

# Quality Management Committee Meeting Minutes June 22, 2006

**Meeting Objective: Continue to work on quality indicators for the potential outcomes we have developed.**

- Announcements
  - Tammy has accepted a position with the Division of Licensing and Protection
  - ListServe: Anyone interested in participating should contact Stephen within the next week. If at least half of the Committee members are interested, we will move forward.
  - Feedback: Karen Topper and Green Mountain Self Advocates are continuing to collect feedback across the State over the next couple of weeks. DDAS Leadership has been shown copies of the potential outcomes and has some feedback and suggestions.
  - **There will be no Committee meeting in July** to allow Stephen and Joe to review all the feedback being received.
  - After outcomes and indicators are finalized, the next steps will be developing data sources and data collection methods for the Quality Management Plan document.
- Discussion of Outcomes and Indicators: As a large group, the Outcomes and Indicators document was revisited and edited in real time, using feedback and input from a variety of stakeholders. These edits can be found on the outcomes and indicators document dated June 22, 2006. Joe served to represent suggestions from the Communication Task force and the DDAS Leadership Team.
  - Outcome and Indicators 1
    - Need to simplify the language
    - Service plan is a way to get at what people want and is important not to lose it
    - Raise the bar by having Person-Centered Planning across all programs
    - Holistic was very important and members did not want to see this taken out, so if it doesn't fit here we should fit it in somewhere else
    - The concept of learning is important across all various groups and includes guardians, families, surrogates, etc.; may not fit here but is important and needs to be included.
  - Outcome and Indicators 2
    - Discussion over what 'integrity' means; some felt that if you are treated with dignity and respect it goes without saying but some felt strongly that this needs to remain.

- Some people felt that ‘...free from abuse, neglect, and exploitation’ was redundant as it is law; argument to that fact was that people at times need to be reminded that this does exist.
- Discussion over what was meant by not assuming over disability or ability. Some didn’t want this to be removed but we have to look at how this could be measured. Need to do more work on this to see if it is measurable and how it would be done
- Outcome and Indicators 3
  - Change ‘participants’ to ‘individuals’
  - Discussion over trying to make sure that individuals receive the same respect as any other member of the community, and consider human rights.
  - Make sure that individuals were not only educated on abuse, neglect, and exploitation but show understanding.
  - Members felt that individuals should also be able to say that they had a choice in staff even at an Adult Day center.
  - Negotiated risk is used in a particular program; the concept needs to be there but re-worked across all programs, suggestion of alternate language, such as ‘Dignity of Risk’.
- Outcome and Indicators 4
  - Language change: ‘Individuals communicate effectively’; move ‘receive support’ to an indicator
  - Comments were made around the fact that technology may not necessarily be someone’s chosen method of communication.
  - Communication task force suggested that the first indicator have necessary supports, and also that individuals have the opportunity to expand their skills.
  - ‘Objective’ is a better work than ‘unbiased’.
  - Task force felt that Individuals who know who to contact to help be moved to support system; this made sense to the committee.
- Outcome and Indicators 5
  - Shorten the outcome
  - Most felt that ‘meaningful’ was an assumption; therefore changed to ‘Individuals will direct their own lives’.
  - Many felt that this could be combined with number 1, others felt that it could be argued either way, feeling was it was not a good idea to combine these until more feedback had been brought forth.
  - TBI does not currently self manage but felt that we should look at the bigger picture and what we would like to see happen down the road.
- Outcomes and Indicators 6
  - The Quality Management Unit wanted an indicator around appropriate and timely referrals.
  - An indicator about collaboration between State and Federal government is missing.

- DDAS Leadership Team felt this was a means to an end and not a manageable outcome.
- Suggestion to change the outcome to 'Individual will receive efficient and effective services'
- It was felt that bringing outcomes 9 and 6 together would strengthen both of them
- Wordsmith this outcome.
- Outcomes and Indicators 7
  - GMSA feedback was to see more on relationships (around sexual intimacy and learning), jobs, and transportation
  - Feedback was received that relationships should stand alone as it is its own outcome and very important: 'Individuals receive support to foster and maintain relationships'
  - Many felt there was too much here to measure and much of it was covered in other outcomes and indicators.
  - Some wanted it clearly stated that they are identifying and offering ideas on how to promote living arrangements.
- Outcome and Indicators 8
  - Discussed the addition of jobs, transportation, and learning.
  - Some felt that learning was covered in 7
  - Feedback received that work is important and needs to be very strongly defined.
  - Some felt that transportation should be a strong statement.
  - Argument of how to hold providers responsible if there is no means. Others felt that more coordination with local means of transportation and alternatives could be identified.
  - Language needs to be worked out.
- Outcome and Indicators 9
  - Made a note to potentially combine this with number 6 after all feedback is received
  - B is redundant and covered under person centered planning
  - Look at this more when all feedback is collected.
- Outcomes and Indicators 10
  - Need to acknowledge and include family caregivers.
  - Indicators under this section do not need to state Individuals benefit, take it out and get to the point.
  - Concepts are good and agreed upon, but the language need work.
  - Might be a good idea to review the key goals of various programs and find the similarities.
  - G was wordy and needs to be worked on.
  - Requirements are a given and shouldn't have to necessarily be in this document, they all have standards they have to operate by and it will be covered there.
  - Using the term 'caregiver' would also include family caregivers
  - Inclusion of collaboration with caregivers, providers, and state so that family caregivers have access to everything they need

- Respect should not only go to the individual but the family and friends that support that individual.
- Need a clear definition on how the family is supported or ways to recognize them.
  - Cindy will work on coming up with some ideas on how this can be accomplished.
  - Others who may have experiences that would help in this should send them to Stephen