample size was as big as they wanted it to be. A discussion ensued about how basic the training should be, and the type of testing to be done. J. Capobianco suggested “For Office Use Only” be included and then tap into the expertise of people like him when the tests are needed. He added that no significant test is needed for natural support data, but the reason needs to be documented and why it is being used. A decision is needed in terms of a threshold; if so, staff performance in relation to the threshold needs to be reviewed. A discussion ensued about what the format to create an indicator should look like; i.e. report, research paper, or a tool to prompt staff to fill out information automatically. It was also suggested that a form should be tailored to the indicator of what staff should look at and report.</p>	<p>O&E will review it with an understanding that it is not academic research.</p> <p>It will be used in the training on October 14. Stats 101, Central Tendency and the IDW sheet will be used to work through an indicator by doing data analysis by defining and setting up how it is to be used.</p> <p>The data reporting part needs to be completed.</p>	<p>Jeff</p> <p>Jeff</p>

10. Next Meeting: October 20, 10:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.	IDW on agenda before October 20.	Changes to be communicated via email.	Shauna
11. Check Out/Meeting Evaluation	Good meeting. Good job with agenda/		

Minutes prepared by Doris A. Peoples, September 15, 2005