Appendix H: Quality Improvement Strategy (1 of 2)

Under §1915(c) of the Social Security Act and 42 CFR §441.302, the approval of an HCBS waiver requires that CMS determine that the State has made satisfactory assurances concerning the protection of participant health and welfare, financial accountability and other elements of waiver operations. Renewal of an existing waiver is contingent upon review by CMS and a finding by CMS that the assurances have been met. By completing the HCBS waiver application, the State specifies how it has designed the waiver's critical processes, structures and operational features in order to meet these assurances.

- Quality Improvement is a critical operational feature that an organization employs to continually determine whether it operates in accordance with the approved design of its program, meets statutory and regulatory assurances and requirements, achieves desired outcomes, and identifies opportunities for improvement.

CMS recognizes that a state's waiver Quality Improvement Strategy may vary depending on the nature of the waiver target population, the services offered, and the waiver's relationship to other public programs, and will extend beyond regulatory requirements. However, for the purpose of this application, the State is expected to have, at the minimum, systems in place to measure and improve its own performance in meeting six specific waiver assurances and requirements.

It may be more efficient and effective for a Quality Improvement Strategy to span multiple waivers and other long-term care services. CMS recognizes the value of this approach and will ask the state to identify other waiver programs and long-term care services that are addressed in the Quality Improvement Strategy.

Quality Improvement Strategy: Minimum Components

The Quality Improvement Strategy that will be in effect during the period of the approved waiver is described throughout the waiver in the appendices corresponding to the statutory assurances and sub-assurances. Other documents cited must be available to CMS upon request through the Medicaid agency or the operating agency (if appropriate).

In the QIS discovery and remediation sections throughout the application (located in Appendices A, B, C, D, G, and I) , a state spells out:

- The evidence based discovery activities that will be conducted for each of the six major waiver assurances;
- The *remediation* activities followed to correct individual problems identified in the implementation of each of the assurances;

In Appendix H of the application, a State describes (1) the *system improvement* activities followed in response to aggregated, analyzed discovery and remediation information collected on each of the assurances; (2) the correspondent *roles/responsibilities* of those conducting assessing and prioritizing improving system corrections and improvements; and (3) the processes the state will follow to continuously *assess the effectiveness of the OIS* and revise it as necessary and appropriate.

If the State's Quality Improvement Strategy is not fully developed at the time the waiver application is submitted, the state may provide a work plan to fully develop its Quality Improvement Strategy, including the specific tasks the State plans to undertake during the period the waiver is in effect, the major milestones associated with these tasks, and the entity (or entities) responsible for the completion of these tasks.

When the Quality Improvement Strategy spans more than one waiver and/or other types of long-term care services under the Medicaid State plan, specify the control numbers for the other waiver programs and/or identify the other long-term services that are addressed in the Quality Improvement Strategy. In instances when the QIS spans more than one waiver, the State must be able to stratify information that is related to each approved waiver program. Unless the State has requested and received approval from CMS for the consolidation of multiple waivers for the purpose of reporting, then the State must stratify information that is related to each approved waiver program, i.e., employ a representative sample for each waiver.

Appendix H: Quality Improvement Strategy (2 of 2)

H-1: Systems Improvement

a. System Improvements

i. Describe the process(es) for trending, prioritizing, and implementing system improvements (i.e., design changes) prompted as a result of an analysis of discovery and remediation information.

The state of Louisiana utilizes a collaborative approach to develop and maintain the Quality Improvement System (QIS). The Medicaid agency in Louisiana, Bureau of Health Services Financing Medicaid Program Support and Waivers (BHSF/MPSW) has oversight for the implementation of Home and Community Based Services (HCBS) Waivers. The Office for Citizens with Developmental Disabilities (OCDD) is the operating agency, and the local operating arm for HCBS Waivers is the Local Governing Entity (LGE). The LGE provides oversight and monitoring of the contracted support coordination agencies; the contracted support coordination agencies provide oversight and monitoring of service utilization. All of the above mentioned entities also work collaboratively with Louisiana protective services agencies, Health Standards Section (HSS) and/or law enforcement as deemed necessary. The process of trending, prioritizing and implementing system improvement activities are required on all levels with upward reporting to the operating agency for oversight and management of the Quality Improvement System including a summary of root cause analysis completed at each level and recommendations for design changes or other system improvements. This approach provides opportunities for continued communication and review of performance measures, discovery and remediation activities.

The Quality Improvement System (QIS) for the Supports Waiver is part of a cross-waiver function of the Office of Aging and Adult Services (OAAS) and the Office for Citizens with Developmental Disabilities (OCDD). The purpose of the QIS is to assess and promote the quality of waiver programs serving older persons and adults with physical, intellectual and developmental disabilities.

The QIS assures a consistent and high standard of quality across waiver programs through:

• Adoption of common standards and performance measures against which waiver programs are evaluated.

• Development of policies, tools, practices, training, protocols, contracts and agreements that embody sound approaches to managing, delivering and assessing HCBS services and supports. To the extent possible, HCBS waiver policies and practices have shared purposes, language and expectations.

• Streamlining and consolidation of functions to strengthen the collection and analysis of timely and reliable data on waiver performance.

• A transparent system of reporting performance data for use by program managers, policymakers, consumers, providers, and other stakeholders.

• A structured and coordinated process to identify improvement opportunities, set priorities, allocate resources, and implement effective strategies.

• A coordinated approach for evaluating the effectiveness of the QIS in meeting program goals.

OCDD has a multi-tiered system for quality improvement. Each level (Direct Service Provider Agency, Support Coordination Agency, Local Governing Entity, OCDD State Office, and BHSF) within the system is required to design and implement a Quality Management Strategy which is further described below.

Direct Service Provider and Support Coordination Agency Processes:

Direct Service Provider and Support Coordination Agencies are required to have a Quality Management Strategy that includes collecting information and data to learn about the quality of services, analyzing and reviewing data to identify trends and patterns, prioritizing improvement goals, implementing the strategies and actions on their quality enhancement plan, and evaluating the effectiveness of the strategies. At a minimum, agencies must review: 1) critical incident data, 2) complaint data, 3) data from case record reviews, and 4) interview/survey data from participants and families. The review process must include review by internal review team(s) composed of agency programmatic and management staff and an external review by the board of directors with stakeholder representation or a separate committee that includes stakeholders. Annually, agencies must submit to OCDD documentation to verify that they engage in ongoing, continuous quality review and enhancement activities.

OCDD LGE Processes:

The LGE is the operating arm for managing the Supports Waiver (SW), and they are also required to have a Quality Management Strategy. This entity represents the primary source for discovery and remediation information regarding the waiver. They are required to collect information on performance indicators, conduct remediation as needed, aggregate data and review to identify trends and patterns and areas in which improvement is needed, and prioritize needed improvements. They are required to design and implement quality enhancement strategies and evaluate the effectiveness of those strategies. Each LGE has a Quality Specialist whose function is to facilitate data analysis and review. Within each LGE, data review is conducted by programmatic and management staff and by the Regional Advisory Committee which is composed of stakeholders. OCDD State Office staff visit each LGE annually to validate the quarterly/annual data reported to State Office on performance indicators, to assure that remediation and system improvements occur as needed, and to provide technical assistance. When performance falls below the outlined measure,

the LGE submits evidence to the operating agency, OCDD, with documentation of the quality improvement activities that have been implemented to improve performance. If the performance is not improved as outlined in the established benchmark, technical assistance will be provided to the LGE.
OCDD State Office Processes:
Aggregate data for waiver performance indicators are reviewed for trends and patterns on a quarterly or annual basis by the OCDD Waiver Section (program personnel) and Quality Section. These groups review data to ensure remediation is being completed by the LGE and to analyze the data for systemic concerns across waivers and across LGEs. Upon completion of the analysis, a representative from these teams presents data to the OCDD Performance Review Committee, with recommendations for system improvement. The OCDD Performance Review Committee is composed of designated members from each of the OCDD sections: Quality, Business Analytics, Clinical, Waiver, Early Intervention, and other members as designated by the OCDD Executive Management Staff. This provides the committee with expertise from several disciplines when reviewing recommendations. It also affords OCDD the opportunity to utilize existing expertise, processes, and tools to address new concerns, recommend strategies, and recommend systemic improvement that is best practice to ensure quality improvement and success. These recommendations are presented to OCDD Executive Management for consideration and approval. When significant system changes are proposed, the OCDD Core Stakeholder Group is convened and given the opportunity to review the proposed systemic changes and provide input regarding the recommendations.
. The Core Stakeholder Group is comprised of waiver participants, families of waiver participants, advocacy groups, including the state DD Council, and a representative from the Governor's office, and meets as needed based on system improvement activities. Recommendations, performance indicator data reports, and quality improvement initiatives status reports are also submitted to the Bureau of Health Services Financing (BHSF) on a quarterly basis.
BHSF/MPSW Processes:
Medicaid/Program Offices Quarterly Meeting – This group convenes at least quarterly to perform executive level oversight of the performance of HCBS waivers, assure their effectiveness and efficiency, and discuss any other programmatic issues common to the program offices and Medicaid. Goals are to act upon issues and recommendations received from the Medicaid HCBS Oversight Committee and other HCBS workgroups. This meeting is a forum for executive level problem resolution, planning, and development of quality redesign strategies. Members include representatives from MPSW, the Medicaid Director or Deputy Director, the OCDD Assistant Secretary or Deputy Assistant Secretary, and other designated staff.
Medicaid HCBS Oversight Committee – meets at least quarterly with the specific purpose to ensure proper oversight of the OAAS and OCDD operated HCBS Medicaid programs. Goals are to review current performance reports, determine need for new activities concerning quality and oversight in waiver programs, and ensure adequate remediation enforcement. Quality recommendations or issues which cannot be resolved at this level are placed on the agenda of the Medicaid/Program Offices Quarterly Meeting. Oversight members include HCBS quality management staff from MPSW and OCDD and are chaired by the MPSW Section Chief or designee. The committee meets at least quarterly with the following standing agenda items:
-OCDD operating agency staff present their analysis of all performance measure findings, remediation activities, and systemic improvements to MPSW as defined in the 1915© waiver quality strategy

ii. System Improvement Activities

Responsible Party*(check each that applies):*	**Frequency of Monitoring and Analysis***(check each that applies):*
☑ **State Medicaid Agency**	☐ **Weekly**
☑ **Operating Agency**	☐ **Monthly**
☐ **Sub-State Entity**	☑ **Quarterly**
☐ **Quality Improvement Committee**	☑ **Annually**
☑ **Other** Specify: Medicaid HCBS Oversight Committee	☐ **Other** Specify:

b. System Design Changes

i. Describe the process for monitoring and analyzing the effectiveness of system design changes. Include a description of the various roles and responsibilities involved in the processes for monitoring & assessing system design changes. If applicable, include the State's targeted standards for systems improvement.

OCDD Process:
Following system design changes, data on performance indicators are reviewed by the Waiver and Quality program staff, as well as the OCDD Performance Review Committee to assure that the information is useful and accurate and to determine if performance has improved. Input is sought, as appropriate, from Support Coordination and Direct Service Provider Agencies, participants and their families, and other stakeholders, to determine whether the system design change is helping to improve efficiency and effectiveness of waiver supports and services. At this point, the Core Stakeholder Group may be convened, if needed, to address if system improvement has resulted from the system design/improvement activities.
BHSF/MPSW Processes:
Medicaid HCBS Oversight Committee – meets at least quarterly with the specific purpose to ensure proper oversight of the OAAS and OCDD operated HCBS Medicaid programs. Goals are to review current performance reports, determine need for new activities concerning quality and oversight in waiver programs, and ensure adequate remediation enforcement. Quality recommendations or issues which cannot be resolved at this level are placed on the agenda of the Medicaid/Program Offices Quarterly Meeting. Oversight members include HCBS quality management staff from MPSW and OCDD and the committee is chaired by the MPSW Section Chief or designee. The committee meets at least quarterly with the following standing agenda items:
-OCDD operating agency staff present their analysis of all performance measure findings, remediation activities, and systemic improvements to MPSW as defined in the 1915© waiver quality strategy
-MPSW Section Chief or designee indicates approval or disapproval of quarterly/annual data and activities;
-Based on evidence presented, MPSW staff provides technical assistance, guidance, and support to the operating agency staff;
-MPSW performs administrative oversight functions for OCDD HCBS program.

ii. Describe the process to periodically evaluate, as appropriate, the Quality Improvement Strategy.

The Medicaid Program Support and Waivers Section works in collaboration with the operating agency, OCDD, to periodically review the quality improvement strategies. Meetings are held to review and evaluate the performance indicators, discovery methods, remediation strategies, systemic issues, policies, procedures and any other issues that have surfaced as a result monitoring activities. Technical assistance is provided to the operating agency as needed by Bureau of Health Services Financing Medicaid Program Support and Waivers (BHSF/MPSW).
The operating agency, OCDD, has a Performance Review Committee which meets at least quarterly and provides ongoing oversight and management of the Quality Improvement System.
OCDD participates in the annual National Core Indicator (NCI) surveys which are addressed to a random sample of participants and families of participants to gauge their satisfaction with OCDD waiver services, and with the performance of support coordinators, LGEs and providers. OCDD aggregates findings to identify areas of concern in service delivery in order to initiate quality improvement strategies.
Findings from this annual review will be analyzed by the Performance Review Committee to revise the QIS. Modifications may be made to quality standards and measures, data collection tools and methods, report formats documenting performance, or dissemination strategies for sharing performance data. New priority projects may be identified to better align the QIS to the needs of waiver managers, LGE program staff, support coordinators and providers and, most significantly, to improve desired outcomes for HCBS waiver participants. The modifications and priorities identified by the Performance Review Committee will be implemented or facilitated by the OCDD Quality Enhancement Section.
Findings from this annual review will be analyzed by the Performance Review Committee to revise the QIS. Modifications may be made to quality standards and measures, data collection tools and methods, report formats documenting performance, or dissemination strategies for sharing performance data. New priority projects may be identified to better align the QIS to the needs of waiver managers, LGE program staff, support coordinators and providers and, most significantly, to improve desired outcomes for HCBS waiver participants. The modifications and priorities identified by the Performance Review Committee will be implemented or facilitated by the OCDD Quality Enhancement Section.

Appendix I: Financial Accountability

I-1: Financial Integrity and Accountability

Financial Integrity. Describe the methods that are employed to ensure the integrity of payments that have been made for waiver services, including: (a) requirements concerning the independent audit of provider agencies; (b) the financial audit program that the state conducts to ensure the integrity of provider billings for Medicaid payment of waiver services, including the methods, scope and frequency of audits; and, (c) the agency (or agencies) responsible for conducting the financial audit program. State laws, regulations, and policies referenced in the description are available to CMS upon request through the Medicaid agency or the operating agency (if applicable).

•All Medicaid providers will be required to fulfil the requirements under the provision of the Single Audit Act to maintain Medicaid enrollment. Medicaid staff will ensure that any provider receiving the amount of funds specified in the Single Audit Act will be required to provide a copy of the independent audit for continued Medicaid enrollment on an annual basis. Disenrollment will occur as a result of non-compliance.

Program Integrity's Surveillance and Utilization Review (SUR) Unit is responsible for conducting post-payment reviews of all fee-for-service Medicaid providers. The post-payment review process used by the Program Integrity Section within the Louisiana Department of Health (LDH) is described in the Louisiana Surveillance and Utilization Review Subsystem (SURS) Rule and the Medical Assistance Program Integrity Law (MAPIL).

Sources for cases come from complaints, referrals (internal and external) and data mining (regularly scheduled data runs and ad hoc data runs). Complaints are received via mail, fax, email, website, hotline, etc. A team made up senior analysts and a supervisor triages all complaints. Onsite visits are determined on a case by case basis and depends on the severity of the complaint. The SURS data mining team produces computer runs that generate open cases. Providers whose income spikes from one period to another are identified through exception processing and will generate case openings.

Post-payment reviews are triggered when potential fraud, waste and abuse is identified either through a complaint, referral or data mining. SURS opens complaint cases throughout the year after the triage process. Some data mining runs (such as SURGE or Spike runs, date of death runs, outlier runs, etc.) are done on a fixed schedule. Other data mining runs are done on an ad hoc basis where project cases are opened and are usually policy-focused. For example, providers billing for in-home services while the recipients are hospitalized.
SURGE Run is a computer run that is produced on a regular basis that identifies providers that meet a set of criteria and/or conditions. The run looks for providers with incomes that surge.

Enrolled providers are divided by regions established by the Louisiana Department of Health (LDH). The computer runs are done by region. There are a total of 10 computer runs. There are 9 in-state runs and 1 out-of-state run. Runs are done on a monthly basis with the exception of the month of June and December. Providers are selected based on 3 criteria: location, amount paid and percent change in amount paid.
•First, a provider must be located in the region that is being reviewed.
•Secondly, a provider must have generated a minimum dollar amount paid in a 12 month period to be included for processing.
•And finally, a provider must have had a "surge" in income from a six month period in one year to a six month period in another year.

A variety of professional staff are used to perform fraud, waste and abuse reviews. Analysts conducting the reviews are primarily Registered Nurses; however, there are dental hygienists and social workers on staff. In addition to the analysts, professional consultants are utilized such as physicians with different specialties, dentists, etc. Complaints are sent to the triage team, which is made up of professional staff that screen complaints for fraud, waste and abuse. If fraud, waste and abuse is involved, further research is done to determine if a comprehensive or focused review is done. Referrals are also made to professional licensing boards, local law enforcement, the Medicaid Fraud Control Unit (MFCU), child/adult protection, DHH program managers, etc. All SURS cases are worked by a professional staff analyst.

Once the review is completed by the analyst, the Quality Assurance (QA) team reviews the findings closely. Also, during the review process, medical consultants may give input as well as the Program Integrity Director and LDH program managers. After the case has completed the QA process, the findings of the review are also reviewed by the

RN Supervisors. From there, the correspondence to provider detailing the results of the audit is presented by the RN Supervisors to the Program Integrity Director and manager. After the findings letter is sent, the provider is entitled to an informal hearing as well as an appeal hearing and judicial review. Once the review findings have been confirmed and finalized, any overpayments due are collected.

Appendix I: Financial Accountability

Quality Improvement: Financial Accountability

As a distinct component of the State's quality improvement strategy, provide information in the following fields to detail the State's methods for discovery and remediation.

a. **Methods for Discovery: Financial Accountability Assurance:**
The State must demonstrate that it has designed and implemented an adequate system for ensuring financial accountability of the waiver program. *(For waiver actions submitted before June 1, 2014, this assurance read "State financial oversight exists to assure that claims are coded and paid for in accordance with the reimbursement methodology specified in the approved waiver.")*

i. **Sub-Assurances:**

a. ***Sub-assurance: The State provides evidence that claims are coded and paid for in accordance with the reimbursement methodology specified in the approved waiver and only for services rendered.*** *(Performance measures in this sub-assurance include all Appendix I performance measures for waiver actions submitted before June 1, 2014.)*

Performance Measures

For each performance measure the State will use to assess compliance with the statutory assurance (or sub-assurance), complete the following. Where possible, include numerator/denominator.

For each performance measure, provide information on the aggregated data that will enable the State to analyze and assess progress toward the performance measure. In this section provide information on the method by which each source of data is analyzed statistically/deductively or inductively, how themes are identified or conclusions drawn, and how recommendations are formulated, where appropriate.

Performance Measure:
I.a.i.a.1. Number and percent of services that are in compliance with the approved rate methodology. Numerator= Number of services that are in compliance with the approved rate methodology. Denominator=Total number of services.

Data Source (Select one):
Other
If 'Other' is selected, specify:
MPSW Tracking System

Responsible Party for data collection/generation *(check each that applies):*	**Frequency of data collection/generation** *(check each that applies):*	**Sampling Approach** *(check each that applies):*
☑ **State Medicaid Agency**	☐ **Weekly**	☑ **100% Review**
☑ **Operating Agency**	☐ **Monthly**	☐ **Less than 100% Review**
☐ **Sub-State Entity**	☐ **Quarterly**	☐ **Representative Sample** Confidence Interval =

☐ **Other** Specify:	☐ **Annually**	☐ **Stratified** Describe Group:
	☑ **Continuously and Ongoing**	☐ **Other** Specify:
	☐ **Other** Specify:	

Data Aggregation and Analysis:

Responsible Party for data aggregation and analysis *(check each that applies):*	**Frequency of data aggregation and analysis***(check each that applies):*
☑ **State Medicaid Agency**	☐ **Weekly**
☑ **Operating Agency**	☐ **Monthly**
☐ **Sub-State Entity**	☐ **Quarterly**
☐ **Other** Specify:	☐ **Annually**
	☑ **Continuously and Ongoing**
	☐ **Other** Specify:

b. ***Sub-assurance: The state provides evidence that rates remain consistent with the approved rate methodology throughout the five year waiver cycle.***

Performance Measures

For each performance measure the State will use to assess compliance with the statutory assurance (or sub-assurance), complete the following. Where possible, include numerator/denominator.

For each performance measure, provide information on the aggregated data that will enable the State to analyze and assess progress toward the performance measure. In this section provide information on the method by which each source of data is analyzed statistically/deductively or inductively, how themes are identified or conclusions drawn, and how recommendations are formulated, where appropriate.

Performance Measure:
I.a.i.b.1. Number and percentage of waiver claims submitted which did not exceed the approved rate. Numerator= Number of submitted waiver claims which did not exceed the approved rate Denominator= Total number of paid claims.

Data Source (Select one):
Other
If 'Other' is selected, specify:
Medicaid Data Warehouse

Responsible Party for data collection/generation *(check each that applies):*	**Frequency of data collection/generation** *(check each that applies):*	**Sampling Approach** *(check each that applies):*
☑ **State Medicaid Agency**	☐ **Weekly**	☑ **100% Review**
☐ **Operating Agency**	☐ **Monthly**	☐ **Less than 100% Review**
☐ **Sub-State Entity**	☐ **Quarterly**	☐ **Representative Sample** Confidence Interval =
☐ **Other** Specify:	☑ **Annually**	☐ **Stratified** Describe Group:
	☐ **Continuously and Ongoing**	☐ **Other** Specify:
	☐ **Other** Specify:	

Data Aggregation and Analysis:

Responsible Party for data aggregation and analysis *(check each that applies):*	**Frequency of data aggregation and analysis***(check each that applies):*
☑ **State Medicaid Agency**	☐ **Weekly**
☐ **Operating Agency**	☐ **Monthly**
☐ **Sub-State Entity**	☐ **Quarterly**
☐ **Other** Specify:	☑ **Annually**

Responsible Party for data aggregation and analysis *(check each that applies):*	Frequency of data aggregation and analysis*(check each that applies):*
	☐ **Continuously and Ongoing**
	☐ **Other** Specify:

ii. If applicable, in the textbox below provide any necessary additional information on the strategies employed by the State to discover/identify problems/issues within the waiver program, including frequency and parties responsible.

b. Methods for Remediation/Fixing Individual Problems

i. Describe the State's method for addressing individual problems as they are discovered. Include information regarding responsible parties and GENERAL methods for problem correction. In addition, provide information on the methods used by the State to document these items.
I.a.i.a.1. BHSF determines all waiver payment amounts/rates in collaboration with OCDD, Division of Health Economics, and as necessary the Rate & Audit section. At the time of each requested rate change, MPSW and the Rate and Audit section reviews evidence that the rate adjustment was applied according to the methodology described in the waiver document. When a rate adjustment proposal is submitted without documentation which supports the current methodology it will not be approved and MPSW will offer technical guidance.
I.a.i.b.1 Upon annual review and analysis of all waiver claims payments through Medicaid Data Warehouse report generation, any discrepancies are resolved individually and systemically in collaboration with Medicaid Information Management Systems staff who oversee the Fiscal Intermediary.

ii. **Remediation Data Aggregation**

Remediation-related Data Aggregation and Analysis (including trend identification)

Responsible Party*(check each that applies):*	Frequency of data aggregation and analysis *(check each that applies):*
☑ **State Medicaid Agency**	☐ **Weekly**
☐ **Operating Agency**	☐ **Monthly**
☐ **Sub-State Entity**	☐ **Quarterly**
☐ **Other** Specify:	☑ **Annually**
	☐ **Continuously and Ongoing**
	☐ **Other** Specify:

c. Timelines

When the State does not have all elements of the Quality Improvement Strategy in place, provide timelines to design methods for discovery and remediation related to the assurance of Financial Accountability that are currently non-operational.

(●) **No**

( ) **Yes**

Please provide a detailed strategy for assuring Financial Accountability, the specific timeline for implementing identified strategies, and the parties responsible for its operation.

Appendix I: Financial Accountability

I-2: Rates, Billing and Claims (1 of 3)

a. **Rate Determination Methods.** In two pages or less, describe the methods that are employed to establish provider payment rates for waiver services and the entity or entities that are responsible for rate determination. Indicate any opportunity for public comment in the process. If different methods are employed for various types of services, the description may group services for which the same method is employed. State laws, regulations, and policies referenced in the description are available upon request to CMS through the Medicaid agency or the operating agency (if applicable).

The Office of Citizens with Developmental Disabilities (OCDD) determines the rates of payment for services. Service rates are promulgated by Medicaid through a rulemaking process, which includes opportunity for public input through written comments, which are entered into record, and a public hearing, where comments may be read into record. This process affords Medicaid oversight of the rate determination process.

Rates for Supported Employment, Day Habilitation, and Prevocational were based on ten years of historic usage of these services, and costs of providing these services as evidenced by data from a 3 year pilot project in which nine small, medium and large, urban and rural state general funded contracted Vocational and Habilitation Providers participated. The project broke down line item costs for each approved cost category, as well as showing specific individual's outlier costs each month. Information from the project was shared with all current state general funded Vocational and Habilitation providers, and other stakeholders. The Rates Subcommittee used this information to develop the specific rates for these three services.

The Rates Subcommittee set Respite and Habilitation rates at the current rate being paid through the New Opportunities Waiver (NOW) for Individual and Family Support (which includes Respite and Personal Care Attendant services). Family members requested that the compensation for these two services remain at the current NOW rate in order to attract quality staff. The NOW waiver rates were defined by actual service costs, reviewed and approved by the NOW stakeholder group.

The cost of Personal Emergency Response System is based on actual utilization costs from 239 providers of the service over a 12 month period.

The cost of Support Coordination services are based upon the provider cost of rendering the service and then adjusted based on the availability of state funding or LDH's ability to secure appropriation.

Both Housing Stabilization and Housing Stabilization Transition Service rates are based on the rate paid to support coordination agencies which employ individuals who have obtained a bachelor's degree and are qualified to provide two levels of supervision. An agency trainer or nurse consultant who meets the requirements as a support coordinator can also be reimbursed a per quarter hour rate for services provided. Administrative support, travel and office operating expenses are included in the 15 minute billing rate.

b. **Flow of Billings.** Describe the flow of billings for waiver services, specifying whether provider billings flow directly from providers to the State's claims payment system or whether billings are routed through other intermediary entities. If billings flow through other intermediary entities, specify the entities:

Billings for waiver services provided to participants in the waiver program are submitted first to the data contractor for post authorization. After services are authorized, providers bill directly to the Medicaid fiscal intermediary for payment.

Appendix I: Financial Accountability

I-2: Rates, Billing and Claims (2 of 3)

c. Certifying Public Expenditures *(select one)*:

◉ **No. State or local government agencies do not certify expenditures for waiver services.**

○ **Yes. State or local government agencies directly expend funds for part or all of the cost of waiver services and certify their State government expenditures (CPE) in lieu of billing that amount to Medicaid.**

***Select at least one*:**

☐ **Certified Public Expenditures (CPE) of State Public Agencies.**

Specify: (a) the State government agency or agencies that certify public expenditures for waiver services; (b) how it is assured that the CPE is based on the total computable costs for waiver services; and, (c) how the State verifies that the certified public expenditures are eligible for Federal financial participation in accordance with 42 CFR §433.51(b).*(Indicate source of revenue for CPEs in Item I-4-a.)*

☐ **Certified Public Expenditures (CPE) of Local Government Agencies.**

Specify: (a) the local government agencies that incur certified public expenditures for waiver services; (b) how it is assured that the CPE is based on total computable costs for waiver services; and, (c) how the State verifies that the certified public expenditures are eligible for Federal financial participation in accordance with 42 CFR §433.51(b). *(Indicate source of revenue for CPEs in Item I-4-b.)*

Appendix I: Financial Accountability

I-2: Rates, Billing and Claims (3 of 3)

d. Billing Validation Process. Describe the process for validating provider billings to produce the claim for federal financial participation, including the mechanism(s) to assure that all claims for payment are made only: (a) when the individual was eligible for Medicaid waiver payment on the date of service; (b) when the service was included in the participant's approved service plan; and, (c) the services were provided:

•OCDD will use a prior authorization and post authorization system to insure that services provided and paid for are in accordance with the Plan of Care (POC).
Medicaid eligibility for services is checked and reviewed by the prior authorization entity. The Supports Waiver uses a system of prior and post authorization to ensure that services provided to waiver participants are provided in the scope, duration, and frequency as outlined in the participants plan of care. Services are prior authorized by the POC in quarterly increments and post authorized for payment after services have been rendered. DHH currently uses a contracted entity for its prior and post-authorizations.
All Medicaid waiver services are paid through prior authorization. Before any payments are made for Medicaid services, the participant is checked for eligibility for waiver services by the state fiscal intermediary. If the date of service matches Medicaid and waiver eligibility, then the claim is paid. If not, the claim is denied and a denial code of service ineligibility is given for the claim.

1. POC prescribed services are entered in the prior authorization system quarterly.
2. Upon the provision of services to the SW participant, the provider submits data on the services provided to our post authorization entity which checks the service record against the POC listed and prior authorized services.
3. Services properly rendered to participants as prescribed by the POC are then eligible for payment and the post authorization for payments is released to the fiscal intermediary.
4. The provider then submits claims for approved services to the fiscal intermediary for adjudication and payment.

5. Services provided to the participant not listed on the prior authorization system are rejected and ineligible for payment until all discrepancies are resolved.
Additionally, through Program Integrity's Surveillance and Utilization Review (SUR) process, providers are reviewed to ensure that services are actually provided for claims that are paid. In addition, it is the responsibility of the providers to ensure that the services are provided in accordance with the approved plan of care, maintain adequate supporting documentation of services provided and to complete data entry into the data contractor's database that captures services provided and releases authorization for payment.

e. **Billing and Claims Record Maintenance Requirement.** Records documenting the audit trail of adjudicated claims (including supporting documentation) are maintained by the Medicaid agency, the operating agency (if applicable), and providers of waiver services for a minimum period of 3 years as required in 45 CFR §92.42.

Appendix I: Financial Accountability

I-3: Payment (1 of 7)

a. **Method of payments -- MMIS** (*select one*):

- (●) **Payments for all waiver services are made through an approved Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS).**
- ( ) **Payments for some, but not all, waiver services are made through an approved MMIS.**

  Specify: (a) the waiver services that are not paid through an approved MMIS; (b) the process for making such payments and the entity that processes payments; (c) and how an audit trail is maintained for all state and federal funds expended outside the MMIS; and, (d) the basis for the draw of federal funds and claiming of these expenditures on the CMS-64:

- ( ) **Payments for waiver services are not made through an approved MMIS.**

  Specify: (a) the process by which payments are made and the entity that processes payments; (b) how and through which system(s) the payments are processed; (c) how an audit trail is maintained for all state and federal funds expended outside the MMIS; and, (d) the basis for the draw of federal funds and claiming of these expenditures on the CMS-64:

- ( ) **Payments for waiver services are made by a managed care entity or entities. The managed care entity is paid a monthly capitated payment per eligible enrollee through an approved MMIS.**

  Describe how payments are made to the managed care entity or entities:

Appendix I: Financial Accountability

I-3: Payment (2 of 7)

b. **Direct payment.** In addition to providing that the Medicaid agency makes payments directly to providers of waiver services, payments for waiver services are made utilizing one or more of the following arrangements (*select at least one*):

- [ ] **The Medicaid agency makes payments directly and does not use a fiscal agent (comprehensive or limited) or a managed care entity or entities.**
- [x] **The Medicaid agency pays providers through the same fiscal agent used for the rest of the Medicaid program.**

☐ **The Medicaid agency pays providers of some or all waiver services through the use of a limited fiscal agent.**

Specify the limited fiscal agent, the waiver services for which the limited fiscal agent makes payment, the functions that the limited fiscal agent performs in paying waiver claims, and the methods by which the Medicaid agency oversees the operations of the limited fiscal agent:

☐ **Providers are paid by a managed care entity or entities for services that are included in the State's contract with the entity.**

Specify how providers are paid for the services (if any) not included in the State's contract with managed care entities.

Appendix I: Financial Accountability

I-3: Payment (3 of 7)

c. **Supplemental or Enhanced Payments.** Section 1902(a)(30) requires that payments for services be consistent with efficiency, economy, and quality of care. Section 1903(a)(1) provides for Federal financial participation to States for expenditures for services under an approved State plan/waiver. Specify whether supplemental or enhanced payments are made. *Select one:*

◉ **No. The State does not make supplemental or enhanced payments for waiver services.**

○ **Yes. The State makes supplemental or enhanced payments for waiver services.**

Describe: (a) the nature of the supplemental or enhanced payments that are made and the waiver services for which these payments are made; (b) the types of providers to which such payments are made; (c) the source of the non-Federal share of the supplemental or enhanced payment; and, (d) whether providers eligible to receive the supplemental or enhanced payment retain 100% of the total computable expenditure claimed by the State to CMS. Upon request, the State will furnish CMS with detailed information about the total amount of supplemental or enhanced payments to each provider type in the waiver.

Appendix I: Financial Accountability

I-3: Payment (4 of 7)

d. **Payments to State or Local Government Providers.** *Specify whether State or local government providers receive payment for the provision of waiver services.*

○ **No. State or local government providers do not receive payment for waiver services.** Do not complete Item I-3-e.

◉ **Yes. State or local government providers receive payment for waiver services.** Complete Item I-3-e.

Specify the types of State or local government providers that receive payment for waiver services and the services that the State or local government providers furnish:

State Developmental Centers, which are public ICF/DDs currently provide Supported Employment, Day Habilitation, and Prevocational Rehabilitation to waiver participants. A State Developmental Center may

provide any of the services in the Supports Waiver as long as they obtain the appropriate license, and enroll as a waiver provider of the specific service(s).

Appendix I: Financial Accountability

I-3: Payment (5 of 7)

e. Amount of Payment to State or Local Government Providers.

Specify whether any State or local government provider receives payments (including regular and any supplemental payments) that in the aggregate exceed its reasonable costs of providing waiver services and, if so, whether and how the State recoups the excess and returns the Federal share of the excess to CMS on the quarterly expenditure report. *Select one:*

- (●) **The amount paid to State or local government providers is the same as the amount paid to private providers of the same service.**
- ( ) **The amount paid to State or local government providers differs from the amount paid to private providers of the same service. No public provider receives payments that in the aggregate exceed its reasonable costs of providing waiver services.**
- ( ) **The amount paid to State or local government providers differs from the amount paid to private providers of the same service. When a State or local government provider receives payments (including regular and any supplemental payments) that in the aggregate exceed the cost of waiver services, the State recoups the excess and returns the federal share of the excess to CMS on the quarterly expenditure report.**

Describe the recoupment process:

Appendix I: Financial Accountability

I-3: Payment (6 of 7)

f. Provider Retention of Payments. Section 1903(a)(1) provides that Federal matching funds are only available for expenditures made by states for services under the approved waiver. *Select one:*

- (●) **Providers receive and retain 100 percent of the amount claimed to CMS for waiver services.**
- ( ) **Providers are paid by a managed care entity (or entities) that is paid a monthly capitated payment.**

Specify whether the monthly capitated payment to managed care entities is reduced or returned in part to the State.

Appendix I: Financial Accountability

I-3: Payment (7 of 7)

g. Additional Payment Arrangements

i. Voluntary Reassignment of Payments to a Governmental Agency. *Select one:*

- (●) **No. The State does not provide that providers may voluntarily reassign their right to direct payments to a governmental agency.**

○ **Yes. Providers may voluntarily reassign their right to direct payments to a governmental agency as provided in 42 CFR §447.10(e).**

Specify the governmental agency (or agencies) to which reassignment may be made.

ii. Organized Health Care Delivery System. *Select one:*

◉ **No. The State does not employ Organized Health Care Delivery System (OHCDS) arrangements under the provisions of 42 CFR §447.10.**

○ **Yes. The waiver provides for the use of Organized Health Care Delivery System arrangements under the provisions of 42 CFR §447.10.**

Specify the following: (a) the entities that are designated as an OHCDS and how these entities qualify for designation as an OHCDS; (b) the procedures for direct provider enrollment when a provider does not voluntarily agree to contract with a designated OHCDS; (c) the method(s) for assuring that participants have free choice of qualified providers when an OHCDS arrangement is employed, including the selection of providers not affiliated with the OHCDS; (d) the method(s) for assuring that providers that furnish services under contract with an OHCDS meet applicable provider qualifications under the waiver; (e) how it is assured that OHCDS contracts with providers meet applicable requirements; and, (f) how financial accountability is assured when an OHCDS arrangement is used:

iii. Contracts with MCOs, PIHPs or PAHPs. *Select one:*

◉ **The State does not contract with MCOs, PIHPs or PAHPs for the provision of waiver services.**

○ **The State contracts with a Managed Care Organization(s) (MCOs) and/or prepaid inpatient health plan(s) (PIHP) or prepaid ambulatory health plan(s) (PAHP) under the provisions of §1915(a)(1) of the Act for the delivery of waiver and other services. Participants may voluntarily elect to receive waiver and other services through such MCOs or prepaid health plans. Contracts with these health plans are on file at the State Medicaid agency.**

Describe: (a) the MCOs and/or health plans that furnish services under the provisions of §1915(a)(1); (b) the geographic areas served by these plans; (c) the waiver and other services furnished by these plans; and, (d) how payments are made to the health plans.

○ **This waiver is a part of a concurrent §1915(b)/§1915(c) waiver. Participants are required to obtain waiver and other services through a MCO and/or prepaid inpatient health plan (PIHP) or a prepaid ambulatory health plan (PAHP). The §1915(b) waiver specifies the types of health plans that are used and how payments to these plans are made.**

○ **This waiver is a part of a concurrent □1115/□1915(c) waiver. Participants are required to obtain waiver and other services through a MCO and/or prepaid inpatient health plan (PIHP) or a prepaid ambulatory health plan (PAHP). The □1115 waiver specifies the types of health plans that are used and how payments to these plans are made.**

Appendix I: Financial Accountability

I-4: Non-Federal Matching Funds (1 of 3)

a. State Level Source(s) of the Non-Federal Share of Computable Waiver Costs. Specify the State source or sources of the non-federal share of computable waiver costs. *Select at least one:*

☑ **Appropriation of State Tax Revenues to the State Medicaid agency**

☐ **Appropriation of State Tax Revenues to a State Agency other than the Medicaid Agency.**

If the source of the non-federal share is appropriations to another state agency (or agencies), specify: (a) the State entity or agency receiving appropriated funds and (b) the mechanism that is used to transfer the funds to the Medicaid Agency or Fiscal Agent, such as an Intergovernmental Transfer (IGT), including any matching arrangement, and/or, indicate if the funds are directly expended by State agencies as CPEs, as indicated in Item I-2-c:

☐ **Other State Level Source(s) of Funds.**

Specify: (a) the source and nature of funds; (b) the entity or agency that receives the funds; and, (c) the mechanism that is used to transfer the funds to the Medicaid Agency or Fiscal Agent, such as an Intergovernmental Transfer (IGT), including any matching arrangement, and/or, indicate if funds are directly expended by State agencies as CPEs, as indicated in Item I-2-c:

Appendix I: Financial Accountability

I-4: Non-Federal Matching Funds (2 of 3)

b. **Local Government or Other Source(s) of the Non-Federal Share of Computable Waiver Costs.** Specify the source or sources of the non-federal share of computable waiver costs that are not from state sources. *Select One*:

◉ **Not Applicable.** There are no local government level sources of funds utilized as the non-federal share.

○ **Applicable**

Check each that applies:

☐ **Appropriation of Local Government Revenues.**

Specify: (a) the local government entity or entities that have the authority to levy taxes or other revenues; (b) the source(s) of revenue; and, (c) the mechanism that is used to transfer the funds to the Medicaid Agency or Fiscal Agent, such as an Intergovernmental Transfer (IGT), including any matching arrangement (indicate any intervening entities in the transfer process), and/or, indicate if funds are directly expended by local government agencies as CPEs, as specified in Item I-2-c:

☐ **Other Local Government Level Source(s) of Funds.**

Specify: (a) the source of funds; (b) the local government entity or agency receiving funds; and, (c) the mechanism that is used to transfer the funds to the State Medicaid Agency or Fiscal Agent, such as an Intergovernmental Transfer (IGT), including any matching arrangement, and/or, indicate if funds are directly expended by local government agencies as CPEs, as specified in Item I-2-c:

Appendix I: Financial Accountability

I-4: Non-Federal Matching Funds (3 of 3)

c. **Information Concerning Certain Sources of Funds.** Indicate whether any of the funds listed in Items I-4-a or I-4-b that make up the non-federal share of computable waiver costs come from the following sources: (a) health care-related taxes or fees; (b) provider-related donations; and/or, (c) federal funds. *Select one:*

- (●) **None of the specified sources of funds contribute to the non-federal share of computable waiver costs**
- ( ) **The following source(s) are used**

Check each that applies:

- [ ] **Health care-related taxes or fees**
- [ ] **Provider-related donations**
- [ ] **Federal funds**

For each source of funds indicated above, describe the source of the funds in detail:

Appendix I: Financial Accountability

I-5: Exclusion of Medicaid Payment for Room and Board

a. **Services Furnished in Residential Settings.** *Select one:*

- (●) **No services under this waiver are furnished in residential settings other than the private residence of the individual.**
- ( ) **As specified in Appendix C, the State furnishes waiver services in residential settings other than the personal home of the individual.**

b. **Method for Excluding the Cost of Room and Board Furnished in Residential Settings.** The following describes the methodology that the State uses to exclude Medicaid payment for room and board in residential settings:
Do not complete this item.

Appendix I: Financial Accountability

I-6: Payment for Rent and Food Expenses of an Unrelated Live-In Caregiver

Reimbursement for the Rent and Food Expenses of an Unrelated Live-In Personal Caregiver. *Select one:*

- (●) **No. The State does not reimburse for the rent and food expenses of an unrelated live-in personal caregiver who resides in the same household as the participant.**
- ( ) **Yes. Per 42 CFR §441.310(a)(2)(ii), the State will claim FFP for the additional costs of rent and food that can be reasonably attributed to an unrelated live-in personal caregiver who resides in the same household as the waiver participant. The State describes its coverage of live-in caregiver in Appendix C-3 and the costs attributable to rent and food for the live-in caregiver are reflected separately in the computation of factor D (cost of waiver services) in Appendix J. FFP for rent and food for a live-in caregiver will not be claimed when the participant lives in the caregiver's home or in a residence that is owned or leased by the provider of Medicaid services.**

The following is an explanation of: (a) the method used to apportion the additional costs of rent and food attributable to the unrelated live-in personal caregiver that are incurred by the individual served on the waiver and (b) the method used to reimburse these costs:

Appendix I: Financial Accountability

I-7: Participant Co-Payments for Waiver Services and Other Cost Sharing (1 of 5)

a. Co-Payment Requirements. Specify whether the State imposes a co-payment or similar charge upon waiver participants for waiver services. These charges are calculated per service and have the effect of reducing the total computable claim for federal financial participation. *Select one:*

- (●) **No. The State does not impose a co-payment or similar charge upon participants for waiver services.**
- ( ) **Yes. The State imposes a co-payment or similar charge upon participants for one or more waiver services.**

i. Co-Pay Arrangement.

Specify the types of co-pay arrangements that are imposed on waiver participants (*check each that applies*):

Charges Associated with the Provision of Waiver Services *(if any are checked, complete Items I-7-a-ii through I-7-a-iv):*

- [ ] **Nominal deductible**
- [ ] **Coinsurance**
- [ ] **Co-Payment**
- [ ] **Other charge**

Specify:

Appendix I: Financial Accountability

I-7: Participant Co-Payments for Waiver Services and Other Cost Sharing (2 of 5)

a. Co-Payment Requirements.

ii. Participants Subject to Co-pay Charges for Waiver Services.

Answers provided in Appendix I-7-a indicate that you do not need to complete this section.

Appendix I: Financial Accountability

I-7: Participant Co-Payments for Waiver Services and Other Cost Sharing (3 of 5)

a. Co-Payment Requirements.

iii. Amount of Co-Pay Charges for Waiver Services.

Answers provided in Appendix I-7-a indicate that you do not need to complete this section.

Appendix I: Financial Accountability

I-7: Participant Co-Payments for Waiver Services and Other Cost Sharing (4 of 5)

a. Co-Payment Requirements.

iv. Cumulative Maximum Charges.

Answers provided in Appendix I-7-a indicate that you do not need to complete this section.

Appendix I: Financial Accountability

I-7: Participant Co-Payments for Waiver Services and Other Cost Sharing (5 of 5)

b. Other State Requirement for Cost Sharing. Specify whether the State imposes a premium, enrollment fee or similar cost sharing on waiver participants. *Select one*:

- (●) **No. The State does not impose a premium, enrollment fee, or similar cost-sharing arrangement on waiver participants.**
- ( ) **Yes. The State imposes a premium, enrollment fee or similar cost-sharing arrangement.**

Describe in detail the cost sharing arrangement, including: (a) the type of cost sharing (e.g., premium, enrollment fee); (b) the amount of charge and how the amount of the charge is related to total gross family income; (c) the groups of participants subject to cost-sharing and the groups who are excluded; and, (d) the mechanisms for the collection of cost-sharing and reporting the amount collected on the CMS 64:

Appendix J: Cost Neutrality Demonstration

J-1: Composite Overview and Demonstration of Cost-Neutrality Formula

Composite Overview. Complete the fields in Cols. 3, 5 and 6 in the following table for each waiver year. The fields in Cols. 4, 7 and 8 are auto-calculated based on entries in Cols 3, 5, and 6. The fields in Col. 2 are auto-calculated using the Factor D data from the J-2-d Estimate of Factor D tables. Col. 2 fields will be populated ONLY when the Estimate of Factor D tables in J-2-d have been completed.

Level(s) of Care: ICF/IID

Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	Col. 7	Col. 8
Year	Factor D	Factor D'	Total: D+D'	Factor G	Factor G'	Total: G+G'	Difference (Col 7 less Column4)
1	6956.57	4965.00	11921.57	81170.00	4029.00	85199.00	73277.43
2	6956.57	5014.65	11971.22	81981.70	4170.02	86151.72	74180.50
3	6956.57	5064.80	12021.37	82801.52	4315.97	87117.49	75096.12
4	6956.57	5115.44	12072.01	83629.53	4467.02	88096.55	76024.54
5	6956.57	5166.60	12123.17	84465.83	4623.37	89089.20	76966.03

Appendix J: Cost Neutrality Demonstration

J-2: Derivation of Estimates (1 of 9)

a. **Number Of Unduplicated Participants Served.** Enter the total number of unduplicated participants from Item B-3-a who will be served each year that the waiver is in operation. When the waiver serves individuals under more than one level of care, specify the number of unduplicated participants for each level of care:

Table: J-2-a: Unduplicated Participants

Waiver Year	Total Unduplicated Number of Participants (from Item B-3-a)	Distribution of Unduplicated Participants by Level of Care (if applicable)		
		Level of Care:		
		ICF/IID		
Year 1	2500		2500	
Year 2	2500		2500	
Year 3	2500		2500	
Year 4	2500		2500	
Year 5	2500		2500	

Appendix J: Cost Neutrality Demonstration

J-2: Derivation of Estimates (2 of 9)

b. **Average Length of Stay.** Describe the basis of the estimate of the average length of stay on the waiver by participants in item J-2-a.

The proposed average length of stay is an estimate based on historic utilization of state general funded vocational and habilitation services taken in conjunction with the phase-in plan. Each subsequent year, the average length of stay estimate will be based on total number of days of waiver eligibility of all support waiver participants divided by the number of unduplicated recipients over the waiver plan year as indicated from prior year data.

Appendix J: Cost Neutrality Demonstration

J-2: Derivation of Estimates (3 of 9)

c. **Derivation of Estimates for Each Factor.** Provide a narrative description for the derivation of the estimates of the following factors.

i. **Factor D Derivation.** The estimates of Factor D for each waiver year are located in Item J-2-d. The basis for these estimates is as follows:

Factor estimates are based on estimated program utilization data for the number of unduplicated participants, and services per participant for each service in the waiver.
Program utilization data was obtained from 5 years of monthly reports on individual's usage of the various services through state general funded programs. Multiplying these estimates by actual service rates derives an estimated cost per service. This dollar amount is then totaled and divided by the number of unduplicated participants for an average cost per participant. A utilization inflation factor is thereby applied to each subsequent year based on program history and other factors.

ii. **Factor D' Derivation.** The estimates of Factor D' for each waiver year are included in Item J-1. The basis of these estimates is as follows:

Factor D' is an estimate based on the actual participant expenditures for all other Medicaid services outside of waiver services. This dollar amount is totaled and then divided by the number of waiver participants to get an estimated average cost. A utilization inflation factor is thereby applied to each subsequent year based on state general funded vocational and habilitation program history and other factors. Medicare Part D recipients who participate in this waiver will be identified through their designated eligibility criteria. All related pharmacy expenditures related to these recipients will be deducted from the total acute Medicaid expenditures before the calculation of the average cost.

Factor D' is less than Factor G' in the Supports Waiver for two reasons. First, the acuity levels of individuals in Louisiana's ICF/DDs are greater than those in the community. As a result, there are greater expenditures for persons in institutions for acute care, particularly for inpatient hospital stays as well as prescription drugs. Secondly, the Supports Waiver participants are higher functioning individuals as evidenced by their participation in vocational training and employment, and other activities. Generally, the Supports Waiver population have fewer inpatient hospital stays, far less prescription drug costs, and enjoy better overall health.

iii. **Factor G Derivation.** The estimates of Factor G for each waiver year are included in Item J-1. The basis of these estimates is as follows:

Factor G is an estimate based on the actual Medicaid expenditures for all intermediate care facilities for the mentally retarded (ICF/MR). This dollar amount is totaled and then divided by the number of waiver recipients to get an estimated average cost. A utilization inflation factor is thereby applied to each subsequent year based on program history and other factors.

iv. **Factor G' Derivation.** The estimates of Factor G' for each waiver year are included in Item J-1. The basis of these estimates is as follows:

Factor G' is an estimate based on the actual Medicaid expenditures for all other Medicaid services provided to citizens residing in intermediate care facilities for the mentally retarded (ICF/MR). This dollar amount is totaled and then divided by the number of waiver recipients to get an estimated average cost. A utilization inflation factor is thereby applied to each subsequent year based on program history and other factors. Medicare Part D recipients who are served in ICF/MRs will be identified through their designated eligibility criteria. All related pharmacy expenditures related to these recipients will be deducted from the total acute Medicaid expenditures before the calculation of the average cost.

Appendix J: Cost Neutrality Demonstration

J-2: Derivation of Estimates (4 of 9)

Component management for waiver services. If the service(s) below includes two or more discrete services that are reimbursed separately, or is a bundled service, each component of the service must be listed. Select "*manage components*" to add these components.

Waiver Services	
Day Habilitation	

Waiver Services	
Habilitation	
Prevocational Services	
Respite	
Support Coordination	
Supported Employment	
Housing Stabilization Service	
Housing Stabilization Transition Service	
Personal Emergency Response System	

Appendix J: Cost Neutrality Demonstration

J-2: Derivation of Estimates (5 of 9)

d. Estimate of Factor D.

i. Non-Concurrent Waiver. Complete the following table for each waiver year. Enter data into the Unit, # Users, Avg. Units Per User, and Avg. Cost/Unit fields for all the Waiver Service/Component items. Select Save and Calculate to automatically calculate and populate the Component Costs and Total Costs fields. All fields in this table must be completed in order to populate the Factor D fields in the J-1 Composite Overview table.

Waiver Year: Year 1

Waiver Service/ Component	Unit	# Users	Avg. Units Per User	Avg. Cost/ Unit	Component Cost	Total Cost
Day Habilitation Total:						**1310839.20**
Day Habilitation	15 minute	180	2452.00	2.97	**1310839.20**	
Habilitation Total:						**400851.36**

Appendix A: Waiver Administration and Operation

Quality Improvement: Administrative Authority of the Single State Medicaid Agency

As a distinct component of the State's quality improvement strategy, provide information in the following fields to detail the State's methods for discovery and remediation.

a. Methods for Discovery: Administrative Authority
The Medicaid Agency retains ultimate administrative authority and responsibility for the operation of the waiver program by exercising oversight of the performance of waiver functions by other state and local/regional non-state agencies (if appropriate) and contracted entities.

i. Performance Measures

For each performance measure the State will use to assess compliance with the statutory assurance, complete the following. Performance measures for administrative authority should not duplicate measures found in other appendices of the waiver application. *As necessary and applicable, performance measures should focus on:*

- Uniformity of development/execution of provider agreements throughout all geographic areas covered by the waiver
- Equitable distribution of waiver openings in all geographic areas covered by the waiver
- Compliance with HCB settings requirements and other new regulatory components (for waiver actions submitted on or after March 17, 2014)

Where possible, include numerator/denominator.

For each performance measure, provide information on the aggregated data that will enable the State to analyze and assess progress toward the performance measure. In this section provide information on the method by which each source of data is analyzed statistically/deductively or inductively, how themes are identified or conclusions drawn, and how recommendations are formulated, where appropriate.

Performance Measure:
A.a.i.1 Number and percentage of performance measure reports which were received on time and complete with operating agency analysis and remediation activities. Percentage = Number of performance measure reports which were received on time and complete with operating agency analysis and remediation activities / Total number of performance measure reports due

Data Source (Select one):
Reports to State Medicaid Agency on delegated Administrative functions
If 'Other' is selected, specify:

Responsible Party for data collection/generation *(check each that applies):*	**Frequency of data collection/generation** *(check each that applies):*	**Sampling Approach***(check each that applies):*
☑ **State Medicaid Agency**	☐ **Weekly**	☑ **100% Review**
☑ **Operating Agency**	☐ **Monthly**	☐ **Less than 100% Review**
☐ **Sub-State Entity**	☑ **Quarterly**	☐ **Representative Sample** Confidence Interval =

Data Source (Select one):
Analyzed collected data (including surveys, focus group, interviews, etc)
If 'Other' is selected, specify:

Responsible Party for data collection/generation *(check each that applies):*	**Frequency of data collection/generation** *(check each that applies):*	**Sampling Approach** *(check each that applies):*
☐ **State Medicaid Agency**	☐ **Weekly**	☐ **100% Review**
☑ **Operating Agency**	☐ **Monthly**	☑ **Less than 100% Review**
☐ **Sub-State Entity**	☐ **Quarterly**	☑ **Representative Sample** Confidence Interval = 95% +/- 5%
☐ **Other** Specify:	☑ **Annually**	☐ **Stratified** Describe Group:
	☐ **Continuously and Ongoing**	☐ **Other** Specify:
	☐ **Other** Specify:	

Data Aggregation and Analysis:

Responsible Party for data aggregation and analysis *(check each that applies):*	**Frequency of data aggregation and analysis***(check each that applies):*
☐ **State Medicaid Agency**	☐ **Weekly**
☑ **Operating Agency**	☐ **Monthly**
☐ **Sub-State Entity**	☐ **Quarterly**
☐ **Other** Specify:	☑ **Annually**
	☐ **Continuously and Ongoing**
	☐ **Other** Specify:

Responsible Party for data aggregation and analysis *(check each that applies):*	Frequency of data aggregation and analysis*(check each that applies):*

Performance Measure:
D.a.i.a.2. Number and percentage of plans of care in which services and supports align with the participant's assessed risk. Percentage = Number of plans of care that meet the assessed risks of waiver participants / Total number of plans of care reviewed in the sample.

Data Source (Select one):
Analyzed collected data (including surveys, focus group, interviews, etc)
If 'Other' is selected, specify:

Responsible Party for data collection/generation *(check each that applies):*	Frequency of data collection/generation *(check each that applies):*	Sampling Approach *(check each that applies):*
☐ State Medicaid Agency	☐ Weekly	☐ 100% Review
☑ Operating Agency	☐ Monthly	☑ Less than 100% Review
☐ Sub-State Entity	☐ Quarterly	☑ Representative Sample Confidence Interval = 95% +/- 5%
☐ Other Specify:	☑ Annually	☐ Stratified Describe Group:
	☐ Continuously and Ongoing	☐ Other Specify:
	☐ Other Specify:	

Data Aggregation and Analysis:

Responsible Party for data aggregation and analysis *(check each that applies):*	Frequency of data aggregation and analysis*(check each that applies):*
☐ State Medicaid Agency	☐ Weekly
☑ Operating Agency	☐ Monthly
☐ Sub-State Entity	☐ Quarterly
☐ Other	☑ Annually

Responsible Party for data aggregation and analysis *(check each that applies):*	Frequency of data aggregation and analysis*(check each that applies):*
Specify:	
	☐ **Continuously and Ongoing**
	☐ **Other** Specify:

Performance Measure:
D.a.i.a.3. Number and percentage of plans of care that address participants' personal goals. Percentage = Number of plans of care that address participants' personal goals / Total number of plans of care reviewed in the sample.

Data Source (Select one):
Analyzed collected data (including surveys, focus group, interviews, etc)
If 'Other' is selected, specify:

Responsible Party for data collection/generation *(check each that applies):*	Frequency of data collection/generation *(check each that applies):*	Sampling Approach *(check each that applies):*
☐ **State Medicaid Agency**	☐ **Weekly**	☐ **100% Review**
☑ **Operating Agency**	☐ **Monthly**	☑ **Less than 100% Review**
☐ **Sub-State Entity**	☐ **Quarterly**	☑ **Representative Sample** Confidence Interval = 95% +/- 5%
☐ **Other** Specify:	☑ **Annually**	☐ **Stratified** Describe Group:
	☐ **Continuously and Ongoing**	☐ **Other** Specify:
	☐ **Other** Specify:	

Data Aggregation and Analysis:

Responsible Party for data aggregation and analysis *(check each that applies):*	Frequency of data aggregation and analysis*(check each that applies):*
☐ State Medicaid Agency	☐ Weekly
☑ Operating Agency	☐ Monthly
☐ Sub-State Entity	☐ Quarterly
☐ Other Specify:	☑ Annually
	☐ Continuously and Ongoing
	☐ Other Specify:

b. ***Sub-assurance: The State monitors service plan development in accordance with its policies and procedures.***

Performance Measures

For each performance measure the State will use to assess compliance with the statutory assurance (or sub-assurance), complete the following. Where possible, include numerator/denominator.

For each performance measure, provide information on the aggregated data that will enable the State to analyze and assess progress toward the performance measure. In this section provide information on the method by which each source of data is analyzed statistically/deductively or inductively, how themes are identified or conclusions drawn, and how recommendations are formulated, where appropriate.

c. ***Sub-assurance: Service plans are updated/revised at least annually or when warranted by changes in the waiver participant's needs.***

Performance Measures

For each performance measure the State will use to assess compliance with the statutory assurance (or sub-assurance), complete the following. Where possible, include numerator/denominator.

For each performance measure, provide information on the aggregated data that will enable the State to analyze and assess progress toward the performance measure. In this section provide information on the method by which each source of data is analyzed statistically/deductively or inductively, how themes are identified or conclusions drawn, and how recommendations are formulated, where appropriate.

Performance Measure:
D.a.i.c.1. Number and percentage of annual plans of care received prior to the expiration date of the approved plan of care. Percentage = Number of annual plans of care received by due date / Total number of plans of care due during reporting period.

Data Source (Select one):

Other
If 'Other' is selected, specify:
Medicaid Data Contractor

Responsible Party for data collection/generation *(check each that applies):*	**Frequency of data collection/generation** *(check each that applies):*	**Sampling Approach** *(check each that applies):*
☐ **State Medicaid Agency**	☐ **Weekly**	☑ **100% Review**
☑ **Operating Agency**	☐ **Monthly**	☐ **Less than 100% Review**
☐ **Sub-State Entity**	☐ **Quarterly**	☐ **Representative Sample** Confidence Interval =
☐ **Other** Specify:	☐ **Annually**	☐ **Stratified** Describe Group:
	☑ **Continuously and Ongoing**	☐ **Other** Specify:
	☐ **Other** Specify:	

Data Aggregation and Analysis:

Responsible Party for data aggregation and analysis *(check each that applies):*	**Frequency of data aggregation and analysis***(check each that applies):*
☐ **State Medicaid Agency**	☐ **Weekly**
☑ **Operating Agency**	☐ **Monthly**
☐ **Sub-State Entity**	☑ **Quarterly**
☑ **Other** Specify: Medicaid Data Contractor	☐ **Annually**
	☐ **Continuously and Ongoing**
	☐ **Other** Specify:

Responsible Party for data aggregation and analysis *(check each that applies):*	**Frequency of data aggregation and analysis***(check each that applies):*

Performance Measure:
D.a.i.c.2 Number and percentage of participants whose plans of care were reviewed and revised to address changing needs. Number of plans of care revised to address changing needs/total number of participants whose quarterly contact indicated a changing need.

Data Source (Select one):
Analyzed collected data (including surveys, focus group, interviews, etc)
If 'Other' is selected, specify:

Responsible Party for data collection/generation *(check each that applies):*	**Frequency of data collection/generation** *(check each that applies):*	**Sampling Approach** *(check each that applies):*
☐ **State Medicaid Agency**	☐	