

Planning for Change in Long Term Care

1202 Northport Drive, Madison Wisconsin 53704 608-242-6200, FAX 242-6531

PLANNING FOR CHANGE IN LONG TERM CARE Steering Committee Meeting July 27, 2006

Present: Jean Kuehn, Kathleen Luedtke, Ken Hobbs, Barb Thoni, GP Foster, Theresa Sanders, Fran Genter, Alexa Butzbaugh, David Sievert, Todd Costello, Craig DuPonte, Karen Musser, Jennifer Thompson, Ginny Graves

Kuehn called the meeting to order at 8:46 a.m.

Minutes of July 13, 2006: Minutes were approved for posting on the web site.

Data Analysis: Graves updated the committee on her meeting with staff at the State of Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS). The Department is providing the first cut of data analysis for the various planning consortia and is forming a steering committee to review data. The target date for getting the data to planning grant administrators is September 8th. The initial data set will be by consortium/region and in the same format as the first data disk

Local data needs: Kuehn suggested members review the last page of the local impact data report and e-mail her with any suggestions for additional data needs. Are we asking the right questions? It was requested that the subcommittees review it and bring back suggestions to the full committee. The County may want to consider setting a similar timeline for the local data analysis.

Explore Regional CMO Model: Kuehn distributed a draft Regional CMO Model and DHFS & County Co-Purchasing Model. Luedtke expressed reservations about the County Co-Purchasing model, as it appears to have the State being a provider, letting contracts, but also bearing risk. The State's interest in developing a "three-way" contract is questionable. Since the Co-Purchase model was not on today's agenda further discussion of that model was set aside. Graves reviewed the Regional CMO model noting that this is a skeletal model that needs to be fleshed out. The dotted lines reflected on the model identify areas where the relationship has to be defined like the relationship between Dane and Rock Counties. In this model each county would have an ADRC. The regional CMO would contract services, receive capitation payments and share the risk. A number of questions were raised concerning the roles the counties may choose to take within the region. Do both counties have to agree on a role as service provider? Luedtke suggested that consortia capitalize on current practices and their strengths. The primary focus is are program requirements being met. One county could choose to be a provider of services and the other county could make a different decision. DHFS is looking at a regional concept and would probably not be agreeable to the counties within a region receiving capitation individually or bearing risk separately. An actuarially sound capitation rate should mean counties would not have to go back to their County Boards and ask them to subsidize the program. If actual costs are higher, rates should be adjusted retrospectively by the State. Disproportionate benevolence of counties is a significant factor at this time and in Dane County local share is largely in developmental disabilities programs. Although our planning grant is targeted to persons with physical disabilities and elderly persons Luedtke reported that developmental disabilities LTC programs would be expected move to a managed care model 12 months after implementation of the first two target populations.

Graves suggested that discussion focus on the potential relationships between the regional CMO and its partners. What benefits will be available to consumers in target groups in each county? Is the intent to have the potential of offering a more integrated care model to all or some of the targeted populations? The Regional CMO is a family care model. Luedtke clarified that the Department wants to focus its resources on exploring integrated care options if counties are interested in that option. Currently the reserving requirements of acute and primary care are different from long-term care. Genter expressed concern about counties having the ability to get licensed as an insurance company in order to manage an integrated model in such a short timeframe.

A Joint Project of Community Living Alliance, Inc., Dane County Department of Human Services, Elder Care of Wisconsin, Inc. and Rock County Human Services

In looking at the responsibilities of the CMO discussion focused on what services the counties might be interested in retaining, developing capacity for, or contracting with our planning partners. Genter discussed Dane County's current practices in long-term care services for elderly persons and persons with physical disabilities. Dane County provides some care management services, but the majority is contracted out. It's not likely that Dane County would wish to add employees to expand their role in this area. In a Regional CMO model, we may wish to retain some of the management functions or contract them out. That analysis still needs to be done. Current capacity would not enable us to take on all of the administrative detail of a managed care model and we would certainly look to the strengths of our partners in this regard as well. Detailed analysis on the various administrative functions, IT ability, claims processing, etc. needs to be completed in the course of this planning process. Additionally, we need to evaluate where provider network responsibilities would be placed since Dane County currently holds contracts or purchases most long-term care services. The Resource Center appears to be a county function though staffing (county or non-county employees) has not been determined. If we start out with Family Care, we would hope to grow the Partnership programs and expand into Rock County.

DHFS will be releasing an RFP to contract with CMO's within the next couple of weeks specific to southeast and west central Wisconsin. This will be an open bidding process. Graves inquired about the timeline for planning consortia to obtain and complete the RFP and become certified. The timeline will be between 1-2 months for the RFP; it's hard to say how long the certification process will take.

It will be important to consider the timeline for the planning process. Though the planning grant runs through September 2007 the next biennium budget is being prepared and will be introduced in 2007. This covers July 2007-June 2009. Considering the State's budget timeline we should be ready to communicate our intention for application well in advance in order to be considered in the biennium budget. We will discuss timelines at our meeting on September 7th. Luedtke suggested that the group communicate to the State by early fall what the timeline might be. We could accomplish that in the quarterly report that is due in October.

Thompson described the service system in Rock County. Rock County provides case management and is beginning to incorporate county nursing staff into the care team. They employ 24 workers in Human Services for physical disabilities and elderly care management and contract with Catholic Charities for developmental disabilities. In Rock County, Developmental Disabilities Services is a separate department and not part of Human Services. Rock County currently does not have a Partnership Program or any relationship with CLA and Elder Care but is open to developing a relationship. MA personal care is not provided by Rock County. Graves asked about IT systems in Rock County. This is a separate department in Rock County and they have not discussed whether this function would stay in-house or not.

Luedtke informed the committee that an RFP is coming for ADRC funding within the next month. The RFP will be due in approximately two months. ADRC's will be developed as funding becomes available.

CMO Development Subcommittee: Musser suggested a CMO Development Subcommittee be formed to focus work on the core functions of a CMO. Planning activities would include identifying, developing and demonstrating readiness of various core functions such as provider development, care management, etc. She distributed a purpose statement and explained that these core functions are applicable regardless of our choice of governance model. DD stakeholders requested that someone from the DD service system be a member of this committee, as that service system will need to understand the process and complete it at a later date as well. Members were in agreement that the subcommittee be formed. Musser will serve as subcommittee chair.

Sanders suggested that we return to a format where subcommittees report to the Steering Committee on their progress, issues, seek direction from the committee on any questions, etc. We will continue to electronically distribute minutes of subcommittee meetings to the Steering Committee members.

Agenda for August 10th meeting: This meeting has been cancelled.

Agenda for August 24th meeting: Presentation by UW Extension.

Suggestions for the meeting of September 7th was to discuss planning timeline, work plan and establish deadlines through 2006.

Meeting adjourned 11:47 a.m.