

Rocky Mountain Health Plans (RMHP) Case Management Agency (CMA) Family Support Council (FSC)

Zoom Link: Join Zoom Meeting
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82268113151>
 Meeting ID: 822 6811 3151

Executive Summary: The council reviewed upcoming schedule changes, with meetings set to occur every 2 months on the first Wednesday of the month in the afternoon. Discussions then focused on the review of FSSP regulations, with particular interest given to Regulation 4, which covers the Council’s responsibilities to provide recommendations and support for the CMA’s service delivery and emergency processes. There was a brief discussion of the new Conflict of Interest policy before RMHP staff presented the findings from the recent satisfaction survey.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Name	Lived Experience	Agency & Affiliation	Attendance (in person/virtual/absent)
Julie Reiskin	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CCDC, Co-Executive Directory	Virtual
Rob Harris	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Community Advocate	Virtual
Alison Sbrana	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CCDC, Moderator	Virtual
Amanda Allen	<input type="checkbox"/>	HCPF	Virtual
Christina	<input type="checkbox"/>	San Luis Valley Care & Connection	Virtual
Jennifer Pieroni	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Harmony House	Virtual
Billie Bemis	<input type="checkbox"/>	RMHP	Virtual
Jerrica Thurston	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mesa County	Virtual
Alexia	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Summit County	Virtual

Do Not Include any Protected Health Information (PHI)

Name	Lived Experience	Agency & Affiliation	Attendance (in person/virtual/absent)
Sheila Worth	<input type="checkbox"/>	RMHP	Virtual
Heather Murphy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Case Management Agency	Virtual
Danielle Angotti	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ARC of West/Central CO	Virtual
Elaine Wood	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ARC of West/Central CO	Virtual
Dyann Walt	<input type="checkbox"/>	RMHP	Virtual
Erica Anderson	<input type="checkbox"/>	RMHP	Virtual
Maria Klickna	<input type="checkbox"/>	RMHP	Virtual
Aubree McKinney	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Family Voices CO, Family Navigator	Virtual
Kelly George	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Parents & Caregivers Connection Group	Virtual
Jamie Nelson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Community Member	Virtual
Sarah Dowling	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CCDC, Notetaker	Virtual

1. Welcome and Overview of Agenda 10:00 a.m.

- Welcome and icebreaker activity led by Julie: Name & favorite summer activity
- Scheduling update from Alison: Proposal to meet every other month (beginning 6 months from now). First Wednesday of the month in the afternoon (1-3 pm)
 - Discussion about time constraints leads to selection of 1-2:30 pm as the time.
 - Deliverable: Alison/Julie follow up with the month rotation once solidified.
- Agenda
 - FSSP Regulations Review (10:20-10:47 am)
 - Conflict of Interest Policy Review (10:48-11:00 am)

Do Not Include any Protected Health Information (PHI)

- Review of Survey Results (RMHP) & open discussion (11:00-11:50 am)
- Conclusion (11:50 am-12:00 PM)

2. Review of Policies and Procedures (Alison) 10:20 a.m.

- **Overview of FSSP Regulations**

- Majority of members & chairperson should be family members of individual with developmental/intellectual disability/delay (current majority).
- Minimum size of council = 5 people (currently >5).
- Criteria in regulations for term lengths & member selection process.

- **FSSP Regulation for review**

FSC must provide guidance to CMA on:

- Implementation of FSSP
- Development of written annual report for service care
 - Will be a future meeting for council members to review & sign off on the annual report.
- Development of written procedure describing prioritization of funding & handling of disputes.
 - Point from Elaine (seconded by Jamie): HCPF has ultimate say on these decisions.
- Emergency fund policy - must include definition of emergency & max amount of funds for families per event or year.
 - Discussed last meeting - continuing to use RMHP's existing definition but council will utilize "trickle-down" method for decision-making. Amount of funds has changed - families can get full amount at one time.
 - Question from Jamie: If there are different definitions of what an emergency entails, will the request escalate for review? A: Yes
 - Concern from Jerrica about efficiency & speed of process. A: This was discussed at a previous meeting, decided that the Council's involvement is important even with the time frame extension.
 - Question from Jerrica (seconded by Jamie): Is there a policy that establishes a specific amount of time for review? A: 1 day for Council to respond, then to co-chairs for 1 day, then to RMHP for 1 day (3 days total). Could be faster depending on responsiveness. Will revisit in a few months after trialing.
 - Question from Jamie: How many people need to vote before the issue is escalated to co-chairs? A: TBD but expectation is not 100% response from councilmembers.
 - Question from Jerrica: Can we have follow-up from RMHP on decisions made? A: Yes
 - Standing agenda item for next meeting: follow up on this discussion.
 - Comment from Amanda: Ensure there is a strong definition & procedure for emergency situations to avoid disagreements on emergency handling processes.

Do Not Include any Protected Health Information (PHI)

- Provide recommendations on defining “other” service category - tabled for future meeting.
- Monitor implementation of overall services in the area.
- Provide recommendations on how to assist families transitioning out of program - tabled for future meeting.
 - Comment from Jerrica: Measure the demographics of who is being served so council knows areas of need that FSSP is supporting.
 - Action item for Alison: Provide more info to Council about families served, following all HIPAA & privacy regulations.
 - Amanda says people can reach out to her directly for info as well.
 - Question for future consideration from Elaine: What can we do to educate families on other resources as they’re transitioning out?

Discussion of New Policies and Procedures:

- **Conflict of Interest Policy Overview**

This is a new policy that all council members will be asked to sign for FY26. Receiving waiver services or having a family member who does is not a conflict of interest.

- **Policy Review**

- Conflict of interest definition: Committee member/family member might personally benefit from a decision involving RMHP.
- Purpose of policy: To ensure integrity in decision-making and make decisions that benefit the whole group, and to ensure that members get services without conflicts of interest.
- Regulations:
 - Council members will not be involved with decisions directly involving their case (i.e., If a member submits emergency request, they cannot vote on the approval of that request.)
 - Question from Jerrica: Clarification on lived experience vs. conflict of interest. Answer from Julie: People can draw on lived experience; however current situations, like a pending denial, would be a conflict.
 - Suggestion from Jerrica: Establish internal criteria to evaluate issues before bringing them to the Council. For example, is the issue specific to my family/will it benefit other families?
 - Members cannot use their Council title for work outside Council.
 - RMHP staff are responsible for receiving emergency requests & determining appropriate Council members to review the requests.
 - Question from Amanda: RMHP cannot share PHI; if one council member is deliberately excluded, this can make it obvious who the request is for. Answer from Julie: That is handled by sending information using blind copy (BCC) and the name will be excluded.
- The policy will be sent out & each Council member must sign the acknowledgement by July 1st. If someone is on this Council and the CAC, they must sign separately for each group.

Do Not Include any Protected Health Information (PHI)

P&P	Discussion Notes	Proposed Changes or Follow-up
P&P 1: Conflict of Interest Policy	Discussion & clarification around “conflict of interest” definition.	No changes
	Concern about potentially exposing a council member’s request by intentionally excluding that person from discussions due to conflict of interest.	Requests will be processed using BCC with all identifying information excluded.
		Follow-up: Policy acknowledgement to be signed by July 1 st .

Policies to be Reviewed During Next Meeting:

- FSSP 4: Provide recommendations on defining “other” service category.
- FSSP 4: Provide recommendations on how to assist families transitioning out of program.

3. Review of Complaints (Dyann Walt) 11:00 a.m.

Review of Survey Highlights

Demographics of DSAs (Billie) <https://hcpf.colorado.gov/my-hcbs-case-management#Map>

- DSA 14: Alamosa, Conejos, Costilla, Mineral, Rio Grande, Saguache
- DSA 16: Grand, Jackson, Moffat, Rio Blanco, Routt
- DSA 17: Mesa
- DSA 18: Delta, Gunnison, and Hinsdale

Statistics from survey

- 22 total response, 8.9% response rate, mostly from DSA 17
- 100% of respondents were comfortable talking about issues with their case manager
- 77% of responses from guardians and 22% from family members
- Majority said that CMs respond within 1-2 business days & get back to people in a timely manner if they had to find answer to question
- 81% said CM fit family’s needs & concerns
- Overall, people are grateful for the program. Some comments about lack of sufficient funding and preference for previous administrator rather than RMHP, or previous policies.

Funding Section of Survey

- 77% said FSSP funding was easy to access this year
- 50% said they got funding in timely manner; 18% were neutral, 18% disagreed
- Majority agreed that the paperwork was doable, helped families receive services & manage the care of family members, improved quality of life
- 81% happy with services received

Do Not Include any Protected Health Information (PHI)

- 55% agreed that FSSP helped people stay home instead of placement out of home
 - Question from Alison: Why is this number so low?
 - Suggestion from Jerrica: Question phrasing could be more clear. Is the goal to keep family member in the home? If so, it's not enough funding to do that. Seconded by Julie & Elaine.
 - Kelly: Limitations around FSSP restrict families from solutions to keep family member home, especially in rural communities, because funds cannot be used to create a separate space for family members outside of the family home.
 - Rob: FSSP can be the only extra benefit people are getting; it may not be ideal, but going from nothing to something is helpful. This survey can be an opportunity to fill in gaps of "service desert" areas.

Overview of Comments Collected in Survey

- Respondent didn't know they were receiving/eligible for funds.
- Funds aren't applicable or usable due to stipulations.
- Long delay in hearing back about funds.
- Disappointment in RMHP taking over funds - "monopoly money".
- Funds don't reflect the family as a whole.
- Ability to access funds - people mentioned discrepancies between funds available and ability to apply funds, or lack of awareness that they had been approved for funds.
 - Julie: Some of these answers don't totally make sense and would need conversation with respondent to clarify. CM needs to follow up to help those respondents understand.

Discussion of New Complaints:

- Suggestion: Create an easier/more person-centered survey or feedback loop
 - Elaine: use comments to create person-centered questions (seconded by Kelly).
 - Danielle: Surveys typically aren't person-centered and are just another task to complete, which could contribute to low response rate. Suggestion to make anonymous-optional, or ask families directly, so people feel heard & there can be follow-up.
 - Kelly (seconded by Jerrica): Agrees with Danielle but acknowledges that many people are more comfortable remaining anonymous.
 - Offer from Elaine to help formulate the questions.
- Discussion about survey development process
 - Jerrica suggests providing more time for people to review the survey and provide feedback. Alison says there are requirements contractually but may be room for improvement of the process.
 - Billie: Let's start this process earlier next time so we have time to dig into responses & formulate questions.
- Questions about timing of the survey or services & how recipients receive them
 - Julie: Do the surveys go to everyone at the same time? Billie: They do not go to all members, they go to a specific percentage all around the same time.
 - Jerrica: How many people replied after the deadline? A: Only 2-3
 - Jerrica: Is there a specific enrollment timeframe, or can individuals apply year-round? When will case managers reach out to members to apply for the next fiscal year? How can we ensure that families who are not currently on FSSP have the same opportunity to enroll as those who are already aware of the resource?
 - Jerrica: Suggestion to re-evaluate the reallocation of funds from family to family.

Do Not Include any Protected Health Information (PHI)

- Discussion in the chat about Medicaid not covering specific needed services/prescriptions in some cases.
- Suggestion: Link survey and available resources directly on website
 - Jerrica: Mentioned during the last meeting that having the survey linked on the website would be helpful.
 - Julie suggests listing the resources linked on the Resources slide on the website so families can easily access more resources.

Summary of discussion of complaint trends

Description of Trend	Action CMA Considering Based on Trend	Input from CAC Members	CMA Follow-up Actions
Survey questions too generic/not person-centered	Looking into other survey feedback mechanisms Discussing beginning the survey development earlier	Offer other opportunities for feedback besides survey Have CMs follow up to clarify feedback Begin the survey development process earlier so council members can review & give feedback	Looking into other survey feedback mechanisms Discussing beginning the survey development earlier
Lack of awareness of funds /available resources		Provide survey & resource links on website for easy access	

4. Wrap Up/Next Steps

11:51 a.m.

- Next Meeting Date and Time: September 10th
- Action items:
 - Council members review and sign Conflict of Interest forms by July 1st
 - Julie/Alison: Confirm & update council on future schedule rotation
 - Council members: watch email for requests & updates in place of next meeting