

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

EDWARD R. MAMBRUNO



for Developmental Services



Dannel P. Malloy
GOVERNOR

Jordan A. Scheff
DDS Commissioner

DDS Council Monthly Report

February 2017

Personnel contacted

Regional Directors, Assistant Regional Directors, Case Manager Supervisors, Case Managers, Quality Management Director, QI Supervisors, Abuse/Neglect Director and/or liaisons and Division heads if I needed specific additional info regarding the issues and concerns of individuals who contacted my office.

In addition, I spoke with other contacts at agencies eg. DCF, Public Health, DSS and the Client Rights and Grievance Specialist, Office of the Commissioner DMHAS.

New England ADA Center, Director of ADA Training and Assistance

Melissa Marshall, Council on Developmental Disabilities

Susan Shanty, DORS CDHI met regarding interpreters.

William Pierce, Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services. Client Rights and Grievance Specialist

Concerns \ Issues

- Individual who recently regained Guardian status has called office seeking many additional supports including movement from current residence.
Due to the circumstances, I contacted Regional Director, CO Legal and Director of A/N. Very difficult situation that needs to be addressed immediately.
All parties are working together to organize and implement a plan to pass keep individual supported by DDS healthy and safe. Regional team has met with individual and has assessed situation.
- Met with an individual supported by DDS and his staff. Individual wanted to meet in person because he has placed numerous calls to his Case Manager Supervisor, Commissioner's Office and my office. Individual believes that a meet in person with me is required in order to clearly understand what he has requested from the region and why this is something they need.
Individual wants respite however wants to choose where to spend his respite days. The region has tried to inform him that this is not something that they can provide.

Individual believes that if he can speak with the Commissioner then he will be able to "convince" him of his need. During one of my conversations with him, I told him that I would meet with him and convey his message to the Commissioner.

Shortly into our meeting after discussing respite and why he would not be able to do as he had planned he stated that "he did not want to hear anymore and the meeting was over". Before the meeting, I had been alerted to the possible reasons why he wanted to choose his respite location and determined that this was not something that I could advocate the region for on his behalf.

After the individual left my office, I spoke with his staff member for a few moments and gave them materials on "Healthy Relationships" and the schedule for the workshops. Told staff to review the materials and determine if this workshop would be advantageous to attend. Told staff that if they believe this is something this individual could benefit from then by all means have a frank discussion with them. Staff thanked me and stated that they thought it was a good idea.

- Aunt, not Guardian called office requesting that I assist in helping her niece move to a placement out of state that specializes in people who are deaf and blind. Team is aware of her aunt's suggestions of participating in this out-of-state Center. Due to the specificities of her aunts requests and because she is not Guardian, she consented to her own removal years ago; they could not and did not return her phone calls.

Please note, case management is not able to share any information unless Aunt can provide DDS with written consent from the Guardian. The Regional Planning Team has not received any consent to share information at this time and individual believes by going to me she can avoid this mandatory consent.

In addition, team has been advised that individual who receives supports from DDS does not meet the necessary requirements for admission and that DDS would not be able to assist with this unless Aunt is willing to private pay for placement.

Due to the circumstances, individual being deaf and blind I questioned if she was receiving all accommodations required by the ADA. Called the Case Manager Supervisor who stated he would go in and visit individual and determine if she was indeed receiving all accommodations required by the ADA.

After visit, it was determined that individual could see and had no problems communicating. Staff has stated that she has made great strides since she has been placed there and that this is something they hear from aunt from time to time.

After receiving a prompt and thorough evaluation from the Case Manager Supervisor it was determined that she was receiving all accommodations and any move could not guarantee benefits that the aunt has consistently stated.

I contacted aunt, reminded her of HIPAA, and told her that if she wanted to pursue this move she would have to do so through private pay. I also reminded her that she needed to receive consent from the current Guardian if she wanted to arbitrarily place calls to the case manager and expect replies.

- Sister who lives in the Midwest and who is not legal Guardian has a brother receiving services from DDS, called upset that because she had a very difficult time relating the message that their mother had passed away.

Sister asked if she was entitled "to be kept informed of where he is living, be notified if he became critically injured or becomes terminally ill and should he pre-decease her, will she be notified?" As with the previous guardianship cases told them the easiest way to resolve this problem would be to receive consent from the current Guardian.

However, because some of these questions could be considered time sensitive I contacted legal. They stated that no information specific to this individual should be released without authorization although DDS could provide her with the Guardian's contact information to which she could ask for consent.

Called individual and gave her the information regarding receiving consent from the current Guardian. Told her that because she did not give any specifics in her e-mail I could not have his case manager relay the contact information of the current Guardian therefore, I asked for brother's name so that they would be able to contact her.

- Mom not Guardian e-mailed office asking for a change in placement for daughter to an out-of-state placement. Mom feels that daughter would thrive in this setting. Followed all HIPAA regulations.

Contacted Case Manager Supervisor and asked for background. CMS told me that they had gone through this with mom before when she was Guardian. Region determined that daughter would do better with a change in guardianship, which was granted by probate.

Contacted mom told her that the amongst other things placement out of the state is something that DDS only does as a last resort and even if placement is found when an opening in Connecticut is found that can support that individual they are usually moved back.

Also, told mom that these decisions, as she probably already knows, are made by the Guardian and the DDS team. At this time, the team did not feel that the daughter needed any additional supports and was doing very well at her current placement.

- This month, there was an inordinate amount of calls regarding Guardianship. I do not know whether this will become a trend or the reasons why. However, as with all concerns I will monitor.

February 2017

Areas of Concern

○ Case Management -	5
○ Case Management Requests -	4
○ Day Program –	5
○ Eligibility -	4
○ Funding/Budget -	5`
○ Guardianship –	7
○ (Health & Safety –	2
○ HIPAA -	-
○ Information/Referral –	22
○ Placement –	4
○ Birth to 3-	-
○ School District services-	-
○ Autism-	2
○ Mental Health Issues	2
○ ADA	4

ISSUES/CONCERN TOTAL – 67