



Ohio's Employment First Funding Re-design Work Group
Thursday October 30, 2014
Time: 9:00a to 4:00p

Facilitators: Allan I. Bergman and Lisa Mills, PhD

Attendance: Greg Dormer (OOD), Kristen Helling (DODD), Monty Kerr (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), Joe Kowalski (DODD), Greg Swart (DODD)

Not present: John Pekar (Fairfield/Vinton DD), Pete Moore (OACB), Christina Miller (DODD)

Others in Attendance: Ray Schmidt on behalf of John Pekar (Fairfield/Vinton DD), Courtney Frantz (DODD), Kim Linkinhoker on behalf of Pete Moore (OACB), Joe Russell (OACB).

Notice: The November 5, 2014 work group meeting is canceled. The rescheduled date will be December 17, 2014. The work group meeting will be held at Fairfield DD, Pickerington Regional Office.

I. Review of 10-20-14 Meeting Minutes and Guiding Principles

- a. Meeting minutes for 10-20-14 approved as presented.
- b. Guiding Principles- remove "prevailing" wage from guiding principle #2. See updated version [here](#).

II. Review of Draft Service Definitions

a. Employment Navigation - All work group members reviewed the proposed definition and provided the following feedback/recommendations:

- This service is to support informed choice about community employment and to ensure people make continued progress toward community employment through combination of: (1) provision of specialist support (similar to specialist support available through some other existing waiver services); and (2) employment support broker functions (similar to existing support broker role in SELF waiver).
- Need to determine if there should be a time limit for this service
- Concern that there may be overlap between Employment Navigator and SSA roles, which is not the intention. Employment Navigator would be an active member of the team to support the multi-agency navigation of employment services and to support individuals in making an informed choice.
- Need to ensure role of Employment Navigator is clearly defined as an "employment specialist" and does not conflict with the role of an SSA.
- Concern that there could be a conflict of interest if providers of employment services are also Employment Navigators. The analogy of Support Broker under the SELF waiver was introduced. A Support Broker cannot also be a county board, regional council of government, or provider of any SELF waiver service.

- Other Service Limitation Considerations - This service should not be offered through a provider of facility based services.
 - Provider qualifications are important and should include a demonstrated expertise in obtaining and supporting integrated employment and knowledge about multiple systems, including VR, Education and Workforce Development.
 - Core training should be established and would be determined by DODD. Evaluate CESP, ACRE, and CWIC. Training should include Employment First, funding sources, etc.
 - Employment Navigator would be a process facilitator rather than a coach for community activities/discovery/intermediate skill development, etc.
 - The work group discussed the possibility of Employment Navigator as specialized Targeted Case Management (TCM). Introducing as TCM would require a state plan amendment (SPA) and service would become an entitlement for anyone with a developmental disability who is Medicaid eligible (i.e. would not have to be enrolled in a waiver).
 - In the definition ensure discovery process is lowercase.
 - Make sure it is clear that the Employment Navigator is not doing the on-the-job training but gathering data to further inform the career plan
 - Workgroup supports an informed choice process for all individuals identified as place 3 or place 4 on the path to employment; Need to explore what this would require. Is this a policy change? EF Rule, etc.
 - Consider defining person-centered planning and discovery to set an expected standard.
 - Revise the last section of the definition to remove similarities to SSA role
- b. Integrated Prevocational (IPV)- All work group members reviewed the proposed definition and provided the following feedback/recommendations:**
- Remove personal care/assistance from service limitations and put in the context of the definition.
- c. Integrated Day Supports (IDS)- All work group members reviewed the proposed definition and provided the following feedback/recommendations:**
- Questions arose from the retirement reference and what "rest times" throughout the day can be accommodated within Integrated Day Supports.
 - Questions arose from career exploration being included in integrated day services.
 - Further clarity to questions will be provided in the rule; currently the work group is outlining definitions.
 - Remove personal care/assistance from service limitations and put in the context of the definition.
 - Should employment activities (i.e. career exploration) be included in IDS? Concern that if there is no employment activity in IDS, the opportunity to provide an informed choice about community employment is lost; Discussion about need for informed choice process including job/career exploration for all individuals identified as place 3 or place 4 on the path to employment, regardless of specific services they may be receiving. Lisa distributed copies of an Informed Choice service definition from Iowa's waiver that was developed to accomplish this purpose, for review and discussion by the Work Group.
 - Evaluate IDS compared to community inclusion in self-waiver.

Every Person. Every Talent. Every Opportunity

- Much discussion around pros and cons of HPC being used to fund integrated day supports (rather than having separate IDS service) to ensure continuity for the individual and not “compartmentalizing” their life. For this to occur, would need assurances that current ADS funding would transfer to HPC.

III. Small Groups: Outlining Provider Types and Required Qualifications

a. Employment Navigation

- **Provider Type:** County Board and Provider Agency (there was continued discussion regarding this and a final recommendation was not made.) Concern expressed that there could be a conflict of interest issue if Employment Navigator also works for a provider of employment/day services.
- Core training should be established and would be determined by DODD. Evaluate CESP, ACRE, and CWIC. Training should include Employment First, funding sources, etc.
- **Required qualifications:** college education, collaborative, experience in DD field
- **Other comments:** no additional reported.

b. Integrated Prevocational Services

- **Provider Type:** Provider Agency
- **Required qualifications:** core training (EF, person-centered planning, career planning, discovery, etc.). The standard provider requirements- CPR, 1st Aid, abuser registry, etc.
- **Other comments:**
 1. There was discussion about permitting a legally responsible person, relative, or legal guardian to provide the service in rural areas or to support cultural sensitivities.
 2. Additional discussion centered on education level and the potential to consider not requiring a HS diploma. Having this requirement might exclude someone with a disability from providing this service. Might limit mentorship as an option.
 3. Oversight needs to be tied to outcomes.
 4. Training should be portable. Evaluate credentialing.

c. Integrated Day Supports

- **Provider Type:** Provider Agency and not parents, family members or guardians
- **Required qualifications:** 18 years of age, high school diploma/GED, background check, core training, informed choice protocol.
- **Other comments:**
 1. Evaluate this with HPC

d. Informed Choice Service (based on the service definition from Iowa)

- **Provider Type:** should not be legally responsible person, relative, legal guardian, or provider agency.
- **Required qualifications:**
 1. Should not be a provider of other services.
 2. Must have demonstrated expertise in VR, Education, Workforce Development, and supported employment
 3. Required training course- see current Supported Employment web-course.
 4. Training in discovery, community employment, and person-centered planning.

Every Person. Every Talent. Every Opportunity

- **Other comments:**

1. This service should be part of Employment Navigation.
2. This service should work in connection with SSA
3. Should this be a service that a person can access more than once in their life?
4. This should be required if a person refuses community employment. See above.
5. School to Work Transition- This needs to be incorporated into school services. This should be a service available while someone is in school
6. Continued review of the Iowa informed choice process.
7. Career exploration should be part of this service

The work group was not able to fully outline agency staff qualifications or agency qualifications. Additional time is needed to review the above.

IV. Acuity Discussion

- a. The request was made to start with the foundation of a current tool, rather than creating a new tool.
- b. Start: Is the AAI (4 levels) correlated with the amount of support a person needs in community employment? Lisa will walk us through Washington and SIS/Supplement (additional algorithm.) Additionally she will present information from Oregon. The target is to look at current AAI to see if we can realign with new service array.
- c. A comparison will be completed on EF data to waiver utilization data.
- d. Current data from OOD/DODD Partnership will be used. For the 85 people employed, data on number of hours worked will be compared to support hours provided, and length of time on the job. These data will then be compared with the AAI rating that exists for each person to see if there is correlation or not.
- e. No current correlation between AAI and DDP
- f. Vic Gable will engage Ohio APSE in reviewing the DDP and identifying components that are relevant to predicting likely support needs for participation in individual supported employment.

V. Larger Discussion Points:

1. The goal of the work group is to ensure employment is discussed and addressed in each person's service planning and in all services provided, and that people are able to be provided the appropriate services and supports to move along the path to community employment.
2. Rates need to be evaluated based on level of support
3. Provider qualifications need to be a main component of this work group.
4. Non-medical transportation (NMT) definition and rates should be evaluated.
5. Expand the expectations for employment to be addressed/supported in all services including HPC.
6. Explore revising statute to include "informed choice" process for everyone (as discussed and referenced above from Iowa service definition) and include integrated employment at competitive wage as the priority outcome for all adult services.

VI. Homework

- a. Some members volunteered to engage in discussions outside the workgroup regarding proposals to address the relationship between HPC and Integrated Day Supports.

Every Person. Every Talent. Every Opportunity

- b. Ohio APSE will help with evaluation of DDP as potential tool for accurately determining acuity level for participation in individual supported employment.
- c. DODD will gather outcome and service data to allow comparisons described in IV above.

VII. Next Meetings:

- 1. The next meeting of the Work Group is on Monday, November 10th at the CDC from 9:00 am to 4:00 pm
- 2. The following meeting is on Monday, November 24th at the CDC from 9:00 am to 4:00 pm.
- 3. The following meeting is on Wednesday, December 17th at Fairfield County DD, Pickerington Regional Office, from 9:00 am – 4:00 pm.