Ohio's Employment First Funding Re-design Work Group
Monday November 24, 2014
Time: 9:00a to 4:00p

Facilitators: Allan I. Bergman and Lisa Mills, PhD
Attendance: John Pekar (Fairfield/Vinton DD), Greg Dormer (OOD), Kristen Helling (DODD), Carmen Shelton (Advocate), Debbie Hoffine (DODD), Lori Horvath (DODD), Dan Ottke (Clermont DD/OAAS), Vic Gable (Wood DD/APSE), Clay Weidner (DODD), Mary Vail (Goodwill Columbus), Steve Koons (Goodwill Cincinnati), Dave Reichert (Cuyahoga DD), Rick Black (Butler DD), Laura Zureich (Champaign/Shelby DD), Stacy Collins (DODD), Chris Filler (OCALI), Jason Umstot (OPRA), Pete Moore (OACB), Joe Kowalski (DODD), Monty Kerr (DODD)
Not Present: Greg Swart (DODD) and Christina Miller (DODD)

I.   **Review of November 10, 2014 Meeting Minutes**
   A. **Discussion:**
      1. Discussion centered on the section in meeting minutes, Review and Discussion-point 4- *Career Exploration should be included in the Informed Choice process.* Concerns brought forward that if Career Exploration is in the Informed Choice process this would limit the involvement of private providers. Additionally, it was noted that the hours assigned for Career Exploration in the Informed Choice process may not be sufficient and needs to be re-evaluated within the work group process. It was noted that Goodwill Cincinnati currently gets paid for 17 hours and has two weeks to complete career exploration for the purposes of making informed choice about whether to pursue integrated competitive employment.
      2. Employment Navigation is going to be a critical role with shifting service expectations and philosophy. We need to be strategic and mindful when planning the implementation of this service. Counties that have little or no experience with supported employment or doing things similar to employment navigation may have the greatest challenge and will need the most support, training and technical assistance.
      3. Employment service providers need to be involved from the very beginning in working with the person and getting to know the person well. This is likely to have impact on provider success in outcome-based service components.
      4. We are designing and building something new from the ground up. We are trying to leave our current system on the sidelines and start fresh, focusing on braided funding and services in a non-duplicative way so that each funder/provider that becomes involved at some point along the person's path to employment respects and utilizes and builds on what has occurred prior.

Every Person. Every Talent. Every Opportunity   1

5. The recommendation made in 11-10-14 meeting minutes, section IIa, bullet 9 was not completed regarding the service provision of free choice of provider. This will be added to the final version of the minutes.
6. With regard to section IIa, bullet 10, it was pointed out that there is a concern about employment service providers having exclusive arrangements with certain businesses and how this may impact employment opportunities for everyone seeking employment and how this impacts "free choice of provider" requirement under Medicaid.

B. 11-10-14 meeting minutes were approved as presented, with change described in #5. above

II. Review of Who Am I? Document
A. Discussion:
1. This document is a starting point to capture our conversations from our prior meetings. The tool will be modified for use with people with disabilities. The conceptual concepts of the *Community Integrated Supports- Funding Redesign Pilot Proposal* presented on 11-10-14 helped inform the development of this tool for people, families, career centers, educators, legislators, etc.
2. Ensure to define the places on the Path to Employment.
3. Make service names less prominent (how to code supports should come last in planning) and consider making staffing ratios less visible (so people focus on the type of support they need and not on other factors).
4. Evaluate the addition of individual learning styles based on different environments. This can help determine appropriate staffing ratio for a particular person receiving a particular type of support. Think about how people learn best and whether they could do well in small group or really need 1:1.
5. Design suggestion- color code the entire document to align with the identified place on the Path to Employment. Spell out "CE" everywhere it appears.
6. Share document with self-advocacy groups.
7. Evaluate the benefits of sharing this with OOD Counselors. Note on document where the plan would be to go to OOD first. Include phrase like "We will ask OOD first if you need this kind of support."
8. Evaluate doing this as a side-by-side comparison with OOD. This would show when OOD should become involved.
9. Address transition from school to employment in this document or consider a separate version specifically for transition-age youth who are still involved with school system. In future guidance, reference the transition assessment and planning processes that involve multiple agencies and are working well in some parts of the state. so replication is encouraged statewide. These processes should be something the Employment Navigator (EN) is involved in once a youth is eligible for EN service..

III. Review of Current Waiver Services and Proposed Waiver Services Document

A. **Discussion:**
   1. Ensure to include this information into the framework of the Who Am I? document.
   2. This document is to help the group work toward service categories that are non-duplicative.

IV. **Review of Proposed Service Definitions:**
   A. **Employment Navigation Draft #3:**
      1. Major change was rolling in the Informed Choice Process, revision of language to include time frames.
      2. 2nd paragraph- revise this paragraph and add, "and desired outcome."
      3. 1st paragraph- add the reference to the DD system within the sentence, *"This service assures the facilitation and coordination of a seamless transition among needed employment services and supports from various services, including*...."
      4. Discussions centered on who could provide this service. The group was informed that this cannot be a specialized and separate form of TCM. If it is the recommendation to include in current TCM, provider qualifications would need to change for all SSAs.
      5. If pursue Employment Navigation as a separate service (e.g. like Support Broker under waiver) it will be necessary to compare this with the current TCM rule to reduce the possibility of service duplication.
      6. A point was made that the current definition as written might prevent a high percentage of county boards from providing the EN service.
      7. A point was made that EN is already being accomplished to some extent in TCM. Capacity issues related to EN service would be addressed if it were part of TCM because state currently has capacity to provide TCM to 45,000 people.
      8. Discussion varied between whether or not EN should be a provider limited function, SSA limited function, or targeted SSA function. The group developed the following chart:

Employment Navigation	PRO	CON
1. Part of TCM	• Everyone with TCM would get this service, i.e. accessible to more people	• Amount of training required for SSAs. • There would be caseload implications
2. Waiver Service	• Support broker analogy: provider of EN cannot also be a provider of any day/employment service	• Only offered to those with a waiver. • Cannot limit to one type of provider as a waiver service, due to free choice of provider.

9. Large discussion around conflict of interest regarding the EN service. The group reviewed the Draft for Discussion: Conflict of Interest Policy for Employment Navigator and asked to vote.

   a) **Options:**
     (1) An entity certified to provide Employment Navigator services is prohibited from providing other adult day or employment services under the wavier.
     (2) If any entity certified to provide Employment Navigator services also provides other adult day and employment services under the waiver, the entity cannot provide Employment Navigator services to a waiver participant for whom they are also providing another day or employment service.
     (3) The Employment Navigator is a liaison between the individual and the SSA. As such the Employment Navigator will defer to the SSA to provide linkage with providers and to assist the individual to exercise free choice of provider.
       (a) The group stated that the definition should be combination of #1 and #3 and include a firewall.

   b) The above options were revised to, *"Employment Navigation can only be provided by an entity that also provides SSA functions. If the SSA also provides day/employment services, appropriate firewalls must be in place for Employment Navigation to minimize conflict of interest."*
       (a) Litmus test given, all DODD employees unable to vote: Agree: 11, Not Agree: 2 (correction, 12-17-14).

   10. Consensus:
     (1) EN is a service that should fall under TCM.
     (2) Consensus was that not all points of the Informed Choice Process as written should be included in EN.
       (a) Informed Choice #1, #2, and #5 should stay in the EN service.
       (b) Informed Choice #3, #4, and #6 should be a wavier service.
     (3) Ensure the parts of the Informed Choice Process that will be a stand-alone wavier service include conflict free provisions.

B. Review of Supported Employment- Individual Employment Support and Supported Employment- Small Group
   1. The work group was unable to review. In order to prepare for the next session work group members were asked to review the service definitions and email Kristen directly their feedback.

V. Review and Discussion: Draft Employment Services Reimbursement Methodology Spreadsheet.
   A. Discussion:
     1. Recommendation was made to evaluate AAI, LOC, and DDP and see if one or more of these current tools could be modified or drawn from to create a method for determining acuity level for the new day/employment service array, rather than creating a new tool for Ohio.

B. **Employment Navigation**- the group agreed to not address recommended rate methodology for this service until consensus was made on service definition.

C. **Supported Employment- Individual**
   1. **SE Assessment and discovery**
      a) Concerns presented around acuity and hours allotted for assessment and discovery. Hours vary from 30 hours to 60 hours, per report from providers at work group meeting. Re-evaluate hours proposed.
      b) Group asked to evaluate a two phase reimbursement model for this service. First phase would be reimbursement for the completion of assessment/discovery. Second phase would be reimbursement tied to successful outcome, i.e. placement bonus paid to provider who did assessment/discovery.
      c) Broaden the definition of discovery.
      d) OOD reviewed reimbursements for Career Exploration and Job Coaching that they currently use.
   2. **Assistive Technology Assessment and Report**
      a) Group discussed comparison services provided through the DD waiver and OOD service structure. OOD provides the service and it is reimbursed at $95.00 per hour.
      b) Provider qualifications for this specific service would need modified, as it is not the intention that all providers of SE-Individual be authorized to provide assistive technology assessment.
   3. **Work Incentives Benefits Analysis and Report**
      a) Provider qualifications for this specific service would need modified, as it is not the intention that all providers of SE-Individual be authorized to provide work incentive benefits analysis and report.
      b) The group reviewed current reimbursement through WIPA contracts and OOD.
   4. **Internship and Work Experience**
      a) Reviewed OOD reimbursement structure: Job Readiness Training, $218.75 per week per person, with wage add-on. Up to 36 weeks (9 academic months) for students and 52 weeks for adults. Project Search is considered Job Readiness Training. It was clarified that the payment per week is the same, regardless of hours worked by the person doing the internship/work experience.
      b) In order to sustain services with the current rate structure, providers reported that they must serve multiple people at one location. This reduces individuality and flexibility.
      c) Evaluate the avg. support percentages in our spreadsheet. The current percentages are too low.
      d) Evaluate the ability to use prior authorization for increased support.
   5. **Employment Planning or Self-Employment Planning**
      a) Confusion on why this service was removed from Job development or self-employment launch phase. Clarification that having plan before job development allows the individual and team to evaluate the plan and have input into it (including identifying pieces that team members can contribute to job development or self-employment launch phase.) Making plan part of job

development service can result in provider being lone party undertaking the job development or self-employment start—up effort.

6. **Job Development or Self-Employment Launch Phase**
   a) Questions pertained to the conceptualization of the funding structure for this service. OOD can provide aggregate data on all individuals served but it will not specifically look at individuals with IDD or individuals with supported employment IPEs.
   b) Reminder to add collaboration under provider qualifications.
   c) Build in a clause where if someone drops out of the process due to medical reasons or extenuating circumstances (define)- Add in reimbursement for services provided even though outcome was not met. It was pointed out that Sheet 2 does include a category of payment for Job Development if 9 months of effort and no outcome. Will modify this to include situations where a person drops out prior to placement or 9 month point.
   d) Evaluate rapid placement bonus, tier based on acuity.
   e) Evaluate tying this to a performance report card.

7. **Initial Job Training/Coaching**
   a) Proposed reimbursement would provide flexibility to provide the required services to help someone maintain their job.
   b) Evaluate options for up-front payments.

8. **Extended Job Training/Coaching**
   a) No concerns, comments, or feedback shared from the group.

9. **Job Advancement**
   a) No concerns, comments, or feedback shared from the group.

10. **Career Advancement**
    a) Evaluate possible recoupment of service costs, if someone ends services before outcome achieved.

11. **Reemployment Services**
    a) No concerns, comments, or feedback shared from the group.

12. **Personal Care**
    a) This service cannot be billed at the same time as job coaching. Job coach could provide the service if on-site, but it should not be the only reason the job coach is present.
    b) Continued discussions on why we would create a personal care service strictly towards employment, as it is a service that could be provided throughout someone's entire day (HPC). Comment made that personal assistance in workplace (that does not involve personal care or job coaching) might be needed and may not be covered under existing HPC definition.
    c) Annual cap should be 1680 hours.

13. **Supported Employment- Small Group**
    a) Annual cap should be 1680 hours.
    b) Time limit will require flexibility due to medical issues or extenuating circumstances (define). Recommended the time period stops. We need to be clear in how we draft our language around this procedure.

14. **Integrated Prevocational Services**
    a) Raise annual cap to 1680 hours
15. **Integrated Community Supports**
    a) Raise annual cap to 1680 hours
16. **Larger Discussion Points- Rate Methodology Spreadsheet**
    a) Once final service definitions, provider qualifications, and rate methodology are decided, will we have the ability to revisit assumptions? The target is to establish a short-term side-by-side billing system to analyze revised adult day array.
    b) Continued discussions occurred around the need/importance to have access to data on supported employment in Ohio and the need to relate it back to the work we are doing.
    c) How does the proposed rate methodology take into account individual needs?
    d) The methodology proposed is only the starting point and ideas are open for discussion and feedback. The group discussed fee-for-service vs. outcome-based. The group was updated that OOD will reevaluating their current reimbursement structure.
    e) Opinions varied between fee-for-service and outcome-based reimbursement. A final recommendation was not made.
    f) We are attempting to develop a person-centered funding structure that takes into account the level of supports each person needs to move along the Path to Employment.
    g) Work group members were informed that other state data was used to pull together proposed rate methodology.
    h) The group stressed the importance to incentivize private providers for working with individuals with higher complex needs.

VI. **Acuity Discussion**
    A. Main request is to evaluate existing instruments (AAI, LOC, and DDP) and prepare for a discussion in December.

VII. **Homework**
    A. Please review draft definitions and get feedback to Kristen by Wednesday November 26, 2014.
    B. OOD will attempt to pull data based on individuals with IDD.
    C. Allan will send out language analysis on the impact of the Ryan block grant.
    D. Review AAI, LOC, and DDP.

VIII. **Upcoming Meetings**
    A. Wednesday December 17, 2014 at Fairfield DD, Pickerington Regional Office, 9:00a to 4:00p.
    B. Two additional meetings will be scheduled for early 2015. Dates/Times- TBD