HCBS STRATEGIES, INC.
Improving Home and Community Based Systems
www.hcbs.info   410-366-HCBS (4227)
info@hcbs.info

Assessment and Support Plan Pilot Stakeholder Kickoff Meeting		
3.28.19		In-person
Note	Andrew Cieslinski	
Attendees	Jennifer Giurgila, Chris Russell, Carol Meredith, Shannon Seacrest, Melissa Emery, David Bolin, Marsha Unruh, Gerrie Frohne, Julie Reiskin, Marie Rittenhouse, Charlene Willey, Glenna Massey, Sayuri Kelly, Raven Starr, Melissa Jones, Lauren Swenson, Ravi Teja Gorta, Tim Cortez	

Introduction & Overview
- Information already summarized in the presentation is not repeated in the notes. The notes primarily capture stakeholders' feedback and input.
- The presentation that was used to facilitate the stakeholder discussion can be found at: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1gCO1ExGohDYW2gBp5cP_yjyn-9EQLuQT/view?usp=sharing
- Lauren Swenson provided an overview of the Office of Community Living's mission and vision and how the Assessment and Support Planning (A/SP) process fits into the vision using slides 2-4.

Background on Assessment and Support Planning (A/SP) Redesign
- Steve Lutzky provided an overview of the goals, purpose, content, and flow of the A/SP redesign using slides 7-12.
  - Julie Reiskin asked who would be conducting the Level of Care Screen.
    - Lauren Swenson explained that the preliminary vision has been to have a NWD agency, such as the Aging and Disability Resource Center (ADRC), conduct the Level of Care Screen, however no decisions have been made about this process yet.
    - Julie said that it would make sense to have the case manager complete the Screen or have it available online for participants to complete.
    - Julie asked whether the participant would have to respond to the assessment twice if they were part of the inter-rater reliability assessment.
      - Steve Lutzky clarified that participants would only need to respond once and one case manager would lead the meeting and the other would score based on the responses to the lead case manager.
  - Charlene Willey asked when participants would have to go through the A/SP process if they are already eligible under the 100.2.
    - Steve Lutzky clarified that this would occur as part of the annual reassessment.
    - Charlene said that the reassessment process will need to be clearly established for individuals with IDD who are currently assessed using the Supports Intensity Scale (SIS), as there are not clear reassessment dates.
  - Julie Reiskin asked whether the new process was intended to create a new eligibility determination or mimic the current level of care.
    - Tim Cortez said that the goal is to use the new items to replicate the current Level of Care determination.
    - Julie said that this has broad implications and the Center for Law and Policy, Disability Law of Colorado, and Colorado Legal Services should be invited to future stakeholder meetings.

Colorado Stakeholder Meeting Minutes

Assessment Overview
- Steve Lutzky provided an overview of the Assessment process using slides 14-18.
  - In discussing the Psychosocial module, Steve noted that during the training, case managers pointed out that many participants use medications to manage behaviors and it may be helpful to distinguish this from other types of planned interventions. The Department is working to add a response choice that separated use of medications from other planned interventions.
    - Shannon Seacrest said that she wanted to ensure that participants are not being chemically restrained and not given the option to use alternative mechanisms to address behaviors.
    - Steve pointed out that adding this new response choice would help to better understand if that is occurring.
  - Gerrie Frohne asked whether participants get to decide if they have the capacity to keep themselves safe in the Safety and Self-preservation module.
    - Steve Lutzky explained that the module captures information about the participant's ability to understand an emergency and how to react/evacuate in the event of an emergency. Because this is an assessment, case managers should consider what the participant tells them, what others tell them, and what they observe to make a judgement.

Support Plan Overview
- Steve Lutzky then provided an overview of the Support Planning process using slides 20-24.
  - Julie Reiskin asked whether the participant is required to have documented goals to receive services.
    - Steve Lutzky clarified that participants are not required to share goals.
  - Tim Cortez said that the Department is working with the University of Colorado-Colorado Springs and Eileen Forlenza to develop a training curriculum for participants and representatives to teach them how to lead their Support Planning process.
    - Shannon Seacrest said that she has been involved in this group, and she has concerns about the length of the training and that it is focused heavily on IDD. She said that there will need to be additional development for it to apply to all populations.
    - Chris Russell had a concern about the conflict between guardians and participants in making decisions in the Support Planning process. She said that the training needed to include addressing this dynamic.
  - Shannon Seacrest said that it would be helpful to have a timeline for all Department efforts (No Wrong Door, Conflict Free Case Management, Case Management Redesign) and how the timelines align with the A/SP.

Pilot Overview
- Steve Lutzky provided an overview of the pilot using slides 26-36.
  - Steve Lutzky clarified that the second pilot phase will be conducted with a subset of the case managers from phase one.
    - Shannon Seacrest said that she had a concern that the use of a subset of case managers familiar with the A/SP will skew the time study data towards the time it takes assessors familiar with the process to complete the A/SP rather than new assessors.
      - Melissa Jones clarified that the Department wants to understand the time the A/SP takes when it is fully implemented, and case managers are familiar with the tool to better inform updates to the rates for case management.
      - Tim Cortez said that the Department has allocated additional funds for the training and the rollout phases that would help mitigate costs associated with the learning curve.
  - Chris Russell said that she would like to have case managers be more familiar with a broader range of programs and services rather than specializing in a waiver.

- Shannon Seacrest clarified that the new A/SP process is going to automatically calculate which Waivers the participant is eligible for from the assessment so that participants can discuss all their options.
  - Steve Lutzky said that the largest concern for data collection at this point is having a large enough sample of Children with Life Limiting Illness (CLLI) for the Hospital Level of Care (H-LOC) development. There are approximately 175 individuals on this waiver and it is important to have a sample of at least 100 individuals because this Level of Care will determine eligibility for this waiver.
    - David Bolin said that that the Department should mandate that CLLI case managers participate and contact CLLI service providers and have them inform families about the importance of participating.
  - Chris Russel asked whether there will be one H-LOC for all waivers.
    - Steve Lutzky said that there will likely be different H-LOCs for different waivers because people go into the hospital for a variety of reasons and some programs may have substantially different costs.
  - Julie Reiskin asked why younger adults with physical disabilities are included in the same category as older adults. She said this is a concern because these populations can have substantially different needs.
    - Steve Lutzky explained that the budget constraints and concerns about placing too much burden on case managers prohibited getting a larger sample.
  - Charlene Willey said that she has a concern about only collecting information from 100 people with IDD given the wide range of IDD conditions that require a variety of support needs.
    - Steve Lutzky explained the Department had to balance the available budget and the amount of burden being placed on case managers with the desire to have larger sample sizes. Gains in statistical power drop dramatically after the sample size is around 100 and become negligible after about 400. HCBS Strategies is trying to increase the likelihood that cases for which the new eligibility criteria may be problematic by having case managers flag those for special scrutiny.
    - Charlene said that there are also individuals on IDD waivers who also have mental health needs.
      - Steve said that the mental health sample will likely include individuals with IDD and/or EBD.
  - Charlene said that to feel more comfortable about the sampling process she would have to better understand the training process.
    - Steve said that for both phases there will be in-person trainings in five sites throughout the state. The materials for these trainings were adapted from the training manuals that can be found on the blog.
  - Tim Cortez reminded the group that resource allocation will be addressed as a future effort with a separate contractor.
  - Chris Russell asked whether the Department would be able to grant a grace period in the first year after the rollout of the new criteria so participants did not lose services.
    - Steve Lutzky said that these will be conversations that occur as part of the discussions on establishing the new eligibility criteria.
  - Shannon Seacrest asked what the review process will be for individuals who are no longer eligible for services during the transition to the new process.
    - Steve Lutzky said that that is part of the discussion about developing the new eligibility criteria. He emphasized that because case managers interpret the ULTC 100.2 differently, applying any tool that is scored consistently will result in changes in eligibility. Therefore, it will be important to discuss how to minimize the impact of this for people whose eligibility changes.

Colorado Stakeholder Meeting Minutes

- o Shannon said that there needs to be a conversation about integrating the CES eligibility determination process with the new A/SP process.
- o Julie Reiskin asked whether the case managers who were selected for the pilot were screened to determine whether they were planning to stay at their job to ensure sustainability for the pilot.
  - Lauren Swenson said that it would have been inappropriate for the Department to ask case managers if they were planning to quit.
  - Steve Lutzky explained that the Department sent an invitation to all case managers, but emphasized the timeline of the pilot, which hopefully discouraged case managers who were considering leaving from participating. HCBS Strategies evaluated the caseloads of the case managers from the past year to prioritize case managers with the most certifications.
- o The group said that not having the Case Management Agencies of Jefferson County, DDRC, participating in the pilots was problematic.
  - Julie Reiskin recommended that the Department look at contracts with these agencies to ensure that they are required to participate in these projects in the future.
  - Lauren Swenson said that some CMAs do not allow their case managers to participate in pilots due to Human Resource constraints.
- o Shannon asked which tools were not able to be incorporated into the A/SP.
  - Steve Lutzky clarified that the PAT, PCAT, and CES application will remain separate tools, however the A/SP will provide guidance from the assessment results.

Next Steps
- The next stakeholder meeting will be held from 9a-12p on May 7th.
- Steve Lutzky asked the group preference for how weeks where two stakeholder meetings need to be held should occur, either two separate meetings or one all-day meeting.
  - o Group preferred to hold an afternoon meeting on one day and a morning meeting on the following day.

4