

The In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) Quality Assurance (QA) Initiative Stakeholders' meeting was attended by State and county staff; consumers, providers, and various advocacy groups; union officials; and others. Attendees received a folder containing: an Agenda and a draft copy of IHSS QA Procedures Manual.

Brian Koepp, Chief of the Adult Programs Branch, QA Bureau, opened the meeting by welcoming attendees, including those who participated via teleconference. The purpose of the meeting was to provide Stakeholders with an update of the workgroups' activities and to provide opportunity for Stakeholders input. Brian introduced the workgroup co-chairs and asked each of them to summarize the objectives, accomplishments, ongoing activities, and current status of their group.

Social Worker Training Workgroup:

The objective of this workgroup is to develop goals, objectives, and the approach and scope of training for development of a standardized training curriculum and work aids to operate an ongoing statewide training program for county staff on the supportive services uniformity system. With the assistance of county surveys and the California Welfare Directors Association (CWDA), the workgroup was able to identify those areas where the social workers felt the focus of the training should be. California State University Sacramento (CSUS), College of Continuing Education (CCE) was selected to provide the training. Pilot training classes were conducted at four counties (Shasta, Santa Barbara, Marin and Fresno) in July. After a few minor adjustments, the IHSS Training Academy began in September 2005.

Phase 1 of the training is addressing uniform practices for assessing consumers' needs and authorizing services. Phase 2 of the training is scheduled to begin in January of 2006. The second phase will include training on services for children and protective supervision. The training classes are being scheduled throughout California, including outlying areas, to insure accessibility for all counties. The California Department of Social Services (CDSS) is continually monitoring and evaluating the training. Attendees are being requested to complete evaluations at the completion of the two day training. Those results indicate that it is being well received and appreciated.

Forms Workgroup:

The objective of this workgroup is to develop and implement a statewide mandatory Provider Enrollment form and a Protective Supervision Medical Certification form as addressed in Senate Bill (SB) 1104. This workgroup held five meetings between March and August 2005. The meetings were attended by approximately 30 participants. The group was able to finalize the Protective Supervision form, and it has been submitted to the CDSS Legal office for input and final approval. A 24-Hours-A-Day Care Plan was also developed. This form is available for county use but is not mandatory. Both forms

can be viewed on the IHSS website. The Provider Enrollment form is nearing completion, requiring some clarification on minor issues. At this time, no further meetings are scheduled for this workgroup.

State/County Operations Workgroup:

The objective of this workgroup is to develop procedures for county and state QA staff to utilize while implementing mandates of SB 1104. The group held six meetings, one was conducted in San Diego County; and the remaining meetings were held in Sacramento. The workgroup also discussed QA as it relates to The IHSS Plus Waiver. County procedures were also discussed in the workgroup.

In March, the workgroup presented draft emergency regulations that would require counties to have a dedicated QA function. The workgroup also presented a draft All County Information Notice (ACIN) that provided written instruction to the counties regarding various mandated activities. County feedback was requested regarding this ACIN. In May, the workgroup had further discussion regarding the role of the county and state QA staff and sampling methodologies and how to select the cases that QA would review.

A QA Procedural Manual was presented in July. Feedback and suggestions for any possible changes was requested, giving interested individuals and groups the opportunity to make adjustments. The goal is to release the final version of the form in October, 2005.

The September meeting discussed the issue of a required annual QA/Quality Improvement plan to be submitted to the State. They also discussed how they were going to use the data they accumulate through the QA activities to improve the overall improvements in the IHSS program. At the September meeting, there was consensus that the workgroup goals had been achieved and no more meetings are scheduled at this time. It was noted that some remaining issues did exist and those will be addressed in All County Letters (ACL) and ACINs which will be available to the stakeholders and interested people through the IHSS website.

Regulations Review and Revision Workgroup:

The objectives of this workgroup include reviewing and updating current IHSS regulations based on existing statutes and developing new regulatory language for the IHSS Plus Waiver (IPW) and QA Initiative as defined in SB 1104. The workgroup consists of approximately 60 active members who include county representatives; CWDA; California Association of Public Authority (CAPA); advocacy groups, such as United Protection and Advocacy, Inc. (PAI); Service Employees International Union (SEIU); consumers; providers; Administrative Law Judges (ALJs); and California Department of Health Services(DHS).

The workgroup made considerable progress drafting regulatory packages. At the last meeting, five packages were reviewed and approved to move forward to the official public process. The workgroup approved an entirely new section for the IPW, defining the program as well as requirements for eligibility. A draft package of Assembly Bill (AB) 925, IHSS in the Workplace, has also been produced by the workgroup.

The workgroup has three emergency regulation packages ready to move forward. They include Variable Assessments, Protective Supervision, and State and County QA Procedures. The next meeting scheduled for this workgroup is in January 2006.

Fraud/Data Evaluation Workgroup:

The objective of this workgroup is to develop policies, procedures, and applicable due process requirements to identify and recover overpayments from IHSS providers. The workgroup held four meetings and interfaced activities with State and County Operations Workgroup. Two interagency meetings were also held. The statutory provisions were compiled into three categories; 1) Interagency Processes and Procedures, 2) Data Evaluation, and 3) Verification of Receipt of Services. The participants divided into groups and discussed what would be needed to achieve or implement the activities.

The workgroup submitted a draft ACIN to be reviewed, which will be released soon. An outstanding issue in regards to interagency procedures with DHS remains and the group is awaiting further instruction on that issue. The workgroup reached consensus that they had achieved their objectives and closed on August 30, 2005.

Hourly Task Guidelines Workgroup:

The objective of this workgroup is to develop an hourly task guideline that will specify a normal time range to perform necessary tasks associated with each assessed need. Since February of 2005, this workgroup has held six meetings which were attended by numerous individuals in person as well as by teleconference. Additional information has been gathered from a variety of sources including other states, the Case Management, Information and Payrolling System (CMIPs), surveys from consumers, providers, and focus groups given by both CDSS and CSUS. The workgroup feels that the most important element about the Hourly Task Guidelines is the word "guidelines." Consensus from the workgroup is that establishing "guidelines" does not take away the fact that assessments must still be based on each consumer's individual needs. The group stressed the fact that there will be exceptions to the guidelines which need to be justified based on each consumer's need.

This workgroup has three more scheduled meetings and have now shifted their focus to time ranges, with the goal to obtain a range that is both workable and convenient. They

are working on core tasks, with the understanding that not every specific instance can be identified.

Brian Koepp concluded the meeting by thanking all that attended.

(For detailed information regarding workgroups' questions and answers please scroll down.)

SUMMARY OF THE IN-HOME SUPPORTIVE SERVICES QUALITY ASSURANCE
STAKEHOLDERS' MEETING

Organizer: CDSS, Adult Programs, Quality Assurance Bureau
Location: Secretary of State Auditorium, 1500-11th Street, Sacramento, CA
Date: September 28, 2005
Time: 10:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

Attending:

Joseph M Carlin, CDSS	Theresa Mary Johnson, OWL
Kathleen Schwartz, Sac Co DHSS	Eric Fair, CWDA
Pamela Ng, Sac Co IHSS QA	Sandy Goodsill, STEP
Diana Kacic, CWDA	Lisa Barrows, STEP
Anastasia Dodson, Senate Budget Cmte	Ken Field, Shasta Co PA
Guy Howard Klopp, Sac Co QA	Steve Ferguson, Addus Hlth Care
Scott Brathwalte, Sac Co IHSS	Wendy Duchen, SEIU 434B
Marty Omoto, CDCAN	Lola Young, Sac Co IHSS
Greg Gibeson, CDAA	Cheri Martin, Adult Services DSS
Frances Gracechild, RU	Peter Hadell, Tuol DSS
Evan LeVang, ILSNC	Susana Torricella, DHS
Anthony Nico, SF Co	Sharon Rehm, Sac Co IHSS
Barbara, SF Co	Margo Shearer, Sac Co IHSS
Bernadette Lynch, PA	Annette Hetterer, Sac Co IHSS
Wayman Hindsman, CDSS/OTA	C Forbes, IHSS
Susan Miller-French, NAHHCP	Jeanette Johnson, Sac Co IHSS
Pam Porteous-Hunt. SILC	Karan Spencer, CDSS QA
Charlene Locke, DDS	Patrick Finch, CDSS QA
Judy Leawell, DHSS	Laurie Silva, CDSS QA
Susan Schwendimann, Sac Co	Michele Loftin, CDSS QA
Clint Jossey, Contra Costa Co	Andrea Allgood, CDSS QA
Fay Mikiska, Sac Co	Martha Bracha, CDSS QA
Jovan Agee, UDW	Jeannie Smalley, CDSS QA
Ann Sutherland, UDW	Julie Lopes, CDSS QA
Ana Bravo, Sac County DA	Brian Koepp, CDSS QA
Tony Anderson, The Arc of Ca	Eileen Carroll, CDSS
Jeannie McKendry, DHS	Jenny Ruoff, CDSS
Michael Bush, DHS	Desi Gonzales, CDSS
Roxanne Keller, DHS	Bea Sanchez, CDSS QA
Barbara Bigliera, CAHSAH	Linda Williams, CDSS QA
Nina Weiler Harmell, AARP	Susie Swatt, State Senate
Melody McInturf, Sac Co DHHS	Eva Lopez, CDSS
Pamela Care, Sac Co DHHS	Robert Harris, SEIU 434B
Curtis Earnest, SEIU 434B	Bill Powers, CARA

Stakeholders Meeting

Question: If this is a Stakeholders input meeting and the work is already finished, why is input being requested?

Answer: Not all workgroups are complete. This meeting is being held to update Stakeholders on the groups that are complete and advise them why the group was shut down. The meeting will also advise Stakeholders on the progress of the other groups.

Question: What is the validity of Stakeholders' input if this program is already being implemented?

Answer: Stakeholders' input is important as we always continue to build. What we decide is never 100% and we are always open to changes. The programs have not been implemented without Stakeholders' input. This has been an ongoing process since October 2004. We have had three previous Stakeholder meetings, all of them with telephone conference capabilities.

Question: I am concerned that Los Angeles (LA) County IHSS consumers have been late in hearing about how to access the workgroups. How many LA County IHSS consumers were involved in the workgroups?

Answer: We do not know how many LA County consumers have been involved in the workgroups. We tried to reach out to consumers in many different methods, such as focus groups and surveys that went out through the PA and CAPA. We do not know what happened in each local county. We have tried to keep this entire process as open to the public as possible. We actually took one of our meetings on the road to San Diego and, surprisingly, we did not have a very good turnout at that meeting.

Social Worker Training Workgroup

Question: Is there information on the web regarding the Social Worker Training, such as what they are being trained on?

Answer: Yes, there will be a training piece on the QA website that focuses strictly on the training. CDSS wants everyone to be able to see what the counties are being trained on, what information is going out, what information we are getting back, and what questions we are being asked. This information should be available on our website soon.

Question: Does the training contain information on AB 925, IHSS in the Workplace?

Answer: No, Phase I does not. Critical regulations are in the process of being developed at this time, and we will be offering training on them as soon as they are finalized.

Question: If the goal of the training is statewide uniformity of assessments, why are there only 4 small pilot counties receiving the training?

Answer: The 4 counties mentioned were the pilot counties for September only. The CSUS will be conducting training to all 58 counties through the end of the year.

Question: Will the same 4 counties be used as pilots for Phase II?

Answer: No, not necessarily.

Question: Are social worker training courses being video taped so the outlying counties can also get the training?

Answer: The possibility of videotaping the training has been discussed, but there is a concern that the social workers who only receive the videotaped training will not benefit from the interaction of a live classroom setting. The CSUS is conducting training throughout California, including the outlying areas to enable attendance by all required individuals.

Question: Will there be some kind of certificate available for those who have completed the training?

Answer: Yes, participants who attend both of the training days will receive a certificate.

Question: Is the training going to take two to five years to get everyone trained?

Answer: The CDSS is on a schedule to have everyone trained on Phase I by January 2006. Phase II is to be completed by June 2006.

Question: Will community advocates be trained, or is the training only for social workers?

Answer: SB1104 talks about training social workers, social worker supervisors, PA staff, and QA staff. It does not specify advisory groups; however, that is where video taping of the training could be beneficial.

Forms Workgroup

Question: Are the protective supervision and provider enrollment forms the only ones that are being revised by the Forms Workgroup?

Answer: Yes, at this point in time, as those are the two forms mandated by SB 1104. The workgroup has also created a 24-Hours-A-Day care form which will not be a required county form.

Question: Since the 24-Hours-A-Day care form is not required, how will individuals find out if a particular county is using it?

Answer: It will have to be determined by contacting the county in question. If a county chooses to adopt the form, it is assumed that the use will be countywide.

Question: Is there going to be any type of change to the statewide time card that providers complete?

Answer: We are not looking at redoing timesheets as part of QA. We know that there are issues regarding them and are trying to determine how we at the state level can assist the counties with this important issue.

State/County Operations Workgroup

Question: Is the QA Procedural Manual designed for the social workers or the providers?

Answer: The QA Procedural Manual is for the state and county QA staff to utilize when performing QA activities.

Question: Is there a provision in the QA Procedural Manual that county QA, IHSS advisory staff, or the PA be part of the ongoing process in the procedures?

Answer: The State has suggested to the counties that they obtain input from PA advisors and other Stakeholder advocates when developing QA improvement plans.

Question: How can we make sure that the PA and advisory committees are involved in a meaningful way in any county QA issues?

Answer: There has to be interaction at the county level and the State level, and the State needs to rely on people at the local level to interact with the counties. CAPA has been involved in our process.

Question: What is the timeline for sending input regarding the Procedurals Manual?

Answer: September 30, 2005.

Regulations Review and Revision Workgroup

Question: Why has there not been any telephone (teleconference) access, meeting notification, or information access for this workgroup?

Answer: The Regulations Workgroup has a larger scope than most of the other workgroups. It has to do with the waiver and overall IHSS regulations. The material from this group is on our website, and all information has been sent to hundreds of interested parties. Other material has been provided through e-mails and various other means. Given the complexity of the material and that continuity to be a participant is higher than most workgroups, we would want to limit the participation to participants in the room.

Question: Is the 9-month work plan posted on-line?

Answer: The plan was just adopted last week, but will be posted on the website as soon as possible.

Fraud and Data Evaluation Workgroup

Question: Is the intention of QA to go after consumers who have a high amount of hours?

Answer: No, the intention of QA is to insure that people are getting the benefits to which they are entitled to and to minimize abuse in areas that might be prone to abuse and errors. In the QA Procedurals Manual there are procedures in place that remedy underpayments if it turns out through the reviews that the consumer should have received more hours.

Question: Shouldn't overpayment collections only be required if the individual is over the income eligibility amount?

Answer: The program looks at whether or not you received benefits that you are entitled to. It does not differentiate whether or not the overpayment was caused by an administrative error or if it was willful fraud. The rate that reimbursement is collected does, however, take that fact into consideration. Different counties make the final decision on how actively they will pursue collection from overpayments.

Question: What are the categories of fraud that the workgroup is looking at?

Answer: We do not have specific categories identified. What we are doing is focusing on looking at data matches in different areas. Some of the areas that we will be expanding on are Medi-Cal Acute Care, skilled nursing, The Over-300-Hours Report, and CMIP data.

Question: What kind of fraud is the workgroup looking for? How will this affect the consumer?

Answer: The intent of the fraud workgroup is to implement procedures that will minimize abuse in the program. The workgroup wanted clearer instructions on how to delineate the difference between preventing and detecting fraud.

Question: Is the 28-page document that was used to interview consumers representative of what would be used to try and detect fraud?

Answer: That particular document was a tool used by CDSS' Evaluation and Integrity Unit (EIU) as a guide to evaluate a county and the level of service the consumer was receiving. The form was designed to look at several areas of the program. We wanted to find out the consumers' relationship with the county, whether the county understood the consumers' needs, if the consumers needs were being met, and the quality of the services being received. The form was never fraud generated.

Question: How were consumers chosen for home visits?

Answer: Home visits were chosen by random sampling from a variety of living situations. At the time EIU conducted home visits, they were strictly voluntarily; however, the State is currently researching statutes to determine if it is required for consumers to participate in county and State QA home visits.

Hourly Task Guidelines Workgroup

Question: Will the reassessment request procedure and appeals process remain the same?

Answer: Yes, normal procedures will still be in effect. ALJs are optimistically looking forward to the guidelines for consistency to help shape their decisions. The ALJs are being invited to the training sessions where the guidelines will be discussed.