

*Max Lytle, President*  
*Developmental Connections*  
*2281 ½ S. Business Hwy. 65*  
*P.O. Box 1701*  
*Hollister, MO 65673*  
*417-335-4135; fax 417-335-5286*  
*maxlytle@centurytel.net*



*Jennifer Wooldridge, President Elect*  
*Jefferson County, [jgwooldridge@dsjc.org](mailto:jgwooldridge@dsjc.org)*  
*Debra Miller, Secretary*  
*Howard County, [dmiller@endlessoptions.org](mailto:dmiller@endlessoptions.org)*  
*Jake Jacobs, Treasurer*  
*Jackson County, [jjacobs@eitas.com](mailto:jjacobs@eitas.com)*  
*Alecia Archer, Member-at-Large*  
*Jasper County, [jcsfb@jcsfb.com](mailto:jcsfb@jcsfb.com)*  
*Cathy Arrowsmith, Past President*  
*Marion County, [carrowsmith@mcsddf.com](mailto:carrowsmith@mcsddf.com)*

*Missouri Association of County  
Developmental Disabilities Services*

**Meeting Minutes**  
**April 23, 2009**

**Introductions**

- Alecia Archer reports that the MoE web page will have a QA piece added in the next 3 months
- Lynn Wells reported that a 1.7m HUD grant has been awarded in Buchanan County

**DMH/DD Work group Updates**

- Peg Capo reported on the DMH Level of Need work, including the modifications of current tool. It does not take into account prevention and other concerns. Now has a scoring mechanism, and the group will be scoring existing customers with old and new tool and comparing the differences.
- DMH/Medicaid Waiver workgroup met last week and will meet again next Monday. Currently focused on recommendations 1 and 2, identifying a service package and identifying the differences from other waivers. Will need data for Medicaid/MOHealthNet in the future. Expect to be able to report to DMH by the end of May. Will this waiver serve adults and children? Children may not be Medicaid eligible, at 18 they are. County pledges are secured. Will there be a different screening method? Will it serve those who are waiver and non waiver eligible? Will it address the wait list? Not a state wide waiver? How will slots be allocated?
- Ron Kruse reported that TCM workgroup has been collecting all forms used by all TCM providers and they will be looking at this on May 1st. It is a pretty big stack of papers.
- DESE/VR workgroup has been looking at the first 8 recommendations in the waiver report, looking at utilizing a waiver rather than all GR funding. There is a lot of buzz in the workshop world. They meet tomorrow, April 24th
- Restraint/Seclusion work group has not met.
- The communication workgroup has met and is looking at guiding principles. The second meeting is scheduled with DMH counsel, Rikki Wright, and will be an in-service on rules and statutes. Tec Chapman will bring information back to MACDDS. This work group is moving quickly.
- Provider relations workgroup was reported on by Ann Graff. They have had 3 meetings centering around the language in the directive, and including discussions about consultative vs. prescriptive, certification and accreditation, with a preliminary thought of certification visit to be scheduled during the accreditation year. Working toward less duplication between the groups.

Also looking at training materials that will be used state wide for consistency. At the third draft now, should be completed by July 1st.

- Quality Assurance was reported on by Ron Kruse. They have had 2 meetings plus a phone conference to be held tomorrow, with a document and training soon to follow. Margi Mangini leads this group. Questions were asked about an agency or organization not meeting regulations, how is that handled? Critical status is looked at if critical incidents are noted in core areas. A plan would need to be submitted to the QA group that agency/organization works with. A plan would also need to be submitted if an agency or organization goes from a 3 year to a 1 year accreditation. Should an agency or organization funded by a SB40 should be notifying the SB40 of these issues? If DMH funding is on hold, should the SB40 funding also be? Should you be on an enhancement plan if you are getting accolades or are accredited? If the critical plan is used as a tool to introduce data to a monitoring tool, then should satisfaction and other feedback surveys be utilized as well? Can providers get information on themselves pulled from the APTs?
- Jake Jacobs reported on the Fiscal Review work group. Chip Long reviewed the steps for the audit reviews at a recent inservice. There is no opportunity for input or changes, just training on how it is. Input was being taken on the directive portion. Three handouts were distributed.
- Marcus Whitlock reported on the Consumer Relations Workgroup. Sandy Wise has asked specifically for MACDDS input in this group, Vicki McCarrell added that she has other employees and herself on this work group and that it seemed more like a TCM group.

### **DMH-DD Monthly Update**

Bernie Simons, Division Director

- Copies of the TCM agreement were distributed and are also available on the web page
- Announcements
  - Missouri should be number 1
    - System change needs to happen
    - There is a companion document to the video completed recently
    - NASDDDS recently printed an update and Missouri was in their news as a state making systems changes with redirected dollars
  - Communicate/collaborate/coordinate
    - Maintain enthusiasm
    - Maintain level of energy
    - Maintain multiple tasks
    - Positive feedback
    - Roger Garlich will begin as community liaison July 1!
- Budget at state level, no committees named yet. Governor's recommendation was neutral to the Division.
- FQHC dental discussion from yesterday was revisited; a couple of scenarios were discussed.
- Certification Fee bill as it relates to handouts, talk up the possibility of growing additional services for people. HB on the back of the handout has the FMAP rebate circled, and Jeff Grosvenor will check on the rebate timeline, July 1? Next year's budget? 8.06% is the difference and it is in effect from October 2008 through Decembers 2010. It would be good to collectively work up a handout that shows how it is going to be used, how it relates to the number of people served and to the number of people hired. This may be scrutinized by citizens on local and state basis. HJR 23 tops out the amount a taxing entity can levy, HJR36 is not TABOR but kind of sounds like it.