

## QUALITY ASSURANCE STAKEHOLDERS MEETING NOTES

Organizer: CDSS Adult Programs Branch, Quality Assurance Bureau  
Location: Department of Technology Services, 9323 Tech Center Drive,  
Conference Room 2, Sacramento, CA.  
Date: April 21, 2006  
Time: 10:00 A. M. – 11:30 A.M.

The Quality Assurance Initiative Stakeholders meeting was attended by State and county staff; consumers and providers, various advocacy groups; union officials, Senate staff and public authority (PA) representatives, in person and via teleconference. Attendees received a folder containing the following: An Agenda, Office of Regulations Development (ORD) website information, and a copy of the In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) Program Service Categories and Time Guidelines Regulations Manual of Policies and Procedures (MPP 30-757). These items are posted on our website under the April 21, 2006 meeting notice.

Brian Koeppe, Chief, Quality Assurance Bureau, Adult Program Branch called the meeting to order by welcoming attendees and stated the purpose of this Stakeholders meeting was to provide Stakeholders with an overview of the Hourly Task Guideline (HTG) regulations to provide a better understanding of the context and purpose of each regulation. This will assist Stakeholders who wish to comment during the Public Comment period, which began on March 31, 2006, and ends at the close of the Public Hearing scheduled May 17, 2006.

Brian then gave an overview of how the proposed HTG regulations were developed. He explained that the development of HTGs were part of the Quality Assurance Initiative. Brian stated that CDSS was asked to form a workgroup to develop HTG's which consisted of various State and county staff, PA representatives, union representatives, consumers, providers, and advocates. Through this diverse array of individuals, CDSS gained valuable input in meeting its goal.

Further, he explained that in developing HTGs, the workgroup first focused on identifying which service categories needed guidelines. They determined that HTGs were not appropriate for certain service categories and not necessary for the service categories which already had guidelines in place. The workgroup identified twelve service categories as needing guidelines.

The next phase was for CDSS to begin gathering data, and the workgroup was asked to provide CDSS with any contact information known to gather pertinent data. As part of this process, CDSS gathered data from the State's Case Management Information and Payrolling System (CMIPS), other states, professional organizations, and social worker subject matter experts, as well as from focus groups and surveys with the assistance of California State University Sacramento (CSUS), and the PAs. This was an effort to see what CDSS could bring back to the workgroup that would be helpful in assisting to develop a product.

CDSS then developed the Task Tools Guide to identify subtasks under the 12 service categories identified as needing new HTGs. The initial focus was on how to capture all information needed for social workers to appropriately assess time in a consistent manner statewide. The Task Tools Guide also included circumstances to consider which might take more or less time. After careful consideration of data gathered and statistical methodologies that would best serve the IHSS population, a decision was made to use Interquartile ranges by functional index ranking based on CMIPS statewide caseload data (February 2005) as the statewide “normal range of time” standard. These time ranges and examples of when “exceptions” to the ranges should occur were then added to Task Tools Guide.

CDSS was asked to test the proposed HTGs, and initial timeframe to have HTGs adopted by June 30, 2006, was extended to August 30, 2006, to facilitate this process. CDSS, CWDA, and advocates formed a Field Test Design Sub-Committee. Six counties volunteered to do the field test (Humboldt, Kern, Lassen, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Santa Barbara). The proposed HTG Task Tools Guide, excluding the proposed HTG time ranges at the advocates’ request, was tested during the month of January 2006. The Field Test was focused on measuring the Task Tools Guide’s usefulness to social workers and identifying if any items for consideration were missed. The test was successful in identifying a common item that needed to be added to the Task Tools Guide, which was subsequently included and incorporated into the proposed HTG regulations. CDSS also did some comparisons of the hours authorized in the Field Test to the proposed Interquartile ranges. The Field Test findings were provided to all workgroup members and posted on our website.

The initial HTG regulation package was then completed and is now in the regulatory Public Comment period which provides all Stakeholders and the general public an opportunity to identify what they think may need to be changed until the close of the Public Hearing on May 17, 2006. Brian provided the website address for ORD which will provide Stakeholders with specific information on where to send their comments and then turned the meeting over to Julie Lopes, Manager, Operations Unit, Quality Assurance Bureau.

Julie provided an overview with a Power Point Presentation entitled “Stakeholders Hourly Task Guidelines Regulations Overview.” She reiterated the purpose of providing an overview of the proposed regulations is to provide a better understanding of the purpose and changes to each regulation and that any comments regarding the proposed HTG regulations need to go through the formal regulatory process noted on the ORD website. She then walked through each regulation and explained the format and text; what strikeouts and underlines mean; what changed, identifying whether the change was a technical or substantive; and what had been relocated from one section to another. Julie then encouraged Stakeholders to take the opportunity to review the proposed regulations and provide their comments and/or concerns during the Public Comment period because this provides CDSS with valuable input to ensure that we have covered everything necessary and/or appropriately. Julie then opened the floor for questions and comments.

## Questions, Comments, and Answers

**Question:** Between the Task Tools and regulations it appears that for lay persons it would be easier to work with Task Tools. Should everybody be working with the regulations?

**Answer:** The Task Tools do not replace the regulations. The regulations give the authority to apply the policies and procedures listed on the Task Tools. The Task Tools Guide was designed to be an aid for social workers. It is the option of social workers to use the Task Tools Guide as an aid to the regulations if it works best for their needs. The Notices of Actions (NOAs) regarding HTGs will cite regulations as the appropriate authority.

**Questions:** When you are saying what “bowel and bladder” does include, has this section been relocated? Where in the regulations does it state that a provider can perform enemas, catheters, etc?

**Answers:** “Bowel and bladder” care does not include the insertion of enemas, catheters, suppositories, digital stimulation or colostomy irrigation as part of bowel program. These tasks should be assessed as “paramedical” services under MPP Section 30-757.19.

**Questions:** As far as a bowel program, for many of us consumers it does include an evacuation process through an enema. As social workers go out on assessments, will training be provided to social workers that this is part of “paramedical” services? Is there a possibility to specifically state under “paramedical” that it includes a bowel procedure for a bowel program?

**Answers:** CDSS will issue an implementing cover All County Letter (ACL) summarizing regulation changes and/or clarifications when the regulations are implemented. As far as specifically, adding language regarding a bowel procedure under “paramedical” at MPP Section 30-757.19,” this is a great comment to make as part of the formal Public Comment process if this language is not presently stated at the cite.

**Question:** Will CDSS be changing the increments of tenths of an hour for payrolling? It is very difficult for people to understand increments of tenths of an hour. For example, 1.15 minutes instead of 1.5; it is very difficult for providers who have not completed school and/or people with cognitive disabilities to understand tenths of an hour. Since consumers must signoff on time sheets and indicate the amount of time a provider has worked, it would be easier if time was recorded in hours and minutes rather than hours and increment of tenths of an hour.

**Answer:** The issue certainly is one that CDSS is aware of. We understand that it is very confusing for consumers to have time sheets record tenths of an hour. However, due to limitations of our computer system (CMIPS), CDSS must continue to use the tenths of an hour. The CDSS is in the process of revising the CMIPS system, and the new enhancements will address this issue, but not in a short term period of time.

**Question:** For those of us who are on the In-Home Operations (IHO) Program, part of the requirements for a consumer and/or a case manager who is assessing a consumer is to sign up the person the consumer selects to work under the IHO Program on the payroll for IHSS. It is a convoluted and very difficult process that can take weeks at a time, leaving the consumer without care they need. Is it appropriate to discuss this issue during the Public Comment/Hearing period, or would it not have anything to do with what this Stakeholders meeting is trying to achieve?

**Answer:** Hopefully when the new CMIPS system is implemented, these IHO payment issues will also be fixed.

**Question:** Is applying lotion in the “bathing” section?

**Answer:** Yes, it is listed under “bathing, oral hygiene, and grooming” in the proposed MPP Section 30-757.14 (e) (1).

**Question:** Under “care and assistance with prosthetic devices,” where does it define the cleaning of a wheel chair?

**Answer:** Language regarding cleaning of a wheel chair was added under “miscellaneous domestic services” at amended MPP Section 30-757.11(k) for policy clarity and consistency.

**Question:** Under the previous category under “prosthetics” in the current regulations it lists elastic stocking/garments, and corsets. Shouldn’t those be under “dressing” since that is the time when one would put those on in order to add more time during the “dressing” category, rather than being considered under “prosthetic devices”? I believe this is more of a “dressing” function and something to consider. Those who are doing the assessments/evaluations may want to make an “exception” when dressing involves “prosthetic devices.”

**Answer:** CDSS gave careful thought when incorporating the many comments received during the month of December 2005 regarding adding tasks to appropriate service categories. It could have been placed here in error, or it might have been considered for a specific reason while performing these tasks when there is a prosthetic device. This is a great public comment to ensure that we reevaluate where these tasks should be.

**Question:** In cleaning up a kitchen after meals, meal clean-up specifically does not include wiping down counters. It includes washing and drying dishes, pots, pans, and utensils. Why does it not include wiping down counters?

**Answer:** We believe this task is currently under “domestic” services. Wiping down counters was not included under “meal clean-up” in the current regulation. These proposed HTG regulations were written based on the Task Tools Guide subtasks identified after several discussions which involved the HTG workgroup’s input and a review process. Certainly make this comment known through the Public Comment period. This way it can be reviewed by our Legal department and addressed formally.

**Question:** There is some concern regarding the current policy changes. Having experienced the existing system not being able to address when some individuals needs are not being met quickly, is there a possibility that a 1-800 consumer hotline that could be setup for a year or six months for consumers to call when counties are not responding?

**Answer:** This is beyond the scope of this Stakeholders meeting, but you can make the suggestion as a general Public Comment, and we will have the opportunity to have the appropriate CDSS staff address it.

**Comment:** Joe Carlin, Deputy Director of the Disability and Adult Programs Division, then commented. He explained and assured all that CDSS certainly does not want to implement policies that pose a threat to consumers' health and safety. The CDSS has been working very closely with all Stakeholders and the Legislature and has taken into consideration everyone's comments in establishing policies. He further assured the Stakeholder members that CDSS intends to monitor the new HTG policies very closely after implementation and that CDSS will continue to have dialog through ongoing meetings to enable individuals to share their views of the impact new policies.

**Questions:** Will Administrative Law Judges (ALJs) be attending the IHSS Training Academy Phase I and Phase II? And will they be involved in the HTG process for review and feedback?

**Answers:** Yes, Berry Bernstein and Karlin Harmison, of our State Hearings Division, attended and provided feedback. They both expressed satisfaction with the IHSS training Academy and were glad that training is available.

Julie Lopes then concluded her presentation.

Brian Koepp, thanked the Stakeholder members for their time, and again urged all to review the current HTG regulations provided on the website links for ORD. The meeting was then adjourned.

**IHSS STAKEHOLDER MEETING  
HOURLY TASK GUIDELINES REGULATIONS  
ATTENDEES AT THE APRIL 21, 2006 MEETING**

Name	Organization
Joe Carlin	CDSS
Eva L Lopez	CDSS
Brian Koepp	CDSS
Joan Boomer	CDSS
Julie Lopes	CDSS
Linda Williams	CDSS
Beatriz Sanchez	CDSS
Laurie Silva	CDSS
Elizabeth Cervantez-Salas	CDSS
Debbie Wender	CDSS
Karen Spencer	CDSS
Charissa Miguelino	CDSS
Jovan Agee	UDW
Steve Ferguson	ADDUSS Homecare Council
Kathleen Schwartz	Sacramento Co./DHHS/IHSS
Sergio Contreras	SEIU Local 434B
Debra Schwieger	El Dorado Co. IHSS QA
Greg Gibson	Distric Attorney
Mike Collins	SILC
Deborah Doctor	PAI
Clint Jossey	Contra Costa Co. IHSS
Teddie-Joy Reimheld	PASC Public Authority
Nina Waler	AARP
Tony Anderson	The AVC of CA
Tamara Rasberry	SEIU
Bernadette Lynch	Public Authority
Peggy Collins	Senate
Karen Kieslar	CAPA
John Stansbury	Marin Co.PA
Hal Zukis (Telephone Conference)	World Institute of Disability
John Wilkins (Telephone Conference)	Quality Homecare Coalation
Janell Obando (Telephone Conference)	SEIU 434B
Victoria Browder (Telephone Conference)	SEIU 434B
Yvette Elam (Telephone Conference)	SEIU 434B
Lisa Burrows (Telephone Conference)	Strategies to Empower People
Bob Benson (Telephone Conference)	CDSCAN
Charles Calavan (Telephone Conference)	PA/Alameda
Ritchie Smith (Telephone Conference)	PA/Los Angeles Co.
Terri Cummings (Telephone Conference)	PA/Madera Co.
Jan Schiller (Telephone Conference)	Advisory Board/Alameda
Marty Omoto (Telephone Conference)	CDCAN



