



Quality Design Team Meeting Summary

Quality Design Team	Date of Meeting: August 12, 2011
<p>Present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jan Abelseth • Kate Bishop • Stan Butkus • Judith Berek • Bridget Cariello • Michael Doherty • Marisa Geitner 	<p>Absent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maxine George • Stephen Glicksman • Robin Hickey • Neil Mitchell • Richard Monck • Tom Richards • Anne Swartwout
Discussion Topics	Summary of Main Discussion Points, Considerations, Recommendations, Next Steps, etc.
<p>Review and Approve the July 27th Summary</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary from July 27th was reviewed and approved by the group. • The meeting for August 23rd has been cancelled and may be rescheduled for August 26th. • The design team discussed some of the “take aways” from all of the presentations: 1) The team recommends consultation to finalize the benchmarks and outcomes that distinguish the different levels of quality (i.e. 1-5), 2) Need to have different demonstrations that look at different structures of measurement, and 3) need guidance tools for the interviewers/surveyors to help ensure interrater-reliability.
<p>Review and discuss Quality Matrix</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Design Team reviewed the broad concepts of the Matrix to determine if anything needed to be added or changed. • It is expected that the Matrix will evolve and become more sophisticated as it moves forward. • The team discussed the need to be aware of the possibility of the additional cost that agencies may incur with a new quality review process. • The Design Team discussed how quality ratings would relate back to an MCO and if this would differ from how direct service providers are surveyed/rated and if the



Quality Design Team Meeting Summary

	<p>measurements would be or should be the same.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The team felt that the MCO must have developed a code of conduct and conflict of interest standards and must have a process for how they develop contracts with agencies. • The contract to be an MCO must include parameters to ensure choice for individuals, access to quality services (e.g. agencies must have a certain rating on the survey), and due process and an appeals process, qualifications that direct service providers must meet. • The team also discussed the need to assist agencies who truly want to improve quality by providing best practices and technical assistance and making this available across the state. • Design Team members will share the Matrix with outside groups to gain additional feedback. 	
<p>Presentation/discussion of preliminary recommendations for steering committee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to remember that protecting health and safety is of vital importance. It must continue to be a focus and there must be continual improvement in this area. • Technology needs to be coordinated, comprehensive, available to all agencies (no matter the size), and in place across all interested parties (OPWDD, MCO, service providers), so that agencies can improve in the delivery of service and OPWDD can have better oversight of the delivery of those services. • See the updated Quality Matrix. 	
<p>Action Items</p>		
	<p><u>Action Item</u></p>	<p><u>Owner</u></p>
<p>Design Team send additional comments on the Steering Committee Report to Stan, Jan, Kate, and Anne</p>	<p>Kate Bishop & Anne Swartwout, Stan Butkus, and Jan Abelseth</p>	<p><u>Due Date</u> August 19, 2011</p>
<p>Send a list of individuals and groups that would be willing to review the Matrix to Kate Bishop</p>	<p>Judy Berek</p>	<p>August 17, 2011</p>
<p>Additional Documents of Reference</p>		
<p>Draft Quality Matrix,</p>		

Next Meeting: To Be Determined