Tennessee's State Medicaid Agency (SMA), the Bureau of TennCare (TennCare) submits this amended Statewide Transition Plan in accordance with requirements set forth in the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) Home and Community Based Services (HCBS) Settings Rule released on January 16, 2014 (see 42 C.F.R. § 441.301(c)).

This amended Statewide Transition Plan builds on the waiver-specific Transition Plans approved by CMS on March 27, 2015 (TN.0128.R05.01, TN.0357.R03.00 and TN.0427.R02.01), the originally proposed Statewide Transition Plan submitted on January 26, 2015, and all previous and subsequent versions which were posted for public review and comment. This plan includes data gleaned from the provider self-assessments, information submitted in response to the CMS Letter of Reaction, further details about settings and assessment validation based on the 10/14/2015 conference call with CMS, and additional public comments received as well as changes made in response to those comments, and reflects guidance that continues to be issued by CMS, including but not limited to the Settings Requirements Compliance Toolkit (in particular Frequently Asked Questions Regarding the Heightened Scrutiny Review Process... issued on June 26, 2015) and the Home and Community Based Services (HCBS) Training Series Webinars Presented During SOTA Calls (Home and Community-Based Settings, Excluded Settings, and the Heightened Scrutiny Process – November, 2015; and Home and Community- Based Setting Requirements: Systemic and Site-Specific Assessments and Remediation – December, 2015). Due to the need to renew the Statewide and Comprehensive Aggregate Cap (CAC, formerly Arlington) Waivers and amend the Self-Determination Waiver, TennCare submitted and received approval for Transition Plans specific to each waiver renewal application. Transition Plan activities were designed to lead to both a waiver-specific Transition Plan for each waiver program as well as a Statewide Transition Plan. Tennessee's originally proposed Statewide Transition Plan differed from the approved waiver-specific Transition Plans in the areas specified below:

- Section 1: The description of additional public input activities specific to the Statewide Transition Plan
- \*The addition of Section G: State Self-Assessment Results and Compliance Activities
- Summary of Additional Comments on Statewide Transition Plan and Changes Made

\*Note: Findings of the State Self-Assessment and Compliance Activities previously set forth in Section G have now been incorporated into relevant sections of the amended Statewide Transition Plan, rather than as a separate section.

This amended Statewide Transition Plan differs from the originally proposed Statewide Transition Plan in the areas specified below:

• Section 1: Public Input Activities include activities since the originally proposed Statewide Transition Plan was submitted.

- Sections 2 and 3: The description of TennCare's systemic assessment process, outcomes of the TennCare's systemic assessment and systemic assessment remediation milestones and timelines (described in the narrative and presented in the chart submitted as Attachment 1 with this amended Statewide Transition Plan
- Section 4: The description of TennCare's individual site-specific assessment process, including assessed settings; the outcomes of TennCare's site-specific assessments; the Heightened Scrutiny review process, TennCare's remediation process for non-compliant settings, milestones needed to address non-compliant settings and timelines for milestones established by providers to be completed; and TennCare's oversight and monitoring process to ensure ongoing compliance with the final rule;

In preparation for development of both the state's approved waiver-specific and originally proposed Statewide Transition Plans, TennCare completed certain activities believed to be pertinent to the development of each plan. Those activities are detailed below. The Provider Self-Assessment and Individual Experience Assessment tools, the Assessment Worksheet including instructions with timelines were submitted separately to the CMS regional project officer.

# Section 1: Transition Plan Development and Public Input Activities (Forms of Public Notice)

Provider information and training meetings:

- Invitations were posted on the TennCare website and distributed through provider and advocacy organizations, the Department of Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (DIDD) and contracted Managed Care Organizations (MCOs). Copies of the materials were submitted separately to the CMS regional project officer.
- Seven separate meetings were held across the state between July 8<sup>th</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup>, 2014 on the U.S. Department of Labor's Fair Labor Standards Act and CMS' HCBS Final Rules titled "New Federal Rules: Fair Labor Standards Act & Person-Centered Planning and Home and Community Based Settings: An Informational Session for HCBS Providers"" A copy of the training materials are available

at: <u>https://www.tn.gov/assets/entities/tenncare/attachments/ProviderNewRuleSession.</u> <u>pdf</u>. The invitation, available at the link below, included a listing of all provider training dates, times and

locations: <u>http://www.tn.gov/assets/entities/tenncare/attachments/ProviderNewRuleSe</u> <u>ssionFinal.</u>

<u>pdf</u>.

- 628 attendees in total
- The PowerPoint presentation was posted on the TennCare website on July 25, 2014 and submitted separately to the CMS regional project officer.

### Consumer and family information materials and meetings:

- Consumer/family friendly materials were developed with input from provider and advocacy organizations.
- Materials were posted on the TennCare website and distributed through provider and advocacy organizations, including independent support coordinator agencies, DIDD and MCOs

(<u>https://www.tn.gov/assets/entities/tenncare/attachments/NewRulePresentationforConsumersFamilies.pdf</u>).

- TennCare hosted 2 open forum conference calls to educate consumers and families on the HCBS Settings Rule and the importance of their public input.
  - A total of 251 distinct phone numbers accessed the calls, but since there were several participants who were gathered in groups, the actual number of participants is unknown, but greater than the number represented by distinct phone numbers.
  - HCBS providers participated in these calls as well as consumers and families.
- Some providers held family meetings.
- Copies of the materials utilized were submitted separately to the CMS regional project officer.

# State posting of draft waiver-specific transition plans and assessment tools for public comment:

- All Transition Plan and Assessment Tool documents were posted at: <u>https://tn.gov/tenncare/topic/transition-plan-documents-for-new-federalhome-and- community-based-services</u>. Individuals could provide comments online through the website, via the US postal service, or by emailing program staff directly.
- The comment period for the proposed waiver-specific Transition Plans extended from July 25 through September 19, 2014 as an interactive, working time between the state, providers, advocates, consumers and families. TennCare updated documents based on comments received and reposted the documents to the TennCare website as updated drafts.
- The Transition Plans were revised based on:
  - Public comments received regarding timelines and assessment activities; and
  - Feedback received from CMS, including removal of Person-Centered Planning (PCP) components.
- The proposed Transition Plans were revised and reposted on September 18, 2014.
- Documents were finalized (based on additional comments received), posted and entered into CMS web portal with waiver submission on October 1, 2014.
- Cover letter, assessment tools and assessment tools instructions were submitted separately to the CMS regional project officer.
- The final version of the Transition Plans submitted to CMS was posted on the TennCare website:

http://www.tn.gov/assets/entities/tenncare/attachments/TNProposedStatewideTransit ionPlan.pdf.

## State posting of originally proposed Statewide Transition Plan:

In addition to public input activities conducted in advance of the previously approved waiverspecific Transition Plans, the originally proposed Statewide Transition Plan was made available for additional public comment via the following activities:

- The proposed Statewide Transition Plan was posted on the TennCare website at <u>https://tn.gov/tenncare/topic/transition-plan-documents-for-new-federal-home-andcommunity-based-services</u> on December 23, 2014 for a 30 day public comment period. Reviewers were invited to provide comments via the website.
- On December 23, 2014 an email was sent directly to stakeholders, including advocacy organizations and provider associations, requesting each to share with their membership and the consumers and families they serve. In addition, the proposed plan was emailed to the Department of Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities and the State's three contracted MCOs to share with their provider networks.

# State posting of amended Statewide Transition Plan:

• The amended Statewide Transition Plan was posted on the TennCare website at: <u>https://tn.gov/tenncare/topic/transition-plan-documents-for-new-federal-home-and-community-based-services</u> on November 2, 2015 for a 30 day public comment period.

Stakeholders were invited to provide comments via the website US Postal mail or directly to TennCare staff.

- On November 4, 2015 an email including the Statewide Transition Plan was sent directly to stakeholders, including advocacy organizations and provider associations, to share with their membership and the consumers and families they serve. In addition, the proposed plan was provided to the Department of Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities and the State's three contracted MCOs to share with their provider networks, with a request to also share with the individuals they serve and their families.
- On November 13, 2015, the Statewide Transition Plan was revised to include an updated explanation of the state's Heightened Scrutiny review process and reposted. An email notification including the November 13<sup>th</sup> Statewide Transition Plan was sent directly to stakeholders, including advocacy organizations and provider associations, to share with their membership and the consumers and families they serve. In addition, the revised proposed plan was provided to the Department of Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities and the State's three contracted MCOs to share with their provider networks, with a request to also share with the individuals they serve and their families. In addition, on November 16, 2015, a memo was sent to the Department of Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities and the State's three contracted MCOs for dissemination

to the each of the providers selected for Heightened Scrutiny review, including advisement that the Statewide Transition Plan had been updated to reflect the Heightened Scrutiny review process. The memo was also sent to provider associations and stakeholder groups. The 30 day public comment period was extended through December 13, 2015 to ensure the public had time to review and respond to the revised STP.

- On December 11, 2015, the Tennessee Network of Community Organizations, the largest association of HCBS waiver providers, requested that TennCare extend the public comment period. That request was submitted to CMS the same day and on December 15, 2015 CMS granted the public comment extension request.
- On December 16, 2015 TennCare posted notification of the extension, changed the date on the public comment form, and notified internal staff responsible for public comment submissions of the extension.
- The TennCare website comment function included guidance for individuals who needed assistance with reading the plan and submitting comments. In addition, providers and advocacy organizations were encouraged to assist persons and families they support as needed in reading and understanding plan, and providing comments.

# Systemic Assessment Process, Outcomes and Remediation

TennCare's Systemic Assessment Process included two primary components: State Medicaid Agency (SMA) Self-Assessment (including outcomes and remediation), described in Section 2 below, and Contracted Self-Entity Self-Assessment (including outcomes and remediation), described in Section 3 below.

# Section 2: SMA Self-Assessment, Outcomes and Remediation:

### SMA Self-Assessment Process:

The state initiated ongoing internal strategy meetings to assess all rules, regulations, policies, protocols, practices and contracts. Additionally, the State developed and implemented strategies for obtaining consumer and family, provider, advocate, and other stakeholder input into the self-assessment of state standards, requirements and practices. TennCare presented specialized webinars to consumers, families, and caregivers. During these webinars TennCare asked for stakeholder input on the development of the transition plan, help establishing a timeline for reviewing compliance, assistance with developing the assessment tools and input on entities presumed not HCBS. Instructions for adding input were included in the PowerPoint presentation: <u>http://www.tn.gov/assets/entities/tenncare/attachments/NewRulePresentationf orConsumersF amilies.pdf</u>. Finally, information such as CMS Exploratory Questions and CMS Fact Sheets were made available on the tn.gov

website <u>http://www.tn.gov/tenncare/topic/transition-plan-</u> <u>documents-for-new-federal-home-and-community-based-services</u>.

The State's systemic assessment included a review of state statutes, 1915(c) waivers, rules, contracts, rate methodologies and billing practices, protocols, policies, and procedures across all departments involved in the licensure and administration of Medicaid-reimbursed HCBS. The specific items reviewed during this assessment are explained in greater detail below:

**State statutes:** The State assessed state statutes concerning licensure for all state departments authorized to license Medicaid-reimbursed HCBS settings. The assessment involved reviewing statutory authority concerning the Tennessee Departments of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services (DMHSAS), Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (DIDD), Health (DOH), and Human Services (DHS) located in Tennessee Code Annotated Titles 33, 68, and 71, respectively.

**1915(c) and 1115 Waivers:** The State assessed its three 1915c Waivers serving individuals with intellectual disabilities that are administered by the DIDD, and the 1115 Demonstration Waiver which provides authority for the CHOICES HCBS program. All aspects of the waivers were reviewed.

**State rules:** The State assessed rules for all state departments authorized to license and administer Medicaid-reimbursed HCBS settings. This assessment involved reviewing state rules for the Bureau of TennCare, DMHSAS, DOH, and DHS concerning the areas of licensure, HCBS setting definitions, and residents' rights in TennCare Rule 1200-13-01, DMHSAS Rules 0940-01 – 0940-06, DOH Rules 1200-08-01 – 1200-08-36, and DHS Rules 1240-01 – 1240-09.

**State contracts:** The State assessed all state contracts concerning the administration and provision of services in Medicaid-reimbursed HCBS settings. This assessment involved reviewing the State's Contractor Risk Agreement (CRA) with its three Managed Care Organizations (MCOs), its 1915(c) Waiver Interagency Agreement with DIDD, the DIDD Provider Agreement, and the MCOs' HCBS Provider Agreements. Of note, the MCO HCBS Provider Agreements must also be approved by the Tennessee Department of Commerce and Insurance (TDCI).

### SMA Self-Assessment Outcomes:

**HCBS Definitions and Provider Qualifications**: Many of the proposed changes to waiver definitions were included in waiver renewal applications and amendments, including amendments for the following definitions: Residential Habilitation; Support Coordination; Nursing Services; Employment and Day Services; Family Model Residential; Intensive Behavioral Residential Services; Medical Residential Services; and Supported Living. In addition, there were areas identified for strengthening language and requirements related to the care planning process and participant rights.

Additional changes to Employment and Day services have been identified that the State believes will help to set expectations and appropriately align incentives toward individual integrated employment and community integration.

**State Statutes**: As a result of assessment, the State determined that Tennessee Code Annotated Sections 33-2-404, 68-11-202, and 71-2-412 relating to DMHSAS, DIDD, DOH, and DHS should be amended to include compliance with the new federal HCBS setting rule. TennCare worked in collaboration with DIDD as it relates to Title 33. Statutory revisions were submitted (including authority to revise licensure and other rules, as applicable) during the Tennessee's legislative session January through April, 2015.

**State Regulations**: Rules requiring modification included those that are under the authority of another state department (Tennessee Code Annotated Sections 33-2-404, 68-11-202, and 71-2-412 relating to DMHSAS, DIDD, DOH, and DHS). In addition to promulgating revised regulations under its own purview, as determined to be appropriate, TennCare will provide appropriate education and explanation to other state departments regarding need for any rule revisions, which TennCare will formally request in writing, in order to allow the state to come into compliance as applicable. Legislation to provide statutory obligation and authority to make such rule revisions was passed in the 2015 legislative session.

**State Rules:** As a result of assessment, the State made separate determinations of compliance for each state department it assessed.

The State determined that DMHSAS Rules contain two provisions that are non-compliant with the HCBS Settings Rule in DMHSAS Rule Section 0940-05-06. The first provision limits participant rights concerning times for visitors. The second provision allows providers to modify rights to community access and integration and participation in daily activities, using a process for the modification of participant rights that is different than the modification process for provider-owned and operated settings in the HCBS Settings Rule. Additionally, the State determined that the participant rights' sections of the DMHSAS Rule could be strengthened by amending the section to include reference to the rights provided in the HCBS Settings Rule. The proposed timeframe for this is January 1, 2017.

The State determined that the DOH Rules contain multiple provisions that are non-compliant with the HCBS Settings Rule in DOH Rule Section 1200-08-25-.14 concerning assisted care living facilities and 1200-08-36-.15 concerning adult care homes – level 2. These sections limit times when residents can receive visitors, access common areas, and fails to require lockable doors to individual living units with only appropriate staff accessing the key. Additionally, the State determined that the participant rights' sections of the DOH Rules could be strengthened by amending these sections to include references to the rights provided in the HCBS Settings Rule. The proposed timeframe for this is January 1, 2017.

The State determined that DHS Rules contain three provisions that are non-compliant with the HCBS Settings Rule in DHS Rule Section 1240-07-10. Two provisions reference providing adult day care in a nursing facility and the other provision limits participant's choice of daily activities. Additionally, the State determined that the participant rights' sections of the DMS Rule could

be strengthened by amending the section to include reference to the rights provided in the HCBS Settings Rule. The proposed timeframe for this is January 1, 2017.

**State Protocols, Procedure and Policies** (including Quality Management practices): As a result of the assessment, the State determined that compliance with the HCBS Settings Rule could be strengthened by amending TennCare's Needs Assessment and Plan of Care Protocols to incorporate the HCBS Settings Rule requirements into those protocols, and by amending the following six DIDD protocols concerning HCBS settings to similarly strengthen compliance with the Rule: Employment and Day Services, Family Model Residential, Medical Residential, Residential Habilitation, Semi-Independent Living Services, Supported Living.

**Training Requirements**: As a result of the assessment, the State identified areas in the DIDD Provider Manual that could be amended to strengthen compliance with the HCBS Settings Rule. The State also determined that its CRA with its MCOs could be amended to include references to the HCBS Settings Rule related to provider credentialing and re-credentialing and ongoing education and training. The DIDD service delivery system and the MCO service delivery system operate under different waiver authorities and utilize different provider networks. As a result, provider credentialing requirements may vary. However, where possible, the state will ensure consistency across provider credentialing requirements as it relates to compliance with the HCBS Settings Rule. All training related to the HCBS Settings Rule is developed and conducted in a consistent manner across both service delivery systems and across all applicable providers.

**State Contracts, Rate Methodology, and Billing Practices**: This included contracts/Interagency Agreements TennCare currently holds with DIDD and the MCOs. As a result of assessment, the State identified several areas in which it could strengthen compliance with the rule. The State determined that its CRA with its MCOs could be amended to include references to the HCBS Settings Rule as follows:

- In the plan of care process, include expectations pertaining to employment and community integration
- Require MCOs verify provider compliance with the Rule when credentialing and recredentialing HCBS providers;
- Require MCO Provider Agreements contain language requiring providers to maintain compliance with the Rule; and
- Require ongoing provider education and training on the Rule.

The State determined that its 1915(c) Waiver Interagency Agreement with DIDD should be amended to include a requirement that DIDD ensure prior to contracting with a new provider that the new provider is compliant with the HCBS Settings Rule, and to also conduct ongoing compliance monitoring for existing HCBS providers. The State determined that the DIDD Provider Agreement should be amended to include language requiring providers to comply with the HCBS Settings Rule and maintain ongoing compliance.

The state determined that in its 1915(c) waivers, the rate methodologies and service definitions should be revised to better align with the intent of the HCBS Setting rule and incentivize providers that offer services in a more integrated manner. **Information Systems:** While no areas of non-compliance were identified as a result of the assessment, The State recognizes the opportunity to continually work internally, as well as externally with contracted entities to ensure infrastructures are flexible when needed.

### SMA Self-Assessment Remediation Milestones and Timelines:

**State Statutes:** In order to amend the state statutes (as detailed above) the State needed to submit and pass legislation authorizing the departments that license Medicaid-reimbursed HCBS to amend their departmental rules.

• The State proposed legislation to amend Tennessee Code Annotated Sections 33-2-404, 68-11-202, and 71-2-412 as detailed above during the 2015 legislative session of the 109<sup>th</sup> General Assembly. Rather than attempting a comprehensive re-write of statutory language, TennCare proposed language to be added to each of the applicable statutes that would allow the licensing authority to modify its rules to ensure compliance with the HCBS settings rule, even if such rule is in conflict with a previously existing statutory provision—in essence, pre-empting the previous requirements of state law to ensure compliance with the federal HCBS settings rule. HB101/SB112 was passed on April 2<sup>nd</sup> and approved on April 16<sup>th</sup> granting authority for the DOH board for licensing healthcare facilities and the DMHSAS, DHS and DIDD to amend licensure rules to be consistent with the federal HCBS Settings final Rule. Therefore, the statutory assessment and revision process is complete (<u>http://www.tn.gov/sos/acts/109/pub/pc0153.pdf</u>).

**1915(c) Waivers:** In order to amend the State's 1915(c) Waiver definitions in Appendices C, the State needed to revise the service definitions in the Waivers as well as revise language related to the care planning process and participant rights, and submit these revisions as part of its Waiver amendment and renewal requests to CMS. Additional changes in employment and day services to further strengthen compliance in non-residential settings are part of an amendment to each of the State's 1915(c) waivers that was posted for public comment in November 2015 (<u>https://www.tn.gov/tenncare/topic/hcbs-for-individuals-with-intellectual-and-developmental-disabilities</u>). An approach for modification of the reimbursement structure to de-link staffing ratios from rates of reimbursement for certain services is being contemplated for 2017, and provider education around person-centered plan development and implementation to ensure that expectations pertaining to protection from harm are not prohibiting individual choice and freedom began in the fall and will continue with revisions to the provider manual in 2016.

• The State submitted waiver renewals to CMS on October 1, 2014. Changes to the waivers in areas as identified above in two of its three 1915(c) Waivers, and comparable changes were submitted in an amendment to the State's remaining 1915(c) Waiver, as applicable, on October 15, 2014. Waiver renewal requests and all amendments were

approved by CMS on March 27, 2015.. Redesign of reimbursement methodologies to eliminate staffing requirements has begun, including an initial planning meeting with HSRI through a Technical Assistance Grant funded by CMS via New Editions Consulting, and initial stakeholder discussions. We expect that design and implementation of a new reimbursement approach cannot be completed until at least July 1, 2017. Provider education around person-centered plan development and implementation to ensure that expectations pertaining to protection from harm are not prohibiting individual choice and freedom will proceed and is expected to continue into 2016, and will be reflected in changes to the provider manual to be completed by December 31, 2016. Additional changes in the waivers will be proposed based on key learnings as the state moves forward with implementation of remediation strategies, in order to align incentives toward helping to support individual integrated employment at a competitive wage and integrated community living as the preferred outcomes for all program participants. TennCare and DIDD are working with a national subject matter expert on Employment and Day Services definition revisions and rate structures. Proposed revisions to service definitions were presented to stakeholders for initial input in the fall of 2015 and posted for public comment. It was determined that changes in the service definitions should be implemented at the same time as changes in reimbursement. The proposed rate structure will be posted for public comment prior to being submitted as waiver amendments. The projected date that these changes will be implemented is July 2017.

**State Rules:** The State has identified areas of non-compliance and areas to strengthen compliance in State rules across multiple departments as detailed above. The rulemaking process is lengthy, comprising a minimum of roughly six months from the notice of rulemaking to a final rule. TennCare will promulgate new rules, including collecting stakeholder input, by January 1, 2017. In addition, TennCare will collaborate to assist other state departments in revising their rules, as applicable, by January 1, 2017, or will take necessary steps to otherwise plan for transition if compliance cannot be achieved. Copies of memos to other state departments will be submitted to the CMS Regional Project Officer once mailed to applicable state departments.

**State Contracts:** In order to amend the state contracts as detailed above, the State needed to include in its CRA with its contracted MCOs and its Interagency Agreement with DIDD HCBS Settings Rule language.

• The State amended its CRA with the MCOs to include the HCBS Settings Rule language detailed above in the CRA effective January 1, 2015 with additional amendments made effective July 1, 2015. The State monitors MCO compliance with the CRA through several quality mechanisms including routine audits, and these components have been incorporated into that compliance monitoring structure. Therefore, this contractual amendment has been made and is

complete.<u>https://www.tn.gov/assets/entities/tenncare/attachments/MCOStatewideContract.pdf</u>.

- The State amended its 1915(c) Waiver Interagency Agreement with DIDD to include the HCBS Settings Rule language detailed above effective July 1, 2015. The State monitors DIDD compliance with the Interagency Agreement through several quality mechanisms and these components have been incorporated into that compliance monitoring structure. Therefore, this contractual amendment has been made and is complete.
- The State will amend its DIDD Provider Agreement in 2016 to include reference to the HCBS Settings Rule. This Provider Agreement will be effective January 1, 2017.
- The State required all MCOs to submit revised HCBS Provider Agreements to the State for review no later than August 15, 2015 to demonstrate that the MCOs have included the CRA requirement for providers to maintain compliance with the HCBS Settings Rule in these agreements. This includes review and approval by the TN Department of Commerce and Insurance (TDCI).

**State Protocols, Procedures, and Policies:** In order to amend the state protocols, procedures, and policies, including the DIDD Provider Manual, the State must first amend the documents internally and then make the revised documents available to contractors and providers, as applicable.

 The State revised its Needs Assessment and Plan of Care protocols as detailed above and submitted these protocols to the MCOs on January 1, 2015. DIDD has revised the 6 protocols identified above and submitted them to the State for review. Approved protocols will be circulated to providers and posted to the DIDD website by December 31, 2016. Additionally, DIDD will revise its Provider Manual and circulate it to providers by December 31, 2016.

# Section 3: Contracted Entity Self-Assessment, Outcomes and Remediation:

### Contracted Entity Self-Assessment Process:

During the Systemic Self-Assessment Process, LTSS contracted entities, Managed Care Organizations (MCOs under the 1115 Waiver) and the Department of Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (DIDD under the State's three 1915 (c) Waivers) were assigned the following tasks:

 The DIDD and MCOs were required to review all policies, procedures and practices (including Quality Management practices), training requirements, contracts, billing practices, person-centered planning requirements and documentation, and information systems to determine their compliance with the HCBS Settings Rule. Each entity was required to submit its assessment along with evidence of compliance to TennCare. Each entity was also required to identify any modifications needed to achieve compliance with the HCBS Settings Rule. TennCare reviewed each entity's self-assessment and

evidence of compliance (100% review and validation) to ensure that all aspects of the system are congruent with CMS expectations and will allow the State to operate HCBS programs in a manner which comports with the HCBS Settings Rule.

- All revisions to contract language (Provider Agreement), policies, procedures, training requirements, etc. needed to achieve compliance with the new rule were submitted to TennCare for review and approval, and implementation will be tracked by the State in accordance with approved timeframes.
- Upon approval, final versions of revised documents will be completed and distributed to providers.
- Additional provider education/training sessions have been scheduled for the first two weeks of March 2016. All education and training sessions and materials will be led by or reviewed and approved by TennCare.
- Specific to DIDD, in instances where a change in rule or policy requires a public comment period, adjustments will be made accordingly to accommodate the timelines needed to process and respond to public input and incorporate such comments into document revisions.

# Contracted Entity Self-Assessment Outcomes:

## MCO Self-Assessment

To facilitate MCO self-assessment, TennCare conducted a readiness review of its MCOs for compliance with provisions of TennCare's Contractor Risk Agreement (CRA), which included assessing MCO compliance with the HCBS Settings Rule. TennCare required its MCOs to review, amend, and create policies, protocols, procedures, and training documents in the desk review portion of the readiness review to demonstrate that the MCOs had requirements "to ensure provider compliance with the HCBS Settings Rule during provider credentialing, care planning processes, and provider re-credentialing pursuant to CRA requirements." MCOs submitted amended and newly created policies, protocols, procedures, and training materials concerning the HCBS Settings Rule to TennCare on May 8, 2015. TennCare LTSS staff reviewed the documentation and responded with edits and comments on May 22, 2015. In response to TennCare feedback, MCOs resubmitted revised documentation on May 29, 2015, and TennCare reviewed and provided final approval of these documents on June 5, 2015.

Following the desk review portion of the readiness review, TennCare visited each MCO on-site during the week of June 8 – 12, 2015 and required as part of this on-site demonstration that MCOs present systems changes and supporting documentation to "demonstrate how the MCO will ensure initial and ongoing compliance from HCBS providers concerning the HCBS Settings Rule." All MCOs demonstrated that they had made system modifications and related changes to ensure HCBS provider compliance with the HCBS Settings Rule, and TennCare provided notice of successful completion of all readiness review activities to its MCOs on June 22, 2015.

In addition to the readiness review process, TennCare requested that all MCOs submit their revised HCBS provider agreements to the Tennessee Department of Commerce and Insurance by August 15, 2015 for TennCare review to ensure the agreements all contained requirements that HCBS providers comply with the HCBS Settings Rule as prescribed by the CRA and effective July 1, 2015. By August 15, 2015 all MCOs submitted evidence of amended HCBS Provider Agreements with language requiring the following: 1) Provider agrees to maintain compliance with the HCBS Settings Rule detailed in 42 C.F.R § 441.301(c)(4)-(5); and 2) MCO will verify that the provider is in compliance with the HCBS Settings Rule detailed in 42 C.F.R § 441.301(c)(4)-(5) prior to executing the Provider Agreement.

#### DIDD Self-Assessment

DIDD conducted a self-assessment and presented the findings to TennCare on March 30, 2015. As part of its assessment, DIDD reviewed its policies, provider manual, procedures and practices, contracts, billing practices, and information systems. As a result of its selfassessment, DIDD made the following determinations: 1) All of its policies relating to HCBS Waiver Services are compliant with the HCBS Settings Rule; 2) Changes are needed to its Provider Manual; 3) Changes are needed to its medical necessity protocols and Quality Assurance tools; 4) All of its training requirements are compliant; however, DIDD added information to new provider training and orientation to include expectations concerning the HCBS Settings Rule, and conducted HCBS Settings Rule training for all Independent Support Coordinators and State Case Managers supporting members in 1915c Waivers that concluded on October 31, 2015; 5) All of its contracts and provider agreements contain language that does not contradict any HCBS Settings Rule requirements; however, DIDD determined that it could reinforce HCBS Settings Rule compliance with providers by adding an explicit requirement to maintain compliance with the HCBS Settings Rule in its Provider Agreement; 6) All of its billing practices are compliant but will be revised as described above; and 7) All of its information systems are compliant.

On September 30, 2015 DIDD submitted its revised Provider Manual to TennCare for review. DIDD added "Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services HCBS Settings Final Rule Requirements" under the Training section to account for HCBS Settings Rule training created for new providers. Under Other Components of the QMS (Quality Management System), "Provider HCBS Final Rule Self-Assessments" has been added, as well as "Individual Experience Assessments (IEAs)." Under Residential, Employment and Day services, residential edits includes: 1) modifications to the final rule process and documentation requirements; 2) residential property can be rented, owned, or occupied by person supported under tenant law or a lease agreement; 3) the home and person's bedroom can be locked; 4) persons supported shall choose roommates in shared living arrangements; 5) persons shall have freedom to furnish and decorate their sleeping and living units; 6) persons will have freedom and are encouraged to control their own choosing at any time; and 7) all residential settings must meet the individual accessibility and safety needs of the person. Under the same section,

employment and day objectives includes: 1) exploring supported employment; 2) job shadowing; 3) exploring volunteer opportunities; 4) being an active community member; 5) taking a class in the community; 6) participating in experiences that coincide with interests; 7) training in a specific skill; 8) informational interviews; 9) participating in Discovery. Additionally, further guidance on Day Services Settings include: 1) the setting is integrated in and supports full access to the greater community; 2) is selected by the person; 3) ensures individual rights of privacy, dignity, respect, and freedom from coercion and restraint; 4) optimizes autonomy and independence in making life choices; and 5) facilitates choice regarding services and who provides them.

#### **Contracted Entity Remediation Milestones and Timelines:**

#### TennCare contracted MCOs

As detailed above, TennCare ensured that MCOs remediated all non-compliant processes during the readiness review.

To ensure compliance on an ongoing basis, pursuant to CRA requirements effective January 1, 2015, TennCare has worked with MCOs to ensure the HCBS Setting Rule is embedded in MCOs' contracting, credentialing, and monitoring processes for both new and current provider sites.

The effective CRA citations/contract language is below:

A.2.11.9.4.1.3. At a minimum, re-credentialing of HCBS providers shall include verification of continued licensure and/or certification (as applicable); compliance with policies and procedures identified during credentialing, including background checks and training requirements, critical incident reporting and management, and use of the EVV; and compliance with the HCBS Setting Rule detailed in 42 C.F.R § 441.301(c)(4)-(5).

A.2.12.11. Prior to executing a provider agreement with any CHOICES HCBS provider seeking Medicaid reimbursement for CHOICES HCBS, the CONTRACTOR shall certify that the provider is compliant with the HCBS Settings Rule detailed in 42 C.F.R § 441.301(c)(4)-(5). The provider agreement with a CHOICES HCBS provider shall meet the minimum requirements specified in Section A.2.12.9 and shall also include, at a minimum, the following requirements:

A.2.12.11.14. The contractor shall require that all CHOICES HCBS providers maintain compliance with the HCBS Settings Rule detailed in 42 C.F.R § 441.301(c)(4)-(5).

The State monitors MCO compliance with the CRA through several quality mechanisms including routine audits, and these components have been incorporated into that compliance monitoring structure. In addition, MCOs verify HCBS Settings compliance as part of credentialing and re-credentialing activities and during their annual audits of all providers.

TennCare's LTSS Audit & Compliance unit conducts annual HCBS credentialing audits as well.

#### DIDD

As detailed above, DIDD determined that its provider manual and medical necessity protocols contained non-compliant language. These documents have been submitted to TennCare and are currently under review for approval and will be distributed to providers no later than June 30, 2016.

Additionally, TennCare has identified one additional item for DIDD to remediate:

DIDD should add a provision to the DIDD Provider Agreement that requires providers maintain compliance with the HCBS Settings Rule. While this is already an expectation of DIDD HCBS providers included in TennCare's contract with DIDD, the requirement is not included in the provider agreement. Adding this provision will be accomplished by June 30, 2016.

The effective DIDD/TennCare Interagency Agreement language is below:

A.24. The Contractor shall ensure, prior to contracting with a new provider and as part of ongoing monitoring of existing providers, that all HCBS settings where Medicaid-reimbursed services are provided are compliant with the CMS HCBS Settings Rule 42 C.F.R. § 441.301(c)(4)-(5) and in accordance with the state's approved transition plan.

A.30. The Contractor shall comply with state and federal rules, laws and regulations, all applicable federal and state court orders including, but not limited to, those set forth in Grier v. Goetz, CMS HCBS Settings and Person-Centered Planning Rules in 42 C.F.R. § 441.301(c), and TennCare policies and procedures in the administration of the Waivers.

### DIDD CQL accreditation:

Finally, as part of DIDDs ongoing partnership with The Council on Quality and Leadership, the Department has been working on network accreditation and has submitted a Personal Outcome Measure <sup>®</sup> Plan (POM) in order to implement the POMs on an individual and systemic level by May 2016. The plan includes policy and process actions in the areas of: 1) People Exercise Rights; 2) People Choose Where and with Whom to Live; and 3) People Choose Personal Goals <u>http://www.tn.gov/didd/news/7827</u>.

In January 2015, DIDD received official Person-Centered Excellence network accreditation from the Council on Quality and Leadership (CQL) <u>http://www.tn.gov/didd/topic/policy-innovation</u>.

### Section 4: Provider Self-Assessment, Outcomes and Remediation:

### Provider Self-Assessment Process

Mandatory trainings were conducted via webinar for HCBS residential and day program service providers on the Provider Self-Assessment and Validation process. Six of these training

webinars were conducted beginning on October 15, 2014 and were completed November 13, 2014. In addition, a recorded version was posted to the TennCare website for providers to access anytime.

The provider self-assessment process commenced on October 15th, 2014 and concluded on March 31, 2015. TennCare's contracted entities (DIDD and the MCOs) then worked from April 1 through September 30, 2015 with providers on validating the self-assessment and approving any provider transition plan as applicable. The original Statewide Transition Plan detailed the process and is below:

- The State conducted statewide provider education and training sessions on how to complete the Provider Self-Assessment Tool. These training sessions were conducted October 15, 2014 through November 15, 2014.
- Providers received the applicable Provider Self-Assessment Tool with the Assessment Tool instructions and time lines. At a minimum, all HCBS residential, employment and day program provider settings were required to complete a self-assessment.
- Providers were required to include persons served, family members/representatives, advocates, and other stakeholders in their assessment process.
- Providers were required to include in their self-assessment a description of their selfassessment process, including participation of the aforementioned persons.
- Providers submitted their respective Self-Assessment along with *specific evidence* of compliance for further review by TennCare or its designee (DIDD or MCOs). Additional evidence was requested or additional reviews conducted as needed to further assess and validate compliance with these rules.
- Providers who self-reported or were assessed upon review and validation to be noncompliant with the HCBS Settings Rule were required to submit a Provider Transition Plan identifying the area(s) of non-compliance and describing their proposed plan for coming into compliance along with associated time lines. Information regarding Provider Transition Plans and specific timelines for achieving compliance is incorporated in this amended State Transition Plan.
- All completed and validated Provider Transition Plans were reviewed and approved by the DIDD or MCO as applicable, and implementation will be monitored based on approved timeframes, with oversight by TennCare.
- Providers needing assistance to achieve compliance requested such assistance from the entity with whom they are contracted (DIDD or MCO), another (compliant) provider of the same service type, and/or consumers and family members or advocates.
- Providers assessed to be unwilling or unable to come into compliance, will be required to cooperate with transition assistance to ensure all individuals served are transitioned to an appropriate provider type that was determined to be compliant with the Rule or has an approved transition plan that is believed to be adequate to bring the provider into compliance, maintaining continuity of services.

- I. TennCare, in conjunction with DIDD or the MCOs, as applicable, will oversee all necessary transition processes:
  - i. A *minimum* of 30 days' notice will be given to all persons needing to transition between providers. Additional time will be provided to complete these transitions as needed and consistent with the State's approved Transition Plan. The State will ensure that sufficient time is permitted to safely transition individuals to another compliant setting of their choice, and to assure continuity of services. This will include instances where the person's new residential setting must be developed and/or modified to meet their needs.
  - ii. A description of the process and choice of appropriate providers will be included with each notice. The person's ISC, case manager or care coordinator, as appropriate, will conduct a face to face visit as soon as possible to discuss the transition process, and ensure that the person is making an informed choice of an alternate setting that meets the HCBS Settings Rule criteria, as well as ensuring that the person understands any applicable due process rights.
  - iii. The person's ISC, case manager, or care coordinator, as appropriate, will further ensure that any critical services and/or supports are in place in advance of the transition to the person's new service provider.

Settings assessed:

1915 (c) waiver settings assessed included:

- Residential Habilitation
- Employment and Day (Community and Facility Based Day, In-home Day, and Supported Employment)
- Family Model Residential Support
- Medical Residential Services
- Supported Living

1115 CHOICES waiver settings assessed included:

- Adult Day Care
- Assisted Care Living Facility
- Critical Adult Care Home

Specific to settings, the provider assessment asks 48 questions in the areas of: physical location, community integration, resident rights, living arrangements, and policy enforcement. Each area

contains probing questions based on the CMS Exploratory Questions and in total the assessment can be cross-walked to the CMS HCBS Final Rule requirements.

#### Validation Process:

TennCare has implemented a multi-layered validation processes to ensure responses from providers represent complete and accurate interpretations of the final rule requirements. First, each contracted entity was charged with reviewing and validating 100% of all provider self-assessments, supporting documentation and transition plans. Each contracted entity was required to identify a point of contact that would be responsible for tracking and reporting assessment progress on a monthly basis to TennCare. Documentation that supported the provider's assessed compliance included: cross walk of supporting documentation, provider policies, training documentation, member materials, and any other pertinent information such as maps, pamphlets or photos and make-up and minutes from stakeholder meetings. If it was determined by the reviewer that the documentation submitted did not support compliance then the applicable indicator(s) was marked accordingly on the tracking mechanism and the provider received additional technical assistance in order to become compliant or revise the self-assessment and/or transition plan as appropriate to accurately reflect compliance.

Each contracted entity utilized staff that was familiar with the program to help with the validation process. For example, DIDD utilized its three regional offices to validate provider responses. The designated regional office staff were either part of the quality assurance monitoring or were in some way part of the larger quality management system. The review team consisted of: 1) one person from Quality Assurance, these are the regional QA directors who are involved in surveys for numerous providers; 2) one person from the Accreditation Team, these are people that are out in the field very frequently conducting Personal Outcomes Measures <sup>®</sup> and Basic Assurances reviews at agencies; 3) one person from Operations, these are staff that are involved with ongoing monitoring, remediation of issues and technical assistance to providers; and 4) one person from Compliance; these are Compliance Directors and the organizers of information who are heavily involved in the Quality Management Committee process and routinely work with agencies and data storage.

TennCare strongly believed that providers should involve their stakeholders that are outside of the provider agency, but are directly impacted by the final rule, in the entire self-assessment process as a way to further ensure validity. TennCare required all providers establish a HCBS Setting compliance stakeholder group consisting of agency executive staff, direct support staff, individuals served, a family member or representative of individuals served, an advocate from an organization not associated with or receiving payment from the agency, and a support coordinator/care coordinator. Each provider was required to utilize this stakeholder group in the self-assessment and transition plan development process and submit documentation demonstrating stakeholder involvement, agreement with provider self-assessment and agreement with the provider transition plan.

The contracted entity's designated reviewers were all trained on the validation process and TennCare's expectations prior to the assessment process beginning. Additionally, providers were trained on the self-assessment process, including validation, prior to the begin date. TennCare required each contracted entity to submit three completed self-assessments as a quality oversight measure. TennCare reviewed and returned its findings to the reviewer prior to the contracted entity returning the validation documentation to the provider. The intent of this quality oversight was to inform the reviewer of TennCare's expectations and for the designated reviewer to then apply this broadly across all of their provider self-assessment reviews. Designated reviewers were encouraged to reach out to TennCare throughout the validation process whenever assistance was needed to ensure consistency. Some contracted entities verified provider documentation through an on-site review prior to approving the self-assessment. For example, one MCO conducted on-site reviews of 6 Adult Day Care settings and 21 Assisted Living Facility settings. While this was not a requirement, TennCare encouraged each contracted entity to conduct on-site verification, as needed in the review and validation process.

Second, TennCare conducted a post review of completed provider self-assessments and approved transition plans. The intent for this oversight was not only to ensure that both the contracted entities and providers were interpreting the requirements accurately, but also to determine areas of systemic weakness that will inform future quality management process. In this post review TennCare asked each contracted entity to submit three approved provider self-assessments, all supporting documentation and accompanying approved transition plan if applicable. After reviewing all the documentation an analysis was developed that included strengths, weaknesses and remediation steps. The analyses were once again intended to inform the contracted entities of TennCare's expectations on interpreting the final rule. The remediation steps were built into the analysis to ensure each provider had a clear path for amending their provider transition plan.

An additional phase of TennCare's validation process will utilize the Individual Experience Assessment. TennCare will crosswalk responses from the provider self-assessment outcomes with the Individual Experience Assessment outcomes to form a base-line of how well the providers assessed their performance in meeting community integration expectations from the individual's perspective. Each individual IEA result that reflects non-compliance with one or more components of the HCBS Final Rule requirements will be addressed and resolved by the appropriate entity (e.g., the provider for concerns regarding service setting or service provision; the Independent Support Coordinator or Care Coordinator for issues that require adjustments in the person-centered plan to reflect the person's choices, needs, and preferences; or the State for issues regarding state policy or practices that may require clarification. In addition, a threshold of compliance for HCBS providers (based on a comparison of the IEAs and the provider self-assessment) will be developed for meeting expectations as it relates to sitespecific settings and transition plans. If the provider fails to meet the threshold then the provider will be required to revise their self-assessment and transition plan. TennCare may

desire to make changes to the IEA upon final data analysis. Any augmentation to this assessment and the implementation of this survey in the future would be made to ensure that each individual supported is comfortable sharing his/her true experience. Additionally, TennCare may utilize IEA survey results to compare with other survey tools (such as the National Core Indicator Project—administered in all of TennCare's HCBS programs) to identify trends or variances.

#### Heightened Scrutiny Process:

In order to identify settings for which heightened scrutiny should be applied, TennCare incorporated questions regarding the presumption of institutional characteristics into the provider self-assessment tool. The physical location area and the indicators focus directly on presumed characteristics of an institution:

- 1. The setting is NOT located in a building that is also a publicly or privately operated facility that provides inpatient institutional treatment (a NF, IMD, ICF/IID, hospital).
- 2. The setting is NOT located in a building on the grounds of, or immediately adjacent to, a public institution.
- 3. The provider does NOT own or operate multiple homes located on the same street (excluding duplexes and multiplexes, unless there is more than one on the same street).
- 4. The setting is NOT located in a gated/secured 'community' for people with disabilities.
- 5. The setting or dwelling is NOT located in a farmstead or disability-specific community.
- 6. The setting is NOT designed specifically for people with disabilities.
- 7. Individuals who reside in the setting are NOT primarily or exclusively people with disabilities.

In addition, in the provider self-assessment tool, the living arrangements area and many of its indicators focus on having the qualities of an institution:

- 1. Do individuals in the setting have access to public transportation?
- 2. Is the setting free from gates, Velcro strips, locked doors, or other barriers preventing individuals' entrance to or exit from certain areas of the setting?
- 3. Do individuals have the freedom to furnish and decorate their sleeping or living units within the lease or other agreement?
- 4. Are cameras that are present inside the setting only utilized in direct relation to the person-centered plan of care?
- 5. Do individuals have access to food anytime, as appropriate?

Any negative responses to these indicators or any positive responses that were not appropriately supported by documentation during the validation review were addressed by the assigned contracted entity reviewer and remediation steps were captured in the provider's transition plan. Per public comment, TennCare will recognize exceptions to gates, Velcro strips, locked doors, or other barriers utilized as safety measures for individuals with the approval of a

Human Rights Committee. As a final verification and validation step, TennCare has determined it is necessary to apply a "heightened scrutiny" review to specific services/settings. This heightened scrutiny review will be based on the CMS Heightened Scrutiny process: http://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid-chip-program-information/by-topics/long-termservices- and-supports/home-and-community-based-services/downloads/settings-thatisolate.pdf. This will help the State to determine whether such settings in fact should be "presumed to have the qualities of an institution," and if so, will require submission of evidence to CMS in order to demonstrate that the setting does not have the qualities of an institution and that it does have the qualities of a home and community-based setting. Tennessee does not intend to submit services/settings to CMS for application of Heightened Scrutiny unless the State believes that the setting in fact has the qualities of a home and community based setting, which may include steps that will be taken by the provider as part of an approved transition plan which the State believes are expected to achieve compliance. TennCare will work directly with providers and contracted partners to review specified settings for compliance with the HCBS Settings Rule using the process as defined by CMS. The State will also engage advocacy organizations in the review process. The intent is to further evaluate any setting that may be institutional in nature—by virtue of physical location, or because it is designed specifically for people with disabilities and individuals in the setting are primarily or exclusively people with disabilities and the on-site staff that provide services to them. Tennessee is utilizing this process to clearly identify what it believes to be appropriate and sufficient in establishing and demonstrating that the settings meet the qualities for being home and community based settings. The settings that will be included in the Heightened Scrutiny review are:

- Adult Day Care
- Assisted Care Living Facilities
- Facility Based Day
- Residential Habilitation settings where more than 4 persons reside
- Supported Living and Residential Habilitation settings close in proximity (e.g., next door or multiple homes on a cul-de-sac)
- Intensive Behavioral Residential Services (IBRS)\*

\*While not included in the initial self-assessment process (because all settings were established after the rule became effective), Intensive Behavioral Residential Services will also be subject to this review to ensure full compliance with the HCBS final rule.

The Heightened Scrutiny review utilized by TennCare will include: review of data pertaining to services utilized by all persons receiving services in the specified setting—for example, for Facility-Based Day Services, a review of data to determine the number of individuals in the setting participating only in facility-based day services, those receiving a combination of facility-based and community-based day services, those receiving integrated employment, and the relative percentage of persons and time spent in each such setting; an on-site visit and assessment of physical location and practices; review of person-centered plans and individual

experience assessments for individuals receiving services in the setting; interviews with service recipients; a secondary review of policies, training and other applicable service related documents; and additional focused review of the agency's proposed transition plan, including how each of the above is expected to be impacted as the plan is implemented. An assessment tool specific to each service/setting that will be utilized by the State will be provided to applicable providers prior to the State's on-site visit. The CMS Heightened Scrutiny process requires public input and as such will be incorporated into the State's review process.

Per CMS, evidence of how a setting overcomes its presumed institutional qualities should focus on the qualities of the setting and how it is integrated in and supports full access of individuals receiving HCBS into the greater community, not on the aspects and/or severity of the disabilities of the individuals served in the setting.

TennCare recognizes that individual choice is paramount and that to ensure compliance with the Rule, individuals must be given a choice of settings, including options that do not serve only people with disabilities. Per public comment regarding homes in close proximity, TennCare will review such settings homes in conjunction with the person centered plan to ensure that unless otherwise specified, the person has chosen to live in the specified setting.

The TennCare Heightened Scrutiny review will begin April 1, 2016 and conclude by March 31, 2017. This will allow time for the state to conduct a thorough review, including an on-site visit, of each applicable setting and spend the time needed with each individual provider to ensure an adequate transition plan is in place.

TennCare will conduct comprehensive trainings that review the HCBS Settings Rule with a focus on the heightened scrutiny review process. This training will be targeted to the providers that TennCare has identified as requiring a heightened scrutiny review as described on page 21. Again, TennCare will provide an explanation of the HCBS Settings Rule requirements, target the portions of the rule that speak to settings that have qualities of an institution and are therefore "presumed" not HCBS, provide guidance for coming into compliance, and outline the heightened scrutiny review process. This will include a walk-through of any tools that will be utilized as part of the review process and at least an hour for questions, answers and dialogue immediately following the training presentation. Based on public comments to have input into the trainings, TennCare conducted "kick-off" Heightened Scrutiny Process sessions at regional provider forums during the month of January 2016 and collected questions and comments to be used to inform the training sessions. Likewise, during the training sessions, any feedback received on the tools presented for use will be taken into consideration for any potential revisions before the heightened scrutiny process begins.

The targeted trainings for providers will be conducted March 2 – 11, 2016.

In addition, four targeted information/training sessions for persons supported and family members will be conducted February 17-26, 2016 via conference call and webinar.

TennCare will conduct a comprehensive training session with contracted entities; DIDD and the MCOs on February 11, 2016.

# Provider Self-Assessment Outcomes:

The following data was gleaned as a result of the provider self-assessment:

# Total Number of Provider Settings Assessed: 1245

Total Residential Provider Settings: 704

- Residential Habilitation and Medical Residential: 170
- Family Model Residential: 290
- \*Intensive Behavioral Residential Services: 0
- Supported Living: 144
- Assisted Care Living Facility: 99
- Adult Care Home: 1

\*Note: IBRS was a new waiver service and a provider had not been established at the time of the provider self-assessment. The Department of Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities has certified 2 IBRS sites and are in the process of assessing each for HCBS compliance. IBRS settings will be included in the heightened scrutiny review process.

Total Non-Residential Settings: 541

- Community-Based Day: 167
- Facility-Based Day: 86
- Supported Employment: 99
- In-Home Day: 147
- Adult Day Care: 42

### **Compliance among Providers:**

- Total number and percentage of provider settings deemed 100% compliant with the HCBS Settings Rule: 170 settings or 14%.
  - o DIDD non-residential: 83
  - o DIDD residential: 73
  - MCO non-residential: 9
  - o MCO residential: 5
- Total number and percent of providers settings who have identified at least one area that is currently out of compliance with the HCBS Settings Rule and thus have submitted a transition plan in order to come into compliance: 1048 or 84%.

• Total number and percent of provider settings deemed non-compliant with HCBS Settings Rule and opting not to complete a provider level transition plan: 27 settings or 2%.

Total number and percent of provider settings presumptively non-home and community based, but for which the state will provide justification that these settings do not have the characteristics of an institution and do have the qualities of home and community-based settings will be determined upon conclusion of the state's heightened scrutiny review process

**1048 Transition Plans Received.** Of the transition plans received, the number and percent requiring action in each of the following areas in order to come into compliance:

- Physical Location: 367 or 35%
- Community Integration: 694 or 66%
- Residential Rights (Residential Only): 408 or 39%
- Living Arrangement (Residential Only): 552 or 53%
- Policy Enforcement Strategy: 936 or 89%

#### **Contracted Entity Analysis:**

The contracted entities were asked to summarize the assessment results. The CHOICES MCOs responses centered on community integration and transportation. Based on the back-up documentation submitted, community activities outside the setting, transportation resources and training on how to utilize transportation resources were all areas that needed more training and clear policy development and implementation.

Based on the DIDD analysis submitted, community integration also appeared to be one of the biggest opportunities for improvement. Facility-Based Day (FBD) service was mentioned multiple times in the summary. FBD neither encouraged community integration nor had developed ways to integrate the setting with non-disabled peers. Some did have parallel use for the building; such as club use or recreation for the community. There was one self-defined disability community. Community integration was lacking personal community connection with non-disabled peers being promoted and supported by providers. Public transportation education was not being pursued due to providers having internal transportation and the cost of transportation being included in the rates for residential and day services.

Additionally individual rights and privacy stood out as an area that is lacking adequate provider understanding, lacking up to date policy, or lacking appropriate implementation. Rights were not well defined, in some cases differences in defined rights were noted for different services or sections of a program. Staff was not always receiving training regarding the rights of persons supported. There was little education on rights and member experience for volunteers. There

appeared to be longstanding trend of placing restrictions for an extended amount of time rather than finding ways to phase out the plans and/or looking at least restrictive methods. DIDD found instances of both video and auditory monitoring in private area. Some providers had blanket policies in place that were restrictive in nature not offering flexibility to people supported and at times, imposed restrictions on a group of people with certain behavioral concerns without a Human Rights Committee review. Some residential settings, usually residential habilitation homes, which are larger and more congregate, did not have basic privacy mechanisms in place, such as locked bedroom doors.

Finally, legal lease or tenant agreements were not in place before this process for Family Model and they were inconsistently found for Residential Habilitation. Providers did begin to put these in place either while developing their assessments or through transition plans.

It was noted that a majority of DIDD providers believed the lack of flexibility in achieving community integration was due in part to the inflexible rate structure of day services. Some DIDD providers continue to feel that facility-based settings and services should be a choice regardless of the propensity to segregate. Providers, and some families and people supported, feel that if the person chooses this service from among other service options that the service should be an acceptable option. Also noted, some CHOICES providers believed that the HCBS Setting Rule and Person-Centered Planning flagged individuals receiving Medicaid and set them apart from other members receiving services.

# Provider Self-Assessment Remediation Milestones and Timelines

### Provider Transition Plan:

Provider level transition plans were required when there was a deficiency in any of the provider self-assessment compliance areas: physical location, community integration, resident rights, living arrangements, or policy enforcement, whether identified by the provider or as part of the contracted entity validation process. For each of these sections, there were specific indicators that need to be met at 100%. If these indicators were not met, then the provider was required to address the deficiency in their provider transition plan. Each contracted entity reviewed these plans and either approved them or provided additional technical assistance in order to meet the September 30, 2015 deadline for submitting both final self-assessments and transition plans. Supporting documentation for compliance in each area was also required.

Transition Plan Timelines: Number and percent transition plan approved to occur:

- Within 6-9 months of submitting the provider self-assessment (September 30, 2015 through December 31, 2015): 654 or 62%
  - The DIDD Regional Offices have monitored the agencies with target dates within this range. Quarterly meetings began January 1, 2016. DIDD West Region reported 6 (which they note as all) of their transition plans have been implemented. Middle is in the process of completing their quarterly findings and will send that data to TennCare when it is available. East is tracking all their transition plans in a large Excel document. It appears 125 have come into compliance with their 2015 target dates.
- Within 1+ year of submitting the provider self-assessment (March 31, 2016 through March 30, 2017): 299 or 29%
- Within 2+ years of submitting the provider self-assessment (March 31, 2017 through March 30 2018): 32 or 3%
- More than 3 years of submitting the provider self-assessment (beyond March 31, 2018):
  63 or 6%

While the timelines outlined above were established by individual providers as a result of public comment received, as well as the heightened scrutiny review process, TennCare will be working with providers whose settings are subject to the heightened scrutiny review process to revise transition plans to reflect additional time needed for transition. As part of the heightened scrutiny review process, providers will be asked to submit data regarding services provided. Providers whose data reflects large numbers of persons served spending most of their time in a facility based setting with minimal to no community interaction will be targeted for review first. This will allow the state to complete the heightened scrutiny review with these providers earlier in the timeline and work individually with each provider to modify transition plans to ensure adequate time is allocated for meeting compliance.

### Tracking and Monitoring Provider Transition Plans:

Each contracted entity is responsible for ensuring provider transition plans are being implemented effectively. The process for tracking and monitoring transition plans is to be determined by the contracted entity. For example, DIDD will begin monitoring provider transition plans during routine provider visits. A tracking spreadsheet that identifies the provider transition plan milestones and deliverable dates will be used to help coordinate this effort. The regional office provider supports teams will monitor the plans on a monthly basis and roll their findings up into a quarterly summary for discussion and review. Quarterly meetings will be held to provide plan implementation updates. The quarterly meetings will take data that has been rolled up and determine if additional technical assistance is warranted. Technical assistance will be provided if there is a problem with the implementation of the transition plan, if an agency is not implementing the plan or if the agency decides to

significantly change their plan or implementation of their plan. TennCare will require all contracted entities to submit transition plan monitoring updates on a quarterly basis.

#### MCO Credentialing and Re-credentialing:

As previously discussed, the State ensured that all MCOs incorporated an HCBS Settings Rule criterion into their existing credentialing and re-credentialing tools as part of the MCOs' readiness review. Based on feedback from the November 2015 – January 2016 public comment period suggesting more uniformity among MCOs in their HCBS Settings rule evaluations, the State is currently working with MCOs to develop a standard HCBS Settings compliance tool and process for credentialing and re-credentialing providers while each MCO continues to use their individual HCBS Settings Rule criterion. TennCare previously provided guidance on ensuring this process is tailored to the appropriate type of provider during its monthly MCO status call on October 19, 2015. For example, if a provider has been assessed by a different contracted entity for final rule compliance then the information requested would be different than for a new provider that has never been assessed for final rule compliance. The process for ensuring final rule compliance prior to credentialing and re-credentialing providers became effective on July 1, 2015. The standard credentialing and re-credentialing tool will be utilized by all MCOs and will be effective once the tool has been vetted and approved internally.

#### DIDD Basic Assurances ®

As part of DIDD's ongoing partnership with The Council on Quality and Leadership, the Department has submitted a network accreditation Basic Assurances <sup>®</sup> Plan in order to bring all Basic Assurances <sup>®</sup>into alignment by January 2016. The Basic Assurances <sup>®</sup> can be cross-walked with the CMS final rule and is a tool utilized by a number of states to measure provider compliance or incorporated in standards and certification tools. DIDD has incorporated a number of the Basic Assurances <sup>®</sup> in their Provider Manual that is currently under review, as well as matched assurances to the DIDD provider Quality Assurance monitoring tools. Some areas that were addressed in DIDD's Basic Assurance <sup>®</sup> Plan include: 1) the organization supports people to exercise their rights and responsibilities; 2) staff recognize and honor people's rights; 3) the organization upholds due process; 4) decision-making supports are provided to people as needed; 5) people have meaningful work and activity choices; and 6) policies and practices facilitate continuity of natural support systems.

### Targeted training

Now that phase one of the compliance process has been completed and TennCare has analyzed the provider self-assessments, targeted training will begin in areas that appear to be most

critical. Targeted training will be provided to contracted entities in order to ensure that those responsible for training and credentialing fully understand how to operationalize the final rule. TennCare has contracted with a national employment expert and is in process of contracting with a national expert on person-centered planning to help build health plan capacity. Targeted training will also be provided to service providers in order to provide a deeper understanding of the final rule. Based on the final provider-self assessments, areas of community integration and living arrangement need further emphasis to ensure final rule compliance. TennCare will work with DIDD and the MCOs to develop and conduct these targeted trainings as well as facilitate focus groups described in section E below. Additionally, provider training will look at how the providers assessed themselves versus how the contracted entity's assessed the provider. This will shed light on the possible gaps in truly understanding the intent of the final rule and will provide opportunities for more specialized education. Finally, targeted training will be provided to persons supported and their family. TennCare wants to ensure that persons supported and their family understands the reason for changes in the way HCBS are rendered. It is also important for this target audience to know that services and supports will still be available; however these services and supports may look different.

Transition of Beneficiaries to Compliant Provider:

If a provider site is not in full compliance with the HCBS Setting Rule, then the expectation is that the provider will come into compliance as evidenced by an approved transition plan with reasonable timelines for achieving compliance deliverables and a clear mechanism in place for the contracted entity to provide on-going support (as necessary) to ensure providers are implementing the approved plan. If the provider cannot or refuses to come into compliance then TennCare will use its process for transitioning people from the non-compliant setting to a setting that meets all requirements.

TennCare has worked with the contracted entities to collect data regarding providers that will not come into compliance with the final rule and the people that will be impacted. A number of the providers that chose not to comply did not have Medicaid recipients receiving services. However, it will be necessary to move some people. Currently there are less than 20 people that will be transitioning due to their provider choosing to not comply with the final rule. TennCare's process for transition is outlined below. A transition letter will be sent to the individuals impacted and their family if applicable, as well as a letter to the provider. Specific guidance has been described in the provider letter to ensure continuity of services. Due to the proximity of the holiday season when individuals for transition were identified, TennCare determined it would be less disruptive for those individuals and their families to begin the transition process in February 2016. TennCare will monitor the transition process during its monthly status calls.

TennCare, in conjunction with DIDD or the MCOs, as applicable, will oversee all necessary transitions. The transition process instructions provided to the MCOs and DIDD is as follows:

- 1. The state will ensure that reasonable notice and due process is provided to anyone needing to transition.
  - a. At least a 30 day advance notice will be the minimum.
  - b. Upon determining the need to transition a person, the contracted entity's care coordinator will make a face-to-face visit to the person and if applicable caregiver/guardian/conservator to discuss the specific reason(s) for the need to transition the person and to officially begin the notification of transition process.
    - i. Please invite caregivers, family members, friends, and anyone else that is important to this person. This face-to-face meeting should reflect everyone's sincere desire to ensure continuity of services while meeting the person's needs during this transition process.
- 2. A formal notification letter that outlines the specific reason for the transition and the due process procedure and timeline available to the person and if applicable his/her caregiver/guardian/conservator will be sent to no less than 30 days prior to transition. The general language will be provided by TennCare. The specific reason(s) for transition and due process procedure will be added by the MCO/DIDD.
- 3. The contracted entity will send the current provider of service a formal notification letter indicating the intent to transition the person supported.
  - a. Again, this notification should occur no less than 30 days prior to transition.
  - b. The current provider should be directed to participate with TennCare, contracted entities, advocates or ombudsman, and other agencies, as applicable, in activities related to the transition of person.
    - i. This includes, but is not limited to, participation in planning meetings, ongoing provision of information, and other activities as directed. The general language will be provided by TennCare. The specific reason(s) for transition requirement will be added by the MCO/DIDD.
    - *ii.* The two notifications (to the person supported and the provider) should be sent simultaneously to ensure both parties are aware of the need to transition at the same time.
- 4. The contracted entity will ensure that the person is given ample opportunity to learn about the variety of settings that are available and are compliant with the HCBS Settings Rule.
  - a. The person should be afforded the opportunity to select from non-disability specific settings and select their roommates if applicable.
  - b. Supports will be provided to the person to assist in transition choice and the caregiver's schedule will be accommodated to support the person in making an informed decision about an alternate setting.

- *c. ISCs/ Care Coordinators should be researching all possible, appropriate settings for this person to choose from.*
- 5. Once a new provider has been selected, a person centered planning meeting will take place to define the timelines for transition, as well as identify specific supports and services needed in order to make a safe transition.
  - a. Additional time should be built into the transition plan to ensure safety, continuity of services, for development of or modifications to existing settings, and to assure that all supports and services will be in place prior to the person's transition to the new provider.
- 6. The contracted entity will ensure that all supports and services are in place prior to the person's transition to the new provider.
  - a. This should be done through an on-site visit 7-10 days prior to the person transitioning and should include at a minimum the person, caregiver/guardian/conservator (if applicable), the MCO Care Coordinator/DIDD Individual Supports Coordinator, a contracted entity advocate or ombudsman, and the new provider.
  - b. Any modifications or changes identified during the on-site visit as necessary for the person's health, safety, or welfare will be addressed prior to the transition.
- 7. After transitions have occurred, the contracted entity will ensure that the MCO Care Coordinator/DIDD Individual Supports Coordinator first three (3) monthly contacts will occur face-to-face.
- 8. Contracted entities will provide TennCare transition updates as defined by the State.

# Part D. Individual Experience Assessment

- Individual Experience Assessment process: February 1, 2015 through January 31, 2016
  - I. Each individual's ISC, case manager or care coordinator, as applicable, will assist the individual and his/her family member/representative, as appropriate, in completing an initial Individual Experience Assessment. Service provider staff may participate as requested by the individual and his/her family member/representative.
  - II. Such assessments will be conducted during the individual's annual personcentered plan review, or sooner if an amendment or plan review is conducted prior to the annual review.
  - III. This initial assessment period will be ongoing for one year to allow each ISC, case manager and care coordinator the opportunity to conduct the Individual Experience Assessment while completing a scheduled annual review or needed amendment.
  - IV. For provider owned/controlled settings, any proposed modification of requirements set forth in the HCBS Settings Rule for the individual shall be reviewed to confirm that:

- i. There is a specific individualized assessed need for such modifications;
- ii. Prior interventions and supports including less intrusive methods have been tried and demonstrated to be unsuccessful;
- iii. The proposed modification is appropriate based on the specific need identified; and
- iv. The proposed modification, including interventions and support will not cause harm to the individual.
- V. Each of the above items (i.-iv.) shall be documented in the person-centered plan, along with:
  - i. The method of collecting data on an ongoing basis to measure the effectiveness of the modification; and
  - ii. A specific time limit for periodic review of the data and the effectiveness of the modification to ensure it continues to be appropriate.
  - iii. The individual shall provide informed consent of the proposed modification.
- VI. If a modification to the HCBS Settings Rule is determined to be inappropriate based on the person's individualized needs (and in accordance with the requirements above), the area identified as non-compliant will trigger a new assessment of the provider, as applicable, and a Transition Plan developed by the provider to address any issues of non-compliance will be submitted to the contracting entity for review, approval and monitoring of implementation.

### Part E. Achieving Initial Compliance

Upon review and validation of the State, contracted entities, and provider self-assessments, TennCare submits this amendment to the originally proposed Statewide Transition Plan with setting specific outcomes, remediation activities, milestones for achieving compliance with the HCBS Settings Rule.

In addition, , the State will submit an amendment to its three 1915 (c) waivers that will amend each waiver-specific Transition Plan, with timelines and milestones for achieving compliance with the HCBS settings requirements in the final rule, as well as incorporation of waiver revisions based on public comments where appropriate.

For providers needing assistance to come into compliance the state proposes to implement the following strategies, July 1, 2015 through March 31, 2017:

 Facilitate focus groups of non-compliant and compliant providers who can talk through provider specific issues and problem-solve how to achieve compliance together. For example, DIDD hosted a facility-based day workgroup focused on achieving compliance through conversion strategies during the 2015 waiver year. National subject matter experts were asked to present methods for converting day programs from congregated

and segregated to full integration into the community. Continued participation will be voluntary and can include consumers and family members who may aid in the problem solving process. The primary focus will be on residential settings in the living arrangements category and on non-residential settings in regards to facility based day and sheltered workshop services. As described in Section 3 above, in January 2016 TennCare conducted provider training on HCBS Setting requirements and the upcoming heightened scrutiny review process. These trainings were held in each region during the regularly scheduled DIDD Quarterly Provider meetings. Each training offered a presentation by current DIDD providers that have converted their facility-based day services to community-based services.

• Provide one-on-one technical assistance (TA) (TA will be provided upon request by the DIDD, MCO and or TennCare as appropriate)

# Part F. Assuring Ongoing Compliance

Once overall compliance is achieved, strategies to ensure ongoing compliance will include:

- Incorporating the Individual Experience Assessment (as described above) into all initial and annual person-centered plan reviews. This means each person served will have an opportunity upon enrollment in a program and annually to provide information on his/her experience with supports provided in Medicaid reimbursed HCBS settings.
- Quality Assurance monitoring methodologies will incorporate the addition of monitoring performance measures that ensure compliance with HCBS Settings and PCP Rules. TennCare has renamed and expanded the role of an existing Care Coordination Unit to monitor and ensure PCP practices are implemented effectively and a person's experience with HCBS settings is congruent with the intent of the final rule. This unit is now referred to as the Person-Centered Practices team.
- The Plan of Care document utilized by the MCOs is being revised to a standardized template that aids in facilitating person-centered planning practices.
- Annual consumer/family satisfaction surveys that include questions relevant to the HCBS Settings and PCP Rules. TennCare previously participated in the National Core Indicators for individuals with I/DD and has begun participation for seniors and adults with physical disabilities beginning with face-to-face surveys in 2015.
- Exploration of the use of national accreditation standards to support its ongoing compliance monitoring efforts.
- Training of the TennCare Audit & Compliance staff and the LTSS Person-Centered Practices staff in Person-Centered Thinking, Planning and Practices to ensure staff are knowledgeable on how to ensure the final rule is being adhered to.

### Amended Statewide Transition Plan Public Comments

### Comments on the Amended Statewide Transition Plan

In order to help organize comments for incorporation into the Amended Statewide Transition Plan and to gauge satisfaction with the transition planning process, the State asked entities submitting comments to answer 12 questions regarding the Amended Statewide Transition Plan and offered opportunity to comment on each question as well. Entities were also encouraged to submit any other comments or recommendations beyond the scope of these questions.

The State received 44 public comment surveys online and 278 public comment surveys via mail, totaling 322 written public comment surveys plus an additional 5 personal letters via mail. The surveys were from 6 different types of submitting entities and most public comment surveys included comments/recommendations. The six submitting entities included: family members, non ISC (Independent Support Coordinator) provider, advocacy organization, ISC/CM (Case Manager)/CC (Care Coordinator), Consumer and Other. The "Other" category is solely comprised of provider staff. The overwhelming majority of public comment surveys were identical. For example, all 153 public comment surveys from the "Other" category (provider staff) were identical and an additional 125 family members submitted identical responses as the "Other" category (total of 278 comment surveys with identical question responses and comments). ). It appears that one (or perhaps more) large facility-based day providers (or their staff and/or family members of persons supported) may have developed a template response to the 12 questions, and disseminated the response to staff and family members of persons supported by their program(s). The template response was then submitted by 153 staff and 125 family members. These responses express frustration with the Statewide Transition Plan and process, in particular with the lack of clarity regarding how expectations pertaining to employment and community integration are impacted by a person's right to choose services and settings. The responses strongly support the continuation of facility-based day services based on the choice of the person, and request more time and additional resources to achieve compliance with the HCBS settings rule.

TennCare tracked all the responses to the survey questions, as well as the corresponding comments which will be discussed further.

The surveys received provided a total of 2494 written comments. 2224 of those comments were identical (as described above), 182 comments were unique, 48 were not applicable to the Amended Statewide Transition Plan and 40 of the comments received were in reference to proposed waiver amendments pertaining to Employment and Day Services that were posted at the same time which are now planned for a later implementation date.

TennCare recognizes that this is a complex document and the impact of the rules on certain settings are difficult to understand and concerning to families and providers who have relied on these settings for decades. Large facility-based providers who have invested heavily in capital-related expenses, and whose programs have long relied on a facility-based delivery model are struggling to envision a different future, and to develop plans to move in

that direction, particularly in the face of strong opposition from the families of persons they serve as well as staff. This appears to have shaped many of the comments received which are reflective of the concerns that consumers, their families and providers have.

The 5 personal letters and 1 email that provided comments share personal stories of loved ones that are happy with their current services, which are provided in a facility based setting, and do not want these services to change. They voice concerns with being in the community for extensive periods of time, fear of the idea of employment and of the possibility of loved ones being moved to a different location. We hope our responses, the letter and FAQs that are being mailed to consumers and families and the information/training sessions discussed in the STP and the responses will help alleviate some of these concerns.

#### Summary of the Comment on Amended Statewide Transition Plan and Changes Made

There were 12 questions reviewers were asked to respond to. Those questions and a summary of comments received are as follows:

1. Did you participate in any provider's self-assessment process for compliance with HCBS Settings Rule?

Yes responses: 26 No responses: 293

As described in Section 4, TennCare required that each provider establish a stakeholder group that consisted of agency executive staff, direct support staff, individuals served, a family member or representative of individuals served, an advocate from an organization not associated with or receiving payment from the agency, and a support coordinator/care coordinator in the provider self-assessment process. Based on provider self-assessment submissions of Stakeholder lists, meeting minutes and attendee signatures, all providers were compliant with this required component of the self-assessment process, even though the vast majority of persons commenting indicate that they did not participate in the process.

Of the 293 respondents that replied "No" to this question, 124 came from the "Family Members" category, 14 came from the "Non ISC Providers" category, 1 came from the "Advocacy Organizations" category, 0 came from the "ISC/CM/CC" category, 1 came from the "Consumers" category and 153 came from the "Other" category. Of the 26 respondents that replied "Yes" to this question, 7 came from "Family Members", 17 came from "Non ISC Providers", 1 came from an "ISC", and 1 came from a "Consumer".

Comments: There were 15 additional comments to this survey question (some were the same or similar), 1 comment was not applicable to the question and 3 comments referenced facility-based day services.

- Several commenters noted that they did participate in their agency's self-assessment process and one also commented that their agency now meets regularly to share information and help consumers and family members stay informed.
- One responder stated they should have been notified directly from the state on new HCBS ruling and Transition Plans.
  - The state's communication and initial training plan was conducted in July of 2014 and is detailed in Section 1, pages 2-4. TennCare also provided training specific to the self-assessment process October – November 2014 as described in Section 4, beginning on page 15.
  - TennCare attended regional provider meetings in January to lead targeted discussions regarding the HCBS setting rule's Heightened Scrutiny Review process and will be conducted more in-depth training discussions on the requirements and process for consumers, family members, and providers.
  - TennCare and DIDD have also developed, with review and input from advocates, a letter and Frequently Asked Questions that DIDD is in process of mailing to each person (or their conservator, as appropriate) supported by a provider who will be part of the Heightened Scrutiny Review. These materials will also be posted online and disseminated through providers and advocacy groups.
- Several other commenters expressed stress and frustration regarding the provider selfassessment process and confusion about timelines for compliance with the new rule.
  - As described in Section 4, pages 15-16, to ensure consistency TennCare provided training to the reviewing entities, reviewed a sample of initial provider self-assessment results with the reviewing entities and provided feedback. Additionally, TennCare reviewed a sample of completed other self-assessments as well as transition plans and provided recommendations for remediation.
  - The communication processes identified above will provide additional information to consumers, family members, and providers regarding the rule and the Heightened Scrutiny Review.
  - The plan now also reflects that some providers, in particular large facility-based day providers who have relied heavily on services provided in these settings, may require additional time to achieve compliance.
- Three responders to this question expressed confusion about what will happen with facility based day programs and individuals' choice in such services and concern about what will be available for people who do not work.

- There does appear to still be confusion about what the Rule requires in regards to facility based day programs among families and providers. Additional written guidance from CMS regarding the impact of personal choice as part of the person-centered planning process, as it relates to facility-based services and settings would be helpful. In addition to a letter and FAQ document for consumers and family members, TennCare will provide consumer and family training prior to the heightened scrutiny process February 17-26, 2016. Provider specific training will be conducted March 2-11, 2016. Language regarding these targeted trainings has been added to Section 4, page 22 and Section 4, page 31.
- One responder wanted to know if reimbursement rates will be increased due to the changes that will require more skilled staff.
  - Language has been added to Section 2, page 10 explaining that TennCare and DIDD are working with a national expert on revisions to day and employment definitions and rate structures. The estimated date that these changes will be implemented is July 2017.
- One ACLF stated the self-assessment process was cumbersome, with vague wording and was not understood.
  - As described in Section1 and Section 4, there was an extensive communication and information/training process targeted to providers. In addition, contracted reviewers were available to work with providers as needed. TennCare staff worked directly with ACLF providers who expressed confusion with the process
  - As noted above, additional targeted training, including for ACLF providers, will be conducted in early March, prior to the Heightened Scrutiny Reviews.

2. Is the process for making sure the State complies with the CMS HCBS Settings Rule clear in the STP?

Yes responses: 8 No responses: 297

Of the 297 respondents that replied "No" to this question, 153 came from the "Other" (provider staff) category and 125 came from the "Family" category and included the identical comment (below).

"No it is not clear. "Additionally, <u>further guidance</u> on Day Services Settings include: 1) the setting is integrated in and supports full access to the greater community; <u>2</u>) is selected <u>by the person</u>; <u>3</u>) ensures individual rights of privacy, dignity, respect, and freedom from coercion and restraint; <u>4</u>) optimizes autonomy and independence in making life choices; and <u>5</u>) facilitates choice regarding services and who provides them." This guidance needs to be provided sooner than later as there appears to be a strong contradiction between

person centered planning/choice and the fact that individuals/families cannot keep a service they desire (facility based day). See underlined."

- There does appear to still be confusion about what the Rule requires in regards to facility based day programs among families and providers and the impact of personal choice as it relates to facility-based services. In addition to a letter and FAQ document for consumers and family members, TennCare will provide consumer and family training prior to the heightened scrutiny process February 17-26, 2016. Provider specific training will be conducted March 2-11, 2016. Language regarding these targeted trainings has been added to Section 4, page 22 and Section 4, page 31. In addition, more work is yet to be done in relation to person centered planning and employment/community integration. The state is contracting with national subject matter experts on employment and day services, and person centered practices to provide training at an organizational and systems level. The amended STP does not speak to TennCare's person centered planning and practices strategies as, per CMS, the plan centers on setting site compliance. Additional written guidance from CMS regarding the impact of personal choice as part of the person-centered planning process, as it relates to facility-based services and settings would be helpful
- Other Comments: There were 25 additional comments to this survey question, 9 comments were not applicable to the question and 8 comments referenced facility-based day services.
- Some responders expressed the need for clear objectives, clear guidelines, clear language, and clear parameters and direct notification "of approval".
  - The state's communication and initial training plan was conducted in July of 2014 and is detailed in Section 1, pages 2-4. TennCare also provided training specific to the self-assessment process October – November 2014 as described in Section 4, beginning on page 15. Additionally, Section 3 and Section 4 further describe the review and validation process. All providers were notified in writing by DIDD or an MCO, as applicable, upon approval of the provider's self-assessment and transition plan, as appropriate. The state's heightened scrutiny review process training and technical assistance started in January 2016, with additional trainings targeted to consumers and families scheduled for February 2016 and provider specific trainings scheduled for March 2016. Language in regards to scheduled trainings was added to Section 4, page 22 and Section 4 page 31.

3. Are there any policies, procedures, or practices not addressed in the STP that you think do not comply with the CMS HCBS Settings Rule?Yes responses: 11 No responses: 16

- o 153 "Other" and 125 "Family Member" respondents did not answer the Yes/No question but submitted an identical statement, most of which reiterated concerns with the timeline and resources for achieving compliance. "I do believe that the timeline set in the Statewide Transition Plan is overly ambitious for providers to comply with given that there are no additional resources being provided to build the infrastructure needed to provide these community based services. These services will require additional vehicles, and the cost associated with vehicle operation. It will be extremely difficult for providers to make the transition noted here in the timeframe given." The comment also stated that commenters were not sure if there were other documents to be addressed because the STP "is a complicated document with lots of detail that has not been explained by TennCare." As stated above, the state's communication and initial training plan was conducted in July of 2014 and is detailed in Section 1, pages 2-4. TennCare also provided training specific to the selfassessment process October – November 2014 as described in Section 4, beginning on page 15. Additionally, Section 3 and Section 4 further describe the review and validation process. All providers were notified in writing by DIDD or an MCO, as applicable, upon approval of the provider's self-assessment and transition plan, as appropriate. The state's heightened scrutiny review process training and technical assistance started in January 2016, with additional trainings targeted to consumers and families scheduled for February 2016 and provider specific trainings scheduled for March 2016. Language in regards to scheduled trainings was added to Section 4, page 22 and Section 4 page 31.
- The plan now also reflects that some providers, in particular large facility-based day providers who have relied heavily on services provided in these settings, may require additional time to achieve compliance.
- Language has been added to Section 2, page 10 explaining that TennCare and DIDD are working with a national expert on revisions to day and employment definitions and rate structures that will help to align resources toward more integrated services. The estimated date that these changes will be implemented is July 2017.

Other Comments: There were 16 additional comments to this survey question, 2 comments were not applicable to the question and 3 comments referenced facility-based day services.

- One commenter recommended the SMA should have an oversight committee or policy council made up of stakeholders to plan and make recommendations to the SMA and to help ensure consistency with policies and expectations across the SMA, DIDD and the MCOS.
  - TennCare has regularly scheduled meetings with stakeholders, including provider associations, advocacy organizations, DIDD and the MCOs. Most meetings are set to occur on a quarterly basis, but occur more frequently when needed or upon

request. Additionally, TennCare solicits input, both formally and informally on all program changes and implementations.

- Several commenters stated the plan was unclear and difficult to follow.
  - TennCare understands the complexity of the STP and the HCBS Settings Final Rule. As described in Section 4, page 22 and Section 4, beginning on page 15, extensive training has been provided and additional training is being conducted in February and March 2016. Language in regards to scheduled trainings was added to Section 4, page 22 and Section 4 page 31 to address this and similar comments.
- One Commenter discouraged the addition of any requirements in the Statewide Transition Plan that are not required by CMS.
  - TennCare has worked diligently to interpret the rules per CMS guidance and is implementing requirements that will assist the state in meeting the Final Rule's compliance standards.

4. Is there any difference in the way the provider self-assessment process is described in the STP versus the way it was carried out?Yes responses: 9 No responses: 11

Comments: There were 13 unique comments to this survey question, 5 comments were not applicable to the question.

- A few commenters stated the self-assessment process was conducted as described.
- Several commenters voiced concerns with communication, such as little notice prior to the provider self-assessment expectations, not being adequately or directly distributed to stakeholders and not being notified or informed of the consequences of the assessment.

The state's communication and initial training plan was conducted in July of 2014 and is detailed in Section 1, pages 2-4. TennCare then provided training specific to the self-assessment process October – November 2014 as described in Section 4, beginning on page 15. Also as described in Section 4, the timeline for the provider self-assessment process was October 2014 through March 31, 2015 with the validation process concluding September 30, 2015 as described in Section 3 and Section 4. The state believes this communication and training plan was adequate.

- One commenter stated that there were inconsistencies in reviewing homes in close proximity.
  - As a result of public comment, TennCare will include homes close in proximity to each other to the heightened scrutiny review process. Language has been added to Section 4, page 22 to include settings close in proximity. The state will partner with DIDD and the MCOs as applicable, in the heightened scrutiny review of all settings to ensure consistency.

5. If a provider is not able or willing to come into compliance, is the relocation process for people served by that agency clear and understandable? Yes responses: 20 No responses: 7

6. Does the relocation process meet all the needs of a person who is moving to a different service provider?

Yes responses: 7 No responses: 287

Due to the same or similar nature of responses for questions 5 and 6, the comments are summarized together below.

For both question 5 and question 6, 153 "Other" and 125 "Family Member" respondents did not answer the Yes/No question but submitted the (identical) statement and some additional responders submitted the same or similar concerns as summarized below:

- Commenters stated the relocation process was understandable but did not feel it was reasonable. Concern was expressed about the timeline, and the process not being person-centered regarding individual choice (not being able to stay with the facility-based provider who may not be compliant).
  - Commenters seemed to be associating the relocation process to facility based day services. Similar comments/concerns are expressed and addressed throughout each question and comments received. In addition to a letter and FAQ document for consumers and family members, TennCare has scheduled information sessions targeted to consumers who receive facility based day services and their families February 17-26, 2016. These sessions will highlight previously presented portions of the Final Rule and CMS guidance that are specific to settings presumed not HCBS, and explain the state's heightened scrutiny review process as described in Section 4 beginning on page 19. Provider specific training will be conducted March 2-11, 2016. Language regarding these targeted trainings has been added to Section 4, page 22 and Section 4, page 31. In addition, as described in Section 4 page 27 the state intends to assist in the facilitation of focus groups to assist providers with implementing transition plans and meeting the requirements of the Final Rule.

Additional language regarding the state's current and planned efforts for focus groups has been added to Part E, beginning on page 31.

• Additional written guidance from CMS regarding the impact of personal choice as part of the person-centered planning process, as it relates to facility-based services and settings would be helpful.

Other Comments: There was a combined total of 33 additional comments (some noted above), 7 comments were not applicable to the question and 4 comments referenced facility-based day services – these comments are noted above.

- One commenter stated a bullet point of specifics would be better.
  - As a result of this comment, the relocation process formatting has been modified for ease of reading/following. See pages 28-30 for format changes of the specific requirements. Additional simplification can be accommodated as contracted entities work with providers, if necessary.
- One commenter asked questions about the timeline for transition once an individual is notified and what happens if the person cannot find a suitable provider.

The relocation process is detailed beginning on page 28. The process specifies that the timeline for transition will be individualized (see 5 and 5.a below). The process also specifies activities required for assisting each person who must relocate in identifying new provider (see 4.a-c below):'...4. The contracted entity will ensure that the person is given ample opportunity to learn about the variety of settings that are available and are compliant with the HCBS Settings Rule.

- a. The person should be afforded the opportunity to select from nondisability specific settings and select their roommates if applicable.
- b. Supports will be provided to the person to assist in relocation choice and the caregiver's schedule will be accommodated to support the person in making an informed decision about an alternate setting.
- *c. ISCs/ Care Coordinators should be researching all possible, appropriate settings for this person to choose from.; and*

"5. Once a new provider has been selected, a person centered planning meeting will take place to define the timelines for transition, as well as identify specific supports and services needed in order to make a safe transition.

a. Additional time should be built into the transition plan to ensure safety, continuity of services, for development of or modifications to existing settings, and to assure that all supports and services will be in place prior to the person transitioning to the new provider.

7. Were there settings that were not addressed in the STP that need to be reviewed?Yes responses: 7 No responses: 14

153 "Other" and 125 "Family Member" respondents did not answer the Yes/No question but submitted the (identical) statement below:

- "Much more clarification needs to be provided on what modifications to facility based services would meet the community inclusion rule. My preference is that facility based services be allowed with assurances that community interaction occurs on a reasonable basis not every day- not all day. This will be very difficult for staff to do every day."
  - In addition to a letter and FAQ document for consumers and family members, TennCare has scheduled information sessions targeted to consumers who receive facility based day services and their families February 17-26, 2016. These sessions will highlight previously presented portions of the Final Rule and CMS guidance that are specific to settings presumed not HCBS, and explain the state's heightened scrutiny review process as described in Section 4 beginning on page 19. Provider specific training will be conducted March 2-11, 2016. Language regarding these targeted trainings has been added to Section 4, page 22 and Section 4, page 31. In addition, as described in Section 4 page 27 the state intends to assist in the facilitation of focus groups to assist providers with implementing transition plans and meeting the requirements of the Final Rule. Additional language regarding the state's current and planned efforts for focus groups has been added to Part E, beginning on page 31.
  - Additional written guidance from CMS regarding the impact of personal choice as part of the person-centered planning process, as it relates to facility-based services and settings would be helpful

Other Comments: There were 14 unique comments to this survey question, only 2 were applicable to the question, and several of the remaining comments referenced facility-based day services.

- One commenter listed Personal Assistance.
  - Per CMS guidance released in 2015, the state will be requiring a review of personcentered plans for individuals who receive supports in their homes to ensure that they have full access to the greater community. In addition, TennCare will require the next phase of Individual Experience Assessments to be conducted on persons receiving non-residential supports in their own homes.
  - Compliance is also monitored across services and settings through the QA process, and through the NCI and NCI-AD survey processes as well as Individual Experience Assessments conducted with each person served.

- One commenter stated that there were not additional settings that needed to be reviewed but asked for clarification on requirements for facility based day settings.
  - As stated previously, in addition to a letter and FAQ document for consumers and family members, TennCare has scheduled information sessions targeted to consumers who receive facility based day services and their families February 17-26, 2016. These sessions will highlight previously presented portions of the Final Rule and CMS guidance that are specific to settings presumed not HCBS, and explain the state's heightened scrutiny review process as described in Section 4 beginning on page 19. Provider specific training will be conducted March 2-11, 2016. Language regarding these targeted trainings has been added to Section 4, page 22 and Section 4, page 31. In addition, as described in Section 4 page 27 the state intends to assist in the facilitation of focus groups to assist providers with implementing transition plans and meeting the requirements of the Final Rule. Additional language regarding the state's current and planned efforts for focus groups has been added to Part E, beginning on page 31.
  - As previously noted, additional written guidance from CMS regarding the impact of personal choice as part of the person-centered planning process, as it relates to facility-based services and settings would be helpful

8. Are the proposed provider self-assessment remediation milestones and timelines in the STP reasonable?

Yes responses: 6 No responses: 296

Of the 296 respondents that replied "No" to this question, 153 "Other" and 125 "Family Member" respondents replied "No" to this question and added the following statement:

- "TennCare and DIDD should allow the maximum transition time as permitted by CMS at least January 1, 2019."
  - In light of public comments received, TennCare is revising its original proposed heightened scrutiny review process timeline. Language has been modified and added to Section 4, pages 25-26 to reflect this change. While the state did not impose timelines on providers other than the CMS mandated timeline of March 2019 and each provider established their own timelines for implementing their provider specific transition plan, it is clear we need to work with providers to ensure adequate time has been allocated for transitioning into compliance. The timelines reflected in the amended STP Section 4, pages 25-26 are timelines submitted by providers in their provider specific transition plans that have been approved by DIDD or an MCO and TennCare. We now anticipate that some of these timelines will be modified on an individual provider basis as the state conducts and completes the heightened scrutiny review process.

Other Comments: There were 15 additional comments to this survey question, 3 comments were not applicable to the question and 5 comments referenced facility-based day services.

- Most of the comments for this survey question were regarding the timeline for compliance being rushed, TennCare needing to allow the maximum transition time and that the timeline is too aggressive for providers to make such a big adjustment to their services.
  - The state is working to meet the CMS required compliance timeline of March 2019. In light of public comments received, TennCare is revising its original proposed heightened scrutiny review process timeline. Language has been modified and added to Section 4, pages 25-26 to reflect this change. While the state did not impose timelines on providers other than the CMS mandated timeline of March 2019 and each provider established their own timelines for implementing their provider specific transition plan, it is clear we need to work with providers to ensure adequate time has been allocated for transitioning into compliance. The timelines reflected in the amended STP Section 4, pages 25-26 are timelines submitted by providers in their provider specific transition plans that have been approved by DIDD or an MCO and TennCare. We now anticipate that some of these timelines will be modified on an individual provider basis as the state conducts and completes the heightened scrutiny review process. Also, as described in Section 4 page 27 the state intends to assist in the facilitation of focus groups to assist providers with implementing transition plans. Additional language regarding the state's current and planned efforts for focus groups has been added to Part E, beginning on page 31.

9. Is the strategy for ensuring that the State stays in compliance with the HCBS Settings Rule sufficient in the STP?Yes responses: 15 No responses: 6

153 "Other" and 125 "Family Member" respondents did not answer the Yes/No question but did comment that "It appears to be more than sufficient."

Other Comments: There were 11 additional comments to this survey question, 3 comments were not applicable to the question.

- A few commenters expressed concern that the strategy for staying compliant was not easy to understand and a few others stated the strategy was more than was needed.
- It is the state's responsibility to ensure ongoing compliance with the HCBS Settings Final Rule. We have developed processes we believe are necessary to ensure ongoing compliance.

10. Please provide suggestions on the process for providing assistance to providers to help them come into compliance.

153 "Other" and 127 "Family Member" respondents replied with the following (identical) statement:

- "First, allow reasonable time frames. Secondly, provide the resources needed to modify the system. Thirdly, modify the daily requirements for day services so that community inclusion can and does occur - but not every day, not all day. Please have some understanding of the extreme disabilities of some of those served. Fourthly, recognize not everyone can or should work."
  - This comment appears to hit on many repeated 'themes' or issues that are clearly of concern to consumers, families and providers. The first one being the remediation milestone timeline. In light of public comments received, TennCare is revising its original proposed heightened scrutiny review process timeline. Language has been modified and added to Section 4, pages 25-26 to reflect this change. While the state did not impose timelines on providers other than the CMS mandated timeline of March 2019 and each provider established their own timelines for implementing their provider specific transition plan, it is clear we need to work with providers to ensure adequate time has been allocated for transitioning into compliance. The timelines reflected in the amended STP Section 4, pages 25-26 are timelines submitted by providers in their provider specific transition plans that have been approved by DIDD or an MCO and TennCare. We now anticipate that some of these timelines will be modified on an individual provider basis as the state conducts and completes the heightened scrutiny review process. In addition, as described in Section 4 page 27 the state intends to assist in the facilitation of focus groups to assist providers with implementing transition plans and meeting the requirements of the Final Rule. Additional language regarding the state's current and planned efforts for focus groups has been added to Part E, beginning on page 31. The second issue is the concern, and in some instances fear, that is being expressed regarding the future of facility based day program settings. There does appear to still be confusion about what the Rule requires in regards to facility based day programs among families and providers. In addition to a letter and FAQ document for consumers and family members, TennCare will provide consumer and family training prior to the heightened scrutiny process February 17-26, 2016. Provider specific training will be conducted March 2-11, 2016. Language regarding these targeted trainings has been added to Section 4, page 22 and Section 4, page 31. In addition, more work is yet to be done in relation to person centered planning and employment/community integration. The state is contracting with national subject matter experts on employment and day services, and person centered practices to provide training at an organizational and systems level. The amended STP does not speak to TennCare's

person centered planning and practices strategies as, per CMS, the plan centers on setting site compliance.

- Other Comments: There were 16 additional comments to this survey question, 2 comments were not applicable to the question and 2 comments referenced facility-based day services.
- Several commenters mentioned mentoring efforts from providers that are doing this well.
  - As described in Section 4 page 27 the state intends to assist in the facilitation of focus groups to assist providers with implementing transition plans and meeting the requirements of the Final Rule. Additional language regarding the state's current and planned efforts for focus groups has been added to Part E, beginning on page 31.
- Most commenters felt they do not have a full understanding and stated that more faceto-face training would be beneficial. One of these commenters also expressed that distributing information through the MCOs and DIDD is not effective.
  - In addition to a letter and FAQ document for consumers and family members, TennCare will provide consumer and family training prior to the heightened scrutiny process February 17-26, 2016. Provider specific training will be conducted March 2-11, 2016. Language regarding these targeted trainings has been added to Section 4, page 22 and Section 4, page 31. TennCare utilizes several resources for distributing information. Specifically, all information related to the HCBS Settings Final Rule and the STP is sent directly to stakeholders, including advocacy organizations and provider associations, to share with their membership and the consumers and families they serve. This includes case managers and ISCs who have regular contact with the individuals they serve and their families. In addition, it is provided to the Department of Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities and the State's three contracted MCOs to share with their provider networks, with a request to also share with the individuals they serve and their families.
  - A few recommendations centered on clear expectations, giving examples of what a meaningful day looks like, use simplified language and have regular dialog about the ongoing process.
    - As described in previous responses, in addition to a letter and FAQ document for consumers and family members, TennCare will provide additional consumer and family training focused on those who utilize facility based day services, prior to the heightened scrutiny process February 17-26, 2016. Comprehensive provider training will be provided March 2-11, 2016. The state recognizes that many providers are struggling with how to come into compliance and need

understandable, achievable examples of how to meet the Final Rule criteria. To help these providers, as described in Section 4 page 27, the state intends to assist in the facilitation of focus groups to assist providers with implementing transition plans and meeting the requirements of the Final Rule. Additional language regarding the state's current and planned efforts for focus groups has been added to Part E, beginning on page 31.

11. Is the TennCare Heightened Scrutiny process clear and understandable in the STP?Yes responses: 7 No responses: 20

Comments: There were 11 unique comments to this survey question including 1 that stated the process was very clear. 5 comments were not applicable to the question and 3 comments referenced facility-based day services.

- 1. The remaining commenters primarily felt the heightened scrutiny process was not clear in the amended STP and have concerns as to the impact on their loved ones' services.
  - Note, the heightened scrutiny review process training has started statewide and will continue through March 2016. Training will be provided to contracted entities, consumers and family members, advocacy organizations and providers/ISC/CM/CC. As always, all materials will be posted on the TennCare website and distributed as applicable.

12. Are there other settings besides (the list) that you think TennCare should review under its Heightened Scrutiny process?

Yes responses: 4 No responses: 34

Comments: There were 11 unique comments to this survey question. Only 1 was applicable to the question. The majority of the remainder referenced facility-based day services.

- One commenter asked what the qualifications are going to be for those conducting heightened scrutiny.
  - The heightened scrutiny review team will include a TennCare representative and a representative from the reviewing entity, DIDD or an MCO as applicable. TennCare staff is well versed in HCBS Settings compliance, as well as person centered planning philosophy and conducting training specifically for DIDD and the MCOs on the heightened scrutiny review process. Additionally, each reviewing entity participated in all the trainings leading up to the provider selfassessment and will participate in consumer/family and provider trainings on the upcoming heightened scrutiny process.

Please note that there were 5 personal letters send to TennCare absent the survey questions. These letters were either non-applicable to the amended STP or referenced facility-based day services.

#### Summary of Comments on Amended Statewide Transition Plan and Changes Made

Below are "Other Comments" that were received:

 10 commenters made references to policies and other documents, including State Protocols, Procedures and Policies referenced in Section 2, MCO policies, procedures and protocol, DIDD policy and procedures, and state revision rules that have not been finalized or shared and requested continued public input whenever changes to such documents are made. (*Pursuant to existing state statute, all rule changes regardless of state department require public hearing and comment period. In addition, all policies related to DIDD waiver services are subject to public hearing and comment period. TennCare policies and protocols related to the MCO program operations are developed in conjunction with the MCOs and reviewed every six months and revised as necessary based on experience with implementation and feedback if applicable.)* 

10 commenters recommend that all credentialing, training and compliance requirements related to HCBS be globally consistent among all state departments as well as MCOs. Of those commenters, 9 specifically also asked what kind of training will be required. (*Clarifying language was added to Section 2, page 8 under Training Requirements to address this comment in regards to DIDD and MCOs' provider credentialing and training. Consistency across all other state departments was addressed in the previously submitted version of the Statewide Transition Plan and remains in Section 2, page 7 under State Statutes, State Regulations and State Rules.)* 

• 299 commenters expressed concern that the STP was not adequately distributed - specifically to families and further stated that the responsibility should not have been placed on the advocacy organization. Section 1 (As stated in Section 1, page 3 of this Amended Statewide Transition Plan, the document was distributed to and by multiple organizations:

"On November 4, 2015 an email including the Statewide Transition Plan was sent directly to stakeholders, including advocacy organizations and provider associations, to share with their membership and the consumers and families they serve. In addition, the proposed plan was provided to the Department of Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities and the State's three contracted MCOs to share with their provider networks, with a request to also share with the individuals they serve and their families.

• On November 13, 2015 the Statewide Transition Plan was revised to include an updated explanation of the state's Heightened Scrutiny process and reposted. An

email notification including the November 13<sup>th</sup> Statewide Transition Plan was sent directly to stakeholders, including advocacy organizations and provider associations, to share with their membership and the consumers and families they serve. In addition, the revised proposed plan was provided to the Department of Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities and the State's three contracted MCOs to share with their provider networks, with a request to also share with the individuals they serve and their families. ...")

- Recommend review of DIDD licensure rules as they are related to HCBS (feel there are some that conflict with the rule). Section 2 page 7
- 314 commenters expressed that people of retirement age, unable to work or unable to stay in the community for six hours, and that choose FBD should be able to continue to receive those services. (Section 2, does not state that people of retirement age cannot attend FBD programs. As part of the heightened scrutiny process described in Section 4, all FBD settings will be assessed through the heightened scrutiny review process to ensure compliance with the Final Rule. The state will work with any setting that is not in compliance to ensure their transition plan is adequate for coming into compliance. Providers who choose not to meet compliance criteria will be required to work with the state on transitioning members as appropriate.)
- 10 commenters noted implication that there may be additional changes to the waiver in the future and they encourage stakeholder input. (*Pursuant to CMS regulations, all waiver amendments are posted for a public input period. In addition to this, language has been added to Section 2, page 6, HCBS Definitions and Provider Qualifications to clarify TennCare's intent in regards to future waiver amendments and stakeholder involvement and public input.*)
- 9 Commenters stated they would like to have more input in the development of the heightened scrutiny tool and the provider training scheduled for 2016. (As a result of this comment, language has been added to Section 3, page 19 that describes TennCare's response: "...This training will be targeted to the providers that TennCare has identified as requiring a heightened scrutiny review as described on page 22. Again, TennCare will provide an explanation of the HCBS Settings Rule requirements, target the portions of the rule that speak to settings that have qualities of an institution and are therefore "presumed" not HCBS, provide guidance for coming into compliance, and outline the heightened scrutiny review process. This will include a walk through of any tools that will be utilized as part of the review process and at least an hour for questions, answers and dialogue immediately following the training presentation. Based on public comments to have input into the trainings, TennCare conducted "kick-off" Heightened Scrutiny Process sessions at regional provider forums during the month of January 2016 and collected questions and comments to be used to inform the training sessions. Likewise,

during the training sessions, any feedback received on the tools presented for use will be taken into consideration for any potential revisions before the heightened scrutiny process begins.")

- 9 commenters suggested a change in wording from "appropriate provider" to "compliant provider" and also a list of all non-compliant providers. (Language was added to the referenced section, Section 4 page 16 to read : "Providers assessed to be unwilling or unable to come into compliance, will be required to cooperate with transition assistance to ensure all individuals served are transitioned to an appropriate provider type **that was determined to be compliant with the Rule**, maintaining continuity of services".)
- 9 commenters recommend adding "unless otherwise specified in the PCP" in regards to homes in close proximity. As written, the HS language limits the person's choice. Section 4 page 19. (TennCare recognizes that individual choice is paramount. Per public comment TennCare will review homes in close proximity in conjunction with the person centered plan to ensure that unless otherwise specified, the person has chosen to live in close proximity). In addition, as stipulated in all training that has been and will be provided, and pursuant to the Final Rule, modifications to the rule must be included in an individual's person-centered support plan and include all requirements as specified in the Rule. This already addressed in Part D, IV-VI;
- 9 commenters recommended under item 1: that transportation access be measured against access to the general public as most rural areas don't have public transportation; (This is in regards to exploratory questions that were utilized as part of the already completed provider self-assessment tool. The state does not intend to hold providers in rural areas accountable for community resources that are not available in such areas.)
- 9 commenters recommended under Section 4 that the use of the DIDD Human Rights Committee review of safety measures be included. (*The state agrees with this recommendation and language has been added to Section 4 to include a review of the HRC processes.*)
- 9 commenters stated it is unclear what entity will coordinate the strategies for providers needing assistance to come into compliance. Section 4 page 27 (In the section and page referenced, it was already stated that "...TennCare will work with DIDD and the MCOs to develop and conduct these targeted trainings as well as facilitate focus groups described in section E below...".)

## Comments on the Waiver-Specific Transition Plan

The State received 35 online comments, 21 comments via mail, and 4 comments via email, totaling 60 written public comments. (These were written comments from 60 submitting entities; most entities submitted multiple comments/recommendations.) These included three letters from advocacy groups: one from The Arc Tennessee; another from the Tennessee Parent Coalition encompassing parents of individuals with I/DD across the state, including Nashville, Memphis, and Chattanooga; and the third from the TennesseeWorks Partnership Team and Employers and Providers Workgroup. The vast majority of comments received were from family members, conservators, or representatives of individuals with disabilities served in the state's HCBS programs.

Of the 60 written comments received, 5 were not applicable to the Transition Plan or Assessment documents, and 21 were specific to concerns about the potential elimination of facility based day services under the new HCBS setting regulation. Comments were also received during face-to-face meetings with various provider groups and during statewide informational calls targeted to individuals with I/DD and their family members or conservators. A summary of the comments pertaining directly to the Proposed Transition Plan and changes to the Transition Plan based on those comments is below.

## Summary of Comments on Waiver-Specific Transition Plan and Changes Made

In order to help organize comments for incorporation into the Transition Plan, the State asked entities submitting comments to answer certain questions regarding the Transition Plan. Entities were also encouraged to submit any other comments or recommendations beyond the scope of these questions.

1. Are the suggested timelines appropriate?

• Almost all of the commenters focused on the timeline set forth in the regulation for achieving compliance with the HCBS Setting Rule, rather than the specific timelines proposed in Tennessee's Transition Plan. The majority of these commenters stated that they believe the full 5 years will be necessary for transition and 3 years at minimum. (*The State has not yet established a deadline for achieving full compliance, and recognizes that any proposed date is subject to CMS approval. This date will be determined based on state, contracted entity, and provider self-assessments, as well as action steps and timelines for achieving compliance, but will occur no later than March 17, 2019.)* 

Concerns were expressed, however, with the proposed timeframes for completing provider self-assessments and contracted entity self-assessments. Based on these comments, the State modified the Transition Plan to extend the timelines for

submission of these self-assessments, incorporating a training period for providers on the new tool, as further described below. These changes in the Transition Plan are addressed in Part B, 2 and Part C, 3 with the extension of Contracted Entity Self-Assessment and Provider Self-Assessment activities, respectively, from December 31, 2014 to March 31, 2015.

- 2. The best methodology/process for completing the assessments?
  - The majority of commenters declined to make specific recommendations regarding the process.
  - Several commenters recommended training for providers on the self-assessment process prior to its implementation. (*This comment was addressed in Part C, 3*) with the addition of "a. The State will conduct statewide provider education and training sessions on how to complete the Provider Self-Assessment Tool. These training sessions will be conducted between October 15, 2014 November 15, 2014.")
  - Several commenters also affirmed the importance of self-advocate and family involvement in all aspects of the assessment process, and recommended that the Transition Plan reflect ways to ensure that their perspective would be included in the assessment of compliance with the new rule. (*This comment resulted in a change in Part C, 3, c. Providers will be required to include persons served, family members/ representatives, advocates, and other stakeholders in their assessment process.*)
  - Some commenters expressed concern regarding individuals who may be required to transition to new providers should their current providers not come into compliance with the new rule. (*This comment resulted in the addition of a new i. under Part C, 3 , i., reflecting the oversight of the SMA, in conjunction with DIDD or the MCO, as applicable, in all necessary transition processes.*)

## 3. Strategies for initial achievement of compliance and assurance of ongoing compliance?

The majority of commenters responded that they need more guidance from CMS, particularly on non-residential services. Providers and families expressed significant concern regarding the potential impact of the new rule on facility-based day services, and whether such services will continue to be permitted under HCBS programs. (*TennCare received verbal guidance from CMS on non-residential service compliance which will be addressed in provider training, and is proceeding accordingly. The State will incorporate into its Transition Plan assessment and compliance processes any additional written guidance that may be issued by CMS, as it becomes available.*)

Many commenters expressed satisfaction with the current services provided in Tennessee, affirming their belief that programs are person-centered and operating in compliance with the new rule, and are concerned that changes related to the rule will disrupt services for members—in particular, facility-based day services.

• There were recommendations that the State also consider other ways of measuring ongoing compliance in addition to the individual experience assessments. (*This resulted in the addition of a 4<sup>th</sup> bullet under Part F, exploring the use of Core Indicators data and national accreditation to support ongoing compliance monitoring efforts.*)

## 4. OTHER comments

• The overwhelming majority of commenters again expressed concern about the effect the HCBS Setting Rule will have on facility-based day services. Most of these commenters are concerned that Tennessee will do away with facility-based day programs in part or altogether, and strongly oppose such changes. (*This comment did not impact changes necessary to the Proposed Transition Plan; verbal guidance received from CMS will be addressed in provider training and ongoing communication with stakeholder groups.*)

Other comments requested changes in certain language, e.g., not using "plan of care." ("Plan of care" has been changed to "person-centered plan" throughout the Transition Plan.)

## Summary of Additional Comments on Statewide Transition Plan and Changes Made

Since Section G is the only substantial difference between the initial proposed waiver-specific Transition Plan and the proposed Statewide Transition Plan, the State asked entities submitting comments to address their comments specifically to Section G of the proposed Statewide Transition Plan, while also providing additional opportunity for comment on portions of the Statewide Transition Plan that were previously posted for public comment, i.e.,

1. Please provide any comments/suggestions on Section G of the proposed Statewide Transition Plan

2. OTHER comments

## Summary of Additional Comments on Statewide Transition Plan

The state received 25 additional online comments in response to the posted Statewide Transition Plan. This included one comment from a family member, 3 comments from

Independent Support Coordinators (ISCs, contracted to provide Independent Support Coordination or case management under two of the State's HCBS waivers) and 21 comments from non-ISC HCBS providers, one of whom indicated they were also a family member.

A summary of these additional comments received and changes to the Statewide Transition Plan based on those comments are as follows:

- The first commenter (an ISC) expressed concern that not all families were aware of public meetings and materials posted on the TennCare website and questioned whether persons submitting comments are representative of the broader population served under the waivers. The ISC also expressed concern regarding community-based day services and support for facility-based day services as a "well-rounded option" for many individuals. Other concerns included ample time for transition if an agency is unable to come into compliance, and additional time for completion of Individual Experience Assessments since they have not yet commenced. (*The Individual Experience Assessment Tool is being revised per feedback received after training sessions were provided and will begin February 1, 2015.*)
- The timeline for completion of the Individual Experience Assessment was also the focus of a second ISC's comments, noting that the assessments have not yet begun and recommending that the dates be adjusted to provide for additional time to complete these assessments.
- 2 commenters (an ISC and a non-ISC HCBS provider) had questions about the provider self-assessment process, and one specifically asked about assessments for non-residential providers. (Comprehensive provider training was conducted and each provider was assigned to a designated reviewer entity, DIDD or an MCO. Each designated reviewer has been in contact with providers to explain their submission process and provide access to the online assessment tool. Representatives from each designated reviewer are available to providers, and individual follow up is conducted on a regular basis with providers. All provider questions will be addressed by designated reviewers. Guidance on the non-residential provider assessment tool as well. Additionally, the "Exploratory Questions to Assist States in Assessment of Non-Residential HCBS Settings" provider by CMS is posted on the state's website and was distributed to HCBS providers and the link was also included by DIDD in their weekly provider newsletter, Open Line.)

• 17 comments (all from non-ISC HCBS providers) were identical, with one offering additional detail on the otherwise consistent responses. Each indicated that CMS guidance on the HCB setting rule—in particular, guidance pertaining to non-residential services "lacks clarity." They reiterated concerns previously expressed in response to the waiver-specific Transition Plan, i.e., "It is still a concern that 'an overwhelming majority of commenters again expressed concern about the effect the HCBS Setting Rule will have on facility-based day services' this was not really addressed in the transition plan." Similar concern was also expressed in 3 additional comments from non-ISC HCBS providers, reiterating their support for facility-based programs as a continued choice for individuals receiving HCBS. A few went so far as to say that the new rules will actually constrain the choice of individuals receiving HCBS by making people "do things they do not want to do" and "taking away the CHOICE [sic] of where they want to be and what makes them happy." (Facility Based Day (FBD) settings were specifically addressed in the comprehensive provider trainings that were conducted by the state, guidance on completing the self-assessment for FBD settings was provided during the training and is also embedded within the assessment tool).

The 17 identical comments (plus 1 additional comment) from non-ISC HCBS providers requested additional training in the assessment of compliance with the new HCB setting rules for providers in non-residential settings.

- These same 18 comments voiced concern that the March 31, 2015 deadline for completion of provider self-assessments is proving to be more challenging than anticipated. (6 months was provided for completion of these self-assessments. The timeline is necessary in order to allow time for review and validation, and development of corrective actions by the end of 2015. The state and designated reviewers are tracking provider progress and will work individually with agencies struggling to meet the imposed deadline.)
- The 17 identical comments requested that a FAQ document regarding the provider selfassessment process be posted on state websites. (A FAQ document will be developed in partnership with the designated reviewers and posted to the TennCare, DIDD and MCO websites by February 6, 2015).
- These 17 identical comments (plus one from another non-ISC HCBS provider) requested the opportunity to review and provide input on any revisions in state law, rules and regulations, policies, protocols, and practices that might result from state or contracted

entity self-assessments. All but one also requested review of any changes in the provider agreement. 17 of the 18 comments expressed appreciation that, as indicated in Part G.2 above, there will be public notice period prior to the implementation of revisions in state rules and regulations.

• The opportunity for public input on any changes in implementing regulations and appreciation for the indication of such in the Transition Plan was the subject of the only additional comment received from a Family Member on the Statewide Transition Plan.

In response to these comments, in addition to ongoing efforts to ensure opportunity for public input and ongoing support and assistance to providers, including a FAQ document regarding the self-assessment process, several adjustments (or clarifications) were made in the Statewide Transition Plan.

First, in Section 2, Part D, 4, the date for completing Individual Experience Assessments has been modified to reflect that such assessments will now commence on February 1, 2015 and continue through January 1, 2016.

Second, in Section 2, Part C, 3.i.i.1., we have emphasized that 30 days advance notice is the *minimum* amount of notice that will be required in instances where a person must transition from a non-compliant provider to a new compliant provider, and that "[a]dditional time will be provided to complete these transitions as needed and consistent with the State's approved Transition Plan. The State will ensure that sufficient time is permitted to safely transition individuals to another compliant setting of their choice, and to assure continuity of services. This will include instances where the person's new residential setting must be developed and/or modified to meet their needs."

Finally, Section 2, Part C, 3.b. was modified to clarify that Provider Self-Assessments are applicable to all residential, employment and day program providers in a Section 1915(c) waiver or the State's MLTSS programs and to delete PA providers from the list of providers required to complete a self-assessment. This is based on guidance in a Questions and Answers document developed by CMS which advises that states are not required to assess services provided in a person's private home. Consistent with CMS guidance, we will nonetheless utilize the person-centered planning process to ensure that all services are being provided in a way that supports the person's opportunities for employment and integration into the broader community.

#### Amendments to STP Based on Advocacy Review Committee Feedback and Public Comments

After completion of the State's on-site Heightened Scrutiny visits, the State developed and implemented a two-fold review process for those settings subject to Heightened Scrutiny review that were either compliant upon review or submitted State-approved transition plans to achieve compliance, in order to further vet these settings before submission to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS). Those two steps – the Advocacy Review Committee and Public Comment process – are detailed below.

#### Advocacy Review Committee (ARC)

The first step in the vetting process was review of State-approved Heightened Scrutiny settings by the ARC. Invitations to participate in the ARC process were extended to: The Arc Tennessee, The Tennessee Council on Development Disabilities, the Statewide Independent Living Council of Tennessee, Disability Rights Tennessee, the Tennessee Disability Coalition, and AARP Tennessee.

ARC activities were originally set to be completed in Tennessee's STP by the Milestone date of September 29, 2017. However, the State previously requested and received CMS approval to extend this deadline to May 15, 2018 to account for the revised ARC process explained below.

Initially, the ARC process included the opportunity for ARC members to review and comment on each setting that the State determined was non-compliant in one or more areas based on the on-site Heightened Scrutiny visit, but that submitted a State-approved transition plan to overcome those institutional characteristics. In February 2018, TennCare began providing ARC members with documentation submitted by each of the non-compliant settings, which included the results of on-site Heightened Scrutiny review visit concerning member interviews, staff interviews, physical settings observations, the transition plan from the provider that had been approved by TennCare, and corresponding policies and procedures in support of the transition plan. The expectation was that ARC members would independently review tools and provide feedback to TennCare.

Upon initiating ARC review, the State received a recommendation from ARC members to change the approach to collecting the ARC's feedback. The ARC suggested a revised process in which the State would convene on-site meetings to review and discuss evidence collaboratively. In response, the State held two on-site meetings with ARC members on April 30, 2018 and May 11, 2018 in which the State presented evidence gleaned from Heightened Scrutiny visits, categorized by setting type, and described action steps that have been approved in provider transition plans for the ARC to determine whether these transition steps were sufficient to remediate the non-compliant areas.

ARC members were also given the opportunity to conduct a deeper review in conjunction with State staff of the evidence packet for any setting upon request. Based on ARC members' requests, State staff reviewed sites selected by ARC members in detail.

The ARC discussions resulted in valuable feedback that has been summarized in the attached letter submitted on behalf of four of the participating organizations and located at the end of this revised STP. Specifically, the feedback identified three areas for improvement, with responses provided by the State as follows:

1. "The most deeply systemic compliance issue for providers is delivering individualized services, which has historically not been part of the HCBS provider business model and, we fear, is not fully funded by HCBS rates."

The State has previously taken several steps to address this concern. One was redesigning the Plan of Care template that was used for members in the State's two managed long-term services and supports programs, and in its place the State has implemented a Person-Centered Support Plan and Comprehensive Assessment that focus on collecting information about each member in terms of their interests and goals to make this person-centered outcome approach the primary focus of the plan. A second step was to develop and implement the Individual Experience Assessment (IEA) in the State's two managed long-term services and supports programs and in the State's 1915c HCBS Waivers. The IEA captures, on an annual basis, each individual's opinion of whether they are provided the rights afford by the HCBS Settings Rule through responses to a series of questions, and requires the State's contracted entities, TennCare Managed Care Organizations and the Department of Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, to work with providers to remediate areas where individuals express concern with non-compliance. A third step in individualizing the service experience concerns the implementation of flexible scheduling in the State's implementation of electronic visit verification requirements as required by the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Cures Act in its two managed longterm services and supports programs in order to allow for greater choice in when services are delivered. Finally, the State significantly amended its day and employment benefits in its three 1915c HCBS Waivers to both expand community integration and employment opportunities and expand flexibility for both persons supported and providers. The amendments, currently pending CMS approval, also realign reimbursement to help support the provision of more individualized employment and day services, and the achievement of individualized employment and community living goals. Finally, in the Section 1915(c) waivers, Governor Haslam and the General Assembly have appropriated provider rate increases four of the past five fiscal years, including for fiscal year 2019, approximately \$50 million in a combination of recurring and non-recurring funding.

2. "Additionally, individualized services should increase processes that support 'dignity of risk'. State service system and policy reforms that support an individual's right to participate in the community without undue restrictions will be essential for realizing person-centered services over the long-term"

We agree. TennCare has launched a Systems Transformation Initiative, engaging self-advocates, advocacy organizations, providers, health plan partners, and DIDD as part of a Systems Transformation Leadership Group to help identify and address changes that are needed to ensure a person-centered service delivery system across Medicaid programs and authorities. Among the key "drivers" of systems transformation prioritized by the group, the one with the largest number of initiatives is policy and regulation, including several which are specifically targeted at helping to support self-determination, including the concept of "dignity of risk." TennCare is developing a Dignity of Risk protocol with input from the group, and plans to continue efforts to evolve quality monitoring and critical incident systems and approaches in ways that continue to assure health and safety, while not inadvertently restricting individual rights and community participation. In addition, the State has fully embraced Supported Decision-Making as an alternative to more restrictive forms of legal representation, including creating a benefit in the State's Employment an Community First CHOICES program that provides funds for individuals and their families to receive counseling on alternatives to conservatorship, and ongoing collaboration with the Tennessee Council on Developmental Disabilities, The Arc Tennessee, and Disability Rights Tennessee to explore additional opportunities to support less restrictive decision making alternatives for those who need support. In addition, TennCare has required Managed Care Organizations to establish Settings Compliance Committees (building off the concept of Human Rights Committees in the 1915c HCBS Waivers) to maintain panels of clinicians and other trained staff who regularly review cases concerning rights restrictions to ensure the restrictions are compliant with the modification process in the HCBS Settings Rule.

3. "And, finally, a closely related systemic issue is transportation for HCBS recipients, which, we believe, is not adequately addressed nor funded by HCBS rates"

Transportation issues were a commonly stated barrier from providers during the Heightened Scrutiny review process, particularly Adult Day Care providers. The State continues to work with Adult Day Care providers and their licensing department, the Department of Human Services, on ways to better facilitate how transportation is provided in these settings. Additionally, the State developed a community transportation benefit in its Employment and Community First CHOICES program, and continues to actively pursue the possibility of leveraging ride share companies like Uber and Lyft for this purpose. Finally, the State continues to pursue partnerships with advocacy groups and various State agencies to identified subsidized transportation opportunities.

#### Public Comments on the List of Approved Providers Subject to Heightened Scrutiny

The second step in the vetting process was to place the full list of 257 State-approved settings subject to Heightened Scrutiny on the State's Medicaid website for public comment. The settings were placed on the following page, and remain on this page, though the public comment feature has now been disabled: <u>https://www.tn.gov/content/tn/tenncare/long-term-services-supports/opportunity-for-public-comment---heightened-scrutiny---approved-provider-settings-.html</u>.

The list of settings was released for public comment on June 15, 2018 and the comment period ended July 15, 2018. The State provided notice of the public comment process using two methods. On June 15, 2018, public notice was posted to the TennCare website. Additionally, on the same day notice of the opening of the comment period along with a link to the comment page was sent via email to representatives from the following stakeholders:

- AARP Tennessee;
- The Arc Tennessee;
- The Tennessee Council on Development Disabilities;
- The Statewide Independent Living Council of Tennessee;
- Disability Rights Tennessee;
- The Tennessee Disability Coalition;
- The Tennessee Commission on Aging and Disability;
- Tennessee Community Organizations (TNCO);
- Tennessee Association of Adult Day Services;
- BlueCross BlueShield of Tennessee;
- Amerigroup;
- UnitedHealthcare; and
- The Tennessee Department of Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities.

To help organize comments for incorporation into the Amended Statewide Transition Plan and to gauge satisfaction with the heightened scrutiny review process, the State asked commenters submitting comments to answer 2 questions regarding the list of provider settings that the State identified as those that have overcome the institutional presumption and will be submitted to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) for further review. These questions were:

Question 1: Is there a setting or are there settings listed in the attached document that you think is not/are not either fully complaint or will be fully compliant with the HCBS Settings Rule upon full implementation of an approved transition plan? If so, why?

Question 2: Is there a setting or are there settings not listed in the attachment that you think should be included in this list as approved to go to CMS that is not/are not included? If so, name them and explain why.

Commenters were also encouraged to submit any other comments or recommendations beyond the scope of these questions using an "other" field in which they could write narrative responses. A mailing address was provided on the webpage for any individuals wishing to submit comments by mail.

The State received a total of three online public comments, as well as an email from one of the commenters with questions. The three submissions were made by an HCBS Provider, a Family Member/Representative, and a citizen who self-identified as a former HCBS provider. No submissions were made by mail. The survey responses for each submission and the State's response to each comment are included below, including responses to questions posed by one commenter via email.

#### **Summary of Public Comment Submissions:**

Question 1: Is there a setting or are there settings listed in the attached document that you think is not/are not either fully complaint or will be fully compliant with the HCBS Settings Rule upon full implementation of an approved transition plan? If so, why?

The question was followed by the option to respond either "yes" or "no". All three submissions contained a "no" response to question 1 and did not include additional comment.

Yes responses: 0 No responses: 3

Question 2: Is there a setting or are there settings not listed in the attachment that you think should be included in this list as approved to go to CMS that is not/are not included? If so, name them and explain why.

The question was followed by the option to respond either "yes" or "no". Two submissions contained a "yes" response and one responded "no".

Yes responses: 2 No responses: 1

The two who responded "yes" were asked to name the setting and provide an explanation. The explanations provided in each submission are listed below, followed by the State's response.

#### HCBS Provider:

Yes, Adult Day Service Providers in TN, by definition and operation should all be considered compliant. All current providers are compliant; however, it should be ensured that future providers are considered compliant as well.

#### **State Response:**

There are two parts to this response.

The first is to address the difference between licensure and the HCBS Settings Rule requirements, and the second is to detail the evaluation process specific to Adult Day Care providers as part of the State's Heightened Scrutiny process.

A licensed Adult Day Center in the State is not automatically compliant with the HCBS Settings Rule. Licensure rules for Adult Day Care in the State are governed by the Tennessee Department of Human Services (DHS). DHS Rules are not written specifically for Medicaid providers, and apply to any entity wishing to provide Adult Day Care in the State, whether that entity is private pay or will accept Medicaid reimbursement. The requirements of the federal HCBS Settings Rule are distinct from State licensure requirements and apply only to entities wishing to receive Medicaid reimbursement and concern member rights and quality of experience. An example of the differences between licensure and the HCBS Settings Rule specific to Adult Day Care in the State is that DHS's licensure rules permit an Adult Day Care to be located in a nursing facility, while the HCBS Settings Rule prohibits co-location of an Adult Day Care Center in a nursing facility.

To assist in alerting providers to the difference between licensure rules and the requirements of the HCBS Settings Rule specific to Medicaid-reimbursed providers, the State's Medicaid Agency has worked with DHS to amend the provider application page of their website to include information about the HCBS Settings Rule for providers interested in providing Medicaid-reimbursed services, as well as issuing a letter about the rule to currently-licensed providers.

The State selected Adult Day Care as one of six provider types subject to the Heightened Scrutiny process to determine compliance with the HCBS Settings Rule due to results provided from the provider self-assessment process described beginning in Section 4 on page 15 of this STP. Through responses from Adult Day Care providers, TennCare determined that Adult Day Care providers, due to the trends of institutional qualities provided in the self-assessment responses, would need to submit evidence to demonstrate that the setting does not have the qualities of an institution and that it does have the qualities of a home and community-based setting.

Following the Heightened Scrutiny Review process, all Adult Day Center providers receiving Medicaidreimbursement that expressed a desire to continue receiving such reimbursement were found to be either compliant, or were able to submit a State-approved transition plan addressing any areas of non-compliance identified during the Heightened Scrutiny Process and will be compliant upon full implementation of that transition plan.

While non-compliant Adult Day Care providers that began operations prior to the HCBS Settings Rule implementation were allowed to transition to compliance, the State requires that all new Adult Day Center provider settings demonstrate full compliance with the HCBS Settings Rule before they are eligible to provide Adult Day services to Medicaid recipients, which is assessed through the health plan credentialing process.

#### Citizen and former HCBS provider:

Yes. (Additional explanation was not submitted.)

#### Other Comments:

The final section of the survey provided an opportunity for the public to submit any other comments or recommendations beyond the scope of these questions. Two of the three submissions included other comments which are listed below, followed by the State's response. Note, that as indicated in one of the comments, the commenter submitted questions to the State not included in the comment that the state is replying to as part of its response.

#### Family Member/Representative:

While it appears my sister's facility may have "overcome the institutional presumption" I remain concerned about the State's oversight in critical areas. I have had to intervene many times to ensure my sister's routine and non-routine meds are kept on track. State inspections appear to be weak when it comes to reviewing medication and other medical documentation.

I was very disappointed to hear that her clothing protector was deemed demeaning while her medications going off track don't seem to be noticed at all by the States' numerous inspections.

#### **State Response:**

The State's Heightened Scrutiny Review of each provider setting included an assessment of compliance with the requirements set forth in the HCBS Settings Rule, focused on the review of providers' policies, practices, physical location, and member experiences related specifically to the requirements of the federal Rule. While State reviewers noted any concerns identified outside of the scope of the HCBS Settings Rule in the feedback report and required a response from the provider, the purpose of the reviews, and the training and credentials of the reviewers, was distinct from State licensure or quality assurance reviews that review medication and medical documentation.

If the commenter, or other parties reviewing this response, has/have concerns about medication or medical documentation for themselves or family members, and they or their family members are receiving Medicaid-reimbursed long-term services and supports, the State would direct these inquiries to the following entities:

#### Managed Care Organizations (MCOs):

Members receiving services in the CHOICES or Employment and Community First CHOICES Programs or their representatives have several options to address concerns within their MCO. Members or their representatives may contact the member's Care or Support Coordinator. If the member or representative does not know the contact information for the member's Care or Support Coordinator, the member or representative can contact the member's MCO using the contact information on the member's TennCare Member ID card.

Another option is for the member or representative to contact their respective MCOs' member advocates for CHOICES or ECF CHOICES, as applicable. The member advocates work to assist members to resolve complaints, including advising members or their representatives on how they can file complaints to the MCO. Contact information for an MCO's member advocate is located in the MCO member handbook.

Finally, with or without the assistance of the member advocate, individuals may file complaints with the MCO. Explanations of how to file a complaint with a member's MCO are located in the member's MCO handbook. The member or representative may also contact the member's MCO using the contact

information on the member's TennCare Member ID card.

#### Department of Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (DIDD):

Persons supported receiving services in one of the three DIDD HCBS Waivers or their representatives have options to address their concerns within DIDD. The person supported or representative may contact the person supported's Independent Support Coordinator or Case Manager, as applicable. If the person supported or representative does not know the contact information for the person supported's Independent Support Coordinator or Case Manager, the person supported or representative may contact the applicable regional office using this link: <a href="https://www.tn.gov/didd/divisions/regional-offices.html">https://www.tn.gov/didd/divisions/regional-offices.html</a>.

Additionally, if the person supported or representative wishes to file a complaint with DIDD, information regarding this process is available via the following link: <u>https://www.tn.gov/didd/divisions/protection-from-harm/questions---answers.html</u>.

#### Department of Health:

Lastly, individuals or their representatives experiencing a problem with a health care professional or health care facility may file a complaint with Tennessee's Department of Health via the following link: <u>https://www.tn.gov/health/health-professionals/hcf-main/filing-a-complaint.html</u>.

#### Citizen and former HCBS provider:

Based on my direct experience working with groups addressing homelessness, there are a number of settings that in terms of structures, may only include tents and perhaps only tarps to prevent rain and sun from coming directly into a place where a person is trying to live. I think it would be very unfortunate if medicaid services were not provided to people who are state and nation do not provide enough shelter resources that would enable a Medicaid participant to claim a setting that is leased. The reality is many people live and exist where ever they can on a daily basis so there setting changes throughout the day and night.

I wrote on June 22, 2018 via email to Crissonya Phillips the Director of HCBS Settings in the Programs Operations Dvision of the Department of Intellectual and Development Disabilities who referred me to Katie Powell, the Director of HCBS Quality and Compliance in the Division of TennCare, Long-Term Services and Supports. I submitted some questions in writing via email to Ms. Powell on June 25, 2018 but received no reply. I would like to be able to submit more comments after talking with Ms. Powell. The spirit of my comments is that if I would be in a circumstance where my physical or mental challenges required me to need medicaid services, I would not like my setting to be artificially restricted to a setting that is limited in the number of people it can serve. The economic reality is that resources are going to be needed in a variety of settings with a personal preference of mine that services are provided in some manner rather than no manner at all because the definition of settings are too narrow in their effort to be community based.

[Note from the State: The questions referenced above in the comment are included immediately below]:

What is the definition of a dwelling, sleeping unit, living unit, private unit? Most of these terms come from the attached HcbsSettingCRiteriaRemediationCrossWalk.xls which is also referred to <u>https://www.tn.gov/tenncare/long-term-services-supports/transition-plan-documents-for-new-federal-home-and-community-based-services-rules.html</u> web page as the "Statewide Transition Plan Regulatory Crosswalk for HCBS Settings." This may or may not include the definition of an apartment, including whether a stove needs to be in each apartment or dwelling.

What is the definition of gated/secured 'community' referenced on page 3 Section B question 4 from the Tn Residential Provider Self Assessment https://www.tn.gov/content/dam/tn/tenncare/documents/TNResidentialProviderSelf-Assessment.pdf

Then finally a more direct question - What rules on size and setting apply to a Semi-Independent Living Service provider?

#### **State Response:**

The Heightened Scrutiny process subject to public comment only included 6 provider-owned and/or controlled setting types as specified in this STP: Critical Adult Care Homes, Adult Day Care, Facility-Based Day, Assisted Care Living, Residential Habilitation with 4 or more residents, and Supported Living or Residential Habilitation in Close Proximity. Consistent with CMS guidance that private residences are presumptively compliant with the HCBS Settings Rule, the State did not include private residences as part of the Heightened Scrutiny review process, although the State and its contracted entities investigate and remediate instances of non-compliance with the HCBS Settings Rule on a case-by-case basis in private residence when non-compliance is either discovered by or reported to the State or its contracted entities. Both the commenter's statements submitted as part of public comment and the questions submitted via email concern what restrictions, if any, exist around types of provider-owned and/or controlled settings and private settings that are permissible settings in the State in which individuals can receive Medicaid-reimbursed services.

The comment specifically mentions the homeless population and seeks to determine whether the federal Rule or the State's implementation would inadvertently impact homeless individuals seeking Medicaid services. The State does not restrict homeless individuals from enrolling in Medicaid, and partners with certain advocacy groups to help facilitate these enrollments (See, for example, https://www.nhchc.org/about/tenncare-shelter-enrollment-project/). However, for homeless

example, <u>https://www.nhchc.org/about/tenncare-shelter-enrollment-project/</u>). However, for homeless individuals needing long-term services and supports, the primary focus would likely initially be on helping the individual to obtain stable (even if temporary) housing as well as employment to help maintain the stability of such housing, as applicable, so that needed supportive services could then be wrapped around. In the commenter's public comment, the commenter additionally states: "The spirit of my comments is that if I would be in a circumstance where my physical or mental challenges required me to need medicaid services, I would not like my setting to be artificially restricted to a setting that is limited in the number of people it can serve". The State does not "artificially restrict" residence sizes in either provider-owned and/or controlled settings or in private settings. Provider-owned and/or controlled setting capacity is determined by licensure requirements based on considerations like fire and safety codes, and capacity in private residences is similarly determined by local and state building codes. It is unclear from the comment whether the commenter is advocating for more individuals to live in each setting. The State's position – consistent with its approach in reviewing settings subject to Heightened Scrutiny – is to encourage independent living to the greatest degree possible, as well as integration (i.e., opportunities to live and interact with people who do not have disabilities, and to ensure, as required under the federal regulation, that federal HCBS funding is only provided in settings that are not institutional in nature.

To address the specific questions received via email from the commenter:

1. What is the definition of a dwelling, sleeping unit, living unit, private unit?

The CMS guidance document entitled "Regulatory Requirements for Home and Community-Based Settings" (<u>https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/hcbs/downloads/requirements-for-home-and-community-settings.pdf</u>)

references a unit or dwelling as, "a specific physical place that can be owned, rented, or occupied under a legally enforceable agreement by the individual receiving services, and the individual has, at a minimum, the same responsibilities and protections from eviction that tenants have under the landlord/tenant law of the State, county, city, or other designated entity".

2. What is the definition of gated/secured 'community'

In a guidance document released to states entitled, "Guidance on Settings that Have the Effect of Isolating Individuals Receiving HCBS from the Broader Community" (<u>https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/hcbs/downloads/settings-that-isolate.pdf</u>), CMS defines a gated/secured community:

Gated communities typically consist primarily of people with disabilities and the staff that work with them. Often, these locations will provide residential, behavioral health, day services, social and recreational activities, and long term services and supports all within the gated community. Individuals receiving HCBS in this type of setting often do not leave the grounds of the gated community in order to access activities or services in the broader community. Thus, the setting typically does not afford individuals the opportunity to fully engage in community life and choose activities, services and providers that will optimize integration into the broader community.

3. What rules on size and setting apply to a Semi-Independent Living Service provider?

The CMS guidance document entitled, "HCBS Final Rule Regulations 42 CFR Part 441 Questions and Answers Regarding Home and Community-Based Settings"

(https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/hcbs/downloads/q-and-a-hcb-settings.pdf) addresses the question of size requirements. According to CMS, the HCBS Settings Rule requirements do not address the number of individuals living in a residential HCB setting. The guidance states that, "while size may impact the ability or likelihood of a setting to meet the HCB settings requirements, the regulation does not specify size. Even a very small residential setting may have policies that restrict individual access to things such as food and telephone use that would not be consistent with HCB requirements, while facilities that serve a larger number of individuals may have structured their system in a manner that comports with the qualities required. The HCBS rule defines the minimum qualities for a HCB setting as experienced by the individual; states may set a higher threshold for HCB settings than required by the regulation, including the option to establish size restrictions and limitations."

The State did specify that only certain Semi-Independent settings were subject to Heightened Scrutiny review based on two criteria:

- Residential Habilitation settings where more than 4 persons reside
- *Residential Habilitation settings where 4 or fewer persons reside that are in close proximity to other Residential Habilitation or Supported Living settings.*

All Residential Habilitation settings are required to be compliant with the HCBS Settings Rule. However, Heightened Scrutiny was only applied to those that met the above criteria.

Additionally, Tennessee's Department of Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities licensure Rules limit one-and two-family dwelling settings to a maximum of three persons-supported (see Tenn. Rule 0465-02-04-.10(1)). Additionally, licensees must fully comply with the applicable fire codes and level of care standards.

## Attachment 1

## Advocacy Review Committee Letter to CMS on the Heightened Scrutiny Review Process



#### STATE OF TENNESSEE COUNCIL ON DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES DAVY CROCKETT TOWER, FIRST FLOOR 500 JAMES ROBERTSON PARKWAY NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37243-0228 PHONE 615-532-6615 FAX 615-532-6964

July 13, 2018

To: Administrator Seema Verma Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services 7500 Security Boulevard Baltimore, MD 21244

Re: Heightened Scrutiny Stakeholder Feedback in Tennessee

This letter summarizes input from the Tennessee Disability Policy Alliance to the Tennessee State Medicaid Agency, TennCare, via TennCare's Advocacy Review Committee. The Tennessee Disability Policy Alliance is comprised of four statewide disability organizations connected to national networks: The TN Council on Developmental Disabilities, Disability Rights TN, The Arc TN, and the Statewide Independent Living Council of TN.

We appreciated the opportunity to provide input on TN's Heightened Scrutiny process. In particular, we appreciated TennCare's willingness to meet with us in person to review and discuss the evidence collaboratively. TennCare's team presented well-organized material by staff that were intimately familiar with the process and the evidence.

The Tennessee Disability Policy Alliance focused on broad, system-level feedback for TennCare's Heightened Scrutiny process after reviewing the evidence. Our takeaways are outlined below:

- The state teams, led by TennCare, implemented an effective process for gathering meaningful feedback about *the experience* of Tennesseans receiving home- and community based services (HCBS);
- The transition plans approved by the state reflect important changes to culture and practice. It will be critical to continue to monitor the implementation of these changes over the long-term;
- The most deeply systemic compliance issue for providers is delivering individualized services, which has historically not been part of the HCBS provider business model and, we fear, is not fully funded by HCBS rates;

July 16, 2018 Page 2

- Additionally, individualized services should increase processes that support 'dignity of risk'. State service system and policy reforms that support an individual's right to participate in the community without undue restrictions will be essential for realizing person-centered services over the long-term;
- And, finally, a closely related systemic issue is transportation for HCBS recipients, which, we believe, is not adequately addressed nor funded by HCBS rates.

To help address the long-term, systemic issues we urge TennCare to continue working with the Tennessee Disability Policy Alliance.

Sincerely,

Wande Willis

Wanda Willis, Executive Director Tennessee Council on Developmental Disabilities

Carrie Hobbs Suiden

Carrie Hobbs Guiden, Executive Director The Arc Tennessee



Council on Developmental Disabilities

The A

Tennessee

Lisa Primm, Executive Director Disability Rights Tennessee



Linnet Overton, Executive Director Statewide Independent Living Council of Tennessee



## Attachment 2

# List of Approved Providers Subject to Heightened Scrutiny

## Home and Community-Based Settings to be submitted for CMS Heightened Scrutiny Review on 9/1/2018

Adult Care Home		
Provider Name	Provider DBA	City/Region
Quiet Oaks Assisted Living LLC	NA	Graysville/TN East
The Crumley House Brain Injury Rehabilitation Center	The Crumley House	Limestone/TN East

Assisted Care Living Facility		
Provider Name	Provider DBA	City/Region
Alexandria Place	NA	Jackson/TN West
Asbury Place Maryville	NA	Maryville/TN East
Asbury, Inc	Asbury Place Steadman Hill	Kingsport/TN East
Austin Hewitt House	Keestone at Hewitt House	Pulaski/TN Middle
Autumn Assisted Living Partners	NA	Nashville/TN Middle
Autumn Care Assisted Living	NA	Knoxville/TN East
Bellwood Assisted Living, LLC	NA	Lebanon/TN Middle
Cades Center, Inc	Cades Center Assisted Living	Jackson/TN West
Christian Home for the Aged	Appalacian Christian Village at Pine Oaks	Johnson City/TN East
Clarksville Residential LLC	Dogwood Bend Assisted Living	Clarksville/TN Middle
Columbia Senior Living, LLC	Popular Estates Assisted Living	Columbia/TN Middle
Cookeville Senior Living LLC	Cedar Hills Senior Living	Cookville/TN Middle
Country Cottage - RCL, LLC	Country Cottage	Lawrenceburg/TN Middle
Elmcroft Senior Living	Elmcroft of Twin Hills	Madison/TN Middle
Grace Home Care Inc	Azalea Trace Assisted Living	Nashville/TN Middle
Henderson Residential, LLC	Southern Oaks	Henderson/TN West
Henderson Villa Inc	NA	Henderson/TN West
Heritage Place of Lexington	NA	Lexington/TN West
Huntingdon Residential, LLC	Harmony Hill	Huntingdon/TN West
Keestone Senior Community LLC	NA	Lawrenceburg/TN Middle
Lakewood Place	Lakewood Place Loudon	Loudon/TN East
Lee Street Developers LLC	Rose of Sharon's Senior Villa	Chattanooga/TN East
Lynfield Place	NA	Selmer/TN West

Mabry Assisted Living	NA	Gainesboro/TN Middle
Madison Residential LLC	Hickory Gardens	Madison/TN Middle
Manchester Residential LLC	Autumn Oaks Assisted Living	Manchester/TN Middle
Martin Residential, LLC	Greenbrier Meadows	Martin/TN West
Maturecare of Standifer Place LLC	Assisted Living at Standifer Place	Chattanooga/TN East
McMinnville Boarding Home for the Elderly	NA	McMinnville/TN Middle
McMinnville Residential	Riverview Terrace	McMinnville/TN Middle
Milan Residential Care	Dogwood Pointe Assisted Living	Milan/TN West
Morristown Senior Living Community, LLC	Regency Retirement Village	Morristown/TN East
MountainBrook Assisted Living	NA	Sevierville/TN East
Mt Juliet Senior Living LLC	Living	Mount Juliet/TN Middle
Murfreesboro Residential Care	Park View Meadows	Murfreesboro/TN Middle
NorthCliff Assisted Living	NA	Lexington/TN West
Oak Haven Assisted Care Living Facility LLC	Oak Haven LLC	Huron/TN West
Optimum Assisted Living,LLC.	NA	White Bluff/TN Middle
Paris Residential Care	Eiffel Gardens Assisted Living	Paris/TN West
Regency House Assisted living	NA	Hixson/TN East
Regency Retirement Village	Jackson Senior Services, LLC	Jackson/TN West
Richland Place Senior Living Center	NA	Portland/TN Middle
Ridgemont Manor, Inc.	NA	Memphis/TN West
Ripley Residential, LLC	Asbury Cove	Ripley/TN West
River Oaks Place Loudon	NA	Loudon/TN East
Riverdale Assisted Living	NA	Memphis/TN West
Rockgate Seniors Residence	NA	Cowan/TN East
Sandgala LLC	Crown Cypress Assisted Living	Kingsport/TN East
Savannah Residential LLC	RiverWick Assisted Living	Savannah/TN West
Senior Citizens Home Assistance Services Inc	Renaissance Terrace	Knoxville/TN East
Shelbyville Residential LLC	Celebration Way Assisted Living	Shelbyville/TN Middle
Smyrna Residential, LLC	Azalea Court	Smyrna/TN Middle
Southern Manor Living Center	NA	Fayetteville/TN Middle
Southern Manor Living Centers of Winchester, LLC	NA	Winchester/TN Middle
Spring Hills Residential, LLC	Willow Springs and Arbors	Spring Hill/TN Middle
Springfield Residential LLC	Springfield Heights Assisted Living	Springfield/TN Middle

SSA Bristol ALF, LLC	Broadmore Senior Living	Bristol/TN East
SSA Johnson City ALF, LLC	Broadmore Senior Living at Johnson City	Johnson City/TN East
Stonecrest Assisted Living Facility	NA	Lafayette/TN Middle
Sweetwater Living	NA	Sweetwater/TN East
Sycamores Terrace Retirement Community	NA	Nashville/ TN Middle
The Summit of Lawrenceburg	NA	Lawrenceburg/TN Middle
The Village at Allandale	NA	Kingsport/TN East
Tri-Age Adventures, Inc.	Knollwood Manor	Lafayette/TN Middle
Trousdale Senior Living Center	NA	Hartsville/TN Middle
Victorian Square	NA	Rockwood/TN East
Wayne County Assisted Living	NA	Waynesboro/TN Middle
Wellmont Madison House	NA	Kingsport/TN East
Whitwell Senior Living, LLC	Valley View Assisted Living	Whitwell/TN East

Adult Day Center		
Provider Name	Provider DBA	City/Region
21st Century Day Services, Inc	NA	Gallatin/TN Middle
ALPS Adult Day Services	NA	Morristown/TN East
Alzheimer's Day Services of Memphis, Inc.	Dorothy's Place	Memphis/TN West
Alzheimer's Day Services of Memphis, Inc.	Grashot Center	Memphis/TN West
Alzheimer's Tennessee Inc.	Program	Knoxville/TN East
American Senior Care Centers, Inc.	Centennial Adultcare Center	Nashville/TN Middle
American Senior Care Centers, Inc.	Centennial Adultcare Center	Murfreesboro/TN Middle
Ave Maria Adult Day Center	NA	Bartlett/TN West
Caring Hearts of Dunlap, Inc	Caring Hearts	Dunlap/TN East
First Tn. Human Resource Agency	Adult Day Services	Johnson City/TN East
Global Mobile Care	NA	Memphis/TN West
Heritage Adult Day Care	NA	Cleveland/TN East
Kelly's Adult Daycare, Inc	Sharon's Adult Day Center of Cleveland	Cleveland/TN East
Keystone Adult Day Program	NA	Oak Ridge/ TN East
LifeCare Heritage, Inc.	LifeCare Foundations	Nashville/TN Middle
Maturecare of Standifer Place LLC	Adult Day Care at Standifer Place	Chattanooga/TN East
Saving Grace Adult Day Care	NA	Mount Juliet/TN Middle

Signal Centers, Inc	NA	Chattanooga/TN East
The Crumley House Brain Injury Rehabilitation Center	The Crumley House	Limestone/TN East
Therapy & Learning Center	NA	Jackson/TN West
Valecia Cardell Behold Senior Activity Day Center	NA	Chattanooga/TN East
Wellmont Madison House	Wellmont Madison House ADC	Kingsport/TN East

Facility-Based Day		
Provider Name	Provider DBA	City/Region
Adult Community Training	NA	Lenoir City/TN East
Arc Knox County	NA	Knoxville/TN East
Cerebral Palsy Center for Handicapped Adults Inc.	Cerebral Palsy Center	Knoxville/TN East
Comcare, Inc.	NA	Johnson City/TN East
Comcare, Inc.	NA	Greeneville/TN East
Community Health of East Tennessee, Inc.	C.H.E.T.	Jacksboro/TN East
Cumberland Mountain Industries	NA	Tazewell/TN East
Dawn of Hope	NA	Johnson City/TN East
Dawn of Hope, Inc.	NA	Johnson City/TN East
Douglas Cooperative, Inc.	DCI Sevier County	Sevierville/TN East
Douglas Cooperative, Inc.	DCI Blount County	Maryville/TN East
Douglas Cooperative, Inc.	DCI Cocke County	Newport/TN East
Easter Seals TN	Easter Seals	Parsons/TN West
Emory Valley Center	EVC	Wartburg/TN East
Emory Valley Center	EVC	Oak Ridge/TN East
Emory Valley Center	EVC	Oak Ridge/TN East
Evergreen Presbyterian Ministries, Inc	Evergreen Life Services	Antioch/TN Middle
Exceptional Enterprises	NA	Coalmont/TN East
Frontier Health	NA	Kingsport/TN East
Frontier Health	NA	Bristol/TN East
Goodwill Industries of Middle TN, Inc.	NA	Nashville/TN Middle
Greene County Skills, Inc.	NA	Greeneville/TN East
Habilitation and Training Services, Inc	H.A.T.S., INC	Gallatin/TN Middle
Habilitation and Training Services, Inc	H.A.T.S., INC	Springfield/TN Middle
Hardin County Skills, Inc.	NA	Savannah/TN West

Helen R. Tucker Adult Developmental Center	NA	Ripley/TN West
Helping Hands of Hawkins County, Inc	Chip Hale Center	Rogersville/TN East
Hilltoppers, Inc.	NA	Crossville/TN Middle
Impact Centers, Inc.	NA	Pulaski/TN Middle
Journeys in Community Living	NA	Murfreesboro/TN Middle
Life Bridges, Inc.	NA	Cleveland/TN East
Livitup, Inc	NA	Memphis/TN West
Madison Haywood Developmental Services, Inc.	MHDS	Brownsville/TN West
Madison Haywood Developmental Services, Inc.	MHDS	Jackson/TN West
Madison Haywood Developmental Services, Inc.	MHDS	Bolivar/TN West
McNairy County Developmental Services	MCDS	Selmer/TN West
Michael Dunn Center	NA	Kingston/TN East
New Horizons Corporation	NHC	Nashville/TN Middle
New Life TN	NA	Winchester/TN Middle
Pacesetters, Inc.	NA	McMinnville/TN Middle
Pacesetters, Inc.	NA	Layfayette/TN Middle
Pacesetters, Inc.	NA	Livingston/TN Middle
Pacesetters, Inc.	NA	Cookville/TN Middle
Progressive Directions	NA	Clarksville/TN Middle
Progressive Directions	NA	Dover/TN Middle
Prospect, Inc.	NA	Lebanon/TN Middle
Rhea of Sunshine, Inc	NA	Dayton/TN East
Scott Appalachian Industries	NA	Huntsville/TN East
Sertoma Center, Inc.	NA	Knoxville/TN East
Shelby Residential Vocational Services	SRVS - Tipton	Covington/TN West
Shelby Residential Vocational Services	SRVS - Collierville	Collierville/TN West
Shelby Residential Vocational Services	SRVS- Memphis	Memphis/TN West
Skills Development Services, Inc.	NA	Tullahoma/TN Middle
Skills Development Services, Inc.	NA	Fayetteville/TN Middle
Skills Development Services, Inc.	NA	Shelbyville/TN Middle
Skills Training And Rehabilitation Services	S.T.A.R.S.; Inc.	Pikeville/TN East
The Orange Grove Center, Inc.	NA	Chattanooga/TN East
Therapy & Learning Center	NA	Jackson/TN West

Tri-County Center	NA	Athens/TN East
Waves, Inc.	NA	Franklin/TN Middle
Waves, Inc.	NA	Fairview/TN Middle

Residential Habilitation		
Provider Name	Provider DBA	City/Region
Arc Knox County	NA	Knoxville/TN East
Arc Knox County	NA	Knoxville/TN East
Buffalo River Services	NA	Waynesboro/TN Middle
Buffalo River Services	NA	Waynesboro/TN Middle
Comcare, Inc.	NA	Greeneville/TN East
CS Patterson Training and Habilitation Center	NA	Newbern/TN West
CS Patterson Training and Habilitation Center	NA	Trenton/ TN West
CS Patterson Training and Habilitation Center	NA	Trenton/TN West
Dev Svcs of Dickson Co	NA	Dickson/TN Middle
Douglas Cooperative, Inc.	DCI Jefferson County	Jefferson City/TN East
Douglas Cooperative, Inc.	DCI Sevier County	Sevierville/TN East
Douglas Cooperative, Inc.	DCI Blount County	Maryville/TN East
Douglas Cooperative, Inc.	DCI Cocke County	Newport/TN East
Emory Valley Center	EVC	Oak Ridge/TN East
Emory Valley Center	EVC	Clinton/TN East
Emory Valley Center	EVC	Oak Ridge/TN East
Emory Valley Center	EVC	Oak Ridge/TN East
Frontier Health	NA	Bristol/TN East
Emory Valley Center	EVC	Oak Ridge/TN East
Frontier Health	NA	Kingsport/TN East
Hilltoppers, Inc.	NA	Crossville/TN Middle
Hilltoppers, Inc.	NA	Crossville/TN Middle
Hilltoppers, Inc.	NA	Crossville/TN Middle
Impact Centers, Inc.	NA	Mt Pleasant/TN Middle
James Developmental Center, Inc.	Giant Leaps Residential	Waverly/TN Middle
James Developmental Center, Inc.	John Murphree Group Home	Waverly/TN Middle
James Developmental Center, Inc.	Allen Group Home	Waverly/TN Middle

Life Bridges, Inc.	NA	Cleveland/TN East
McNairy County Developmental Services	McNairy County Developmental Services	Selmer/TN West
Michael Dunn Center	Michael Dunn Center- Brentwood	Kingston/TN East
Michael Dunn Center	Michael Dunn Center- Shaw	Kingston/TN East
Michael Dunn Center	Michael Dunn Center- Greenwood	Kingston/TN East
Sertoma Center, Inc.	NA	Knoxville/TN East
Shelby Residential Vocational Services	SRVS	Memphis/TN West
Skills Development Services, Inc.	NA	Tullahoma/TN Middle
Skills Development Services, Inc.	NA	Tullahoma/TN Middle
Skills Development Services, Inc.	NA	Fayetteville/TN Middle

Residential Habilitation and Supported Living in Close Proximity		
Provider Name	Provider DBA	City/Region
A+ Care Solutions, Inc.	NA	Jackson/TN West
Adult Community Training	NA	Lenoir City/TN East
Behavioral Services of Tennessee	NA	Cordova/TN West
Bios of TN, LLC	Better Life Senior Services	Hohenwald/TN Middle
Breakthrough Corporation	Breakthrough	Knoxville/TN East
Brenda Richardson MCH	BRMCH	Bartlett/TN West
Buffalo River Services	NA	Lawrenceburg/TN Middle
Comcare, Inc.	NA	Greeneville/TN East
Community Health of East Tennessee, Inc.	C.H.E.T.	Jacksboro/TN East
D&S Residential Services	NA	Alcoa/TN East
D&S Residential Services	NA	Bartlett/TN West
Dawn of Hope	NA	Johnson City/TN East
Easter Seals TN	Easter Seals	Lexington/TN West
Emory Valley Center	EVC	Oak Ridge/TN East
Exceptional Enterprises	NA	Coalmont/TN East
Exceptional Enterprises	NA	Coalmont/TN East
Exceptional Enterprises	NA	Gruetli-Laager/TN East
Exceptional Enterprises	NA	Gruetli-Laager/TN East
Exceptional Enterprises	NA	Coalmont/TN East
Golden Life	NA	Clarksville/TN Middle

Habilitation and Training Services, Inc	H.A.T.S., INC	Gallatin/TN Middle
Habilitation and Training Services, Inc	H.A.T.S., INC	Gallatin/TN Middle
Hilltoppers, Inc.	NA	Crossville/TN Middle
Hilltoppers, Inc.	NA	Crossville/TN Middle
Hilltoppers, Inc.	NA	Crossville/TN Middle
Lakeway Achievement Center, Inc	NA	Morristown/TN East
Life Bridges, Inc.	NA	Cleveland/TN East
Lighthouse	NA	Limestone/TN East
Madison Haywood Developmental Services, Inc.	MHDS	Jackson/TN West
Michael Dunn Center	NA	Harriman/TN East
Michael Dunn Center	NA	Harriman/TN East
Mid-South Area Res Ser	NA	Memphis/TN West
NIA	NA	Clarksville/TN Middle
Prolex	NA	Chattanooga/TN East
Prospect, Inc	NA	Lebanon/TN Middle
RHA Health Services	NA	Gallatin/TN Middle
Rhea of Sunshine, Inc	NA	Dayton/TN East
Rhea of Sunshine, Inc	NA	Dayton/TN East
Scott Appalachian Industries	NA	Huntsville/TN East
Sertoma Center, Inc.	NA	Knoxville/TN East
Sertoma Center, Inc.	NA	Knoxville/TN East
Sertoma Center, Inc.	NA	Knoxville/TN East
Sertoma Center, Inc.	NA	Knoxville/TN East
Sertoma Center, Inc.	NA	Knoxville/TN East
Sertoma Center, Inc.	NA	Knoxville/TN East
Sertoma Center, Inc.	NA	Knoxville/TN East
Shelby Residential Vocational Services	SRVS	Memphis/TN West
Support Solutions of Mid-South	NA	Memphis/TN West
Tennessee Family Solutions	NA	Smyrna/TN Middle
Tennessee Family Solutions	NA	Smyrna/TN Middle
Tennessee Family Solutions	NA	Murfreesboro/TN Middle
The Orange Grove Ctr	NA	Chattanooga/TN East
The Orange Grove Ctr	NA	Chattanooga/TN East

The Orange Grove Ctr	NA	Chattanooga/TN East
The Orange Grove Ctr	NA	Chattanooga/TN East
The Orange Grove Ctr	NA	Chattanooga/TN East
The Orange Grove Ctr	NA	Chattanooga/TN East
The Orange Grove Ctr	NA	Chattanooga/TN East
The Orange Grove Ctr	NA	Chattanooga/TN East
The Orange Grove Ctr	NA	Chattanooga/TN East
The Orange Grove Ctr	NA	Chattanooga/TN East
The Orange Grove Ctr	NA	Chattanooga/TN East
The Orange Grove Ctr	NA	Chattanooga/TN East
West Tennessee Family Solutions	NA	Bartlett/TN West
West Tennessee Family Solutions	NA	Bartlett/TN West
West Tennessee Family Solutions	NA	Bartlett/TN West