2013-15 Policy Option Package

Agency Name: Aging and People with Disabilities
Program Area Name: Advocacy and Development Unit
Program Name: Medicaid Funded Long-Term Care Services/Older Americans Act Services

Policy Option Package Initiative: APD Innovations and Pilots Initiative
Policy Option Package Title: APD Innovations and Pilots Initiative
Policy Option Package Number: 108-01
Related Legislation: Healthy People
Program Funding Team: Healthy People

Summary Statement: This POP supports research and development account funding for innovations and piloting new approaches to long term care services. Initiatives will serve Medicaid, pre-Medicaid and non-Medicaid populations. Innovations and pilots will be tracked and outcomes measured leading to the statewide adoption and implementation of new evidence-based approaches that increases the efficiency and effectiveness of services. The implementation of successful pilots will re-establish Oregon as a nationwide leader in its field. Currently APD relies on grants which may not be timely or offer options to address key areas of innovation. APD is seeking 1 % of its appropriation for this fund.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Option Package Pricing:</th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>Total Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. WHAT WOULD THIS POLICY OPTION PACKAGE (POP) DO AND HOW WOULD IT BE IMPLEMENTED?

This POP funds an APD research and development account to move APD from relying solely on grant based opportunities for innovations in services and service delivery approaches. APD has been hampered in its goals to offer the most comprehensive, consumer-preferred, efficient, cost-efficient services and stay current in the latest developments in its field by a lack of resources needed to test new services and new service delivery options. With funding from this POP, APD envisions that it will be able to support 8-10 pilots over the course of a biennium.

Implementation: Innovative and pilot ideas will be submitted to the APD Advocacy & Development unit for consideration. Pilots may cover a wide range of topics such as prevention, service improvements, use of technology, new methods of coordination, cost savings and others that address the needs of seniors and people with disabilities. An application form has been developed to document ideas to be considered. Staff may assist the concept originator to develop the proposed concept to the point of submission. A process for concept evaluation is being drafted which will include such factors as: relationship to key performance measures, agency goals and mission, stakeholder input, partnerships, budget, timing, sustainability, service equity, proposed outcomes and more. Concepts that emerge as priorities will be implemented upon agency approval.

A key element of all approved pilots will be an evaluation component. Periodic evaluation will be required and will be used to determine if the pilot/idea will proceed as planned. Pilots that meet expected outcomes will be considered for permanent implementation, statewide if applicable. Through this process, APD will be better able to focus its resources on locally tested, successful, evidence-based practices that meet agency goals.
2. **WHY DOES THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES PROPOSE THIS POP?**

DHS is proposing this POP to move the agency forward in exploring innovative ways to meet future needs and demands. This package will well-position the agency to offer evidence-based, effective approaches that are preferred by the populations served by APD. The agency will be engaged in continuous improvement in services and service delivery through a program of testing innovative ideas with potential to address DHS and APD mission and goals as well the triple aim of better health, better health care and lower costs.

3. **HOW DOES THIS FURTHER THE AGENCY’S MISSION OR GOALS?**

This POP furthers the agency mission and goals as it keeps the agency current with evolving population and individual needs and preferred, evidence-based methods to achieve well-being and enhance independence. In statute, APD is charged with providing individuals with opportunities and choice, working with local partners and committed to service excellence. To meeting its mission and goals, APD must have funds to explore new and continuously test and improve current choices and options available.

**410.010 State policy for seniors and people with disabilities.** (1) The Legislative Assembly finds and declares that, in keeping with the traditional concept of the inherent dignity of the individual in our democratic society, the older citizens of this state are entitled to enjoy their later years in health, honor and dignity, and citizens with disabilities are entitled to live lives of maximum freedom and independence.

- Mission - To help Oregonians in their own communities achieve wellbeing and independence through opportunities that protect, empower, respect choice and preserve dignity.

- Goals related to seniors and people with disabilities - People are safe and living as independently as possible, People are able to support themselves and their families through stable living wage employment, Choices made by seniors and people with disabilities about their own lives are honored, Partners, clients and stakeholders are actively engaged in a variety of collaborative and meaningful ways. Culturally specific and responsive services are provided by highly qualified and diverse staff. The
department is committed to equal access, service excellence and equity for all Oregonians, Children and youth are safe, well and connected to their families, communities and cultural identities.

- APD Mission: The SPD mission is to make it possible to become independent, healthy and safe. SPD contributes to the DHS mission by helping seniors and people with disabilities of all ages achieve well-being through opportunities for community living, employment, family support and services that promote independence, choice and dignity.

4. **IS THIS POP TIED TO AN APD PERFORMANCE MEASURE? IF YES, IDENTIFY THE PERFORMANCE MEASURE. IF NO, HOW WILL APD MEASURE THE SUCCESS OF THIS POP?**

Yes.

The DHS 2011-2013 performance measures include:

# 10- Access to I& R and I & A- access to accurate and consistent Information & Referral and Information & Assistance for people who are not currently served by SPD.

# 11- Seniors Living Outside of Nursing Facilities- The percentage of Oregon’s seniors receiving SPD long-term care services that are living outside of nursing facilities.

One consideration for the approval of pilots will be the key performance measures. Some pilots will likely target individuals not currently served by APD. Most pilots are likely to support community based rather than nursing facility services.
Another internal APD performance measure is percentage of implemented pilots that yield expected results. This POP would directly support this key APD performance measure as the POP funds the pilots to be measured.

5. DOES THIS POP REQUIRE A CHANGE(S) TO AN EXISTING STATUTE OR REQUIRE A NEW STATUTE? IF YES, IDENTIFY THE STATUTE AND THE LEGISLATIVE CONCEPT.
No, no existing statute change is needed.

6. WHAT ALTERNATIVES WERE CONSIDERED AND WHAT WERE THE REASONS FOR REJECTING THEM?
The agency can continue to rely on identifying and applying for individual grants to support pilots and innovations. Grant funding is competitive, may not be timely or address areas of key interest to the agency so is not a reliable source of funding for continuous improvement and innovation.

Grant funding also may come with additional undesirable burdens, commitments, and lack the flexibility needed to support alternatives in Oregon worth pursuing. As a long-time leader of providing long-term care services at the community level, Oregon is often disadvantaged as other states are encouraged by grants and funding opportunities that assist them with getting to Oregon’s current environment: they use grants to catch up to us. Innovative opportunities offered through the national funding lens that move Oregon ahead of our current state are rare. Self-funding new innovative approaches would allow Oregon to continue to progress as leaders providing long-term care services and supports without the undesirable strings that may come from other funding sources.
7. **WHAT WOULD BE THE ADVERSE EFFECTS OF NOT FUNDING THIS POP?**
The adverse effects of not funding this POP include keeping the agency at the status quo of seeking grant funding as available and having limited funding to support testing innovations that could bring greater consumer satisfaction, more efficiency, save costs and further advance and enhance programs and services consistent with agency mission and values.

8. **WHAT OTHER AGENCIES (STATE, TRIBAL AND/OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT) WOULD BE AFFECTED BY THIS POP? HOW WOULD THEY BE AFFECTED?**
Other Department of Human Services programs, the Oregon Health Authority, local governments, consumer advocacy and stakeholder organizations will be affected by this POP as they may be partners in pilots, suggest pilots, and are likely to benefit from the results of successful pilots.

9. **WHAT ASSUMPTIONS AFFECT THE PRICING OF THIS POP?**

One assumption affecting the pricing of this POP is that approximately 1 % of the organization’s budget is enough to fund promising new ideas.

**Implementation Date(s):**  7/1/13

**End Date (if applicable):**  7/1/15
a. Will there be new responsibilities for the Department of Human Services? Specify which Program Area(s) and describe their new responsibilities.

- Advocacy & Development unit- will solicit ideas, participate in and manage the evaluation process, staff pilots and evaluations, report outcomes, recommend next steps, facilitate transition of successful pilots to ongoing practice and wider application as appropriate

b. Will there be new administrative impacts sufficient to require additional funding? Specify which office(s) (i.e., facilities, computer services, etc.) and describe how it will be affected. See Addendum A - Administrative Services Division LC/POP Impact Questionnaire (at the end of this document).

No, pilots will be funded through the POP and other administrative needs will be handled by the agency.
c. **Will there be changes to client caseloads or services provided to population groups? Specify how many in each relevant program.**  
Changes to services may occur depending on the pilots. Service changes would likely mean a greater array of service choices and/or services that better (more person centered, lower cost, more efficiently) meet service needs.

d. **Will it take new staff or will existing positions be modified? For each classification, list the number of positions and the number of months the positions will work in each biennium. Specify if the positions are permanent, limited duration or temporary.**  
Existing staff will cover any needs.

e. **What are the start-up costs, such as new or significant modifications to computer systems, new materials, outreach and training?**  
No additional start-up costs related to the POP are anticipated.

f. **What are the ongoing costs?**  
On-going costs are anticipated to be 1% of the current APD agency budget.

g. **What are the potential savings?**  
Potential savings are difficult to quantify at this time but the goal of pilots is to increase efficiency and cost effectiveness and enhance cost avoidance. Estimates of savings will depend on individual projects, their success and statewide application.

h. **Based on these answers, is there a fiscal impact?**  
Yes.
### TOTAL FOR THIS PACKAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>GF</th>
<th>OF</th>
<th>FF</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Payments</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Agency Name)* - Fiscal Impact Summary by Program Area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Other Fund</th>
<th>Federal Funds- Ltd</th>
<th>Total Funds</th>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area 1</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 2</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 3</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 4</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are the sources of funding and the funding split for each one?