



**Performance Improvement (PI) Committee**  
**4/7/06, 2006; 1pm- LLRC**

**Present:** S. Reitmeier, D. Sabourin, P. Cowan, , J. Capobianco, G. Karmes, L. Newberg, M. Phillips, D. King, D. Virgo, S. Kapica, N. James-Emerick, , K. Gauthier, S. Brown, B. Wilson, , J. Kearney L. Hall

**Absent:** B. Leadford, S. Glancy, B. Fowkes, J. Newberry, E. Kurtz, D Chisholm, G. Petrik, C. Witherow and L. Brown, V. Taylor, P. Moise

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION POINTS	ACTION/OUTCOME	RESPONSIBILITY
1. Review of Minutes and Agenda	<u>Agenda Change(s)</u> Lenawee Update added  <u>Minutes Change(s)</u> None  <b>Note: A draft of the Regional Performance Improvement Policy was distributed for review and feedback requested for the PI meeting in May 2006.</b>	<b>Agenda approved with change</b>  <b>Minutes approved</b>	
2. ORR Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Denice Virgo presented charge and work plan for the Office of Recipient Rights. It received consensus from department and coach.</li> </ul>	<b>Recipient Rights Office Charge and Work plan were approved</b>	
3. WCHO Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nicole James-Emerick reported that 1<sup>st</sup> DCH indicators have been submitted. A handout listing data out of compliance was presented.</li> <li>It was noted that the report presented only listed the out of compliance data not all the other data that was in compliance, it was suggested that the future reports come from a more strength based approach vs. a negative approach.</li> <li>Eighty-nine percent of all submitted to state was missing consumer employment information.</li> </ul>	<b>N. James-Emerick will email to committee members the excel spreadsheet detailing all 1<sup>st</sup> quarter DCH data for each county</b>  <b>Shauna is working with IM to resolve the issue of consumer employment missing from PI data</b>  <b>It was decided that counties out of compliance will analyze data and submit</b>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HSAG made it clear during their visit a plan of correction is needed. It was suggested by some PI committee members to do an analysis of the data first to find root causes. Then determine if a plan of correction or an explanation is needed. It was also suggested to review two quarters of data before doing a plan of correction.</li> </ul>	<p><b>explanation/root cause for quarter one data to PI Committee</b></p> <p><b>PI liaison will insure that forms get completed and brought back to PI in May 2006. Nicole will email form to PI liaison</b></p> <p><b>It was determined to review 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter data when it is reported to Nicole.</b></p> <p><b>DCH workgroup will complete form if data is out of compliance and relay information PI liaison</b></p>	
4. Member Services Charge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gratia Karmes presented the Member Services Charge.</li> <li>• A suggestion was made to stagger consumer surveys and to have surveys come from affiliate and not counties/departments/providers.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Member Services Charge approved</b></p>	
5. Lenawee update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gratia Karmes distributed PI Update Report for Lenawee County covering the period of 10/05 -12/05.</li> <li>• Lenawee CMH has transferred all PI functions to either regional committees, local management team or both. They are seeking to incorporate some of the financial reports into PI or Compliance process. Most of their committees have not reported for this period due to fact only 1<sup>st</sup> quarter activities was reported.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Lenawee Update Approved</b></p>	
6. Incident Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incidents Reports (IR) are a tool that could be used across the organization. It was requested to move incident reports from their current location, Recipient Rights file. All the information contained in the Rights file is subject to FOIA.</li> </ul> <p><i>It was noted that detailed information is often lost when transferred from IR to another source, such as a progress note. Incident reports are more detailed and progress notes are not as specific.</i></p>	<p><b>It was determined to form a workgroup to review Incident Reports.</b></p> <p><b>The workgroup will include Providers, Rights, PRU, Clinical Care, Compliance, Risk Management, Encompass, Support Staff and Finance</b></p> <p><b>A Champion for Incident Report workgroup will be selected at first meeting</b></p>	

7. UR Charge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Larry Newberg distributed reviewed charge and work plan for the Utilization Review Committee.</li> <li>Consumer satisfactions (PCP), residential services and habilitation supports waiver will be reported on in June 2006 by the UR Committee.</li> <li>It was suggested that UR committee recruit line staff for input.</li> </ul>	<b>Utilization Review charge and work plan were approved</b>	
8. Dashboard Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A draft of the 2006 Indicator Dashboard form was distributed. There was discussion around dashboard indicators, their reporting dates, how they align with the strategic goals, etc.</li> <li>Penetration rates need to be reported out for all age consumers and not selected category per the original UR indicator.</li> </ul>	<b>For committees that are charged in reviewing certain data elements, Each county will bring that indicator data to the perspective committee for review</b>  <b>There will be a breakout by county and by affiliation also</b>	
9. Next Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May 4, 2006; 1:00-4:00; LLRC</li> </ul>	<b>PI Policy CSTS Update Monroe Update Livingston Update</b>	