

Residential Transition Workgroup Meeting Minutes

May 15, 2013

Attendees: Peter Mason, Len Cipollone, Shannon O'Brien, Stan Sobey, Katie Banzhaf, Stephen Becker, Mark Kovitch, Sheila Cordock, Chet Fisher. Quincy Abbot, Mary Pat DeCarlo.

1. Review and approval of minutes from the meeting on April 18, 2013.
2. Committee Updates given
 - Implementation Committee met and reviewed the PRAT Survey. There was discussion regarding the efficiencies of PRC and what changes could be made. Peter is going to try to find out when we may expect to see changes in the PRC process.
 - Residential Issues Committee. No Report.
 - CCH Committee met. They had asked Mary Pat to attend their meeting to discuss how the professional Parent model is working in DCF and how it differs from the CCH model. Differences were discussed. Mary Pat also presented to the committee that in Mass. and New Hampshire the Shared living model is used. Programmatically it is virtually the same as CT CCH however each residents allotted funding on average is twice what CT is paying.
 - IHS Committee. The Committee held an open meeting for all providers on May 14, 2013 to explain how the transition to the new IHS rates will be implemented. Many questions were asked and FAQ will be developed and posted on line.
 - Data Management: No Meeting
 - Sustainability: No Meeting
3. FYI 2013 Day Transition update was given by Peter. The Residential Implementation committee will be looking at Day Implementation committee did to see what could be duplicated.
4. Discussion regarding the 1:1 rate in CLA was started with the review of calculation that Len worked on. For a 3 bed home with 2 1:1 the third person is a 1:1 by default. We may have to come up with a different formula for 3 and 4 bed homes. A separate hourly rate may have to be developed for the overnights, with the number of hours of staffing to be determined by the team. Mark expressed his concerns regarding the direct hours per week allotted in standard month rate. The committee also questioned the number of clinical hours for someone who is in need of 1:1 staffing.
5. The use of Assistive Technology and the process for reimbursement through the rates was discussed. Several issues need to be addressed; philosophy, and human rights. Would the savings from the technology remain with the agency or go back to the department?
6. The Committee discussed the Shared Living model and that this model of residential services would fall under Self Determination.
7. There was discussion regarding at what point would an agency need to go to URR vs. PRAT for approval for increased funding. The committee would need to discuss this further.