

## CRP Quality Scorecard Workgroup Meeting

*Meeting Attendees: Janet Cool, Steve Tribbie, Jim Gears, Greg Dormer, Ken Pe nix, Cora Hamman, Dave Volak, Kelly Manns, Randy Strunk, Karen Blumhorst, Debbie Kuhn*  
*Absent: Mary Ann Thompson, Doug Mitchell, Dan Orosco*

### CONSUMER SURVEYS

- ❖ Greg will provide further guidance about how we will proceed with the consumer and counselor surveys as there has been a large amount of feedback about the consumer surveys. Many of the concerns stem from process related questions that have yet to be determined, so these will be addressed as this milestone (which is one of 8 deliverables on the scorecard project) moves forward. IT → consumer surveys should try to “prepopulate” some information before the survey is sent (provider name and address, dates of service, etc.).

Next, the workgroup reviewed some of the items that had been previously suggested at the 4/7/14 meeting along with the following potential items that may be considered on the CRP Scorecard related to these topics:

### ❖ DEMOGRAPHICS

Gender, age, transition/not transition

- ❖ Criminal history is something a key aspect that affects vendor performance, especially placement svcs.

- Yes/no on personal information; detail on offense page in AWARE. Consider showing on score card as % misdemeanor, % felony convictions?

- ❖ Educational history

- ❖ Geographic info – urban or rural

- Use definitions that align with the CSNA and
- Use county of residence

- ❖ Work history?

- ❖ Ethnicity/race

### JOB TYPE – OCCUPATIONAL CODES

Outcome info: Coded on IPE

- VRC should review and update at closure (If different outcome different from IPE goal an amendment is needed)



## CRP Quality Scorecard Workgroup Meeting

- ❖ Benefits
  - These items are Input by VR staff based on vendor's report
  - Clear guidance to VRC r/t benefits @ closure REQUIRED (Gaithri?) Establish how to validate this. Ensure "benefits offered" is checked on AWARE employment screen.
  
- ❖ Hrs/week may be influenced by consumer preference, not vendor performance (benefits).
  - Separate referrals for part-time employment from referral for full-time employment?
  - Separate hours worked by SSI/SSDI vs. non (Ex: 33.6 hrs. per week for non-SSI/SSDI; 18.7 hrs. per week for SSI/SSDI).
  - # of cons. Served: separate those w/SSI and SSDI verified.
  - Need for hrs/wk if mtg. standard?
  - Separate consumers who "place themselves" from wages /hrs/benefits.
  
- ❖ Need VR to better define calculation of wage per hour (\$ for each hour, or earnings/40 hrs. per week?)
  
- ❖ Placement plan (vendor)
  - in line w/hrs and wages.
  
- ❖ Develop different levels of "viewability" for:
  - Consumers
  - VRC
  - CRPs and OOD
  
- ❖ QUALITY MEASURES (NON-PLACEMENT SERVICES)
  - VRC and consumer survey feedback (Dave's email from 4/8/14).
  - CARF requires these areas which Greg suggested might best be captured during on-site monitoring visits:
    - Timeliness
    - Access
    - Efficiency
    - Effectiveness
    - Satisfaction
  - Consider the top 3-5 services to evaluate non-pl. services.
  - Look at other states' data, but understand OH purchases more.

### GENERAL NOTES

## **CRP Quality Scorecard Workgroup Meeting**

- The workgroup indicated that the scorecard needs a way of compensating for OOD errors that may appear in the data. Without specific instances it is difficult to determine how to compensate for this. The scorecard will rely on information in AWARE. If AWARE data is inaccurate, efforts should first be made to correct the data before the scorecard queries are run. If an OOD error is so egregious that it causes scorecard data to grossly misrepresent a vendor's performance, OOD will need to consider how to modify the output to accurately represent a vendor's performance. Such validation of data will take place after OOD begins working on pulling specific data element queries from AWARE.
- Some members of the workgroup indicated that if vendors are to be evaluated with a scorecard, OOD staff providing direct services (e.g., Job Developers) should also be given a scorecard for comparison purposes.

### **NEXT STEPS** (for 5/20 mtg)

- Review SOC recommendations
- Review preliminary data pulled for demographics/SOCs
- Decisions about capturing impairment codes
- Follow up on decisions about Quality Measures
- Definitions and information to define how to decipher the scorecard
- Determine if OOD will have a scorecard for the internal Job Developers