

CRP Quality Scorecard

Notes

May 20, 2014
(9:30am – 1pm)

Present: Steve Tribbie, Jim Gears, Janet Cool, Ken Penix, Cora Hammond, Dave Volak, Randy Strunk, Dan Orosco, Kelly Manns, Karen Blumhorst, Doug Mitchell Absent: Greg Dormer, Debi Kuhn, Mary Ann Thompson

- Follow up from April 28
none
- Recap from NE CRP Director's meeting w/ Dave V. (5/7)
Dave shared that the climate at the NE meeting held on 5/7 was not positive and the group provided lengthy feedback which was reviewed amongst the work group. Only a few of the items correlated directly with the scorecard milestone which has been taken into consideration in our planning efforts. A majority of feedback again was focused on concerns about consumer surveys which is a separate milestone and will be taken into consideration as Greg Dormer and Jim Gears continue their work. Additionally the feedback contained questions about OOD's in house Job Development that is a separate initiative than the scorecard also. One scorecard-related question was asked about the legality of publishing a scorecard. The feedback provided during discussion was that the scorecard does not involve CPI, so there is no personal privacy issue. The content of the scorecard will reflect activity funded by public dollars, and records pertaining to such activity are public records insofar as they do not include CPI.

Dave suggested when we are ready to complete the User Acceptance Testing of the new provider database that we consider having our workgroup members split up in their regions and cover the testing with a group of providers. This phase should be in August.

Ken shared feedback from the Ohio Council that the workgroup reviewed and discussed. Many of the questions related to disability categories/specialties that the work group is addressing through the impairment categories/cause codes (see below). Other questions requested inclusion of information that is not captured in AWARE and are more reflective of the specialty case work CRPs provide. Items related to OOD staffing levels and whether or not the vendor also is a contractor with OOD were questioned, this is detail that is not intended for the scorecard. There were questions about timeliness but because there is not a reliable way to pull this data from AWARE, timeliness of service will have to be built into a subsequent phase of the scorecard. Another question was related to the amount of units being authorized for specific services and how this would relate to a faster placement. Such information is not readily available at this juncture and would need to be built into a separate service-specific level of the scorecard at a later date. Vendors would like to be ensured that

they can review accuracy of data and the ability to sort scorecard regionally, which have been established by the workgroup early on as something we will accommodate. Lastly, Ohio Council suggested that “members would like OOD to have a scorecard.” Janet and Steve shared that, through this process there have been some excellent suggestions by the workgroup that would help enhance the quality of services from an internal perspective. These will be summarized as part of the “Lessons Learned” process for this milestone.

- Review data pulls for:

- ❖ SOC/Industry coding

- Steve shared the data that was pulled from AWARE for these categories. There was discussion about whether or not all categories should be listed. This was not determined and will be discussed as the scorecard is developed.*

- ❖ Impairment/cause codes

- In preparation for the meeting on 5/29, the work group is to review the proposed breakdowns that Debi, Cora and Jim prepared that crosswalks the impairment codes to cause codes to proposed categories for reporting. Jim asked that everyone review the handout to ensure the categories are linked appropriately.*

- ❖ Quality Measures (wage, hour, benefits)

- Steve and Janet shared the spreadsheet with the group that has been pulled from AWARE data on the above 3 items. There was discussion about the need to update AWARE so it reflects “benefits available” as a required field. Jim emailed Gaithri to request feedback about this consideration.*

- (Break around 11:15)

- Steve and Janet shared a preliminary draft of what the scorecard might include based on the items the work group has discussed. There was great feedback and input about a couple items that would currently not provide what we thought, so these items will be removed during this phase of the scorecard.*

There was positive feedback from the workgroup about the first draft and that this process is not a simple process until data can be better captured in AWARE for some of the items related to timeliness of service delivery. It was suggested that the “Transition and Non-Transition” info on the scorecard also indicate the age range to improve the user’s understanding. This will also be further defined through the “Use of the Scorecard” document that will include more extensive definitions. Another idea was to provide a hyperlink to the user directions document and to each provider’s website from the scorecard which will be suggested.

- Next Steps (Quality measures for non-placement services)

For next week's meeting, the work group is going to break into two subgroups to develop the definitions of how to utilize the scorecard and descriptions of the data elements on the scorecard. Steve will work with this subgroup that will include Karen, Doug, Ken and potentially Debi or Dave. Janet will work with the process subgroup that will work on developing criteria for how often the scorecard will be updated, the CRP vetting process, where the scorecard will be housed, who will have access and to what level of access, what period of time will the scorecard data be reflective of. This group will consist of Dan, Kelly, Randy, Cora and either Debi or Dave.

Janet scheduled a meeting on 5/28 with the Director and Assistant Director to review the proposed draft of the scorecard and to discuss future phases that would be recommended as a result of the work this group has undertaken. There have been several items that should be considered for future renditions of the scorecard, but due to limitations in reliable data collection methods, some of these were not possible for the development phase of this project.

Following the above meeting, Steve and Janet will develop a communication plan to share the draft document statewide for the workgroup members to obtain feedback from their areas.

Give JN the EXCEL data sheets so he can begin drafting the graphics of the scorecard.

- Next Meeting – May 29 (9:30 am – 1:00 pm)