

NOTE: This section was inadvertently left out of the last public comment period and is being posted now for 30 day public comment. The document has been updated to document the progress as of 10/18/2022.

The Initial round of reviews yielded the following data.
(No Settings were identified for Heightened Scrutiny)

Provider Self- Assessment Results 2015

Non-Residential

Setting Type – Provider Controlled	Total	Compliant	May be Compliant with Remediation	Non-Compliant
IDDW Facility-Based Day Habilitation	51	0	51	0
IDDW Supported Employment	13	0	13	0
TOTAL	64	0	64	0

Residential

IDDW ISS serving 1-3 people*	54	0	54	0
IDDW Group Home serving 4+ people*	18	0	18	0
TOTAL	72	0	72	0

*No providers were found, based on the self-assessment survey, to be totally compliant. These self-assessments were voluntary and not every provider responded. Only self-assessments submitted were reviewed.

Desk Reviews Results 2016

Non-Residential

Setting Type	Total	Compliant	May be Compliant with Remediation	Non-Compliant
IDDW Facility-Based Day Habilitation*	51	0	51	0
IDDW Supported Employment**	13	0	13	0
TOTAL	64	0	64	0

*10 Facility-Based Day Habilitation Sites were determined to be Priority I and 41 Facility Day Habilitation Sites were determined to be Priority II.

**1 Supported Employment Site was determined to be Priority 1 and 12 Supported Employment Sites were determined to be Priority II.

Residential

IDDW ISS serving 1-3 people***	54	0	54	0
IDDW Group Home serving 4+ people****	9	0	0	0
TOTAL	63	0	63	0

*****ISS serving 1-3 people were determined to be Priority I and 45 ISS serving 1-3 people were determined to be Priority II.**

******Group Homes serving 4 or more people were determined to be Priority I and 6 Group Homes serving 4 or more people were determined to be Priority II.** There are now 9 less group homes serving 4 or more people because people chose to move to other settings.

Only assessments submitted for desk reviews were reviewed and not all providers submitted assessments.

The survey was circulated from 4/1/2015 to 8/19/2015. New settings and/or providers were added to the initial list as they were created. This process is ongoing. As survey information is gathered, BMS reviewed the submitted information as follows to identify the following key indicators of non-compliance and to prioritize settings reviews:

Key Indicator: Providers that self-identify as being in compliance, but Member responses indicate otherwise.

Key Indicator: Member responses indicate provider compliance, but Provider response indicates otherwise

Key indicator: Provider responses that self-identify gross non-compliance among the five requirements of 42 CFR 441.301(c)(4)(i)/441.710(a)(1)(i)/441.530(a)(1)(i). These providers are scored as 0, 3 or 4 on the assessment instrument. (Appendices K and N of State Transition Plan).

Key Indicator: Analysis of provider respondents to identify those with licensed (owned or leased settings) which did not respond as instructed.

Key Indicator: Any provider setting for which BMS has received a complaint alleging noncompliance.

These Key Indicators translate into Scores based as follows:

Score of 1 No indication of an Institutional Setting AND No indication of Isolating Effects AND Score of less than 10% for Conditions that Restrict Choice or Rights (Compliance)

Score of 2 No indication of an Institutional Setting AND Score of 1-49% for Isolating Effects AND Score of 10-49% for conditions that Restrict Choice or Rights

Score of 3 No indication of an Institutional Setting AND Score of 1-49% for Isolating Effects AND Score of 50% or higher for conditions that Restrict Choice or Rights

Score of 4 Any indication of an institutional setting OR Score of 50% or higher for Isolating Effects. (Gross Non-Compliance)

Providers with identified Key Indicators are considered Priority I.

Providers without identified Key Indicators and scoring 1 or 2 on the self -assessment instrument are considered Priority II.

The relation of score to priority is as follows:

Score 0 (no answers) Priority II

1 Priority II

- 2 Priority II
- 3 Priority I
- 4 Priority I

No providers were found, based on the self - survey, to be totally compliant. Priority II (Score 1 or 2) providers had self-surveyed to indicate substantive compliance.

Initial On-Site Results 2016-2017

Non-Residential

Setting Type – Provider Controlled	Total	Compliant	May be Compliant with Remediation	Non-Compliant
IDDW Facility-Based Day Habilitation	55	0	55	0
TOTAL	55	0	55	0

NOTE: Page 5 of the CMS Informational Bulletin September 16, 2011, regarding employment and employment related services states that “Waiver funding is not available for the provision of vocational services delivered in facility based or sheltered work settings.” Supporting Employment is not providing in settings licensed or leased by a provider or where members are grouped together to receive supported employment services, thus Supported Employment was removed as a Setting Type. Facility Based Day Habilitation settings and Group Homes serving 4 or more people received an initial on-site review.

*Some providers incorrectly identified themselves in the provider survey. For example, some incorrectly identified settings as owned or leased by the provider when an on-site review revealed this was not the case. Some listed a setting as a day program that was an office for case managers only. That is one reason the total amount of Facility Based Day Habilitation sites dropped from 64 or 55, however, some sites did close also.

Residential

IDDW ISS serving 1-3 people	34	1	33	0
IDDW Group Home serving 4+ people	14	0	14	0
TOTAL	48	1	47	0

Follow up On-Site Review Results 2016-2018

Non-Residential

Setting Type – Provider Controlled	Total	Compliant	May be Compliant with Remediation	Non-Compliant
IDDW Facility-Based Day Habilitation	55	55	0	0
TOTAL	55	55	0	0

Residential

IDDW ISS serving 1-3 people	34	1	33	0
IDDW Group Home serving 4+ people	14	14	0	0
TOTAL	48	15	33	0

Initial Review Results for Specialized Family Care 2018

Setting Type – Provider Controlled	Total	Compliant	May be Compliant with Remediation	Non-Compliant
Residential				
IDDW Specialized Family Care Homes	63	27	36	0
TOTAL	63	27	36	0

Follow Up Review Results for Specialized Family Care 2019

Setting Type – Provider Controlled	Total	Compliant	May be Compliant with Remediation	Non-Compliant
Residential				
IDDW Specialized Family Care Homes	63	63	0	0
TOTAL	63	63	0	0

All Specialized Family Care Settings were found to be compliant as of 12/31/19.

SUMMARY AS OF 10/18/22 OF ALL SETTINGS

Non-Residential

Setting Type - Provider Controlled	Total	Compliant	May be Compliant with Remediation	Non-Compliant
IDDW Facility Based Day Habilitation	57	57	0	0
TOTAL	57	5	0	0

Setting Type - Provider Controlled	Total	Compliant	May Be Compliant with Remediation	Non-Compliant
IDDW ISS Serving 1-3 people	359	55	304	0
IDDW Group Home Serving 4+ people	26	14	12	0
IDDW Specialized Family Care Homes	63	63	0	0
ADW Private Homes	9	9	0	0
TBIW Private Homes	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	457	141	316	0
 Setting Type - Member Controlled*				
IDDW Private Homes	4482	0	4482	0
ADW Private Homes	7382	0	7382	0
TBIW Private Homes	85	0	85	0
TOTAL	11,949	0	11,949	0

***Individual, privately-owned homes (privately-owned or rented homes and apartments in which the individual receiving Medicaid-funded home and community-based services live independently or with family members, friends, or roommates) are presumed to be in compliance with the regulatory criteria of a home and community-based setting. The state includes private residences as part of the overall quality assurance framework when implementing monitoring processes for ongoing compliance with the settings criteria, as well as any oversight provisions in the approved HCBS waivers or State Plan Amendments.**