



Performance Improvement (PI) Committee
12/7/06; 1pm- LLRC

Present: D. Sabourin, P. Cowan, D Chisholm, M. Perez, L. Newberg, D. King, G. Harris, B. Gates, D. Virgo, C. Witherow, S. Kapica, J. Capobianco, N. James-Emerick, L. Brown, P. Moise, K. Gauthier, L. Hall, V. Taylor, S. Brown, B. Fowkes, D. Douthat, J. Kearney

Absent: B. Leadford, B. Wilson, S. Glancy, J. Newberry, E. Kurtz, M. Phillips, K. Milner, S. Reitmeier and P. Cowan

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION POINTS	ACTION/OUTCOME	RESPONSIBILITY
1. Review of Minutes and Agenda	Agenda additions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none Minute changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • none • M. Harding has taken on the role of EIC co-chair and will be the PI representative for that committee. E. Kurtz has taken on additional responsibilities and may not be able to attend PI meetings. 	Agenda and minutes were approved.	
2. All committee data reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCC is still working on reviewing the data and did not submit report. • Customer Service: 4th quarter, indicator #1, threshold was met. Graphs attached w/report. Report accepted. • Compliance Committee one indicator is on EQR, not reported on because reviewers not here yet. Indicator #1 not met. Fifty nine POC items that is due. Report approved. Meeting time frames often affect quality of work. Example given was PowerPoint on the DRA. Will report 2/07. • UR Committee addresses one indicator, from one item on the Person Center Plan satisfaction survey questionnaire; threshold was met, both quarters, question is being revised and will be shown next reporting period • Due Process and & Appeals: 1st indicator-no data, two 	The Customer Service, Compliance, UR, Due Process and Appeals, Office of Recipient Rights and Professional Development Committee Reports were approved.	

	<p>hearings for the quarter but were rescheduled for November, more local resolution is occurring and indicators will change, 0% for second indicator, consumers chose to be heard by judge, threshold was not met, affiliation is pursuing local resolution, however doesn't have the ability to approve the outcome, one case was taken to UR for input around CLS services. Report approved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Office of Recipient Rights Indicator #2, related trend in all three counties exists. Indicator #3, Renaissance is the front runner, however they serve a large population and when the data is compared more closely it will show otherwise. Data collection methods may be revised to group areas, such as residential and day treatment. It was suggested to qualify headings. D. Sabourin will be consulted. Three month baseline is being conducted on indicator #3. Report approved. • EIC will report 1/07 • PDC report disbursed and reviewed. Indicator was not met. Awaiting follow up from State on the State Licensure clarification and J. Webb stated it will not be for another year. Second indicator, train the trainer model will be used. S. Reitmeier and L. Hall presented. Two staff from each local agency attended training and those folks will choose project to embed learning org. principles. M. Phillips absent. All selected people have been trained. The selected projects are the beginning of many. Indicator #2, threshold was not met based on original threshold. Next year better data will be met. Skill sets need to be used with actual work products. Indicator listed is not the current indicator, it needs to be changed. Report approved. • NMC report disbursed, and presentation tabled until 1/07 • Finance: will report 1/07 		
<p>3. Customer service staff survey</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A staff satisfaction survey is needed for joint commission purposes, per A. Barrins suggestion. Does staff feel safe? Staff and consumer need to be surveyed on this issue. CSTS has an existing zoomerang survey. Discussion was had on the possibility of one survey being created for the affiliation. 	<p>It was decided Compliance (M. Perez) will review standard to determine frequency and detail requirement of staff satisfaction survey. Clarification will be gotten on the standard.</p>	

<p>4. Encompass report request training</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T. Sharp, WCHO EIC liaison and committee chair of the reports committee. Report request was reviewed. • The enhancement process is similar to the report request. It goes thru the liaison and to the helpdesk. IM will be reviewing all requests in the Monday morning meeting. Then it would go to EIC for review. Enhancement will be changed to Encompass suggestion. • Current Encompass system has been designed four separate ways to accommodate each county's processes. Previous IT projects were converted into projects. Current projects are delayed due to additions being added. • EIC projects will be reviewed to determine how long a project takes to complete and what are the milestones and the whole testing phase and how it's perceived and actually occurs. • One ideal IM has is to have the users run their own report, by pulling data. A similar process is currently being done in Oakland County. More detailed reports will be dependent on the report writer. It was suggested to have criteria for describing a report. • Building up skills and knowledge of the liaison will assist in getting the data requested in a report. It was decided early on the affiliation would not have each county pulling similar reports and analyzing data differently. • E. Kurtz previously did an analysis to compare differences of processes in each county. An example is the exception to the 14 day rule and the departments from access to claims. Item will be brought forward to AEC. The idea has not been moved on. 		
<p>5. PI forms</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New forms were distributed for review. S. Reitmeier will be focusing on leadership in each of the affiliates with the PI liaisons to assist them in taking information back to their management teams and using. A structure needs to create at PI to address not meeting state indicators. • The MDCH workgroup reviews MIMBUS data before it goes to the state. The concern is it is after the fact and POC is explanation and not really a POC. The change management definitions and meanings really need to get 	<p>Feedback due by 12/19/06.</p>	

	<p>communicated to staff that do the work to make certain it is meaningful and not just a POC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PI System needs to be built on how to have the conversations to assist staff/committees meet their goals and state measurements. More information on actual reporting and monitoring and tracking of POC will occur at PI. It was stated PI committee actually needs a charge, detailing what the committee is responsible for doing. Will POC be created by PI and how frequently will it be monitored. • Discussion was had on the time frame, 90 days after the quarter, to clean the data being an issue. Also the monitoring of POC needs to be determined. Reports can be run at anytime however the data is not accurate and needs to be manually clean. Another concern is that everyone is not Encompass using the system the same. Variances in how process are done and the system is used is what is causing the need for data scrubbing. It was stated monthly monitoring is needed. There is currently no process for reviewing POC and giving feedback. • A plan of correction process built into the PI process and is clear is needed. Idea will be explored and brought back to PI for review. 		
6. PI Report Distribution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Third quarter reports that go to the board. It will go to the regional board in January 2007. The AEC PI Report goes thru the '06 fiscal year. 	Report will go to AEC on 12/18/06.	
7. Next Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • January 4, 2007; LLRC, 1p-4p 	Agenda Items	