

CENTRAL INDIANA FIRST STEPS

Provider Issues Comm. Meeting

10/2/15 Date

Name	Agency	Changes to current contact info
1. Paul Blain	PediPlay	
2. Natalie Newlin	PediPlay	
3. Katanna Quares	LPCC	
4. Debbi Davis	SPOE	
5. Jeri Williams	collab for kids	
6. Patte Sebanc	Sycamore Services	
7. Stacy Hobbs	LPCC	
8. Carlie Tamminga	SIIISC CDHHE Network	
9. Karl Chowdy	ACT	
10. Felicitas	SPOE led Im	
11. Molly Cleck	KOF	
12. Michele Aleman	CDHHE	
13. Mary Ruth	Autism Soc of IN	
14. Deborah	Accord	
15. Mary Ann	#501	

CENTRAL INDIANA FIRST STEPS

Provider Issues Comm. Meeting

10/2/15 Date

Name	Agency	Changes to current contact info
1. <i>Therese Andrews</i>	<i>ESC</i>	
2. <i>Natalie Carr</i>	<i>Feeding Friends</i>	
3. <i>Ashley Berry</i>	<i>GTC</i>	
4. <i>Sabrina McDonald</i>	<i>Sycamore</i>	
5. <i>Donna Turner</i>	<i>TILC</i>	
6. <i>Pamela Humes</i>	<i>CKF</i>	
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		
11.		
12.		
13.		
14.		
15.		

**Cluster G Provider Issues Committee Meeting Agenda
October 2, 2015**

Outcome Statement: Families are presented with adequate information to make an informed choice regarding the selection of provider Agencies and location of services.

Performance Standards:

1. Families in all areas of the cluster will have available providers for needed services.

Performance Measures: Profile reports and First Steps data system reports will be utilized in the measurement of this performance standard.

- 1) Introductions (if needed)
- 2) Approval of minutes
- 3) Action Item Updates
- 4) SPOE Updates
- 5) Ancillary Providers
- 6) Burmese Interpreters
- 7) Announcement/Close

**CENTRAL INDIANA FIRST STEPS
LOCAL PLANNING & COORDINATING COUNCIL
Provider Issues Committee Meeting Minutes
October 2, 2015**

Present: Debbi Davis-SPOE, Terri Williams-Collab.For Kids, Donna Turner-TTLC, Pam Humes-CKF, Michelle Coleman-CDHHE, David Chowdry-ACT, Mary Roth-Autism Society of IN, Satrina McDonald-Sycamore, Carrie Tamminga-SJIISC/SRNDHH, Jason Berty-Children’s Therapy Connection, Patti Sebanc-Sycamore Services, Deb Miller-Accord Therapy, Barb Blain-Pedisplay, Cleek-KOI, Natalie Case-Feeding Friends, Natalie Newlin-PediPlay, Holly Andria-Crossroads, Teri Williams-Collab for Kids, Nancy Moore-KOI, Stacy Holmes-Council, Polly Hines-SPOE, Katarina Groves-Council

Agenda Items	Discussion	Action Items
Welcome & Introductions	Katarina called the meeting to order and introductions were made.	
Approval of Minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group reviewed minutes from the previous meeting. Patti made a motion to approve the minutes as written. Holly seconded. The motion carried, and the minutes were approved. 	
Action Item Updates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debbi pointed out that the SPOE/SC/AT and Agency Responsibilities Document was emailed out in advance of the meeting and will be discussed later in the meeting. • Katarina said that the Little 7 meeting would be discussed later in the meeting. • Debbi will discuss interpreter concerns during SPOE updates. 	
SPOE Updates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debbi directed everyone’s attention to the provided data. Referrals are up in all counties except Hamilton which has experienced a 1% decrease. Debbi also noted IFSP’s are up significantly, however she has been unable to isolate initial IFSP data in the new ISPOE system due to that system’s limitations. Child count data is also increasing. Debbi also included data covering Cost per Child for the group to review. The cluster has also experienced an increase in the Average Cost per Child. Debbi reminded everyone of the need to consider things that might be impacting this data and to be vigilant regarding service recommendations. She then directed everyone’s attention to the State Profile Reports and compared Cluster G’s data to state data as a whole, in particular the Average Cost Per Child data. She 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debbi will make final changes to the draft document.

noted this is not the most accurate comparison as some clusters are artificially low due to a lack of available providers and services. Since June of 2014, Cluster G has seen a 14% increase in Average Cost per Child which mostly stemmed from increases the last two quarters. Debbi said that the Average Cost per Child data includes evaluations. There are restrictions that do not allow DTs to conduct evaluations on infants which could impact this data. The Cluster's DT utilization is down 20% and OT utilization is up 24%. Debbi said that the state is aware of this issue as it is a concern among all clusters. Debbi also said that the SPOE will start tracking initial IFSP recommendations again. This will have to be done manually. This information will help determine whether there are changes occurring in recommendations that are impacting this data. She asked the group to consider what actions can be taken from an agency standpoint to monitor this issue. Nancy felt that we need to continue to have an open exchange among SC, ATs, and agencies to be creative in addressing the needs of each child. She also expressed concern over a decrease in DT referrals and wondered if DTs have been devalued over time in the FS System. Several in the group felt like there has been an increase in identifying children with sensory issues. Jason felt that OTs from their agencies are over utilized while DTs are underutilized and felt this might be related to the fact that OTs are often conducting the assessment and might not recommend DT services as often. Carrie felt that agencies should continue to have conversations with their providers about facilitating dialogue with families (e.g. a conversation that adding more services is not necessarily better). Barb felt that more frequent use of therapy consultations might also help from an agency standpoint. Debbi said that SPOE managers continue to urge SCs and AT members to have thoughtful conversations with agencies to creatively address the needs of the child. Carrie also advocated

for the idea that the first quarter of services be a time to continue to assess the needs of the child, starting with minimal services until a therapist(s) can truly come to understand the needs of the child. Jason felt cautious about this idea for fear that we might skew too far by making very scaled back recommendations that did not fully address what the child might need. Carrie felt that the AT has done a good job communicating with agencies, asking questions about recommendations, and taking agency input seriously. Jason questioned whether the Average Cost per Child data has seen significant changes when broken out by agency. Debbi noted that this data for evaluations has stayed fairly consistent, but that there are some individual agencies whose costs have seen an increase. However, this varies from agency to agency and from quarter to quarter. There has been a general upward trend in the Average Cost per Child for most agencies, but there is not a particular agency that would be the driving force behind the cluster's increase in Average Cost per Child.

- Debbi also reviewed child outcomes data. Cluster G had one area of concern, which is the "percentage of kids who substantially increased their functioning with use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs" which is considered the adaptive outcome. Cluster G was slightly below the target for the April-June 2015 quarter. The percentages for this outcome have historically varied widely. Debbi pointed this out in the QIP. Per one of the strategies noted in the QIP, Debbi asked agencies/providers to review the training webinar on the IIDC website covering the scoring process for child outcomes. Polly has reviewed a sample of exit scores and has observed some seeming confusion regarding scoring. SPOE/AT staff will also do a better job of communicating with agencies regarding any issues with scoring in a more direct fashion. AT providers will also review the training webinar as a refresher. The domains that are used for analysis are the social domain, the

cognitive domain (not communication), and the adaptive domain. The group questioned why data is gathered on all domains when only three are used. Debbi will try to get clarification about why the state collects data on all domains.

The group expressed concerns about collecting data on children that are in the program less than six months. Many felt that this information might skew data. Debbi was unsure of the exact process, but stated her understanding is that these scores are not actually included in the data.

- Debbi directed everyone's attention to the document that outlines SPOE/SC/AT and agency responsibilities from referral through record closure. Debbi highlighted that when no agency can provide the requested service, the SPOE is required to put the name of the agency that was selected first on the IFSP (no provider names). This would be in lieu of writing a service coordination only plan. If after 30 days the agency is unable to find a provider(s), then a concern will be submitted to the LPCC. Nancy asked when an agency is listed on an IFSP in this way, what would be listed in terms of frequency. Debbi said that the frequency would be based on what the assessment team recommends as appropriate and what is decided at the IFSP. Debbi felt that this issue will not come up often in Cluster G. Discussion ensued about agencies sharing providers and how this is currently being done around the state. Debbi noted that agencies must work out their own processes regarding how they will share providers. She will talk to other clusters about how they are handling the authorizations and what seems to be easiest. Debbi told the group that if they have proposals to share providers, they must let her know. She will then let the SC know how to move forward. Directing attention back to the document, Jason asked about the section that says the SC will let the first choice agency know when no agency has availability. He wanted to know by when the first choice agency

	<p>would be made aware of this. Debbi will note that this will happen prior to the IFSP. She will also add that agencies will be contacted via Teamwork when the referral is opened up to all agencies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A discussion ensued about families wanting to change providers and how agencies can be made aware of these issues. Mary thought that it might be a good idea to develop something in writing to explain to parents that they cannot simply choose the provider they want if the agency has offered a suitable provider. Many agencies have had experiences with families no longer wanting a particular provider without any explanation being provided. Some felt that this information should be noted in Teamwork. Barb felt that parents can be encouraged to advocate for themselves by being urged to be up-front about their concerns with a particular provider. • Polly is putting together some small focus groups to address issues around things like communication, initial service recommendations, decreasing services, and discharging a child from services. Agencies were urged to let Polly know if they have providers they think would be interested in participating. For the first meeting, the SPOE will select a handful of providers to invite that have offered particularly good feedback in the past. 	
<p>Little 7 Meeting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Little 7 Ancillary Provider meeting was briefly discussed. Katarina noted that there are only a handful of ancillary providers. Patti, Nancy and Jason have agreed to assist with getting information to these providers. Stacy asked the group what are the specific issues to be discussed with these providers. Jason said that these providers, while small in number, have not received the same support that other providers have and may not be as aware of standard procedures. Debbi asked for clarification on whether the group wants to address all ancillary providers or only the few independent ones. Patti wondered how many referrals were received by these providers. Debbi said that the independent 	

	<p>providers generally had an average of about 20 children. Nancy believes that some good things that could come out of a meeting like this would be the development of a protocol that could be used with all Little 7 providers and to determine what type of training is needed. Barb suggested that a DVD could be developed that each new Little 7 provider could view. It was also discussed that perhaps Little 7 providers employed by agencies could also attend. Debbi felt like the information that agency providers would need would be different from what independent providers would need. Jason felt that it would be good to bring both together so that they could glean information from one another. Stacy wondered how difficult it will be to get them to attend. Patti suggested including something to make it worth their time to come. Patti, Jason and Nancy will work with Katarina, Stacy, and Debbi to develop a meeting for these providers.</p>	
<p>Interpreters</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debbi has spoken to the company that provides Burmese interpreter services for the SPOE about extending the same rate to all cluster agencies. The SPOE currently has an arrangement with the agency for \$50 for one hour with a one hour minimum. The agency does seem agreeable to making this arrangement. 	
<p>Announcements/Close</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • .Patti will be changing her role within Sycamore to Director of Special Projects. Satrina will be taking on Patti's former role with FS. • Children's Therapy Connection is moving within the same complex to double the size of their space. 	<p>Next Meeting:</p> <p>January 8, 2016 at 9:30am at the ProKids Office.</p>

Respectfully submitted,
Stacy Holmes