



Access and Choice Design Team Meeting Summary

Access and Choice Design Team	Date of Meeting: June 20, 2011
--------------------------------------	---------------------------------------

<p>Present: Bradley Pivar; Shameka Andrews; Joe Gerardi; John Maltby; Chris Nemeth; Shelly Okure; Wendy Orzel; Peter Smergut; Maryellen Moeser (OPWDD coordinator).</p> <p>Absent: Gerald Huber; John Gleason; Barbara Wale.</p>
--

Discussion Topics	Summary of Main Discussion Points, Considerations, Recommendations, Next Steps, etc.
-------------------	--

<p>Overview of briefing material and key questions for design team.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The team discussed the briefing materials outlined in the Access and Choice Design Team PowerPoint including eligibility and access to OPWDD’s service system, the tools currently used in OPWDD’s system for various purposes related to needs assessment and service planning, and challenges in the current system related to access and choice including some strengths and weaknesses of OPWDD’s Developmental Disabilities Profile (DDP). • Additional challenges identified by design team members include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ perception across the system that individuals will lose benefits if they work full-time and this is a significant deterrent to seeking employment for people with developmental disabilities (applicable to the Benefits and Services Design Team); ✓ balancing abilities and strength based approaches with the needs assessment and still access funding streams;
---	---





Access and Choice Design Team Meeting Summary

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Individuals/family members fear that once services and supports that are no longer needed are given up, they will not be able to access them again when needed; ✓ inconsistent awareness and availability of service options such as Consolidated and Supports and Services (CSS) (Benefits and Services Design Team); ✓ lack of incentives for people to move from twenty-four hour staffed residential settings to less restrictive settings and for providers to offer this option and work with individuals on this goal/transition; and ✓ perception that OPWDD’s system provides the “Cadillac service package or nothing”
<p>Guided Brainstorming:</p> <p>(a) What are the factors and support needs that should be considered in a needs assessment instrument that will drive resource allocation decision making for people with developmental disabilities?</p> <p>(b) What are the factors that should be considered in the administration of a systems-wide needs assessment that will drive resource allocation decision making?</p>	<p>The team discussed the following factors and considerations related to needs assessment and equitable resource allocation and proposed that a technical workgroup be formed to look at needs assessment tools from other states (see action items below) to supplement this list:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent assessments: the team discussed the need for an unbiased party to perform the assessments, to have a quality review of assessments, and to ensure accuracy and other checks and balances in the needs assessment system. The entity/organization that conducts the needs assessment should be independent from providers that get paid to deliver supports and services. • Flexibility: Needs assessment that drives resource allocation needs to build in flexibility to address emergency and crisis needs without staffing for these emergencies all the time. Flexibility is needed to adapt to changes in the





Access and Choice Design Team Meeting Summary

	<p>person’s support needs (e.g., if a primary caregiver is ill). The needs assessment cannot be on “automatic pilot”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Predictability: resources are available when people need them but people do not need to grasp resources/services all at once because of fear of resources/services not being available when needed. Consider level of support/resources that are needed on the person’s worst day. • Strength-based approach: The strengths of the person need to be a part of the needs assessment process. In addition, the ability of the person to make decisions and self-advocate should also be assessed. • Qualifications and Checks and Balances: The needs assessment tool is only as good as the person conducting the needs assessment and the information that is available. There needs to be consistency in qualifications, training for people that complete the assessments, independent quality review of assessments, and other checks and balances in the system. • No Wrong Door: Adequate qualifications and training was further discussed in relation to the concept of “No Wrong Door”. It was noted by a design team member that everyone involved in the service delivery system, even individuals who answer phones, should have adequate training and information so they don’t send people to the wrong door which often happens today (a self-advocate noted that it could sometimes take 3 weeks to 3 months to find the right door with the current system). • Transparency: transparency and/or thorough use of web-based technology are components that need to be integrated in the needs assessment and resulting resource allocation process.
--	--





Access and Choice Design Team Meeting Summary

- Choice:** The team discussed that people need equal access to the full menu of services and that the advantages and disadvantages of each service needs to be articulated so that persons with developmental disabilities can make informed choices about the supports and services that can best meet their needs and goals (also relevant for Services and Benefits). The team believes that all individuals that choose to self-direct an individualized budget should have the right to do so. Also discussed was that a person should have the right to say “no” without having it deemed a “behavior”. It was noted that the right to privacy should be emphasized.
- Choice and Risk:** discussion on risks and choice related to needs assessment e.g., if the needs assessment indicates that a person needs a certain support to address health/safety risk factors but the person chooses not to receive the service, how would this be addressed especially if the provider and/or Managed Care Organization (MCO) is responsible for the health and safety of the person and assumes the risk.
- Community inclusion and Choice:** How much does the person want and how much does the person have access to now? This needs further discussion as the team felt that this was a “value” that is interpreted differently by the “system” and that community inclusion has different meaning that has evolved over time (e.g., used to mean a bus ride). The person should have a choice of community inclusion opportunities and how much is provided.
- Needs Assessment and Person-Centered Planning:** The team discussed that needs assessment included a person-centered planning component in that the needs assessment should take into account what the person’s life goals and desires are as well as their needs. Open question





Access and Choice Design Team Meeting Summary

	<p>for further exploration is how to connect needs assessment with person-centered planning.</p>
<p>Discussion Points related to other design team charters and open questions:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move away from defining programs and define outcomes instead (for consideration by Services and Benefits Team). • Use of the term “habilitation” drives policy that we are trying to make people “normal”—think about moving away from this terminology (for consideration by Services and Benefits Team). • Concern was expressed by a parent that “managed care” could be viewed as a disincentive to person-centered planning and self-direction (for consideration by Fiscal Sustainability Team e.g., incentivizing person-centered planning and self-direction).

Action Items

<u>Action Item</u>	<u>Owner</u>	<u>Due Date</u>
<p>Establish technical subgroup to review needs assessment tools from other states including the 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 to identify components that are missing from the developmental disabilities profile and to answer other key questions. John Maltby and Peter Smergut agreed to work on this technical subgroup with a designated and knowledgeable OPWDD staff person.</p>	<p>Jerry Huber</p>	<p>June 30, 2011</p>

Additional Documents of Reference

See resource guide.

Next Meeting Tentatively Scheduled for July 13, 2011 from 9:00 AM-12:30 PM

