dshs adrc expansion plan

Partnership Meeting #3 Notes

# Participants

* + **Janet Adams**, DSHS/ADSA/DDD
  + **Emily Berndt,** 211*info*
  + **Pat Buff** (sitting in for Trina Forest), Association of Centers for Independent Living in Washington
  + **Mark Hammond,** DSHS/HCS
  + **Heather Hebdon**, PAVE
  + **Cathy Knight**, WA Assoc. of AAA
  + **Kara Panek**, DSHS/ADSA/DBHR
  + **Linda Porter,** DSHS
  + **Bob Riler**, Pierce Co. ADRC

# Introduction

* Morgan recapped the previous meeting and went through agenda: to discuss illustrative MOUs and get feedback, discuss potential prioritization, and look at next steps.
* Morgan provided an overview and discussed the structure of the MOU document. He guided the discussion towards whether the right organizations are listed, and the “purpose” and “scope of agreement” sections.

# MOU DOCUMENT

## Partnerships within DHSS/ADSA

* JANET: Division of Developmental Disabilities has regional offices; will it be broken down by each division?
  + SUSAN: At the local level, that’s where we’ll look at local services, but at the State level we’ll take out the detail but just leave the four divisions. People will understand there are details for each division, but those details will not be spelled out in the state level document.
* BOB: As long as it filters down to the local office. We need to find a way to get the information to the local agencies (better communication channels)

## Partnerships Within DSHS (Not ADSA)

* Susan: Within DSHS, there are challenges since different people lead different divisions. Because of the amount of regulation in place, the best potential step is to have a letter of agreement process, but first communicate and talk about how we could work more closely. Discussions need to take place first.
* SUSAN: Are there any other DSHS divisions we’re missing?
  + JANET: Division of Vocational Rehabilitation and Division of Juvenile Rehabilitation

## Partnerships with other State Agencies

* MORGAN: should transportation services be here? What about WSDOT?
  + SUSAN: There are so many local transportation services
  + JANET: Wouldn’t WSDOT be more appropriate as a local agreement?
  + JANET: They used to have an Advisory Committee on coordinated transportation, that would be the place to go
* BOB: What about the Department of Commerce? There are several programs in the department of Commerce that might be ones we want to look at.
  + SUSAN: Yes, there are also community actions centers
* Additional departments mentioned:
  + The Department of Blind, Deaf, and Hard of Hearing (In DSHS?)
  + The Dept. of Early Learning
  + The Department of Health – several programs worth looking into

### *Purpose*

* Morgan reviewed the “purpose” section of the MOU document
* SUSAN: When we’re talking about State agencies, we need to incorporate the local regional office that we need to promote at the local level
* SUSAN: I’m a little concerned that there is too much detail. We may prefer a general format.
  + JANET: Agree, this is too specific, because some of these things we are not able to do. One general purpose statement may work better.
  + SUSAN: Yes, it’s advisable to have one general purpose statement

### *Scope of Agreement*

* Morgan reviewed the “Scope of Agreement” section of the MOU document
* SUSAN: Any time you’re making referrals HIPAA becomes important and we may change language regarding privacy to say “relevant state/federal requirement”
* JANET: What does disseminate information to local providers mean?
  + MORGAN: The key piece here is to make sure partners keep each other “in the loop” regarding what they need to know
  + JANET: You should change the language to describe “sharing information around what each other are doing so they can benefit”. That would be more clear that how it is currently stated.
* SUSAN: For #3, change “coordinate” to “share”?
* EMILY: I think specifically for each agency, you have to tailor it for what the agency provides. We have witnessed some turf wars within the State to making referrals to ADRCs over assisted living centers. Some ADRCs want us to make the first referral to the ADRC and then the ADRC will provide the other referrals
  + SUSAN: This is because the ADRC may know about more options
  + EMILY: The rural areas do not coordinate as much with the ADRC as we thought they would. But our agreement is if anybody calls we refer them to the ADRC.
  + MORGAN: The point is well taken that it’s case-by-case
* EMILY: To have many different MOUs around the State (different sets) it can make it confusing for the staff. It can be confusing and monotonous, so having a similar template for all MOUs across the State makes it much easier
* JANET: For something to be taken seriously, the fewer bullets you have, the better the agreement. Figure out the 3 or 4 things the ADRC wants to see happen with each agency, it seems it would be easier to build partnerships this way. It can get complicated – try to avoid as much over-complication as much as possible.
  + MORGAN: There is a sequencing here. What are the foundational elements?
  + JANET: Sharing of information, understanding how to get to that information, developing local partnerships.

## Partnerships with Statewide Organizations

* SUSAN: Of the organizations providing services that we’ve listed, are any missing?
* JANET: ARC of Washington. Also, what about AARP? Are you looking at those types of organizations?
  + Susan: That will go in the next group.

### *Purpose*

* SUSAN: Some of the statewide organizations will have local contacts and resource managers.
* JANET: Where do the AAAs fit in?
  + SUSAN: They are the sponsors of the ADRCs. They need to follow the standards and take the funds they’re already using and put some of it in the ADRC, and work as a convener on a larger scale. It’s really a program sponsored on the AAA
* CATHY: We’re in a different situation because we are the ADRC

### *Scope of Agreement*

* MORGAN: 5 and 6 are more important that the other elements.
* SUSAN: Change language in #5 “provide and accept” to “helping local organizations establish relationships”.
* SUSAN: We would promote that the ADRCs create, if not already in place, local MOUs with regional 211s.
* EMILY: In Oregon, we have meetings with ADRCs for data sharing

## Partnerships with Statewide Advocacy Groups

* MORGAN: Any organizations we’re forgetting?
  + JANET: People First of WA – organizations of advocates with developmental disabilities)
  + BOB: Self Advocates of WA

### *Scope of Agreement*

* BOB: There are some things you just want to keep local
* CATHY: Sometimes agencies that are not HUD-certified want to be in the database. We need to think about what criteria allows an organization to get in the database.

## Local ADRC Partnerships

* MORGAN: Are any potential partnerships missing?
* EMILY: I think it’s comprehensive but you’re going to have to tailor the MOU for each organization
* MARK: Aside form statewide processes that have been agreed upon, it’s worth exploring if there are other things that happen at the local level. At least put it out they’e so relevant agencies are aware of it
* JANET: you’re talking about many different MOUs. Any ways to simplify or streamline and make it less time consuming?
  + BOB: It is a time consuming, labor-intensive process. Not all want to do it, and the ones that don’t are still considered partners. I offer it as something we would like, and some do and some don’t. We have about 20 formal MOUs and 20 who don’t want to
  + SUSAN: Also, the MOUs are not new to the ADRCs. Bob has the right approach – the important thing is to establish good relationships.
  + BOB: The biggest hassle we have is people view it as a legal document and get concerned, then they take it to an attorney. It is a challenge to quell people’s fears and to explain this document functions like a handshake.
  + MARK: When there’s a single liaison, point of contact to coordinate, it helps. If you can put that in the MOUs, then it doesn’t have to be so formalized

### *Roles and Responsibilities*

* MORGAN: Does the MOU have more function and effectiveness at the State level?
  + Susan: The important thing is that the local level organizations are talking and building relationships and that the Statewide organizations are making that happen. But from a Federal standpoint, they want to see a written agreement. It’s really about developing trust more than the written agreement
  + Bob: I like the idea of the local partners filling in the blanks
* MORGAN: Do these MOUs work, is anything missing?
* SUSAN: Would this group like to see the paired-down version we’re discussing?
  + JANET: I think it would be helpful
* PAT: What is the purpose of the MOU? Especially if those who don’t sign are still considered partners.
  + SUSAN: They’re about making agreements to share data and resources. About resolving issues of confusion regarding who the appropriate referrals are. They help to work out the protocols for the frontline staff in both parties.
* PAT: How often does the cross-training happen?
  + SUSAN: That would be agreed to amongst the parties

## Prioritization

* MORGAN: Which organizations should we reach out to first?
* JANET: The “within ADSA” category should be a high priority since they are the sponsoring agency
* MORGAN: How should we prioritize between the state agencies and the service providers?
  + JANET: I think the local service providers should be prioritized
  + BOB: It’s hard to prioritize. It’s important that everything happens. They’re all high priority and there needs to be a constant effort to produce MOUs
  + MARK: This is about local connections. It should be focused on connecting clients at the local level. The local groups should take priority over the State, but it’s a bit nebulous to assign priority.
  + MORGAN: Mark, it sounds like you’re saying that improving service should be a guiding principle for who to prioritize.
* CATHY: AAAs are struggling to establish relationships with health plans and health providers. It’s hard to sit at the table with them if they don’t see a good reason.

So I think there needs to be an emphasis on shoring things up with all of the relevant organizations inside and outside DSHS. However general those agreements are, they still help. I agree there has to be a priority at both local and state levels. But it’s important the discussion happens at the appropriate level.

* + SUSAN: So what you’re saying is working from both ends and getting the ducks in place at the state level and having a similar message from different departments and agencies within the state would be helpful.
  + CATHY: I’m saying let’s use the MOUs as effectively as we can where they add the most value
* SUSAN: We’ll work on this document more and send it out to people. A clear message is we don’t want to create more work that is not useful for the MOUs and we don’t want to create barriers

# Next steps

* MORGAN: Not sure if there is a need for a fourth meeting. We’ll be in touch about that. Also, we’ll send the MOU document back to you with our corrections.