Minnesota's Self Determination Project
A Developmental Disabilities Project Partnership - Blue Earth, Dakota, Olmsted Counties and DHS

System Redesign Work Group Meeting Minutes
May 6, 1999

Attending: Milt Conrath, Beth Fondell, Karen Courtney, Greg Kruse, Trish Reedstrom, Kathy Kading, Barb Roberts, Jill Slaikeu, Becky Fluegel

The purpose of the meeting was to develop the parameters for the focus group/action task force (See April meeting minutes)

The Workgroup addressed the following items: outcomes of task force, composition, guiding principles, frameworks, tasks and communication.

Outcomes:
- Provide a report for policy makers
- Provide action plan for change in regulation
- Propose legislative language for change
- Assure implementation of proposals as per the intent

Principles and frameworks:
- Karen will put together a detailed description of principles that build from freedom, authority and responsibility. The Workgroup will review these at the next meeting.

This may also include identifying the operational characteristics that make a task force successful and influential such as
  - Understanding the outcomes
  - Understanding the principles
  - Understanding roles
  - Use of subgroups and consultants
  - Communication and working relationships
  - Evaluation
  - Follow-along

Composition
- The composition and invitation letters will be drafted at the next meeting. Convenient meeting times will be important to assure full participation. The following individuals
were suggested.
Persons with disabilities
Legal advocacy (Ann Henry)
ARC (Bob Brick)
DHS
Corporate provider
Small providers
Local ARC
County representation
Regional county alliance representation
Legal reps (substitute decision makers)
DD Council or membership (i.e. Mary Fenske)
U of M (Charlie)

The purpose of the next meeting will be to detail time lines, work assignments, invitations and additional parameters. The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, May 27, 1999 from 9:30 am to 12:00 at the Dakota County offices in South St. Paul.

Tasks

Tasks identified may be done by the task force members, sub-groups and consultants.
Compile data (stories, rule/regulation information)
Provide rule and regulation review (facilitated)
  Identify related rules/statutes (Barb and Jill to put together)
  Links across all rules
  Identify language change and supporting language throughout
Identify community leaders
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System Redesign Meeting Minutes
4/15/99

Attending: Kathy Kading, Trish Reedstrom, Greg Kruse, Milt Conrath, Karen Courtney, Polly Owens, Becky Fluegel, Carol Estrada, Jill Slaikeu, Barb Roberts

This meeting was a follow-up to meetings that had occurred last fall and early winter regarding equity and access issues. County cost and recipient data was distributed.

The development of a capitation was discussed. The process, outcomes, and progress of the managed care demonstration were reviewed. Rate setting, risk sharing, and provider parameters were discussed with regards to what was needed for flexible funding.

**DT&H**

There is a need for individualized rates for DT&H. A task force may be formed as an outcome from some legislation, but more information is needed. Barb will contact Joan Warmington, DHS DT&H policy person, for details. More work with the DT&H associations is needed.

Jill reported that the bulletin announcing changes in supported employment will be distributed soon. Providers still need to be "Rule 38" providers, however contracting for an flexible rate is allowable.

It was felt that contacting the Rule 75 pilot programs for information and "lessons learned" would be helpful for future work on developing individualized rates.

**Group Residential Housing (GRH)**

GRH has not been part of the managed care demonstration project capitation. The workgroup discussed the need for housing funds. The current system is rule based and not person need based. A new person has been hired to fill John Hasting's position. Barb will find out who this is and arrange a time to meet on issues.

**Rules/Regulations**

Because rules/regulations are interrelated, there continues to be a need to analyze the links and parameters, and develop an action plan for change. The Future's Initiative presented an idea for regional focus groups to look at the rules, however this was not part of any legislation.
package and no action has been taken in this area. Milt reported that Ann Henry and Bob Brick are interested in pursuing this. It was felt that the Project should take a leadership role in this activity to provide assistance in understanding the issues, discuss lessons learned and share experiences with avenues for change.

The next system redesign meeting will focus on developing a support framework for a focus group. Work group members will come with ideas re: who should be involved with a focus group, who are people who can influence system change, what are the outcomes that focus groups would work toward? Etc.

1115 Waivers
There was a discussion about HCFA 1115 waivers, their purpose and limitations. 1115 Waivers typically are not the solution to long term systems problems. They provide an opportunity for trying methodologies over a short period of time. If the outcome if proved to be beneficial, the waiver could be renewed, but typically there is no concentrated path to change laws to support the outcomes. That means that at the end of a project, there must be a transition method to establish the previous "old" methodology.

MR/RC Waiver and MMIS
Operationalizing the consumer directed community supports services of the MR/RC Waiver is difficult when MMIS requires units instead of money amounts to be approved. Jill will follow-up on the current systems parameters and research what is needed to change the current system.

Next Meeting
The next System Redesign Meeting will be held on Thursday, May 6, 1999 from 9:30 am - 12:00 at the Eagan Lottery Building, Lone Oak Rd, Eagan, MN
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System Redesign Work Group Meeting Minutes
October 12, 1998

Attending: Kathy Kading, Trish Reedstrom, Jane Wiemerslage, Polly Owens, Grey Kruse, Milt Conrath, Karen Courtney, Barb Roberts, Jill Slaikeu, Katherine Finlayson, Troy Mangan

The work group reviewed the funding flexibility ideas from the September planning day.

Milt and Trish reported on the Future's Initiative's work that includes identifying and developing an action plan to support flexibility in the Consumer Support Grant. Removing the parental fee and providing matching federal funds would be helpful. Bill Lamson has been contacted about these recommendations and is supportive. The Future's Initiative will be developing legislation. The Work Group recommended that the Self Determination Project be supportive of the legislation.

Matching funds is not a new issue at DHS. Troy will research where this has been held up in the past and provide information at the next meeting.

ICF/MR transition to a more flexible use of funding was discussed. Recent litigation in other states has raised questions about the role of ICF/MR as an entitlement and how waivered services is related to that issue. There was lengthy discussion about the ICF/MR infrastructure and how 3,200 beds make up the current ICF/MR "system". It was felt that any transitions would need to incorporate self determination.

It was decided that a work day to address the many issues be held. The product from that meeting will be an information sheet that includes obstacles, opponents, infra-structure, ideas on what a transition could look like, the reasons why a transition is needed. This information sheet could potentially be used as a basis for putting together a legislative package in 2000.

The DT&H rate structure was discussed. It was decided that this area would be left to the DT&H organizations and the Project would not initiate work in this.

The supported employment amendment to the MR/RC waiver will provide some flexibility for persons to receive supported employment even if they never resided in an ICF/MR.

Statute prohibits 24 hour services by one vendor. There has been strong opposition from advocates in the past. It was recommended that this issue be referred to the Future's Initiative Work Group. Trish and Milt will follow-up on this recommendation with that group.
The use of the MR/RC amendments and waiver efficiencies were discussed. It was decided that a meeting with the Project counties, and staff representing the waiver (Jill and Kristin) will be held to talk about support parameters and allocations. Jill will set up the meeting.

Due to time constraints the rule and regulation discussion was tabled and will be included in the planning meeting. The planning day to discuss ICF/MR and rules is scheduled for November 18, 1998 from 10:00 am - 2:00 pm in room CXB7 in the building next to the Dakota County offices - 201 Concord Exchange, South St. Paul.
Promoting and supporting home care changes are the primary activities of the group at this point in time.

Karen shared a draft proposal that Dakota County has been working on that supports flexibility in home care by adding a consumer directed health support service. This proposal will be presented at a meeting with DHS staff and other interested persons. The technical development on how to implement the changes is not determined, however the acceptance of the concept is the primary goal.

There was a brief discussion on spending and authorized services and how changes would impact the home care budget.

Polly reported that she had talked to DT&H providers regarding DT&H legislative changes. The MHC is interested in supporting legislation around rate variances, and sees rate structure changes as a future agenda item. Other ideas included decreasing the connection with ICF/MRs and to add a new employment category, and discontinuing the need determination process. The leadership of MHC may be changing soon, so it was decided Project staff should talk to them again after their annual elections.
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System Redesign Workgroup Meeting Minutes
5/4/98

Attending: Polly Owens, Linda Leiding, Milt Conrath, Karen Courtney, Trish Reedstrom, Barb Roberts, Devin Nelson, Darlene Olson, Dan McCarthy, Carol Estrada

The Project goals and criteria were reviewed. There was a change on Item I. A. 4 to encompass more areas than just home care. Barb will contact the RWJF on the areas that were modified from the original proposal.

Barb reported that the legislation ideas that were discussed at the Information and Resource Committee were given to the CSMD Operations Team.

Milt reported on the stakeholders meeting with DHS Senior Management. That meeting encompassed direction for services, shaping the legislative agenda for 1999, and placing emphasis on building local capacity.

There was discussion regarding prioritizing to work on legislation. Subcommittees will be formed to develop detail ideas in the following areas:

  MA Home Care - Carol, Barb, Milt
    (Carol will distribute the PCA Task Force information and Home care related statute language. Committee members will also look at the waiver amendment language frameworks for ideas)
  Case Management - Dan, Barb and Sharen Larson
    (Lessen prescriptiveness of team meeting members)
  DT&H - Polly and Darlene
  GRH - Housing Workgroup

The next meeting of the system redesign workgroup is scheduled for Monday, June 1, 1998 from 1:30 pm - 3:30 in Room 5B at DHS.
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MEETING NOTICE

DATE: April 13, 1998
TO: System Redesign Workgroup Members
FROM: Barb Roberts
612/296-1146

The Self Determination Project Systems Redesign Workgroup is scheduled to meet on Monday, May 4, 1998 from 1:00 pm to 3:00 pm at DHS in Room 3 B.

The purpose of this meeting is to
- discuss further system redesign efforts needed and develop a work plan to address those efforts
- review accomplishment criteria for our goals/objectives
- decide on adding or deleting goals/objectives
- identify issues
  - how are we addressing the "old"
  - what are the newest issues

If you have additional agenda items, please let me know.
Minnesota's
Self Determination Project
A Developmental Disabilities Project Partnership - Blue Earth, Dakota, Olmsted Counties and DHS

SYSTEM REDESIGN WORKGROUP MEETING MINUTES
8/18/97
10:00 am - 12:00 pm

Attending: Greg Kruse, Karen Courtney, Larry Riess, Polly Owens, Linda Leiding, Pat Gilbertson, Dean Ritzman, Darlene Olson, Bob Meyer, Barb Roberts

UPDATE ON WAIVER AMENDMENTS

The revised version of the waiver amendments was discussed. The amendments should be submitted to HCFA by the end of the week.

CONTRACT PLAN FOR CONSUMER EDUCATION AND SUPPORT

Barb distributed a sample contract plan handout that counties may use as a model.

HOME CARE DISCUSSION

Bob Meyer presented a summary on home care services. One of the main goals will to make services more flexible and move authorization to the local level. Unbundling supports and providing consumer specialized supports is the direction. If consumers arrange their own PCA services use of vouchers, funds into a checkbook, pooling, and other methodologies may be possibilities.

There was discussion on how to increase incentives for prudent purchasing. Changes need to be budget neutral. Legislative strategies are being discussed. Implementation of changes: July 1998 would be optimistic because there would need to be MMIS changes, training, local capacity building and technical assistance. 1999 may be more realistic.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATES

Legislative language is being developed in the area of DT&H and guardianship. Because the deadline for legislative ideas is this week, more information will be available in the near future. DHS will not be proposing Family Support Grant legislation. Initial research has indicated that a state carried liability insurance policy would probably need legislation and a funding source (pre determined or a fiscal note). More information should be available at the next liability meeting.
TRACKING AND DISPERSING FUNDS

Barb presented an update on the reporting requirements. There is one area yet to provide information in order for a matrix to be completed. [There was no time to review case scenarios]

OUTSTANDING ISSUES

Liability issues, worker's compensation, and any other outstanding issues will be deferred to the Liability Workgroup. Because the work emphasis has shifted to the local project sites, another meeting of the System Redesign Workgroup will not be scheduled until needed (i.e. for legislative updates, waiver amendments status). Barb will keep the workgroup updated.
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SYSTEM REDESIGN WORKGROUP MEETING MINUTES
6/23/97
9:00 am - 12:00 pm

Attending: Milt Conrath, Greg Kruse, Polly Owens, Trish Reedstrom, Larry Riess, Gerry Nord, Linda Leiding, Barb Roberts

DHS's Division restructuring was discussed briefly.

There was discussion regarding the future focus of this workgroup. A Workgroup Progress Summary was discussed (attachment). Areas of work have been identified by the workgroup and are being addressed. Dispersing, tracking and allocating funds currently need the most concentrated work.

Reporting and tracking requirements for funding streams needs to be identified. Barb will do some preliminary work to determine requirements and what other areas have done (PMAP) then DHS and county staff will meet to strategize on methodologies and recommendations for system development and viable procedures to use for dispersing and tracking funds.

It was suggested that the workgroup bring case scenarios to the next meeting to assist with developing flow processes.

There was discussion on coordinating issues project wide or individually at the local level. It was suggested that at the next Information and Resource meeting a strategy for addressing issues will be discussed. What can or should counties do outside of the DHS process to promote change? Milt will distribute a list to committee members prior to the August 8th meeting in preparation for the discussion.

Legislation needs were discussed. A summary is being compiled to give the workgroup a better idea of the areas to be addressed. Using the BOGIC method to pursue changes may be better than to present a large package of legislation. All legislation suggestions will go through the DHS process for development. This is an example of an area for discussion at the Information and Resource Committee meeting referenced above.

The DHS waiver staff is working on the amendments. Barb will contract Dan and Bob to set up a meeting for the Workgroup to provide input on the amendments prior to submission to HCFA.

The next meeting of the System Redesign Meeting is scheduled for Monday, August 18, 1997 10:00 am - 12:00 pm at the Eagan Lottery Building.
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SYSTEM REDESIGN WORKGROUP MEETING MINUTES
June 6, 1997
1:00 pm-3:30 pm

Attending: Milt Conrath, Greg Kruse, Carol Pankow, Linda Leiding, Kathie Kading, Troy Mangen, Lee Ann Erickson, Carrie Vinapol, John Hasting, Paul Fleissner, Sharon Laures, Pat Gilbertson, Dan McCarthy, Katy Mattson, Barb Roberts

ACTIVITIES/PROGRESS

SILS
- The AGs office is researching me ability to pay relatives
- Unlicensed providers can be used to service one person or to serve persons from a single related family that the provider is not related to. Other changes would require legislation
- Rule and statute limit eligibility to persons 18 years or older. A variance is possible for limited time persons. Legislation would be needed for a global change without a variance.
- There is no statutory or rule relating to funding consumer transportation. Implementation would be policy based.
- Paying for section VIII housing with SILS funds would be prohibitive

ICF/MR
- Beds can be decertified "one at a time", however Rule 53 and risk issues remain.
- Portability of benefits remains a problem

Family Support Grant
- See attached summary

Waivered Services
- See attached proposed amendments

Resource capacity - Alternate ways to allocate resources is being discussed to provide additional capacity. The state must clarify to HCFA the number of unduplicated persons served.

Additional service suggestions from the workgroup- Provide choice for leisure activity. There was a lengthy discussion with regard to funding this activity.
Housing

John Hastings answered questions and presented housing related information. DD services are not currently part of the Housing with Services Act, however to provide another option this may be a consideration.

There is legislation now that allows GRH funds to be given to a county in a grant form for management at the county. This current model has the county managing the funds and not the consumer.

John discussed consumer owned housing and the benefits and challenges. The workgroup will direct questions regarding possible housing scenarios to John and he will provide technical assistance on what can and cannot be done in the current system (Barb will put these together in a summary for the workgroup's use).

NEXTMEETING
The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, June 23, 1997, 9:00 am - 12:00 pm at the Eagan Lottery Building.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>ACTION PLAN</th>
<th>COMMENTS/ OUTSTANDING ISSUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SYSTEM REDESIGN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation - General</td>
<td></td>
<td>Areas identified. DHS to decide on focus, scope and methodology with input and assistance from strategic resource group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Flexibility</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>General areas identified - Issues addressed as they &quot;surface&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waivered Services</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Final draft of amendments needs to be routed to workgroup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Support Grant</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICF/MR</td>
<td></td>
<td>More discussion/strategizing needed to increase flexibility prior to 1115 waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT&amp;H/employment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Need to determine scope of legislation to pursue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Counties working with John H. to identify what can be done now Outstanding: Legislation identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Home care</td>
<td></td>
<td>Action plan needs to be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardianship</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Need to determine scope of legislation to pursue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>Action plan needs to be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance Framework</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Consensus on framework for the Project and identify activities on local leve needs to be done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Framework draft needs to be shared (DHS and local sites)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA</td>
<td>ACTION PLAN</td>
<td>COMMENTS/OUTSTANDING ISSUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUALLY CONTROLLED RESOURCES</td>
<td></td>
<td>State needs to approve plan to develop a policy with Minnesota Joint Underwriters. Actual policy development needs to be done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Intermediaries</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Research on who can be considered a FI needs to be completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersing and tracking funds</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Framework identified. Further discussion needed to determine methodologies at the local level and determine work needed to make options viable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Pools</td>
<td></td>
<td>Further discussion needed to determine parameters and methodologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related areas - taxes, worker’s comp,</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Addressed with fiscal intermediary research and discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion on the local level. Project framework for local implementation needs to be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework for local implementation</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>6 point framework finalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Commonalities and potential contractor tasks identified. Local sites need to identify specifics. DHS needs to provide funding scope. Contracts need to be drafted to &quot;release&quot; RWJF contractor funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phasing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Workgroup needs to assess the initially addressed phases and determine specifics and time lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Technical Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>Action plan needs to be developed to address specialized needs (providers, case managers, advocates, fiscal information)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAM

Activities For Family Support Program In the Minnesota's Self Determination Project

The following is a response to a number of concerns regarding how the FSG program can be utilized in the Self Determination Project:

1. Due to the passage of the recent legislation on the FSG program, beginning Jan. 1, 1998, the commissioner shall allocate state funds to county social service agencies on a calendar year basis. Each county’s guaranteed floor shall be calculated as follows:

   95% of the county's allocation received in the preceding calendar year and for the calendar year 1998 allocation, the preceding calendar year shall be considered to be double the six-month allocation. When the amount of funds available for allocation is less than the amount available in the preceding year, each county's previous year allocation shall be reduced in proportion to the reduction in statewide funding for the purpose of establishing the guaranteed floor.

   For the period July 1, 1997, to December 31, 1997, the commissioner shall allocate to each county an amount equal to the actual, state approved grants issued to the families for the month of January 1997, multiplied by six. This six-month allocation shall be combined with the calendar year 1998 allocation and be administered as an 18 month allocation.

   At the commissioner's discretion, funds may be allocated to any non-participating county that requests an allocation.

   Due to the passage of this legislation, we are unable to guarantee 100% of the funds from the previous year with this program. This language dealing with the allocation of funds is boiler plate language which is utilized by the department when allocating funds in this manner.

2. In order to be eligible for the FSG program, one of the requirements to participate in the program, an individual with MR\RC must be determined by a screening team to be at risk of institutional placement. At this time, we do not have legislative authority to waive this requirement. This will require legislative action and the earliest implementation would be July 1998 which would then allow the grant to not require the at risk status.

3. In regard to expanding the expense categories, the definition is quite liberal now, and many items not listed in the expense category, may fall into the "other category" which is already identified as a category for allowable expenses. However, the grant still may not be used to cover purchases which are covered by other funding sources such as private insurance and M.A.

4. Currently, families receiving the Title XIX home and community-based waivered services for persons with mental retardation and related conditions are not eligible for the Family Support Program. This also would take legislative action and further discussion needs to occur as to whether this is a viable option.
5. In statute the maximum monthly grant is $3,000 per eligible person per state fiscal year. The county social service agency may exceed $3,000 per state fiscal year for an individual for emergency circumstances in cases where exceptional resources of the family are required to meet the health, welfare-safety needs of the child. The county's may set aside up to five percent of its allocation to fund emergency situations.
Proposed Amendments to Minnesota's MR/RC Waiver
July 1997

Purpose:

* Strengthen role of family, friends, and generic community supports
* Promote consumer self-determination and full inclusion
* Increase flexibility of service delivery
* Increase funding flexibility
* Increase consumer control over the resources and supports they receive
* Create additional support/service options within the current allowable resources

Proposed Amendments:

1) Remove funding/service limits that exist within the federal plan:
   * Housing access
   * Caregvier Training and Education
   * Respite care

2) Allow reimbursement for the following additional services:
   * extended PCA
   * chore services
   * transportation
   * consumer training and education
   * consumer-directed community support

3) Modify plan to increase flexibility:
   * language regarding reimbursement restrictions for residential habilitation
   * provide resource capacity incentives to local agencies who:
     - provide for consumer-directed service development & delivery,
     - have attained institutional discharge goals,
     - have planning mechanism to meet current recipients changing needs,
     - have a quality assurance/consumer satisfaction system in place.
**Additional considerations for the Self-Determination Systems Redesign Sub-committee:**

Much of flexibility in the use of current MR/RC Waivered services is contingent upon the involvement and authorization of the case manager. The Individual Service Plan is frequently identified as the mechanism that will articulate provider qualification, monitoring, evaluation parameters, etc for some of the services that were added to the program. The scope of the duties of a case manager in Minnesota are defined in 256B.092. Additional analysis is needed on what needs to change in the case management system to promote consumer-directed options.

Need to establish a consistent means of identifying and tracking the barriers that present themselves when trying to develop and implement consumer-directed support options. Some provisions of existing Rule may be problematic (e.g. MN Rule 9525.1800, subp.8 - definition of daily intervention).

True self-determination involves people having the opportunity to make long term plans for their future. This will require us to assure that consumers have the funding and authority to accomplish these things. We are moving to create options which allow consumers to control and direct MA waiver resources on an annual or short term basis, it seems important that we begin to consider options that allow persons to accumulate resources to pursue their dreams through the creation of some sort of "consumer-directed support credits".
SYSTEM REDESIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
May 9, 1997

9:30am-3:30pm

Attending: Milt Conrath, Greg Kruse, Sharon Laures, Kathi Kading, Bob Meyer, Carol Pankow, Pat Gilbertson

ACTIVITIES/PROGRESS FROM THE LAST MEETING

Waivered Services -
The waiver team is working on the amendments, unbundling of services, service definition flexibility, and provider qualifications. They are looking at how other states have been operating (New York). Dan has consulted with the attorney general's office regarding family being paid. Payments to families is being addressed in terms of purchaser, employee, and provider. Dan will continue to follow and report at the next meeting.

Taxes-
Barb will be meeting with a tax specialist from the state revenue department to look at service descriptions and parameters. Research that Medstat had done was shared.

MA Home Care
Pam Erkel, home care supervisor, is interested in working with the Project. She will be invited to meetings when home care issues are on the agenda for discussion.

Housing
John Hastings is interested in assisting.

DT&H
Carol is researching statute interpretation and day program definitions and how changes can be made.

REDESIGN DISCUSSION AND DEVELOPMENT

The phase-in approach was discussed. As part of Phase I, there remained questions about SILS and the Family Support Grant. Milt will compile a list of barriers and questions to address. These will be analyzed by state staff to identify changes needed to create flexibility in using those funds.

All agreed that developing strategies to handle liability issues, fiscal intermediaries and funding flow need to be in place before individuals can be considered part of the Project. The amount of funding per person makes a difference regarding liability issues. Meetings were set up to begin working on these issues.
Service choices based on information gathered from consumers, case managers, and regional staff were reviewed. Additional ideas will be added to have an on-going resource for system redesign to assure redesign efforts will address consumers choices for support.

A time line for activities was developed and will be incorporated into the workplan (See attachment)

There was discussion regarding ICF/MR, granting counties conversions, more than 4 persons living under one roof, and what could be done sooner than the 1115 waiver. Carol and Bob will begin to research this. It was felt that housing and ICF/MR should be part of the planning in Phase I. Planning for systems development should also be on-going through all phases.

**RESOURCE ALLOCATION**

Individual allocations of resources must be fair, defensible, incent what we would like to see as outcomes and be cost effective, assure life safety, and provide for life style choices. Ideas on allocating were discussed: ie. allot funding based on functional assessments for determining health and safety needs and addressing vulnerabilities, developing a range of dollars. If consumers are given funds, typically they will purchase cost effectively. Although each county may develop an individualized methodology, approaches with a systematic framework should be developed. This will assist with defensibility. Quality assurance may be easier to measure with a systematic framework that looks at health and safety, and satisfaction with life choices.

**OTHER ITEMS**

Department staff are working on providing parameters and instructions for claiming FFP and reporting through SEAGER.

Diane Sprague was identified as a resource for housing issues.

Pam Erkle will be invited to the next meeting.

The following meeting dates/times were set:

- **System Redesign Subcommittee**
  - June 6, 1997 - 1:00pm - 3:30pm
  - Evergreen Knoll Restaurant - Fairbault
  - (Following the Advisory Committee meeting)

- June 23, 1997 - 9:00am - 12:00pm
  - Eagan Lottery Building

- **Technical Development for Individually Controlled Resources/Liability Issues**
  - May 28, 1997 1:30pm - 4:00pm
  - Olmsted County Offices - Rochester

- June 12, 1997 1:00pm - 3:30pm
  - Barb will find a meeting place
### System Redesign Activities Timelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SILS and Family Support Issues Determined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICF/MR Issues - Research on bed decertification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review system redesign areas identified for policy flexibility and ease of implementing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiver Amendments Submitted to HCFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine legislation needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Allocation - Systematic framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance - Evaluation protocols</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersing and tracking funds - Develop initial methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability, fiscal intermediaries, payroll, worker's comp, issues resolved and procedures in place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing and planning automation of tracking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minnesota's Self Determination Project

SYSTEM REDESIGN/BUDGETS SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
April 25, 1997
1:30 pm-3:30 pm

Attending: Milt Conrath, Trish Reedstrom, Judy Emke, Sharon Laures, Larry Riess, Bob Meyer, Carol Pankow, Pat Gilbertson, Greg Kruse, Kathi Kading

Funds Included in Individual Controlled Resource (Budget)

A "phase-in" approach was discussed. Time lines and finalizing this approach will be discussed at the next meeting.

Phase I - Waivered services, county funds, family support grant and SILS
Phase II - Home care, housing, and other
Phase III - ICF/MR, DT&H, funding restructuring as allowed under the 1115 waiver

Phase I
Waivered Services - Preliminary action plan
  Prepare amendments as needed to accomplish
    - unbundling of services (single services)
    - consider adding services (transportation, pca
    - service definition flexibility
    - provider qualification revisions
    - allocation flexibility

Research
  - DT&H and supported employment (interpretation of statute, federal)
  - family as providers (definitions? federal requirements?)
  - current status on what can be done now with no change
  - determine what can be done now on amendments and use a "round 2" approach if needed so as not to slow down what can be done now.

Review and time lines
  - Advisory committee would like to see proposed amendments
  - Target amendments to be ready by June 15, 1997
OTHER DISCUSSION

There was discussion on the concept of waiverizing ICF/MRs. Key issues included choice, people experiencing something different from ICF/MR, taking resources with the person, destabilizing the current system and provider viewpoints.

Liability - Is there a way to allow investment into current liability insurance pools. The needs may go beyond foster care liability. Wisconsin is proposing legislation. Barb will check with Gerry Nord regarding information he may have.

Taxable vs. non-taxable service categories - There is a need to research and determine the tax status of services (i.e. income from foster care isn’t taxed while income from providing waived services is taxable). There is a desire to assess new services, wording and status to have as many services as possible in the non-taxable category.

MA home care services - There needs to be more discussion on how home care services can be part of a person's controlled resources. The 1115 waiver would allow more flexibility, however now MA home care services linked to waivered service provision through the current averaging methodology. This will be an agenda item for the next meeting.

The dispersing and tracking of funds development must happen concurrently with this subcommittee's work, so individuals will be able implement purchasing control over resources. Each county has estimated the number of individuals to participate in the Project in 1997, so it is critical that methodologies of dispersing and tracking funds be in place for those people to begin participating in the Project by Fall.

At the next meeting the subcommittee will continue to work on refining the phase-in framework. Actual service choice scenarios will be discussed to look at additional redesign needed (i.e. case management, DT&H funded by the waiver, what’s different about service delivery for family support grant, SILS and county funds).

The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, May 9, 1997 from 9:30 am - 3:00 pm. Barb will find a meeting place.
SYSTEM REDESIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
April 18, 1997
1:00 pm-3:30 pm

Attending: Milt Conrath, Kathi Kading, Larry Riess, Pat Gilbertson, Bob Meyer, Barb Roberts

The discussions carried over from the Individual Budget meeting in the morning. It was decided that initially the Individual Budgets and System Redesign subcommittees would be combined. There will still be a need to work on the disbursing and tracking of funds.

The subcommittee discussed what choices consumers may want in purchasing which would lead to the need to make changes in the system. Any "models" that reflected individual choices needed to be relationship-based and not "boxed in" as may be with the current system.

It is important to look at not only now, but also long range.

There was discussion about looking at simplified funding streams that may not be negatively impacted by taxes.

Recommendations for areas that would need to change:

Waiver - Single services and unbundling should be available. This would mean adding services such as transportation and analyzing the service parameters that require some services to be provided only in combination with a residential service. The feasibility of managing an amount of dollars with a determined unduplicated count instead of the current slot based approach should be addressed. The outcome could provide more flexibility.

Guardianship - There was a discussion regarding conflict of interest, choosing a case manager or provider as a guardian, and how roles are determined and understood. Having the freedom to choose all aspects of life including guardianship, vulnerabilities and life enhancement were also discussed. It was recommended that Katherine Finalyson needs to provide some direction and consult in this area. Barb will contact her.

Housing - There needs to be a choice, and lessen the dependence on licensed "sites". This is one area that needs intensive efforts. Minimally there is a need to:

- review the current status of the housing laws
- determine if barriers are policy or law based
- evaluate technical aspects (MAXIS, payments, payee, links with accounting, edits)
- development of technical assistance tools for housing access, financing, ownership responsibilities, home loans, provider involvement, county roles, etc
evaluating and reviewing housing system changes to truly provide consumers choice such as legislation needed, block grant as a demonstration, simplification, education and technical assistance, developing links with financial institutions, leases in consumers names John Hastings needs to be contacted for assistance and support in this area.

If housing and service dollars must be kept separate, are there methodologies to balance and adjust funds from a pool as life circumstances of a person change (i.e. a person's roommate moves out and housing costs might have to be adjusted, the person's individual controlled resource amount might stay the same, but the proportion of housing to service dollars could fluctuate.)

MA Home Care - More information is needed on making funding directly available to consumers and regarding authorization strategies, etc. Barb will contact home care staff to provide information and strategies.

Providers - There needs to be a strategy for supporting service providers during change. Technical assistance will be needed to assure as consumers choose to move or change providers, providers have business methodologies to adjust or "re-tool" the business. This will be included as a discussion item for the education subcommittee.

The subcommittees felt that any "category" must break free from its box and allow flexibility. Is there a general support strategy for redesign across all? The principles are global and relationship-based strategies would also be global.

For the next meeting subcommittee members will look at choices consumers might want/need, how these translate into key components for redesign, what needs to change and be part of an action plan to make the necessary change happen. The next meeting will focus on these thoughts, staging (what funding components could/should be included at points in time), and beginning work on funding disbursement/tracking.

The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, April 25, 1997 following the Advisory meeting. (Approximately 1:15 pm to 3:00 pm)
SYSTEM REDESIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
April 18, 1997
1:00 pm-3:30 pm

Attending: Milt Conrath, Kathi Kading, Larry Riess, Pat Gilbertson, Bob Meyer, Barb Roberts

The discussions carried over from the Individual Budget meeting in the morning. It was decided that initially the Individual Budgets and System Redesign subcommittees would be combined. There will still be a need to work on the disbursing and tracking of funds.

The subcommittee discussed what choices consumers may want in purchasing which would lead to the need to make changes in the system. Any "models" that reflected individual choices needed to be relationship-based and not "boxed in" as may be with the current system.

It is important to look at not only now, but also long range.

There was discussion about looking at simplified funding streams that may not be negatively impacted by taxes.

Recommendations for areas that would need to change:

Waiver - Single services and unbundling should be available. This would mean adding services such as transportation and analyzing the service parameters that require some services to be provided only in combination with a residential service. The feasibility of managing an amount of dollars with a determined unduplicated count instead of the current slot based approach should be addressed. The outcome could provide more flexibility.

Guardianship - There was a discussion regarding conflict of interest, choosing a case manager or provider as a guardian, and how roles are determined and understood. Having the freedom to choose all aspects of life including guardianship, vulnerabilities and life enhancement were also discussed. It was recommended that Katherine Finalyson needs to provide some direction and consult in this area. Barb will contact her.

Housing - There needs to be a choice, and lessen the dependence on licensed "sites". This is one area that needs intensive efforts. Minimally there is a need to:
  review the current status of the housing laws
  determine if barriers are policy or law based
  evaluate technical aspects (MAXIS, payments, payee, links with accounting, edits)
  development of technical assistance tools for housing access, financing, ownership responsibilities, home loans, provider involvement, county roles, etc
evaluating and reviewing housing system changes to truly provide consumers choice such as legislation needed, block grant as a demonstration, simplification, education and technical assistance, developing links with financial institutions, leases in consumers names John Hastings needs to be contacted for assistance and support in this area.

If housing and service dollars must be kept separate, are there methodologies to balance and adjust funds from a pool as life circumstances of a person change (i.e. a person's roommate moves out and housing costs might have to be adjusted, the person's individual controlled resource amount might stay the same, but the proportion of housing to service dollars could fluctuate.)

MA Home Care - More information is needed on making funding directly available to consumers and regarding authorization strategies, etc. Barb will contact home care staff to provide information and strategies.

Providers - There needs to be a strategy for supporting service providers during change. Technical assistance will be needed to assure as consumers choose to move or change providers, providers have business methodologies to adjust or "re-tool" the business. This will be included as a discussion item for the education subcommittee.

The subcommittees felt that any "category" must break free from its box and allow flexibility. Is there a general support strategy for redesign across all? The principles are global and relationship-based strategies would also be global.

For the next meeting subcommittee members will look at choices consumers might want/need, how these translate into key components for redesign, what needs to change and be part of an action plan to make the necessary change happen. The next meeting will focus on these thoughts, staging (what funding components could/should be included at points in time), and beginning work on funding disbursement/tracking.

The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, April 25, 1997 following the Advisory meeting. (Approximately 1:15 pm to 3:00 pm)
AGENDA

I. PROGRESS ON ACTIVITIES

- Dan McCarthy:
  Waivered services amendments
  Family as providers
  Other related issues

- Carol Pankow:
  Family Support Grant
  SILS
  DT&H
  ICF/MR

- Barb Roberts:
  Evaluation and Quality Assurance
  Fiscal Intermediaries

II. HOUSING

  - Discussions with John Hastings
  - Identification of the issues
  - Developing an action plan

III. REVIEW OF TIME LINES

  - Any adjustments?

IV. NEXT MEETING
DATE: May 2, 1997

TO: System Redesign Subcommittee Members

FROM: Barb Roberts

612-296-1146

SUBJECT: Next Meeting

The next meeting of the System Redesign Subcommittee is scheduled for

Date: Friday, May 9, 1997  Time: 9:30 am - 2:30 pm

Place: Evergreen Knoll Restaurant  NOTE: This is a change from 5A at DHS

Main floor conference room
2127 NW 4th Street
Faribault, MN
Phone: 507/332-8929

Directions: From 135 - Take the Faribault exit #56. Go east until you come to Western Avenue. Turn right on Western Avenue, go 1/2 block beyond the stop sign to the first driveway on the left side and the restaurant is on the corner of Western Avenue and 4th.

Please find attached the minutes from our last meeting.

Agenda: We will continue where we "left off" at our last meeting (current status based on last discussions, refining the phase-in framework: preparing for real consumer choices and resource allocation methodologies).

See you on Friday, the 9th!
Self Determination Project

Individual Budgets and System Redesign Subcommittee
April 25, 1997
1:15 pm - 3:00 pm
Eagan Lottery Building

AGENDA

I. General review from previous meeting

II. Funding to be included in individually controlled resources (individual budgets)
   - Staging
   - Phase-in parameters
   - Timing

III. Consumer choices and change needed
    - Questions to address from last meeting
    - Translation into redesign
    - Action plan

IV. Determining resource allocations (based on decision from II above)
    - Multiple methodology approach?
    - Historical - current, new?
    - Assessment?

V. Subcommittee for resource dispersing and tracking (funding flow)
   - Develop methodologies (staging approaches?)
   - Technical work - systems
   - Fiscal intermediaries - functions, parameters

VI. Other items and next meetings
Self Determination Project

System Redesign Subcommittee Meeting
April 18, 1997
1:00 pm - 3:00 pm
DHS 2nd Floor N. - DD Resource Room

Subcommittee Members
Milt Conrath
Paul Fleissner
Linda Leiding
Larry Riess

AGENDA

I. Review/findings from New Hampshire Trip

II. Discussion - redesign areas
   - Questions worksheet
   - Critical issues identified

III. Work plan development
   - "What ever it takes" - What will it take
   - Time lines and staging
   - Assignments/activities

IV. Report to the Advisory Group

V. Next Meetings

Attachments
New Hampshire trip summary
Questions worksheet
Wall charting notes from 3/31/97 meeting
# Self Determination Project

## Policy and Implementation Frameworks

**System Redesign**

### Question 1: What is the action plan needed to implement system redesign and promote new system models?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>What Are the Key Components for Redesign?</th>
<th>What Service Models Would Consumers Want/Need?</th>
<th>What Needs to Change</th>
<th>Critical Issues</th>
<th>Direction and/or Decisions</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waivered Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREAS</td>
<td>WHAT ARE THE KEY COMPONENTS FOR REDESIGN?</td>
<td>WHAT SERVICE MODELS WOULD CONSUMERS WANT/NEED?</td>
<td>WHAT NEEDS TO CHANGE</td>
<td>CRITICAL ISSUES</td>
<td>DIRECTION AND/OR DECISIONS</td>
<td>ACTION PLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing or Certification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT &amp; H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardianship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Support Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Disability Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREAS</td>
<td>WHAT ARE THE KEY COMPONENTS FOR REDESIGN?</td>
<td>WHAT SERVICE MODELS WOULD CONSUMERS WANT/ NEED?</td>
<td>WHAT NEEDS TO CHANGE</td>
<td>CRITICAL ISSUES</td>
<td>DIRECTION AND/OR DECISIONS</td>
<td>ACTION PLAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation related (Rules, Statutes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUESTION 2:** What work groups need to be formed to accomplished system redesign?  
(essential people, expertise etc)

**QUESTION 3:** What are the time lines for implementation of activities  
(priorities for staging, essential groupings of areas, etc)
I. New Hampshire Structure

- 12 Area agencies - function similarly to Minnesota's counties
  - intake, eligibility, assessment
  - arranging, monitoring services
  - run by board of directors
  - contract for services
  - some area agencies do all services (foster, waiver, family support)
  - consumers sign off on contracts
  - case management (most case managers do not have a social work background)
  - provider agencies (area agency or contracted) coordinate family services
  - created individual budgets based on allocation pool in self det. project
  - manage waiting lists - teaming approached used to allocate
  - training to families and own management
  - developed a risk pool for unexpected needs
  - Region 4 agency - independent broker available on short term basis
    - broker not part of immediate team, finds what can get from system and strategize on where to get the rest
  - Quality assurance individualized by area agency - most use satisfaction survey
  - Most living arrangements/services developed under the Self Determination Project were individual "sites" or no more than 3

- State tracks persons waiting that are in NF, out of state
- Funding allocations to area agencies and MA match managed at state
- Guardianship system relies heavily on care giver for decision making
- Counties not involved with service development
- 6 bed secure crisis beds - under the corrections system
- Appeals are few - state hears appeals and can mandate change to area agencies
- Currently working on standards for area agencies (i.e eligibility)
- State provides minimal training - ISP related to waivered services
- Individual service plans - streamlined
  - No formal assessment tool - talk to people about what they want
  - Individual determines who comes to the meeting
  - Satisfaction survey
  - Goals are about what a person wants — not always habilitative/active treatment
    - not always measurable
    - look at what gets people interested in life (i.e. not teeth brushing)
  - ISPs can take many forms (i.e. letter, pictures, tapes)
  - Person or legal rep records their own progress
• Information publications by an advocate agency
• Supplement for room and board similar to MSA, but not as prescriptive

II. New Hampshire Waivered Services
• 14 years old
• Fee for service structure
  - fees set in 1983 as base, then increases yearly
• Working on amendments to have a "all encompassing" service category.
• Working on a single regulation for the new service category
• Converted ICF/MRs to waiver -1 private ICF/MR left
• Money allocated in a pool to the area agency
• ISP reviewed at state, however no in-depth review (1 staff for 2000)
• 3 persons residing together is maximum
• Living arrangements must be certified in not own home/family home
• Allow payments to families where adult child receives service

III. Finances and Budgeting - Area Agency - Region V
• Individual budgets based on 75% of historical costs
• Use of risk pool for unexpected needs
• % of funds held for coordination and general management on whole group served
• Coordination and general management adjusted if person leaves a provider
• Consumers and case managers should know the cost of services
• Funds must be able to be moved around
• Day programs are not individualized yet (total program divided by # persons)
• All types of funds are put into a pool at the area agency. NH has flexibility on "service cross over"
• Any savings on services (below individual budget) goes into a pool

IV. New Hampshire State and Area Agencies Strategies to make Self Determination Successful
• Commitment to the values and concept from the top down
• Be principle driven
• Have an understanding that self determination does not equal independence
  - levels of support are still there, just address differently
• All staff must be "on board" with the concept - they become personally empowered
• Education to consumers which includes social skills training, being a self advocate, voter training and what it means to be a citizen
• Survey the satisfaction of consumers and build supports around what is learned
• Insist on informal supports and development of community involvement/awareness
• Need incentives to consumers to spend wisely and use informal supports
• Provide a fiscal intermediary to handle workers compensation, taxes, employment issues
  (Typically consumers do not want to be employers)
• Make purchasing services simple
• State must give permission to the agency to be creative
• State must have a liaison with local agencies
• Case management teams can be effective so one person doesn't have to "know it all"
• Case managers must learn to give up "control" and back out as needed (i.e. family coordinating services, overseeing budget etc.)
• Provide a high level of support to case managers through training in budget management, negotiation training, ISP development, being a facilitation, working with a team, recognizing when to "let go"
• Create opportunities for consumers to find staff
• Provide incentives for staff to take on the role of "agent of change"
• Establish the amount of control all involved will have
• Provide consumers a choice to be a part of the project initially
• Provide mechanisms for consumers to write checks for services if they wish
• Responsibility for health and safety and monitoring must be decided "up front"

V. Barriers to Self Determination Identified by Area Agencies and State Staff
• Certification of living arrangements and services
• HCFA
• Individualized budgets and all budgeting activities
  - staff not trained to do this
  - more control but no clear process developed
• No financial support for change
• Slow process with no savings quickly
• Consumers and parents
  - afraid of change
  - don't want to take on more
  - lack of education
  - afraid to lose what they now have ( base) if they demonstrate efficiency
  - failure and no safety net
• Liability issues - who is considered the employer

VI. Lessons Learned Through the NH Self Determination Project
• Involve the community, guardians and providers "up front"
• Case managers can't do all the educating
• Support risk takers
• Budgeting can't be done in a vacuum - involves knowing the community
• Work on dispelling fears early in the project
• Provide information and do public relations work "up front"
• Decrease the "meeting" format for getting things done
• When consumers and case managers know budgets, providers are more accountable
• Assure consumers know the responsibilities of being an employer if they choose to manage all aspects of a budget
• When developing new creative ways to pay for services, consult the business manager/accountant first
• Always check with Dept. Of Labor on taxable and tax free arrangements
• An electronic banking system won't have the capacity to deal the taxes
• An agency or independent accounting agency This become part of their budget
General Philosophy:

* Move from rule-based system to relationship-based system
* Change base of control of supports to individual/family
* Don’t create new boxes
* Expectation for shift of responsibility
* Informed and supported consumers
* Assurance of health/safety and public accountability
* Simplify process - simple and straight-forward

General Criteria/Outcomes:
* Funding reconfiguration
  Outcomes:
  * Individual budgets that include federal, state & local resources
  * Local control of funds
* Licensing variances
  * Assurance of health & safety
  * Local q.a. accountable to consumer, public & state
  * Process includes continual quality improvement
  * Relationship-based support system
* Housing
  Included in funding and Licensing/QA
* Work (same as housing)
* Licensing
  * QA & Evaluation
  * Increased access to desired/needed supports for consumers
  * Whatever it takes
  * Applicability to other disabled populations and statewide implementation
WHAT FUNDING SOURCES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED IN THE INDIVIDUAL CONTROLLED RESOURCE (BUDGET)?

DIAGRAM:
- Family
- County
- Self Determination
- Individual Controlled Resource
- Housing: SRH, MSA, SSI
- Other?
- Crisis
- Critical Issues

- DTH Statute
- State Set Rates
- Provider Specific
- Lobby
- Prior Auth System
- DDS Waiver Needed
- Statute
- Policy
- MVIS
- Consumer Ownership
- Block Grants
Self Determination Project

INDIVIDUAL BUDGET SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
April 18, 1997
10:00 am-12:00 pm

Attending: Kathi Kading, Milt Conrath, Larry Riess, Dan McCarthy, Barb Roberts

The outcomes from the New Hampshire trip were reviewed.

MAKING RESOURCES AVAILABLE FOR INDIVIDUAL PURCHASING

The county vision/perspectives were reviewed.
Funding flow, accessibility, and parameters were discussed at length. See attached diagram relating to funding sources available today and their relationship to self determination individual resource development. Waiver, SILS, Family Support and county dollars will be the most immediate to be available. There will need to be planning and prioritizing on how other funding streams can become part of the total resources available to a person.

Waiver amendments and parameters were discussed.

Staging of the funding available as part of a person's total individual resource will have to occur in order to begin the Project.

Housing and MA home care are critical issues. Even with managed care, the housing dollars are still very separate. Barb will follow up with Bob on involving DHS staff in these areas.

At this point in time system redesign and individual budget development are closely linked. These two committees will be merged for a short time to establish a framework, where changes need to occur to allow funding streams to blend, and prioritizing action plans. Branch workgroups are expected to be needed. Barb will begin to put together a team of people to address the technical aspect of how funds are dispersed and tracked.

Technical assistance development on fiscal intermediaries and implementation of funding flow related to a person's choice for purchasing is a priority.

To further assist with the framework and the action plan, committee members will identify what research and/or data needs there are to answer the questions discussed (worksheet).

The next meeting of the Individual Budget/System Redesign Committee will follow the Advisory Committee meeting on Friday, April 25th at the Eagan Lottery Building.
- Provider rep.
  * Dakota - consumer family, county, state, community members, local advocacy, providers
  * Blue Earth
  * Olmsted - allow for individualization; unique, local support/ed; activities

* Primary
  - Work group
    * Secondary work groups share information, learn from each other (effective/ineffective)
    * Avoid duplication when possible - coordination/collaboration, i.e., generic materials, development, etc., project info

1) Work groups on consumer education/support
   * project-wide
   * local

2) Define/refine project goals/objectives
   * for consumer audience
   * for persons that support consumer audience

3) Materials development

4) ID & develop/refine strategies, education, information sharing, support
   * Consumers/families
   * Person that support....
- content
- timelines
- individualized budgets resource mgmt
- PCP models/approaches
- housing options

* Clearly define project goals & objective so that consumers can be informed

* Large group training/presentations aren't always most effective

* Educate people who support the consumer so that they can educate consumers (whoever is closest to person, i.e., case manager, direct care, provider, family member, friend, advocate
  - community inclusion
  - dignity/respect
  - sharing of real life stories from people who actually experienced "ambassadors tapes" via case managers 1:1= works

* Educate and support consumers to be self-advocates to make informed choices (ind risk) decision making

* Informed choice requires experiencing options/possibilities

  Advocates need to be educated and ready to respond to consumer & family info requests & advocacy needs

* Consumer Education
  - identify support needs and selection/hiring
  - service evaluation - educate consumers to assess quality of services/supports they receive

People First, ARC, Act, Inc.

Continue to ask consumers what they need in terms of education/information one-to-one with people that know consumer best.

* Educate professionals how project will change they system and change how they traditionally do business and if they do business

* Address dual system issue with professionals
  - ARC/ACT/PACER
  - W's (?)
  - State
  - Consumers/families
General Philosophy:
* Move from rule-based system to relationship-based system
* Change base of control of supports to individual/family
* Don’t create new boxes
* Expectation for shift of responsibility
* Informed and supported consumers
* Assurance of health/safety and public accountability
* Simplify process - simple and straight-forward

General Criteria/Outcomes:
--- Funding reconfiguration
   Outcomes:
   * Individual budgets that include federal, state & local resources
   * Local control of funds
--- Licensing variances
   * Assurance of health & safety
   * Local q.a. accountable to consumer, public & state
   * Process includes continual quality improvement
   * Relationship-based support system
--- Housing
   Included in funding and Licensing/QA
--- Work (same as housing)
--- Licensing
   * QA & Evaluation
   * Increased access to desired/needed supports for consumers
   * Whatever it takes—
   * Applicability to other disabled populations and statewide implementation
- Methodology for Establishing Individual Budget.
  * Mankato State Contract is one option
  * PCA assessments and tweaking, individual care requirements are a point in time
  * Dream Plan - person-centered planning - dreams funded
  * Historical costs with or without discounts
  * Waiver allocation structure
  * Usual and customary - bid out to establish budgets - RFA
  — * Guess and by gosh
  * Other states

- Staging of who to bring in/services/service funding/methodologies, i.e., dreaming with people with county dollars then expanding.... PCA, waiver

- Waiver flexibility

- Housing funding flexibility

- What needs to be in an individual budget - phasing
ADVISORY COMMITTEES/PUBLIC RELATIONS/COUNTY MENTORING

Between project communication - Barb and local coordinator to decide how to do.
Mentoring for other target populations

- Communication(s)
  (a) Clearing house/resource
    - information
    - technical assistance
    - materials
    - go through state coordinator
  
(b) Barb teach project coordinator - decide how they want to do that communication

(c) Meetings should rotate and be closer to the local projects

This is critical - ASAP

Local Advisory
* each project to decide
* may want to target groups already in existence > ASAP

State Advisory
Then this:
* Three members from each project plus Barb (if outside folks come in, too much education and turf issues)
* Have regular "fact sheets" go out to stakeholder groups - Legal Aid, ARC, SILS, ARRM, etc.
* Group decides how often to meet

Public Relations

* Slogan "Just Do It - One Person at a Time!"
* Right now use concept paper "fact sheets" for getting information out.
* In a year, do more "talks and training out" when we know something
* Hit the conference circuit "ARRM, MSSA, SILS, MNDACA, Supervisor Conference"
* Maybe piggy-back on the Project Foresight Conference for a training on S.D.
* Use RSS newsletter and quarterly meetings to talk with case managers

County Mentoring
TBA Later Down the Road
At least a year off "he needs to know what we are doing

INDIVIDUAL BUDGETS MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT