

Seniors and People with Disabilities

Mary Lee Fay
Authorized Signature

Number: SPD-IM-09-033
Issue Date: 4/1/2009

Topic: Developmental Disabilities

Subject: Eligibility Determination of adults, prior to 2001, with Developmental Disabilities

Applies to (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> All DHS employees | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> County Mental Health Directors |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Area Agencies on Aging | <input type="checkbox"/> Health Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Children, Adults and Families | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Seniors and People with Disabilities |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> County DD Program Managers | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): |

Message:

Applies to adults, determined to be adult eligible prior to 2001

This memo is regarding the process of updating eligibility statements of adult individuals served by Community Developmental Disabilities Programs (CDDP).

In recent years, as diagnosis and evaluation (D & E) services for developmental disabilities has evolved, Senior and People with Disabilities (SPD) has tried to provide specificity and clarification where necessary in applying standards for determining eligibility. Consequently, this has resulted in several questions and concerns about the validity of adult eligibility determinations prior to 2001.

Individuals who were determined eligible as adults prior to 2001, were done so by applying D & E standards as they were recognized at the time. Furthermore, for individuals who believed that once they met requirements as an adult with a developmental disability, there would be no need for further review, re-evaluating their eligibility now will potentially create much confusion and anxiety among individuals and their families.

The recent specificity and clarification provided by SPD does not invalidate the application of the standard as it was understood at the time. Assuming the prior standards were correctly applied and met at the time, CDDP's are **not required** to reevaluate the eligibility using the current standard, or to transfer information onto a new form.

SPD authorizes the CDDP to accept the eligibility statements of individuals who were determined adult eligible prior to 2001, using the Oregon adult standards available at the time (see attachment for examples). Individuals who fit the standard as understood should have documentation from the CDDP accompanying their eligibility statement that states they meet this criteria (or standard).

The CDDP's commitment to improve its current process and to have trained and qualified staff making eligibility determinations is to be commended. We believe that by focusing on the really obvious errors of the past and by ensuring the consistent application of the standards (as currently defined) the majority of individuals who have been long time participants in the DD community will not be disrupted. This should also reduce the impact on workload for eligibility staff as well as ensure the implementation of a fair system for everyone both new and old to the system.

If you continue to have questions, please contact your respective SPD Diagnosis and Evaluation Coordinator.

If you have any questions about this information, contact:

Contact(s):	Chelas Kronenberg & Kathy Richards		
Phone:	Chelas 503-945-6799 Kathy 503-974-4241	Fax:	503-373-7274
E-mail:	Chelas.a.kronenberg@state.or.us Kathryn.a.richards@state.or.us		

<u>SITUATION/EXAMPLE</u>	<u>HOW TO WRITE PROGRESS NOTES</u>	<u>...ALSO THINK ABOUT..</u>
DD diagnosis, no standardized testing	<p>“‘Jane’ was previously determined eligible as an adult with a developmental disability of Cerebral Palsy on (insert date here) based on a medical diagnosis of CP and documented delays in the following areas: (use whatever is appropriate- mobility, self care, communication and community use). The standards of eligibility that were in place at the time adult eligibility was completed for Jane, did not take into consideration that a standardized adaptive assessment was needed. Since Jane was determined eligible using the standards that were appropriate on (insert date) I am continuing her eligibility as she continues to require supports similar to people who have mental retardation – or ...she continues to require the following supports (and document her support needs).”</p>	<p>You could also have the services coordinator complete an informal adaptive assessment (contact D&E coordinator for examples) and reference the assessment in the progress notes.</p>
One child IQ test	<p>“‘Jane’s adult eligibility was completed on (insert date) using the one IQ score, completed at age 10, which was considered to be a current functioning level when adult eligibility was completed. It was not the standard practice to arrange adult IQ testing when it was obvious that the person’s IQ functioning was still at a level consistent with previous IQ score. I am continuing her eligibility as Jane continues to require supports as a person with mental retardation.”</p>	<p>You can also add in here, additional medical doctors statements, psychiatrist comments if applicable, educational records or have the services coordinator complete an informal adaptive assessment (contact your D&E coordinator for examples) etc. It would be appropriate to also document the continued need for supports and list the specific support</p>

<u>SITUATION/EXAMPLE</u>	<u>HOW TO WRITE PROGRESS NOTES</u>	<u>...ALSO THINK ABOUT..</u>
IQ average scores	“Jane was determined eligible as an adult with mental retardation based on the average of her IQ scores taken from all 4 IQ tests, which total an IQ score of *****. This was a standard that was applied for individuals determined eligible prior to 2001. I am continuing Jane’s eligibility for services based on this standard and her continued need for supports similar to people who have mental retardation. “	
IQ between 66-75 with no adaptive	“Jane was determined eligible as an adult with mental retardation on (insert date) based on the following IQ score(s). The practice at the time Jane’s eligibility was determined was that adaptive assessments were not necessary when IQ scores were under 70. Jane continues to require supports of someone who has mental retardation as evidenced by (you could give examples of her support needs here)”. ”.	You could also have the services coordinator complete an informal adaptive assessment to support on-going eligibility (ask your D&E coordinator for examples)
No eligibility statement on file	<p>“Jane was enrolled into CPMS on (insert date). It is documented by her (PCP, Psychiatrist, counselor, ISP team etc) that Jane has required the following supports.</p> <p>Then document the next step – if there is an IQ evaluation on file, reference this and what you are planning – continuing her eligibility status for example.”</p> <p>If there is no IQ assessment on file and the individual does not have a DD diagnosis, consult with your D&E coordinator BEFORE scheduling any Admin Exams.</p>	Consult with your D&E coordinator before scheduling any Admin Exams

<u>SITUATION/EXAMPLE</u>	<u>HOW TO WRITE PROGRESS NOTES</u>	<u>...ALSO THINK ABOUT..</u>
Adaptive over 70 with no areas under –2.00 standard deviations from the mean	“Jane was determined eligible as an adult (with mental retardation OR DD-only) based on the following test scores..... At the time that her eligibility was determined, the standard practice of eligibility did not weigh heavily on adaptive scores. Jane continues to require supports in the following areas..... and therefore continues to be eligible as an adult with mental retardation.”	