



August 10, 2017

# CDDO Peer Review of McPherson County CDDO

Review Team:

Linda Young, KDADS

Colin Rork, KDADS

Rae Lynne Baker, Cowley County CDDO  
Director

Cheryl Rutz, Quality Assurance Specialist,  
DPOK, Inc.

Samantha Boldra, Owner/Operator, Steadfast  
Advocacy for Meaningful Independence

# CDDO REVIEW REPORT SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

McPherson County CDDO  
August 10, 2017

## 1. GENERAL COMMENTS

The review team thanks the CDDO for all the hard work, preparation and coordination to make this review as effective and efficient as possible. The McPherson CDDO Peer Review was held on August 10, 2017 beginning at 8:30a.m. Prior to August 10, 2017, the McPherson County CDDO was last reviewed on June 22, 2010. Currently Nancy Brouwer serves as Director of the McPherson County CDDO and she was the primary point of contact for KDADS throughout the review process. Desk review materials were submitted timely, all information requested was received. Files and samples were separated and labeled by specific outcome, and all required documentation was supplied for the on-site review. The organization of on-site review materials was very helpful and much appreciated.

## 2. IDENTIFIED STRENGTHS

**1. Entry of Information into the KAMIS system-** The CDDO was very timely in entering information into the KAMIS system and the CDDO appeared to have well developed processes in place to streamline and handle their workload volume. All sample files reviewed for eligibility, crisis funding, annual functional assessments were completed in a timely and prompt manner, including the entering of all information into the KAMIS system.

**2. Linking Individuals/Families to other community agencies which might be able to serve them-** KDADS received several complimentary comments from parents/guardians of individuals who had went through the eligibility process indicating that they found the CDDO staff to be extremely approachable, responsive and helpful in the identification and linking of these individuals to other resources and entities within the community which might be helpful to meet their loved ones needs. There were many examples in which CDDO staff were identified as taking individuals to actual agencies and introducing them to other service providers which might be identified to assist them.

**3. Client Transition Questionnaire –** The CDDO had designed a comprehensive document which outlined the process for providers to follow when an individual was transferring services from one CSP entity to another.

### **3. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CDDO**

#### **1. Outcome Desk Review: Review of Policies and Procedures, Website and Newsletters – Monitoring Activity 1.**

Issue: The CDDO website currently contains basic information; however, the content of the website could be enhanced and reorganized in a more user friendly manner. Some of the CDDO policies/procedures need to be updated to provide more clearer language.

Recommendation: The CDDO should consider enhancing and reorganizing its website information to include more specific information about CDDO processes. The website would benefit from the reorganization of material on the site by grouping information into more user-friendly categories as well. Specific suggestions for enhancements to the website are listed under Section 1, Probe 3 on the Peer Review Tool Document. As far as policies, there are specific recommendations for policy language updates listed in Section 1, Probe 1 of the Peer Review Tool Document which the CDDO should consider. KDADS recommends that the CDDO develop a policy for Fiscal Management, a protocol for the Distribution of State Aid Dollars and a policy for Crisis Requests.

#### **2. Outcome 3: CDDO completes all management responsibilities as required – 3f**

Issue: The CDDO indicated that it relies solely on affiliate meetings to solicit feedback on the CDDO operation and CDDO area system management.

Recommendation: The CDDO should consider additional alternative ways to engage their affiliate network to gain feedback about their operations and/or to engage their affiliates on issues which are unique to their catchment area in regard to service gaps. To encourage more affiliate feedback, this might be accomplished through Survey Monkey, satisfaction surveys or through anonymous surveys or through various workgroups to address issues pertinent to the service catchment area.

#### **3. Outcome 5: Unbiased service option information-**

Issue: The CDDO currently uses two separate choice forms. One form includes all services offered and then lists a generic option of self-direct FMS services. If this FMS option is chosen, then a separate FMS provider choice form is completed.

Recommendation: KDADS would request that the CDDO consider combining the two documents into one comprehensive choice form so that all options are listed regardless of what services the individual/guardian is choosing.

## 4. FINDINGS

### **Outcome 7: CDDO will serve as single point of entry and maintain an effective application, eligibility determination and service choice process. –**

Issue: The CDDO had a policy “Training on Eligibility Determination” which outlined what their training requirements are for eligibility staff. The CDDO could not provide any evidence or documentation that they had trained their staff on the items listed in the policy. The CDDO indicated they had not been tracking the training items and had no documentation in their personnel files to substantiate staff had been trained on the identified topics.

Recommendation: KDADS would like to see the CDDO develop a plan with timelines to address this issue. The plan will be due to KDADS within 30 days of receipt of this report.

### **Outcome 10: CDDO will maintain a locally developed impartial QA process that reasonably addresses regulatory requirements.**

Issue: The CDDO has a policy “Quality Oversight and Enhancement” which is dated April 2017. The current policy indicates that the CDDO will do on-site reviews and records reviews for 20% of the individuals receiving case management services. The policy proceeding this current policy indicated the CDDO would complete a 10% review of cases. Neither is currently happening. The CDDO indicated they have completed about three on-site reviews over the past year. They also indicated they currently have no formal assessment tool they are utilizing for these reviews. Follow up with the provider had been happening by phone, but there is no documentation trail that the provider has addressed the identified issues to ensure the provider has resolved the identified concerns. The CDDO is doing some record reviews as items for the annual functional assessment come into the office. The CDDO indicates they currently do not have a Quality Assurance Committee and there was no evidence found in the COCM meeting minutes to indicate that quality items had been reviewed with this group on an on-going basis. As far as critical incident events, the CDDO is currently not documenting their follow up on significant issues. There is no current tracking/trending being completed on quality indicators, except a spreadsheet which logs what critical incidents have been received monthly. The CDDO indicated that they are working toward developing an on-site visit tool and that they are working toward putting corrective action requests in writing in the future. They are also exploring developing a corrective action document for use with their affiliate network.

Recommendation: KDADS would like to see the CDDO develop a plan with timelines to address this issue. The plan will be due to KDADS within 30 days of receipt of this report.

**Outcome 11- Is CDDO informing person/family/guardian of available community services choices and types in or near the person’s home annually?**

Issue: KDADS reviewed a sample set of seven files. It appears the CDDO has implemented two separate processes to address individuals residing in ICF/IDD facilities. Those out of county are being sent information by mail, which included the 1995 DD Reform Act Rights information. Those within the county, the CDDO was directly meeting with, however, the CDDO indicated that they are using a different set of rights to distribute to the individuals they were meeting with in person. The Article indicates that the CDDO should be informing individuals of their “rights pursuant to the Developmental Disabilities Reform Act”.

Recommendation: KDADS would like to see the CDDO develop a plan with timelines to address this issue. The plan will be due to KDADS within 30 days of receipt of this report.

**Outcome 12: CDDO maintains a council of community members that meets the regulatory requirements – 12a.**

Issue: There were 17 total individuals listed on the membership list. Membership included four individuals who were identified as having I/DD, three family/guardian members, eight agency representatives/member at large and two CDDO representatives. Membership terms for clients/guardians/family members all expire in 2018. There were no identified term limits for the affiliate members or the member at large. The policy “Council of Community Members” indicates that 51% if the individuals/guardians must be present to conduct business, but the policy also eludes that the Council will reflect a majority membership from persons served and the family members or guardians who are not employees of the CDDO or its affiliates. Council bi-laws indicate that the membership for individuals/guardians/family members should be comprised of 60% of the group membership. The current membership does not meet the Article requirements that a “majority or 51%” of the council should be made up of individuals/guardians/family members. The current membership does not meet what is outlined in current council bi-laws. The current CDDO membership roster does not indicate when the member first was appointed to the council so it was not possible to tell if any members had been on the council more than two consecutive terms. Terms for affiliates were also not limited and there was often more than one member from an affiliate attending a specific meeting, which even more skewed the membership alignment. The CDDO should consider staggering terms to not allow for the entire client membership population to have their terms expire at the same time. A pamphlet about the COCM had incorrect KDADS contact information listed on it.

Recommendation: KDADS would like to see the CDDO develop a plan with timelines to address this issue. The plan will be due to KDADS within 30 days of receipt of this report.

**Outcome 13: CDDO maintains an effective dispute resolution system that meets regulatory requirements. –**

Issue: The CDDO has a current policy “Dispute Resolution” to address the dispute process. The CDDO indicates in their policy that the policy is shared annually with all individuals receiving services and the policy is posted on the CDDO website.

Upon reviewing what the CDDO gives the individuals, it was noted that on an annual functional assessment, the individuals receiving services are given information about “Appeals and Grievance Procedures” for the Basis Functional Assessment. It is also noted in the CDDO “Consumer Rights and Responsibilities” document that the CDDO provides the contact information for the Administration’s Office of Administrative Hearings. The actual dispute resolution process is not reviewed with individuals/guardians as outlined in the policy.

Recommendation: KDADS would like to see the CDDO develop a plan with timelines to address this issue. The plan will be due to KDADS within 30 days of receipt of this report.

## **6. BEST PRACTICE RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. The CDDO may want to consider the periodic development and dissemination of a newsletter to be sent to guardians/individuals, especially those who are waiting for services and possibly as well to be sent to affiliates. Newsletters can be a good way to stay in touch with individuals and they can provide insight to what is available, or any changes/updates. Guardians/individuals may opt to receive an electronic newsletter update so they can stay informed.

## **SUMMARY:**

This review identified many CDDO strengths as well as opportunities for improvement. The McPherson County CDDO staff was very organized and accommodating. Overall, the CDDO does a great job meeting state requirements. The CDDO staffs’ knowledge, experience and in-depth involvement are beneficial to all involved with the process.

# Peer Review Tool

## Review Team Members:

- 1) Linda Young, PICS, KDADS
- 2) Colin Rork, PICS, KDADS
- 3) Rae Lynne Baker, Director, Cowley County CDDO
- 4) Cheryl Rutz, QA Specialist, DPOK, Inc.
- 5) Samantha Boldra, Owner, Steadfast Advocacy for Meaningful Independence

Date of Review: August 10, 2017

CDDO Name: McPherson County CDDO

CDDO Address: 121 W Marlin, Suite 410, McPherson, KS 67460

Contact Person: Nancy Brouwer, Director

Phone Number: 620-245-5211

Email: nancyb@mcphersoncountyks.us

### Scoring Compliance Key

(1) =Yes (2) =No (7) = NA

## ACRONYM REFERENCE GUIDE

“ANE” Abuse, Neglect, Exploitation

“BASIS” Basic Assessment and Services Information System

“CDDO” Community Developmental Disability Organization

“COCM” Council of Community Members

“CSP” Community Service Provider

“ICF” Intermediate Care Facility

“ICF/IID” Intermediate Care Facility for Individuals with Intellectual Disability

“KDADS” Kansas Department for Aging and Disability Services

“PD” Position Description

“QA” Quality Assurance

Program Contact:

KDADS Program Integrity

Community Services and Program Commission

266 North Main, Suite 230

Wichita, KS 67202

(316) 337-6649

Linda.Young@ks.gov

**Desk Review Activities - Section I**  
**Review of Policies and Procedures, Website & Newsletters**

#		1	2	7	Strengths & Comments	Findings & Recommendations
1.	CDDO ensures that its policies are distinct to the CDDO, and CDDO operated CSP policies are distinct to CSP. CDDO and CSP functions are governed by two distinct sets of policies.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	McPherson County CDDO is a standalone CDDO and is not affiliated with a CSP.	<p>Recommendation: Please consider the following updates/changes to the policies:</p> <p>Policy 1: Please clarify the procedures for Larned outreach more clearly in the policy. On collection of basis section: Please clarify that annual assessment information is to be forwarded 10 days from the date the annual functional assessment meeting is scheduled.</p> <p>Policy 3: The CDDO indicated that they recently made changes to the way Options Counseling is being conducted and that their policy needed to be reworded to reflect the new methods they are using.</p> <p>Policy 4: The CDDO indicated that the language about the Multi-County CDDO Council needs to be eliminated.</p> <p>Policy 6: CDDO needs to update the QA policy to reflect what their future system will entail. They indicated that they are in the process of developing site review evaluation forms to conduct their QA visits and that the CDDO itself plans to be more actively involved in the QA process.</p> <p>Policy 8: If applicable, please add the reference to the regulation or KDADS policy referenced for this policy (not sure this is applicable since this appears to be a</p>

						<p>policy which has been developed outside regulation standards).</p> <p>Policy 9: Please clarify that the CDDO does attend meetings with individuals/guardians if they are unable to reach a resolution with the CSP provider on their own. Also, please add the reference to the regulation or KDADS policy reference for this policy.</p> <p>Policy 10: Please spell out in the policy what the initials SIDH stand for.</p> <p>Policy 11: Language needs to be clearer on the opening paragraph statements.</p> <p>Policy 12: Language could be clearer on number of individuals sitting on the council, how terms are organized and number of affiliates which are on the council. The bi-laws for the council indicate 60 percent are to be individuals/families/guardians and 40 percent affiliates/members at large. CDDO should consider staggering terms.</p> <p>Policy 13: CDDO indicates that the language in the policy could be clearer to indicate consumers with no TCM do not have PCSP's.</p> <p>Policy 14: CDDO indicates the policy language could be clearer about who reports are routed to (KDADS QMS) and when the local CIR is used for follow-up issues not tracked in the AIR system. The CDDO indicated they need to develop a more descriptive procedure for Fiscal</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						Management (30-64-33),the distribution of state aid funds and a policy for crisis requests.
2.	Does the CDDO have a newsletter? If yes, review one years' worth. Does the CDDO ensure written communication demonstrates impartiality of the CSPs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N/A	Most communication is completed in person through affiliate meetings or by email with affiliates. The CDDO may want to consider implementing a newsletter as this can be a great way to increase overall communication and could also reach individuals/families/guardians.
3.	Does the CDDO have a company website? If so, does website ensure impartiality of CSPs?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The CDDO's website is part of the overall McPherson County government website, but has its' own website tab under the department's header. The website's content includes basic information about the CDDO and I/DD services. All the links on the website were working and were functional at the time of the review. The three staff who are employed by the CDDO are all featured on the website and the site includes their titles for those staff employed. The backdrop picture on the site seemed to be very pleasing. The CDDO's policies/procedures were posted on the website. The submit and sign forms were a nice addition.	Recommendation: The content of the website could be enhanced to include some of the following information: On Gemini, the site indicated "Not for Public". This language was confusing to the basic reader and it was not clear that this affiliate was not accepting referrals. Please consider placing the affiliate application process on line. Might want to consider placing the appeals and dispute resolution information to the website in a specific section (it is in the policies; however, this may be information the public or someone affiliated with the CDDO may need to access without going through the policy section). Might want to consider posting the most up to date affiliate agreements on line when these are updated. Might consider organizing material in a more user-friendly manner, so that groups needing it would not have to search for materials (for example, information needed for affiliates,

						information needed for individuals applying for services, information for those individuals currently receiving services. On the home page, the CDDO may want to consider adding language that speaks to where the funding comes from, perhaps being a bit more specific so that it is easier for a lay person to understand. On the eligibility information page, there is a laundry list of what documents are needed to determine eligibility, but there is no information on the site about how to go about doing the eligibility process. The affiliates listed on the website were not identified by the types of services they provide. It was unclear what the touring form was used for (received further clarification while the team was on-site).
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

**On-Site Review – Section II**  
**Outcome #1**

**K.A.R. 30-64-20 - CDDO Maintains data regarding CDDO Review Improvement Plans (if any) requested during past review period including rebuttal and date.**

#		1	2	7	Strengths & Comments	Findings & Recommendations
1.	CDDO submitted a performance improvement plan to KDADS as requested. There is documented plan available. Review team and KDADS approved plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CDDO is not being held accountable to this regulation this peer review cycle.	N/A
1a.	CDDO maintains and monitors data for performance improvement plan. CDDO maintains data in a manner that allows evaluation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CDDO is not being held accountable to this regulation this peer review cycle.	N/A

1b.	CDDO is responsive to data results. CDDO has revised the performance plan as needed.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CDDO is not being held accountable to this regulation this peer review cycle.	N/A
1c.	Completion of improvement plan items occurred. Items completed within timeline and is verified by data and/or outcomes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CDDO is not being held accountable to this regulation this peer review cycle.	N/A

Outcome #2						
K.A.R. 30-64-21 - CDDO Maintains policy and procedure changes that are approved as required.						
#		1	2	7	Strengths & Comments	Findings & Recommendations
2.	CDDO will initially and on an on-going basis, follow the regulatory process when developing policy. Did CDDO run policy/procedure changes through the appropriate process: COCM Input, Board Approval, KDADS approval?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The CDDO had recently submitted their policies for review by KDADS and this process was completed in June 2017. There was evidence that the policies were posted for public comments. Policies were also reviewed by the COCM and at an affiliate meeting.	Due to the peer review process, further comments from the team have been received as indicated in Question #1.
Outcome #3						
K.A.R. 30-64-22 - CDDO completes all management responsibilities as required.						
#		1	2	7	Strengths & Comments	Findings & Recommendations
3.	CDDO maintains affiliate agreements with all affiliates. Does CDDO have current affiliate agreement for each affiliate?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The CDDO provided the review team with current affiliate agreements for all affiliates for the on-site portion of the review. They also provided a copy of a new affiliate agreement they are planning to send out to update all affiliation agreements within the next month. Affiliate meeting minutes also indicated that the CDDO will be updating affiliation agreements shortly.	Please ensure that all affiliation agreements are signed by both the CSP and the CDDO. Stairs CSP Appendix A: this document was not signed by the CDDO. Also, Gemini has Appendix C present; however, this was not applicable and needs to be removed. It is noted that new affiliation agreements are being distributed at this time, so the CDDO just needs to ensure all documentation requirements are in order when these are received, prior to filing these.
3a.	If the CDDO has cancelled or suspended an affiliate agreement, was the action consistent with regulatory	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CDDO has not cancelled or suspended any affiliate agreements.	N/A

	criteria? Criteria: 1) provider did not accept rate equal to that established by the Secretary 2) Provider has established pattern of not abiding by service area procedures 3) Entering into an agreement would seriously jeopardize the CDDO's ability to fulfill its responsibilities.					
3b.	Did CDDO report BASIS information to KDADS in the agreed upon timeframe? (All functional assessments shall be entered into KAMIS within seven calendar days of completion of the assessment.) KDADS will sample completed assessments and dates to compare against KAMIS entries (5 days to initiate assessment from date of request, 30 days to complete assessment from date of request, 7 days to enter in to KAMIS).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	KDADS reviewed a random sample of 20 individuals who had BASIS/functional assessments in the last year. The CDDO provided evidence showing that BASIS/functional assessment information was entered into KAMIS in the agreed upon timeframe for all individuals sampled. The CDDO was very prompt in entering the information into KAMIS and in all instances the information on the sample set reviewed indicated that all information was entered typically in five days or less, with only one record being sampled which showed entry in a seven day timeframe.	No concerns.
3c.	Following a sample of crisis/exception requests, do CDDO processes/procedures meet state guidelines?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	KDADS requested a sample of 4 crisis/exception requests. Evidence provided indicates CDDO is following crisis and exception process as outlined by KDADS for those approved for crisis funding. Requests appeared to be processed in a timely manner. The consumer receives the McPherson County CDDO Funding Committee application which includes instructions	Please consider adding a "header" on the Consumer Instructions for Completing the Application Process" document to further clarify that this document is used for crisis requests.

					for completing the application process, The CDDO also has a Crisis Exception Policy checklist they utilize. All denials contained an email which outlined appeal rights and offered other suggestions of agencies the individual might be able to access for alternative services.	
3d.	Following a sample of eligibility determinations, do CDDO processes/procedures meet state guidelines? For example, was each person provided with “comprehensive options counseling?” Is the functional assessment/or reassessment occurring within the stated timeframe?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	CDDO provided a spreadsheet list of individuals who had eligibility determinations over the past year. A sample set of 9 files were selected for review of this indicator. Processes/Procedures meet state guidelines and evidence shows they are implemented as written. The review of the files indicate that individuals are receiving comprehensive options counseling through face to face meetings. Initially, all options are shown and the individuals chooses what services they wish to receive. The CDDO counseling form included additional questions such as what other needs to do have? What questions do you have? What kind of other information would you like to receive?	No concerns.
3e.	Following a sample of provider case transfers inside and outside the CDDO catchment area, does CDDO ensure processes/procedures meet state guidelines?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	KDADS sampled 6 provider case transfers inside and outside the CDDO catchment area. The team reviewed the CDDO Area Transfer Form document and the Notification of Options Counseling form. Evidence demonstrates	The CDDO provider has updated the forms for transfer, but they have not yet implemented use of these forms. It would be good for the CDDO to begin use of these documents as soon as possible, as the new forms appear to be very comprehensive.

					CDDO processes/procedures meet state guidelines.	
3f.	Following a sample of affiliation agreements, does CDDO ensure agreements are uniform for like services? CDDO operated CSP must have an affiliation agreement with CDDO. Affiliation agreement cannot extend advantages not offered to other CSPs.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Most affiliate agreements reviewed are uniform for like services. There is no evidence any agreement extends advantages not offered to other CSPs.	There was some discrepancy in agreements distributed in different years. New Beginnings Workers Comp requirements on 2005 contract/agreement looked different than Choices workers comp requirements on 2008 signed contract/agreement. Since new affiliate agreements are being sent out shortly, this issue should resolve itself.
3g.	Does evidence and documentation demonstrate that affiliated service providers have opportunity for input on CDDO area system management? Correspondence and interviews verify the CDDO makes input opportunities available for all affiliates.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The CDDO did provide evidence that they held quarterly affiliate meetings. Minutes indicated that affiliates are given the opportunity for feedback and to ask questions. Affiliates are informed of stakeholder meetings and of any updates for the CDDO system.	Recommendation: The CDDO should find additional alternative ways to engage their affiliate network to gain feedback about their operations and/or to engage their affiliates on issues which are unique to their catchment area in regard to service gaps. This might be accomplished through Survey Monkey or through anonymous surveys since the Executive Director indicated that relationships with some CSP providers are strained or through various workgroups to address issues pertinent to the catchment area.
3h.	Does CDDO have any individuals who work for both the CDDO and the CSP? If so, review a sample of PD's.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The CDDO is a standalone CDDO, so this question does not apply.	N/A
3i.	CDDO will maintain a separation in function between the CDDO and CSP management and operations. It is clear which functions are CDDO and which are CSP. If there are personnel that work for both entities their position	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The CDDO is a standalone CDDO, so this question does not apply.	N/A

	description reflect such. Paper and electronic information is stored securely to ensure CSP division of a CDDO does not have access.					
<b>Outcome #4</b>						
<b>K.A.R. 30-64-22 - Unbiased affiliation process</b>						
#		1	2	7	Strengths & Comments	Findings & Recommendations
4.	CDDO must have written policies/procedures that are approved in accordance with Article 64 requirements that clearly address the CSP affiliation process, and states the affiliation requirements. Evidence of a policy/procedure and it is followed.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The CDDO has a policy “Affiliation Process” which outlines the process for affiliation. The policy addresses the affiliation process and states the affiliation requirements. The CDDO keeps a checklist with required documentation which indicates what documents have been received and what documents are still pending. When a potential affiliate makes an inquiry about affiliation, the CDDO mails out the Affiliation Agreement Requirements form.	No concerns.
4a.	CDDO must maintain documentation that identifies the current status of all individuals/entities/applicants requesting affiliation, including notification of appeal/grievance rights. Evidence of a process for affiliation and its monitoring.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The CDDO has a policy “Affiliation Process” which outlines the requirements. The affiliate file was reviewed and showed that there were no current affiliates on-boarding at this time. The affiliate file shows completed checklists that indicate monitoring of the affiliation process. There is also a Dispute/Grievance Policy outlining the CSP’s right to appeal.	No concerns.

Outcome #5						
K.A.R. 30-64-22 - Unbiased service option information						
#		1	2	7	Strengths & Comments	Findings & Recommendations
5.	CDDO policies and procedures are implemented as written for sharing, with persons requesting/receiving services, impartial information regarding all service options. The policy and procedures ensure all CSP options are shared.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The CDDO has two choice forms at the present time. One form indicates all services and then lists self-direct FMS services as an option. If this FMS option is chosen, then a separate FMS provider choice form is then completed.	Recommendation: Please look at including the FMS providers and other providers into one comprehensive choice form so that all options are listed regardless of what services the individual/guardian is choosing.
Outcome #6						
K.A.R. 30-64-22 - Access to HCBS & Day/Res State Aid funding is not dependent on the person's chosen service provider.						
#		1	2	7	Strengths & Comments	Findings & Recommendations
6.	CDDO policies and procedures for accessing state aid funds are made available on request. An impartial process for determining funding decisions is in place.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The CDDO supplied Quarterly State Aid Tracking reports. The CDDO is currently distributing the funds between three entities and funding is primarily used to support transportation. All funding is expended annually.	Recommendation: The CDDO has no policy/procedure on Fiscal Management or how they make decisions on how they distribute their state aid funding. These items need to be developed.
Outcome #7						
K.A.R. 30-64-23 - CDDO will serve as single point of entry and maintain an effective application, eligibility determination & service choice process.						
#		1	2	7	Strengths & Comments	Findings & Recommendations
7.	Eligibility staff have been trained per regulation. CDDO has developed a training program and such have been approved by COCM. Evidence eligibility staff have completed identified requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The CDDO had a policy "Training on Eligibility Determination" which outlined what their training requirements are for eligibility staff.	The CDDO could not provide any evidence or documentation that they had trained their staff on the items listed in their policy. They indicated they had not been tracking the items and had no documentation in their personnel files to substantiate this. KDADS will be issuing

						a finding on this issue. KDADS would like the CDDO to develop a plan with timelines to address this issue. The plan will be due to KDADS within 30 days of receipt of this report.
7a.	CDDO policies and procedures are impartially implemented as written for the process that is utilized for persons wishing to change CSPs in that CDDO area. Policies and procedures are implemented as written.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The CDDO had a “Touring” policy and a “Provider Change Policy”. Both policies were reviewed. Feedback from the interviews completed with guardians seems to support that the CDDO is implementing these policies as written. The CDDO uses a Client Transition Questionnaire form for the transition process. This form appeared to be very comprehensive.	No concerns.

**Outcome #8**

**K.A.R. 30-64-23 - Informed Choice of Community Service Providers**

#		1	2	7	Strengths & Comments	Findings & Recommendations
8.	CDDO effectively maintains documentation of service provider change/transition requests/notifications. Notifications are maintained.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	A sample pull of 9 files was reviewed. The “Provider Change Process” policy was also reviewed. From the sample set reviewed, it appears the CDDO is implementing the policy as it is written. Also consumers sampled had a completed choice form with an appropriate signature being obtained from the individual/guardian.	No concerns.

**Outcome #9**

**K.A.R. 30-64-25 - CDDO will maintain a process in coordination with affiliates that results in services being offered and provided in a way that does not discriminate against any persons because of severity of person’s disability.**

#		1	2	7	Strengths & Comments	Findings & Recommendations
9.	CDDO process is effective. All persons that request services, for	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The CDDO has “Uniform Access to Services” policy which states that	No concerns.

	whom funding is available, receive requested services. Review: affiliate agreement; policy/procedure; any agreements for provider specialization and capped capacity.				affiliates can specialize, but cannot do so based on an individual's severity level of their disability. This language was also found in the current and proposed affiliation agreement. The options counseling choice form also is marked if an affiliate is currently capped for the acceptance of new referrals.	
9a.	CDDO identifies number of persons the Secretary of KDADS has determined inappropriate for community services because the person presents a clear and present danger to self of community.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The CDDO has not had any persons the Secretary of KDADS has determined inappropriate for community services because the person presents a clear and present danger to self and community.	N/A

**Outcome #10**

**K.A.R. 30-64-26 & 30-64-27 - CDDO will maintain a locally developed impartial QA process that reasonably addresses regulatory requirements.**

#		1	2	7	Strengths & Comments	Findings & Recommendations
10.	QA process addresses the required regulatory requirements including: Choice, Person-Centered, Rights & Responsibilities, Paid/Delivered, Third Party payment responsibility and ANE reporting information?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The CDDO had a policy "Quality Oversight and Enhancement" which is dated April 2017	The current policy implemented in April 2017 indicates that the CDDO will do on-site reviews and records reviews for 20% of the individuals receiving case management. The policy preceding this policy indicated the CDDO would complete a 10% review of cases. Neither is currently happening. The CDDO indicated they have completed about three on-site reviews over the past year. They also indicated they currently have no formal assessment tool they are utilizing for these reviews. Follow up with the provider had been happening by phone, but there is no documentation trail that the

						<p>provider has addressed the identified issues or that the CDDO has followed up on the issues to ensure the provider has resolved them. The CDDO is doing some record reviews as items for the annual functional assessment come into the office. The CDDO indicates they currently do not have a Quality Assurance Committee and there was no evidence found in the COCM meeting minutes to indicate that quality items had been reviewed with them on an on-going basis. As far as critical incident events, the CDDO is currently not documenting their follow up on significant issues. There is no current tracking/trending being completed on quality indicators, except a spreadsheet which logs what critical incidents have come in monthly. The CDDO indicated that they are working toward developing an on-site visit tool and that they are working toward putting corrective action requests in writing in the future. They are also exploring developing a corrective action document for use with their affiliate network as well. KDADS will be issuing a finding on this item. KDADS would like to see the CDDO develop a plan with timelines to address this issue. The plan will be due to KDADS within 30 days of receipt of this report.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

10a	CDDO maintains evidence that the same remediation and follow-up process is utilized for all CSPs for same services.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The CDDO indicated that they had not issued any corrective actions within the past year.	A quality assurance process, including corrective action follow-up needs to be developed as described in Outcome 10.
-----	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--	--

**Outcome #11**

**K.A.R 30-64-29 - CDDO will develop, implement and maintain a gatekeeping system for public and private ICFs/IID that is in compliance with regulations.**

#		1	2	7	Strengths & Comments	Findings & Recommendations
11.	Is CDDO informing person/family/guardian of available community services choices and types in or near the person's home annually?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	KDADS had requested a sample set of 7 individuals be pulled for review of this question probe. It appears the CDDO has implemented two separate processes to address individuals residing in ICF/IDD facilities. Those out of county are being sent information by mail, which included the 1995 DD Reform Act Rights information. Those within the county, the CDDO was directly meeting with, however, the CDDO indicated that they are using a different set of rights to distribute to the individuals they were meeting with in person.	The Article indicates that the CDDO should be informing individuals of their "rights pursuant to the developmental disabilities reform act." KDADS will be issuing a finding on this item. KDADS would like to see the CDDO develop a plan with timelines to address this issue. The plan will be due to KDADS within 30 days of receipt of this report.
11a	Does CDDO have documentation of ICF/IID requests?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The CDDO indicated that there were no requests within this past year.	N/A

**Outcome #12**

**K.A.R 30-64-31 - CDDO maintains a council of community members that meets the regulatory requirements.**

#		1	2	7	Strengths & Comments	Findings & Recommendations
12.	Did CDDO provide a list of the council of community members?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, a list was provided.	No concerns.

12a	<p>Does the council membership meet the regulatory requirements?          Comprised of a majority of persons served, family members and/or guardians and includes affiliates of the CDDO for no more than 2 consecutive 3 year terms.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>There were 17 total individuals listed on the membership list. Membership included four individuals who had I/DD, three family/guardian members, eight agency representatives/member at large and two CDDO representative. Membership terms for clients/guardians all expire in 2018. There were no identified term limits for the affiliate members or the member at large. The policy "Council of Community Members" was reviewed as well as Council Meeting Minutes. The policy indicates that 51% of the individuals/guardians must be present to conduct business, but the policy also eludes that the Council will reflect a majority membership from person served and the family members or guardians who are not employees of the CDDO or its affiliates. Council bi-laws were also reviewed and these indicate that the membership for individuals/guardians/family members should be comprised of 60% of the group membership.</p>	<p>The current membership does not meet the Article requirements that a "majority or 51%" of the council should be made up of individuals/guardians/family members. The current membership does not meet what is outlined in the bi-laws which indicate 60% of the membership should meet these requirements. The current CDDO membership roster does not indicate when the member first was appointed to be on the council, so it was not possible to tell if any members had been on the council more than two consecutive three year terms. The CDDO also indicated it does not limit the affiliate terms to this restriction and that they can have a number of individuals from one affiliate listed on the membership roster. It was also noted per the meeting minutes that at times, there was more than one agency representative from an agency represented at the meeting, which even more skews the membership alignment. A pamphlet on the Community Council indicated that individuals could contact KDADS at an incorrect address (SW Harrison Street). The CDDO should also consider staggering terms. Based on this information, KDADS will be issuing a finding on this item. KDADS would like to see the CDDO develop a plan with timelines to address this issue. The plan</p>
-----	---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--	--

						will be due to KDADS within 30 days of receipt of this report.
<b>Outcome #13</b>						
<b>K.A.R. 30-64-32 - CDDO maintains an effective dispute resolution system that meets regulatory requirements.</b>						
#		1	2	7	Strengths & Comments	Findings & Recommendations
13.	CDDO has policies/procedures implemented as written and approved in accordance with Article 64 requirements, and clearly addresses how persons requesting/receiving services and family members receive information regarding the CDDO complaint/grievance process is accessed.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The CDDO has a current policy “Dispute Resolution” to address the dispute process. The CDDO indicates in their policy that the policy is shared annually with all individuals receiving services and the policy is posted on the CDDO website.	Upon reviewing what the CDDO gives the individuals, it was noted that on an annual basis the individuals receiving services are given information about “Appeals and Grievance Procedures” for the Basis Functional Assessment. It is also noted in the CDDO “Consumer Rights and Responsibilities” document that the CDDO provides the contact information for the State of Kansas Department of Administration’s Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH). The actual dispute resolution process is not reviewed with individuals/guardians as outlined in the policy. KDADS will be issuing a finding on this issue. KDADS would like to see the CDDO develop a plan with timelines to address this issue. The plan will be due to KDADS within 30 days of receipt of this report.
13a	CDDO will maintain evidence that the dispute resolution process is made available to all persons requesting it and to any persons whom a negative action has been initiated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	KDADS requested to review ALL incidents in which adverse actions had been taken by the CDDO in the past year. The CDDO indicated that they had no adverse incidents during the past year.	N/A.
13b	CDDO must maintain evidence of all incidence in which the dispute	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CDDO indicates there have been no formal disputes within the past 12-month	N/A

	resolution process was initiated by any party.				time frame. Three complainants initiated the process but cancelled prior to dispute resolution being scheduled. The CDDO provided evidence of them sending the dispute resolution language in each interaction.	
13c	CDDO must evaluate the collected data in effort to utilize trends to improve the CDDO system.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	There has been no dispute resolution data to trend. However, the CDDO does upload the Quarterly Complaint Tracking Form to KDADS to track complaints.	The CDDO needs to be prepared to track and analyze data on disputes if these occur in the future.
<b>CONSUMER/FAMILY INTERVIEW</b>		<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	
<b>7 total respondents</b>						
1) Did you understand the eligibility application process? If not, please explain	7	0			1) Nancy and Louie have been helping us a lot. They've been taking care of everything.	
2) Do you believe the eligibility determination process is understandable and timely? If not, please explain.	6	1	0		1) Beyond unbelievable how much help they've been. So kind. So impressed. It could be a long process, but they are making it as quickly as they can. 2) Not timely, but understandable. 3) They called me back quickly.	
3) Do you believe the service referral process (including options counseling) was timely? If not, please explain.	5	0	2		1) No comments received.	
4) Did the CDDO make you aware that you can appeal or request a review of any decision made by your CDDO? If not, explain.	5	1	1		1) Showed paper. Explained everything. 2) Yes 3) I didn't think he would qualify, so I didn't ask. But, I don't remember getting any information regarding this. 4) Don't remember.	
5) If currently receiving services, did you receive information on all service providers in your area when you found out you had funding and could begin the process of selecting a provider?	1	0	6		1) On SED waiver. Within in a month of I/DD waiver, they were going to terminate his case because he has a case manager through Prairie View. 2) On waiting list.	

6) If currently receiving services, have you every changed service providers? If so, how did you receive information about all your service options?	0	1	6	1) Not receiving services.
7) If currently receiving services, do you know who to contact if you want to change service providers? If so, who?	4	1	2	1) Wouldn't know who to contact on that. Would assume it would be the CDDO. 2) Made it perfectly clear. 3) Talk to CDDO.
8) Do you have any other information regarding your interactions with the CDDO that you would like for us to consider?	6	1	0	1) All pleasant. Worked with me well. Have had a great experience so far. 2) The ladies were wonderful. Used their personal car to take me to meetings to figure out who I would want for case management. 3) Overall, a good experience. 4) Our son has progressed. We are lifting guardianship. He wasn't as severely disabled as we thought. The CDDO gave us referrals and other information to help us. They did a great job interviewing our son. They actually took my son and I to the other programs that he might qualify for (2 other places). They were wonderful. I give the CDDO credit because they took us around to introduce us to other services. I spoke with them a lot and they were very helpful. The staff I dealt with were awesome. 5) The three ladies I worked with there were all friendly from the receptionist on up to the others. Since my son didn't qualify, they were helpful and gave me suggestions of other things I could pursue. 6) Very friendly and willing/eager to help.
<b>COMMUNITY SERVICE PROVIDER INTERVIEW</b> <b>7 total respondents</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>
9) Does the CDDO have an effective process for completing the annual BASIS assessment? If no, please explain?	6	1	0	1) All information is to be given to the CDDO 10 days prior to the assessment and additional information can be added if needed. 2) Contact is made by the case manager about a month in advance of the annual BASIS assessment in order to schedule it timely.

				3) The CDDO will not hold a BASIS after 2:00pm. This is not effective for many guardians/family.
10) Does the CDDO maintain a process to solicit (ask you) for your input on CDDO policies/procedures, major local systems change and statewide initiatives for which they represent your area? If not, please explain.	6	1	0	1) We review at the affiliate meetings. 2) A copy of the policy and procedure book is given to affiliates for review and comments. 3) Typically, the CDDO gives us the policy or procedure. They did ask for comments on the most recent policies they developed and put in place. 4) Policies are discussed and we receive emails about changes at the state level.
11) Does the CDDO share information about your CSP with persons seeking services?	7	0	0	1) Choice form. 2) Each provider is listed on a handout developed by the CDDO. 3) They contact the department head with the appropriate information. 4) I am not sure what they exactly do. It is my understanding they give them a brochure from each CSP. 5) Well we know they do because of the choice form. 6) Keeps an updated list of our availability. 7) They have copies of our brochures at their office.
12) Does the CDDOs literature demonstrate impartiality regarding the CSPs in your area?	7	0	0	1) It is just a list of CSP's and the services they offer. 2) All providers are listed with no preference made. 3) The literature demonstrates impartiality regarding CSP's. 4) They have brochures on every CSP.
13) Are you aware of communication in which the CDDO benefitted one CSP over another? If yes, please explain.	1	6	0	1) Our case managers and staff who attend BASIS and PCSP meetings regularly give feedback that the CDDO Director is hateful and disrespectful about MCDS and our staff in these meetings. She will roll her eyes and make negative comments which cast a negative impression about MCDS. Families, MCO Care Coordinators are present and witness this. We have communicated this feedback to the CDDO as it continues.
14) Does the CDDO manage an effective process for persons to access your services? If not, please explain.	6	1	0	1) We had issues with the CDDO providing choice forms to us in a timely manner. We would hear from a family and the CDDO would hold the choice form for some time. The CDDO has most recently put policies in place to address this.
15) Does the CDDO maintain and share (if requested) a list of names of those persons	6	1	0	1) Unsure. I only provide services for two clients and have requested no more referrals. 2) I am not aware of this practice with the McPherson County CDDO.

interested in services who have consented to release their names?				
16) Does your CSPs grievance/dispute resolution process refer the person to the CDDO if the issue is unresolved? If not, please explain.	7	0	0	1) No comments received.
<b>CDDO STAFF INTERVIEW</b>				
<b>Y      N    N/A</b>				
<b>Nancy Brouwer, Executive Director and Angela Butler, Administrative Assistant</b>				
17) Has the CDDO refused to affiliate with a provider? If so, was the appropriate regulatory criteria applied?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No. I was told I could never NOT affiliate. I have never turned anyone down.
18) Has the CDDO cancelled/suspended an affiliate agreement? If so, was the appropriate regulatory criteria applied?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	No. Tried, because there was a company running with no insurance, kept asking them and felt like she was being ignored/dishonest with. Shared area with another CDDO, got together talked and sent out a letter to state and state said they did not want to displace all those people. CDDO stood ground and made sure they became insured. Feel like at times all we can do is “bark”, but we have no teeth to enforce things.
19) Does the CDDO solicit input from all affiliates regarding policies/procedures, major local systems change and statewide initiatives for which they represent your area? If so, how?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes. Through affiliate meetings. If get email prior, send out email and then at next affiliate meeting they present it. Sent rate notices and policies/procedures for them to review and asked for comments/suggestions (no one responded). We did go over it page by page at an affiliate meeting and gave some input on wording.
20) Does the CDDO maintain separation in CDDO/CSP functions? If so, how?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not apply
21) Do you explain the difference between the CDDO and CSP functions to families and consumers? If so, how?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Does not apply.
22) Do all CSPs in your area serve anyone requesting services, regardless of severity of disability? If not, please explain	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes. Had one that they couldn't find provider for because he started a house on fire on purpose, went to another place in Topeka and started that place on fire. No one wanted that responsibility and last they heard he is somewhere in Wichita. He doesn't want services until he is trouble.
23) Does the CDDO QA process assure services are provided in a manner consistent with Article 64 including: Choice, Person-	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Most of it. The only thing is, we are too busy, haven't gone to do QA like we should. When we see something, we contact CSPs and licensing. But we do not go out like they should. We do QA on assessments, are they happy, any problems, etc.

Centered, Rights & Responsibilities, Paid/Delivered, Third party payment responsibility, Report ANE? If so, how?				Developing tool to go out on visits and got a camera. Want to keep one or two Fridays a month open so we can do it. Tried to have COCM do that, but everyone didn't like it, felt like they were being spied on. Other CSPs don't want to know what each other are doing, so now CDDO staff is going to do it and we will take their findings to the COCM.
24) Does the CDDO inform persons and providers of the dispute resolution process? If so, how?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, at every basis assessment they get a copy of it. Let them know their rights as well as provide their rights in hard copy. It is also on their website and policies/procedures. For providers, they are informed on the website or if they ask for it.
25) What does your CDDO do in terms of best practices, or something that may set you apart from other CDDOs across the state? What are your organizations greatest strengths?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I don't know at this point. I like the way we do assessments with seamless docs. Relationship with consumers, know them by name, this is a positive. Have good relationships with most of their CSPs and lots of praise from the MCO's. Send out email every Friday morning with list of dates and time, person, CSP, Case Manager and where the meeting will be located. This way, the CDDO knows that MCO is notified.
26) In your opinion, what are some areas your CDDO could make improvements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Almost every area. There is always place for improvement. Working on improving QA, continue improving forms. Not happy with affiliate agreements, so old, so we are sending new ones out. Continue gaining experience to make improvements
27) What CDDO function do you find to be the most challenging?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Disputes. Always he said/she said. Always having to fight to tell them she knows what she is doing. Keeps documentation to cover, keeps information for years. Have disputes with one CSP and feels like always walking on eggs.
28) What does your organization do in terms of strategic planning? Looking forward over the next five years, what sort of goals may your organization be working towards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Just trying to get all forms and stay on top of all changes, the new rule, PCSPs. Duck and cover. Revamping P/P, forms, new letterheads, developing QA tool, tracking form. Get everything done. Keep heads above water to get everything up to par.
29) How does your organization measure your success? Specifically, what sort of data does your CDDO capture? How do you analyze the data?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	We are still open. By emails and what guardians/CSPs have to say, whether they are happy or not. Stopped satisfaction surveys because we never got anything back. There have been compliments about us even in Wichita. Making MCOs happy.
<b>BASIS ASSESSOR INTERVIEW</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>
<b>Nancy Brouwer, Executive Director and Angela Butler, Administrative Assistant</b>				
1) Please walk us through the assessment process for an initial assessment and a reassessment. What does the timeline look like from start to completion?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Initial-they come in, like to have parent or someone close come with them. Go through assessment and try to put good spin on it because it is so negative; reassure we are not judging them. Give them their rights.

				<p>Do BASIS assessment, do tour if they want tour, then do options counseling. Once they make choice we complete</p> <p>Reassessment- started new policy; send out form quarterly to Case Manager to let know when date assessment is due. List they can refer to to know when their assessments are due by. With BASIS protocol, once they schedule they have to provide documents 10 days prior to assessment for assessor to review. Also send out a letter when they schedule their assessment, date/time, when information is due. Send reminder to case manager, or anyone else who pulls information. Have a list to track that information with due dates; if not in, will cancel BASIS and they will have to reschedule. There have been a couple times MCO is not happy because they cannot make it there; make them reschedule because schedule is so tight. Go through information that service providers send them, tracking/behavior/meds/PCSP/IEP/Risk assessments. If see something that is not correct in PCSP we tell them they will be stopping doing that. From now on we will get a letter describing what is wrong, with corrections. Have 200 plus assessments to do a year. Go through all rights and responsibilities, choice form, etc. If consumer gets upset in the middle of assessment they will allow them to leave.</p>
2) Is the consumer always present for their BASIS assessment? If not, please explain why.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	We allow consumers to leave during times where they could be triggered (behaviors, etc.). If the consumer is not comfortable we will allow them to leave. There are times where a consumer would not be present at BASIS. Day services setting up an outing, nursing sets up appointment, if they are home sick. If that happens, we go a few days later to see them and see how things are going. No matter what, we will have a face-to-face prior to completing assessment.
3) Does the CDDO report BASIS information to KDADS in the agreed upon timeframe? If not, please explain.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, haven't had any go beyond the 7 days. Have program called seamless docs, helps process and automatically emails to Angela so she can enter into KAMIS.
4) What do you find to be the most challenging aspect of your position?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Getting information from the Case Managers. Seems like anytime ask for something or implementing new protocol they are accused of favoritism, etc., non-stop battle with some CSPs. Behavior tracking is the worst.
5) In your opinion, what improvements can be made to the assessor process?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	A tool that is not so negative. Went to a session where they were asked their opinion and she was not invited back, they did not like her opinion.
6) What sorts of education and training is offered to you by the CDDO or you participate on your own?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Doing them every day. Listening to roundtables if there is a roundtable; ask other CDDO's questions. Shadow each other. Haven't taken BASIS test since 2011 when it

				came out. Sat with Angie when she was taking hers and there are answers that you have to answer wrong. It is hard for new people to go through that training.
--	--	--	--	---