

2013-15 Policy Option Package

Agency Name: Department of Human Services
Program Area Name: Developmental Disabilities
Program Name: Office of Developmental Disabilities
Policy Option Package Initiative: Reestablish quality assurance positions in Community Developmental Disability Programs and Support Service Brokerages
Policy Option Package Title: Restoration of Quality Assurance Positions
Policy Option Package Number: 109-7
Related Legislation:
Program Funding Team: Healthy People

Summary Statement:

This package would restore resources for quality assurance activities eliminated, via the reduction of funded positions, from Community Developmental Disability Programs (CDDPs) and Support Service Brokerages during the 09-11 biennium. These resources are central to implementing ongoing quality assurance and improvement activities in the developmental disability delivery system. These resources are required to effectively (1) meet the DHS goal of providing effective and efficient services, (2) comply with CMS expectations for effective quality assurance and remediation efforts at the state and local level, (3) evaluate the effectiveness of the DD system sustainability efforts, and (4) integrate the DD system and health system transformation efforts.

	General Fund	Other Funds	Federal Funds	Total Funds
<u>Policy Option Package Pricing:</u>	\$3,428,160	\$0	\$3,407,600	\$6,835,760

1. WHAT WOULD THIS POLICY OPTION PACKAGE (POP) DO AND HOW WOULD IT BE IMPLEMENTED?

This Policy Option Package would restore the quality assurance resources back to the developmental disability service delivery system. In prior years these resources existed in the form of Quality Assurance positions embedded in CDDP's and Support Service Brokerages. These organizations have certain designated quality assurance responsibilities. These positions existed in prior years but were eliminated during the 09-11 biennium due to the State's economy and resulting DHS budget issues.

- 2. WHY DOES THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES PROPOSE THIS POP?** The quality assurance resources were embedded in the CDDP's and brokerages in the form of dedicated staff positions. These positions were the first line of addressing quality assurance issues and quality improvement needs for services for people with developmental disabilities. The positions conducted activities and provided information necessary to address local service needs and channeled information to the Office of Developmental Disability Services for the purposes of statewide quality assurance and improvement activities. Since the local quality assurance positions were eliminated the overall scope and depth of quality assurance activities for services to people with developmental disabilities has significantly been scaled back from prior years and state central office staff have had to be utilized to the best degree possible to help fill the need for quality assurance and state oversight information. This has been done at a time when the Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Services (CMS) as the primary funder of services, is requiring more quality assurance and service oversight activities. These pressures for improved quality assurance and remediation efforts are expected to be present at the local service delivery and state systems level.

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

The implementation of quality services that produce intended results is central to the overall mission of DHS and in the accomplishment of every stated goal. These resources are critical in assuring adequate efforts can be placed on needed quality assurance and improvement activities.

4. IS THIS POP TIED TO A DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES PERFORMANCE MEASURE? IF YES, IDENTIFY THE PERFORMANCE MEASURE. IF NO, HOW WILL DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES MEASURE THE SUCCESS OF THIS POP?

This POP is aligned with the DHS and ODDS fundamentals and Breakthrough monitoring, measuring, and improving the quality of services. More specifically this POP will be tied to the Key Performance Measures addressing the need to make sure people are free from abuse and the measure regarding improved employment outcomes.

Additionally, the QA positions will be an investment for our desired future state. They will help in assuring that the implementation of the DD system sustainability plan is working as intended and will be a source of information and effort in addressing how the DD system can interface effectively with CCO’s and the general health system transformation efforts.

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

- 6. WHAT ALTERNATIVES WERE CONSIDERED AND WHAT WERE THE REASONS FOR REJECTING THEM?** The alternatives are those in place today, continuing with a scaled down quality assurance and improvement system that does not address all areas needing attention and using current central staff, as addition to utilizing some state central staff to the degree possible over their current duties, to address statewide quality assurance and improvement needs.
- 7. WHAT WOULD BE THE ADVERSE EFFECTS OF NOT FUNDING THIS POP?** There is a risk of non-compliance with CMS expectations in the area of quality assurance and meeting the requisite state oversight assurance required in implementing Home and Community Based Waiver services.
- 8. WHAT OTHER AGENCIES (STATE, TRIBAL AND/OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT) WOULD BE AFFECTED BY THIS POP? HOW WOULD THEY BE AFFECTED?** Community Developmental Disability Programs (CDDPs) and Support Service Brokerages would be effected because they are charged with quality assurance and improvement responsibilities.
- 9. WHAT ASSUMPTIONS AFFECT THE PRICING OF THIS POP?** This is based on state staff assuming the QA positions in the field for both CDDPs and Brokerages. 40 FTE were calculated at a Step 2, OPA2 positions. I feel there will be additional costs once program has consulted with OIS and Central Services regarding these positions.

Implementation Date(s): 7/1/13

End Date (if applicable): _____

- a. **Will there be new responsibilities for the Department of Human Services? NO**
- b. **Specify which Program Area(s) and describe their new responsibilities.**
- c. **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.**
- d. **Will there be changes to client caseloads or services provided to population groups? Specify how many in each relevant program. No.**
- e. **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. Yes, 24 months per biennium, in a permanent position of an OPA2.**
- f. **What are the start-up costs, such as new or significant modifications to computer systems, new materials, outreach and training? No.**
- g. **What are the ongoing costs? Salaries and S&S**
- h. **What are the potential savings? None.**
- i. **Based on these answers, is there a fiscal impact? Yes**

TOTAL FOR THIS PACKAGE

<u>Category</u>	<u>GF</u>	<u>OF</u>	<u>FF</u>	<u>TF</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>FTE</u>
Personal Services	\$2,783,000	\$0	\$2,762,640	\$5,545,640	40	35.20
Services & Supplies	\$633,360	\$0	\$633,200	\$1,266,560		
Capital Outlay	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
Special Payments	\$11,800	\$0	\$11,760	\$23,560		
Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		
Total	\$3,428,160	\$0	\$3,407,600	\$6,835,760	40	35.20

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

	Program Area 1	Program Area 2	Program Area 3	Program Area 4	Total
General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Other Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Federal Funds- Ltd	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Positions	0	0	0	0	0
FTE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

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