

AGENDA

DS Payment Model Work Group

DATE: MAY 6, 2019

TIME AND LOCATION: 2:30 PM – 4:00 PM; AHS-WSOC CHERRY B (IN SALLY FOX AREA)

WORK GROUP MEMBERS:

DVHA: Donna Hatcher, Pat Jones, Alicia Cooper; Nicole DiStasio, Erin Flynn, Jenney Samuelson,

DAIL: Clare McFadden, Jennifer Perkins, Camille George, Bard Hill, Jim Euber; Jennifer Perkins

Policy Unit: Ashley Berliner

Vermont Care Partners: Lynne Cleveland Vitzthum

Northeast Kingdom Human Services: Denis Houle, Deb Cogan

Rutland Mental Health Services Community Care Network: Ellen Malone

Howard Center: Carrie Hathaway

ARIS: Jason Richardson

Family members / individuals: Stephen Rauh; Christian Wellhoff

2:30 – 2:40	WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, OBJECTIVES OF MEETING	DONNA, ALL
-------------	---	------------

Meeting Objectives:

1. Establish our position within the timeline
2. Review / clarify take-aways from April 25 meeting
3. Compare models against criteria
4. Capture insights for ways to measure achievement of criteria
5. Document team decisions / feedback

Inform

Discuss

Decide

Materials: Refer to “Required Elements of Any Payment Model”; and “Comparison of Payment Model Options”

2:40 – 3:10	POSITION WITHIN TIMELINE AND TAKE-AWAYS	ALL
-------------	---	-----

Description: Payment model development must primarily consider level of complexity for reaching final model determination. Take-aways from past meetings surfaced key areas of interest for the work group which require clarification and group understanding. Key areas include but are not limited to: better understanding of tiered model, meaning / application of “caps, distinction between supports budget and needs assessment and service planning.

Inform

Discuss

Decide

Decision Points: Determine if any conclusions from past meetings require further clarification or modification.

3:10 – 3:30

REVIEW MODELS AGAINST THE CRITERION OF **ECONOMICAL**

ALL

Description: Market costs would be needed to understand level of alignment; market costs would require documentation of services delivered. Do payment models support efficiency by *aligning with market costs* so that payments are neither too high nor too low? How can estimated averages help support a goal of “economical”? Are there ways to measure?

Inform

Discuss

Decide

Decision Points: Confirm take-aways and input of team scoring

3:30 – 4:50

REVIEW MODELS AGAINST THE CRITERION OF **QUALITY**

ALL

Description: Do payment models support and reward the achievement of defined outcomes? This criterion is required by the federal government. Defined outcomes should be supported and rewarded but are difficult to define in the HCBS world.

Inform

Discuss

Decide

Decision Points: Should we work on potential desired outcomes later in the process? Confirm take-aways and input of team scoring

As time
permits

REVIEW MODELS AGAINST THE CRITERION OF **SUFFICIENT**

Description: Are there any differences amongst the models in the level they attain sufficiency? Does each model example offer a similar level of support for provider networks in their efforts to ensure adequate access to services? If there are differences, are the differences due to the model type or simply possibilities which might exist regardless of the model?

Decision Points: Confirm input of team scoring and considerations for future planning insights.

3:50 – 4:00

WRAP-UP & NEXT STEPS

ALL

Description: Summarize action items and next steps.

Inform

Decision Points: Determine time frame to fully review criteria for payment model options; explore potential additional areas where greater clarification or understanding is needed.

Discuss

Decide

Next Meeting: May 24, 9:30-11:00, Oak Conference Room in Sally
Fox area

MEETING SUMMARY/ACTION STEPS: