CSoC Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) Meeting Minutes

Cook Quanty Assurance Committee (QAC) viceting winders					
Date of Meeting August 13, 2014					
Meeting Time 2:00 – 3:30 p.m.	Members	PARTICIPANTS			
	Guests	 ☐ Connie Goodson (OBH) ☐ Sheila A. Jordan (OBH) ☐ Alicia Blades (Magellan) ☐ Donna Harren (Magellan) ☐ Brandy Johnson (Magellan) ☐ Foley Nash (Magellan) ☐ Joseph Shayka (Magellan) 			

Agenda Item/Topic	Discussion	Action	Responsible Party	Target Date
I. Call to Order	Michael Comeaux called the meeting to order at 2:09 pm	None	None	None
II. Roll Call	Members announced themselves.	None	None	None
III. Approval of Minutes	Minutes of each of the minutes from: April 10, May 14 and June 11 meetings were each moved (Janice Fruge) and seconded (Kristin Savicki) for approval.	None	None	None
IV. Discussion of QA/IMT Data Report Duplication and Next Steps	Michael shared that Magellan requested a review of reports to check for duplication between reports submitted to the QAC and to the IMT. He and Connie Goodson met with Lori Marshall (Youth IMT Chair) to review all reports to determine if there was duplication. That review revealed that 12 of the 17 QAC reports are the same as IMT reports. Michael shared the need for a critical discussion about duplication of efforts between the QAC and IMT. He noted that the members of the IMT (some of whom are also members of the QAC) are more entrenched in review of these reports, as well as working closer with the data and processes	Prepare proposal for joining QAC reports into the IMT process, to be presented to SGB	Connie and Michael	October SGB meeting

CSoC Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) Meeting Minutes

Agenda Item/Topic	Discussion CSoC Quality Assurance Committee (QAC) M	Action	Responsible	Target
	which are the subjects of the reports. Michael shared that this duplication of efforts calls for a determination of the real need for the QAC since the IMT and its process is more developed; and that the IMT may be able to add a "quality" piece to its review. There was discussion among members about the real need for 2 separate committees reviewing so many of the same reports. Connie shared that the decision to "release" the QAC would be one made by the State Governance Board, but only after presentation of a rationale on the duplication of efforts. Michael noted that is the QAC was joined in the IMT, both compliance and quality could be addressed in one venue. There was a motion (Patty Thomas) and second (Janice Fruge) to propose joining of the QAC reports into the IMT process to avoid the duplication of efforts, thus removing the need for a QAC. The members approved the motion. Connie advised that the SGB process would require that the proposal be presented at the next SGB meeting (October 23); and then a vote for approval would happen at the next meeting (January 2015). Until the time approval is granted, the QAC should proceed, as usual.		Party	Date
V. Review of Quality Measures Data Reports	There are no outstanding reports to review at this time	None	None	None
VI. Public Comment	None	None	None	None
VII. Adjournment	The members agreed there was not need of a September meeting, as new reports would not be issued until after the usual September meeting date, so the September meeting would be cancelled; and meetings would resume with the already-scheduled October 8 th date. The meeting was adjourned at 2:48pm	Cancel September meeting	Sheila	Immediately

Michael Comeaux, Chair, CSoC QAC

Date