

Rate Tool Selection Criteria

State:

Person Contacted:

Interview done by Date:

Follow Up Needed:

Scoring Guide

Criteria	Questions	Most interesting to Oregon	least interesting to Oregon
----------	-----------	----------------------------	-----------------------------

Foundation for Rates Rules and Definitions

The model operates in a formal structure established by statute or administrative rule and available to all stakeholders.	When was process started and rule put in place? Is copy available on line or can it be mailed? How much of your system and waiver does this apply to?	Rules or statute describe the process and the roles and responsibilities of the players in detail.	Process is required in written policy statements rather than rules or some details such as roles and responsibilities, the frequency of rate updates, etc. are sketchy or missing.
Rates are readily available to the public.	Where can we find the information? Whose else can find it?	Availability of rate information is prominently advertised, provided on-line and in printed materials available on request, easy to understand	Rates are available but not advertised. Difficult to determine who to call to request the information.
Rates are updated on a regular basis that is prescribed in an administrative rule.	How frequently is the planned update? Who is involved? How has it been done? Use same parties as initial?	Schedule for update written and known to parties	update schedule as needed and unclear to players
			update schedule not addressed

Rate Tool Selection Criteria

State:

Person Contacted:

Interview done by Date:

Follow Up Needed:

		Scoring Guide		
Criteria	Questions	Most interesting to Oregon		least interesting to Oregon
Services are defined in sufficient detail to see the relationship between services and costs	Can get list and sample?	Service definitions include type and content of service, intensity (staffing ratio) and outcome }	Complete list of services but limited detail to tie to cost	limited list of services and detail
Service definition address the variety of desired options for community and living supports equal to or greater than Oregon's	Can get a list and actual definitions? What has worked and not worked? Any added later?	clear and complete definitions for residential, employment and community services		Services bundled in broad packages with traditional definitions
Units of service are clearly defined and workable	Review of ability and experience with bundling and unbundling services ?	definitions clear, process allows for it and maintains accountability		
Eligible and Qualified providers are defined in a manner that supports capacity and any rate variation	What types of providers using system, definitions, comparative rates? What has been your experience with changes in provider categories?	State uses multiple types of providers (organizations, independents, other) and clearly defines status, expectations and other variables that justify rate variations	State uses limited types of providers, but clearly defines expectations to justify any rate variation	State uses one type of provider and does not address this issue

Rate Tool Selection Criteria

State:

Person Contacted:

Interview done by Date:

Follow Up Needed:

Scoring Guide

Criteria	Questions	Most interesting to Oregon		least interesting to Oregon
Definitions of Allowable and Non Allowable Costs	Published list (general or by service)	Already clearly defined for each service and rate	some definitions but some negotiation	Material provides general guidelines and leaves much open for negotiation

Transparency and Clarity of Rate Setting Process

Rates are based on studies that are conducted by an independent party working under a contract with the Department.	who? How long/ how much cost? How did you address the variations in what agencies define as acceptant and not and director indirect?	State used experienced 3rd party and comprehensive study	Internal study by state unit different than DD	provider submission of information
Rates and the methods used to establish them are clearly explained in writing	What guidelines were used in study and are now shared?	policy, manual and training easily available on line	material partially available	Limited unclear access or understanding
Assumptions used in rate setting are clearly documented	What are they?	Are documented before the fact	Are documented after the fact	Are not documented

Rate Tool Selection Criteria

State:

Person Contacted:

Interview done by Date:

Follow Up Needed:

		Scoring Guide		
Criteria	Questions	Most interesting to Oregon		least interesting to Oregon
The rate-setting process includes(ed) participation of people representing county, provider and family perspectives.	How were they used initially and how are they used at this stage of the process?	process includes all major stakeholder (field test) groups and was followed by orientation/training done by reps of each perspective (tools available)	Some involvement and orientation	process seems imposed with little participation and orientation
There is a mechanism for authorizing “rate exceptions”, i.e. rates that exceed the published rate.	Describe policy, process, and level of utilization	Mechanism exists is clear, simple and readily available to all parties has approval and QA review	Mechanism exists but does not have all characteristics	No mechanism

Rate Tool Selection Criteria

State:

Person Contacted:

Interview done by Date:

Follow Up Needed:

		Scoring Guide		
Criteria	Questions	Most interesting to Oregon		least interesting to Oregon
There is a mechanism for authorizing rates when an emergency exists and the normal precursors such as the assessment and development of an ISP have not been completed.	Describe policy, process, and level of utilization	Mechanism exists is clear, simple and readily available to all parties has approval and QA review	Mechanism exists but does not have all characteristics	No mechanism
The billing process is simple and minimizes administrative costs for the provider.	Sample policy process and forms. Individual how address confirmation of service delivery (customer sign off, CM review) ? Does process help individual see relationship between their budget and services?	process rated by all stakeholders as simple		Meets requirements but is seen as cumbersome by providers
Providers are paid the same rate for the same service (or level of service), except when regional cost differences (or similar circumstances) have resulted in different rates.		Experience information and feedback from providers and customers		If this is not true why?
Rates based on time recognize indirect (non face to face) costs "productivity time", allowing for preparation time & other necessary activities to be included in the cost at defined levels.	Have you set limits on the % of indirect? How stringently did you list categories of in-direct or admin time? Hoe did you address (if at all) capacity building activities not focused on an individual customer?	Rates clearly define this as included in allowable. Providers feel adequate. Little bickering over it in state	Clearly defined but not agreement	Not considered clear or adequate

Rate Tool Selection Criteria

State:

Person Contacted:

Interview done by Date:

Follow Up Needed:

Scoring Guide

Administrative overhead and Capacity

Criteria	Questions	Most interesting to Oregon		least interesting to Oregon
Rate adjustments are made for economy of scale and other defined differences in types of providers.	How has this been addressed? Has the system proved workable for state? For providers?	have fair and equitable process for balancing economy of scale and still cover essential admin cost. (More than prorating)		Have not addressed in any way other than prorating
Regional cost differences are recognized ... and are clearly defined.	Can you identify criteria, method of identification, % of variation, and workability	Established criteria for differences, related cost studies, stakeholder consensus and regular review		NA
Rates structure allows for "flexibility", e.g. extra cash that could be used by the provider for unanticipated costs.		Yes limits?		No
Rates offer payment for vacancies to preserve service capacity.	all services or targeted? Rate and process, workability?	Yes limits?		No
Rate structure allows for built-in incentives for the achievement of desired outcomes.	Identified services, process, level of incentive	yes for employment and inclusion		

Rate Tool Selection Criteria

State:

Person Contacted:

Interview done by Date:

Follow Up Needed:

Scoring Guide

Criteria	Questions	Most interesting to Oregon		least interesting to Oregon
How is choice fit in rate structure?		Can individual choose a service option that is more expensive? (less cost effective)		
How does rate structure address use of other resources and natural supports?				

What is the interface in your state between rates, IBA and QA ?		Clear interface with all components of interest to Oregon	systems are not working together	State has only one component of system
A mechanism exists to address any difference between the service cost and the amount paid.		There is a recognition of the difference and a political strategy	Recognition and no strategy	Not Addressed
This State compares to Oregon		Size , population and issues similar	Somewhat similar	Not similar
State level of Experience and Analysis		Able to assess impact on a variety of stakeholders rates, providers, individuals and waitlists)		Not able to assess as result of limited time or information