

DD System Transformation Workgroup
DMH – Conference Room B
December 11, 2013

Attendance

Dan Haug, Tricia Dusheke, Rikki Wright, Jake Jacobs Kathleen Featherstone, Peg Capo, Mary Sullivan-Thomas, Alecia Archer, Wendy Sullivan, Linda Bowers, Vicky Davidson, Cory McMahon, Jeff Richards, Greg Kramer, Vicki McCarrell, Etta Mitchell, Scott Shepherd, Ann Graff, Les Wagner, Terry Combs, Mike Rea, Jeff Grosvenor, Bernie Simons,
By Phone: Stephanie Briscoe, Marcy Volner, Jhan Hurn, Wendy Witcig, Douglas Riggs, Ron Kruse

Review of meeting

Dan Haug stated the purpose of this group is to make the big decisions but will work with others and be flexible to meet the requirements for all around the state.

The “Frequently Asked Questions” handout was discussed and a copy of this is on the DD website.

Discussed the DMH, Division of DD Redesign Workgroup Draft (attachment is on website)

1. Intake and Eligibility

- Worksheet is a starting point for discussion purposes.
- Intake eligibility data by county is not necessary at this point. We will do as we go along with the pilots.
- The appeal process will be on the next agenda. Bring your ideas with you to discuss this topic.
- Training for eligibility and certification will be done on MELS. The assessment workgroup has one more meeting before finalizing the details.
- Data on eligibility in CIMOR needs to be collected and reported as well as retained. This topic will be on the next agenda and divisions need to bring some ideas with them.

2. Priority of Need (PON)

- The PON committee group will be getting together again soon to discuss training. The 4 individual volunteers need to get together before the larger group meets in January.
- The packets of information currently don't match and are issues with missing info. Will need suggestions from the 4 individual volunteers on how to fix this.

- We need to be fiscal responsible with this and keep as a mandatory funding item.
- We need a good definition of what the URC score of 12 is. Guideline #33 which is Priority of Need (PON) “Critical Service Situation” Guidance was discussed at a recent Columbia meeting. Crisis is when the caregiver is not able to meet the needs and the environment doesn’t meet the medical or behavioral concerns of individual, therefore, would be considered a 12. Keith Schafer’s focus on 12s is to get to people in crisis and make sure no one falls through the cracks. We need clarification so it is clear for all however.
- We need to measure what success is with PON. The PON group will look at this and define this.

3. Service Coordination

- Discussed doing 100% of case management within 24 months with the co-ops was reasonable. Some thought the 24 month deadline might be tough to do.
- Need consistency.
- Is the compensation level negotiable? Different parts of the state have different Medicaid compensation.
- Dan Haug suggested a sub group be formed to clarify the Medicaid issue.
- Is there enough money in non-Medicaid vs. Medicaid? If have low Medicaid funding could that cause an issue?
- If all entities don’t take on 100% of case management will still be left with two systems.
- Discussed the possibility of contracting out for case management or doing an RFP to roll over areas without case management.
- Currently funding lots of kids who are 50% eligible and can’t service without losing money so refused and how will we manage that? Bernie Simons stated this is a volunteer program and not requiring anything. We could negotiate allocations and do pilots in certain areas.
- Need to agree and plan a time table to negotiate Medicaid rate issues with some kind of consistency.
- Need to protect the most vulnerable clients not based on Medicaid or non-Medicaid.
- Need to marry advocacy with the funding.
- Agreed to move forward with the pilots.

4. Budget Authority & Allocation of Resources

- Not using state plan services before going to a waiver is a problem with case management. Creates cost overruns.
- Could utilization review process resolve?

- Need clarity on rules. State plan before the waiver but is individual circumstances and different scenario's to consider.
- Giving the same allocation based on what was spent in the past is not a great idea.
- Allocation for residential for county money will follow the individual. Allocation based on what's filled for individuals and has flexibility.
- Can the state ask for supplemental if used all of the allocation? In a crisis we can
- There is no mandatory funding so we will have to revisit this in more detail.

5. Tasks the State will always continue to perform

- Quality Enhancement, Home and Community Based Waiver Assurances, Abuse and Neglect Investigations.
- All of the items listed in the PowerPoint created by Alecia Archer will remain as tasks the state will continue to perform as well.
- Allocation should not affect the family.
- Now we have preventative services at the local level and they can determine and be more responsible to each individual.
- If had an ombudsman this would need to be an independent person and would not necessarily be the duty of the state.
- How we link information technology back and forth at each location needs to be addressed per the locations abilities.

The DMH, Clarification of DD System Redesign Workgroup Draft dated December 11, 2013 was reviewed. (Attachment on website) This will be open until 5:00 this Friday for comments. This document will also be placed on the DD System Redesign website.

- Need to insert a paragraph on what our purpose statement is going to be.

6. Define Core Functions:

- Criteria, CM at 100%, Appeals

7. Determine criteria for selecting pilot sites

- Suggested doing 2-3 pilots at first.
- Wouldn't limit based on size.
- Organizations with a history in established and accredited agencies.
- Urban vs. rural is a possibility.
- Have to determine who is ready to do this.
- We will need a business model from their side to present and need flexibility.
- Should we create a template for them so don't all come to the table with completely different business models?

- Get a co-op going might be a good idea.
- Pursue different scenarios and maybe not have all the same type of pilots.
- Concerns with this group picking who the pilots are going to be. Maybe DMH should do that instead was discussed.
- Need a fiscally sound entity that can handle the pilot throughout the process.

Next Meeting: Is scheduled for Wednesday, January 15th.