Comprehensive Assessment and Support Plan Summary Report

Report 4 for the Colorado Assessment and Support Plan Pilot Prepared for the Colorado Department of Health Policy and Financing



HCBS STRATEGIES INCORPORATED

WWW.HCBS.INFO

June 11, 2020

Contents

| Executive Summary | 4 |
|--|----|
| Background & Overview | 5 |
| Background on the New Assessment and Support Plan Process Pilot | 5 |
| Overview of the Case Managers & Individuals Participating in the Pilots | 6 |
| Pilot Case Managers | 6 |
| Pilot Participants | 6 |
| Overview of Engagement Efforts to Inform the Assessment & Support Plan Updates | 7 |
| Stakeholder Advisory Group Engagement | 7 |
| Case Managers | 7 |
| Service Recipients and Their Representatives | 8 |
| Description of the Analyses Used to Inform the Assessment & Support Plan Updates | 8 |
| Module Updates | 9 |
| Caregiver | 9 |
| Change 1, Section: Caregiver Information - Overview of Assistance | 9 |
| Change 2, Section: Caregiver Information - Caregiver Tables | 10 |
| Employment, Volunteer, and Training (EVT) | 12 |
| Change 1, Section 2: Employment- Information about Current Job | 12 |
| Functioning Module (Ages 4 and Older) | 12 |
| Overall Change 1- Usual and Most Dependent | 12 |
| Overall Change 2- Preferences and Guidance to Workers | 14 |
| Changes to Mobility Section | 14 |
| Changes to Transferring Section | 15 |
| Changes to Dressing Section | 16 |
| Changes to Toileting Section | 16 |
| Changes to Eating Section | 16 |
| Changes to Housework Section | 17 |
| Changes to Phone Use Section | 18 |
| Changes to Transportation Section | 18 |
| Functioning Ages 0-3 | 19 |
| Change to Section Age 0-5 Months | 19 |
| Health | 19 |
| Change 1, Section 3: General Health | 19 |
| Change 2, Section 4: Risk Screen | 19 |
| Change 3, Section 5: Medications | 20 |
| Change 4, Section 10: Assessment of Feet | 21 |

| Housing and Environment | 21 |
|---|----|
| Change 1, Section 2: Home Environment | 21 |
| Change 2, Section 3: Housing Affordability | 21 |
| Change 3, Section 4: Housing Supplement | 21 |
| Participant Engagement | 22 |
| Change 1, Section 2: Receiving and Understanding Information | 22 |
| Psychosocial | 22 |
| Change 1, Section 2: Depression Screen | 22 |
| Safety & Self Preservation | 23 |
| Change 1, Section 2: Personal Safety | 23 |
| Change 2, Section 4: Living Safely in the Community | 23 |
| Sensory and Communication | 24 |
| Change 1, Section 3: Functional Communication | 24 |
| Change 2, Section 3: Functional Communication | 25 |
| Change 3, Section (Formerly) 6: Supports Needed | 25 |
| Support Plan Updates | 25 |
| Section 1- Participant's Identifying Information | 25 |
| Section 2- Support Plan Administrative Information | 26 |
| Section 4- Progress Towards Goals from Previous Support Plan | 26 |
| Section 5- Personal Goals | 27 |
| Section 6- Activities to Fulfill Goals | 28 |
| Section 10- Choosing Medicaid Home and Community Based Services | 29 |
| Section 11- Identifying My Supports | 29 |
| Section 12- Authorizing My Services | 29 |
| Section 13- Support Sources to Fulfill Activities | 29 |
| Section 14- Planning for Temporary Increase in Services | 30 |
| Section 17- Disaster Relocation Planning | 30 |
| Section 18- Minimizing My Risks | 31 |
| Recommendations for Additional Changes | 32 |

Executive Summary

The Colorado Department of Health Care Policy and Financing (the Department) contracted with HCBS Strategies to pilot a new assessment and support planning (A/SP) process for Medicaid-funded long term services and supports (LTSS). The Department undertook this effort because of concerns about the reliability and validity of the items in the current assessment used for eligibility determinations, the Uniform Long-Term Care (ULTC) 100.2.

The new A/SP process was piloted in five phases with 648 participants:



Throughout the pilot process HCBS Strategies engaged three primary groups outside of the Department to obtain feedback on the draft A/SP process and input on the proposed changes:

- Stakeholder advisory group- The Department recruited a stakeholder advisory group comprised
 of individuals receiving services, family members, advocates, providers, case management
 agencies, and other community members to inform the development, piloting, and
 implementation of the new A/SP process. Throughout the pilot process, HCBS Strategies has
 provided briefings to this group and obtained their feedback through over 40 hours of in-person
 and remote meetings.
- Case managers- Throughout the pilot process case manager feedback was obtained via regular web-enabled check-in meetings; feedback sheets completed after each A/SP session; and the Help Desk operated by HCBS Strategies.
- Individuals seeking or receiving services and their representatives who participated in the pilots- Throughout all pilot phases case managers recorded participant feedback within their feedback sheets. Participant's direct feedback about their experience with the A/SP was collected via phone or email during the Support Plan and Time Study pilots.

In addition to the narrative feedback provided by these groups, HCBS Strategies also conducted the following analyses on the 413 participants assessed during the LOC and NF/H-LOC & Reliability pilots to identify items that could be updated or removed from the pilot process.

- Reliability Analyses- Discussed in detail in the Reliability Analyses Report, these analyses were
 used to identify items with low inter-rater reliability that could potentially be improved or
 removed from the A/SP item set.
- Factor Analyses- Factor analyses, which provide the intercorrelations of constructs, were
 conducted for domains within the assessment that contain multiple items measuring similar
 constructs (e.g., items measuring the transferring constructs and mobility constructs).
- LOC Analyses- Discussed further in the LOC Pilot Comparative Analyses Report, HCBS Strategies
 used a modeling spreadsheet to identify items that were most predictive of an individual
 meeting Nursing Facility-Level of Care (NF-LOC). This modeling exercise, along with the reliability
 and factor analyses, allowed us to recommend removing certain items that were not necessary
 for establishing NF-LOC.

This document summarizes the draft changes to the A/SP process that have been proposed by participants, case managers, stakeholders, and the Department throughout the pilot process as of February 2020. Representatives from the Department, HCBS Strategies, and DXC intend to meet in May and June 2020 to discuss additional refinements based on input from the Support Plan and Time Study pilots. These changes will be reflected in updated Microsoft Word versions of the A/SP.

Background & Overview

The Department of Health Care Policy and Financing (the Department) contracted with HCBS Strategies to develop and pilot the new assessment and support planning (A/SP) process because of concerns about the reliability and validity of the items in the current tool used for eligibility determinations; the lack of consistent collection of all necessary data; and the ability of the current assessment to support a personcentered process, including the development of a person-centered Support Plan. Senate Bill 16-192, which was enacted after the Department began developing a new assessment and support planning process, added a legislative mandate to create a single assessment process for all individuals receiving long term service and supports (LTSS).

After extensive stakeholder engagement during the planning and development phases of the A/SP, this process was piloted from March 2019 through May 2020. This document summarizes the draft changes to the A/SP process that have been proposed by participants, case managers, stakeholders, and the Department throughout the pilot process as of February 2020.

Background on the New Assessment and Support Plan Process Pilot

The new A/SP process was piloted in five phases:



The **level of care (LOC) pilot** only collected data using the LOC Screen, which includes both current assessment items from the ULTC 100.2 and the items designed to replace them. The purpose of this pilot was to compare the items across the current and new assessment and comply with the Center for Medicare & Medicaid Services' (CMS) Testing Experience Functional Tools (TEFT) grant.

The **Nursing Facility (NF)/Hospital (H)-LOC and Reliability pilot** collected data necessary to fulfill the following functions:

- Replicating the NF-LOC for adults.
- Establishing a more objective NF-LOC criteria for children.
- Establishing objective and prospective H-LOC for all of Colorado's relevant HCBS waivers.
- Testing the reliability, including the inter-rater reliability, of select items in the new assessment that may be used for NF-LOC, H-LOC, and resource allocation that have not previously been tested for reliability.

The next two phases were staggered to allow case managers to become familiar with the Comprehensive A/SP process prior to the final phase, the Time Study pilot.

 The Comprehensive Assessment pilot allowed case managers to pilot the full assessment process, which included both the items that were tested in the NF/H-LOC & Reliability pilot and new mandatory and voluntary items. This also allowed case managers to become familiar with the new case management IT system that houses the A/SP, Ariel Care and Case Management.

- The **Support Plan pilot** was the first opportunity for case managers to conduct the Support Plan. Case managers first conducted the assessment process from the Comprehensive Assessment pilot and then developed a Support Plan with the participant and their support team.
- The **Time Study pilot** is the culmination of the Comprehensive and Support Plan pilots. At this point, case managers, who were now familiar with the new A/SP process, documented the time it took to complete the A/SP. This time will be analyzed and summarized in a future report to inform future case management rate updates.

Overview of the Case Managers & Individuals Participating in the Pilots

Pilot Case Managers

Case managers were drawn from the existing pool of case managers at the Single-Entry Points (SEPs), Community Centered Boards (CCBs), and the Department of Human Services (DHS). An invitation that emphasized the importance of this effort and the compensation available went out to all case managers. One hundred and twenty-three case managers expressed a desire to participate. Information on the number of assessments these case managers conducted in the past year and the populations they assessed was obtained from the Department, and this information was utilized to select a pool of 68 case managers based on the following criteria:

- The total number of assessments they had conducted in the past year;
- The populations they had assessed;
- The geographic area they served, to have a range of agencies and representation across urban, rural, and frontier settings.

This pool of 68 case managers also included four additional case managers who, after not being selected, indicated that the number of assessments they would be conducting would be substantially higher than the information from the past year predicted.

For both the LOC and NF/H-LOC & Reliability pilots, case managers participated in day-long trainings held in-person at five sites across the state. Several case managers withdrew from the pilot because they left their agencies or had other family or work pressures they did not originally anticipate. At the end of the LOC pilot, there were 62 case managers, 52 of whom continued to the NF/H-LOC & Reliability pilot.

A pool of 25 pilot case managers was recruited for the Comprehensive Assessment, Support Plan, and Time Study pilots. Because of other commitments and the work and family life challenges that resulted from COVID-19, the pilot ended with 21 case managers.

Pilot Participants

Participants were selected from scheduled ULTC 100.2 initial assessments or reassessments. Populations that individuals were selected from included individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities (IDD); older adults and adults with physical disabilities (APD); individuals with mental health conditions; and children.

Case managers were instructed to offer all participants with scheduled ULTC 100.2 assessments during the pilot timeframes the opportunity to participate in the pilot to prevent them from introducing a selection bias (e.g., only selecting cases that would take less time to assess). As shown in **Exhibit 1**, 646 participants agreed to participate in the pilot.

Exhibit 1: Number of Pilot Participant Assessments by Population and Assessor Method

| Population | # of Assessments |
|---------------|------------------|
| Children | 160 |
| APD | 205 |
| IDD | 150 |
| Mental Health | 131 |
| Total | 646 |

Overview of Engagement Efforts to Inform the Assessment & Support Plan Updates

Three primary groups outside of the Department were engaged to obtain feedback on the draft A/SP process and input on the proposed changes:

- Stakeholder advisory group
- Case managers
- Individuals seeking or receiving services and their representatives who participated in the pilots

Stakeholder Advisory Group Engagement

The Department recruited a stakeholder advisory group to inform the development, piloting, and implementation of the new A/SP process. This group is comprised of service recipients, family members, advocates, providers, case management agencies, and other community members including the following representatives:

- Chris Russel- Family Member & Aveanna Home Care
- David Bolin- Accent on Independence Homecare
- Bill Levis- AARP & Family Member/Guardian
- Melissa Emery- Rocky Mountain Human Services (Community Centered Board)
- Carol Meredith- Advocate- Arcof Arapahoe and Douglas
- Shannon Seacrest- Colorado Cross Disabilities Coalition (CCDC) & Family Member
- Marsha Unruh- Independence Center & Guardian
- Lee Ray- Advocate- Arc of Arapahoe and Douglas
- Gerrie Frohne- Family Member
- Julie Reiskin- Colorado Cross Disabilities Coalition (CCDC)
- Charlene Willey- Family Member
- Jennifer Giurgila- Jefferson County Options for Long Term Care (Single Entry Point)

The stakeholder engagement process during the planning and development phases included 125 hours of in-person work with the advisory group. Throughout the pilot process, HCBS Strategies and Department staff have provided briefings and obtained feedback through over 40 hours of in-person and remote meetings with this group.

While extensive feedback has been provided throughout the A/SP process, updates identified in this document were reviewed with the stakeholder group in March 2020 during six hours of in-person meetings.

Case Managers

There were three primary mechanisms for capturing input from the case managers throughout the pilot process:

- Regular check-in meetings- Throughout the first four pilot phases HCBS Strategies facilitated biweekly meetings with the pilot case managers to check in on pilot progress, discuss feedback, and brainstorm updates. During the Time Study pilot, these meetings occurred once per week. In total, 27 of these check-in meetings were held.
- **Feedback sheets** During the LOC, NF/H-LOC & Reliability, and Time Study pilots case managers submitted Microsoft Word and Excel-based feedback sheets after each A/SP meeting. Within these sheets, the case managers identified areas that presented challenges and proposed updates to address these concerns.
- **Help Desk** Throughout the pilot process HCBS Strategies operated a Help Desk that fielded questions and captured individual feedback from the case managers. Much of this feedback was shared with the group during the check-in meetings.

Service Recipients and Their Representatives

Throughout all pilot phases, case managers recorded participant feedback within their feedback sheets. To collect direct feedback from participants during the Support Plan and Time Study pilots, participants were contacted via phone and/or email. Feedback was intended to be conducted in person but had to completed via phone and/or email due to the COVID-19 pandemic. During these meetings, participants and their representatives were asked questions about their experience with the A/SP through the following questions:

- What were your overall impressions of the process, including the questions you were asked and how much time the process took?
 - Do you remember any specific topics or questions that you really liked?
 - Do you remember any specific topics or questions that you did not like or seemed overly intrusive into your life?
 - Was there anything that you were not asked about that you would like to discuss with your case manager?
 - O Were there any topics that you do not think need to be discussed as part of the process?
 - o Did it feel like your case manager was comfortable using the new process?
 - O Did your case manager use a laptop or tablet during the assessment?
 - Were you able to follow along with your case manager during the assessment and support planning process?
 - o Did the process feel conversational or more like a questionnaire?
- With regards to the Support Planning process, were you able to come up with goals that you felt were personally meaningful to you?
 - o **If No:** What support would you have liked to have available to come up with personal goals that are meaningful to you?
- Do you have any other feedback or questions for me?

Description of the Analyses Used to Inform the Assessment & Support Plan Updates

In addition to the collection of narrative input on the changes for the A/SP, HCBS Strategies also conducted the following analyses on 413 of the participants assessed during the LOC and NF/H-LOC & Reliability pilots.

Reliability Analyses- Discussed in detail in the Reliability Analyses Report, HCBS Strategies
conducted analyses to establish the level of inter-rater reliability of each assessment item using
kappa statistics and percent agreement. These analyses were used to identify items with low
inter-rater reliability that could potentially be improved or removed from the A/SP item set.

- Factor Analyses- Factor analyses, which provide the intercorrelations of constructs, were conducted for domains within the assessment that contained multiple items measuring similar constructs. For example, the transferring section of the Functioning module contained seven types of transferring tasks. Factor analyses revealed that these seven items were highly correlated in measuring the overall need for support with transferring, so this list of seven transferring tasks was pared down to three. These analyses allowed us to simplify the assessment while maintaining the integrity of the constructs it measures.
- LOC Analyses Discussed further in the LOC Pilot Comparative Analyses Report, HCBS Strategies used a modeling spreadsheet to identify items that were most predictive of an individual meeting NF-LOC. This modeling exercise, along with the reliability and factor analyses, allowed us to recommend removing certain items that were necessary for establishing NF-LOC.

Module Updates

This document includes the sections of the assessment and support plan that were modified as a result of the pilots, such as the addition of new items or the removal of items or sections. Sections of items that were changed (e.g., language, response options) are highlighted in green. Items that were added are highlighted in blue at the beginning. Items that were removed are highlighted in red.

The document also includes symbols or formatting that was used to provide guidance for the automation:

- The A/SP is comprised of mandatory and voluntary items. Mandatory items, which are used for establishing LOC, waiver targeting criteria, potentially for resource allocation (future effort), and/or are essential for support planning, are denoted with the symbol Θ .
- Instructions for case managers are included as red text.
- Skip patterns are included as green text.
- Items specific to participants under the age of 18 are included in orange text.

Caregiver

Change 1, Section: Caregiver Information- Overview of Assistance

The Department was required to test several caregiving items under the TEFT effort, including items to capture whether assistance is available in the home and the frequency of paid and unpaid

| | | ecause the caregiver table later in this module (and described under the next change ver Section) already captures this information, the following items were removed: |
|----|------------------|--|
| 1. | Does the O No | participant have assistance in their home? • Yes |
| 2. | Code the month. | level of assistance in the participant's home (both paid and unpaid) during the past |
| | • 0 | 5. No assistance received |
| | • 0 | 4. Occasional/short term assistance |
| | • 0 | 3. Regular night time |
| | • 0 | 2. Regular daytime |
| | • 0 | 1. Around the clock |
| A. | Unpaid: | B. Paid: |

Change 2, Section: Caregiver Information- Caregiver Tables

- A triage item was added to determine whether the participant has paid or unpaid supports that should be documented as part of the assessment process.
 - **3.** Does the participant have paid or unpaid caregiver supports? (This includes IHSS, CDASS, and Family Caregiver programs. This excludes other services provided by a Medicaid agency authorized via the Support Plan.)

O Yes

O No (End of module)

• The previous version of the module broke out the caregiver types into three tables: Unpaid, Paid by Medicaid, and Paid by another Source. The three tables collected very similar information; however, the paid tables also capture payment source and the unpaid table collected information about the relationship to the participant. Having three tables also meant that if a caregiver provided unpaid and paid support, they would need to be entered into one of the Paid tables and one of the Unpaid tables.

To streamline the process and improve the clarity, the three tables were condensed into one. Within this new table the following adjustments were also made:

- Items were added to identify the type of paid and unpaid help the caregiver provides and a text field that captured this same information was removed because it was redundant to have both checkboxes and a text field.
- o An answer choice of "Unpaid" was added to the Payment Source section.
- A Back-up Planning section was added to allow participants to provide this information during the caregiving discussion rather than revisiting the discussion during the Support Plan meeting.

4. **Identify Caregiver Supports-** For each complete the information set below. Use age-appropriate guidelines to identify support provided that is beyond what is expected of a caregiver of a child of a similar age without disability related issues.

| Caregiver Information | Distance from Participant | Caregiver Help- Paid [Check all that apply] | Caregiver Help- Unpaid [Check all that apply] | Frequency: How Often is Assistance Provided | Will Support Continue in the Future? | Back-up Planning |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| Preferred Phone #: Preferred Email: Caregiver Is: Regular support Back-up support | O Lives with O Within 5-10 minutes O 15-20 minutes O Longer than 20 minutes | Self-care assistance (for example, bathing, dressing, toileting, or eating/feeding) Mobility assistance (for example, bed mobility, transfers, ambulating, or wheeling) IADL assistance (for example, making meals, housekeeping, telephone, shopping, or finances) Medication administration (for example, oral, inhaled, or injectable medications). Medical procedures/ treatments (for example, changing wound dressing, or home exercise program). Management of equipment (for example, oxygen, IV/infusion equipment, enteral/parenteral nutrition, or ventilator therapy equipment and supplies). | □ Self-care assistance (for example, bathing, dressing, toileting, or eating/feeding) □ Mobility assistance (for example, bed mobility, transfers, ambulating, or wheeling) □ IADL assistance (for example, making meals, housekeeping, telephone, shopping, or finances) □ Medication administration (for example, oral, inhaled, or injectable medications). □ Medical procedures/ treatments (for example, changing wound dressing, or home exercise program). □ Management of equipment (for example, oxygen, IV/infusion equipment, enteral/parenteral nutrition, or ventilator therapy equipment and supplies). | As needed Less than once a month About once a month About once a week 3-4 times a week Once a day 2 or more times per day, less than continuously Continuously (ongoing basis or 24hrs/day) | Yes, Can continue providing Yes, Can increase amount of assistance Yes, Need to decrease amount of assistance No, Cannot continue providing Do not know Does a transition plan need to be developed for the caregiver? Yes No | Support source is responsible for arraigning back-up Yes No What should I do if the support does not show up? Who else can help and how they can help? Text field Any other concerns I have if my other supports are not |
| Payment Source Unpaid Self-paid Paid by other family member/ friend Medicare Medicaid Private LTC Insurance Private Health Insurance VA DVR Other: | Relationship to Participant Spouse Parent Adult Child Other family member: Friend Neighbor Other, specify:_ | concerns). Advocacy or facilitation of person's participation in appropriate medical care (for example, transportation to or from appointments). Other advocacy not related to medical care | Supervision (for example, due to safety concerns). Advocacy or facilitation of person's participation in appropriate medical care (for example, transportation to or from appointments). Other advocacy not related to medical care Assistance with daily (or routine) problem solving Non-medical transportation Social opportunities Other, describe: | Would the Participant Prefer a Different Caregiver? Yes, describe: No | Does the Caregiver Need Support Services/Training? Yes, describe: No | available. Text field |

Employment, Volunteer, and Training (EVT)

Change 1, Section 2: Employment- Information about Current Job

To support Colorado as an Employment First state, the Department proposes to document summary information about the participant's current job, if applicable. The following table has been added to the EVT module:

| Name of Employ er | Start Date | End Date (If known) | Employment Status | Type of Employment | Employment Category | Wage Rate | Approx. Wage Per Hour | Average Hours Per Week | Employment Support |
|----------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|--|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Text | Calen | Calend ar | O Full-time O Part-time O Seasonal | Competitive integrated employment Work crew/enclave Pre-vocational Self-employed | Assembly, Manufacturing, or Packing Building/Ground s Cleaning or maintenance Food Prep/Food Service Office Work, Communications , Administrative Retail Technology, Social Media or Development Other: | Hourly: earns minimum wage or more Hourly: paid less than minimum wage Paid per piece or deliverable Salaried | Text | 32 or more hours per week 20-31 hours per week Less than 20 Intermit tent (e.g. seasona I or as needed) | Is the participant receiving supported employment services? O No O Yes, identify source of supported employment: DVR in the past year HCBS Waiver If "Yes", date approved: |

Functioning Module (Ages 4 and Older)

Overall Change 1- Usual and Most Dependent

As part of the FASI effort under TEFT, each ADL and IADL item in the Functioning module required responses to both Usual (support needed in the last 3 days) and Most Dependent (support needed in the last 30 days) performance. Case managers and participants reported that the distinction between Usual and Most Dependent did not typically yield new information and analyses showed that removing Most Dependent had minimal impact on meeting Level of Care (LOC) thresholds. Because of this, the measure Most Dependent was eliminated for all items; the exception to this is menses care, which will be measured using the last 30 days rather than 3. Additionally, to clarify the intent of Usual performance, the prompt was changed to "Last 3 Days". Below is an example of the update from the item Walk 150 feet.

1B. Walk 150 feet: Once standing, the ability to walk at least 150 feet in a corridor or similar space. For example, an aisle in a grocery store.

| Last 3 Days | Performance Level |
|-------------|--|
| 0 | Independent - Participant completes the activity by him/herself with no assistance from helper (Skip to Item 1D-Walk 150 Outside of Home) |
| 0 | Age- appropriate dependence- The participant requires a level of support consistent with his/her age (Skip to Item 1D- Walk 150 Outside of Home) |

| O | Setup or clean-up assistance - Helper sets up or cleans up; participant completes activity. Helper assists only prior to or following the activity |
|---|--|
| 0 | Supervision or touching assistance - Helper provides verbal cues or touching/steadying assistance as participant completes activity. Assistance may be provided throughout the activity or intermittently |
| O | Partial/moderate assistance - Helper does less than half the effort. Helper lifts, holds, or supports trunk or limbs, but provides less than half the effort |
| 0 | Substantial/maximal assistance - Helper does more than half the effort. Helper lifts or holds trunk or limbs and provides more than half the effort |
| 0 | Dependent - Helper does all of the effort. Participant does none of the effort to complete the task OR the assistance of 2 or more helpers is required for the participant to complete the activity |
| 0 | Activity not Attempted- Participant refused |
| 0 | Activity not attempted due to short-term medical condition or safety concern |
| O | Not applicable- Participant does not usually do this activity |

However, case managers and stakeholders identified that variability in support needs over the past 30 days is important to capture for some participants. Because of this, the following items (example from Transferring) have been added after each ADL to identify whether support variability exists and the circumstances around the variability.

2D. Has the level of support the participant needs for transferring varied over the last 30 days?

- O No (Skip to Item 2H- Transfer Equipment)
- O Yes, identify the highest level of support needed in the past 30 days:

| Last 30 Days | Performance Level | | | | |
|--------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| • | Independent – Participant completes the activity by him/herself with no assistance from helper | | | | |
| 0 | Age- appropriate dependence- The participant requires a level of support consistent with his/her age | | | | |
| 0 | Setup or clean-up assistance – Helper sets up or cleans up; participant completes activity. Helper assists only prior to or following the activity | | | | |
| 0 | Supervision or touching assistance – Helper provides verbal cues or touching/steadying assistance as participant completes activity. Assistance may be provided throughout the activity or intermittently | | | | |
| • | Partial/moderate assistance – Helper does less than half the effort. Helper lifts, holds, or supports trunk or limbs, but provides less than half the effort | | | | |
| 0 | Substantial/maximal assistance – Helper does more than half the effort. Helper lifts or holds trunk or limbs and provides more than half the effort | | | | |
| 0 | Dependent – Helper does all of the effort. Participant does none of the effort to complete the task OR the assistance of 2 or more helpers is required for the participant to complete the activity | | | | |
| O | Activity not Attempted- Participant refused | | | | |
| O | Activity not attempted due to short-term medical condition or safety concern | | | | |
| 0 | Not applicable- Participant does not usually do this activity | | | | |

| - Italians, incompact | a. c.e.p ae . e.j a.e e a | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| O Activity not attempted du | e to short-term medical condition or safety conc | rern |
| O Not applicable- Participan | t does not usually do this activity | |
| E. How frequently has this enhanced | support for transferring been needed | l in the past 30 days? |
| O 2 or more times per day | O 1-3 times per week | O Other: |
| O Daily | O 3-4 times per month | |
| O 4-6 times per week | O 1-2 times per month | |
| • | th instance of enhanced support last? | |
| O 0-15 minutes | O 31-45 minutes | O Greater than 60 minutes |
| O 16-30 minutes | O 46-60 minutes | |
| G. Describe the circumstances that r | esult in this additional support need. | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

Overall Change 2- Preferences and Guidance to Workers

factors.

In the previous version of the Functioning module, the voluntary items Preferences and Guidance for Workers that follow each ADL and IADL were separated. After receiving feedback that many of the checkbox constructs across the items overlap (e.g., "Gait belt" under Preferences and "Caregivers use a gait belt" under Guidance for Workers) the items were merged and aligned. An example of this change from the Mobility section is provided below. These changes were made to all similar items throughout the module.

1T. Preferences and Guidance for Workers – Identify the participant's preferences and what he/she wants workers to know when supporting him/her to get around his/her home. Consider age-appropriate

| ☐Access to backup equipment or same | ☐Misplaces/forgets assistive device |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| day repair | □Motivated |
| ☐Activity limited; afraid of falling | ☐Poor navigation |
| ☐Assist participant over thresholds | ☐Propels own wheelchair |
| ☐Behavioral issues | ☐Pushed in wheelchair |
| □Can walk, but prefers wheelchair | ☐Provide contact guard when walking |
| □Cane | ☐Provide physical support with stairs |
| □Caregivers use a gait belt | ☐Remind to use assistive device |
| □Contact guard when walking | ☐Recharge batteries daily |
| □Cooperates with caregiver | ☐Sees well enough to navigate independently |
| □Crutch | □Unable to walk/bear weight |
| □Disease/symptoms interfere with | □Use gait belt |
| performing task | □Visual impairment |
| □Electric wheelchair | □Walker |
| □Has a steady gait | □Walker with seat |
| □Keep walkways clear | ☐Will not use assistive device |
| □Leans to one side | □Other: |
| ☐Leave assistive device within reach | □Other: |
| ☐Manage his/her own ability needs | □None |
| ☐Manual wheelchair | |

Changes to Mobility Section

The following updates were made within the Mobility Section.

- Based on the review of LOC and reliability analyses, the following items were removed:
 - Walk 50 feet with two turns: Once standing, the ability to walk at least 50 feet and make two turns.
 - LOC analyses showed that this item does not contribute additional information for establishing LOC beyond the other walking items within the module.
 - 4 steps: The ability to go up and down four steps with or without a rail.
 - Reliability analyses and subsequent focus on this item revealed that this item is challenging for participants to conceptualize and does not contribute additional information beyond the other step related items in the module.
 - Walks for 15 minutes: Without stopping or resting (e.g., department store, supermarket)

- The FASI guidance for this item has assessors code the support needed only if the participant is able to walk for 15 minutes; if the participant cannot walk for 15 minutes they are scored as "Dependent". Because of this, the item does not contribute enough additional information to justify remaining in the module.
- Walks across a street: Crosses street before light turns red
- Wheels across a street: Crosses street before light turns red
 - Both walking and wheeling across the street include physical and cognitive elements that are potentially confounded within the item (e.g., physical ability to walk/wheel across the street and cognitive ability to know when it is time to do so). Other items in the Functioning, Safety and Self-preservation, and Memory & Cognition modules address these areas.
- Items Walk 150 feet and Walk 10 feet were reordered so that if a participant can walk 150 feet independently, they are not required to respond to the walk 10 feet item.
- Additional context was added to the Walk 150 feet item so that it now reads:
 - **Walk 150 feet:** Once standing, the ability to walk at least 150 feet in a corridor or similar space. For example, an aisle in a grocery store.
- Reliability analyses revealed that there were significant issues with the language of the item "Code
 the participant's level of independence for walking OUTSIDE OF THE HOME based on the furthest
 distance that the participant could walk "Independent" above. If no distance was selected as
 "Independent", code for walking 10 feet outside the home." To address this issue, the item was
 broken into two separate items:
 - Code the participant's level of independence for walking 150 feet OUTSIDE OF THE HOME.
 - Asked of participants who can walk 150 feet independently.
 - o Code the participant's level of independence for walking 10 feet OUTSIDE OF THE HOME.
 - Asked of participants who cannot walk 150 feet independently
- The use of a rail was clarified, with the phrase "or without" a rail eliminated from the item "12 steps: The ability to go up and down 12 steps with or without a rail" to ensure that the intended construct is being measured.

Changes to Transferring Section

- LOC analyses showed that the following items do not contribute additional information for establishing LOC and were removed:
 - Sit to lying- The ability to move from sitting on side of bed to lying flat on the bed
 - Lying to sitting on side of bed- The ability to safely move from lying on the back to sitting on the side of the bed with feet flat on the floor, and with no back support
 - Chair/Bed-to-Chair Transfer The ability to safely transfer to and from a bed to a Transfer

The transferring items that remain in the Functioning module are:

- Roll left and right- The ability to roll from lying on back to left and right side, and return to lying on back on the bed
- Sit to stand- The ability to safely come to a standing position from sitting in a chair or on the side of the bed
- Car transfer- The ability to transfer in and out of a car or van on the passenger side. Does not include the ability to open/close door or fasten seat belt

Changes to Dressing Section

- LOC analyses showed that the following item does not contribute additional information for establishing LOC. Additionally, the ability to make appropriate daily decisions is a construct captured within the Memory & Cognition module. This item was removed.
 - Item removed from Dressing: Ability to select an outfit that is appropriate and safe for weather
 - Comparable construct in Memory & Cognition: Ability to make appropriate decisions regarding daily tasks, such as picking out an outfit, deciding when and what to eat, or selecting what to do throughout the day

Changes to Toileting Section

- LOC analyses showed that the following items, which were initially included because they are constructs within the ULTC 100.2, however they do not contribute additional information for establishing LOC. The item was removed.":
 - How often does the participant need assistance to keep him/herself clean after toileting?
 - o How often does the participant need assistance to keep toilet environment clean?

Changes to Eating Section

• Case managers identified that there was a lack of information around support needed to cut foods and concerns about choking/aspirating. The following items have been added to capture this information:

6B. Cutting food-The ability to use suitable utensils to cut food once a meal is presented on a table/tray.

| | n | 1 |
|--|---|---|
| | ٤ | J |

| Last 3 Days | Performance Level |
|----------------|---|
| 0 | Independent - Participant completes the activity by him/herself with no assistance from helper. |
| O | Age-appropriate dependence- The participant requires a level of support consistent with his/her age. |
| O | Setup or clean-up assistance - Helper sets up or cleans up; participant completes activity. Helper assists only prior to or following the activity. |
| 0 | Supervision or touching assistance - Helper provides verbal cues or touching/steadying assistance as participant completes activity. Assistance may be provided throughout the activity or intermittently. |

| O | Partial/moderate assistance - Helper does less than half the effort. Helper lifts, |
|---|--|
| • | holds, or supports trunk or limbs, but provides less than half the effort. |
| 0 | Substantial/maximal assistance - Helper does more than half the effort. Helper |
| | lifts or holds trunk or limbs and provides more than half the effort. |
| | Dependent - Helper does all of the effort. Participant does none of the effort to |
| O | complete the task OR the assistance of 2 or more helpers is required for the |
| | participant to complete the activity. |
| O | Activity not Attempted- Participant refused |
| O | Activity not attempted due to short-term medical condition or safety concern |
| O | Not applicable- Participant does not usually do this activity |

| 6C. Does the pa | rticipant need a modified diet because of a concern about choking or aspirating? 🕕 |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| O No | |
| O Yes, ty | pe of modified diet: |
| | ☐ Soft/pureed food |
| | ☐ Thickened liquids/foods |
| | ☐ Moistening dry foods |
| | ☐ Cut food into small pieces |
| | □ Other: |
| 6D. Does the paraspirating? O No | rticipant exhibit conditions/diagnoses, behaviors, or symptoms that may cause choking or |
| _ | nditions/diagnoses, behaviors, or symptoms that may cause choking or aspirating: Coughing during meals Holding food in mouth/cheeks Difficulty or pain swallowing Other: |
| | |

Changes to Housework Section

• Participants and case managers identified that laundry is often a major area of support and an important distinction is whether the laundry facility is located within the residence. The following items are proposed to be added capture this information:

2C. Laundry- The ability to wash, dry, and fold laundry, including getting to and from the laundry area and carrying a laundry basket. Items skipped if participant is less than age 8

| <u> </u> | radially basket: Items skipped if participant is less than age of |
|----------------|--|
| Last 3 Days | Performance Level |
| O | Independent - Participant completes the activity by him/herself with no assistance from helper |
| | • |
| • | Age-appropriate dependence- The participant requires a level of support consistent with his/her age |
| | |
| \circ | Setup or clean-up assistance - Helper sets up or cleans up; participant completes |
| | activity. Helper assists only prior to or following the activity |
| 0 | Supervision or touching assistance - Helper provides verbal cues or touching/steadying assistance as participant completes activity. Assistance may be provided throughout the activity or intermittently |
| | Partial/moderate assistance - Helper does less than half the effort. Helper lifts, |
| \mathbf{O} | |
| | holds, or supports trunk or limbs, but provides less than half the effort |

| 0 | Substantial/maximal assistance - Helper does more than half the effort. Helper |
|---|--|
| • | lifts or holds trunk or limbs and provides more than half the effort |
| | Dependent - Helper does all of the effort. Participant does none of the effort to |
| O | complete the task OR the assistance of 2 or more helpers is required for the |
| | participant to complete the activity |
| O | Activity not Attempted- Participant refused |
| O | Activity not attempted due to short-term medical condition or safety concern |
| O | Not applicable- Participant does not usually do this activity |

2D. Is the washer and dryer the participant uses for laundry located within his/her residence? Items skipped if participant is less than age 8.

| ۷o |
|----|
| |

O Yes

Changes to Phone Use Section

• Case managers and stakeholders identified that texting is an important point of communication for many individuals, however it was not previously captured in the assessment. The following item was added to capture this information:

3C. Texting- The ability to unlock a cell phone and open, read, create, and respond to a text message

| | _ | |
|---|---|--|
| | п | |
| | | |
| / | | |

| Last 3 Days | Performance Level |
|----------------|--|
| 0 | Independent - Participant completes the activity by him/herself with no assistance |
| • | from helper |
| 0 | Age-appropriate dependence- The participant requires a level of support |
| • | consistent with his/her age |
| O | Setup or clean-up assistance - Helper sets up or cleans up; participant completes |
| • | activity. Helper assists only prior to or following the activity |
| | Supervision or touching assistance - Helper provides verbal cues or |
| 0 | touching/steadying assistance as participant completes activity. Assistance may |
| | be provided throughout the activity or intermittently |
| Q | Partial/moderate assistance - Helper does less than half the effort. Helper lifts, |
| 9 | holds, or supports trunk or limbs, but provides less than half the effort |
| O | Substantial/maximal assistance - Helper does more than half the effort. Helper |
| 9 | lifts or holds trunk or limbs and provides more than half the effort |
| | Dependent - Helper does all of the effort. Participant does none of the effort to |
| 0 | complete the task OR the assistance of 2 or more helpers is required for the |
| | participant to complete the activity |
| O | Activity not Attempted- Participant refused |
| O | Activity not attempted due to short-term medical condition or safety concern |
| O | Not applicable- Participant does not usually do this activity |

Changes to Transportation Section

• The following item was added to capture additional information about utilizing transportation:

7A. Transportation: The ability to schedule and access transportation to get around in the community. This includes using a personal vehicle and/or community transportation options including taxis, buses, and paratransit. ••

| Last 3 | Parformanca Laval |
|--------|-------------------|
| Days | Performance Level |

| • | Independent - Participant completes the activity by him/herself with no assistance from helper |
|----------|--|
| • | Age-appropriate dependence- The participant requires a level of support consistent with his/her age |
| • | Setup or clean-up assistance - Helper sets up or cleans up; participant completes activity. Helper assists only prior to or following the activity |
| O | Supervision or touching assistance - Helper provides verbal cues or touching/steadying assistance as participant completes activity. Assistance may be provided throughout the activity or intermittently |
| O | Partial/moderate assistance - Helper does less than half the effort. Helper lifts, holds, or supports trunk or limbs, but provides less than half the effort |
| O | Substantial/maximal assistance - Helper does more than half the effort. Helper lifts or holds trunk or limbs and provides more than half the effort |
| O | Dependent - Helper does all of the effort. Participant does none of the effort to complete the task OR the assistance of 2 or more helpers is required for the participant to complete the activity |
| O | Activity not Attempted- Participant refused |
| O | Activity not attempted due to short-term medical condition or safety concern |
| O | Not applicable- Participant does not usually do this activity |

Functioning Ages 0-3

Change to Section Age 0-5 Months

To support the justification for meeting NF-LOC, the following items have been added as items 1 and 2 of this section:

| 1. | |
|----|---|
| | |
| | Other concerns that may affect the amount of support the child needs: |
| | ☐ None of the above apply (Skip to Item 3- Dressing) |
| 2. | Is at least one of the bathing functional impairments expected to last for at least one year from the |
| | date of assessment? |
| | O Yes |
| | O No |
| | |

Health

Change 1, Section 3: General Health

• The following item was incorporated into Section 4, Item 1 "In the past year participant has been seen by his/her primary care provider":

Has the participant had a physical examination by a qualified medical professional performed in the past year?

| O | No |
|---|------------------------|
| O | Yes |
| | Number of times: |
| | Reason(s): |
| | ☐ Physical examination |
| | ☐ Other: |

Change 2, Section 4: Risk Screen

• To distinguish between falls experienced by children and adults, the following item was added:

| Ch | Has somebody worked with you to reduce your risk or fear of falling? Change 3, Section 5: Medications The previous version had the items "Participant currently takes prescription medications" and "Regularly takes over the counter medications, vitamins, or supplements." The items were combined to "Participant currently takes prescription medications and/or over the counter medications" to streamline the process and response options were added to the medication table to distinguish between prescription and over the counter medications. Participant currently takes prescription medications and/or over the counter medications. No Yes Participant refused to provide information | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|------|------|-------|-----------|------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|--|--------------------------|---|
| Name of Medicat on | Medicatio n Type | Dose | Unit | Route | Frequency | Started in last 90 day | Taken for psycho tropic reason | Taking as Prescri bed | Unders tand why partici pant/ child taking med. | Prescribing Physician | Planned Stop Date, If applicable |
| | ORX | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Оотс | | | | | | | | | | |
| | O RX | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Оотс | | | | | | | | | | |
| | ORX OOTC | | | | | | | | | | |
| | ORX OOTC | | | | | | | | | | |

were updated to mirror the changes of 1) including a measurement in variability of support needs over the past 30 days and 2) the combination of preferences and guidance for supports that were previously

described in the discussion on the Functioning Module updates.

The following items were moved from the Safety and Self Preservation module and are now included in the fall conversation in the Health module to have all items related to falls contained in one assessment

Had two or more falls or any fall with injury.

O Yes, falls related to a disability support need

• Yes, age-appropriate falls

O No

module.

Change 4, Section 10: Assessment of Feet

At the recommendation of case managers, the skip on this voluntary section for participants under age 18 was removed and is available to be reviewed with participants of all ages.

Housing and Environment

Change 1, Section 2: Home Environment

• The following items were moved to Section 1 of the Safety & Self Preservation module:

| A. | Emergency Preparedness: | No | Yes | N/A |
|----|---|----|----------|----------|
| 1. | Can get out of the home easily in an emergency | O | • | O |
| 2. | Emergency exit plan is in place | O | O | O |
| 3. | Emergency kit available (flashlight, candle, water, etc.) | O | 0 | O |
| 4. | Emergency phone numbers easily available | O | 0 | O |
| 5. | Disaster response plan is in place. | 0 | O | O |

The following items were removed because they are captured by items in the Safety & Self Preservation module, which are displayed after the table:

| C. | Environmental Quality Interview: | No | Yes | N/A |
|----|---|----|-----|----------|
| 1. | Do you feel comfortable living in your home? | O | O | O |
| 2. | Is your home quiet enough at night that you are not awakened by | O | O | O |
| | noise? If no, describe the noise and how often this occurs. | | | |
| 3. | Does your home have enough room for personal items that are | O | 0 | • |
| | important for you to have near you? | | | |
| 4. | Do others in your home leave your personal things alone or get your | 0 | • | O |
| | permission before using? | | | |

- Items from the Safety & Self Preservation Module that capture the construct of the items above:
 - Do you feel that you have enough privacy in your home?
 - o Do you feel that someone around you has been using your money in a way that you did not give them permission to?
 - o Are you ever worried for the security of your belongings?

Change 2, Section 3: Housing Affordability

- "Medications" was removed from the table in the item "Indicate if the participant had to go without any of the following because of lack of money in the past year" because it is already captured in the Health module via the item:
 - o Has issues with getting prescription and/or over the counter medication filled or refilled regularly.

Cha

| nar | inge 3, Section 4: Housing Supplement | |
|-----|--|---|
| | With the exception of the item below, i Assessment were removed from the asses | tems captured as part of the current <i>Community Transiti</i> ssment to reduce redundancy. |
| _ | Are there other needs required for successful tran | sition to a new residence? • |
| 0 | Yes [Check all that apply] | |
| | Household Setup Needs | ☐ Appliances – large (e.g., refrigerator/stove) |
| | ☐ Furniture | |
| | | |
| | | |

| ☐ Appliances – small (e.g. microwave enabling | ☐ Moving expenses |
|--|---|
| participant to make simple meals) | ☐ Packing/unpacking assistance |
| Linens | ☐ Pre-move cleaning of home |
| ☐ Houseware items | ☐ Yard clean-up |
| ☐ Toiletries | ☐ Pest eradication |
| ☐ Clothing | ☐ Initial food supplies |
| ☐ Basic household set-up items | Other: |
| ☐ Electric Service set up and deposit | Other Transition Needs |
| ☐ Telephone service set up and deposit | ☐ Prepared meals |
| ☐ Gas service set up and deposit | ☐ Skills training to become more independent |
| ☐ Water service set-up and deposit | ☐ Working with a peer to learn how to |
| ☐ Security deposit required for lease on residence | successfully transition |
| P.O. Box | Other: |
| _ | ion is important to understand participants' ability to ers. The following items were added capture this |
| information: | ins the following items were duded capture this |
| Is the participant able to read printed or write impaired, includes Braille)? Yes No Unknown Is the participant able to count numbers from 0 Yes No Unknown | ten information (if participant is blind or visually to 20 and backwards from 18 to 6? |
| Psychosocial | |

Change 1, Section 2: Depression Screen

Case managers identified the need for a Depression Screen that is tailored for individuals with Intellectual
and Developmental Disabilities (IDD) and their caregivers. Two versions of the Glasgow IDD Assessment,
one directed at the participant and the other directed to the proxy, were added to this voluntary section.
Additionally, the following triage item was added to determine which version of the Depression Screen
is most appropriate to complete:

1. Does the participant have an intellectual and/or developmental disability? O_{No} • Yes, and participant is able to meaningfully communicate thoughts, feelings, and needs, including with a support (Skip to Item 13- Have you felt sad?) •Yes, and participant is unable to communicate emotions, thoughts, and feelings in any meaningful way (Skip to item 33- Has the participant appeared depressed?) Safety & Self Preservation Change 1, Section 2: Personal Safety To capture sufficient information to inform support planning, case managers have requested that the following items be added: 1. In the past five years has adult protective services (APS) and/or child protective services (CPS)/child welfare received a report or referral of mistreatment about the participant? ☐ Unknown/Choose not to respond ☐ Yes, unsubstantiated allegation(s) have been made, describe:_____ ☐ Yes, current involvement ☐ APS Yes, past involvement. Year(s) of involvement: ☐ APS ☐ CPS 2. Is the participant currently on probation and/or parole? • O No • Yes, describe reason: O Unknown/Choose not to respond Change 2, Section 4: Living Safely in the Community The previous version of this section captured the hours of support needed across each setting during a 24-hour time period (awake, asleep, employment, day program, other community activity) for each type of supervision listed. Case managers reported that this resulted in significant frustration because it: 1) required the participant to attempt to typify a day when in fact support needs can vary significantly throughout a week, and; 2) was very challenging to estimate on an hourly level. > The proposed response to this feedback is to provide the level of frequency with which the identified support is needed using the following new response options: All of the time activity occurs > 50% or more of the time activity occurs Less than 50% of the time the activity occurs ➤ Weekly Less than weekly up to monthly

An example of the table used for capturing this information for awake time in residence is below.

1A. At residence, awake time.



| Supervision Type Needed | Frequency | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| ☐ Stand by remote/phone support | All of the time activity occurs | | | |
| | > 50% or more of the time activity occurs | | | |
| | Less than 50% of the time the activity | | | |
| | occurs | | | |
| | > Weekly | | | |
| | Less than weekly up to monthly | | | |
| ☐ Remote video/auditory/other | All of the time activity occurs | | | |
| supervision/monitoring | > 50% or more of the time activity occurs | | | |
| | Less than 50% of the time the activity | | | |
| | occurs | | | |
| | ➤ Weekly | | | |
| | Less than weekly up to monthly | | | |
| ☐ Onsite supervision (supervising support can be | All of the time activity occurs | | | |
| asleep) | > 50% or more of the time activity occurs | | | |
| | ➤ Less than 50% of the time the activity | | | |
| | occurs | | | |
| | ➤ Weekly | | | |
| | ➤ Less than weekly up to monthly | | | |
| ☐ Awake onsite supervision | ➤ All of the time activity occurs | | | |
| • | > 50% or more of the time activity occurs | | | |
| | Less than 50% of the time the activity | | | |
| | occurs | | | |
| | ➤ Weekly | | | |
| | Less than weekly up to monthly | | | |
| ☐ Direct sight and hearing supervision (excludes | ➤ All of the time activity occurs | | | |
| remote monitoring) | > 50% or more of the time activity occurs | | | |
| O, | Less than 50% of the time the activity | | | |
| | occurs | | | |
| | ➤ Weekly | | | |
| | ➤ Less than weekly up to monthly | | | |
| ☐ Undivided attention of one person | ➤ All of the time activity occurs | | | |
| , i | > 50% or more of the time activity occurs | | | |
| | Less than 50% of the time the activity | | | |
| | occurs | | | |
| | ➤ Weekly | | | |
| | ➤ Less than weekly up to monthly | | | |
| ☐ Undivided attention of one person with one or | ➤ All of the time activity occurs | | | |
| more persons able to provide assistance at a | > 50% or more of the time activity occurs | | | |
| moment's notice | Less than 50% of the time the activity | | | |
| | occurs | | | |
| | > Weekly | | | |
| | Less than weekly up to monthly | | | |

Sensory and Communication

Change 1, Section 3: Functional Communication

• For the items "Understanding verbal content (excluding language barriers)," "Participant's ability to express ideas and/or wants with individuals he/she is familiar with," and "Participant's ability to **express ideas and/or wants with individuals he/she is not familiar with"**, the following response option was **added** so that age-appropriate difficulty is adequately captured.

o "Age-appropriate difficulty with expressing needs and/or ideas"

| Change 2, | , Section | 3: | Functional | C | Commui | nication |
|-----------|-----------|----|-------------------|---|--------|----------|
|-----------|-----------|----|-------------------|---|--------|----------|

| | Because the Health module alreatitems were removed: | dy captures information on speech and language therapy, the following |
|------------|--|--|
| | Participant currently receives sp | eech and language therapy: |
| | O Yes, describe: | [Skip to Item 12- Augmentative Communication Device] |
| | O No | |
| | O Unknown | |
| | - | to receive speech and language therapy services: |
| | O Yes | |
| | O No, describe: | |
| Change | 3, Section (Formerly) 6: Supports I | Needed |
| | Plan. Item 1 is captured in the of Communication module and Iten | se the information is otherwise captured in the assessment and Support equipment tables and comment boxes contained within the Sensory & a 2 is captured within the discussion about emergency safety in the Safety is in this section that were removed are: |
| | • | issues related to sensory and communication issues that need to be to the participant? For example, does he/she need signaling devices |
| | O No | |
| | | |
| | | n an emergency because of a vision, hearing, or communication need? |
| | O No | , and the second |
| | • Yes, describe: | |
| | | |
| Suppor | t Plan Updates | |
| Section 1- | - Participant's Identifying Informatio | n |
| Ch | nange 1- Decision Supports | |
| | The items that address whether | the participant has legally authorized decision makers and, if so, whom, vanced Directives to this first section to ensure all information is current port Plan. |
| 1. | Participant has someone who assists guardian, etc.): O No [Skip to Section 2- Support Pla | s with or is legally authorized to make decisions (e.g., POA, DPOA, legal |
| 2. | | assisting or authorized in making decisions: |
| 3. | Decision making capacity: | |
| | ☐ Guardian (Non Parental) | ☐ Conservator |
| | ☐ Guardian (Parental) | ☐ Power of Attorney (POA) |
| | ☐ Parent- Non-guardian | ☐ Surrogate Decision-maker for health care |
| | ☐ Trustee | decisions (DPOA) |
| | ☐ Representative Payee | ☐ Partner of parent |
| | ☐ Legally Authorized Representative | e Stepparent |
| | Responsible Party | ☐ Other Relative |

| ☐ Friend☐ Advocate | | | Other: | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 4 | If " Adı I. Typ | Advocate (Guardian (Non-Parental)" or "Guardian (Parental)" ministrative Information pe of Legal Guardianship Limited guardianship. Describe: Full guardianship | | 2- Support Plan |
| Section 2 | 2- Sup | port Plan Administrative Information | | |
| C | Chang | e 1- Location of Support Plan Meeting | | |
| | • | Based on suggestions from case managers, comme the response list. These responses include Alter Program. | | |
| | • | Other Community Setting answer option was remochoice. | d because it was redundant with the | "Other" answer |
| | 1. | Location of Support Plan meeting: 🕕 | | |
| | | O Alternative Care Facility (ACF)/ | O Case management ag | gency office |
| | Assi | Assisted Living | O Hospital | |
| | | O Day Program | O Nursing Facility | |
| | | O Participant's home | O ICF/IID | |
| | | Other family member's home | O Other: | |
| C | Chang • | e 2- Support Plan Meeting Date The wording of the item "Date Support Plan was Meeting" to provide clarity on the intent of the ite | | of Support Plan |
| C | Chang • | e 3- Individuals Participating in Support Plan IV To verify the participant's participation in the "Participant is present at the Support Plan meeting | Support Plan meeting, the manda | tory attestation |
| Section 4 | 4- Pro | gress Towards Goals from Previous Support Plar | | |
| C | Chang • | e 1- Verification that Progress Towards Goals verified The following item was added to ensure that the continued stay review (CSR) and revision to the Superior to the Superio | e progress towards goals table is u | pdated at each |
| | | 1. I updated the progress towards my goal(s) in to O Yes O No | e table below. 🕕 | |
| C | Change • | e 2- Updates to the Progress Towards Goal Tab In the column "Timeframe for Achieving Goal" the | | t term goals that |

are likely to be accomplished in within the support planning year

• To accommodate revisions to the Support Plan where progress has yet to be made, the response **Revision** to Support Plan, no progress at this time was added to the column "Score of Progress Towards Goal"

26

| Goal | How Progress Towards Goal Will be Measured | Timeframe for Achieving Goal (S)= Short term, Accomplish Within Support Plan Year (O)= Long Term, Ongoing Goal (F)= Future Goal | Progress Made Towards Goal- Use measures identified in previous plan | Score of Progress Towards Goal | Systemic Barriers |
|--|---|--|--|--|----------------------|
| Autofill from previous Support Plan | Autofill from previous Support Plan | Autofill from previous Support Plan | Text | Goal achieved, can remove Goal being achieved but should remain active Goal is on target to be accomplished Goal relevant, barriers to overcome: Goal no longer relevant, can remove. Explain: Revision to Support Plan, no progress as this time | Text |

Section 5- Personal Goals

Change 1- Updates to the Goal Table

- Case managers and participants identified that ranking and rating goals was often a redundant exercise and recommended removing the ranking of the goals. This change has been incorporated into the table.
- Case managers reported that some participants are not able to contribute to the Support Plan meeting
 and when a proxy is developing the goals there should be a way to show the participant is unable to
 provide a rating of each goal. The response Unable to Respond was added to the column "Participant
 Rating of How Meaningful Goal Is"
- In the column "Timeframe for Achieving Goal" the option "S" was added to identify short term goals that are likely to be accomplished in within the support planning year

| Goal | Participant Rating of How Meaningful Goal Is | Legally Recognized Representative Rating of How Meaningful Goal Is | How Progress Towards Goal Will be Measured | (S)= Short term, Accomplish Within Support Plan Year (O)= Long Term, Ongoing Goal (F)= Future Goal |
|------|---|--|---|--|
| Text | Extremely Meaningful Very Meaningful Meaningful Somewhat Meaningful Not Meaningful Unable to respond | Extremely Meaningful Very Meaningful Meaningful Somewhat Meaningful Not Meaningful | Text | Dropdown |

Section 6- Activities to Fulfill Goals

Change 1- Clarifying Skills Building

- To clarify that the intent of the Skills Building checkbox is to identify opportunities for participants to receive habilitative training to improve their independence in completing a task, the "Skills Building" column was updated to "Increasing Independence Through Skills Building". This change was also made in the activities table within Section 7- Health and Safety.
- The columns "Support Sources" and "Challenges" were moved to their own section, Section 13- Support Sources to Fulfill Activities, so case managers do not have to navigate back to this table after identifying supports and services.

| Goal Rank | Goal Ranked # 1 by Participant: | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|---|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Activities to fulfill goal | Start Date | End Date | Preference/ Guidance | Increasing Independence Through Skills Building | Participant Direction | Identify Services and Supports to Fulfill the Activity | | | |
| Text field | Date field | Date field | Text field | | | Text field | | | |

Section 10- Choosing Medicaid Home and Community Based Services

Change 1- Determining Whether Participant Would Like to Discuss Alternative Waiver Options

• To allow participants to determine whether they would like to discuss the pros and cons of all waivers that they are eligible for the following item was added:

| 1. Iwo | _ | ussion about the pros and cons of the waivers that I am eligible for. $lacktriangle$ |
|--------------|---|--|
| Change 2- DD | Waiver Status Review | w |
| | ure case managers are ng item was <mark>added</mark> . | e reviewing the status of the participant on the DD Waiver waitlist, the |
| | iver | ist Review- My case manager reviewed my waiting list status for the DD |
| • | rent preference: | |
| Cui | O As soon as availab | le |
| | O Safety net | |
| | O See date: | |
| As | a result of this review v | vas the preference changed? |
| | O Yes, identify chang | ge: |
| | O No | |

Section 11- Identifying My Supports

Change 1- Caregiver Tables

• Both the caregiver table that auto-populates from the Caregiver modules (Item 1) and the caregiver table used to identify caregivers not documented during the assessment (Item 2) were updated to reflect the changes made in the Caregiver module.

O Not applicable, do not wish to be placed on the DD waiting list or already enrolled in DD waiver

O No (Must review waiting list status prior to proceeding with Support Plan)

Section 12- Authorizing My Services

Change 1- Improving Section Clarify

• Items in this section were previously included within Section 11- Identifying My Supports. To more clearly separate the identification of supports and service authorizations, authorizations were broken into their own section, Section 12.

Section 13- Support Sources to Fulfill Activities

Change 1- Improving Support Plan Flow

• The columns "Support Sources" and "Challenges" were moved from the activities tables in Sections 6 and 7 to their own section, Section 13- Support Sources to Fulfill Activities, so that case managers do not have to navigate backwards in the Support Plan after identifying supports and services.

| Goal 1: Autofill from Section 6 Item 2 | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Activities to fulfill goal | Support Sources | Challenges | | | |
| | | ☐ Unmet Need | | | |
| Populate from Section 6 Item 2 | Text field | ☐ Systemic Challenges: <i>Text Field</i> | | | |
| | | □Other Challenges: Text Field | | | |

Section 14- Planning for Temporary Increase in Services

Change 1- Simplifying Service Authorization Tables

- The table for State Plan service authorization (Item 5) was added and both the waiver and State Plan tables were condensed to only include necessary information for temporary authorizations. This includes eliminating the fields for Start/End dates, Assessed Need, Guidance to Workers, Skills Building, and Provider Agency.
- The column "# of Units to be Added on a Temporary Basis" was added to both the waiver (Item 4) and State Plan (Item 5) tables to allow case managers to easily identify changes to the services identified in Section 12- Authorizing My Services during a period that requires a temporary increase.

| Funding Stream HCBS Waiver | Service | # of Units Authorized | # of Units to be Added on a Temporary Basis | Unit Rate | Total Cost of Service |
|---|--|--------------------------|--|---|-----------------------|
| Populate from Waiver selected in Section 10 | Dropdown tailored to funding stream selected | Pull from Item 12.1a | Number field | Fixed field based on service option selected in Column 2 | Auto- calculated |
| Populate from Waiver selected in Section 10 | | | | | Auto- calculated |

Section 17- Disaster Relocation Planning

Change 1- Identifying if Disaster Relocation Plan Has Already Been Developed

- The following updates were made to Item 2 to clarify if a disaster plan has been developed and where it is located.
 - 1. My provider has or will develop a Safety Plan for me and/or my information has been entered into or will be entered into an online system for safety and disaster response used by first responders in my area, such as Smart911:

| · •• ==· | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Have not developed a Disaster Relocation Plan | | | | |
| Developed and maintained by provider, briefly describe the provider plan: | | | | |
| Has been entered into a response system, date of last update: | | | | |
| Will be entered into response system, date information will be entered: | | | | |

Section 18- Minimizing My Risks

Change 1- Streamlining the Section

- Cased managers and participants identified that the following items are redundant and should be removed from the section:
 - o Assessed needs not attached to a support source, Medicaid service, or unmet need
 - o Summary of health and/or safety risks related to medical/health conditions
 - o Summary of health and/or safety risks related to behaviors
 - o Summary of health and/or safety risks related to environment or other issues

Recommendations for Additional Changes

Because these changes only reflect those identified through February 2020, representatives from the Department, HCBS Strategies, and DXC intend to meet in May and June 2020 to discuss additional refinements based on input from the Support Plan and Time Study pilots. These changes will be reflected in updated Microsoft Word versions of the A/SP.

In addition to the updates identified within this document, HCBS Strategies recommends the following:

Searchable Medication Table- The Department has expressed interest in being able to
identify medication interactions to mitigate critical incidents and to use this information to
better coordinate prescription medications. The current medication table format, which
includes an open text field for medication name, dose, route, and frequency, provides a
myriad of opportunities for erroneous data to be captured. Additionally, case managers have
identified that the current table format is very time consuming because of the lack of a search
feature.

HCBS Strategies recommends including a searchable medication table that allows the user to search for both prescription and over the counter medications. The dose, route, and frequency fields in the medication table should be pre-defined based on the medication name entered (e.g., Ambien would have 5, 10, 15, 20, etc. listed in the dose field rather than an open text). Additionally, there should be a flag for case managers when a medication is typically taken for psychotropic reasons.

• Searchable Diagnosis Table- Case managers document diagnoses in the assessment that are self-reported by the participant and/or included within the PMIP. They have identified that trying to create a common list of diagnoses would quickly become overwhelming given that many service recipients have co-occurring, complex diagnoses. Additionally, the Department is exploring pre-populating the PMIP with diagnoses from the assessment that can be verified by the medical professional completing the PMIP. This will require accurate spelling and ICD codes.

To streamline the documentation of diagnoses and provide clear communication of the diagnoses via the PMIP, we recommend including a diagnosis table that is searchable by both diagnosis name and ICD-10 code.

- Remove the Hospital LOC module- This module was included to determine whether additional information about medical complexity was needed to establish Hospital LOC. Analyses have revealed that this information is not necessary and can be removed.
- Add Functioning Items for Children Ages 0-3 to the LOC Screen- After discussions with the
 Department staff and stakeholders, the ADL items from the 0-3 module should be integrated
 into the LOC Screen to establish NF-LOC for this population. These items should automatically
 populate from the LOC Screen to the Functioning Ages 0-3 module.