

**Michigan Local Public Health Accreditation Commission Meeting Minutes  
September 17, 2004  
MPHI Interactive Learning Center**

**ATTENDEES**

COMMISSION: Jeffrey Elliott, Doug Paterson, Duke Anderson, Richard Sacks, Kathy Fedder, Michael Mortimore; *via teleconference*: Harvey Wallace, Thomas Kalkofen, Loretta Davis-Satterla  
OTHERS: Jim Butler, Debra Tews, Melody Parker, Konrad Edwards, Tom Crook, Greg Cline; *via teleconference*: Mary Kushion

**APOLOGIES**

Anne Rosewarne, Ellen Clement, Michael Massanari, Cynthia Taueg, Jean Chabut

---

**OPENING REMARKS**

Discussion led by Parker and Butler regarding the pilot process of shifting the immediate focus of the Commission from initial On-site Review Report (OSRR) review to discussion of action items recommended by AQIP workgroups and subcommittees. Elliott requested and received confirmation that the Local Liaison Report to Local Health Departments (LLR) would continue trend reports on indicators such as MDA's published in the July 2004 issue and MPHI's (June 2004). Kalkofen expressed an interest that was supported by Anderson and Mortimore in still receiving the electronic versions of OSRRs prior to the vote for Accreditation; the request was noted and will be facilitated by MPHI.

**PRESENTATION OF ON-SITE REVIEWS AND CORRECTIVE PLAN OF ACTION STATUS**

Summary presentation of the initial On-Site Review Reports by MPHI staff is a pilot process, subject to feedback and approval from the Commission members. A full reading and presentation of the On-Site Review Report is not required for the local health department's initial presentation as no vote by the Commission is required.

Reminder: local health departments will retain official cycle one accreditation status during cycle two until the Michigan Departments of Community Health, Agriculture, and Environmental Quality effect a subsequent decision pursuant to recommendations by the Accreditation Commission.

The following local health departments were presented to the Commission:

**Northwest Community Health Agency  
Luce-Mackinac-Alger-Schoolcraft District Health Department  
Shiawassee County Health Department  
District Health Department #10  
Western Upper Peninsula District Health Department**

**Mid-Michigan District Health Department** was presented as "Pending Implementation," meaning that the department has completed Corrective Plan of Action submission and is now in its implementation phase.

*Approved 12/17/2004*

**UPDATE ON ACCREDITATION QUALITY IMPROVEMENT**

Kushion's summary report on activities by the AQIP II Workgroup, the Boilerplate Workgroup and the A-G Workgroup:

**AQIP II:**

A draft of the survey form for the Reviewer Evaluation Process has been developed. It will be presented to the Commission at its December meeting, as the Workgroup wishes to begin collecting data at the beginning of Cycle 3.

Training meetings for Accreditation Reviewers have been expanded from twice yearly to quarterly with the involvement of Local Health Services.

The monthly Local Liaison Report to LHDs has been expanded to add more detailed information on Accreditation. The Accreditation web site has been expanded to add more information on the Commission, including meeting minutes.

The Workgroup asked the Commission for clarification of the "Met with Conditions" designation new to the 2004 Accreditation On-Site Review. The workgroup recommends that communication of the applicable criteria be communicated to LHDs and reviewers. No Corrective Plan of Action is required and the indicator must be corrected by the next cycle's review or it would be deemed "not met".

Currently, final OSRRs are disseminated to the department's health officer, then after a 7-10 day period, a full report is mailed to the chair of the county's board of health and a summary report is delivered to the chair of the county commission. The Workgroup recommended to the Commission that only the health department's governing body should receive a full report.

*Motion by: Duke Anderson*      *Second by: Mike Mortimore*

Motion: recommend to the three state agencies that only the local health department's governing/authoritative body be notified of the On-Site Review's final results 2 weeks after the health officer.

Discussion:

It was determined that the dissemination of the final report to governing bodies was vital for effective implementation of corrective action.

*Tally: All in favor*

**BOILERPLATE:**

Kushion yielded floor to Butler for summary of Boilerplate Workgroup activities.

Items being explored by the Boilerplate Workgroup include corrective action timelines, especially those that include consent agreements; what powers and legal authority are identified by the Public Health Code and how (if any) sanctions and incentives can be applied.

***Approved 12/17/2004***

**Michigan Local Public Health Accreditation Commission Meeting Minutes**  
**September 17, 2004**  
**MPHI Interactive Learning Center**  
**Page 3**

Representatives from MDCH Legal Affairs have perused the code at length and determined that there are broad legal powers, even though Accreditation is not named, per se. It was suggested that changes to administrative rules be explored versus change to the Code itself. MDCH Budget/Contract representatives have agreed to examine CPBC language in the same vein.

Discussion ensued regarding quality improvement action versus sanctions/negative consequences. A summary of how the three agencies have handled the first ten Not Accredited health departments will be presented to the Boilerplate Workgroup at their next meeting in October and subsequently to the Commission.

Kalkofen broached the 50-50 cost sharing tie-in topic. Butler commented that once essential services were established, it would definitely be a topic for further discussion.

A-G:

As part of defining a local health department plan of organization, Minimum Program Requirements (MPRs) and indicators are being linked, where applicable, to the Public Health Code (PHC) by the A-G sub-committee. The process will assist the Department of Community Health in returning PHC information and language back into the MPR format. The rationale is that when processes are anchored in the code, they are law-based and therefore easier to argue for budgetary inclusion. Possibilities to be explored for the future include merging pertinent portions from A-G into one section and producing a document that supports public health infrastructure.

**UPDATE ON ACCREDITATION COMMISSION BY-LAWS REVIEW**

Butler presented a summary of precursory activities regarding sub-committee review of the Commission's by-laws. A discovery meeting was held with Elaine Beane regarding the creation of the by-laws, yielding several important facts including the following:

- The term "by-laws" in this case is a misnomer; they are actually Operating Procedures
- At the time of its creation, the MPHI Board did not want to create a governing body because in so doing, it would have ceded power from the state government to the Commission, in effect creating a quasi-governmental entity

The sub-committee will meet within the next few weeks to identify points and plans for updating the Commissions Operating Procedures.

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

Mortimore asked for clarification regarding WIC Program procedure in relation to Accreditation. A copy of the integration process will be sent to Commission members.

Prepared by: Melody D. Parker  
Accreditation Coordinator  
517-324-8340  
mparker@mphi.org

***Approved 12/17/2004***