

**Summary of Survey Findings for
Administration and Case Management Services
Developmental Disabilities Resource Center**

Community Centered Board

Date of Survey: December 1, 2005

Survey Team Members:

Shari Repinski, DDD

Daphne Hicks, DDD

Kristi Esquibel, DDD

Jane Davis, DDD

Candie Dalton, DDD

Jamie Nally, Denver Options

Scott Parker, Parker PCA

Leanna Seiford, Developmental Pathways

Barbara Steiner-Reynaldo, DDRC

“Program Quality Standards for On-Site Surveys” of Community Centered Board (CCB) Administration and Case Management Services (January 2002) were used to conduct the survey. All applicable standards were applied. The purpose of this report is to identify the methods utilized to conduct the survey, transmit the specific findings of the survey and to communicate the observations and recommendations of the survey team. The report consists of two sections: a narrative section providing an overview of the survey findings and a summary of deficiencies cited as a result of the survey for which a Plan of Correction (POC) is requested. The POC is due in this office by February 10, 2006.

The survey began with an entrance conference at which time the purpose of the survey was explained, survey schedules were finalized, and an opportunity for questions, comments and clarification was provided. This was followed by a brief training session for the peer surveyors from other agencies and a period of record review.

The record reviews consisted of reviewing the master record of 50 persons in the sample of all persons receiving services from the CCB. Subsequent to record review, each surveyor met with or called persons to interview the person, a family member and/or a staff person who knew the person well. Administrative records of the CCB (e.g., personnel files, complaint logs, investigative reports, etc.) were reviewed and CCB staff interviewed concerning the agency’s administrative practices.

The findings of the surveyors were then reviewed in a team meeting to determine those areas in which the agency’s practices were in compliance with rules, areas that appeared to be strengths of the agency and areas that would require the attention of the agency staff and administration to correct identified problems.

General findings from the survey were summarized and presented at an exit conference that was attended by involved agency staff. Areas of unmet regulatory requirements as well as exemplary practices of the CCB were reviewed.

OVERVIEW OF SURVEY FINDINGS

COMMUNITY CENTERED BOARD ADMINISTRATION

The agency's practices in CCB Administration are exemplary. The survey team noted many strengths in these processes and the requirements of DDD rules have been met in all areas. The agency's process for the selection of service agencies meets all requirements. The agency monitors all comprehensive service providers and increases the amount of monitoring and technical assistance for service agencies not meeting requirements. Several internal committees are utilized to communicate and coordinate efforts to monitor and improve services to individuals. DDRC is not currently monitoring Support Services (SLS/CES) provided by the agency and will need to develop a process to do so. Verbal reports from service agencies include that DDRC is responsive to expressed concerns and problems and that there is a cooperative relationship that exists between them. Persons receiving services have obtained information regarding individual rights and the Human Rights Committee meets the requirements for membership and operation. All allegations had been investigated thoroughly and completely and reports were very well written. Finally, the agency meets requirements for the maintenance of the waiting list and the selection of persons for services from the waiting list.

CASE MANAGEMENT SERVICES

The case management services provided by the agency met the majority of the requirements of DDD Rules. There is a comprehensive and organized program to provide training to Case Managers and observations of surveyors included that Case Managers were competent and very knowledgeable of the strengths, needs, and preferences of persons receiving services. Case management processes met all of the DDD requirements related to determination of eligibility.

Individual Plan (IP) Development- The agency's development and implementation of IPs met the majority of requirements. The surveyors were impressed by the quality of the IPs for individuals. IPs provided detailed information regarding persons' abilities and needs and the services identified were appropriate to meet those needs. IDTs consisted of appropriate persons to develop the IP and the document identified the outcomes of services and supports. Notice of the IP meeting was not always provided at least 10 days prior to the meeting and for individuals in CES, it could not be determined when the IP document was sent to the individual/parents.

Service and Support Coordination- In general, services and supports identified in the IP were coordinated as needed to ensure continuity of services. In many situations, IDTs were held frequently to discuss changing needs and to coordinate services and supports among service providers. Rights suspensions, however, were not always reviewed by the IDT at least every six months.

Case Management Monitoring- Interviews with Case Managers indicated that they were knowledgeable of the persons' service and support needs, and the current circumstances of persons on their caseloads. Additionally, persons receiving services and their guardians knew the name of their case manager and reported regular contact with the Case Manager stating that he/she was always available to assist with service issues and questions. For many of the persons reviewed, documentation of case management monitoring was thorough and complete and monitoring activities occurred at the required frequency, however this was not the case for several individuals. Surveyors noted problems with face-to-face contacts occurring only during IDT/IP meetings and not at specific program sites. In addition, follow up to problems noted during monitoring activities did not always occur as required. Monitoring activities were not always clearly documented to indicate what specific activity occurred or what actions were taken to address concerns.

SUMMARY

Overall, the administrative and case management practices of DDRC meet most of DDD's requirements. Although there are several corrections to be made in practices and process, and deficiencies are cited in the survey report, the agency's staff was aware of most of the problems identified by surveyors. The majority of the processes and practices implemented by the CCB are excellent and the agency is encouraged to continue with its efforts and commitment to the provision of high quality case management services.