

Questions and Comments	Response
Whats the breakdown of assisted living and DD providers?	DHMH will look into specific numbers of providers across programs and make that information available in the transition plan.
Will you be able to do specific analysis for DD?	Yes, DHMH will look to create ways to further assess the DD providers for qualities of HCBS. We will include this in the transition plan.
Did the survey go out in an alternative format such as one with pictures?	This is the only version of the survey that we sent out. We have provided the option of sending hard copy versions to those who want it.
5th grade reading level is not really allowed in the DD waiver. Why is it allowed for the survey?	In addition to participant and representatives, we are targeting providers and case managers because they are the ones who have to be in compliance with the final rule. We aimed for a fifth-grade reading level realizing that many users across programs were going to be targeted.
How will you make those clarifications? Will you include them in the data pre or post analysis?	We are still looking at the data, since this was a preliminary look. We just finished collecting the surveys on October 31st. We're still trying to make sense of the data. There were questions if there was a high percentage of missing data. So it was matter of looking at the numbers. The final results will be included in the transition plan
From what I understand of the survey, the intent seemed to be whether or not the providers felt their setting met the proper criteria. From what I hearing, this data is not going to be useful for the transition plan. I hope a more comprehensive assesment that accurately describes the situation is done.	The results are preliminary. Today's conference is on November 12th, while the surveys were due on October 31st, so we are still inputting the data. We believe that it can be a useful benchmark for developing the transition plan. The transition plan will address the analysis of the survey data as preliminary.

<p>My concern is that the preliminary results will influence transtion plan? Am I hearing that correctly?</p>	<p>These results give us a direction moving forward. It's not a final result by any means. We have heard a variety of comments over the past few months and we've been receptive to those ideas. As were writing the transtion plan, we will take a variety of assessments into account.</p>
<p>As a provider, when we're asked the question "Is the participant allowed to manage their own money," most of us answer yes, but there might be particular clients, for whom the person-centered plan does not include money-management. It's hard to answer that question in a way that accurately describes the situation for all of our participants.</p>	<p>That's very helpful.</p>
<p>We have some concerns. When you publish these reuslts will there be break downs for the type of provider and participant and will you state the limitations of this survey? We want to make sure there's full disclosure when you publish the final analysis.</p>	<p>The survey results are going be written up and given to the state to include in the transition plant. The full results will be included in the final analysis.</p>
<p>One of questions on the slides just confuses me. It states something to the effect of "Do you provide services to folks other than individuals with diabilities?" I'm confused why that question is even up there. Can you explain the thinkng behind that?</p>	<p>Some of the criteria for the final rule states "Are you only serving individuals with disabilities?" The concern is if those settings segregate those people from the community.</p>
<p>Is it the setting vs. the provider? I could understatnd the issue with the setting, such as an apartment building only for those with a disability. But as a proider, of course we're only going ot be taking care of people with a disability.</p>	<p>It's really the setting.</p>

<p>One of the concerns in the room, I'm guessing, is that the survey results doesn't provide any breakdown between the different waivers. The survey results might be very misleading, since it seems that the providers are overreporting [compliance with the Final Rule]. But in fact, it could be that 80% are in assisted living as compared to DD or vice versa.</p>	<p>More than likely the waiver populations will need to be looked at separately to accurately reflect differences.</p>
<p>There's frustration with the survey since the questions don't seem to accurately measure the CMS guidelines. Are you getting what you want to measure? I really don't see that right now.</p>	<p>Again these are preliminary results. This is a big picture look across the state for needs to be done for future assessments.</p>
<p>Are you completely wedded to this being the baseline data?</p>	<p>We have a very tight timeline, and we were hoping to have some data that we could utilize, along with waiver and regulatory reviews. We will not have time before the creation of the transition plan to do an additional survey, but we can include the need to do another one. This will be used as preliminary data.</p>
<p>People would feel better about a more service-specific and setting-specific survey.</p>	<p>We appreciate that feedback.</p>
<p>A variety of providers and advocates are wondering the effect of these changes on day services and employment services. There wasn't much talk about those services in the survey. There needs to be more breakdown for age group and waiver group.</p>	<p>Agreed, CMS said they would provide more data about non-residential providers, but we have not received guidance from them yet. We hope to move forward with non-residential services and settings once we get additional information. Other states are having the same issues since they received no guidance from CMS on this issue, so they used methods such as surveys to find information. We met with a group from MACS last week, and it was suggested that we look at more employment data.</p>

One of the recommendations we emphasized was that the data needs to be validated. You collected this data from 80,000 feet, so I would encourage you validate this data. As of now, this data is not valid.	



