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Why Standardize HCBS Assessment Items and Measures?

• It harmonizes data elements and allows standardized information capture with other Medicare and Medicaid sponsored post-acute care assessment items
• It can align person-centered data across all sources and requirements
• It allows data to follow the individual
• It enables electronic exchange of HCBS data across the continuum of care
Uniformity of Assessment Across Service and Care Settings
How Can States Use Standardized Assessments?

- Assist in determining eligibility for Medicaid HCBS programs
- Assist in developing person-centered service plans
- Monitor quality and measure program impact
- Report across multiple programs within a state
Introduction to Functional Assessment Standardized Items (FASI)

Jennifer Bowdoin, CMS
What is FASI?

Identifies personal priorities for functioning

Assesses for functional status and need for assistance in daily activities

Person-centered, standardized item set

Adapted from Looking Forward: HCBS Quality Measures Alignment and HCBS CAHPS, CMS, Center for Clinical Standards and Quality
# FASI Domains and Data Element Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Element Code</th>
<th>Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GG0130</td>
<td>Self-Care (e.g., Eating, Bathing, Dressing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG0170-0175</td>
<td>Mobility (e.g., Positioning, Transfers, Ambulation, Wheeling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG0185</td>
<td>Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (IADLs) (e.g., Meal Preparation, Shopping)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG0125</td>
<td>Assistive Devices for Everyday Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F0900-0920</td>
<td>Living Arrangements, Availability of Assistance, Availability of Paid and Unpaid Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG0135, GG0180, GG0190, FO910, F0925</td>
<td>Personal Priorities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FASI Vision

- Align and standardize core HCBS functional assessment items with corresponding items within Medicare and Medicaid programs
- Utilize FASI within the CMS Data Element Library (DEL)
- Receive National Quality Forum (NQF) endorsement of related FASI performance measures
FASI Implementation: CMS Data Element Library and Interoperability

FASI’s inclusion in current interoperability initiatives:

- Inclusion in the CMS DEL, which serves as a repository of data elements used in CMS Assessment Instruments and their associated health IT standards.

- Inclusion in Logical Observation Identifiers Names and Codes (LOINC), a clinical terminology standard that provides a set of universal codes and structured names to unambiguously identify things you can observe and measure.\(^1\)

- Added to the PACIO-eLTSS-PAC Transition Summary Use Cases

\(^1\)Adapted from FASI Final Report
Use Case: FASI and Interoperability

SCENE 1: Home with LTSS
SCENE 2: Hospital
SCENE 3: SNF
SCENE 4: Home with HHA
SCENE 5: Person and Family Access

Source: PACIO Use Case Example
Colorado: FASI Adoption
Steve Lutzky, HCBS Strategies
The current tools used to assess LTSS populations include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ULTC 100.2</td>
<td>Home-grown tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports Intensity Scale (SIS) for I/DD Populations</td>
<td>Standardized, nationally used tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental tools</td>
<td>Over 30 supplemental tools created by Department and local staff to support access processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment and access processes vary significantly across populations and programs.
Limitations to Legacy Tools

ULTC 100.2

• No set timeframes (e.g., in last 30 days)
• Definitions and responses are vague and overlapping
• Collects very little information outside of ADLs
• Limited use when developing support plan

SIS

• Requires agency staff to be specially trained on tool and pay for training/tool
• Some stakeholders unhappy with the use of the SIS: length of time to complete; concerns that it doesn’t capture enough information; concerns about the use for development of Support Levels
Limitations to Legacy Tools (cont.)

Local agencies have developed 30+ non-standardized tools to collect missing information from legacy tools

Other issues with tools include:

- No person-centered information
- No natural support and caregiver information
- No screen of other areas of interest/need (e.g., employment, self-direction)
- Very limited information that is useful for support planning
Stakeholder input during development of the intake and assessment tools included:

- Input from community members and staff from over 15 agencies

- 8 stakeholder meetings on child assessment tool
- 21 stakeholder meetings on adult assessment tool

Stakeholders were presented with a variety of national and state-specific tools:

- interRAI
- CMS’ CARE (FASI)
- Washington’s CARE
- MnCHOICES
Developed a blog to share information and collect feedback:
Colorado Assessment Blog

Made major changes to the modules and process as a result of stakeholder input

Conducted meetings throughout state to share progress and gather feedback
## Crosswalk of LTSS Assessment Tools by Purposes of Tools Endorsed by Stakeholders and States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of Tools</th>
<th>InterRAI</th>
<th>CARE</th>
<th>WI</th>
<th>MN</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>SIS</th>
<th>ICAP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person-Centered</td>
<td>Could Add</td>
<td>Could Add</td>
<td>Could Add</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Could Add</td>
<td>Could Add</td>
<td>Could Add</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination w/ medical services</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Facilitates</td>
<td>Facilitates</td>
<td>Facilitates</td>
<td>Facilitates</td>
<td>Facilitates</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Could Add</td>
<td>Could Add</td>
<td>3 Items</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Could Add</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining Eligibility for Different Populations</td>
<td>EBD</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain Injury</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spinal Cord Injury</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No Plans</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Allocation</td>
<td>EBD</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Could Develop</td>
<td>State-specific</td>
<td>State-specific</td>
<td>State-specific</td>
<td>State-specific</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Could Develop</td>
<td>State-specific</td>
<td>State-specific</td>
<td>State-specific</td>
<td>State-specific</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDD</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Could Develop</td>
<td>State-specific</td>
<td>State-specific</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>State-specific</td>
<td>State-specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain Injury</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Could Develop</td>
<td>State-specific</td>
<td>State-specific</td>
<td>State-specific</td>
<td>State-specific</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spinal Cord Injury</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Could Develop</td>
<td>State-specific</td>
<td>State-specific</td>
<td>State-specific</td>
<td>State-specific</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>State-specific</td>
<td>State-specific</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Intake &amp; Triage tools</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Could Develop</td>
<td>Could Develop</td>
<td>State-specific</td>
<td>State-specific</td>
<td>State-specific</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Planning Tools</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Could Develop</td>
<td>Could Develop</td>
<td>State-specific</td>
<td>State-specific</td>
<td>State-specific</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical/Functional Issues</td>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>State-specific</td>
<td>Could Develop</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Could Develop</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Quality of Life/Participant Experience</td>
<td>Could Add</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Could Add</td>
<td>State-specific</td>
<td>Could Add</td>
<td>Could Add</td>
<td>Could Develop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirically Validated</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>MDS portion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used in other States</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1 State</td>
<td>1 State</td>
<td>1 State</td>
<td>1 State</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS Endorsed</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tools Selected as Starting Point for the Assessment Process

After careful review, Department and stakeholders decided to use components of the following tools:

CMS’ CARE tool (Later changed to FASI)
- Standardized items throughout the tool (e.g., functioning, health)

Minnesota’s MnCHOICES comprehensive assessment
- Modular format would serve as basis for CO process
- Person-centered items and modules (e.g., Personal Story)
- Items CARE/FASI did not contain (e.g., Psychosocial/Behaviors)
Approach for Developing the New Assessment Process

- Understand current LTSS assessment process
- Identify how processes can be improved (redesign goals and outcomes)
- Identify existing tools to be included in the new assessment process
- Customize the tools to meet Colorado’s needs
- Pilots for components of the process
- Adapt process for children
- Develop plans for Person-centered Support Plan, automation, full-scale testing, and statewide implementation
Other LTSS Systems Changes New Assessment Process will Support

- More person-centered system
- More informed choice about self-direction
- Restructuring case management including being able to tailor amount and type to participant preferences and needs
- Foster competitive employment
- Support emerging separation of eligibility assessment vs. support planning and ongoing case management
Other LTSS Systems Changes New Assessment will Support (cont.)

- Objective and empirically-based **person-centered budgets**
  
  Give people more choice and control over services

  Allows expansion of consumer directed principles to other services

- Enhance **quality management efforts**, including quality of life/participant experience data
Connecticut Universal Assessment (UA) Tool: Developing & Implementing a Quality Management Plan

Dawn Lambert, Co-Lead, Community Options
CT Department of Social Services

Doreek Charles, MSW
Bonnie Sutherland, BA
Wendy Thibeault, BA
Julie Robison, PhD
UConn Health, Center on Aging
Federal funding was granted to CT which required the state to **implement standardized instruments to help facilitate eligibility determinations, person-centered assessments, and individualized service planning.**

The CT Universal Assessment (UA) was designed to standardize assessments across waivers, improve reliability of assessments, and reduce redundancy of multiple assessments.
All affected state agencies (Dept. of Social Services [DSS], Dept. of Mental Health and Addiction Services [DMHAS], Dept. of Developmental Services [DDS]) worked together to identify tools.

Stakeholders reviewed existing CT functional assessment tools across multiple domains (Activities of Daily Living [ADL], Instrumental Activities of Daily Living [IADLs], Cognition, Behavior, etc.) and identified standard questions, definitions, and process.

Workgroup reviewed, analyzed, and ranked standardized tools, including national and ones created in other states.
Workgroup chose interRAI Homecare (HC) as base for the Connecticut Universal Assessment

InterRAI HC Assessment is a comprehensive holistic clinical assessment that focuses on the person’s functioning, strengths, and quality of life.

Currently being used in North America (Canada and multiple states in the U.S.), Europe (Italy, Switzerland, Finland, Estonia, etc.), and Asia/Pacific Rim (Hong Kong, Japan Singapore, Australia, New Zealand).
interRAI Assessments:

Developed by an International panel of experts on:
- Assessment  
- Health Services Research  
- Tool Specific Subject Matter

Compatible systems across human services sectors

Wellness  
Community Health  
Home Care  
Assisted Living  
Long-Term Care Facility

Post-acute Care  
Palliative Care  
Pediatric  
Children’s ID, MH  
Acute Care

Inpatient Mental Health  
Forensic Supplement  
Correctional Facilities  
Community Mental Health  
Developmental/Intellectual Disabilities  
Self-Reported Quality of Life

Each version of a system represents vigorous research and testing to establish the reliability and validity of: items, outcome measures, assessment protocols, case-mix algorithms, and quality indicators

Assessment driven decision-making, from clinical to policy. Data is collected once & used many ways
The CT Universal Assessment is a person centered whole person approach to assessment that identifies needs, strengths, preferences, and risks.

- Key Domains -
  Cognition, Communication, ADLS, IADLS, Mood and Behaviors, Psychosocial Well-Being, Disease Diagnoses, and Health Conditions.

Additional care planning items and other instruments added including the ASSIST Tool (screen substance abuse) and Mini-Cog.

- Automated web-based assessment system
  - Using laptop assessors code responses at the time of assessment
  - Paper version of tool can be utilized if needed

- Reduce redundancy of multiple assessments, reduce burden for consumer and assessor at reassessment

- Equitable distribution of resources based on functional need

Standardized assessment across multiple programs/waivers such as:

- CT Home Care Program for Elders
- Personal Care Assistance Waiver
- Acquired Brain Injury Waiver
- Autism Waiver
- Community First Choice
- Money Follows the Person
- Connecticut Housing Engagement and Support Services (CHESS)
CT Universal Assessment - Portal View

**C.1 Cognitive Skills for Daily Decision Making**

Making decisions regarding tasks of daily life e.g., when to get up or have meals, which clothes to wear or activities to do:

- Independent - Decisions consistent, reasonable, and safe
- Modified independence - Some difficulty in new situations only
- Minimally impaired - In specific recurring situations, decisions become poor or unsafe; cues / supervision necessary at those times
- Moderately impaired - Decisions consistently poor or unsafe; cues / supervision required at all times
- Severely impaired - Never or rarely makes decisions
- No discernable consciousness, coma [Skip to Section G]

**3. Which assessment tool do you wish to use?**

- None
- Mini-cog assessment
- Current mental status assessment
- Other cognitive assessment tool

**C.2 Memory / Recall Ability**

Code for recall of what was learned or known

1. Memory and Recall Ability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Memory</th>
<th>Yes, Memory OK</th>
<th>Memory problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Short term memory OK - seems / appears to recall after 5 minutes</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Universal Assessments Completed
July 2018-March 2020
(n=58,428)
- Contracted CT agencies complete HCBS program assessments for older adults and individuals with disabilities.

- High quality and reliable assessment data is vital to ensure equitable access to support and services and to inform individual and policy level care decisions.

- The State of Connecticut and UCONN Quality Management (QM) staff strive for the UA Quality Management to be a source of support for all Universal Assessment users.
The Goal: initiatives contained in the UA Quality Management Plan allow for mutually beneficial improvements in not only the data obtained from assessments but time, efficiency, productivity, and increased satisfaction for both the users and the consumers.

- Key UA QM focus areas include:
  - Ensure clear and concise communication with all stakeholders
  - Determine assessment data accuracy and consistency
  - Conduct targeted interventions based on results of data
  - Develop and implement standardized training and continued education
  - Enhance the assessor and consumer experience by increasing efficiencies and efficacies
Ensuring clear and concise communication and feedback with all stakeholders is vital to UA Quality Management interventions, this includes:

- Initial outreach and providing draft QM plan to state and agency leadership for review, feedback and approval
- Ongoing engagement to state and contracted agencies
  - Providing reports and status updates of assessment performance, targets, and outcomes
  - Consulting with national interRAI trainers as needed

Current and newly cultivated relationships are fostered to encourage the development and maintenance of the Universal Assessment Quality Management.
Conducted initial evaluation of baseline assessment coding accuracy

- Developed 37 key correlations for standardized identification of coding inconsistencies
- Established assessor baseline coding error rate utilizing correlation assessment data
- Assessors exhibiting high correlation data error rates are targeted for interventions
- 37 key correlations (logical link of assessment items) were developed to identify coding inaccuracies.

- **Correlation Examples:**
  - **IF** Section C1, Question 1 **Cognitive Skills for Daily Decision Making** coded Severely Impaired
  - **THEN** Section C2 Question **Type of support person needs in the home with activities that require remembering decision making and judgment** must be coded Someone needs to be with person always or Someone needs to be around always, but check on person now and then
  - **IF** Section K, Question 22 **Foot Problems** coded Foot problems, does not walk for other reasons **THEN** Section G **Mobility Walking** must be coded Activity Did Not Occur
  - **IF** Section C, Question 3 **Which assessment tool do you wish to use?** coded **Mini-cog** AND the Three-item recall score is <3 **THEN** Section C2, Question 1a **Short term memory** must be coded Memory problem
SQL used to retrieve Universal Assessment Data and pulled in using SPSS-ODBC

SPSS Syntax created to run each correlation and total number of errors that occurred in 37 correlations run

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Username</th>
<th>Total number of errors that occurred in the 37 Correlations run</th>
<th>Total Assessments Finalized</th>
<th>Total Assessments with Errors</th>
<th>Total Percentage Assessments With Error</th>
<th>Total Errors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency 1</td>
<td>JaneDoe1</td>
<td>0 Errors 1 Errors 2 Errors 3 Errors 4 Errors 5 Errors 6 Errors 7 Errors 8 Errors 10 Errors</td>
<td>2 5 10 6 1 2 2 1 0 0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency 1</td>
<td>JaneDoe2</td>
<td>18 10 21 25 19 2 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Example: *(Data collected from 01/01/2020 – 03/20/2020)*
- Assessors sorted by the percentage of finalized assessments with 1 or more errors during timeframe
- Assessors having 50% or more of their assessments with 1 or more correlation error(s) targeted for shadowing intervention
The first phase of the shadow visits are targeted shadows. Using the correlation data, assessors are identified for a target shadow visit based on:

- Percent of Assessments with 1 or more Errors
- Total Number of Errors

The Targeted Shadowing Group = Assessors having 50% or more of their assessments with 1 or more correlation error(s).

Assessor with 10 or fewer finalized assessments in the sample during the specified timeframe are not included in the Target group.

The Random Shadowing Group = Assessors having 49% or fewer of their assessments with 1 or more correlational error(s). Random Shadowing occurs following the completion of all the Targeted Shadowing.

Shadow visit tracking forms developed in ReDCAP database:

- Assessor Demographics, Consumer Visit Summary, Shadow Results, Identified Follow-up Interventions
Assessor are also identified for Targeted Shadow Visit based on 3 failed Competency Quiz Attempts

- **UA Competency Quiz QM Initiative:** a UA Competency Quiz was designed to ascertain the participant’s knowledge on both interRAI and CT Specific Coding and to help improve the quality and accuracy of assessments

- Custom web-based testing tool utilized to create secure online UA Competency Quiz

- The quiz for each assessor includes 15 randomly selected questions from the possible 150 question bank.

- Each assessor has up to 3 attempts to pass with a score of 80% or higher. Questions were developed for each assessment domain including interRAI and CT specific questions.

- **Section C - Cognition 1 pt**
  You arrive at the home of Ms. Lindy Ligament, to complete her annual Reassessment. As you administer the Mini-Cog assessment, Lindy draws the clock correctly, scoring the full 2 points. However, Ms. Ligament only remembers 2 of the 3 words in the 3-item recall, giving her a total score of 4.
  What do you code for Section C. COGNITION Item C.2.1 Memory and Recall Ability a. Short Term Memory
  A) Memory, OK
  B) Memory Problem

- **Section E - Mood and Behavior 1 pt**
  Last month when you spoke with Neil Nail he said he has been crying daily but isn’t sure why. When you bring up the subject during your six-month visit, he reports following up with his geriatric psychiatrist a week ago who adjusted his medication. Neil happily tells you he has stopped crying since the adjustment.
  How do you code for Section E. MOOD AND BEHAVIOR E.1 Indicators of possible depressed, anxious or sad mood: Item f. Sad, pained or worried facial expressions
  A) Not present
  B) Present, but not exhibited in last 3 days
  C) Exhibited on 1-2 of the last 3 days
  D) Exhibited daily in the last 3 days
# Shadow Visit Assessor Rating Scale with follow-up interventions and responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency Level</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Assessor Follow-up Intervention</th>
<th>Responsible Party to Ensure Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V vetted</td>
<td>All 16 Domains accurately coded based on information gathered</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>All 4 Core Domains accurately coded and 2 or fewer Other domains inaccurately coded</td>
<td>Recommendation: Review interRAI/CT Specific Manual for Domains coded inaccurately</td>
<td>Agency Trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaching Proficiency</td>
<td>All 4 Core Domains accurately coded and 3 or more Other domains inaccurately coded</td>
<td>Required: Review interRAI/CT Specific Manual for Domains coded inaccurately</td>
<td>Agency Trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendation: Targeted Quiz/Vignette Questions</td>
<td>UConn UQM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendation: Targeted PDF Review</td>
<td>UConn UQM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Proficient</td>
<td>3 or fewer Core Domains accurately coded and 0 or more Other domains inaccurately coded</td>
<td>Required: Review interRAI/CT Specific Manual for Domains coded inaccurately</td>
<td>Agency Trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Required: Retraining (Classroom)</td>
<td>UConn QM or Agency Trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Required: Targeted Quiz/Vignette Questions</td>
<td>UConn QM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Required: Re-shadow visit after above interventions completed</td>
<td>UConn QM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Core Domains are:** Cognition, ADLs, IADLs, Behavior

**The following assessor skillset will be taken into consideration:**
- Assessor did/did not demonstrate clinical judgement and appropriately probe and gather information to accurately code items
- Assessor did/did not demonstrate clear knowledge and application of coding guidance (intent, definitions, process, and coding)
- Assessor did/did not conducted an appropriate environmental assessment (perform walkthrough, view assistive devices, assess risks and barriers)
- Assessor did/ did not appropriately engage the consumer and formal/informal supports to build rapport
Key aspects of the QM training intervention include:

- Revise and produce ongoing trainings and supportive materials to ensure standardized instruction, amendments, and enhancements.

- Conduct train the trainer sessions to provide and review with trainers updated training materials, including but not limited to training plan, power point presentations, self-paced/web based training modules, etc.

- Evaluate and ensure knowledge and capacity to apply and use provided training standards and materials for appropriate use of the Universal Assessment.
  - Shadow contractor trainers and observe group training sessions and provide feedback regarding observed sessions.
- Based on review of Assessment PDFs and Correlation Data intensive Statewide Cognition Training held for all 4 contractor agencies

- **198 Total Participants, including:** Directors, Supervisors, Assessors, Agency Quality Team members and Trainers

- Quality Management Cognition Training Focus areas included: Content and Coding, Item Correlations, “Real Life” Field Examples, Opportunity for Questions and Feedback

![Bar chart showing what participants liked most about the cognition training](image-url)
The final key aspect of the UA QM plan is to enhance the assessor and consumer experience by increasing efficiencies and efficacies. This includes:

- Developing an ongoing process to identify and review challenges, risks, and barriers

- QM staff to accompany assessors to directly experience end to end assessment and paperwork process.

- Identify needed systems enhancements to include improved logic, performance, and functionality
Questions or Comments?

Contacts:
Dawn Lambert, Co-Lead, Community Options  
CT Department of Social Services  
Dawn.Lambert@ct.gov

Doreek Charles, MSW  
UConn Health, Center on Aging  
dcharles@uchc.edu

Julie Robison, PhD  
UConn Health, Center on Aging  
jrobison@uchc.edu
Questions
FASI Resources and Technical Assistance
Future FASI Learning Opportunities

FASI Early Adoption Work Group

January 13, 2021
3:00 – 4:00 EST

A community of practice for states at the forefront of FASI implementation

FASI Webinar #2: FASI Adoption Approaches

February 18, 2021
2:00 – 3:00 EST

Email HCBSMeasures@lewin.com for more information
Helpful Websites

CMS Data Element Library:  https://del.cms.gov/DELWeb/pubHome

FASI V1.1.: https://del.cms.gov/DELWeb/pubDataEleAsmtInstrRpt?asmtId=1&asmtVrsnId=1.1

eLTSS:  https://oncprojecttracking.healthit.gov/wiki/display/TechLabSC/eLTSS+Home

PACIO:  https://confluence.hl7.org/display/PC/PACIO+Project+Functional+Status