


2009 Community Practice Review Northeast Region Findings

Northeast Review (Early Bird and On-site)
held October 19-30, 2009




Class Members: 41

Number in Sample: 17 (41%)


**3 Independent Case Management Agencies
in Sample, also NERO for SMEM**

Visions	11 in sample
NMBHI	2 in sample
Keetoni	2 in sample
NERO/SMEM	2 in sample



Day and Residential Agencies in sample:

	Day	Residential
AWS	4	4
SMEM	4	4
R-Way		2
Las Cumbres	1	
Taos County Arc	2	1
Family Options	1	1
CDD	2	2
People Centered	1	
Northern NM Quality	1	2
Phame	1	
Expressions of Life		1



Class Members with Immediate or Special Needs

Two individuals were found to have Special Attention Needs
12 % of sample

Issues were identified that may, if not addressed, effect the person's health, safety and/or welfare.


Two individuals were found to need immediate attention
12% of sample

Individuals for whom health, safety, environment and/or abuse or neglect issues were identified during the review.)

In 2007 and in 2008, no one was found to need Immediate Attention; one person each year required Special Attention. There were 17 people in the 2007 sample/16 in the 2008 sample.

In 2006, no one reviewed was found to need Immediate Attention;
two people (12%) required Special Attention.

In 2005, one person (6%) needed Immediate Attention, and
six people (35%) required Special Attention.




Identified Indicators of Good Practice

People are active in their communities and have roles/memberships

- ❑ Twelve people attend church.
- ❑ Nine people frequent the library.
- ❑ Three people are regulars at the Bowling Alley and four people are swimmers and frequent the pool.
- ❑ Two people are part of Special Olympics.


All people in the sample had an identified membership/community role (see this and the next slide). One person had one, two had two, four had three, eight had four, and two people had five memberships/roles.



Identified Indicators of Good Practice

People are active in their communities and have roles/memberships

- ❑ Seven people are volunteers – at soup kitchens, Senior Center, animal shelters and local hospital.
- ❑ Seven people are active parts of their communities through the Fraternal Order of Police, coffee clubs, ceramic and art classes and the American Legion
- ❑ Twelve people are regulars at their local recreation/community centers.
- ❑ Three people are known and active on the pueblo.




Some people are part of and integrated into their communities

- ❑ Fifteen people have adequate access to and use of generic services and natural supports.
- ❑ Fourteen people were seen as adequately integrated into the community.


Some people have friends

- ❑ Eleven people have non-paid friends with whom they interact in the community and visit regularly.




Some people benefit from long term, caring and respectful staff

- ❑ Four people have residential staff that have been with them for at least five years.
- ❑ Two people have day staff that have been with them for at least five years, one for eleven years!
- ❑ Four people have case managers that have been with them for over five years, one for fourteen years!
- ❑ Sixteen people have case managers who thoroughly “know” them and can describe their preferences, wants and needs.




Some people have proactive advocates Case Manager/Guardian

- Ten people were identified as having actively involved guardians. (Seen at least 3 times a month)
- Sixteen people have case managers who are adequately available to them.
- Fifteen people have case managers who fully understand their role/job.



Some people have shown evidence of progress


- ❑ Eleven people are going more places or interacting or participating more in the community.
- ❑ Three people have shown a decrease in identified behaviors.
- ❑ Eight people have increased their communication skills.
- ❑ Six people have increased their choice making.
- ❑ Nine people are becoming more independent in their homes and with their personal skills: preparing snacks, cleaning, laundry, self-care and writing!
- ❑ Four people have improved mobility/physical abilities.



2009 Community Practice Review
Northeast Region
Identified Indicators of Good Practice

Some people have the technology and devices they need


- 111 assistive technology and adaptive equipment devices are needed by the individuals in the sample; 100 are in good repair, available, and used when needed. (91%).**



Findings by Area

A. Expectations for Growth and Quality of Life


Question	2004 (sample=16)	2005 (sample=17)	2006 (sample=17)	2007 (sample=17)	2008 (sample=16)	2009 (sample=17)
31. Does the case manager have an appropriate expectation of growth for this person?	56% Yes (9) 38% Partial (6) 6% No (1)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)	65% Yes (11) 35% Partial (6)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)	75% Yes (12) 25% Partial (4)	76% Yes (13) 24% Partial (4)
42. Does the [day services] direct service staff have an appropriate expectation of growth for this person?	75% Yes (12) 25% Partial (4)	82% Yes (14) 18% Partial (3)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)	82% Yes (14) 6% Partial (1) 12% No (2)	69% Yes (11) 25% Partial (4) 6% No (1)	82% Yes (14) 12% Partial (2) 6% No (1)
52. Does the residential direct service staff have an appropriate expectation of growth for this person?	63% Yes (10) 38% Partial (6)	65% Yes (11) 35% Partial (6)	76% Yes (13) 24% Partial (4)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)	75% Yes (12) 19% Partial (3) 6% No (1)	76% Yes (13) 24% Partial (4)
84. Based on all of the evidence, in the opinion of the reviewer, has the person achieved progress in the past year?	67% Yes (10) 33% Partial (5) (1 CND)	82% Yes (14) 18% Partial (3)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)	88% Yes (15) 12% Partial (2)	75% Yes (12) 25% Partial (4)	65% Yes (11) 35% Partial (6)
85. Overall, does the IDT have an appropriate expectation of growth for this person?	56% Yes (9) 44% Partial (7)	53% Yes (9) 47% Partial (8)	41% Yes (7) 59% Partial (10)	53% Yes (9) 47% Partial (8)	69% Yes (11) 31% Partial (5)	53% Yes (9) 47% Partial (8)
86. Was the person provided the assistance and support needed to participate meaningfully in the planning process?	80% Yes (12) 20% Partial (3) (1 CND)	88% Yes (14) 12% Partial (2) (1 CND)	94% Yes (16) 6% Partial (1)	80% Yes (12) 20% Partial (3) (2 CND)	94% Yes (15) 6% Partial (1)	88% Yes (15) 12% Partial (2)
87. Is the person offered a range of opportunities for participation in each of the life areas?	43% Yes (6) 57% Partial (8) (2 CND)	50% Yes (8) 50% Partial (8) (1 CND)	82% Yes (14) 18% Partial (3)	73% Yes (11) 27% Partial (4) (2 CND)	62% Yes (8) 38% Partial (5) (3 CND)	81% Yes (13) 13% Partial (2) 6% No (1) (1 CND)



2009 Community Practice Review Northeast Region Findings by Area

A. Expectations for Growth and Quality of Life (cont'd)


Question	2004 (sample=16)	2005 (sample=17)	2006 (sample=17)	2007 (sample=17)	2008 (sample=16)	2009 (sample=17)
88. Does the person have the opportunity to make informed choices?	78% Yes (7) 22% Partial (2) (7 CND)	78% Yes (7) 22% Partial (2) (8 CND)	50% Yes (4) 50% Partial (4) (9 CND)	100% Yes (4) (13 CND)	60% Yes (6) 40% Partial (4) (6 CND)	67% Yes (8) 33% Partial (4) (5 CND)
89. About where and with whom to live?	63% Yes (5) 25% Partial (2) 12% No (1) (8 CND)	100% Yes (8) (9 CND)	50% Yes (4) 38% Partial (3) 13% No (1) (9 CND)	100% Yes (6) (11 CND)	63% Yes (5) 25% Partial (2) 13% No (1) (8 CND)	75% Yes (6) 25% Partial (2) (9 CND)
90. About where and with whom to work/spend his/her day?	56% Yes (5) 33% Partial (3) 11% No (1) (7 CND)	78% Yes (7) 22% Partial (2) (8 CND)	67% Yes (6) 33% Partial (3) (8 CND)	100% Yes (4) (13 CND)	60% Yes (6) 40% Partial (4) (6 CND)	73% Yes (8) 27% Partial (3) (6 CND)
91. About where and with whom to socialize/spend leisure time?	56% Yes (5) 44% Partial (4) (7 CND)	100% Yes (11) (6 CND)	70% Yes (7) 30% Partial (3) (7 CND)	100% Yes (4) (13 CND)	56% Yes (5) 44% Partial (4) (7 CND)	75% Yes (9) 25% Partial (3) (5 CND)
92. Does the evidence support that providers do not prevent the person from pursuing relationships and are respecting the rights of this person?	87% Yes (13) 13% Partial (2) (1 CND)	100% Yes (16) (1 CND)	94% Yes (16) 6% Partial (1)	100% Yes (17)	88% Yes (14) 13% Partial (2)	100% Yes (17)
93. Overall, were the direct service staff interviewed trained on the provider's complaint process and on abuse, neglect and exploitation?	19% Yes (3) 75% Partial (12) 6% Partial (1)	18% Yes (3) 76% Partial (13) 6% No (1)	65% Yes (11) 35% Partial (6)	53% Yes (9) 47% Partial (8)	56% Yes (9) 44% Partial (7)	76% Yes (13) 24% Partial (4)
94. Does this person and/or guardian have adequate access to the available complaint processes/procedures?	69% Yes (9) 31% Partial (4) (3 CND)	73% Yes (11) 20% Partial (3) 7% No (1) (2 CND)	94% Yes (16) 6% Partial (1)	100% Yes (17)	93% Yes (14) 7% Partial (1) (1 CND)	88% Yes (15) 6% Partial (1) 6% No (1)



2009 Community Practice Review Northeast Region Findings by Area

A. Expectations for Growth and Quality of Life (cont'd)


Question	2004 (sample=16)	2005 (sample=17)	2006 (sample=17)	2007 (sample=17)	2008 (sample=16)	2009 (sample=17)
95. Does this person know his/her guardian?	100% Yes (3) (2 N/A, 11 CND)	100% Yes (12) (5 CND)	100% Yes (10) (7 CND)	100% Yes (8) (9 CND)	88% Yes (7) 13% No (1) (8 CND)	100% Yes (8) (9 CND)
96. Does this person believe the guardian is helpful?	100% Yes (1) (1 N/A, 14 CND)	50% Yes (2) 50% No (2) (13 CND)	100% Yes (3) (14 CND)	100% Yes (3) (14 CND)	100% Yes (2) (14 CND)	100% Yes (2) (15 CND)
97. What is the level of participation of the legal guardian in this person's life and service planning?	63% Active (10) 31% Moderate (5) 6% Limited (1)	53% Active (9) 35% Moderate (6) 12% Limited (2)	71% Active (12) 29% Moderate (5)	59% Active (10) 29% Moderate (5) 12% Limited (2)	63% Active (10) 25% Moderate (4) 6% Limited (1) 6% None (1)	59% Active (10) 41% Moderate (7)
98. In the Reviewer's opinion, does the person need a friend advocate?	6% Yes (1) 94% No (15)	6% Yes (1) 94% No (16)	6% Yes (1) 94% No (16)	12% Yes (2) 88% No (15)	6% Yes (1) 94% No (15)	6% Yes (1) 94% No (16)
99. Does the person have a friend advocate?	33% Yes (1) 67% No (2) (13 N/A)	100% No (1) (16 N/A)	100% Yes (1) (16 N/A)	0% Yes 100% No (2) (15 N/A)	0% Yes 100% No (1) (15 N/A)	0% Yes 100% No (1) (16 N/A)
100. If the person is retired, does he/she have adequate opportunities to engage in activities of interest during the day?	25% Yes (1) 50% Partial (2) 25% No (1) (12 N/A)	67% Yes (4) 33% Partial (2) (11 N/A)	100% Yes (2) (15 N/A)	(16 N/A) (1 CND)	67% Yes (4) 33% Partial (2) (9 N/A) (1 CND)	100% Yes (7) (10 N/A)



2009 Community Practice Review Northeast Region Findings by Area

A. Expectations for Growth and Quality of Life (cont'd)

Question	2004 (sample=16)	2005 (sample=17)	2006 (sample=17)	2007 (sample=17)	2008 (sample=16)	2009 (sample=17)
101. Does the person have daily choices/appropriate autonomy over his/her life?	56% Yes (9) 44% Partial (7)	88% Yes (15) 12% Partial (2)	59% Yes (10) 35% Partial (6) 6% No (1)	82% Yes (14) 18% Partial (3)	75% Yes (12) 25% Partial (4)	82% Yes (14) 18% Partial (3)
102. Have the person's cultural preferences been accommodated?	100% Yes (14) (2 CND)	100% Yes (15) (2 CND)	94% Yes (16) 6% Partial (1)	94% Yes (16) 6% Partial (1)	94% Yes (15) 6% Partial (1)	100% Yes (17)
103. Is the person treated with dignity and respect?	56% Yes (9) 44% Partial (7)	82% Yes (14) 18% Partial (3)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)	65% Yes (11) 35% Partial (6)	88% Yes (14) 13% Partial (2)	65% Yes (11) 35% Partial (6)



A. Expectations for Growth and Quality of Life

Noteworthy Practice


- **15 of 17 individuals (88%) were provided the support needed to participate meaningfully in the planning process. (94% in 2008, 80% in 2007, 94% in 2006, 88% in 2005, 80% in 2004)**
- **100% of individuals (17 of 17) have providers that do not prevent them from pursuing relationships and are respecting their rights. (88% in 2008, 100% in 2007, 94% in 2006; 100% in 2005, 87% in 2004)**
- **15 of 17 individuals (88%) and/or their guardians have adequate access to the available complaint process/procedures. (93% in 2008, 100% in 2007, 94% in 2006, 73% in 2005, 69% in 2004)**



2009 Community Practice Review Northeast Region Findings by Area

B. Satisfaction


Question	2004 (sample=16)	2005 (sample=17)	2006 (sample=17)	2007 (sample=17)	2008 (sample=16)	2009 (sample=17)
104. Overall, is the person satisfied with the current services?	43% Yes (3) 57% Partial (4) (9 CND)	83% Yes (5) 17% Partial (1) (11 CND)	100% Yes (7) (10 CND)	100% Yes (2) (15 CND)	100% Yes (3) (13 CND)	100% Yes (9) (8 CND)
105. Does the person get along with the case manager?	100% Yes (2) (14 CND)	100% Yes (6) (11 CND)	100% Yes (3) (14 CND)	100% Yes (3) (14 CND)	100% Yes (2) (14 CND)	100% Yes (2) (15 CND)
106. Does the person find the case manager helpful?	100% Yes (1) (15 CND)	100% Yes (2) (15 CND)	100% Yes (1) (16 CND)	100% Yes (1) (16 CND)	100% Yes (2) (14 CND)	100% Yes (2) (15 CND)
107. Does the legal guardian find the case manager helpful?	85% Yes (11) 15% Partial (2) (3 CND)	93% Yes (13) 7% Partial (1) (3 CND)	86% Yes (12) 7% Partial (1) 7% No (1) (3 CND)	100% Yes (15) (2 CND)	100% Yes (12) (4 CND)	100% Yes (16) (1 CND)
108. Does the person have adequate food and drink available?	100% Yes (15) (1 CND)	100% Yes (13) (4 CND)	100% Yes (17)	100% Yes (13) (4 CND)	100% Yes (14) (2 CND)	100% Yes (13) (4 CND)
109. Does the person have adequate transportation to meet his/her needs?	94% Yes (15) 6% Partial (1)	94% Yes (16) 6% Partial (1)	94% Yes (16) 6% Partial (1)	100% Yes (17)	100% Yes (15) (1 CND)	65% Yes (11) 29% Partial (5) 6% No (1)
110. Does the person have sufficient personal money?	87% Yes (13) 13% Partial (2) (1 CND)	100% Yes (15) (2 CND)	100% Yes (16) (1 CND)	94% Yes (15) 6% Partial (1) (1 CND)	100% Yes (15) (1 CND)	93% Yes (14) 7% Partial (1) (2 CND)
111. Does the person get along with their day program/employment staff?	92% Yes (12) 8% Partial (1) (3 CND)	100% Yes (13) (4 CND)	100% Yes (13) (4 CND)	100% Yes (10) (7 CND)	100% Yes (12) (4 CND)	100% Yes (11) (1 N/A, 5 CND)
112. Does the person get along with the residential provider staff?	100% Yes (13) (1 N/A, 2 CND)	100% Yes (15) (2 CND)	94% Yes (15) 6% Partial (1) (1 CND)	100% Yes (12) (5 CND)	100% Yes (15) (1 CND)	100% Yes (13) (4 CND)



B. Satisfaction

Noteworthy Practice


- **13 of 13 individuals (100%, 4 CND) had adequate food and drink available. (100% in 2008, 2007, 2006, 2005, and 2004)**
- **Of the class members for whom a determination could be made:**
 - **100% of guardians found the case manager helpful. (1 CND)**
 - **100% got along with their day/employment staff. (1 N/A, 5 CND)**
 - **100% got along with their residential staff. (4 CND)**



2009 Community Practice Review Northeast Region Findings by Area

C. Assessments

Question	2004 (sample=16)	2005 (sample=17)	2006 (sample=17)	2007 (sample=17)	2008 (sample=16)	2009 (sample=17)
57. Did the team consider what assessments the person needs and would be relevant to the team's planning efforts?	50% Yes (8) 50% Partial (8)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)	53% Yes (9) 47% Partial (8)	65% Yes (11) 35% Partial (6)	75% Yes (12) 25% Partial (4)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)
58. Did the team arrange for and obtain the needed, relevant assessments?	19% Yes (3) 81% Partial (13)	35% Yes (6) 65% Partial (11)	29% Yes (5) 71% Partial (12)	59% Yes (10) 35% Partial (6) 6% No (1)	44% Yes (7) 56% Partial (9)	59% Yes (10) 41% Partial (7)
59. Are the assessments adequate for planning?	19% Yes (3) 81% Partial (13)	59% Yes (10) 41% Partial (7)	59% Yes (10) 41% Partial (7)	35% Yes (6) 65% Partial (11)	81% Yes (13) 19% Partial (3)	82% Yes (14) 18% Partial (3)
60. Were the recommendations from assessments used in planning?	25% Yes (4) 75% Partial (12)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)	47% Yes (8) 53% Partial (9)	47% Yes (8) 47% Partial (8) 6% No (1)	50% Yes (8) 50% Partial (8)	65% Yes (11) 35% Partial (6)




C. Assessments

Noteworthy Practice

- **82% of assessments (14 of 17) were adequate for planning.** (81% in 2008, 35% in 2007, 59% in 2006 and 2005, 19% in 2004)

Practice Improvements


- **71% of teams (12 of 17) considered what assessments the person needs and would be relevant to the team's planning efforts.** (75% in 2008, 65% in 2007, 53% in 2006, 71% in 2005, 50% in 2004)
- **59% of teams (10 of 17) adequately arrange for and obtain the needed, relevant assessments.** (44% in 2008, 59% in 2007, 29% in 2006, 35% in 2005, and 19% in 2004)
- **65% of individuals (11 of 17) had recommendations from assessments that were adequately used in planning.** (50% in 2008, 47% in 2007 and 2006, 71% in 2005, 25% in 2004)



2009 Community Practice Review Northeast Region Findings by Area

D. Adequacy of Planning and Adequacy of Services


Question	2004 (sample=16)	2005 (sample=17)	2006 (sample=17)	2007 (sample=17)	2008 (sample=16)	2009 (sample=17)
61. Is there a document called an Individual Service Plan (ISP) that was developed within the last year?	100% Yes (16)	100% Yes (17)	100% Yes (17)	100% Yes (17)	100% Yes (16)	100% Yes (17)
62. Was the ISP developed by an appropriately constituted IDT?	44% Yes (7) 56% Partial (9)	41% Yes (7) 59% Partial (10)	53% Yes (9) 47% Partial (8)	47% Yes (8) 53% Partial (9)	50% Yes (8) 50% Partial (8)	82% Yes (14) 18% Partial (3)
63. For any team members not physically present at the IDT meeting, is there evidence of their participation in the development of the ISP?	40% Yes (4) 50% Partial (5) 10% No (1) (6 N/A)	33% Yes (4) 33% Partial (4) 33% No (4) (5 N/A)	58% Yes (7) 33% Partial (4) 6% No (1) (5 N/A)	20% Yes (2) 60% Partial (6) 20% No (2) (7 N/A)	27% Yes (3) 45% Partial (5) 27% No (3) (5 N/A)	67% Yes (6) 22% Partial (2) 11% No (1) (8 N/A)
64. Overall, is the long-term vision adequate?	19% Yes (3) 69% Partial (11) 13% No (2)	59% Yes (10) 41% Partial (7)	41% Yes (7) 59% Partial (10)	53% Yes (9) 47% Partial (8)	50% Yes (8) 50% Partial (8)	76% Yes (13) 24% Partial (4)
65*. Overall, does the Narrative and/or Progress Towards Reaching the Long-Term Vision Section of the ISP give adequate guidance to achieving the person's long-term vision?	38% Yes (6) 44% Partial (7) 19% No (3)	65% Yes (11) 35% Partial (6)	65% Yes (11) 35% Partial (6)	29% Yes (5) 65% Partial (11) 6% No (1)	81% Yes (13) 19% Partial (3)	88% Yes (15) 12% Partial (2)
66*. Overall, is Vision Section of the ISP used as the basis for outcome development?	19% Yes (3) 56% Partial (9) 25% No (4)	71% Yes (12) 24% Partial (4) 6% No (1)	59% Yes (10) 24% Partial (4) 18% No (3)	53% Yes (9) 47% Partial (8)	88% Yes (14) 13% Partial (2)	82% Yes (14) 18% Partial (3)
67*. Overall, do the outcomes in the ISP include criteria by which the team can determine when the outcome (s) have been achieved?	19% Yes (3) 25% Partial (4) 56% No (9)	53% Yes (9) 29% Partial (5) 18% No (3)	47% Yes (8) 35% Partial (6) 18% No (3)	47% Yes (8) 53% Partial (9)	38% Yes (6) 63% Partial (10)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)



2009 Community Practice Review Northeast Region Findings by Area

D. Adequacy of Planning and Adequacy of Services (cont'd)


Question	2004 (sample=16)	2005 (sample=17)	2006 (sample=17)	2007 (sample=17)	2008 (sample=16)	2009 (sample=17)
68*. Overall, are the ISP outcomes related to achieving the person's long-term vision?	25% Yes (4) 50% Partial (8) 25% No (4)	76% Yes (13) 24% Partial (4)	59% Yes (10) 35% Partial (6) 6% No (1)	53% Yes (9) 47% Partial (8)	88% Yes (14) 13% Partial (2)	82% Yes (14) 18% Partial (3)
69*. Overall, do the ISP outcomes address the person's major needs?	31% Yes (5) 56% Partial (9) 13% No (2)	59% Yes (10) 41% Partial (7)	47% Yes (8) 53% Partial (9)	41% Yes (7) 59% Partial (10)	44% Yes (7) 50% Partial (8) 6% No (1)	65% Yes (11) 35% Partial (6)
70*. Overall, are the Action Plans specific and relevant to assisting the person in achieving his/her outcomes?	13% Yes (2) 50% Partial (8) 38% No (6)	41% Yes (7) 41% Partial (7) 18% No (3)	71% Yes (12) 24% Partial (4) 6% No (1)	41% Yes (7) 53% Partial (9) 6% No (1)	44% Yes (7) 56% Partial (9)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)
71*. Overall, are the Teaching and Support strategies sufficient to ensure consistent implementation of the services provided?	13% Yes (2) 63% Partial (10) 25% No (4)	65% Yes (11) 29% Partial (5) 6% No (1)	41% Yes (7) 47% Partial (8) 12% No (2)	35% Yes (6) 47% Partial (8) 18% No (3)	56% Yes (9) 25% Partial (4) 19% No (3)	50% Yes (8) 44% Partial (7) 6% No (1) (1 N/A)
72*. Overall, are the recommendations and/or objectives/strategies of ancillary providers integrated into the outcomes, action plans, and Teaching and Support Strategies of the ISP?	13% Yes (2) 50% Partial (8) 38% No (6)	50% Yes (8) 31% Partial (5) 19% No (3) (1 N/A)	31% Yes (5) 56% Partial (9) 13% No (2) (1 N/A)	25% Yes (4) 69% Partial (11) 6% No (1) (1 CND)	31% Yes (5) 44% Partial (7) 25% No (4)	53% Yes (9) 47% Partial (8)
73*. If needed, does the ISP contain a specific Crisis Prevention and Intervention Plan that meets the person's needs?	21% Yes (3) 43% Partial (6) 36% No (5) (2 N/A)	20% Yes (3) 47% Partial (7) 33% No (5) (2 N/A)	33% Yes (5) 53% Partial (8) 13% No (2) (2 N/A)	81% Yes (13) 19% Partial (3) (1 N/A)	64% Yes (9) 21% Partial (3) 14% No (2) (2 N/A)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)



2009 Community Practice Review Northeast Region Findings by Area

D. Adequacy of Planning and Adequacy of Services (cont'd)


Question	2004 (sample=16)	2005 (sample=17)	2006 (sample=17)	2007 (sample=17)	2008 (sample=16)	2009 (sample=17)
74*. Does the ISP contain information regarding primary health (medical) care?	44% Yes (7) 56% Partial (9)	76% Yes (13) 24% Partial (4)	82% Yes (14) 18% Partial (3)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)	94% Yes (15) 6% Partial (1)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)
74a*. Does the ISP face sheet contain contact information for the PCP?				82% Yes (14) 12% Partial (2) 6% No (1)	94% Yes (15) 6% Partial (1)	94% Yes (16) 6% Partial (1)
74b*. Is the Healthcare Coordinator's name and contact information listed in the ISP?				88% Yes (15) 12% Partial (2)	100% Yes (16)	82% Yes (14) 18% No (3)
74c*. Was the ISP (the most current Annual) developed using the new ISP format?				100% Yes (17)	Question not asked	
75. Does the ISP reflect how the person will get to work/day activities, shopping, social activities?	69% Yes (11) 13% Partial (2) 19% No (3)	59% Yes (10) 29% Partial (5) 6% No (1)	88% Yes (15) 12% Partial (2)	59% Yes (10) 29% Partial (5) 12% No (2)	31% Yes (5) 38% Partial (6) 31% No (5)	47% Yes (7) 27% Partial (4) 27% No (4) (2 N/A)
76. Does the ISP reflect how the person will obtain prescribed medications?	38% Yes (6) 38% Partial (6) 25% No (4)	69% Yes (11) 25% Partial (4) 6% No (1) (1 N/A)	53% Yes (9) 29% Partial (5) 18% No (3)	76% Yes (13) 18% Partial (3) 6% No (1)	94% Yes (15) 6% Partial (1)	82% Yes (14) 12% Partial (2) 6% No (1)
77. Does the ISP contain a list of adaptive equipment needed and who will provide it?	50% Yes (6) 50% Partial (6) (4 N/A)	47% Yes (7) 40% Partial (6) 13% No (2) (2 N/A)	46% Yes (6) 31% Partial (4) 23% No (3) (4 N/A)	27% Yes (4) 46% Partial (7) 27% No (4) (2 N/A)	17% Yes (2) 58% Partial (7) 25% No (3) (4 N/A)	46% Yes (6) 38% Partial (5) 15% No (2) (4 N/A)
78. Overall, is the ISP adequate to meet the person's needs?	6% Yes (1) 94% Partial (15)	29% Yes (5) 71% Partial (12)	12% Yes (2) 88% Partial (15)	6% Yes (1) 94% Partial (16)	19% Yes (3) 81% Partial (13)	47% Yes (8) 53% Partial (9)



2009 Community Practice Review Northeast Region Findings by Area

D. Adequacy of Planning and Adequacy of Services (cont'd)


Question	2004 (sample=16)	2005 (sample=17)	2006 (sample=17)	2007 (sample=17)	2008 (sample=16)	2009 (sample=17)
79. If #78 is rated "2", is the ISP being implemented?	100% Yes (1) (15 N/A)	100% Yes (5) (12 N/A)	50% Yes (1) 50% Partial (1) (15 N/A)	100% Yes (1) (16 N/A)	100% Yes (3) (13 N/A)	75% Yes (6) 25% Partial (2) (9 N/A)
80a. If there is no ISP, or if #78 is rated "0" or "1", is the ISP being implemented?	Question added in 2009					78% Yes (7) 22% Partial (2) (8 N/A)
80b. If there is no ISP, or if #78 is rated "0" or "1", are current services adequate to meet the person's needs?	20% Yes (3) 73% Partial (11) 7% No (1) (1 N/A)	25% Yes (3) 75% Partial (9) (5 N/A)	7% Yes (1) 93% Partial (14) (2 N/A)	31% Yes (5) 69% Partial (11) (1 N/A)	46% Yes (6) 54% Partial (7) (3 N/A)	67% Yes (6) 33% Partial (3) (8 N/A)
81. Overall, were the direct service staff trained on the implementation of the ISP?	69% Yes (11) 31% Partial (5)	59% Yes (10) 41% Partial (7)	65% Yes (11) 35% Partial (6)	59% Yes (10) 41% Partial (7)	63% Yes (10) 38% Partial (6)	94% Yes (16) 6% Partial (1)
82. Overall, were the direct service staff able to describe their responsibilities in providing daily care/support to the person?	88% Yes (14) 13% Partial (2)	82% Yes (14) 18% Partial (3)	65% Yes (11) 35% Partial (6)	59% Yes (10) 41% Partial (7)	50% Yes (8) 50% Partial (8)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)
83. Overall, do the progress notes or other documentation in the case management record reflect the status of the goals and services of the key life areas stated in the ISP?	44% Yes (7) 56% Partial (9)	59% Yes (10) 41% Partial (7)	41% Yes (7) 53% Partial (9) 6% No (1)	41% Yes (7) 53% Partial (9) 6% No (1)	44% Yes (7) 56% Partial (9)	59% Yes (10) 41% Partial (7)



D. Adequacy of Planning and Adequacy of Services

Noteworthy Practice


- **14 of 17 people (82%) have an ISP Vision Section used as the basis for outcome development. (88% in 2008, 53% in 2007, 59% in 2006, 71% in 2005, 19% in 2004)**
- **82% of individuals (14 of 17) have ISP outcomes that relate to achieving their long-term vision. (88% in 2008, 53% in 2007, 59% in 2006, 76% in 2005, 25% in 2004)**
- **14 of 17 ISPs (82%) were developed by an appropriately constituted IDT. (50% in 2008, 47% in 2007, 53% in 2006, 41% in 2005, 44% in 2004)**



D. Adequacy of Planning and Adequacy of Services

Practice Improvements


- **76% of ISPs (13 of 17) were found to have adequate long-term visions.** (50% in 2008, 53% in 2007, 41% in 2006, 59% in 2005, 19% in 2004)
- **71% of ISPs (12 of 17) included criteria by which the team could determine when the outcome(s) have been achieved.** (38% in 2008, 47% in 2007 and 2006, 53% in 2005, 19% in 2004)
- **11 of 17 ISPs (65%) had outcomes that addressed the person's major needs.** (44% in 2008, 41% in 2007, 47% in 2006, 59% in 2005, 31% in 2004)



2009 Community Practice Review Northeast Region Findings by Area

E. Individual Service Planning & Summary


Question	2004 (sample=16)	2005 (sample=17)	2006 (sample=17)	2007 (sample=17)	2008 (sample=16)	2009 (sample=17)
141. Does the person have an ISP that addresses living, learning/working and social/leisure that correlates with the person's desire and capabilities, in accordance with DOH regulations?	44% Yes (7) 44% Partial (7) 13% No (2)	82% Yes (14) 18% Partial (3)	59% Yes (10) 41% Partial (7)	82% Yes (14) 18% Partial (3)	81% Yes (13) 19% Partial (3)	100% Yes (17)
142*. Does the person have an ISP that contains a Progress Towards Reaching the Long Term Vision section that is based on a long-term view?	63% Yes (10) 19% Partial (3) 19% No (3)	76% Yes (13) 24% Partial (4)	82% Yes (14) 18% Partial (3)	53% Yes (9) 47% Partial (8)	75% Yes (12) 25% Partial (4)	82% Yes (14) 18% Partial (3)
143. Does the person receive services and supports recommended in the ISP?	50% Yes (8) 44% Partial (7) 6% No (1)	82% Yes (14) 18% Partial (3)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)	65% Yes (11) 35% Partial (6)	75% Yes (12) 25% Partial (4)	82% Yes (14) 18% Partial (3)
144. Does the person have adequate access to and use of generic services and natural supports?	69% Yes (11) 31% Partial (5)	65% Yes (11) 35% Partial (6)	82% Yes (14) 18% Partial (3)	65% Yes (11) 35% Partial (6)	88% Yes (14) 13% Partial (2)	88% Yes (15) 12% Partial (2)
145. Is the person adequately integrated into the community?	19% Yes (3) 69% Partial (11) 13% No (2)	59% Yes (10) 24% Partial (4) 18% No (3)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)	71% Yes (12) 18% Partial (3) 12% No (2)	63% Yes (10) 38% Partial (6)	82% Yes (14) 18% Partial (3)
146. Overall, is the ISP adequate to meet the person's needs?	6% Yes (1) 94% Partial (15)	29% Yes (5) 71% Partial (12)	12% Yes (2) 88% Partial (15)	6% Yes (1) 94% Partial (16)	19% Yes (3) 81% Partial (13)	47% Yes (8) 53% Partial (9)
147. Is the program of the level of intensity adequate to meet this person's needs?	25% Yes (4) 69% Partial (11) 6% No (1)	41% Yes (7) 59% Partial (10)	24% Yes (4) 76% Partial (13)	35% Yes (6) 65% Partial (11)	56% Yes (9) 44% Partial (7)	29% Yes (5) 71% Partial (12)



E. Individual Service Planning

Noteworthy Practice:


- **100% of individuals (17 of 17) have an ISP that addresses all life areas and correlates with their desires and capabilities. (81% in 2008, 82% in 2007, 59% in 2006, 82% in 2005, 44% in 2004)**
- **14 of 17 individuals (82%) have ISPs that have a Vision section based on a long-term view. (75% in 2008, 53% in 2007, 82% in 2006, 76% in 2005, 63% in 2004)**
- **82% of the sample (14 of 17) were receiving services and supports recommended in the ISP. (75% in 2008, 65% in 2007, 71% in 2006; 82% in 2005, 50% in 2004)**
- **88% of the sample (15 of 17) were found to have adequate access to and use of generics services and natural supports. (88% in 2008, 65% in 2007, 82% in 2006, 65% in 2005, 69% in 2004)**




2009 Community Practice Review Northeast Region Findings by Area


E. Individual Service Planning – Historical Scoring

Question	2000	2001	2002	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
141. Does the person have an ISP that includes living, learning/working and social/leisure that correlates to ...	79%	79%	82%	44%	82%	59%	82%	81%	100%
142. Does the person have an ISP that contains a Progress Towards Reaching the Long Term Vision section that is based on a long-term view?	100%	93%	82%	63%	76%	82%	53%	75%	82%
143. Does the person receive services and supports recommended in the ISP?	71%	79%	88%	50%	82%	71%	65%	75%	82%
144. Does the person have adequate access to and use of generic services and natural supports?	57%	79%	88%	69%	65%	82%	65%	88%	88%
145. Is the person adequately integrated into the community?	64%	79%	82%	19%	59%	71%	71%	63%	82%



E. Individual Service Planning – Disengagement






2009 Community Practice Review Northeast Region Findings by Area

F. Team Process


Question	2004 (sample=16)	2005 (sample=17)	2006 (sample=17)	2007 (sample=17)	2008 (sample=16)	2009 (sample=17)
113. Is there evidence that the ISP was reviewed by the IDT within the last six months?	100% Yes (15) (1 N/A)	100% Yes (15) (2 N/A)	94% Yes (15) 6% No (1) (1 N/A)	*question removed as a result of new ISP standards*		
114. Are the individual members of the IDT following up on their responsibilities?	25% Yes (4) 75% Partial (12)	47% Yes (8) 53% Partial (9)	24% Yes (4) 76% Partial (13)	35% Yes (6) 65% Partial (11)	25% Yes (4) 75% Partial (12)	53% Yes (9) 47% Partial (8)
115. If there is evidence of team conflict, has the team made efforts to build consensus?	50% Yes (2) 50% Partial (2) (12 N/A)	80% Yes (4) 20% Partial (1) (12 N/A)	25% Yes (1) 75% Partial (3) (13 N/A)	50% Yes (2) 50% Partial (2) (13 N/A)	50% Yes (2) 50% Partial (2) (12 N/A)	100% Yes (4) (13 N/A)
116. Do records or facts exist to indicate that the team convened meetings as needed due to changed circumstances and/or needs?	67% Yes (10) 33% No (5) (1 N/A)	79% Yes (11) 21% No (3) (3 N/A)	88% Yes (15) 12% No (2)	79% Yes (11) 21% No (3) (2 N/A) (1 CND)	93% Yes (14) 7% No (1) (1 N/A)	100% Yes (16) (1 N/A)
117. Is there adequate communication among team members between meetings to ensure the person's program can be/is being implemented?	69% Yes (11) 31% Partial (5)	76% Yes (13) 24% Partial (4)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)	53% Yes (9) 41% Partial (7) 6% No (1)	88% Yes (14) 13% Partial (2)	100% Yes (17)
118. Do you recommended Team Process Training for this IDT?	6% Yes (1) 94% No (15)	18% Yes (3) 82% No (14)	6% Yes (1) 94% No (16)	6% Yes (1) 94% No (16)	100% No (16)	100% No (17)



2009 Community Practice Review Northeast Region Findings by Area

F. Team Process (continued)


Question	2004 (sample=16)	2005 (sample=17)	2006 (sample=17)	2007 (sample=17)	2008 (sample=16)	2009 (sample=17)
119. Is there evidence or documentation of physical regression in the last year?	19% Yes (3) 81% No (13)	41% Yes (7) 59% No (10)	29% Yes (5) 71% No (12)	25% Yes (4) 75% No (12) (1 CND)	25% Yes (4) 75% No (12)	29% Yes (5) 71% No (12)
120. Is there evidence or documentation of behavioral or functional regression in the last year?	44% Yes (7) 56% No (9)	35% Yes (6) 65% No (11)	18% Yes (3) 82% No (14)	18% Yes (3) 82% No (14)	19% Yes (3) 81% No (13)	18% Yes (3) 82% No (14)
121. If #119 or 120 is Yes, is the IDT adequately addressing the regression?	25% Yes (2) 75% Partial (6) (8 N/A)	60% Yes (6) 40% Partial (4) (7 N/A)	33% Yes (2) 50% Partial (3) 17% No (1) (11 N/A)	83% Yes (5) 17% Partial (1) (11 N/A)	86% Yes (6) 14% Partial (1) (9 N/A)	80% Yes (4) 20% No (1) (12 N/A)
122. Has the person changed residential/day services in the last year? If Yes, was the change:	25% Yes (4) 75% No (12)	18% Yes (3) 82% No (14)	41% Yes (7) 59% No (10)	24% Yes (4) 76% No (13)	19% Yes (3) 81% No (13)	41% Yes (7) 59% No (10)
122a. Planned by the IDT?	50% Yes (2) 25% Partial (1) 25% No (1) (12 N/A)	67% Yes (2) 33% Partial (1) (14 N/A)	71% Yes (5) 14% Partial (1) 14% No (1) (10 N/A)	50% Yes (2) 25% Partial (1) 25% No (1) (13 N/A)	67% Yes (2) 33% Partial (1) (13 N/A)	86% Yes (6) 14% Partial (1) (10 N/A)
122b. Appropriate to meet needs?	75% Yes (3) 25% Partial (1) (12 N/A)	100% Yes (3) (14 N/A)	86% Yes (6) 14% Partial (1) (10 N/A)	75% Yes (3) 25% No (1) (13 N/A)	33% Yes (1) 67% Partial (2) (13 N/A)	71% Yes (5) 29% Partial (2) (10 N/A)
123. Has the IDT process been adequate for assessing, planning, implementing and monitoring of services for this person?	31% Yes (5) 69% Partial (11)	24% Yes (4) 76% Partial (13)	47% Yes (8) 53% Partial (9)	41% Yes (7) 59% Partial (10)	50% Yes (8) 50% Partial (8)	41% Yes (7) 53% Partial (9) 6% No (1)



F. Team Process

Practice Challenges


- **47% of IDTs (8 of 17) had members who were not adequately following up on their responsibilities.** (75% were not in 2008, 65% in 2007, 76% in 2006, 53% in 2005, 75 in 2004)
- **For 59% of the individuals (10 of 17), the IDT process was found to only be partially adequate for assessing, planning, implementing and monitoring of services.** (In 2008 the process was not adequate for 50%, 59% in 2007, 53% in 2006, 76% in 2005, 69% in 2004)



2009 Community Practice Review Northeast Region Findings by Area

G. Health Related Needs


Question	2004 (sample=16)	2005 (sample=17)	2006 (sample=17)	2007 (sample=17)	2008 (sample=16)	2009 (sample=17)
30. Was the case manager able to describe the person's health related needs?	31% Yes (5) 69% Partial (11)	53% Yes (9) 47% Partial (8)	47% Yes (8) 53% Partial (9)	53% Yes (9) 47% Partial (8)	50% Yes (8) 50% Partial (8)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)
38. Was the [day/employment] direct service staff able to describe the person's health related needs?	44% Yes (7) 56% Partial (9)	47% Yes (8) 53% Partial (9)	53% Yes (9) 41% Partial (7) 6% No (1)	47% Yes (8) 47% Partial (8) 6% No (1)	75% Yes (12) 19% Partial (3) 6% No (1)	41% Yes (7) 59% Partial (10)
48. Was the residential service staff able to describe the person's health related needs?	50% Yes (8) 50% Partial (8)	59% Yes (10) 41% Partial (7)	65% Yes (11) 35% Partial (6)	59% Yes (10) 41% Partial (7)	69% Yes (11) 31% Partial (5)	47% Yes (8) 53% Partial (9)
54. Overall, were the team members interviewed able to describe the person's health-related needs?	38% Yes (6) 63% Partial (10)	29% Yes (5) 71% Partial (12)	35% Yes (6) 65% Partial (11)	41% Yes (7) 59% Partial (10)	44% Yes (7) 56% Partial (9)	35% Yes (6) 65% Partial (11)
55. Is there evidence that the IDT discussed the person's health-related issues?	56% Yes (9) 44% Partial (7)	88% Yes (15) 12% Partial (2)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)	65% Yes (11) 35% Partial (6)	69% Yes (11) 31% Partial (5)	82% Yes (14) 18% Partial (3)
56. In the opinion of the reviewer, are the person's health supports/needs being adequately addressed?	13% Yes (2) 88% Partial (14)	29% Yes (5) 71% Partial (12)	18% Yes (3) 82% Partial (14)	47% Yes (8) 53% Partial (9)	38% Yes (6) 63% Partial (10)	29% Yes (5) 65% Partial (11) 6% No (1)



G. Health Related Needs

Practice Challenges


- **65% of team members (11 of 17), overall, were not able to describe the person's health-related needs. (56% were not in 2008, 59% in 2007, 65% in 2006, 71% in 2005, 63% in 2004)**
 - **59% of day service staff (10 of 17) could not adequately describe the person's health-related needs. (25% could not in 2008, 53% in 2007, 47% in 2006, 53% in 2005, 56% in 2004)**
 - **53% of residential staff (9 of 17) could not adequately describe the person's health-related needs. (31% could not in 2008, 41% in 2007, 35% in 2006, 41% in 2005, 50% in 2004)**
- **71% of individuals in the sample (12 of 17) had health supports/needs that were not being adequately addressed. (63% were not in 2008, 53% in 2007, 82% in 2006, 71% in 2005, 88% in 2004)**



2009 Community Practice Review Northeast Region Findings by Area

H. Supported Employment (cont'd)


Question	2004 (sample=16)	2005 (sample=17)	2006 (sample=17)	2007 (sample=17)	2008 (sample=16)	2009 (sample=17)
124. Has the IDT, or the reviewer recommended a supported employment assessment for the person?	75% Yes (12) 25% No (4)	59% Yes (10) 41% No (7)	82% Yes (14) 18% No (3)	76% Yes (13) 24% No (4)	63% Yes (10) 38% No (6)	53% Yes (9) 47% No (8)
125. In the opinion of the IDT or the reviewer, does the person need supported employment?	44% Yes (7) 56% No (9)	59% Yes (10) 41% No (7)	71% Yes (12) 29% No (5)	59% Yes (10) 41% No (7)	38% Yes (6) 63% No (10)	41% Yes (7) 59% No (10)
126. Did the person receive a supported employment assessment?	100% Yes (12) (4 N/A)	100% Yes (11) (6 N/A)	86% Yes (12) 14% No (2) (3 N/A)	69% Yes (9) 31% No (4) (4 N/A)	70% Yes (7) 30% No (3) (6 N/A)	78% Yes (7) 22% No (2) (8 N/A)
127. Does the supported employment assessment conform to the DOH regulations?	33% Yes (4) 67% Partial (8) (4 N/A)	64% Yes (7) 36% Partial (4) (6 N/A)	43% Yes (6) 36% Partial (5) 31% No (3) (3 N/A)	38% Yes (5) 31% Partial (4) 31% No (4) (4 N/A)	20% Yes (2) 30% Partial (3) 50% No (5) (6 N/A)	67% Yes (6) 11% Partial(1) 22% No (2) (8 N/A)
128. Does the person have a career development plan (based on assessments) that meets the person's needs?	20% Yes (2) 60% Partial (6) 20% No (2) (6 N/A)	40% Yes (4) 20% Partial (2) 40% No (4) (7 N/A)	50% Yes (6) 42% Partial (5) 8% No (1) (5 N/A)	40% Yes (4) 40% Partial (4) 20% No (2) (7 N/A)	14% Yes (1) 57% Partial (4) 29% No (2) (9 N/A)	29% Yes (2) 43% Partial (3) 29% No (2) (10 N/A)
129. Is the person engaged in supported employment?	27% Yes (3) 73% No (8) (5 N/A)	50% Yes (5) 50% No (5) (7 N/A)	50% Yes (6) 50% No (6) (5 N/A)	55% Yes (6) 45% No (5) (6 N/A)	29% Yes (2) 71% No (5) (9 N/A)	71% Yes (5) 29% No (2) (10 N/A)



2009 Community Practice Review Northeast Region Findings by Area

H. Supported Employment (cont'd)


Question	2004 (sample=16)	2005 (sample=17)	2006 (sample=17)	2007 (sample=17)	2008 (sample=16)	2009 (sample=17)
130. Is the supported work provided in accordance with the following?	17% Yes (1) 33% Partial (2) 50% No (3) (10 N/A)	30% Yes (3) 20% Partial (2) 50% No (5) (7 N/A)	33% Yes (4) 33% Partial (4) 33% No (4) (5 N/A)	10% Yes (1) 50% Partial (5) 40% No (4) (7 N/A)	0% Yes 17% Partial (1) 83% No (5) (10 N/A)	14% Yes (1) 57% Partial (4) 29% No (2) (10 N/A)
130a. At least a 10-hour work week?	50% Yes (3) 50% No (3) (10 N/A)	30% Yes (3) 70% No (7) (7 N/A)	33% Yes (4) 67% No (8) (5 N/A)	20% Yes (2) 80% No (8) (7 N/A)	0% Yes 100% No (6) (10 N/A)	14% Yes (1) 86% No (6) (10 N/A)
130b. Person earns at least ½ of minimum wage?	50% Yes (3) 50% No (3) (10 N/A)	50% Yes (5) 50% No (5) (7 N/A)	58% Yes (7) 42% No (5) (5 N/A)	60% Yes (6) 40% No (4) (7 N/A)	17% Yes (1) 83% No (5) (10 N/A)	57% Yes (4) 43% No (3) (10 N/A)
130c. Work setting is at least 50% non-handicapped co-workers?	50% Yes (3) 50% No (3) (10 N/A)	50% Yes (5) 50% No (5) (7 N/A)	50% Yes (6) 50% No (6) (5 N/A)	40% Yes (4) 60% No (6) (7 N/A)	17% Yes (1) 83% No (5) (10 N/A)	57% Yes (4) 43% No (3) (10 N/A)
130d. There is a reasonable expectation that the job will continue?	67% Yes (4) 33% No (2) (10 N/A)	50% Yes (5) 50% No (5) (7 N/A)	67% Yes (8) 33% No (4) (5 N/A)	50% Yes (5) 50% No (5) (7 N/A)	17% Yes (1) 83% No (5) (10 N/A)	71% Yes (5) 29% No (2) (10 N/A)



H. Supported Employment

Practice Challenges


- **72% of individuals (5 of 7, 10 N/A) identified as needing a career development plan did not have one that adequately met their needs.** (86% did not in 2008, 60% in 2007, 50% in 2006, 60% in 2005, 80% in 2004)
- **6 of 7 individuals (86%, 10 N/A) identified as needing supported employment were not provided services in accordance with DOH regulation.** (100% were not in 2008, 90% in 2007, 66% in 2006, 70% in 2005, 83% in 2004)




2009 Community Practice Review
 Northeast Region
 Findings by Area


H. Supported Employment - Historical Scoring

Question	2000	2001	2002	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Need an employment assessment?	64%	100%	88%	75%	59%	82%	76%	63%	53%
Need supported employment?	57%	29%	59%	44%	59%	71%	59%	38%	41%
Receive supported employment assessment?	100%	100%	100%	100%	110%	86%	69%	70%	78%
Assessment conforms to DOH Regulations?	89%	71%	87%	33%	70%	43%	38%	20%	67%
Has a Career Development Plan?	38%	100%	30%	29%	40%	50%	40%	17%	29%
Is supported employment provided in line with requirements?	38%	75%	30%	14%	30%	33%	10%	0%	14%



H. Supported Employment – Disengagement






2009 Community Practice Review Northeast Region Findings by Area

I. Day Services


Question	2004 (sample=16)	2005 (sample=17)	2006 (sample=17)	2007 (sample=17)	2008 (sample=16)	2009 (sample=17)
35. Does the day/employment direct services "know" the person?	94% Yes (15) 6% Partial (1)	76% Yes (13) 24% Partial (4)	88% Yes (15) 12% Partial (2)	76% Yes (13) 18% Partial (3) 6% No (1)	88% Yes (14) 6% Partial (1) 6% No (1)	88% Yes (15) 12% Partial (2)
36. Does the direct service staff have adequate input into the person's ISP?	44% Yes (7) 50% Partial (8) 6% No (1)	71% Yes (12) 12% Partial (2) 18% No (3)	53% Yes (9) 47% Partial (8)	59% Yes (10) 29% Partial (5) 12% No (2)	56% Yes (9) 25% Partial (4) 19% No (3)	65% Yes (11) 29% Partial (5) 6% No (1)
37. Did the direct service staff receive training on implementing this person's ISP?	81% Yes (13) 19% Partial (3)	76% Yes (13) 18% Partial (3) 6% No (1)	71% Yes (12) 24% Partial (4) 6% No (1)	65% Yes (11) 24% Partial (4) 12% No (2)	75% Yes (12) 19% Partial (3) 6% No (1)	88% Yes (15) 12% Partial (2)
38. Was the direct service staff able to describe this person's health related needs?	44% Yes (7) 56% Partial (9)	47% Yes (8) 53% Partial (9)	53% Yes (9) 41% Partial (7) 6% No (1)	47% Yes (8) 47% Partial (8) 6% No (1)	75% Yes (12) 19% Partial (3) 6% No (1)	41% Yes (7) 59% Partial (10)
39. Was the direct service staff able to describe his/her responsibilities in providing daily care/supports to the person?	88% Yes (14) 13% Partial (2)	94% Yes (16) 6% Partial (1)	76% Yes (13) 24% Partial (4)	59% Yes (10) 35% Partial (6) 6% No (1)	56% Yes (9) 38% Partial (6) 6% No (1)	76% Yes (13) 24% Partial (4)
39.a. Was the direct service staff able to provide specific information regarding the person's daily activities, including the exact times of the day?			88% Yes (15) 12% Partial (2)	88% Yes (15) 12% Partial (2)	88% Yes (14) 6% Partial (1) 6% No (1)	94% Yes (16) 6% No (1)
39.b. Can the direct service staff describe his/her responsibilities in implementing the person's ISP goals/objectives/outcomes/action plans?			50% Yes (5) 50% Partial (5)	75% Yes (9) 25% Partial (3)	56% Yes (9) 38% Partial (6) 6% No (1)	71% Yes (12) 24% Partial (4) 6% No (1)



2009 Community Practice Review Northeast Region Findings by Area

I. Day Services


Question	2004 (sample=16)	2005 (sample=17)	2006 (sample=17)	2007 (sample=17)	2008 (sample=16)	2009 (sample=17)
40. Did the direct service staff have training in the ISP process?	50% Yes (8) 38% Partial (6) 13% No (2)	88% Yes (15) 6% Partial (1) 6% No (1)	47% Yes (8) 41% Partial (7) 12% No (2)	59% Yes (10) 24% Partial (4) 18% No (3)	50% Yes (8) 38% Partial (6) 13% No (2)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)
41. Did the direct service staff have training on the provider's complaint process and on abuse, neglect and exploitation?	44% Yes (7) 50% Partial (8) 6% No (1)	18% Yes (3) 65% Partial (11) 18% No (3)	65% Yes (11) 35% Partial (6)	65% Yes (11) 29% Partial (5) 6% No (1)	75% Yes (12) 19% Partial (3) 6% No (1)	76% Yes (13) 18% Partial (3) 6% No (1)
41.a. Have training on the provider's complaint process?		41% Yes (7) 12% Partial (2) 47% No (8)	71% Yes (12) 18% Partial (3) 12% No (2)	76% Yes (13) 12% Partial (2) 12% No (2)	88% Yes (14) 6% Partial (1) 6% No (1)	76% Yes (13) 12% Partial (2) 12% No (2)
41.b. Have training on how and to whom to report abuse, neglect and exploitation?		47% Yes (8) 35% Partial (6) 18% No (3)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)	76% Yes (13) 12% Partial (2) 12% No (2)	75% Yes (12) 13% Partial (2) 13% No (2)	82% Yes (14) 12% Partial (2) 6% No (1)
42. Does the direct service staff have an appropriate expectation of growth for this person?	75% Yes (12) 25% Partial (4)	82% Yes (14) 18% Partial (3)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)	82% Yes (14) 6% Partial (1) 12% No (2)	69% Yes (11) 25% Partial (4) 6% No (1)	82% Yes (14) 12% Partial (2) 6% No (1)
43. Is the day/employment environment generally clean, free of safety hazards and conducive to the work/activity intended?	82% Yes (9) 18% Partial (2) (5 N/A)	92% Yes (12) 8% Partial (1) (4 N/A)	100% Yes (13) (1 N/A, 3 CND)	78% Yes (7) 22% No (2) (5 N/A, 3 CND)	85% Yes (11) 8% Partial (1) 8% No (1) (3 CND)	100% Yes (14) (2 N/A, 1 CND)



I. Day Services

Noteworthy Practice


- **88% of day staff interviewed (15 of 17) adequately “knew” the person.** (88% in 2008, 76% in 2007, 88% in 2006, 76% in 2005, 94% in 2004)
- **94% of day service staff (16 of 17) were able to provide specific information about the person’s daily activities.** (88% in 2008, 2007 & 2006)
- **82% of day staff (14 of 17) had adequate training on how and to whom to report abuse, neglect and exploitation.** (75% in 2008, 76% in 2007, 71% in 2006, 47% in 2005)
- **100% of the day/employment environments (14 of 14, 2 N/A, 1 CND) were adequately clean and free of safety hazards and conducive to the work/activity intended.** (85% in 2008, 78% in 2007, 100% in 2006, 92% in 2005, 82% in 2004)



2009 Community Practice Review Northeast Region Findings by Area

J. Residential Services


Question	2004 (sample=16)	2005 (sample=17)	2006 (sample=17)	2007 (sample=17)	2008 (sample=16)	2009 (sample=17)
44. Does the residential direct services staff "know" the person?	94% Yes (15) 6% Partial (1)	82% Yes (14) 18% Partial (3)	88% Yes (15) 12% Partial (2)	94% Yes (16) 6% Partial (1)	81% Yes (13) 19% Partial (3)	94% Yes (16) 6% Partial (1)
45. Does the direct service staff have adequate input into the person's ISP?	75% Yes (12) 19% Partial (3) 6% No (1)	82% Yes (14) 12% Partial (2) 6% No (1)	71% Yes (12) 24% Partial (4) 6% No (1)	59% Yes (10) 29% Partial (5) 12% No (2)	56% Yes (9) 38% Partial (6) 6% No (1)	71% Yes (12) 18% Partial (3) 12% No (2)
46. Did the direct service staff receive training on the implementing this person's ISP?	75% Yes (12) 19% Partial (3) 6% No (1)	76% Yes (13) 24% Partial (4)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)	88% Yes (15) 12% Partial (2)	75% Yes (12) 19% Partial (3) 6% No (1)	100% Yes (17)
47. Is the residence safe for individuals (void of hazards)?	94% Yes (15) 6% No (1)	82% Yes (14) 18% No (3)	94% Yes (16) 6% No (1)	100% Yes (17)	94% Yes (15) 6% No (1)	88% Yes (15) 12% No (2)
48. Was the residential direct service staff able to describe this person's health-related needs?	50% Yes (8) 50% Partial (8)	59% Yes (10) 41% Partial (7)	65% Yes (11) 35% Partial (6)	59% Yes (10) 41% Partial (7)	69% Yes (11) 31% Partial (5)	47% Yes (8) 53% Partial (9)
49. Was the residential direct service staff able to describe his/her responsibilities in providing daily care/supports to the person?	81% Yes (13) 19% Partial (3)	88% Yes (15) 12% Partial (2)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)	75% Yes (12) 25% Partial (4)	88% Yes (15) 12% Partial (2)
49.a. Was the staff able to provide specific information regarding the person's daily activities?			100% Yes (10)	75% Yes (9) 25% Partial (3)	100% Yes (16)	94% Yes (16) 6% Partial (1)



2009 Community Practice Review Northeast Region Findings by Area

J. Residential Services

Question	2004 (sample=16)	2005 (sample=17)	2006 (sample=17)	2007 (sample=17)	2008 (sample=16)	2009 (sample=17)
49.b. Can the direct service staff describe his/her responsibilities in implementing the person's ISP goals & objectives?			76% Yes (13) 24% Partial (4)	71% Yes (12) 24% Partial (4) 6% No (1)	75% Yes (12) 19% Partial (3) 6% No (1)	94% Yes (16) 6% Partial (1)
50. Did the residential direct service staff have training in the ISP process?	50% Yes (8) 31% Partial (5) 19% No (3)	82% Yes (14) 18% Partial (3)	59% Yes (10) 29% Partial (5) 12% No (2)	71% Yes (12) 12% Partial (2) 18% No (3)	50% Yes (8) 38% Partial (6) 13% No (2)	82% Yes (14) 18% Partial (3)
51. Did the residential direct service staff have training on the provider's complaint process and on abuse, neglect and exploitation?	38% Yes (6) 44% Partial (7) 19% No (3)	47% Yes (8) 53% Partial (9)	82% Yes (14) 18% Partial (3)	82% Yes (14) 18% Partial (3)	69% Yes (11) 25% Partial (4) 6% No (1)	100% Yes (17)
51.a. Have training on the provider's complaint process?		53% Yes (9) 18% Partial (3) 29% No (5)	94% Yes (16) 6% Partial (1)	82% Yes (14) 12% Partial (2) 6% No (1)	88% Yes (14) 6% Partial (1) 6% No (1)	100% Yes (17)
51.b. Have training on how and to whom to report abuse, neglect and exploitation?		88% Yes (15) 6% Partial (1) 6% No (1)	88% Yes (15) 12% Partial (2)	100% Yes (17)	69% Yes (11) 13% Partial (2) 19% No (3)	100% Yes (17)
52. Does the residential direct service staff have an appropriate expectation of growth for this person?	63% Yes (10) 38% Partial (6)	65% Yes (11) 35% Partial (6)	76% Yes (13) 24% Partial (4)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)	75% Yes (12) 19% Partial (3) 6% No (1)	76% Yes (13) 24% Partial (4)
53. Does the person's residential environment offer a minimal level of quality of life?	88% Yes (14) 13% Partial (2)	94% Yes (16) 6% Partial (1)	76% Yes (13) 24% Partial (4)	94% Yes (16) 6% Partial (1)	88% Yes (14) 13% Partial (2)	94% Yes (16) 6% Partial (1)



J. Residential Services

Noteworthy Practice


- **94% of residential staff were found to adequately “know” the person. (16 of 17) (81% in 2008, 94% in 2007, 88% in 2006, 94% in 2005, 81% in 2004)**
- **100% of residential staff (17 of 17) received training on implementing the individual’s ISP. (75% in 2008, 88% in 2007, 71% in 2006, 76% in 2005, 75% in 2004)**
- **94% of interviewed support staff (16 of 17) were adequately able to provide specific information regarding the person’s daily activities. (100% in 2008, 75% in 2007, 100% in 2006)**
- **100% of residential staff (17 of 17) had training on the provider’s complaint process. (88% in 2008, 82% in 2007, 94% in 2006, 53% in 2005)**



2009 Community Practice Review Northeast Region Findings by Area

K. Case Management


Question	2004 (sample=16)	2005 (sample=17)	2006 (sample=17)	2007 (sample=17)	2008 (sample=16)	2009 (sample=17)
26. Does the case manager "know" the person?	75% Yes (12) 25% Partial (4)	94% Yes (16) 6% Partial (1)	88% Yes (15) 12% Partial (2)	94% Yes (16) 6% Partial (1)	94% Yes (15) 6% Partial (1)	94% Yes (16) 6% Partial (1)
27. Does the case manager understand his/her role/job?	75% Yes (12) 25% Partial (4)	94% Yes (16) 6% Partial (1)	76% Yes (13) 24% Partial (4)	76% Yes (13) 24% Partial (4)	88% Yes (14) 13% Partial (2)	88% Yes (15) 12% Partial (2)
28. Did the case manager receive training on the topics needed to assist him/her in meeting the needs of this person?	94% Yes (15) 6% Partial (1)	82% Yes (14) 18% Partial (3)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)	82% Yes (14) 18% Partial (3)	81% Yes (13) 19% Partial (3)	88% Yes (15) 12% Partial (2)
29. Is the case manager available to the person?	75% Yes (12) 25% Partial (4)	100% Yes (17)	76% Yes (13) 24% Partial (4)	94% Yes (16) 6% Partial (1)	100% Yes (16)	94% Yes (16) 6% Partial (1)
30. Was the case manager able to describe the person's health related needs?	31% Yes (5) 69% Partial (11)	53% Yes (9) 47% Partial (8)	47% Yes (8) 53% Partial (9)	53% Yes (9) 47% Partial (8)	50% Yes (8) 50% Yes (8)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)
31. Does the case manager have an appropriate expectation of growth for this person?	56% Yes (9) 38% Partial (6) 6% No (1)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)	65% Yes (11) 35% Partial (6)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)	75% Yes (12) 25% Partial (4)	76% Yes (13) 24% Partial (4)
32. Does the case management record contain documentation that the case manager is monitoring and tracking the delivery of services as outlined in the ISP?	56% Yes (9) 44% Partial (7)	53% Yes (9) 47% Partial (8)	47% Yes (8) 53% Partial (9)	71% Yes (12) 29% Partial (5)	56% Yes (9) 44% Partial (7)	76% Yes (13) 24% Partial (4)
33. Does the case manager provide case management services at the level needed by this person?	44% Yes (7) 56% Partial (9)	35% Yes (6) 65% Partial (11)	41% Yes (7) 59% Partial (10)	41% Yes (7) 59% Partial (10)	75% Yes (12) 25% Partial (4)	82% Yes (14) 18% Partial (3)
34. Does the case manager receive the type and level of support needed to do his/her job?	94% Yes (15) 6% Partial (1)	59% Yes (10) 41% Partial (7)	88% Yes (15) 12% Partial (2)	88% Yes (15) 12% Partial (2)	94% Yes (15) 6% Partial (1)	88% Yes (15) 12% Partial (2)



K. Case Management

Noteworthy Practice


- **94% of case managers (16 of 17) were found to adequately “know” the person.** (94% in 2007 and 2008 88% in 2006, 94% in 2005, 75% in 2004)
- **88% of case managers (15 of 17) adequately understand his/her role/job.** (88 % in 2008, 76% in 2007 and 2006, 94% in 2005, 75% in 2004)
- **94% of case managers (16 of 17) were found to be adequately available to the person.** (100% in 2008, 94% in 2007, 76% in 2006, 100% in 2005, 75% in 2004)
- **88% of case managers (15 of 17) were found to receive the type and level of support needed to do his/her job.** (94% in 2008, 88% in 2007 and 2006, 59% in 2005, 94% in 2004)



2009 Community Practice Review Northeast Region Findings by Area

L. Behavioral Support Services

Question	2004 (sample=16)	2005 (sample=17)	2006 (sample=17)	2007 (sample=17)	2008 (sample=16)	2009 (sample=17)
131. Is the person considered by the IDT to need behavior services now?	87% Yes (13) 13% No (2) (1 N/A)	81% Yes (13) 19% No (3) (1 N/A)	82% Yes (14) 18% No (3)	71% Yes (12) 29% No (5)	81% Yes (13) 19% No (3)	59% Yes (10) 41% No (7)
132. In the opinion of the reviewer, does the person need behavior services?	87% Yes (13) 13% No (2) (1 N/A)	69% Yes (11) 31% No (5) (1 N/A)	82% Yes (14) 18% No (3)	65% Yes (11) 35% No (6)	75% Yes (12) 25% No (4)	59% Yes (10) 41% No (7)
133. Have adequate behavioral assessments been completed?	85% Yes (11) 15% Partial (2) (3 N/A)	75% Yes (9) 25% Partial (3) (5 N/A)	86% Yes (12) 7% Partial (1) 7% No (1) (3 N/A)	83% Yes (10) 17% Partial (2) (5 N/A)	85% Yes (11) 15% Partial (2) (3 N/A)	100% Yes (10) (7 N/A)
134. Does the person have behavior support plans developed out of the behavior assessments that meet the person's needs?	62% Yes (8) 38% Partial (5) (3 N/A)	67% Yes (8) 25% Partial (3) 8% No (1) (5 N/A)	79% Yes (11) 14% Partial (2) 7% No (1) (3 N/A)	83% Yes (10) 17% Partial (2) (5 N/A)	77% Yes (10) 15% Partial (2) 8% No (1) (3 N/A)	90% Yes (9) 10% Partial (1) (7 N/A)
135. Have the staff been trained on the behavior support plan?	69% Yes (9) 31% Partial (4) (3 N/A)	75% Yes (9) 17% Partial (2) 8% No (1) (5 N/A)	71% Yes (10) 14% Partial (2) 14% No (2) (3 N/A)	92% Yes (11) 8% Partial (1) (5 N/A)	92% Yes (12) 8% Partial (1) (3 N/A)	90% Yes (9) 10% Partial (1) (7 N/A)
136. Does the person receive behavioral services consistent with his/her needs?	77% Yes (10) 23% Partial (3) (3 N/A)	83% Yes (10) 17% Partial (2) (5 N/A)	93% Yes (13) 7% No (1) (3 N/A)	100% Yes (12) (5 N/A)	77% Yes (10) 23% Partial (3) (3 N/A)	100% Yes (10) (7 N/A)
137. Are behavior support services integrated into the ISP?	23% Yes (3) 54% Partial (7) 23% No (3) (3 N/A)	50% Yes (6) 50% Partial (6) (5 N/A)	43% Yes (6) 50% Partial (7) 7% No (1) (3 N/A)	83% Yes (10) 17% Partial (2) (5 N/A)	54% Yes (7) 15% Partial (2) 31% No (4) (3 N/A)	90% Yes (9) 10% Partial (1) (7 N/A)



L. Behavioral Support Services

Noteworthy Practice

For the 10 individuals in the sample for whom it was applicable (7 N/A)...


- **100% had adequate behavioral assessments completed.** (85% in 2008, 83% in 2007, 86% in 2006, 75% in 2005, 85% in 2004)
- **90% had behavior support plans developed out of behavior assessments that meet the person's needs.** (77% in 2008, 83% in 2007, 79% in 2006, 67% in 2005, 62% in 2004)
- **90% of individuals had staff that had been adequately trained on the behavior support plan.** (92% in 2007 and 2008, 71% in 2006, 75% in 2005, 69% in 2004)
- **100% of individuals received behavioral services consistent with their needs.** (77% in 2008, 100% in 2007, 93% in 2006, 83% in 2005, 77% in 2004)




2009 Community Practice Review
Northeast Region
Findings by Area


L. Behavioral Support Services – Historical Scoring

Question	2000	2001	2002	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Does the person need behavioral services?	64%	71%	76%	81%	76%	82%	71%	75%	59%
Have adequate behavioral assessments been completed?	89%	100%	85%	85%	82%	86%	91%	92%	100%
Does the person have behavior support plan developed out of the behavior assessments that meet the person's needs?	89%	90%	92%	62%	67%	79%	83%	77%	90%
Have the staff been trained on the behavior support plan?	67%	78%	92%	69%	75%	71%	92%	92%	90%
Does the person receive behavioral services consistent with his/her needs?	89%	100%	92%	77%	91%	93%	109%	83%	100%
Are behavioral support services integrated into the ISP?	89%	67%	38%	23%	55%	43%	91%	58%	90%



L. Behavioral Support Services – Disengagement






2009 Community Practice Review Northeast Region Findings by Area

M. Adaptive Equipment/Augmentative Communication


Question	2004 (sample=16)	2005 (sample=17)	2006 (sample=17)	2007 (sample=17)	2008 (sample=16)	2009 (sample=17)
138. Has the person received all adaptive equipment needed?	45% Yes (5) 55% Partial (6) (5 N/A)	67% Yes (10) 27% Partial (4) 7% No (1) (2 N/A)	71% Yes (10) 29% Partial (4) (3 N/A)	67% Yes (10) 33% Partial (5) (2 N/A)	58% Yes (7) 42% Partial (5) (4 N/A)	86% Yes (12) 14% Partial (2) (3 N/A)
139. Has the person received all assistive technology needed?	11% Yes (1) 44% Partial (4) 44% No (4) (7 N/A)	40% Yes (2) 60% Partial (3) (12 N/A)	67% Yes (4) 33% Partial (2) (11 N/A)	27% Yes (3) 64% Partial (7) 9% No (1) (6 N/A)	67% Yes (4) 17% Partial (1) 17% No (1) (10 N/A)	54% Yes (7) 46% Partial (6) (4 N/A)
140. Has the person received all communication assessments and services?	46% Yes (6) 46% Partial (6) 8% No (1) (3 N/A)	45% Yes (5) 55% Partial (6) (6 N/A)	50% Yes (5) 30% Partial (3) 20% No (2) (7 N/A)	27% Yes (4) 46% Partial (7) 27% No (4) (2 N/A)	50% Yes (5) 20% Partial (2) 30% No (3) (6 N/A)	64% Yes (9) 36% Partial (5) (3 N/A)



M. Adaptive Equipment/Augmentative Communication

Practice Improvements

- **12 of 14 people (86%, 3 N/A) identified as needing adaptive equipment received the devices they needed. (58% did in 2008, 67% in 2007, 71% in 2006, 67% in 2005, 45% in 2004)**
- **9 of 14 people (64%, 3 N/A) identified as needing communication assessments/services received them. (50% did in 2008, 27% in 2007, 50% in 2006, 45% in 2005, 46% in 2004)**





M. Adaptive Equipment/Augmentative Communication Historical Scoring

Question	2000	2001	2002	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Has the person received all adaptive equipment needed?	50%	60%	88%	45%	67%	71%	67%	58%	86%
Has the person received all assistive technology needed?	50%	63%	100%	11%	40%	67%	27%	67%	54%
Has the person received all communication assessments and services needed?	56%	73%	50%	46%	45%	50%	27%	50%	64%



M. Adaptive Equipment/Augmentative Communication Disengagement





2009 Community Practice Review Northeast Region

Thank you!

Lyn Rucker
Community Monitor
rpaltd@aol.com
Office: 785-258-2214
Cell: 785-366-6468