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Conflict of Interest Requirements in the HCBS Rule for 1915(c) waivers

• 42 FR §441.301 (c)(1)(vi)
• Providers of HCBS for the individual, or those who have an interest in or are employed by a provider of HCBS for the individual, must not provide case management or develop the person-centered service plan,
• except when the State demonstrates that the only willing and qualified entity to provide case management and/or develop person-centered service plans in a geographic area also provides HCBS.
• In these cases, the State must devise conflict of interest protections including separation of entity and provider functions within provider entities, which must be approved by CMS.
Other Considerations

• Unlike settings, no transition, became effective 3/17/14
  • CMS appears to be drawing a line at the waiver renewal, but the line could change
• Rules address “case management”
  • Does not explicitly discuss implications of whether case management is paid as an administrative cost or with non-federal dollars.
  • CMS has made it clear that if the individual is receiving funds under one of the authorities, the rules apply to the person and all of the supports they receive. *State only dollars will not buy an exemption.*
Where to draw the line between CM and service provision

Core Steps in Implementing a Person-centered Plan

- Set Person-centered goals
- Determine strategies to achieve goals
- Identify types of supports to fulfil strategies
- Choose programs, services, units of service
- Select support providers
- Pick staff, schedules, back-up
- Provide instructions about how to provide supports
- Monitor service provision

Functions for which service providers plan an integral role

• Need to delineate:
  o Support plan vs. implementation plan.
  o Monitoring requirements for case manager vs. service provider.
• Handling transition from current to the compliant system
Selection of States for this Panel

- We conducted interviews with multiple states to assist Alaska in developing a plan, which they are implementing (during)
- Colorado provides an example of a state engaging in an extensive stakeholder input process (before)
- Wyoming provides lessons for a state that has completed the transition (after)
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Our Mission

Improving health care access and outcomes for the people we serve while demonstrating sound stewardship of financial resources
Implementing Conflict Free Case Management in Colorado
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- Challenges Faced While Changing the System
- Approach to Changing the System
- Actual or Potential Benefits/Drawbacks
- Lessons for Other States
Colorado’s Current Case Management System Structure and Conflicts

- Community Centered Boards (CCB) and Single Entry Points (SEP)
- Administrative and Targeted Case Management
- Providers of HCBS waiver services
- Past attempts to address conflict of interest
  - University of Southern Maine, 2007
  - Conflict of Interest Task Force, 2010
  - Conflict Free Case Management (CFCM) Task Group, 2014
  - Community Living Advisory Group, 2014
Challenges Faced While Changing the System

- Services and case management for individuals with intellectual and/or developmental disabilities (I/DD) in place prior to waivers and Medicaid funding
  - CCBs don’t just provide case management
    - The “go-to” place for all things IDD
    - Organized Health Care Delivery System (OHCDS)
    - State Funded Programs
Challenges Faced While Changing the System

• Waiver Redesign for I/DD adult waivers
  ➢ HB15-1318
  ➢ Redesigning services

• Statute Changes
  ➢ CCBs designated by statute to provide CM for individuals with I/DD
Colorado’s Approach to Changing the System

• CFCM Task Group 2014
  - Met from February-October
  - Submitted report with three recommendations:
     Option 1: Complete separation of case management from direct service provision
     Option 2: An agency can provide both case management and direct services, but not to the same individual
     Option 3: An agency can provide both case management and direct services to the same individual, as long as there is a robust, informed consent, opt-out option
  - The Department released the report for public comment February 2015
  - Upon receipt of all public comment, the Department responded to the report, May 2015
Colorado’s Approach to Changing the System

• Colorado contracted with Navigant Consulting, Inc.
  - Financial Analysis of all CCBs
  - Desk Reviews
  - On-site visits

• Colorado contracted with Public Knowledge
  - Conduct bi-weekly to monthly meetings with the Department and CCB Executive Directors
  - Provide a report with recommendations for an implementation plan for CFCM
Actual or Potential Benefits

• Benefits
  ➢ Individuals will be afforded choice in case management agency and in direct services
  ➢ Real or perceived conflict of interest will no longer exist
  ➢ The way in which case management is delivered and reimbursed can be redesigned
    ▪ Individuals can receive the level of case management they need
    ▪ Case management can be reimbursed accordingly
  ➢ Increase in provider capacity
Actual or Potential Drawbacks

• Drawbacks
  - Supporting people (individuals receiving services, CCB employees, community members) through the change
  - Providing a stable transition for all people involved, without eliminating the other essential CCB functions
  - None of the CCBs operate in exactly the same manner
  - Some individuals and families have a longstanding relationship with their case manager, case management agency, and/or direct service provider
Lessons for Other States

• Engage the community from the beginning
• Listen
• Establish a communication plan
• Listen
• Establish a framework
• Listen
• Provide plenty of opportunity for feedback
• Listen
Questions or Comments?
Contact Information

Brittani Trujillo
Case Management Services Coordinator
Brittani.Trujillo@state.co.us

Jed Ziegenhagen
Director, Office of Community Living
Jed.Ziegenhagen@state.co.us
Thank You!
CONFLICT FREE CASE MANAGEMENT: NEW RULES, NEW DIRECTIONS

CMS REGULATIONS EFFECTIVE MARCH 17, 2014
WHAT % OF RECIPIENTS RECEIVE CFCM CURRENTLY?

42% of waiver recipients receive “conflict free” case management.
WHAT % OF RECIPIENTS RECEIVE CFCM CURRENTLY?

68% of ALI recipients
Alaskans Living Independently

41% of APDD recipients
Adults with Physical and Developmental Disabilities
WHAT % OF RECIPIENTS RECEIVE CFCM CURRENTLY?

17% IDD recipients
Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities

19% CCMC recipients
Children with Complex Medical Conditions
WHAT WE’VE DONE SO FAR

• Convened a working group of DHSS, Trust and provider stakeholders
• Made decisions to “redesign the system”
• Hired consultants to facilitate a planning process
• Received “Conflict-Free Case Management System Design” report from consultants containing four options for system design:
PROPOSED APPROACHES TO CFCM

- **Option 1:** Current system with modifications – separation of case management and service delivery
- **Option 2:** State-designated, single case management agency per region
- **Option 3:** State-designated “administrative support only” agencies
- **Option 4:** Multiple agencies that provide case management and administrative support
THE DIRECTION WE’RE GOING

- **Option 1:** Current system with modifications – separation of case management and service delivery
- **Option 4:** Multiple agencies that provide case management and administrative support
  - Promotes choice and quality
  - Administratively feasible
  - Builds on current system
IDENTIFIED TASKS

• Determine current capacity for CFCM in all geographical areas of the state
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number of Care Coordinators</th>
<th>Number of Care Coordinator Agencies</th>
<th>Number of Clients</th>
<th>Number of Clients Served by Independent Care Coordinator</th>
<th>Percent of Clients Served by Independent Care Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDD</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALI</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APDD</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCMC</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southcentral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDD</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALI</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APDD</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCMC</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>320</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDD</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALI</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APDD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCMC</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>326</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDD</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALI</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APDD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCMC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APDD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCMC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDD</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APDD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCMC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,343</td>
<td>1,816</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDD</td>
<td>1,963</td>
<td></td>
<td>336</td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALI</td>
<td>2,059</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,403</td>
<td></td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APDD</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCMC</td>
<td>251</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Waiver Recipients Currently Served by Conflict-Free care coordinators, by Region and Waiver Type*

*Regional totals for care coordinators and care coordination agencies are not available as unduplicated counts.
IDENTIFIED TASKS

Identify places where there is only one willing and qualified agency to provide both case management and HCBS

- By “geographical area”
  - Census area? Region? City? Tribal health region?

- Verification?
IDENTIFIED TASKS

Develop a method to stabilize areas with a “sole-source” provider

• Time-limited “designation”?  
• “Open enrollment” periods?
IDENTIFIED TASKS

Establish strategies to mitigate conflict of interest when “sole-source” agencies are allowed to offer both case management and HCBS

• Disclosure
• “Firewalls”
IDENTIFIED TASKS

• Continue to ensure recipient health, safety and welfare
  • Quality standards for CFCM
  • Excellent provider policy, certification, and compliance support
  • CFCM capacity-building
  • Ensure adequate training resources
  • Negotiate acuity-based rates
Wyoming’s Conflict Free Case Management

Roll-Out Process
Case Management Structure Prior to Change

- Wyoming certifies all providers as independent contractors
- Providers are certified as individuals or agencies
- Both could provide case management and other waiver services they were qualified for to anyone on their caseload
Issues with Model

• Case managers and case manager agencies were essentially monitoring themselves
• No real advocacy
  – Case managers hired by agencies were often forced with the dilemma between advocating or keeping their job
  – Individual case managers who were self-employed were often promoting their own waiver services
Challenges in Trying to Change the System

• We received many concerns from individual case managers, agencies that employed case managers, guardians, and participants
Concerns Included:

- Loss of income for the case manager
- Loss of either a case manager or a provider for the participant and guardian
- Loss of income from case management services for agencies that employed case managers
- Loss of benefits for case managers employed by agencies that had built up retirement and/or insurance
- Loss of case managers

All of the above led to legislative concerns
Approach

• Wyoming was already looking into changes to the case management system, which was part of a legislative mandated waiver re-design of the entire Medicaid Waiver System that included waiver case management services
Research and Decision Making Process

- Wyoming wanted to increase case management qualifications along with exploring available case management models.

- Contracted with National Association of State Directors of Developmental Disabilities Services (NASDDDS).

- Consultant came to Wyoming and met with Wyoming Department of Health (WDH) leaders to describe different approved case management models.
Research Continued

- Stakeholder teams were developed
- Conducted research on other states
- Consulted with the contractor from NASDDDS
- Teams met weekly and discussed:
  - case management models in the states researched
  - how case management was billed; and
  - qualifications for case managers in other states
- Draft recommendations were developed and presented to Senior Leadership of WDH
Research Continued

• The senior leadership team met to discuss recommendations of the case management team
• Final decisions were made regarding case management qualifications and the model to be used
Process to Implementation

• Developed draft case management model
• Received guidance on proposed model from WDH attorney and Attorney General
• Proposals were met with a great deal of negative response and resulted in legislative push back
• Senior leaders spoke to legislators during the legislative session
Around the same time the Wyoming Legislature was meeting, CMS made conflict free case management a requirement.

- Legislature made final decisions on the model and case management qualifications.
Process to Implementation

• Created internal BHD staff team who developed process for reviewing qualifications, grandfathering in for some case managers with the expectation of increased college coursework
• BHD staff team developed a full implementation roll-out process which started July 1, 2014
Implementation

Full roll-out was completed on July 1, 2015, at which time the entire case management system was conflict free.
Actual or Potential Benefits/Drawbacks from Changes

Actual Benefits

• Improved advocacy for participants
• Improved choices in services that best meet needs and wishes of participants *(person-centered planning)*
• Increased independence for participants
• Positive feedback received from the case managers on aspects of the change
Actual Drawbacks

• Loss of benefit packages for case managers that left agencies
• Some difficulty with communication for case managers who are no longer employed with agencies
• Agencies are unhappy that teams are discussing other available waiver service options and/or other providers
Lessons for Other States

• Ensure there are legislators on the stakeholder team
• Try to meet with various legislators to discuss process, proposal, options, and concerns
• Stick to the model that is developed to ensure its integrity
• Anticipate negative comments and requests to allow exceptions
Thank You

• Chris Newman, M.H.A., Senior Administrator, Behavioral Health Division, chris.newman@wyo.gov
• Joe Simpson, M.S., Ed.S., Developmental Disabilities Administrator, Behavioral Health Division, joe.simpson@wyo.gov
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And Special Thanks To:
• Jennifer Adams, Provider Support Specialist
• Sheila Thomalla, Provider Support Specialist
Questions
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