

Steering Committee Meeting

October 15, 2008

Meeting Minutes

In Attendance: Kathy Sykes, Michael McAllister, Michelle Sparling, Jeff Orlin, Wanda Sabb, Julia Barol, Len Kravitz, Todd Handler, Marianne Roche

Michael opened the meeting by distributing the Flip Chart Notes from the CIE Provider Meeting held on 10/2/08. Notes were distributed for the three breakout groups: Office of Developmental Programs, (ODP), Philadelphia Mental Retardation Services (MRS), and Community Integrated Employment (CIE) Providers (see attached).

I. October 2, 2008 Provider Meeting Review

A. ODP Breakout Group

Michael began the discussion with a review of the notes from the ODP Breakout Session that was facilitated by Shauna. The group read through the documented and reviewed the Issues and Solutions described. The review generated the following discussion about each of the issues identified:

▪ **Service definitions allow for workshops**

This concern elicited a long discussion about the details of the new service definitions. It was decided that the Steering Committee should take a closer look at the new service definitions and their exact wording.

▪ **State doesn't understand all that is involved in delivering Community Integrated Employment Services**

This issue generated a discussion about participation in the state-wide employment coalition (Quality Improvement Committee on Employment). It was suggested that members of the Steering Committee should participate in this coalition. Teresa noted that the meetings take place in Harrisburg. There is the possibility of participating by way of Conference call. Teresa has participated in this group in the past and will distribute minutes from past meetings. Len also expressed an interest in participating. Teresa will distribute previous minutes from this coalition. It was agreed that participation with this group would be beneficial to Philadelphia's Vision for Employment 2010 efforts. The next meeting is November 4, 2008.

▪ **Authorization process doesn't allow for the 'ebb and flow' of services in CIE**

There was discussion about how the authorization process works and that the process may not take into account how CIE services are provided. An example given was of critical revisions getting completed in a

timely fashion. It was decided that there needs to be a basic information sharing session with CIE providers to explain how the process works and who to contact when things are not working. There was general agreement that this issue seems to be more within the scope of Philadelphia MRS and Supports Coordination Organizations.

▪ **ISP's address CIE, but funding is not available nor attached (for base funded individuals)**

It was decided that this concern was not an ODP issue.

▪ **Funding for CIE**

This issue generated a discussion about the Individual Emergency Status Forms (IESF) which do not apply to base funded individuals. It was pointed out that IESF funds will not be needed after this fiscal year.

▪ **Will there be enough funded job coach positions to support new referrals? (capacity)**

There was a general conversation concerning best ways to have the capacity to support more people in employment. The group saw this as more of a CIE provider concern and not a direct ODP issue.

▪ **Make employment the priority, and build around employment (for people who work part time)**

There was agreement that this concern is a primary policy issue for ODP. The policy should clearly articulate that the starting point should be to encourage community integrated employment and that other supports should be put in place around the employment outcome. One example discussed was the idea of building supports around a minimum of 5 hours of employment per week. This approach may not encourage meaningful employment outcomes.

▪ **State accountability to employment outcomes**

There needs to be clarity on accountability with respect to employment outcomes. One idea mentioned was to empower Administrative Entities to monitor employment using outcome data and various reporting requirements.

▪ **Benefit concerns of SC's & family members**

The group agreed that this is not an ODP issue.

▪ **Data and quality standards could lead to exclusion of people with more challenges**

After discussion, the group agreed this statement needs to be re-stated for clarity purposes.

▪ **Low expectations are set in day settings**

This issue is another concern that requires clarity with respect to ODP's policy concerning Adult Day and Sheltered Employment services. A change in policy would be to articulate an *Employment First State* position similar to policy statements in Washington, Minnesota, and Vermont. It is difficult to promote employment when segregated options are supported in policy and are funded in the waiver.

▪ **System does not adjust quickly to changing needs/emergencies**

This is an ODP issue where perhaps resources could be set aside to help in these situations. The general idea is to have a process for accessing “gap funding” to address changing employment support needs.

▪ **Service definition does not support CIE as a priority (i.e., 40 hour cap, 6 month review)**

The new service definitions need to be reviewed from this framework. There needs to be more incentives for supporting people in community employment. Perhaps there could be a creative use of the MIG (Medicaid Infrastructure) Grants to address incentives.

▪ **HCSIS does not capture people who are working**

HCSIS only captures service units and costs. The data needs to be useful for accountability and productivity. A data system that addresses employment outcomes such as earnings, type of job, etc. is needed.

▪ **PFDS cap is too low for those in employment**

The cap is being increased to \$26,000. There was discussion that it should be increased to \$30,000.

▪ **Difficulty with getting jobs**

A solution proposed and identified in the Flip Chart Notes for this concern was to “have the state act as a broker to assist in getting more jobs”. There was discussion about how realistic would it be for ODP to become involved with job development given the current mixed messages. There was discussion that this approach would be more meaningful if ODP organized around an Employment-First Policy.

Everyone was in agreement that the Flip Chart Notes from October 2, 2008 will be sent out ‘as is’ to those who participated in the meeting. Providers will be asked for feedback and in the interim the sheets will be honed by the Steering Committee.

There was a suggestion that a meeting with Jeff Petraco from ODP take place to flesh out specific issues that can be addressed by ODP. It was also suggested that when a formal meeting occurs there needs to be some Provider participation as well.

B. MRS Breakout Group

The discussion continued with the Flip Chart notes from the MRS Breakout Session that was facilitated by Michael.

▪ **Role of MRS as it becomes an Administrative Entity**

There was discussion as to how there can be more information provided to explain this role. Kathy mentioned that training for CIE providers should be well organized. A 2 hour time frame was suggested.

Kathy will send Len the list of 25 responsibilities of the Administrative Entity (AE). It was suggested that Len discuss the role of the AE at a Employment Forum meeting. This list can also go on the Philaonthejob website and in the Family Forum.

▪ **Timelines for ISP Critical Revisions and Approvals including timelines for ISP**

The group agreed on the need for an information sharing session on the process for critical revisions, authorizations and ISP approvals. Kathy noted that at this time MRS has a 5 day turn around for approval for plans submitted under the waiver cap. There was much discussion on this topic including the need to share the current process with CIE providers. This is a bigger issue than just the critical revisions. There needs to be a conversation about planning with providers around how they project hours. It needs to be pointed out that it is not about the number of units used in a year but the number of units needed for an employment outcome. There was some discussion about the phase approach utilized by OVR for projecting service hours needed. This approach does not project on a annual. Instead the projections are based on the completion of outcomes. OVR re-authorizes more hours at the completion of agreed upon phases in the employment process.

▪ **Transition from OVR to waiver funding**

The CIE provider needs to be forthright with the individual and their family about this process. An individual needs to be identified as eligible for waiver-funded services. There needs to be coordination between when a person ends OVR funded services and when that person becomes eligible for waiver funded services.

▪ **Inconsistent Information**

This was a general theme across a number of the issues discussed. There continues to be a need to provide accurate information and provide clarity when there are misconceptions about procedures and requirements.

Note: Due to time constraints the MRS Flip Chart Note discussion was discontinued after discussing this issue. The M^{RS} Flip Chart Note discussion will be continued at the next Steering Committee meeting starting with the next issue identified.

II. General Updates

Michael informed everyone that the first Provider Practices Work Group meeting is scheduled for October 24, 2008. A small number of individuals were expected to participate. The agenda includes reviewing the purpose of the Work Group, reviewing the CIE Provider Flip Chart Notes, and a review/edit of the Provider Practices Survey.

A. FY 2009 ODP/Transition Initiative

Discussion occurred around ways to jump-start the Transition Initiative for this year. One idea was to have specific meetings with Supports Coordinator Organization (SCO) at their locations to begin the

process. The SCO would invite the individuals identified in the Initiative to a general information session about employment and what to expect concerning employment services. Subsequently, follow up Career Planning Workshops could be scheduled.

Lists identifying those individuals who have been designated as being in the FY 2009 Initiative will be sent out to each SCO. The final tally is that 10 individuals are from Consortium, 18 are from Partnership for Community Supports (PFCS), 16 are from PersonLink, and 30 are from Quality Progressions (QP). Of that number, 19 are currently receiving OVR funded employment services. Teresa will contact the SCO's to find out convenient dates for meetings.

A Career Planning Workshop has been scheduled with PFCS in February 2009 as part of Who Wants to Work efforts. Partnerships asked if they could invite individuals from their Initiative list as part of this Workshop. This seems to be a good starting point for the 18 people who have been identified.

B. CIE Monthly FY2009 Data

Len distributed a list of who had submitted data for the months of July, August, and September, 2008. The plan is to send out a quarterly report on October 29, 2008. There are several providers that have not submitted any data. These providers will be called and offered technical assistance if needed to assist them in submitting the data. An email will also be sent out to all providers as a reminder for any months that have not yet been submitted.

The next Steering Committee meeting is scheduled for November 19, 2008 at 2 pm at MRS.