

Disabilities Advisory Council Minutes



Meeting: Disabilities Advisory Council
Date: 7/23/2013
Start Time: 2:00 P.M.
End Time: 4:00 P.M.
Location: Conference Room 1020C
 Multi-Agency State Office Building
 195 North 1950 West
 Salt Lake City, UT 84116
Type of Meeting: Regular Monthly Meeting

Members:	Present:	Absent:
Peggy Augustine	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Deborah Bowman	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Kristen Chapman	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Marsha Colegrove	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Dustin Ereksen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tonya Hales/Josip Abrenac	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Shane Sadler	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Paul Smith	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Krissie Summerhays	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Joseph Taggart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Larry Valdez	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
John Westling	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Matters Discussed and Summary of Comments:

Presenter:

Welcome and Announcements

Deborah Bowman, Chair

Review and Approval of Minutes

Deborah Bowman, Chair

- Paul Smith: Change to last page (page 5), 3rd bullet up, 25% improvement needs to be 25% more efficient (not cut)
- Deborah Bowman: Page 2, 3rd bullet from the bottom, insert family/family member
- A motion to accept amendments, seconded and passed unanimously

Review of bylaws and areas for corrections:

- Discussion of leadership term limit with regards to at least one year period
- Clarification on participation in discussions for nonvoting individuals
- Deborah Bowman: Proxy voting discussion—can a person send a proxy vote to a meeting?
 - Tonya Hales—if submitted prior to the meeting seems reasonable
 - Deborah Bowman: Vote by email acceptable
 - Joyce Docort—question on designated voting
- Clarification on BC 1, 2, and 3 before submitting it to the Department of Health.

- BC2 master’s degree requirements considered
 - Nate Wolfley: Anything changed was highlighted
 - Dustin Erekson: Not sure if the language is clear in the documents, hold off on the BC2 and BC2 service code descriptions
 - Paul Smith: Will meet with Jamie again to clarify
- Bylaw discussion closed

Presentation: DPSD Quality Management Contract Reviews and Processes

Chandler

- Review of reviews, sampling, and processes.
 - Chandler: Nate previously sent information out for everyone to review
 - Ten (10) Types of Reviews discussed
 - Autism waiver process is being looked at with stakeholders
 - Types of sampling
 - Waiver sampling (5%)
 - Contract Sampling (5%)
 - May vary depending on the types of services offered
 - Angie: Clarification of statistical level requirements
 - Traditional Provider Process
 - Begin process in July. The provider is contacted by the quality management team in the month the review will happen in.
 - Letter of the contract review is sent
 - Support Coordination Process discussed
 - Watch for duplication in procedures and makes sure if they exist, they exist for a valid purpose
 - Dustin Erekson: Issue of duplication from Licensing and DSPD employee reviews
 - Angie: Currently working on the final product with Office of Licensing
 - Discussion of digital scanning process to input data into USTEPS
 - Discussion of holding on current files, after files have been sent to DSPD.
 - Krissie Summerhays: Concern about files not being viewed in USTEPS yet
 - Jon Westling: Question: if a client has two different programs, is DSPD encouraged to communicate between services providers
 - Angie: DSPD is trying to implement a cohesive and manageable PCSP in the review
 - Deborah Bowman: “Do you feel safe” should be included in asking people in these reviews
 - Chandler: These are included in NCIS and Consumer satisfaction survey
 - Joyce: What is your standard for clean?
 - Chandler: A health and safety issue is the standard we defer to
 - Krissie Summerhays: How do we balance that if the person owns the home?
 - Chandler: This is something we have to examine on a case-by-case basis
 - Angie: Clarification, these are unexpected site visits
 - Chandler: On handwriting issues, we are moving items to Google documents to eliminate illegible writing
 - Discussion on contract expectations and services that are reviewed. Consideration for the waiver being provided to DSPD by the Utah Department of Health

- Tonya Hales: Very dynamic situation for these small groups of children in Utah led us to support a specific group working on these groups.
- Increased reduction has the most confusion. Reduce one service to increase another. Is there another checkbox that could be included such as, “plan change.” Parents are a bit worried when they see the language as stated. Is there some possible options? – Krissie Summerhays

Discussion of changes to the Notice of Agency Action and Hearing Rights

Nate Wolfley

- Recognize NOA’s are confusing, outdated, and may not be applicable
- Deborah Bowman: First changes, paragraph change to remove “In accordance with the requirement....” As a parent, I am lost by this language and would like that language moved towards the end.
 - Tonya Hales: Perhaps get the language in there and then review the language and then we can agree on the content
 - Peggy Augustine: Some parents don’t have the skills to understand some of the language
 - Deborah Bowman: Include a place to allow the parent to say they no longer wish to receive services
 - Deborah Bowman: Include language “as attached” for documentation need
 - Insert “waiting list FOR SERVICES” in the document
 - Deborah Bowman: Include language about allowing the opportunity to invite other people to the meetings
 - Larry Valdez: Include people that can advocate for you and help you
 - Does it have to be sent through mail?
 - Nate Wolfley: Yes, it has to be in writing
 - Deborah Bowman: Wording consideration “if this notice is being given for a reduction.” Too confusing and language too scary
 - Shane Sadler: It is included just in case
 - Nate Wolfley: It is possibly more confusing to get two NOAs
 - Paul Smith: Maybe we could combine these two to reduction or increase
 - Shane Sadler: Sometimes the services are no longer necessary
 - Shane Sadler: Maybe put a qualifier before the sentence “there could be a reduction...” Possibly reword the sentence to eliminate the possibility of confusion. The problem is the 3rd grade reading level and the language is not as spelled out
 - Deborah Bowman: The section above the language should describe the situation
 - Larry Valdez: Support coordinators should have sat down and described it before. Some of that is on the support coordinators
 - Nate Wolfley: The ultimate goal is to put the information into USTEPS and the USTEPS process can automate changes
 - Paul Smith: Do we need to put anything on the top that decreases stress?
 - Joseph Taggart: Include “if you have questions, discuss with your support coordinator”
 - Paul Smith: We will rework these and send them around again

Next meeting is public, encourage people to come and comment.

- Shane Sadler: Limit time per person and forewarn?—Shane Sadler
 - Peggy Augustine: Worry about setting precedence on set time limit. Set the rules and be adaptive
 - Deborah Bowman: Prepare a sign in sheet and allow people to select if they wish to discuss
- Website coming up
 - Nate Wolfley : They are currently moving forward and should have something ready
- Shane Sadler: Have we had discussion if there is a long-term disaster?
 - Paul Smith: Not sure if it will be ready by the time of the meeting as it has not been finalized by DCFS

Adjournment

Minutes Approved _____


Chairperson Signature

With Amendment or, Without Amendment