

WPCC Workgroup Meeting Notes

Monday, July 2nd 2018, 11:00am-12:00 PM

<p><u>Location:</u> Webinar AND Chelan Douglas Health District 200 Valley Mall Parkway, East Wenatchee, WA 98802</p>	<p>GoToMeeting Info: https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/358682781 Meeting Access Code: 358-682-781 No computer audio? Dial in using your phone. United States: +1 (786) 535-3211</p>
--	---

Attendees

Workgroup members present: David Kolde, Kim Fricke, Amy Webb, Dulcye Field, Deb Miller, Courtney Ward

Staff and consultants: Peter Morgan, Caroline Tillier, Kathy Reims, Linda Parlette

Absent: Molly Morris

<p>1. Welcome & Introduction</p>	<p>This meeting was originally scheduled July 12th meeting. We moved it since we had to cancel the June meeting and needed to bring some important recommendations forward at the July 9th meeting of broader WPCC group.</p> <p>Caroline reported that Blake Edwards stepped down from the WPCC workgroup given his transition to a new role as Behavioral Services Director position at CVCH. He will stay involved in the broader WPCC meetings as a CVCH representative.</p> <p>Briefly reviewed minutes from our May meeting. Most of the action items were addressed or on the agenda for today. Caroline acknowledged that identifying a core minimum of SDOH screening questions (action item from May) is still on her to-do list. Plan on making it part of August workgroup meeting agenda.</p>
<p>2. Change Plan Evaluation</p>	<p>The bulk of our meeting was spent reviewing proposed change plan evaluation criteria and stage 2 funding framework. Input from the workgroup will shape revisions in time for recommendations that will be brought forward at the July 9th WPCC and Governing Board meetings. Clarified that the evaluation process will move forward according to the criteria, but base funding will not be adjusted based on scores (scores will be translated into pass/fail only) in 2018.</p> <p>Walked through the change plan criteria and workgroup members offered the following comments/input:</p>

Clarity and Appropriateness of Aim(s) criteria

Proposed criteria: “The aim(s) is well articulated (SMART), fits with the organization’s strategic goals, and closely ties to the change plan topic”

- Amy pointed out that a SMART goal includes measurement and time targets. If AIM statement should have all the SMART elements built into it, it would be redundant with the measures section and timeline criteria for drivers. How do we see these other sections relating to the aims statement and avoid this redundancy?
- Staff explained that aim statement should be complete in and of itself. It might be more general, though it should be supported by the measures and drivers sections.
- Expecting organizations to work on 16 aims does not recognize capacity to achieve sustainable change (which will not happen if efforts are spread too thin)
- Kim pointed out that aims from MLCHC are pretty broad and begin to get clarity when get to measures. Is expecting 2 aims per area too prescriptive given the late date and the fact that all of the Rachael Petro clients only have one?
- One high-level but lofty aim per area might meet expectations if it is supported by robust measures and drivers.
- Action: NCACH staff will fine-tune the criteria description based on this feedback.

Approach

Proposed criteria: “The drivers and action steps are aligned with aim(s), meet evidence based criteria, and suggest reasonable progress along the MeHAF and/or PCMH-A continuum”

- 4 or more drivers per AIM might be a high bar, particularly for small organizations who don’t have a lot of bandwidth to do all this work. May be difficult for them to score well since don't have as much capacity – may need to do one or 2 things at a time to move something.
- Action: NCACH staff will fine-tune the criteria description based on this feedback

Measurement

Proposed criteria: “The plan for measurement is realistic, methodologically sound, and meaningful”

Workgroup members seemed to think this criteria and scoring expectations were clear and reasonable.

Goals/Targets

Proposed criteria: “The goals set for the measures are realistic given the starting point and will help the ACH meet goals established by the HCA”

- What does success look like - need to have a goal for the measures that is specific (e.g. 50%)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • David brought up the issue of goals vs. targets. Goals are the ultimate measure we're shooting for (e.g. HEDIS 90th percentile) and this is where standardization needs to be addressed. Ultimate goal is that everyone should have the same measure (e.g. standards for BP control, A1cs) and have the same end game. Targets may be more time limited and reflect improvement that is achievable in the near term based on the baseline. Also pointed out need for better criteria to determine what "goals are realistic and represent significant improvement" means. How does scoring impact organizations that are starting from a different place? What is meant by "significant"? Need to define this better. • <u>Action</u>: NCACH staff will fine-tune the criteria description based on this feedback <p>Alignment/Path Proposed criteria: "The planned activities are well sequenced, and aligned with the organization's vision for practice transformation"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What's well sequenced vs not well sequenced? Seems more subjective. • <u>Action</u>: NCACH staff will fine-tune the scoring criteria based on this feedback <p>Other Observations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dulcye commented on the desire to have a conversation during the write back process to make sure we could get little questions and clarifications done quickly. A 1 hour phone call would allow organizations to walk through what doing and explain process and rationale. Some measures/aims are going to be easy to understand, but some may require more conversations and context/history. • Regarding pay for participation and expectations of engagement in learning activities (the team assessment scale), Amy recommended that teams receive feedback along the way so that nobody is surprised and everyone has the chance to improve to at least a 2.5 by the end of the learning activity (per criteria).
<p>3. Final feedback on future LAN Offerings</p>	<p>Ran out of time to dig into this, so quickly showed workgroup members the latest timeline for upcoming learning activities based on prior feedback. This timeline will be shared at the broader WPCC meeting on July 9th to solicit final input.</p>
<p>4. Next Meeting / Adjourn</p>	<p>Next Meeting – August 9th!</p>