

**Quality Oversight Committee**  
**March 26, 2008**

New committee co-chair, Lorraine Harris, called the meeting order and asked those present to introduce themselves. All were asked to sign the roll call sheet and give their current e-mail for future use. Additions to the agenda were new fire marshal regulations and the contract since talks will happen prior to the next committee meeting.

**Outstanding Items from Last Meeting**

**Update on Licensing Pre-requisite Work** - Brian Bolen updated the group. He reported that they have received approval from this committee and from SRS regarding the provider pre-requisite licensing changes. The next step is getting broader feedback. He will use the next stakeholder call for this input which is in April. If amendments are needed following this call, SRS will try to make them as quickly as possible. One comment discussed within SRS was the need to add information on limited licenses, such as the intent of a limited license and the pre-requisites for getting one. Brian stated that originally these pre-requisites were, and continue to be: 1) it is a person specific license, 2) there must already be a relationship between the person and the provider wanting a limited license, 3) and if the person leaves that provider's services, the license expires. Another question asked was "Is the limited license dying?" Brian stated the issue will be revisited within SRS, but at this time there is no plan to change current licensing practice. Lorraine Harris asked if this item needed to be maintained on the agenda? It was decided to leave as a standing item "update on licensing", which could include the limited license." It was also decided to keep as an agenda item "updates regarding QOC data." The committee agreed to add "new initiatives" as a standing agenda item. The "Contract" will remain as an agenda item at least once a year. Lorraine stated if others have ideas for agenda items, please e-mail them to her.

**Fire Marshal** - SRS has reviewed the practices of ensuring providers maintain compliance with fire & life safety codes. SRS QA will continue to ensure that inspections by fire professionals occur and are documented. QA staff are not to interpret fire facts for providers as that is the responsibility of the fire professionals. He emphasized that Fire Life Safety Code requirements must be met no matter where services are provided per Article 63. A question asked was if the CDDO quality assurance team visited a residential location and noted dangerous conditions, what should they do? It was decided the local QA committee can bring these conditions to the provider's attention and ensure prompt resolution.

**Contract** - Members pointed out certain small wording changes that may be needed. Brian pointed out that the QOC committee must report on progress on items a. - d in Appendix G. There was discussion on whether Appendix G should stay in the contract. Lorraine asked if there were any needed additions to G? Brian suggested that we need to add language that this committee monitor and provide oversight of the system. He stated we have data out there, but as a system we don't really make good use of it. He stated that SRS is moving to reviews of 7.5% of services in the system. He feels there is need for this committee to take part in oversight. There is a need to look at data or monitor

data. We are an “oversight” committee so we should fulfill that role. A committee member pointed out how difficult it was this past year for the committee to come up with just four data points and so to add more oversight would take even longer to arrive at. Brian asked that the committee commit to trying to do a better job of monitoring the system through the collection and review of data.

It was stated that this group started with the idea of looking at whether State quality assurance duplicates what local quality assurance does and trying to avoid this. Brian feels that some duplication is not a bad thing as it can verify other data, as well as be an additional mechanism to report on services on a statewide basis that is not currently available now beyond the KLO data. He said Amy continues to track and trend data for reporting and analysis purposes. System data is reviewed by various entities as part of SRS’ Quality Management Strategy. Brian feels we should look at what data is currently collected by local QA committees and how we get this data uniformly collected and entered into a data base. Lengthy discussion followed. One suggestion was that SRS could come up with a list of the ten most important QA data items for the committee to monitor since the committee has trouble agreeing on this. It was also pointed out that some CDDO’s are not very interested in changing their current QA system and perhaps we need to be more open minded regarding changes. Another point made was that SRS QA staff could come out and review more than just KLO items. Could what they do be incorporated into “monitor-able” data? Brian feels strongly that the committee should first commit to monitor the system through data as the group would together, in partnership, develop the data points for monitoring. Others present stated they think we need to determine exactly what data we’re going to look at, and then make the commitment. It was also felt that we need to build on what we already are doing.

### **SRS Report by Brian Bolen:**

SRS is moving toward having one QA data collection instrument for all waivers. Brian reported that there is a grant to do this. SRS will use the grant to hire a vendor to look at SRS’ current quality management practices as well as research best practices nationwide and then make recommendations. This is the first phase, studying. The 2<sup>nd</sup> phase it to implement outcomes from these recommendations. It will be a long process, at least 2 years away. He passed around the “Mental Retardation /Developmental Disability Waiver Data and Reports” multi-year document that was reviewed by CMS. He feels even though few gaps were noted, we as a committee need to do better in monitoring and collecting data. Question? how is what this group does, or is talking about doing, different than the instrument Amy is working on for all waivers? Why can’t that be used by this group also? Do we need two? Brian stated that what this committee does would be supplementary and complimentary or even a part of the states overall quality management plan. SRS will always want 1) in-person, thorough monitoring of service quality where people are receiving waiver services and 2) systemic process review, which will include file reviews. The KLO is one piece of information used for licensing determinations. Brian stated he’s wanting the this committee to commit to build upon the data already collected to create an additional statewide monitoring mechanism and to make statewide use of the data that is collected by local committees. **Mary Rose Sudbeck moved that we commit to having a work group develop a document to**

**bring back to the committee for review and discussion. The motion was seconded by Krista, motion carried.** A list was passed around so that interested members could sign up to be in the work group to develop the document.

Lorraine suggested that as the State moves into the “personal assistance service” ,we, as a committee should have Jenifer Schwartz from KACIL attend our next committee meeting. Brian suggested we also include System Transformation and Money Follows the Person staff. Consensus was to invite them.

The group set the next meeting dates. The meeting dates will be Thursday, June 26<sup>th</sup> in Topeka, September 25<sup>th</sup> in Wichita, December 4<sup>th</sup> in Topeka, all at 10:00 AM. The meeting was adjourned.

Minutes submitted by Linda Lock, BCDS, Inc.