

CFAC Meeting Minutes

June 21, 2007

Present: Virginia, Leslie, Dan, Allen, Cheryl, Megan, Gwyn, Edward, Ken, Bradley, Marcus, Steve, Heather, Vincente, Suzanne, and Michael

Guest: Senga Carroll, LCSW (OPC Clinical Specialist in the Quality Improvement/Provider Relations Department)

Minutes: The minutes of the May meeting were approved as written.

REPORTS

Update from CFAC Chair: Virginia reported on the meeting she and Leslie had with Judy Truitt on May 29th. She said they discussed CFAC's concerns about a reduction in DBT services in Hillsborough, and Judy gave reassurances that there have been no cuts in that service. Cheryl mentioned a concern that even if groups had not been cut, they had been moved to a smaller room because DSS was taking over part of the office space that CFN occupied in Hillsborough. Some concern was expressed that perhaps fewer people could access the service because there would be less physical space available, although this was not known for certain. Virginia also shared that Judy Truitt said OPC would be operating under a continuation budget for the time being, because the state had not been able to finalize their budget and determine how much money would go to LMEs for services. Leslie added that Judy had requested CFAC's input into prioritizing the use of state funding that OPC would receive. Because it would not be enough to meet all of the needs for everyone in the OPC area, Leslie said that Management Team and the Area Board were trying to sort out whether it would be better to do a little for a lot of people (i.e., stretch the money to serve as many people as possible, even if they don't get everything they need), or do a lot for a smaller number of people (i.e., focus on the people with the highest level of need and try to meet all of their needs, even if that means some people won't receive any services at all). Dan responded that neither of these were acceptable options, and that the state needed to come up with additional funding. He also suggested that OPC consider both hierarchy of need and hierarchy of cost: that OPC address locally those needs that aren't too costly, and pool resources with nearby LMEs to create a regional entity to assist individuals with a higher degree of needs. Dan also asked that the State-CFAC provide "best practices" for LMEs in dealing with budget shortfalls. Allen expressed concerns that the limited money available to pay for services could be placing providers in financial jeopardy. CFAC members recommended looking at Peer Support models as a way to provide services in a more cost effective manner. Discussion ensued about the possibility of opening a Drop-in Center, which had been an interest of CFAC a few years ago that never materialized. Part of the difficulty is finding a way to fund a Drop-in Center, since it does not provide a reimbursable service and therefore would not generate income to cover the costs involved. Virginia agreed to share CFAC's concerns with Judy Truitt/OPC management.

Note: Because the above discussion ran longer than the allocated time, some of the items on the agenda were rearranged.

NEW BUSINESS:

Post-Payment Reviews for Community Support Services (Senga Carroll, OPC Clinical Specialist)
Both the Division of MH/DD/SAS and the Division of Medical Assistance (responsible for Medicaid in N.C.) want to have reviews of this service to see whether it is being delivered appropriately. They have assigned LMEs to review records of consumers who have been receiving 12 or more hours/week of Community Support services. The Division asked LMEs to inform CFAC of this process.

Senga noted that OPC needs to complete 103 post payment reviews by Sept. 30th. Various OPC staff are conducting these reviews based on their expertise as service providers. The purpose of the reviews is to make sure that Community Support services are being provided in the way the state intended. Staff also need to determine whether the service is being provided appropriately, based on diagnosis and service needs. In *some* of the records reviewed so far, there is insufficient evidence to make a clear determination of the consumer's diagnosis. Also, the quality of the notes is poor in some cases. Based on who is writing the service notes, it appears that most of the staff who are providing Community Support are paraprofessionals (i.e., those with a high school education and limited experience). Most of the Qualified Professionals (QPs) providing the service have a Bachelor's Degree plus 2 years of experience.

Cheryl asked whether a possible outcome of these reviews would be that OPC staff would make recommendations for other services needed by consumers who are receiving Community Support. Senga said that this was a possibility, though they could only recommend services that already exist. They would not be suggesting that new services or resources be created as a result of these post-payment reviews.

Megan shared a concern over the brevity of a diagnostic assessment, i.e., that they may not be accurate if they are not conducted over a longer period of time. If service eligibility is dependent on diagnosis, shouldn't more be done to make sure that the diagnosis is accurate?

REPORTS (cont.)

Update from OPC CFAC Liaison: Michael let CFAC members know that the 2007 Quality Management Conference was coming up in August, and that the sponsors (DMH/DD/SAS, DHHS, and Greensboro AHEC) asked that LMEs send 3 CFAC members along with LME and provider staff. Since Pam and Rhonda are members of AQIC, they are natural choices for this conference. Michael asked for a volunteer for the 3rd CFAC slot, but no one expressed interest at this meeting.

Michael also reported that the Division had decided not to accept or reject any of the Local Business Plans (LBPs) submitted by any of the LMEs. The performance objectives for LMEs are to be spelled out in the contract with the Division, and these contracts have not yet arrived so OPC does not know specifically what it will include. Because H.B.2077 requires that CFACs review and comment on the implementation of the LBP, it is unclear what the Division's decision will mean. OPC will be developing a system to keep CFAC informed of its progress toward the goals included in the LBP and/or the contract with the Division.

Update from State CFAC Liaison: Suzanne did not have a report for this meeting.

COMMITTEE REPORTS:

Adult MH/SA Committee

Virginia reported that this committee discussed the fact that Freedom House planned to take over some of the services that CFN has stopped providing. Allen discussed some experience with the Facility-Based Crisis Service at Freedom House that suggested things are not running very smoothly there. He requested an update on the program's status, and Virginia agreed to look into this.

DD Committee

Bradley reported that the Committee has not met. It is being dissolved (as are other Board Committees) and will be replaced by a new committee.

Child & Family Committee

No report.

AQIC

Neither of the members of AQIC was present at this meeting.

PSW (Peer Support Workshop)

Edward reported that things were moving along well. The PSW Committee is a little behind in finalizing presenters, but hope to have this completed in the next couple of weeks. Cheryl developed a very nice flyer, which was passed around during the meeting this evening. It should also be sent out in a couple of weeks, with a brochure to follow. CFAC members are still invited to get involved in the day of the workshop. Edward also mentioned that, related to the earlier discussion on a Drop-in Center, they PSW Committee had done a lot of work on this idea a few years ago, and ultimately the question was whether to spend a lot of energy on developing an actual center, or to focus on expanding a peer support network. Edward offered to make the work done by the PSW Committee available to CFAC if this idea will be pursued.

NEW BUSINESS:

Budget Update. Michael reported that OPC typically receives a preliminary allocation letter in the spring, letting us know how much state/IPRS money we can expect to receive. OPC uses this preliminary allocation letter to develop the annual budget. Since the legislature has not approved a state budget yet, OPC has not received a preliminary allocation letter and recently learned that we will not get one. LMEs have been told by the Division that they can expect to get "no less than" what they spent in FY 2006-2007. Given this uncertainty, OPC's Board passed a continuation budget. Once we have clear information on our allocation of state money, someone from OPC Management will present budget information to CFAC.

Money Follows the Person. Megan pointed out that "Money Follows the Person" brochures and petitions were distributed in everyone's packet tonight. GACPD is no longer spearheading this movement in NC, but if members already submitted a petition when they were presented several months ago, there is no need to do a new one. Members who have not completed the petition were encouraged to do so, and to share it with their friends and families.

OLD BUSINESS:

CFAC Budget Proposal. Allen presented a budget proposal for CFAC for Fiscal Year 2007-2008. Copies were distributed with packets for this evening's meeting. The total amount remains \$25,000 (which comes from county money, so OPC was able to offer assurances that CFAC would have that amount). Some line items (such as stipends, advertising & printing) were increased because CFAC will be working on increasing membership during the coming year. A motion was made and seconded to approve the budget, and it passed by a unanimous vote.

Proposed Agenda for June Meeting:

Presentation by OPC staff on "Benefit Packages" (projected uses for state money).