

I/DD Waiver CFCM Stakeholder Group

Meeting Minutes: March 14, 2019 10a-12p

Kepro Conference Room and Web-based/Conference call

Talking points, flyer/website, CMS response

- Discussed national transition timeline to conflict free case management which began in 2014, moving forward with the 2020 waiver renewal WV will follow suit with total separation of CM and service provision. This was suggested as an added item to talking points It was noted that currently new SC only agency applications can be accepted now, this stakeholder group asked for clarification related to requirement for Behavioral Health License for ne Case Management agencies. OHFLAC representative will be attending the next meeting in April to discuss /clarify questions related to requirement. Liz will follow up and representative from licensure will be attending next stakeholder meeting to address any lingering questions in order for group to finalize agency certification process for Case Management agencies.

Reviewed new CFCM webpage on BMS site –

- Includes CMS clarification PowerPoints - will be adding the approved flyer, minutes from each stakeholder group meeting. Jason Jones voiced question related to what CFCM can and cannot do which he will submit as FAQ . Requested all agencies send questions to add to the FAQ's as they have them arise. **It was noted that not everyone has clear access to internet and we should ensure people without computers can still ask questions about rule and have SCs answer/clarify on home visits. Phone contact information is also included on flyer.**
- Chris Crytzer suggested adding sometime of timeline graphic to the site to make the information easier to see. Jon Sassi noted that he has received some questions/comments from families regarding feeling picked on and doesn't understand why this is happening to them – suggested informing the families/public on how many people this will be affecting such as how many current members are currently receiving services from only one agency. April noted that currently about 15% of members have separated service agencies; so about 85% are served by one agency and will be separating for this rule.

Reviewed grandfathering question posed to CMS from the previous meeting.

- Liz reviewed the entire question posed by agencies and the response sent back from CMS. In short, no there will be no grandfathering clause/exceptions, unless there is only one willing and able provider in that member's area qualifying for a rural exception. Currently, no one would qualify for rural exception based on surveys submitted to date. It was suggested the CMS question/response be added to the FAQ as well.
- It was asked how CFCM would affect crisis site referral – can you refer a member to your own site? Since there are only so many sites/beds available in the state, would they have to sever the CM relationship to serve as the crisis site? April/Liz noted that they would ask for CMS/BMS clarification, but first thought is that would qualify for the rural exemption if they were the only

willing and able provider and since it is a temporary service it would likely require a written policy to reduce the conflict. Question has been added to FAQ's

Update /preliminary data from survey

- Reviewed current provider survey responses – 40 agencies so far – survey ends March 31. Liz noted that there are at least one provider in every county so far. Most agencies noted they would continue to provide both direct service and case management. 42% noted they have staff physically co-located. It was asked if there was enough additional information provided from those agencies to tell where they are or how that separation occurs. Also, does this information matter if they won't be providing both CM and DS to the same person? Liz noted this survey was just about gathering information to determine how best to separate and also to enable agencies to begin looking at internal changes which may be needed within their structure in order to be able to provide. Same question about #8 – agencies provided more information to Liz than the group currently has available to review – will look more closely at these after the survey closes. It was suggested that an explanation of the cultural exemption be added to the FAQ. Send any additional questions for FAQ to Liz.

Case Management agency certification requirements

- Liz documented stakeholder group recommendation for each section during discussion. It was asked who will be responsible for transfer/discharge – the CM or DS provider? Should there be a definitive effective date like SUD waiver (effective the 1st day of month following request)? There will need to be strong language to clarify responsibility in the manual.
- Barb & others disagree with not having criteria with licensure because it's not fair to count on a service provider to keep or be able to use their space for meetings or if a family wants to have a meeting without the service provider. It was noted that meeting/office space still has to be ADA by law. It was asked if the concern for requiring licensure is about quality because licensure doesn't look at quality.
- It was asked if providers should start best practice separating service agencies for the new waiver slots being release since it's not really fair to get new members/families adjusted to services with one provider for 16 months and then make them switch. April noted that you cannot force the separation of service agencies right now, but providers can educate the new slots about the upcoming change.

Future meeting schedule:

May 9, 2019	Kepro's office & conference call	10:00am – 12:00 noon
June 13, 2019	Kepro's office & conference call	10:00am – 12:00 noon