

CQI Part C Fees and Ability to Pay Workgroup

Meeting Summary Henrico CSB Conference Room C Glen Allen, VA November 8, 2001

Those attending: Linda Eggleston, Brenda Crockett, Katy McCullough, Anne Lucas, Karen Walker, Emily Dreyfus, Wanda Pruett, Nancy Butts, Liz Fletcher, Carol Burke, Sandy Mahon

- I. Review of Minutes - Minutes were reviewed from the October 5, 2001 meeting and corrections were made. Minutes were approved with the corrections.
- II. Updates – Draft Practices Document and dissemination timelines
 - The ATP Practices document was revised by the Lead Agency based upon feedback from the Office of the Attorney General (OAG) and recommendations from the phase in sites. The document was reformatted to improve readability and clarifications were provided to areas discussed at the October meeting. Revised forms were also included. Brenda Crockett reviewed the document and made editing changes, however, a file with incomplete edits was inadvertently forwarded to Part C Office so not all of Brenda's edits were made to the document before submitted to OAG. A copy of the document was shared with the Workgroup. The Workgroup thought the document was clearly based upon their cursory review. The Committee decided that Anne and Brenda would summarize the changes that were not incorporated into the OAG version of the document and Questions and Answers (Q & A) document would be developed to provide clarification to the field. The summary will be forwarded to Workgroup along with a copy of the OAG version in order for additional questions to be identified for the Q & A at the next meeting. All Q & As would be included into the document when revisions are made next year.
 - Concerns were expressed about the delay in getting the final forms to the field. CoCoA is planning to share the OAG version of the financial agreement form and the fee appeal form. Also, CSBs need to be clearly informed that the ATP procedures for Part C will be used for Part C children and that DMHMRSAS Reimbursement will audit them on these procedures, which are not the same reimbursement procedures they are using for the rest of the agency.
 - A significant amount of time was spent discussing confidentiality of the specific financial information (e.g., taxable income, net income and receipts, etc.) vs. the actual financial agreement form. Concerns were raised regarding broadly sharing the specific information with service coordinators and providers. The workgroup indicated that the fee agreement form should be shared with providers but that specific financial information should be kept confidential and only viewed by those on a need know basis. The recommended practice is to maintain financial information in a separate

location/file from the clinical record. A concern was mentioned re: other policies that say to keep only 1 file with all information and this is the reason why this is a “recommended” practice, not a required one. Discussion also focused on certain licensing, billing, certification and other standards that may require an agency to have the specific financial information with the fee agreement form. Anne referenced that the ATP Practices document indicated that all information related to fees had to comply with Part C confidentiality requirements and FERPA. Anne agreed to discuss confidentiality, including the information needed on a release of information form, as well as the client record concerns with Sharon Walsh to provide further guidance.

II. Implementation Issues -

A. Data Tracking Form – timelines for submitting data

- o The workgroup was reminded of the dates for submitting the data tracking forms:

1. First phase-in sites – November 30, 2001
2. Remaining sites – May 31, 2002

Katy shared data from NRV and discussion around the data occurred. Clarification regarding completion of the data form was provided. Brenda and Karen agreed to draft a clarifying memo for the Part C Office to send out to the field to assist them in collecting consistent data.

B. Fiscal Impact -

- o Katy shared data from NRV regarding projections of financial impact. It is possible that the new ability to pay scale along with the increasing number of children being identified and served will result in a deficit of \$40,000+ by the end of the June 30, 2002. Other councils indicated minimal impact. Emily calculated some projections indicating that worse care scenario could range between \$850,000 and \$1,000,000 as a result of the new fee scale. The phase-in sites will submit data by November 30th and the data will be compiled for discussion and review at the December 4th meeting.

F. Other Information

- o A question arose regarding enforcement of the ATP procedures among non-CSB agencies. Anne acknowledged that the enforcement aspect is an issue and recommendations for resolution need to be identified.

IV. Assistive Technology

- o Anne indicated there was nothing new to report at this time.

V. CIMP Report

- o Anne indicated that a copy of the Plan of Improvement for ATP that was submitted to OSEP will be forwarded to the Workgroup. The Workgroup should review the strategies and benchmarks proposed and to discussion ways to assist in evaluating whether or not the process and information that has been put in place is meeting the

expected outcome. Discussion of the Plan of Improvement will be on the agenda for the December meeting.

Meeting adjourned.

Meeting schedule for December:

December 4, 2001 10:00 AM – 3:00 PM
Department for the Blind and Vision Impaired – Library & Resource Center
Conference Room