



MINUTES
Steering Committee Work Group Meeting
Thursday, 11/18/21 from 10:00AM - 12:00PM Held via: Zoom Webinar

Attendance: Mark Vincent, Mark Mills, Ann Potoczak, Carrie Beth Duran, Kimberly Habib, Karen Hatch, Krista Gilbert, Cathy Spinney, Jennifer Pineo, Lisa Beaudoin, Jonathan Routhier, Stephanie Patrick, Denise Nash, Isadora Rodriguez-Legendre, Darlene Hayden, Deb Ritcey, Susan Silsby, Nancy Rollins, Sandy Hunt, Jessica Gorton, Maureen DiTomaso, Drew Smith, Alecia Ortiz. *Note: Members of the public who joined as attendees in listen-only mode are not included in this list.*

Please reference the corresponding slide presentation for the detailed agenda, including topics and themes covered in the meeting and corresponding takeaways and applicable action items. This document provides context into areas of substantive discussion which took place during the meeting.

Major Topics and Themes	Key Discussion Areas
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductions and Ground Rules 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided Waiver Workgroup & Rate Setting RFP Updates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A member requested clarification on expectations of the Steering Committee and that any decisions that the workgroups are making will be brought to the Steering Committee to review. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BDS clarified that the Steering Committee will have input relative to the discussions happening in the workgroups • A member voiced concerns and hoped that the Rate Setting RFP will take into account the issues families are having to renegotiate rates, provide bonuses or stipends, trainings, etc. for DSPs

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment Tool ○ Overview of work ○ Findings ○ Recommendations and Considerations ○ Discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A member asked for clarification on meaning of cross-population. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BDS and A&M clarified that some tools lead to a core set of data that is collected across multiple populations & has modules specific to unique populations. • A member discussed the importance of natural supports and asked how tools measure and account for natural supports. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BDS acknowledged the importance of accounting for natural supports. • A member asked if the initial analysis included a review of the supplemental questions used in New Hampshire? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BDS and A&M clarified that the original data set did not include the supplemental questions. • A member asked if the three recommendations were ranked. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BDS and A&M clarified that the recommendations were not ranked. • A member acknowledged the risk of moving to a score-based budgeting system and conveyed that it's important to 1) validate and ensure consistency in resource allocation and 2) continue to promote the values of an individualized, person-centered approach. • A member emphasized that sometimes tools do not capture the behavioral data, and that New Hampshire needs to be prepared for that. There are concerns about heading towards a strictly assessment-based tool. • A member shared that the grouping of services and needs will be an important step in the process. The tool is one conversation of many that will go into how we assign population characteristics. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A&M and BDS stated that the Steering Committee will likely play an important role in thinking through an exceptions process. • A member noted that there are ongoing implementation challenges related to workforce issues (like high turnover of certain positions). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BDS stated that BDS will continue to listen to people's comments and questions and drill down in how the tools meet our needs. • A member raised concerns that not appropriately accounting for the cost of natural supports could skew the perception of how much care costs and how much care is needed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BDS clarified that Supports Waiver services will likely supplement these natural supports and that an assessment tool will clarify why support costs vary by individual. • A member stated that the Rate Work Group should investigate natural support assumptions. • A member requested a list of the states and which tools they use.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BDS and A&M agreed to distribute additional resources. • A member noted that there is a lot of opportunity to start looking at how will this tie in with life course and other supports. • A member raised concerns over the amount of time that has lapsed since some of the tools have been updated. • A member expressed concerns that the data needs to be cleaned and normalized across the state for base-rate model usage. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A&M and BDS clarified that the intent is to really get an understanding of what it costs to provide services and then build a rate model to make sure we cover the cost. The intent is to develop rates that are more transparent, that we all have more confidence in. • A member asked if in addition to the list of states if quality and satisfaction ratings could be reported from those states as well. Additionally, the member asked is there is an ability to identify a sampling of people receiving services and tools used so that we can look at the results and see how the tools compare. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BDS and A&M stated that they understand the interest for this data but feel this may not give the answers looking for, given how assessments are currently used for planning not budgeting in the state. • A member noted interest in having not just quality of services and satisfaction evaluated in the states where the tools are used, but also in relation to whether they have waitlists. • A member expressed confusion about how an assessment tool will fix the variability problem that was previously identified. Some variation will likely still exist, and an exceptions process may not be sufficient to account for outlier circumstances. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BDS and A&M clarified that a standardized assessment puts structures in place and is one input into the overall process. The rate schedule itself is an essential component in reducing variability. • A member noted that more information about which states use which tools for funding allocation would be helpful. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BDS and A&M agreed to distribute additional resources. • A member asked if BDS can hold conversations with other state directors that use tools for allocation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BDS clarified that the state can seek out these conversations. • A member shared that in the 1990s, NH was rated highly for its DD services and expressed pride in New Hampshire state values, including prioritizing community connections, quality of life, individualized supports, and more. The member expressed concern that a tool desensitizes the users to the individual needs of a person. The member expressed interest in developing a new tool, unique to New Hampshire.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BDS and A&M clarified that some additional investment in supports and resources, like Charting the Life Course, will help with balancing the standardization of an assessment tool with unique individual needs. eams. We certainly want all of those things to happen and that should be happening as we develop care plans. • A member noted the ongoing information technology challenges in the system. • BDS clarified that the perspective of the Steering Committee is valuable. The wealth of knowledge, whether you are a provider, vendor, family member, a self-advocate, and more is an important contribution to the process. Discussions will continue as we go forward.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment Tools – Next Steps 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BDS recapped that the State has had initial conversations with the American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (AAIDD) about conducting an assessment sample using the Supports Intensity Scale(SIS). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If approved, they will conduct a sample of 400 interviews, including supplemental questions to give a baseline of data. The data will be used to inform the work around rate building. Tentatively, the assessments will begin in late Spring and will take about 3-4 months to complete. • A member asked if there was a conflict in the way the SIS is conducted. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BDS and A&M clarified that the intent was to use AAIDD, a gold standard organization, for baseline data collection. • A member noted that CSNI has historically completed SIS samples, and expressed concerns about changing the process. • BDS highlighted AAIDD’s reputation for gold-standard data collection • A member expressed concerns about scheduling. • A member asked about criteria for interviews. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BDS and A&M clarified that developing that criteria is an important follow up. <p>Participant Questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the purpose of having AAIDD come in and ask families to do another interview? Will the interview impact anything they are receiving? Or just for BDS’ methodology? What is this for? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This data will be used as one input into the rate building process. Other information, like provider cost data, will also need to be collected. • How much time would it take for a family to do this interview? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The amount of time will vary, but could be anywhere from 3-5 hours. BDS expressed an interest in ensuring that families are not overburdened. • It’s important that both area agencies and vendors are involved in the rate setting process.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Members expressed concern about lack of visibility into the big picture.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Assignment Next Steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Please refer to the corresponding work group PPT for details on assignments (if any) and next steps.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Meeting Adjourned	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Next meeting 12/16/2021