



**Access & Choice/Assessment Tools**

**Technical Subgroup Summary:**

**Date of Meeting: June 30, 2011**

**Attendees:**

Jerry Huber (Access and Choice Team Lead)  
 Lauren Lange  
 John Kemmer (Fiscal Sustainability Team)  
 John Maltby (Access and Choice Team)  
 Neil Mitchell

Maryellen Moeser  
 Chris Nemeth (Access and Choice)  
 Peter Smergut (Access and Choice)  
 Anne Swartwout

Discussion Topics	Summary of Main Discussion Points, Considerations, Recommendations, Next Steps, etc.
Background and Overview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maryellen presented an overview of the Access and Choice Design Team discussion related to needs assessment tools and support factors and why the Access and Choice Design Team wanted a technical subgroup formed to look at assessment tools and report back to them.</li> <li>• Since this is a topic that spans design teams and is foundational to the People First Waiver, the Fiscal Sustainability Team has assigned John Kemmer to work on the subgroup and the Care Coordination Team will be assigning and/or closely coordinating with the subgroup's efforts.</li> <li>• As a reminder of the overall scope of the Design Teams, the subgroup reviewed the charter questions related to needs assessment tools to help inform the scope of the technical workgroup. It was noted that the charter questions are broad and relate to fundamental questions such as factors that should be taken into account in needs assessment and that this is a very complex area and therefore we should ensure that we keep our focus on the big picture right now in terms of the charters and that later on we would get into more detailed analysis possibly with the help of a consultant.</li> </ul>
Review and Refine Purpose and Scope of Technical Workgroup and how it relates to Charter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subgroup members agreed to the following as their scope and purpose:  <i>The purpose of the Needs Assessment Tools Technical Subgroup is</i></li> </ul>



	<p><i>to review selected needs assessment instruments utilized in other states/systems (e.g., Supports Intensity Scale (SIS), the Inventory for Client and Agency Planning (ICAP), Connecticut Level of Need (LON) instrument; Florida Situational Questionnaire, and the CAANS DD) for identifying individual supports/service needs and resulting resource allocations for people with developmental disabilities. Key questions for the subgroup to explore include the following:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>What is missing from the New York State Developmental Disabilities Profile (DDP) that is in the SIS, ICAP, CON LON, Florida Situational, and CAANS? What is the value of these missing factors in terms of needs assessment in these other instruments that should be considered in needs assessment for the People First Waiver and why?</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>How do the needs assessment instruments take into account the needs of subpopulations such as people who are dually diagnosed, medically frail, children, forensics/risk issues, other subpopulations?</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>2. <i>What is the process and administrative framework for administering the instruments, and managing the assessment system?</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>How is person-centered planning and individual life goals integrated with the needs assessment instruments?</i></li> <li>- <i>How does the needs assessment process lead to a comprehensive care plan?</i></li> <li>- <i>How are changes in life circumstances taken into account after the assessment has been completed and resources, supports and services allocated? How often are needs reassessed? What triggers reassessment?</i></li> <li>- <i>What are the organizations that administer the needs assessment and what is the role of the state in the process?</i></li> <li>- <i>What are the qualifications of the organizations and specific individuals who conduct the needs assessments? What are the training requirements and expectations for ongoing training for individuals who conduct needs assessment?</i></li> <li>- <i>How are individuals and families apprised of how the needs assessment instruments work—i.e., is it transparent? Are individuals and families trained on the instruments?</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>3. <i>How are the needs assessment instruments used to allocate resources (is it through capitated payments, individual budget allocations, allocations of units of service, etc.). How does the methodology work? What needs are carved out for purposes of the funding methodology? Is the needs assessment instrument used to determine the medical needs of the person? Is the instrument used for all individuals in the system or just new participants?</i></li> <li>4. <i>How is quality determined with the various instruments? How is quality oversight of the needs assessment process conducted?</i></li> </ol>
--	---





	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. <i>What input was obtained on these various instruments from people who receive services such as self-advocates and/or how do stakeholders feel about the use of the specific instruments?</i></li> <li>6. How did the states associated with the instruments reviewed come to use the instrument? Was there a shift from a different instrument? How was the transition implemented?</li> <li>7. What are the overall strengths and weaknesses of the instruments reviewed?</li> </ol>
<p>Overview of OPWDD Policy Work in this area to date</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chris Nemeth presented on work that the Policy Division did with regard to a potential supplement to the DDP which would have been used for the purpose of developing individualized budgets. The Policy Division’s focus was on the Connecticut level of need (LON) instrument as it included areas of community safety and natural supports that were missing from the 20 year old Developmental Disabilities Profile (DDP).</li> <li>• The OPWDD Choices electronic recordkeeping system made the DDP-2 format electronic. The content of the DDP-2 was not changed, but instructions were updated and clarified.</li> <li>• The DDP-2 is used in several reports to the Department of Health (DOH) and the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS).</li> </ul>
<p>Other items to be considered</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the fiscal component of assessment, it needs to be kept in mind, what services/needs will be carved out (e.g. certain medical services).</li> <li>• When an assessment tool will be implemented, how did states shift to using this assessment and how did states manage the transition from the assessment tool being used for fiscal allocations?</li> <li>• As the 1115 is a Demonstration Waiver, it is possible that a few assessment tools could be used in a pilot stage as part of the demonstration.</li> <li>• Consider getting input not only from the states in which the assessment tool is being used, but also from providers or individuals</li> </ul>
<p>Next Steps</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was agreed that each subgroup member will review an assessment instrument and answer the questions in the subgroup charter above by July 25, 2011. A written template will be provided to subgroup members.</li> <li>• Maryellen Moeser or a designee will create one document</li> </ul>





	<p>from the templates received that will be presented to the Access and Choice Design Team and other design teams to aid them in making recommendations related to their Design Team charters. This document will be produced in early August. The 4<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Access and Choice Design Team will be focused on answering the needs assessment questions in the charter using the sub-groups products.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At this time, there does not appear to be a need to have another subgroup meeting although we will do a check-in on July 13<sup>th</sup> after the Access and Choice Design Team meeting (this subgroup meeting will tentatively take place from 1:30 PM to 3:00 PM on July 13<sup>th</sup>).</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Deliverable:</u></b> Answer questions in sub-group charter for each instrument to be reviewed and provide in the requested format (format TBD).</p> <p><b><u>Proposed Workplan:</u></b></p> <table style="margin-left: 40px;"> <tr> <td style="padding-right: 20px;">July 13<sup>th</sup></td> <td>Provide status report to Access and Choice Design Team. Sub-group Meeting for check-in 1:30-3:00 PM (after full Access and Choice DT Meeting).</td> </tr> <tr> <td>July 25<sup>th</sup></td> <td>Deliverables due from assignees. Charter Questions answered for each instrument and submitted to Maryellen Moeser</td> </tr> <tr> <td>August 1st</td> <td>Integrated sub-group deliverable provided back to group members to be used for discussions and to make recommendations in Access and Choice DT (4<sup>th</sup> meeting) and other Design Teams as appropriate to their charters.</td> </tr> </table>	July 13 <sup>th</sup>	Provide status report to Access and Choice Design Team. Sub-group Meeting for check-in 1:30-3:00 PM (after full Access and Choice DT Meeting).	July 25 <sup>th</sup>	Deliverables due from assignees. Charter Questions answered for each instrument and submitted to Maryellen Moeser	August 1st	Integrated sub-group deliverable provided back to group members to be used for discussions and to make recommendations in Access and Choice DT (4 <sup>th</sup> meeting) and other Design Teams as appropriate to their charters.
July 13 <sup>th</sup>	Provide status report to Access and Choice Design Team. Sub-group Meeting for check-in 1:30-3:00 PM (after full Access and Choice DT Meeting).						
July 25 <sup>th</sup>	Deliverables due from assignees. Charter Questions answered for each instrument and submitted to Maryellen Moeser						
August 1st	Integrated sub-group deliverable provided back to group members to be used for discussions and to make recommendations in Access and Choice DT (4 <sup>th</sup> meeting) and other Design Teams as appropriate to their charters.						

Subgroup Assignments	Owner	Due Date
Create template/grid for answering questions about	Maryellen Moeser	July 1, 2011



Courtney Burke  
Commissioner



Andrew M. Cuomo  
Governor



Nirav R. Shah, M.D.  
Commissioner



other assessment tools		
Review Supports Intensity Scale ( <b>SIS</b> ) and submit written answers to questions	John Maltby	July 25, 2011
Review Inventory for Client and Agency Planning ( <b>ICAP</b> ) and submit written answers	Peter Smergut	July 25, 2011
Review <b>Connecticut Level of Need (LON)</b> and submit written answers	Chris Nemeth	July 25, 2011
Review <b>Florida Situational Questionnaire</b> and submit written answers	Barbara Wale	July 25, 2011
Review the <b>DDP-2 adaptations</b> from other states (e.g., Kansas and Ohio adapted the DDP) and submit written answers	John Kemmer	July 25, 2011
Review <b>Wisconsin functional screen</b> and submit written answers	Jerry Huber/Lauren Lange	July 25, 2011
Review Child, Adolescent, and Adult needs and strengths ( <b>CAANS</b> ) and submit written questions	Anne Swartwout	July 25, 2011

**Additional Documents of Reference**

1. Assessment Instruments and Community Services Rate Determination: Review and Analysis (6/30/06-prepared by HSRI for Colorado, Gary Smith and Jon Fortune)  
<http://www.hsri.org/news-events/assessment-instruments-and-community-services-rate-determination-revie/>  
 (Note: helpful in providing general info about tools, strengths and weaknesses, and how some states have adapted instruments for resource allocation and websites for further review).
2. DDP-2 Supplement Draft from CT LON (attached).
3. Oregon Rebar: <http://www.oregon.gov/DHS/dd/rebar/2008.shtml>

	Where to get it/Resources
<b>SIS</b>	<a href="http://www.siswebsite.org/cs/SISwhitepaper">http://www.siswebsite.org/cs/SISwhitepaper</a> <a href="http://www.aiddjournals.org/doi/full/10.1352/2009.114%3A3-14">http://www.aiddjournals.org/doi/full/10.1352/2009.114%3A3-14</a> <a href="http://www.oregon.gov/DHS/dd/rebar/2008.shtml">http://www.oregon.gov/DHS/dd/rebar/2008.shtml</a>
<b>ICAP</b>	<a href="http://icaptool.com/">http://icaptool.com/</a> <a href="http://www.oadd.org/publications/journal/issues/vol11no2/download/palucka&amp;homatidis.pdf">http://www.oadd.org/publications/journal/issues/vol11no2/download/palucka&amp;homatidis.pdf</a>





<b>CT LON</b>	<a href="http://www.ct.gov/dds/lib/dds/forms/lon/ctlon.pdf">http://www.ct.gov/dds/lib/dds/forms/lon/ctlon.pdf</a> <a href="http://www.ct.gov/dds/lib/dds/forms/lon/ct lon manual.pdf">http://www.ct.gov/dds/lib/dds/forms/lon/ct lon manual.pdf</a> <a href="http://www.ct.gov/dds/lib/dds/webcast/2009_0430/webinar lon.pdf">http://www.ct.gov/dds/lib/dds/webcast/2009_0430/webinar lon.pdf</a>
<b>Florida Situational</b>	<a href="http://apd.myflorida.com/waiver/docs/qsi-version-4.pdf">http://apd.myflorida.com/waiver/docs/qsi-version-4.pdf</a>
<b>CAANS DD</b>	<a href="http://www.praedfoundation.org/About%20the%20CANS.html">http://www.praedfoundation.org/About%20the%20CANS.html</a>
<b>Wisconsin Functional Assessment</b>	<a href="http://www.dhs.wisconsin.gov/forms/F0/f00366.pdf">http://www.dhs.wisconsin.gov/forms/F0/f00366.pdf</a>
<b>DDP other states</b>	<p>The DDP of Indiana  <a href="http://www.in.gov/fssa/files/OAForumFAQMay07.pdf">http://www.in.gov/fssa/files/OAForumFAQMay07.pdf</a>                      North Carolina info  <a href="http://www.ncdhhs.gov/mhddsas/ncsnap/ncsnap-article-1-3-07.pdf">http://www.ncdhhs.gov/mhddsas/ncsnap/ncsnap-article-1-3-07.pdf</a></p>

[https://](https://...)  
 200202  
 20Instru  
 20Devel  
 20Disab




Courtney Burke  
 Commissioner



Andrew M. Cuomo  
 Governor



Nirav R. Shah, M.D.  
 Commissioner