Advisory Council on Brain Injuries
Core Standardized Assessment Q & A

Questions and comments:
- What is the target group for the assessment?
  People who will be living in the community independently with level of support through the
  HCBS waivers
  - How will this work with disability for SSA?
    This is not connected to SSA determinations; however it is the individual’s assessment so they
    can use it for other purposes. NRF might be able to use this tool for front end work of
    connecting individuals to services but it is intended for use with individuals in the HCBS system.
  - Will this be used to guide clinical services?
    It is to set up member services and case plan to determine the type of services authorized by
    the case manager. A suite of assessments could be used if determined through the process.
  - Will the tool be subjective in measure?
    It will be a validated functional assessment, not a neurological assessment.
  - What is the timing of the assessment?
    Assessment will be completed within 30 days of application for services.
  - Will assessment take input from others in the individual’s support system?
    That is a good recommendation for the listening sessions. The IHC and SIS have that criterion in
    place
  - What about people being interviewed in group and the supports may not be willing to
    talk about the person in front of the person?
    The IHC allows for separate interviews; the SIS has a group interview.
  - How will the assessment be conducted?
    Face-to-face, depending on the tool may include a follow up phone call for clarification or more
    information. Data will be computerized.
  - What assessment would be used if a person is dually eligible?
    May depend on the waiver the individual is applying for – tool may be the same across waivers,
    or there may be two separate tools.
  - Will Telligen take the role of assessor, not the case manager?
    Yes. This will free up case manager time and is part of case management being “conflict free”.
    - There are pros/cons of this method. Con is case manager adds that human component
      of knowing the client.
    SIS is collaborative and the case manager is included in the assessment process. The
    assessment is separate from the level of care determination and Telligen could allow for a
    better level of training and consistency for the administration of the assessment for greater
    inter-rater reliability.
    Case Manager will use the assessment to determine service need and IME will reference it
    during service authorization – this is the same process as today. For level of care
    determination, assessment will be used to determine if member would otherwise need
    institutionalization if not for the waiver – same as we are currently doing but using a different
    tool.
• Recommendation that the BI workgroup be pulled together for a listening session. Lauer (BIA-IA) has this contact list if Moskowitz doesn’t.
• Family conferences are being held in 3 locations of the state. These groups could be included in listening sessions.
• Core doesn’t address mental health or socialization. Ability to take medication is included but not medication compliance.
• Council will hold a special session after the listening sessions conclude to review the comments and make formal recommendations.
• Recommend that Telligen assessors go to the ACBIS certification training.
• How strict is the implementation timeline (only goes until Sept 2015)? Can it be stretched out if needed?

There may be some flexibility but don’t want to stretch this out too long.
• Do the assessments allow for additional information to be included?
SIS doesn’t allow for the introduction of other input but the other assessments do.
• Reassessment and risk of becoming ineligible – can we keep the current tool?

The currently TCM tool is not standardized and doesn’t meet core standards.
• Is there a list of tools that Council members can look at and review?
BIAA has a list of tools on their website

**Brown appointed a task force to meet in Mid-August to provide recommendations:**
Sebert, Johnston, Brown, Hall (chair), Durfey, Johnson, Pearson, and Rachel Anderson volunteered. Ferguson will send out a meeting wizard to determine best date for meeting.