

**Participant Directed Programs Policy Collaborative
July 27, 2022**

**DRAFT Stakeholder Notes DRAFT
For Stakeholder Review & Approval**

The meeting opened at 1:00 p.m. and housekeeping and other preliminary matters were handled. There were 55 people in attendance. Bold indicates a decision was made. Italics indicate action steps committed.

June minutes were approved with these changes:

- Kelly was spelled incorrectly (not Kelli)
- Renee suggested a change to work to month re PALCO on page 3.
- On page 4 change client to employee re termination
- On page 5 put a space between an and increase

OPEN FORUM #1:

- Nicole Arens - PALCO wanted to clarify that Jason Smith works for PALCO. He does more system updates and improvements and she does day-to-day.
- Jessica Corral said Kitten Sheridan has to step away from the attendance role after this month and we need to find someone new for the future. Let Jessica know --also Julie is not available to do the minutes in August. From Jessica Corral - HCPF: To volunteer to take over managing the voting rights list please reach out to John or the Participant Directed Programs Unit: John.R.Barry@state.co.us, HCPF_PDP@state.co.us or you may call 303-866-3504 to volunteer
- Patricia Martinez--she heard if one was on a waiver service could be approved for 5 years at a time. No one was sure what this was about. All waiver services are approved for only one year at a time.
- From Robin Bolduc via chat: What is the average amount of time from application to getting on CDASS? A friend I am helping, applied in January, got EBD intake over 2 months ago and still hasn't got a case manager. I assumed the intake which took 2 hours would be the case manager, but I guess not. Despite their writing RMHS and me writing the state, nothing more has occurred so I can't even begin the AR process.
 - From Dani Comstock- Hi Robin, can you please email hcpf_pdp@state.co.us or call me at 303-866-6138 with this specific case information for the Department to look into further?

CDASS PAR REVISION:

Cheryl Brown from Rocky Mt Health Plans presented the following regarding what case managers have to go through when revising a PAR for any reason including any rate change. (PAR=Prior Authorization Review)

Complexity--very complicated and takes a lot of time. This holds up PAR which means people cannot bill.

Holding up PAR by system: For the 7/1 revision (increases effective 7/1) case managers got emails around 5/25 saying the PARs for a 6/1 start date were going to be held up and clients could not bill. This is a problem as a number of clients will have a renewal each month so regular ongoing approvals have to go forward each month even if other things are happening. The system should not be allowed to just stop things.

If the case manager makes an error in a task worksheet or any other human error the case management agency cannot fix the error in house. They are forced to go to Gainwell, which is the contractor. Then it takes weeks --the person is held up and cannot bill on their PAR.

Her suggestion is to give supervisors the ability to edit so the case management agency could fix this and prevent the crisis for the client not being able to bill. Julie suggested we make the supervisor have the ability to edit a formal recommendation. She said she had seen this problem with clients.

Rebecca from PPL said emails (referred to by Cheryl) did not go out saying that they would not process without revision. She said emails are based on a script. The problem is that there is a gap between when the FMS runs the script and when Gainwell is ready. There is a window of time when the PAR is not going to match. The FMS knew they were supposed to be ready on 6/1, but Gainwell was not ready for a week later. That is the part of the struggle of two systems that do not talk to each other. If someone has an existing PAR there should be no disruption but if the year ends it would be a disruption. This is a serious problem as it can cause labor law violations to occur.

From Kendra Sitton: I agree with Cheryl. That's a great suggestion about having supervisor capabilities to fix those issues as part of the PAR revisions. Veteran CMs and supervisors spend a LOT of time fixing CM errors for these revisions because they are so complex. If things must escalate to the gainwell helpdesk, it is nearly impossible to get a response to get the issues resolved. I'd say almost 99% of our helpdesk tickets did not get resolved with the last revision until we also reached out to HCPF for support. From Rita Noland I like the idea of giving supervisors the ability to make corrections

Dani from HCPF said that the Department is aware of issues and suggestions and will take that back/ She said that if there were errors causing someone to not be paid to contact HCPF and they would resolve that situation. She said if there are any outstanding cases to send to HCPF.

EVV IMPROVEMENT DISCUSSION

This is a time to discuss what has worked and what has not worked over the past month:

What worked: PACLO did a new application in 3 days

What did not work:

Significant problems with the app, more reflective of prior months.

The app has rejected a new aide ID despite accurate entry. The same problem happened 5 months ago, aides had to reach out to PALCO --then PALCO sent a new ID or password, here we are with the same problem, so it has not been resolved.

New aide spent a lot of time to no avail, she will be paid for the time. Client lost another chunk of the budget while PACLO had no consequences.

Why do they have to enter her ID each time she signs in --name shows up but cannot select the name, have to do a lot of entries.

Codes to report problems only assume aide error, success rate about 25% for signing in and out Cannot clock in and out.

Cannot remove past aides, paclo says they do not work with tech end but can reach out Should say provide evidence when possible as this is not always possible.

When Mary Michael reported problem to authenticare they say user error, It says on the website it works without cellular services, but it does not. They have to disconnect from cellular and reconnect with wifi to make it work.

Ghost shift reported after employee already clocked in and it was there for days App does not allow screenshots making it hard to prove these things and PALCO does not believe it.

Ghost shifts cause fraud and one case is documents.

One person had duplicate shifts for all employees --she reached out to PPL and they did not respond so the client did not know which set to approve. She approved one set to get rid of ghost shifts, the system approved both doubling expenses for pay period.

Mark got a ton of notices from PALCO that aides had not filed paperwork as live-in aides to be exempt from EVV, they had turned paperwork in after first, he kept email saying they got it. Then the deadline passed and they stopped the exemption. While they fixed after it was brought to attention and he is worried others had problems and did not get it fixed. Link to the CDASS IHSS feedback form is hard to find.

Mary Michael Justice shared a screen to show links with PPL --link and email to report problems to HCPF this is what we asked for and would like everywhere (PALCO and HCPF). There is no searchable link on PALCO. The HCPF link is not easy to find either.

From Nicole: The feedback form is also on our website two times, once under News and Resources and also in our Mobile app. <https://palcofirst.com/colorado/> Consumer Direct, CDCO has also placed the Feedback links in our contact section: <https://consumerdirectco.com/contact/>

Nicole said that the EVV exemption is not connected with taxes. Nicole said PALCO did not get complaints and clients said they have given up going to PALCO.

PPL response was to ask that any issues be brought to their attention through the EVV help desk 833-204-9041. They take all feedback and go internal and follow up. They need to be able to recreate the issue. She wants info on when something is not followed through-- customer service forwards to EVV helpdesk, she didn't see anything.

Jessica: She got the link for complaints in all FMS newsletters, and to CDCO. She will work with IT to work on search functionality for HCPF. HCPF has a meeting with PALCO about the ghost shifts using examples given to figure out how to fix it. Jessica acknowledged this is NOT user error. It creates significant problems. She said it is taking time to figure this out. She said that the live-in caregiver issue was isolated but she wants to hear if there are other issues. Mary Michael said statistically based on what we have proven problems are likely NOT user error. She said for at least for 6 months it should be assumed to be app error until proven otherwise. Mary Michael and Kelly were thanked for making the effort to facilitate, document and speak up.

We then went into breakout rooms for discussions between specific groups (clients/advocates/AR; IHSS, and other issues) followed by a break.

WORKGROUP REPORT OUT:

IHSS officially discontinued and will move to IHSS breakout in PDPPC Agency as AR--finalized form going into circulation 9/1. There will be a "Shared responsibility pla. 2 forms discontinuing, one is agency responsibility form, 2nd is AR designation form. There will be a 2 week notice before the form is due.

Background check: A new memo is coming out per the group agreement. They are working with CDCO to develop educational resources. This is getting to tail end she is thankful for input and still open to hearing from people.

FMS ANNUAL SATISFACTION SURVEY:

Katie Spaid gave the history and timeline of the survey. There were extensive handouts provided in advance of the meeting. She reviewed the reports for both FMS companies. The response rate is in line with the national average for similar surveys. She explained the likert scale and different parts of the survey. A couple people reported not getting surveys. Jessica said people should reach out to her if you did not get a survey. Several people said we needed to have more relevant questions and be able to better compare FMS. Another comment was that we should rely on FMS more for reporting items such as how many calls they get and for what issues, how many required escalations, if call back was required, was client contacted and how long until contact was made? There will be more discussion in August re improving the survey.

UTILIZATION REVIEW UTILIZATION MANAGEMENT (URUM) UPDATE:

(This is the Telligen process)

Dani Comstock said that they acknowledge the case manager workload issue and are trying to deal with this with Telligen. They are also having more office hours for case managers and trying to simplify the process. She said that we may not need monthly URUM meetings and suggested a change to quarterly updates with stats and other issues. She asked if the URUM group is an overlap? Should updates just be here quarterly with the understanding that if there was a bigger issue a small short term group can happen without committing to an ongoing committee. People liked the idea so this will be implemented.

NCAPPS Update (National Center on Advancing Person-Centered Practices and Systems)
Sandy gave the report and said that they continue to progress on goals of supporting the workforce, looking at a lot of the data. She invited anyone in the group to reach out to her or anyone on the team with questions or thoughts.

PDPPC RECOMMENDATION PROCESS:

Kevin went over the current formal recommendation process as of today, which has been going on for years. They have a template that co chairs use to take the data from a meeting. They take this and put into the proper format identifying if this is a policy or operational recommendation. Then it goes to PDPPC for a vote. Then sent to HCPF if approved. Julie made the operational recommendation to ask HCPF to allow case management agency supervisors to fix PAR errors. There were no objections

Mary Michael suggested recommendations about getting data about the case management outcomes and quality. She will submit the details to Kevin and it will be discussed at the next meeting.

PDPPC PROPOSALS IN DEVELOPMENT:

Liability -this is about the FMS getting liability insurance for clients that want it. Mark Simon said that he read responses from FMS. He said PALCO did not seem to understand the question. We have employer liability coverage on some issues through workers comp. What we do not have is coverage for employer practices. These are different. This needs to be a standing agenda item until we decide if we should pursue it or not. Sandy said it would be a discount individual policy like workers compensation. The decision is about whether it is worth it. They cannot know the cost until they get bids, and they need to know how many people would take the insurance. The costs are based on the level of risk and size of the pool. Mark suggested inviting an insurance expert to attend the next meeting, Kevin asked if he had an idea of who. Mark said no but he recently got a new insurance broker and will ask. Subcontractor issues-not discussed.

Nathan had sent a proposal about allowing ARs to be paid as attendants. One proposal was just allowing this in times of emergency like the middle of the night, or very short shifts. Another was a broader ask and he said when we discuss it he would like to focus at least initially on the narrower allowance. We did not discuss this due to lack of time.

OPEN FORUM #2:

- Gerrie: Because some of these ongoing issues have not been allotted sufficient time we should plan for more time and move them up on agenda before breakout session. Then if needed we can discuss in breakout sessions and come back to the vote. Nathan agreed with Gerrie, to stop cutting the stuff at the bottom of the list. He asked people to read the proposal and focus on the immediate need.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Notes taken by Julie Reiskin