

QUALITY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES

May 9, 2007

Topeka, KS

Present:

Jill Baker-Cottonwood

Jeff Clauser-COF

John Platt-COF

Linda Lock-BCDS

Brad Brack-SDSI

Ed Henry-Twin Valley

Sue Stephens-DSNWK

Bonnie Stotler-Arrowhead

Mary Rose Sudbeck-NCTC

Phyllis Wallace-WCDDO

Angela Allen-New Beginnings

Shevawn Shields-Tri-Valley

Kathy Brennon-Tri-Valley

Amy DeMoss-CDDO of SEK

Dixie Williams-ASNEK

Betty Kane-Riverside Resources

Sara Pearson-Hetlinger

Brian Bolen-SRS

Teresa Still- Big Lakes

Lorraine Harris-DPOK

Teri Kressa-McPherson

Nancy Brouwer-McPherson

Linda Goering-Northview

Teresa Galutia-SRS

Linda Parker-Tri-Ko

Alison Wenzel-Sedgwick Co.

John Sullivan-Sedgwick Co.

Anna McNamara-JCDS

Amy Swanson-SRS

Craig Knutson-SACK

Hal Schultz-SACK

Angela Fullerton-Flinthills

Gloria Canady-Flinthills

Pat McCurdy-CCDS

Agenda Items:

1. Introductions and Change in SRS attendees:

- In regards to the separation of functions between Quality Assurance and Performance Improvement (PI), the SRS staff representation at this meeting will change. Brian Bolen will be co-chairing the meetings along with Jill in the future. **Amy Swanson will continue to attend, however, will serve secondary to Brian. The QA staff will be attending but the PI staff will only serve on sub-groups and / or workgroups, at the request of HCP/CSS staff.**

2. Distribution of meeting minutes from February 8, 2007 and review:

- Concerning the second bulleted item under number one related to the states ability to query home county of persons in ICFs/MR, Brian Bolen reported that the state office will be able to query persons by home CDDO.
- Sue Stephens asked if the minutes are being posted onto the website, as it appears that only the first set of minutes is posted. Amy indicated that she believes that these are being posted but may have been moved to another location. She will check on where on the website the minutes are being posted.

- Steve Sandoval asked for a little more discussion on the TCM minimum requirements. Brian reports that there will be a sub-group meeting the following Monday to further look at how prior authorization for an exception will be requested if TCM billable hours are expected to exceed 60 hours per year. Brian noted that local QA committees will be expected to provide some oversight on minimum TCM requirements, and that it is the provider's responsibility to ensure that case managers meet the minimum requirements by regulations. Jill asked what the status is of the TCM changes in the regulations. Brian reported that the proposed changes have been placed into the regulatory review process and have been sent out through the system to stakeholders for feedback. There will be notification to the public prior to the final regulatory changes taking place. A question was asked concerning case managers who may not be in compliance with the case management code of ethics. Brian noted that it would be the service provider's responsibility to bring them into compliance, and not SRS. Jill noted that this committee will not be making recommendations on regulatory changes for TCM. There will be substantial changes proposed through sub committee A to move related items between article 63 and 64.

3. Questions/concerns with performance outcome data collection:

- Amy Swanson will ask for the data some time in June with the expected due date for reporting sometime in July. The report will cover fiscal 4th Quarter (data collected for April through June).
- There was discussion about placing the form on-line so that the reports can be sent via e-mail. Sue asked if the reports could be sent in PBF format instead of excel format. Amy noted that she would not see any problem with having the report sent in this format.
- Jill reports that the data will be aggregated into one report and will be posted onto the web site for all to see.

4. Contract Issues-SRS and CDDOs

- The group read through appendix G to determine if it still reads as it should in regards to the role of this committee. It was recommended that wording be changed throughout to read "SRS field staff" instead of Quality Enhancement Coordinators (QECs). It was recommended that the wording in item c. be reworded to "Clarification of quality oversight roles between individuals, community service providers, CDDOs and SRS field staff to enhance efficiency and communication. It was recommended that an item #e be added for other areas of interest.
- Brian noted that currently, Appendix G is in the contract. Brian asked for a recommendation from this group to move the Appendix G from the contract to part of policy. A question was asked "What is the policy change process?" Brian noted that drafts are sent out for feedback and there is opportunity for feedback from all SRS/CDDO meetings. It was discussed that Quality Oversight membership language could be added to policy with a reference to the contract. SRS will recommend striking #'s Q-3 and Q-4 under the MRDD Community Services Strategic Planning Outcomes because the outcomes have already been

put into place through the Quality Oversight Committee efforts. Amy and Brian will be developing a formal report to show how this has been incorporated into the system. The committee was asked if they would endorse SRS recommendation to move Article G into Policy instead of the contract, noting that SRS will still bring it up at the contract meetings and make the recommendation there. Most members present at this meeting were comfortable with this recommendation, but it was not a unanimous decision and it is understood that SRS will be bringing this up at contract negotiation meetings.

5. Appendix H (Amy instead of Brian per agenda):

- The committee reviewed the Cross Waiver Quality Management Strategy report that was included as page 13 of the handout material packet. Amy reported that these are the assurances that the state of Kansas must make to CMS. All of the assurance items in columns 1 through 6 must be prioritized. Amy noted that on middle of handout page 17 is an overview that was sent to CMS of how the state of Kansas plans to comply with the assurances. This provides us with areas that we need to focus on within the state. The state yet needs to tweak how the data will be pulled from different systems to prove/document that assurances are in place. Brian noted that CSS will work towards doing things more similarly across the systems/waivers.

6. Report from Subgroup on Licensing (Anna and Brian)

- Ana McNamara from JCDS has agreed to be the co-chair with Brian.
- Ana reports that this subgroup has been working on the performance based licensing draft. This group is in the very beginning steps towards proposing licensing and regulation changes. The subgroup has also been working on re-confirming that performance outcome measures for Community Service Providers are backed by standards and that KLO items apply to the Performance Outcomes. The subgroup is also taking a look at how the percentages for each standard will be applied, and how the percentages effect small providers with limited scope.
- Pages 7 through 9 of the handout packet indicate the proposed changes to date of the draft of the MR/DD Community Service Provider Licensing. The committee reviewed proposed changes related to pre-requisites for owner/operators, and pre-requisites for community service provider. Responding to a question presented about the two year experience level, Brian indicated that a definition of senior management, and middle management, etc. would likely be defined in regulation. There was question about what constitutes the core requirements for a business plan as a prerequisite for community service provider.
- The committee reviewed the different types of licenses proposed, i.e. temporary, provisional and full license. The temporary license would be for new providers and would be valid for 6 months and can be extended another 6 months if the CSP is not serving persons. The provisional license would be issued if deficiencies are found, and would be valid for up to 90 days to provide the CSP an opportunity to fulfill all conditions identified as deficiencies. Two different types of full license are being recommended, one for agencies who have successfully gone through the accreditation process and have achieved the highest level of accreditation. This

license would be valid for two years. The other type of full license valid for one year and is for all other CSPs who have achieved compliance with applicable regulations and performance outcome measures.

- Loraine Harris asked how it would work for those who have licensed services within two different areas. This will need to be addressed at a later date.
- The sub-committee group is going through the draft performance outcome measures to determine if and how these are backed up by regulation and the KLO. The final output of the sub-committee group will be just a recommendation for licensing changes. It was noted the committee is in the very early stages towards making recommendations. Any final recommendations will have to go out to all stakeholders for further input.

7. Report from Subgroup on Performance Improvement (Amy and Linda)

- Amy provided an overview of the performance improvement mission. The sub-committee is now focused on person centered outcomes towards individual independence, productivity, community inclusion and integration. Refer to the handout form Sub-group B that was presented at the last committee meeting. Amy explained that the sub-group has taken each individual bulleted item from this previous handout, and is breaking it down.
- Amy has developed a couple of documents to assist the PI staff in working with CSPs to determine if outcomes are met. This document is intended as a guide for the PI staff and not as a basis for licensing. It will assist the PI field staff to recognize independence, productivity, community inclusion and integration. Amy read some of the questions from this document to illustrate example of the questions that the sub-group came up with. Each question can have four different levels of responses from persons interviewed. Amy was asked by members of the committee if this document could be e-mailed to committee members. Amy agreed to e-mail this document to everyone with the understanding that everyone understand that this document is just a draft.
- The sub-group has also come up with some indicators for time frames for individual outcomes.
- It was noted that there are not many members of sub-group b, so if anyone wants to be added to this list of members, let Linda know of your interest.
- A question was asked, "Can other staff members who are not on the QA oversight committee attend the sub-group meetings. It was noted that there are others who would have great knowledge and interest who could provide input to the group. The response was that others can come if they come along with the regular QA committee member.

8. Other Discussion:

- Brian noted that there is a schedule of CDDO reviews in the Quality Assurance Manuel that is on-line. Brian will be contacting CDDOs about coordinating the reviews.

9. Next Meeting(s):

- There was discussion about changing the meeting dates to Tuesdays or Thursdays instead of Wednesdays. The next meeting was scheduled for Thursday August 9 at 10:00 in Wichita. Location details will be provided later.
- Jill asked that sub-groups A and B meet briefly to determine when their next meetings will be. The scheduled sub-group meeting dates will be officially announced to the full committee at a later date.

Minutes recorded by Bonnie Stotler