Comparison of Different Staff Approaches to Completing DDS Assessment Tool (SIS)
DRAFT V1 1.8.2019

Purpose:
The table below compares different approaches to completing assessments that inform funding for DDS HCBS services. This comparison assumes that the assessment instrument will be the SIS with supplemental questions. This comparison does not directly address the development of a person-centered plan.

Criteria:
The table below uses criteria that were initially generated at a meeting of DAIL staff. The criteria and the table merit further review by a broader group of stakeholders.

Ratings:
Ratings reflect the content of each assessment approach related to the stated criteria. The ratings do not directly address the needs assessment tool itself, or a resource allocation process that may be developed to use the assessment information.

Rating key:
0 – does not meet criteria
1 – somewhat meets criteria
2 – mostly meets criteria
3 – completely meets the criteria

DRAFT

Criteria	DA/SSA provider staff	DAIL staff	Contractors (RFP)	Other state staff	ACO staff
Objective; reduces unnecessary subjectivity					
Supports consistent/equitable determination of level of need/support					
Conflict of interest: reduces conflict of interest, complies with CMS conflict-free case management requirements					
Approach is used by other states					
Allows for viewpoints from multiple people vs. single viewpoint					
Allows for individualization (person-centered)					
Person's team members can participate in assessment					
Assessor has prior knowledge of the assesse and/or assessment has the potential to be influenced by assessor's knowledge/perception of person					
Ease of coordination with the intake/eligibility process					
Single point of accountability					
Ability to conduct assessment in a consistent timely manner					
Ability to maintain a well-trained assessors					
Ease of supervision and training of the program					
Ability to maintain consistency across assessors					
Validity and reliability enhanced by limited number of assessors					
Technical Assistance needs reduced by limited number of assessors					
Cost of licenses (fewer assessors = lower costs)					
Cost of fees (each assessment has a fee)					
Costs of initial 'ramp-up' of assessors (fewer assessors = lower costs)					
Costs of ongoing assessments, first three years (90/10 for state only, possibly)					
Costs of ongoing assessment, beyond three years (local agency medicaid service rate vs. state rate TBD)					
Approach is similar to current approach, ie easier transition					
Potential incentive to overstate needs					
Potential incentive to understate needs					
Total					

DRAFT

DA/SSA staff

😊 Pros	Cons ☹

DAIL staff

😊 Pros	Cons ☹

Contractors

😊 Pros	Cons ☹

Other Comments/Questions:

DRAFT

DRAFT