

SCO Sub-Committee

April 11, 2019

Co-chairs Dan Sausman and Mary Jane Fletcher welcomed members, and everyone present introduced themselves. Leah Grove and Jen Fraker from ODP joined as guests.

Dan asked Joel Goldberg to give a brief explanation of what RCPSO is. Joel explained that it is a network of RCPA providers and SCOs that invested together to form a managed care organization. This was developed in order to be prepared to respond if/when services transition to managed care and also to give input into development of that system. All areas of service (brain injury, physical disabilities, MH, behavioral health, etc.) of RCPA members are represented. RCPSO members are developing a position paper regarding Managed Care and IDD.

Community Health Choices (CHC) is now being implemented in the second part of PA that was scheduled in the roll out. MCOs are required to have a network of services and are in need of Service Coordinators. As a result, some MCOs have been recruiting SCs from the IDD system and offering a much higher rate of pay and some attractive incentives (working from home). This has really hurt some SCOs. There are some positive reasons for individuals to move into CHC and there are also some issues with CHC. Some individuals have been mistakenly moved into CHC causing confusion and errors, some financial issues. For individuals who need nursing, there is an advantage as there is no cap, and they are entitled to services if they have multiple needs. And there is no waiting list. The MCOs are required to develop person-centered plans that cover all service needs including behavioral, pharmacy, medical, etc.

Joan Martin shared that Office of Long-Term Living has issued a Request for Information to gather ideas for redesigning/improving the entry for individuals to CHC. Determining eligibility, intake, broker information, transfers between waivers, etc. Also looking at having one entity handle all pieces (instead Maximus does one part, Aging Well does another, etc.) Response is due April 22, 2019. The plan then is to put out a draft RPI in May, and then in June, have the actual RFP out. January 2020 the new entity would be chosen and use of that new entity implemented by June 2020.

County Assistance Offices are currently overwhelmed with individuals transitioning into CHC and are getting mixed messages. They need to be included in the communication of how this process is implemented.

Jen Fraker and Leah Grove joined the meeting. Leah introduced herself and explained that her primary responsibility with ODP is working with QA&I and SCO issues. (She took Sonya Declet's position). Jen provided some general updates. Last week a communication went out regarding KeyPro webinars regarding scheduling coming up, please join at least one of the sessions. A user guide for the new SIS system is to be distributed. There have been many issues with Assessors not explaining the process or tool well to families, scheduling, and confirmation of assessments. There have been cases of Assessors making decisions without consensus of the group. Jen advised SCOs should either contact your ODP regional lead, or let Jen know right away if you are experiencing any problems with KeyPro or the SIS process. There will then be "meet and greets" scheduled with the new vendor. It has been a bumpy start and it was thought it would be best to wait for these meetings until everything was worked

out. They had decided to bring in a new IT vendor to develop a new scheduling system which has caused some issues. KeyPro asked SCOs to give a contact person/point person for your organization. It would be best to also have a back-up contact person. Jen will follow up regarding that and coordinate a point person session with KeyPro.

The TSM training session was cancelled since the bulletin is still not approved. There is language that also impacts the eligibility bulletin, particularly around individuals with autism only, that needs to be worked out. It is being reviewed at this time. TSM needs adjusted due to waivers that have started since the original bulletin was written, and the eligibility has changed due to the addition of individuals with autism. There is also confusion about CHC intersection, but not likely to impact TSM.

There are many questions currently regarding the eligibility changes and there will also be a new intake manual. BAS uses similar assessment tools but not the same as IDD. BAS will still be involved with the intake process in order to help with the eligibility process. There remains much that still needs to be worked out in the transition. When 6100 goes into effect, all SCOs will simply be SCOs, BAS will be rolled into SCO. Angela Fortney has more information and it would be helpful to have her attend a future meeting to discuss all of this information.

The question of whether SCOs are “stand alone” entities, or if they are considered providers was discussed. The Deputy Secretary believes SCOs are just that, not service providers. QA&I questions seem to blur the line. QA&I questions are being adjusted to add exploratory questions to determine readiness for Chapter 6100. There will be more questions this year, and at least one question is removed. Cycle Two will have many changes but since this is year three of Cycle One, there is a need to gather much of the same information as was collected the first two years.

SCO listening tours are happening around the state. Kristin Ahrens wanted to meet with SCOs face to face to hear about how SCOs are operating, listening to concerns, and gathering Best Practices ideas being utilized throughout the state, and is planning to develop an SCO Strategic Thinking group. She also completed listening tours with individuals and families, and one of their concerns is that they do not feel that SCs can answer many of their questions. Turnover definitely has an impact on the ability to answer questions. SCs also report that there is not room for advancement other than to a Supervisor position. There are differences between SCOs as some are private, and others are civil service. Much of the listening sessions is also regarding the LifeCourse with families, and how it is being utilized in different counties. Overall the sessions have been very helpful and are a good starting point to get conversation going with Kristin.

One SCO has implemented a Service or Community Navigator position to help families when they are entering the service world who can focus on eligibility. In Allegheny county the AE has a position who meets with families to complete intake and they complete the LifeCourse tool, so the “plan” is thought out at the beginning of entering into the “system”.

Interactions with the School system are sometimes challenging due to teachers not always understanding the process of getting a waiver, and misinforming families/teams. If individuals are not MA eligible, SCOs can also ask the counties if there may be base funds to cover services. Base funds are so limited and can only be stretched so far. SCOs may also chose to serve individuals basically for free. (This refers to individuals based on autism only eligibility when an individual loses their MA – AE’s currently decide whether to base fund SC service for them and most do not. SCO’s are then let in the position of serving the individual without funding or close them at whatever risk or consequence that may potentially occur). ODP is looking at TSM admin and how it is distributed across the state.

ODP is having conversations with national leaders to discuss how other states are handling SCOs roles in the Incident management process, and Certified Investigations. Some states who are having the

SCOs complete investigations, they are handled by a part of the SCO that is not Supports Coordinators are doing the investigations. There is of course the concern about SCs relationships with families and how it could be harmed by mixing the roles. ODP is really considering many different alternatives.

Managed Care discussion/work within ODP has stopped for now. At this time there is no movement towards this outcome for now. There is still a lot of conjecture about the future and this possibility among stakeholders.

A question was asked about the ISP “missing pages” in HCSIS. Jen believes it is fixed now. If issues happen, calling the Help Desk is the first step, but if they are not helpful, you can contact Jen for assistance. Sometimes they ask for a screenshot, but obviously that will not help if the screen is blank.

There is some confusion regarding CPS codes and rates for the new fiscal year. The draft rates are not acceptable to some providers, so there may be changes coming.

Individual Monitoring Tool changes – “Jen” informed SCs that something must be put into every comment section (questions are mandatory). The questions will be changing to be as meaningful as possible. The comment section will now be “discussion and observation”. If a person is not employed, and the first answer to the question about employment is No, then you do not fill out the rest of that section. Questions about CPS are going to added, in total thirty questions will be changed/enhanced in the tool, and the guidance will also be updated. Please remind your SCs that the tool is posted in the LMS and available to use.

SCs can pull data out in an extract report Check the Job aide in LMS for details. Questions will be reordered, and medications will not need to be entered anymore. SCs will choose the provider that is providing service the day the monitoring occurs.

Every quarter AEs and SCOs will have access to a report that will include monitoring tool questions that would indicate an issue of concern for individuals who are receiving Residential services. Shelly is developing this tool and has more details about how this will work.

Dan thanked Jen and Leah for coming and sharing information with the committee.

Meeting was adjourned.