

IDD WAIVER REDESIGN CASE STUDIES PROJECT

Mara Baer, AgoHealth LLC

Agenda

- Case Study Project Background Purpose/Process
- Needs Based Criteria Overview
- Case Studies Findings Trends
- Questions/Discussion

Background of Project

In Fiscal Year 2018-2019, the Colorado Department of Health Care Policy and Financing (the Department) engaged Bolton Health Actuarial, Inc. (**Bolton**) to complete **cost impact analyses (Cost Model)** associated with combining the current Home and Community Based Services Supported Living Services (SLS) and Developmental Disabilities (DD) waivers into a single waiver serving individuals with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (IDD).

Bolton created a model that allows the Department to categorize members by Support Level and identify Daily Supports Needs. This model utilizes responses from the Supports Intensity Scale (SIS) assessment to assign each member a Support Level and Daily Supports Needs indicator. **(SIS/Support Levels)**

In addition to determining each member's Support Level, the **Daily Supports Needs** criteria is used to identify which individuals have a need for Residential Habilitation Services and Supports (ResHab) that will allow these members to live and participate successfully and safely in the community. In order to define Daily Supports Needs utilizing currently available data, the Department selected a methodology modeled after the residential algorithm used in the Developmental Disabilities Assessment in Washington. To be eligible for ResHab, an individual must meet the minimum criteria for a subset of responses in the SIS assessment. **(DSN=Needs Based Criteria)**

Case Study Project Purpose

- As recommended in the Bolton Final Report, to further explore the potential use of the Needs Based Criteria, the Department conducted two phases of Case Studies
- In the Phase I Case Studies conducted by AgoHealth/JSI, 429 cases were studied and aggregate analytics completed
- The Phase II Case Studies involved a micro-sample to dig deeper into these analytics

- The purpose of the **Phase II Case Studies** was to:
 - Conduct a small scale sample of 15 in-depth case studies of members in the SLS and DD waivers to evaluate the proposed Needs Based Criteria (NBC) for eligibility to receive Res Hab services.
 - Review the members' support needs, examining the members' living and caregiver situations and support networks and the members' preferences and goals
 - This will help HCPF to ascertain how application of the NBC might affect real-life situations for people, how they do or do not qualify for Res Hab
 - Provide feedback to identify what elements of the NBC looked like the strongest indicators of the need for Res Hab
 - Identify what elements we are missing or need to strengthen to refine the NBC.

Case Study Process

- Identified 45 individuals from Phase 1 study to develop sample
 - ▣ Included additional cases outside of 45 due to limited response rate
- Solicited volunteer stakeholder Case Reviewers
 - ▣ Family members/guardians, Case Management Agencies, community-level advocates & providers
 - ▣ Held group launch session
- Developed case study session guides with Phase 1 data, BUS SP information and LTC100.2 & SIS (NBC) scores

Role of Reviewers

- Case Reviewers confidentially examined member information from the BUS and provided a critique of whether the NBC results accurately reflect the needs of the member per findings in the case record review.
- Key areas of review:
 - ▣ SIS/Support Level
 - ▣ Service Plan details
 - ▣ Living situation & support networks
 - ▣ Waiting List status
 - ▣ ULTC 100.2 Assessment
 - ▣ NBC/SIS scores

Key Questions Asked of Reviewers

- In looking at the LTC Assessment Scores and Needs Based Criteria findings, do you think this person's characteristics indicate they need Residential Habilitation/24-hour services?
- Does there appear to be a conflict between the LTC Scores and the SIS Scores as indicated in the NBC?
- In reviewing the HCBS services, do you see a gap between the need and approved services?
- Are there any services needed that are not indicated in the service plan?
- Would it be possible for this person's needs to be met in other ways than requiring direct human assistance/dependence on staff (i.e. assistive technology/PERS/reminder charts)?

15 Member Sample Demographics

- Sample age ranged from 17 to 55 years old with the majority of the sample aged 21-35 years old.
- Almost half of the sample live with parents (46.7%), others living alone (46.7%) or in another living situation (6.6%).
- The majority of the sample was male (53.3%) vs. female (46.7%).
- 12 of the 15 are enrolled in the HCBS-SLS waiver, 3 are enrolled in the HCBS-DD waiver

Case Study Demographics

Member	Waiver	Support Level	Living Situation	Age	Gender	Res Hab Eligibility
1	SLS	SL 1	Lives Alone with no paid family caregivers, but non-paid family supports	25	male	Not Eligible
2	SLS	SL 1	Lives with Parents	29	Female	Not Eligible
3	SLS	SL 2	Lives Alone	23	Male	Eligible
4	SLS	SL 2	Lives with Parents	25	Male	Eligible
5	SLS	SL 2	Lives in separate apartment in Parents Home	38	Male	Eligible
6	SLS	SL 3	Lives Alone, and gets unpaid support from her Mother	36	Female	Eligible
7	SLS	SL 2	Lives with Mother/Guardian	36	Male	Eligible
8	DD	SL 5	Lives with Parents-paid Family Caregivers/IRSS	31	Female	Eligible
9	SLS	SL 1	Lives Alone with no paid family caregivers	34	Female	Not Eligible
10	SLS	SL 2	Lives with Parents	29	Male	Eligible
11	SLS	SL 2	Lives with Parents who provide ongoing unpaid supports	20	Female	Eligible
12	DD	SL 3	Lives in IRSS (Residential) Services	20	Female	Eligible and enrolled in the Residential Habilitation Service currently
13	DD	SL 2	Lives in IRSS (Residential) Services in a Host Home	54	Male	Eligible and enrolled in the Residential Habilitation Service currently
14	SLS	SL 2	Lives with Parents	24	Male	Eligible
15	SLS	SL 2	Lives with Parents who provide paid family caregiver supports	20	Female	Eligible

Needs Based Criteria Overview

- A member is assumed to have daily support needs (Needs Based Criteria) if at least 1 of the SIS activities (ADLs in 8 categories) meets the minimum threshold. All 3 SIS Scores, across the ADL (Type, Frequency, DST/Time) must meet the minimum threshold. (12 of 15 in sample met NBC)
- Can also meet NBC if member needs assistance for any combination of 3 or more services at least once a day, with *Monitoring* Type and *less than 30 minutes* DST/Time Scores (we did not have any such members with our sample).

Needs Based Criteria Overview

Washington Daily Supports Needs			
SIS Activity	Minimum Type Score	Minimum Frequency Score	Minimum Daily Support Time
A2: Bathing and taking care of personal hygiene and grooming needs	2 Verbal /Gesture Prompt	3 At least once a day, but not hourly	1 Less than 30 minutes
A3: Using the toilet	2 Verbal /Gesture Prompt	3 At least once a day, but not hourly	1 Less than 30 minutes
A4: Dressing	2 Verbal /Gesture Prompt	3 At least once a day, but not hourly	1 Less than 30 minutes
A6: Eating food	2 Verbal /Gesture Prompt	3 At least once a day, but not hourly	1 Less than 30 minutes
A9: Using currently prescribed equipment or treatment	2 Verbal /Gesture Prompt	3 At least once a day, but not hourly	1 Less than 30 minutes
E1: Taking medication	2 Verbal /Gesture Prompt	3 At least once a day, but not hourly	1 Less than 30 minutes
E2: Ambulating and moving about	3 Partial Physical Assistance	3 At least once a day, but not hourly	1 Less than 30 minutes
E3: Avoiding health and safety hazards	1 Monitoring	3 At least once a day, but not hourly	1 Less than 30 minutes
OR			
Any combination of 3 of the SIS activities listed above	1 Monitoring	3 At least once a day, but not hourly	1 Less than 30 minutes

Study Limitations

- Sample development: The original intent was to draw a sample from the Phase 1 study yet despite efforts to contact 45 individuals from Phase 1, less than a quarter agreed to sign the HIPAA form allowing us to use their case.
- 100.2 Assessment: The review of ADL assessment scoring and notes were a critical factor in informing the case reviewers' input on each case, but it was clear from that data that there was significant variability regarding the level of specificity in the narrative information to support the scores on the 100.2
- Sample size: It is important to note that the sample size does limit the applicability of trends to the greater HCBS system. The Bolton Cost Model and Phase I Case Studies provide aggregate trends- this was intended to be real-life examples

Reviewer Feedback

- Many individuals were younger, living with parents and therefore not yet “tested” by circumstantial/environmental/“life” factors
- Parental support was not always clearly outlined in 100.2 assessment, and so these “silent supports” were hard to account for accurately
- 100.2 assessment notes taken by the case managers at times were conflicting in terms of actual client needs or lacked key details.

Quantitative/Qualitative Results

- Of the 15 individuals in the sample, 80 percent were Res Hab eligible based on the Needs Based Criteria.
- Case Review Findings:
 - 2 Cases did not have LTC 100.2 & NBC alignment
 - Insufficient or inconsistent information in the LTC narrative compared to the LTC scores, made it difficult for Reviewers to confidently agree on alignment
 - Reviewers identified 3 areas in particular that were not adequately captured in the NBC: Mental Health issues, Executive Functions limitations, “Silent Supports”

Quantitative/Qualitative Results (cont.)

Case Review Findings (continued):

- In all 12 cases that met the NBC, Reviewers agreed the members have the characteristics requiring Res Hab
- In the 3 cases that did not meet the NBC, the majority felt this was accurate, while a minority indicated that there was not enough information to confidently agree that these 3 members did not need Res Hab
- Reviewers identified that several members have had what seems to be limited exposure, experiences and opportunities in “the real world”, and a transitional service would be beneficial to prepare these members for a move to more independent living.
- Reviewers noted that several members/families were not taking full advantage of HCBS and non-HCBS Resources available and wondered if this could defer the need for Res

Reviewer Feedback: Additional Data Needed

- Critical incident reports,
- Validating some scores with caregiver or family member or case manager, through key informant interviews would paint a clearer picture of each case,
- Eviction or law enforcement activity information,
- Assessment timing,
- Local community information as related to access to services (ie: housing), and
- Other services including medical information not included in the 100.2 or NBC.

Key Takeaways

- Small sample study provides initial window into the usability of the NBC and applicability to real-life members and situations
- Additional helpful steps would include:
 - ▣ Interviews with families/case managers
 - ▣ A broader review of other data sources (medical services, housing access, criminal records, etc.)
 - ▣ Corroborating information should be obtained through the BRIDGE system for these 15 Members
 - ▣ Data review of anomalies noted in the Bolton Cost Model (e.g. Members in SL 5 not eligible for Res Hab)

Follow-up Completed

- The Department heard the panel requests for specific follow up:
 - ▣ Critical Incident Reports
 - ▣ BUS and BRIDGE corroborating data
 - ▣ Telephone or email key informant interviews to solicit more information

Follow up Results and Trends



Behavioral Supports
Needs not
adequately captured



“Silent” Supports



Aging Caregivers



Maximize existing
HCBS & community
resources



24/7 emergency
backup



Transition Services-
Dignity of Risk and
Real life testing

Alignment with new LTSS Assessment

- No decisions have been made about how the Department will proceed; the Department is considering how the NBC could be used for Targeting Criteria within the Assessment
- The new LTSS Assessment includes triggers for the specific waivers and specific levers can be “pulled” to identify if a Member meets the Targeting Criteria for a waiver
- All 8 of the ADLs in the NBC map directly across to Modules/Items in the new LTSS Assessment
- Modifications can be made to the NBC to better refine and capture the need for Res Hab, as appropriate

NBC SIS Activity ADL:	ULTC 100.2 Item:	AT Module:	Item #
A2: Bathing	Bathing	Functioning-ADLs: Item 3. Bathing	3
A2: Personal Hygiene	N/A	Functioning-ADLs: Item 7. Personal Hygiene & 6C Oral Hygiene	7 & 6C
A3: Using the Toilet	Toileting	Functioning-ADLs: Item 5. Toileting	5
A4: Dressing	Dressing	Functioning-ADLs: Item 4. Dressing	4
A6: Eating Food	Eating	Functioning-ADLs: Item 6A. Eating	6A
A9: Using currently prescribed equipment or treatment	N/A	Functioning-ADLs & Health: Embedded throughout all ADLs & Health Item 8. Treatments & Monitoring and 9. Therapies	3,4,5,6,7 and 8 & 9
E1: Taking Medication	Supervision Memory/Cog and/or Supervision/Behavior	Functioning-IADLs & Health: IADLs Item 1. Medication Management and Health 5. Medications Management	2.1 and 5.5
E2: Ambulating & Moving About	Mobility	Functioning-ADLs: Item 1. Walking 2. Transfers	1 & 2
E3: Avoiding Health & Safety Hazards	Supervision/Behavior	Safety & Self Preservation: Items 1. Emergency Safety & 2. Personal Safety and Housing & Environment: Item 1. Environmental Safety	1 & 2 1
Exceptional Medical	Supervision Memory/Cog?	Health: All Items 1-14	Items 1-14
Exceptional Behavioral	Supervision/ Behavior	Psychosocial: All Items	All Items

Questions and Follow-up?



- Any additional trends?
- Specific elements to the NBC that need to be added/considered?
- Programmatic or Structural changes to address trends?
- Technology use considerations?
- What would you like to discuss with the Assessment Stakeholder group?
- What still concerns you about the NBC?
- Other questions?

Next Steps

Discuss with the Larger Waiver Redesign Group on July 7th to garner additional feedback

HCBS Strategies Analysis for alignment with LTSS Assessment using A/SP Pilot Sample

Alignment with new LTSS Assessment (NBC=Targeting Criteria)