



Detroit Long Term Care System Change Task Force



## Meeting Minutes

### Detroit Long Term Care System Change Task Force Access Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

**Date:** Tuesday, April 21, 2009

**Time:** 1:00 p.m.

**Place:** Detroit Wayne County Long Term Care Connection  
1333 Brewery Park Boulevard, Suite 160  
SPE Conference Room  
Detroit, Michigan 48207

#### MEMBERS PRESENT

Marian Banks Nickleberry, Co-Chair  
Earlene Traylor Neal, Co-Chair  
Judy Joyce  
Michael Moore  
Jerry Osborne  
Susan Saccaro  
Carol Smith  
LaTonya Wallace-Hardiman  
Margie Young  
Jane Church via Conference Call

#### MEMBERS EXCUSED

Alicia Buggs  
Arthur Caldwell, Facilitator  
Gwendolyn Cook-Jones  
Anthony Mertic  
Tene Sandra Ramsey  
Alice Sevonty  
Michael Wells

#### MEMBERS ABSENT

Margaret Keyes-Howard

#### RECORDER

Leah Phippen

### I. WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS

Marian Banks-Nickleberry called the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m.

Ms. Nickleberry noted that the Meeting Agenda has been modified from the one previously sent out with the Meeting Notice. Access process presentations from the Detroit Public Library/ TIP and Wayne County Community Mental Health have been removed due to the absence of each agencies representative. Ms. Nickleberry moved that we accept the modified agenda; seconded by LaTonya Wallace-Hardiman. **Motion carried.**

### II. REVIEW & APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

After reviewing the meeting minutes of March 17, 2009 Ms. Nickleberry noted a correction to Page 3, bullet number IV.B, under the last paragraph. Gwendolyn Cook-Jones should be added to the members that volunteered to participate in the work group. Ms. Nickleberry moved to accept the meeting minutes of March 17, 2009 with the noted correction; seconded by Ms. Hardiman.

**Motion carried.**

### **III. OLD BUSINESS**

#### **A. TASK FORCE UPDATES**

Ms. Nickleberry asked how many Access Members were present at the Policy Forum on March 27, 2009. All except one member present attended. She asked members to review the Roundtable Summaries and note the comments on the aspect of improving Access statewide. There were numerous suggestions throughout the summary.

### **IV. NEW BUSINESS**

#### **A. WORK GROUP UPDATE**

In the last meeting, a work group was formed to identify some other communities that were doing very similar work in looking at their Access issues. We wanted to know why people are looking at Access as an issue, what is bringing people together and what challenges they are facing. The work group included Marian Banks-Nickleberry, LaTonya Wallace-Hardiman, Alicia Buggs and Gwendolyn Cook-Jones. They met on April 14, 2009 to put together a series of questions to pose to the communities to make sure that they were consistent. They developed the following questions:

1. Why each Access Focused Groups came together?
2. What they have achieved thus far?
3. What type of finances/funding strategy has assisted them on their journey?

After contacting assigned communities, each work group member submitted a report for the Subcommittee's review. The subcommittee agreed to read them silently.

Ms. Nickleberry reviewed her report on the **Toledo Ohio** Area Agency on Aging (TAAA). Toledo is also focusing on a "No Wrong Doors" process. They have similar concerns as we do in Michigan. The primary reason they have come together is because the state of Ohio has proposed to collapse their budget which will place all long term care services (services for: MH, DD, SA, Elder) under one line item. They have hired a Health Dimensions Consultant to look at collaboration amongst multi-service functions, shared data systems, "No Wrong Door" concept and cross-training. The TAAA is forging a closer relationship with the Disability Community, sharing staff with the Disability Network to learn each other's systems, thus learning how to field calls for all consumer needs. Their current data systems are SAMS, for reporting OAA data and Beacon (Harmony/ Synergy), which is a Resource Database System. Toledo's Resource Data Director, Justin Moor is responsible for updating resource information. Some other issues and challenges that the TAAA is facing are: systems that do not communicate with one another, not understanding other service areas and a Mental Health system that is under-funded, therefore, mentally ill consumers are being "dumped" into Aging Services as soon as they are 60 years of age, causing their Aging services system to be overly stressed.

Ms. Hardiman reviewed the information she submitted on **Boulder, Colorado**. They utilize a system called LINC (Local Information Connection) that provides information on Boulder County human service programs available through public agencies and non-profit organizations. These programs offer assistance to residents in areas such as health care, housing, legal services and child care. A list of Boulder County LINC Agencies and their missions were provided to the subcommittee. Ms. Hardiman also contacted the DHS Department of Oregon and left a voicemail message. Upon browsing their website no systems were listed as a link to other outside agencies.

In Alicia Buggs' absence, Earlene Traylor Neal presented her report on the **Milwaukee WI** Area Agency on Aging and the State of Wisconsin. They have a web based resource system named Harmony-Beacon, such as the system used by Toledo, Ohio. The system was designed for aging and disabilities resources and not only allows various agencies to access information, but it also allows the public to access the same information. The system was designed for public use. The system may not be a collaborative of various agencies, but it is a system governed by the State of

Milwaukee; making it the sole public entity. Ms. Buggs is still waiting to hear back from the Information and Assistance Administrator that oversees the Harmony-Beacon system and will update the subcommittee further at that time. Because of the similarities, Ms. Nickleberry wanted to ask Ms. Buggs how Milwaukee pays for their process. Toledo pays through all 12 AAA agencies in the state pooling resources.

In Gwen Cook-Jones' absence, Ms. Nickleberry reviewed her report on **Houston, Texas'** Harris County Area Agency on Aging. They decided to collaborate because they were looking for a more effective way to service the community with more centralized information. They preferred to develop an electronic system rather than the paper compilation of various agencies that was previously used. Most of their funding comes in the form of grants, with United Way being their largest donor. They also receive private corporate donations. Their collaboration is a combination of private and public entities. They gained their mayor's support as well as individual corporations support to their model. Their biggest challenge is "continual funding". They have to apply on an annual basis to the United Way for a continuation of funding set at an ideal amount of \$300K; but they usually end up operating on a budget of approximately \$250K-\$275K. They were able to save money by housing the collaboration in an existing entity, the Houston Shelter Arms Services, Inc. This organization already had a facility, employees, computers and a few additional resources to manage the data base system. Harmony Information Systems, Inc. of Vermont designed their software and provided training for their local ITS personnel. They suggested that we have our IT Department to call them before deciding on a software designer. Harris County AAA's outcomes are better than they expected. They have better services for their seniors and smooth operations. With less than 50 Agencies in their data base, each agency pays a fee to become licensed to access the system. **Their slogan is "Get Answers, Find Help, Live Better"**. Their next steps in terms of improvements include expansion and better dissemination of information.

Ms. Nickleberry said that this was a great start to exploring our charge. We will bring back to the table presentations from Atlanta, GA; Boulder, CO (I&A); and the State of Oregon. There were no questions on any of the presentations.

## **B. DISCUSSION ON ACCESS SUBCOMMITTEE QUESTIONS PRESENTED AT PREVIOUS MEETING**

Ms. Nickleberry asked subcommittee members if they had answers to present to the questions posed by Alicia Buggs at the last Subcommittee Meeting:

1. How do we, as individual agencies, benefit from this Subcommittee/ Task Force?
2. What would be our individual recommendations?
3. Why are you a part of the Access Subcommittee?
4. What is Access to me?
5. Identify the data that indicates that there IS a problem with Access.

Margie Young presented her answers before the Subcommittee. In reference to how our agency benefits from this Subcommittee/ Task Force, Ms. Young said that it gives her an opportunity to know more about other agencies that have similar missions. The more you know about another person's agency, you are better able to advocate for the person because you do have prior knowledge.

In reference to why are you a part of the Access Subcommittee, she said to share with other agency representatives the role of the Department of Human Services. Ms. Young's primary client population is seniors and disabled adults. She determines their eligibility for nursing homes, AFC Homes and homes for aging. The DHS also has a number of other programs within the agency to assist in other areas of need.

In reference to the meaning of Access, she said that people who need to access the system can do so without it being so cumbersome. If there are too many contacts to call, people tend to fall out of the loop. Ms. Young is looking for a process that will make the system more cohesive.

Ms. Nickleberry agreed that her thoughts were very similar to Margie's. There were no other statements.

### **C. DISCUSSION ON EXTENDED MEETING PLAN TO UPDATE TIMELINE**

Ms. Nickleberry updated Jane Church on the assignment given to the Subcommittee at the previous meeting regarding the Extended Meeting Plan and the questions posed by Alicia Buggs. Ms. Church will complete the assignment and be prepared to present at the next meeting. Ms. Young asked that the Subcommittee prioritize the Discussion Topics. There was a correction to Topic #2. It should read: "Identify key issues that are barriers to **accessing** information..." The subcommittee agreed to switch topic #'s 1 and 2 with one another. They also combined a number of the Specific Access Issues. Topic #'s 4 through 8 were combined. Topic #'s 9 and 10 were combined; and topic #'s 11 through 13 were combined.

During the discussion of the Access Subcommittee's goal, Ms. Church noted that the State of Michigan has the Resource Directory Planning Committee that meets periodically to establish some of the same solutions. Their objective is to act on the discussion of developing a statewide database system that is more robust and complete. They have a grant to develop a statewide database. Judy Joyce asked how the Access Subcommittee could join the State's committee to be in sync with their process. Ms. Church said that she would be willing to be the Access Subcommittee's voice at the state level committee meetings. Ms. Church noted that many of the representatives that make up the state committee are from the same organizations as the Access Subcommittee and that we are just on a local basis. Ms. Church invited the Access Subcommittee to assist in pushing their agenda with advocacy. Ms. Nickleberry asked if the DAAA Access Committee could get a copy of the state committee's goals. Ms. Church will search for them and present them at a later date. Ms. Church noted that the last Committee meeting was on April 7<sup>th</sup> and that their next projected meeting will be on April 29<sup>th</sup>. Michael Wells asked if there was a deadline for the state level Committee. Ms. Church answered that they were given a five-year grant and are only in year two or three. Ms. Nickleberry invited Ms. Church to be added to the agenda to report on the state level process since they are mirroring our process. Ms. Church accepted.

### **V. AGENDA BUILDING**

- The Extended Meeting Plan, after being revised with at the staff level will be reviewed for approval by the subcommittee. The new Extended Meeting Plan will include dates for the Subcommittee's timeline.
- The following community reports will be presented:
  - Atlanta, Georgia
  - State of Oregon
  - Boulder, Colorado (I&A)
- Jane Church will report to the Subcommittee her input on the Extended Meeting Plan and the questions asked by Alicia Buggs; as well as the status of the Resource Directory Planning Committee, their specific goals and how we can be a part of their process or vice versa.
- Development of other workgroups for other focus areas of the Subcommittee

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Leah Pippen

AC/lp

*Moving Towards Enhancing the Quality of Care*