

CFCM IDD Stakeholder Meeting

Minutes

February 14, 2019

10am -12 PM

Kepro Conference room and web based/conference call

1. **Welcome and introductions completed.** Parent/guardian asks what good is input from grassroots folks. Liz states no final decisions are made at this point as to how WV system will be implemented other than separation of the CM service and Direct services being with a minimum of two different agencies and role of stakeholder group is to provide input on the best way for implementation of Conflict Free Case Management within parameters of final ruling established by CMS> This process began in 2014 and state has been moving in the direction of implementation. Can look at what is in place and sync established practices/policies/procedures with conflict free case management. There are members of stakeholder group articulating belief that this process was waste of time, money and resources.
2. **. Review of previous discussion items:**
 - a. **Flyer-** This has gone out for distribution. Response will be reviewed at 3/14 meeting to determine if additional action steps are needed. Development of talking points **to be discussed further**
 - b. **survey-** Discussed today that this had been sent out on 2/13/2019. Survey will remain open to provide a minimum of 30 days response time for agencies. Gives agencies an opportunity to self-review requirements for CFCM as well as provides information this stakeholder group can review. Preliminary results will be reviewed at 3/14 meeting. Data being collected will indicate current agency structure which will be important in order for agencies to demonstrate separation of service provision and case management.
 - c. **Kepro update (distribution list, SC corner, current data/agency update)-** no updates at today's meeting
 - d. **Webpage on BMS website- in process of getting set up.** (Update: Liz will pull up website during stakeholder meeting if available on 3/14).
3. Discussion in reference to "grandfathering" definition and clarification is requested from CMS via group's liaison, Pat Nisbit. If response is received by next meeting date, CMS's response will be shared with stakeholder group. ASC will draft out the question to be posed to CMS and Liz will follow up with Pat Nisbit requesting clarification of "grandfathering" and exception ruling. An additional provider asked if anyone has challenged the ruling for total separation of CM and service provision for individuals. Liz is currently doing research and will discuss findings at next scheduled meeting. TO date, the exemption rule applies only in cases on limited access to agency due to geographic issues and April Goebel points out that this must be supported by documentation. For example in rural areas there may only be one able and willing provider to provide Case Management services. JW asks if anyone has challenged rule and Liz will research question. Other states have utilized MCO structure for case management. JW asked further

question related to grandfathering clause and Liz indicated data from survey could be reviewed at next meeting to determine, based on data, if there are areas we could potentially be looking at as a geographic exemption to rule. Will discuss further at 3/14 meeting and also will discuss response from CMS if response is returned at that date.

4. Liz reviewed guidance provided by CMS defining conflict free case management. Also read key elements for conflict free case management agencies and will obtain requested clarification in reference to group's question related to grandfathering

5. **Agency Certification Process:** Agencies are to do side by side comparison of 3 waivers, (TBIW, ADW and IDDW) , overall, ASC didn't see anything that would be hard for agencies to meet in terms of compliance. April has concerns that we are doing "boiler plate" program transfers , but some things may not be cross-program appropriate. April – ADW and TBI currently have separation agreement. The stakeholder group wanted to look at processes from these programs to see if any would fit.
 - a. Group reviewed draft certification standards which had column added by Liz for stakeholder comments and identified follow up actions. See spreadsheet for details
 - i. SC's should not report to supervisor of other services
 - ii. Smaller agencies may have same supervisor
 - iii. Bob says this could create problem for agencies becoming top heavy
 - iv. Quality management plan= Internal methodology for agencies to review quality and remediate. If not following policy, what would you put in place to fix this. Group agrees that guidelines for quality management plan would be good to have.

Next meeting scheduled for March 14, 2019