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A. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the Michigan Department of Community Health (MDCH) 2013 Application for Participation (AFP) for re-procurement of Medicaid Specialty Prepaid Inpatient Health Plans (PIHPs) is to describe the necessary information and documentation that will be required from the applicant to determine whether the Urban Cooperation Act (UCA) formed entity or the Regional Entity applicant, (jointly governed by the sponsoring Community Mental Health Services Programs (CMHSPs)), meets the MDCH requirements for selection to be certified to Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services as a PIHP effective January 1, 2014.

The AFP is the official vehicle which begins solicitation and selection for the PIHPs for the state-defined regions. Specifically, the AFP identifies the plan for meeting the required functions of the PIHP, including identification of functions that are to be direct-operated, delegated and/or contracted within and outside the sponsoring CMHSPs.

The AFP requires response in the following areas: Governance, Administrative Functions including general management and financial, Information Systems Management, Provider Network Management, Utilization Management, Customer Service, Quality Management, Accreditation, External Quality Review, and Public Policy initiatives including crisis response capacity, health and welfare, Olmstead compliance, substance abuse prevention and treatment capacity, and recovery.

In recognition of the short timeframe between issuance of this AFP and the April 1st due date for the response, MDCH will allow an extended response time, up to 5 p.m. on July 1st, for some items so noted in this document. However, an application is not considered complete until all items requested in the AFP are submitted.

Similar to the 2002 Application for Participation, this AFP is targeted first exclusively to entities comprised of Michigan CMHSPs in compliance with Michigan’s application for renewal of its 1915(b) Specialty Services and Supports Waiver. In the waiver application, Michigan proposed that a first opportunity should be afforded to CMHSPs since these entities have the necessary expertise with the target populations and strong coordination linkages with other community agencies; control other resource streams (e.g., state funds); sustain local systems of care; have already made durable investments in specialized care management strategies and unique service/support arrangements; and have statutorily prescribed protection, equity and justice functions important to individuals, policymakers and Michigan's citizens.
This AFP is intended to re-procure the PIHPs based on new regional boundaries drawn by the MDCH. There will be one PIHP selected per region, and that PIHP will manage the Medicaid specialty benefit for the entire region defined by the MDCH. The PIHP will contract with CMHSPs and other providers within the region to deliver services. It is relevant to note that beginning October 1, 2013, plans for merging Coordinating Agency functions within the CMHSP system must be developed and initiated, with full compliance (merger of functions) with the law (P.A. 500 and 501) by October 1, 2014. This application response will supply information regarding the activities aimed at reaching these goals, and expected roles and timeframes, as much as they are known to the applicant and member CMHSPs at the time of response.

The only acceptable legal arrangements for affiliation going forward will be either UCA agreements or creation of a regional entity under Section 1204b of the Mental Health Code. In either case, such intergovernmental affiliation formations result in the creation of a new legal entity jointly “owned” and governed by the sponsoring CMHSPs. It is this entity that will be considered, recognized and designated as the PIHP (for a region consisting of more than one CMHSP).

As described in the November 26, 2012, “Discussion Draft”, the key objective of this new management entity is to balance and obtain the best two opposites while avoiding the limits of each. The new regional structure must consolidate authority and core functions, while simultaneously promoting local responsiveness. (Please reference the “Discussion Draft-Version 2, November 26, 2012, for further details).

Policies and procedures for “Provider Network Services,” “Provider Procurement,” “Provider Credentialing” and “Customer Services” must be maintained by the regional entity, with common provider application processes throughout the region. The processes and functions MAY be decentralized among more than one entity or CMHSP, but each decentralized unit will be acting under the common policies and procedures of the UCA/Regional Entity. A provider then, moving from one CMHSP to another to provide service should not experience repeated and different application and procurement processes to become a Medicaid provider in a new CMHSP within the same regional entity.

The regional entity policies and procedures for Provider Services need to include the full breadth of what may be needed by any single CMHSP to respond to local need and to take advantage of increasing opportunity for participating in accountable and integrated systems of care with local partners. An individual CMHSP should not be hindered from participating in opportunities to provide integrated and accountable care to serve the Medicaid population in its catchment area. The objective of this new entity is to balance and obtain the best of both opposites (local control/responsiveness and regional standards/consistency), while avoiding the limits of each.
As with the original AFP, this application process differs from typical request for proposal processes because a) the bid does not include pricing; and b) the process is not competitive at this stage. Applicants are indicating their capacity and commitment to performance in a variety of areas. Pricing is determined by the MDCH in compliance with Medicaid regulations, the 1915(b) waiver, and state appropriations and will be shared with applicants prior to contract negotiations to commence in the Spring of 2013.

Other significant MDCH policy decisions impacting applicants that need to be considered are as follows:

1. **Capitation Payments and Data Files**
   The base capitation rates and methodology are currently under evaluation by actuaries. The MDCH intends to re-develop rate structures, methodologies and adjusters that increase the percentage of the ratio reflecting morbidity and decrease the percentage that is based on history/geography. In the 2012-2013 year, the ratio is 50/50 morbidity/geography. MDCH will be increasing the percentage of the ratio that reflects morbidity each year. Ultimately, MDCH will be moving to methodologies that are built on a common statewide rate structure where adjusters are entirely based on morbidity differences or cost of living methodologies common to other areas of health care. MDCH will utilize common actuarial methodologies statewide, as approved by CMS. The concurrent 1915(c) Habilitation Supports Waiver allocation of certificates will also be adjusted based on factors such as the number of people with developmental disabilities served within the region, thus moving away from current historical allocation.

   The data files distributed will be a single file for each consolidated service area. This file will be available only to the PIHP. The PIHP must have the capacity to provide information to and collect information from the individual CMHSPs within the region in compliant, efficient and helpful formats for use by the CMHSPs in understanding the broad scope of enrollees, trends and utilization of the individual CMHSP and as it compares to the other members within the region.

   Single CMHSP PIHPs will be required to report both the administrative cost of PIHP functions borne directly by the PIHP and those PIHP functions carried out by the CMHSP, CMHSP core providers, and managed comprehensive provider networks (MCPNs). To promote full transparency of PIHP and administrative costs, MDCH will require reporting of administrative costs of both the PIHP itself, and administrative costs for direct services for the CMHSP. MDCH intends to place a cap on the administrative cost percentage for CMHSP direct services.
2. **Sub-capitation**

An applicant may sub-capitate for shared risk with its provider network, including CMHSPs, MCPNs, and core providers. The actuarially-sound methodology and rates for sub-capitation, by contractor, must be submitted to MDCH. MDCH retains the right to disapprove any sub-capitation arrangement that is determined not to be actuarially sound or where the arrangement has a high probability to adversely impact the State’s risk-sharing. Sub-capitation rates shall be reasonable when compared to other service rates for similar services. Sub-capitation shall not contribute to risk reserve accumulation that exceeds seven and one-half percent (7.5 percent) of annual per eligible/per month, or an amount consistent with Governmental Accounting Standards Board Statement 10, whichever is less, within the applicant’s region.

3. **Internal Service Fund (ISF)**

The ISF risk reserves that exist on December 31, 2013, for PIHPs whose geographically boundaries have not changed may be continued under the new contract, up to the level justifiable by Governmental Accounting Standards Board Statement 10 and the current ISF Technical Requirement (MDCH/PIHP Contract Attachment 7.7.4.1). For PIHP regions where the geography has changed, (such as individual CMHSPs entering and exiting PIHP regions and PIHP regions combining), MDCH will work with actuaries to determine the percentage of the ISF that shall move to the new PIHP for purpose of servicing the enrollees that move to the new PIHP region. It is expected that the actuarially-determined amount of the ISF to be transferred to the new PIHP will be based on prior fiscal years enrollee data, summarized by diagnoses for those belonging to the exiting CMHSP.

4. **Integrated Care**

All PIHPs will be required to have and provide upon request, signed agreements with all the Medicaid Health Plans (MHPs) in the region. The PIHPs and MHPs shall use the model coordination agreement provided in the contract as a foundational template. The Medicaid Health Plan contracts will contain the same requirement to have signed agreements with the PIHPs. Over the period of the upcoming waiver renewal cycle, new opportunities for integration with physical health care may become available in Michigan. MDCH is exploring options such as Medicaid Health Homes (ACA section 2703) and Integrated Care Dual Eligible Demonstrations (Medicare/Medicaid). Four of the new PIHP regions have been selected as the Dual Eligible Demonstration sites: Regions 1, 4, 7 and 9; others may be selected to participate in the integrated care opportunities. If approved by CMS, both the dual eligible and Medicaid Health Home opportunities will require contract amendments for PIHP regions selected to participate. The PIHPs in the Dual Eligibles regions will also require contracts with the Integrated Care Organizations in order to accomplish the Care Bridge functions and desired outcomes of integrated Medicare and Medicaid-funded behavioral health and physical health care.
5. **Performance Monitoring and Incentives**

MDCH will be implementing a performance incentive structure for the Medicaid PIHPs. During each contract year, MDCH will withhold a portion of the approved capitation payment from each PIHP (range to be determined, but likely to be between .02 and .015). These funds will be used for the PIHP performance incentive awards. These awards will be made to PIHPs according to criteria pre-established by MDCH. The criteria will include assessment of performance from areas such as: access, health and welfare, and compliance with the Balanced Budget Act (BBA) per External Quality Review, including performance measure data validation. In 2014, the two areas of focus will be PIHP proper and complete reporting of monetary amounts and billing/rendering provider; and completeness of Quality Improvement health conditions and developmental disabilities characteristics data.

6. **Program Integrity and Compliance**

A strong compliance and program integrity system is critical to all managed care systems. All PIHPs shall comply with 42 CFR 438.608 Program Integrity requirements. This includes key functions to be owned by the PIHP such as: designation of a compliance officer for the PIHP, region wide policies and procedures showing commitment to comply with federal and state laws, training and education for the compliance officer and employees, clear lines of communication with the compliance officer, discipline and enforcement, internal monitoring and auditing and prompt response to detected offenses. The state is seeking more detail on program integrity and compliance programs than has been required in past applications.

7. **Sanctions**

MDCH will utilize a variety of means to assure compliance with applicable requirements. MDCH will pursue remedial actions and possibly sanctions, including intermediate sanctions as described in 42 CFR 438.700, as needed, to resolve outstanding contract violations and performance concerns. The use of remedies and sanctions will typically follow a progressive approach, but MDCH reserves the right to deviate from the progression, as needed, to seek correction of serious, repeated, or patterns of substantial non-compliance or performance problems. The application of remedies and sanctions shall be a matter of public record.

The range of contract remedies and sanctions MDCH will utilize include:

A. Issuing a notice of the contract violation and conditions to the PIHP with copies to the Board.
B. Requiring a plan of correction and status reports that becomes a contract performance objective.
C. Imposing a direct dollar penalty, making it a non-matchable PIHP administrative expense and reducing earned savings from that fiscal year by the same dollar amount.
D. Imposing intermediate sanctions (as described in 42 CFR 438.700) that may include the following civil monetary penalties:
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- A maximum of $25,000 for each determination of failure to provide services; misrepresentation or false statements to beneficiaries or health care providers.
- A maximum of $100,000 for each determination of discrimination or misrepresentation or false statements to CMS or the State.

E. For sanctions related to reporting compliance issues, MDCH may delay up to 25% of scheduled payment amount to the PIHP until after compliance is achieved. MDCH may add time to the delay on subsequent uses of this provision. (Note: MDCH may apply this sanction in a subsequent payment cycle and will give prior written notice to the PIHP.)

F. Initiate contract termination.

The following are examples of compliance or performance problems for which remedial actions, including sanctions, can be applied to address repeated or substantial breaches, or reflect a pattern of non-compliance or substantial poor performance. This listing is not meant to be exhaustive, but only representative.

A. Reporting timeliness, quality and accuracy.
B. Performance Indicator Standards.
C. Repeated Site-Review non-compliance (repeated failure on same item).
D. Failure to complete or achieve contractual performance objectives.
E. Substantial inappropriate denial of services required by this contract or substantial services not corresponding to condition. Substantial can be a pattern, large volume or small volume but severe impact.
F. Repeated failure to honor appeals/grievance assurances.
G. Substantial or repeated health and/or safety negligence.

8. Transition To State Defined Regions:

The applications submitted in response to the AFP must demonstrate that the PIHPs are able to meet, or have viable plans with specified dates for completion of requirements. Because of the complexity and transition time needed to move some functions from single CMHSPs as PIHPs to fewer and regional entities as PIHPs, this AFP allows the applicant to specify target dates beyond April 1, 2013, for some of the functions.

MDCH reserves the right to require the milestone target dates be adjusted in order for a conditional (or provisional) award to be granted. Should the milestone target dates not be met, MDCH reserves the right to notify CMS the PIHP no longer meets requirements for continuing to function as the PIHP. MDCH may then give notice of termination of the contract and proceed to seek another entity to manage the PIHP functions for that region. A new managing entity could be either a neighboring PIHP or a non-CMHSP-governed entity selected to manage the region through a competitive process (with assurances to maintain the statutory purposes the local CMHSP).
B. INSTRUCTIONS

Since 2002, the PIHPs have managed Medicaid specialty services and supports and carried out their responsibilities for ensuring beneficiary freedom, opportunities for achievement, equity, and participation consistent with the history and mission of CMHSPs. MDCH has been responsible for assuring that PIHPs are in compliance with federal laws and regulations, state Medicaid policy, the Michigan Mental Health Code and Administrative Rules, and the contract between MDCH and the PIHPs. To that end, MDCH will use the results of performance and contract monitoring and external quality reviews for existing PIHP (where the new entity adopts the policies of an existing PIHP) and, as applicable, for CMHPs to inform its review of an applicant’s suitability to become a new PIHP.

In 2009, MDCH and the PIHPs engaged in a comprehensive quality improvement effort called “Focusing a Partnership for Renewal and Recommitment to Quality and Community in the Michigan Public Mental Health System” referred to as the ARR). The ARR addressed updated (from 2002) public policy considerations. PIHPs with the assistance of community stakeholders, performed environmental scans and developed plans for improvement where they found the need. MDCH and PIHP staff worked together as PIHPs made progress in achieving their own goals.

The 2002 AFP and the 2008 ARR are the foundation of the Medicaid Specialty Supports and Services program and the vision and values, and public policy they addressed – such as person-centered planning and self-determination, and culture of gentleness- are still highly regarded, and while not addressed in this AFP, will continue to be part of the contracts between MDCH and the new PIHPs to fulfill provider network adequacy and capacity requirements for the covered specialty services.

This 2013 AFP is also built upon documents that have been the foundation of the Specialty Services and Supports Program since 2002: the FY’12-13 amended 1915(b) Waiver for Specialty Services and Supports, and the FY’13 MDCH/PIHP contracts and the attachments. Finally, it is expected that the applicants are compliant or are able to become compliant with the 1997 Balanced Budget Act, 42 CFR Part 438, and the External Quality Review Protocols.

This 2013 AFP addresses primarily those public policy areas that are new or evolving; and raises expectations for certain administrative capabilities that a mature specialty managed care system such as Michigan’s should be able to demonstrate. This AFP solicits applicant information in the following: Governance; Administrative Functions including General Management, Financial Management, Information Systems Management, Provider Network Management, Utilization Management, Customer Service, Quality Management; Accreditation Status; External Quality Review; and the following Public Policy initiatives: Crisis Response Capacity, Health and Welfare, ADA/Olmstead Compliance, Substance Use Disorder Prevention and Treatment, and Recovery.
We have placed links to documents referred to on this page and other helpful resources identified throughout this AFP on the MDCH web site’s Mental Health and Substance Abuse page.

Responses to this AFP shall be entered in the electronic version of this document in the boxes, tables and spaces provided. Supplementary information shall be attached as instructed and labeled with the requested Attachment number.

Certain items in the application may be submitted subsequent to the April 1st due date but no later than 5 p.m. on July 1, 2013. However, the applicant is cautioned that an application will not be considered complete until all items requested have been submitted. An incomplete application as of July 2, 2013, will result in loss of first opportunity to CMHSPs in the region (through Urban Cooperation Act or Regional Entities). The state will then proceed to open the region to competitive bid.

Please adhere to the page count limitation specified for text boxes and use no smaller than 12-point font. Some text boxes have limits on the number of characters that can be inserted.

Label each attachment with the Region number and item number, save all attachments in PDF into one document, and submit as instructed below.

Responses must be submitted electronically to Marlene Simon at SimonM4@michigan.gov by 5 p.m. on April 1, 2013. Items submitted electronically between April 1, 2013 and July 1, 2013 are to be labeled with the applicant’s region number, the AFP section number and are to adhere to the page count limitation.
C. **MDCH DECISIONS**

Applications will be reviewed by MDCH staff in the two weeks following submission. MDCH reserves the right to conduct a short site review to interview staff or stakeholders, and/or to follow up on any responses received via this application that are unclear or incomplete.

The review of applications, scoring, and site visits will result in one of three decisions below that will be announced by the Department following the conclusion of these activities:

1. **Award without conditions** means that MDCH will contract with the applicant without changes required in the application and without any conditions for meeting target dates for milestone activities. This action will be announced in early June 2014. Announcement may be as late as July 2, 2013, where items from the application noted as allowable for two-part submission are delayed. Contracts will be signed in December 2013, effective January 1, 2014.

2. **Award with conditions** means that MDCH requires that either or both: a) certain improvements must be completed or plans of correction approved before it will contract with the applicant; b) certain milestones must be met by target dates for initiating contract and/or continued contracting as the PIHP for the region. This action will be announced in July 2013, where application is incomplete due to awaiting legal documents or other specifically noted items. Conditions must be met by a date specified in the award announcement. In Wayne County condition may also include transition to authority status by October 1, 2013, as per Public Acts (P.A.) 375 and 376 of 2012. Following the MDCH acceptance of improvements or plans of correction needing resolution prior to January 1, 2014, contracts will be signed in December 2013, effective January 1, 2014.

3. **Unsuccessful application** means one or more of the following:
   a. The application was received after the deadline and will be returned to the sender immediately.
   b. The application did not pass the Governance Section. The application contained section(s) that failed to meet standards, and for which acceptable target milestones and timeframes were not provided. Notification of such a situation will be made within one week following the review of the application (approximately three weeks after the due date). If the application is incomplete due to items with allowable extended due date of July 1, 2013, notice of unsuccessful application will be made the first week of July 2013.
   c. The application lacked signatures from all CMHSPs in the state-defined region as authorized by appropriate action of all individual boards.
   d. Required legal documents (Urban Cooperation Act, Regional Entity) were not filed with the county clerks before July 1, 2013, for multi CMH regions.
e. Wayne County authority not created by October 1, 2013, as required by PA 375 and 376 of 2012.

4. **Open Competitive Process means the following:**
   a. In the event an unsuccessful application is received from a region, MDCH will proceed with an open competitive bid process specifically for that region.
   
   b. The vendor selected for a particular region via MDCH’s open competitive process will be the PIHP for that region, and will be required to report contractually to MDCH.
   
   c. An award of a bid via the open competitive bid process to an entity other than an Urban Cooperative Act or Regional Entity formed by the CMHSPs in that region will not require that PIHP to have CMHSP representation on its board.

Applicants may appeal the decisions in number three above by delivering or faxing a letter requesting reconsideration, within two days of receipt of the notification, to:

Lynda Zeller, Deputy Director  
Michigan Department of Community Health  
Lewis Cass Building, Fifth Floor  
320 S. Walnut Street  
Lansing, Michigan 48913  
FAX (517) 335-4798
D. THE APPLICATION

1. GOVERNANCE
This section will receive a “pass” or “fail” determination. If any one item receives a fail
determination, it will stop the application from further consideration. A fail determination
will result from the applicant’s answer of either “no” without sufficient justifiable
narrative included or an answer of N/A (not applicable) for an application consisting
of an affiliation of CMHSPs. Failed applicants will be notified within one week following
review of the application (approximately three weeks after the due date).

The AFP affords initial consideration for specialty prepaid inpatient health plan designation
to qualified single county or regional entities (organized under Section 1204b of the Mental
Health Code or Urban Cooperation Act). Therefore, the first and most basic requirement is
that the organization submitting an application, be comprised of and jointly,
representatively governed by all CMHSPs in the region pursuant to Section 204 or 205 of

Check all boxes that are appropriate to the applicant as it will be January 1, 2014

1.1  □ Applicant is the sole CMHSP in a state-defined region and is currently one of the
following:
   1.1.2 □ County CMH Agency.
   1.1.3 □ Community Mental Health Organization.
   1.1.4 □ Community Mental Health Authority (Required for Wayne
          County).

OR

1.2  □ Applicant is an entity jointly governed by all CMHSPs in a state-defined region and
     has one of the following legal arrangements:
     1.2.1  □ Section 1204b Regional Entity as defined in Mental Health Code
     1.2.2  □ Urban Cooperation Act (UCA)

1.3  □ In Attachment 1.3 is a plan for the legal entity to be finalized with action steps,
     responsible parties, and timeframes. By no later than 5 p.m. on July 1, 2013, the
     legal entity shall have by-laws filed with the county clerk, and all member CMHSP
     board approvals have been completed.

An application for a region comprised of more than one CMHSP shall submit, no later than
5 p.m. on July 1, 2013, one hard copy of the original signed legal documents that establish
or validate that the entity making application has status as a Regional Entity under Section
1204b of the Mental Health Code or through Urban Cooperation Act and, where applicable,
has the legal basis to enter into a contractual commitment with the Department for a
consolidated application for multiple CMHSP service areas. (These items need not be
scanned and submitted electronically. They must, however, be appropriately labeled with the
Region number and suitable cover sheets.) Note: where an application is being made by a
single CMHSP, appropriate documentation is currently on file with the MDCH, with the
exception of Wayne County which will require proof of Authority Status no later than
October 1, 2013. Submit the hard copy legal documents to Elizabeth Knisely, Director, Bureau of Community Mental Health Services, 5th Floor Lewis Cass Building, 320 South Walnut Street, Lansing, Michigan 48913.

1.4 ☑ An original signed paper copy of the legal document(s) including by laws and enabling resolutions that establish or validate that the entity making application has a status as a Regional Entity or entity formed by Urban Cooperation Act has been submitted concurrent with this application.

OR

1.5 ☑ The legal document(s) will be submitted no later than 5 p.m. on July 1, 2013. The application will not be considered complete until the legal document(s) have been submitted to MDCH, no later than 5 p.m. on July 1, 2013.

The legal document(s) addresses the following:

1.4.1 ☑ The relationship between the parties.
1.4.2 ☑ The roles of each party to the agreement.
1.4.3 ☑ The rights of each party to the agreement.
1.4.4 ☑ Governance arrangements and conditions.
1.4.5 ☑ Functional consolidation of administrative activities.
1.4.6 ☑ Assurances that all members will comply with federal and state standards and regulation and what processes exist to address non-compliance.
1.4.7 ☑ The financial arrangements and interests of each party to the agreement including, but not limited to: cost-sharing, cost-allocations, local match obligations related to Medicaid funds, fund transfers, re-purchase (contracting back) arrangements, resource/asset claims, liability obligations, risk obligations, risk management, contingencies, areas of limitations, and areas of exclusions.
1.4.8 ☑ Established dispute resolution mechanism(s) between the affiliates.
1.4.9 ☑ Identification of the designated regional entity to act as the prepaid inpatient health plan by all CMHSPs within the region.

1.6 ☑ In the text box below is a list of the PIHP board member categories (e.g., person who receives services, family member of a person who receives services, person with a disability, advocate, provider, county commissioner, CMH representative, community member), the number of people to serve in each category, their affiliation (e.g., county), and if known at the time of application, but no later than July 1, 2013, the name of each PIHP board member.

There will be eight (8) CMH representatives, with a mix of Board members and community members. Of these eight (8), two (2) will represent each county: two (2) from Genesee County, two (2) from Lapeer County, two (2) from Sanilac County and two (2) from St. Clair County. Some of the names are known now but not all so a full list will be submitted by the July 1, 2013 deadline.
The remaining five (5) members will represent the individuals served, family members or individuals representing certain groups (e.g. advocacy), as identified by the eight (8) directors, with deference being given to a balanced representation across the region, as well as representation of all populations served (Those with mental illness, intellectual disabilities, serious emotional disturbances, substance use disorders and primary care, residing within the geographic boundaries of the region). Pursuant to P.A. 500 of 2012 at least one (1) Board member will represent the substance use disorder population.

The region will use an “Application for Appointment” form and process for selecting board members. It is likely that any one (1) Board member will represent more than one (1) category.

MDCH shall review the applicant’s, and CMHSP member status regarding compliance with certification criteria, Section 232 of the Mental Health Code. In order to assure adequate specialty services network and capacity, applications will be reviewed to assure all CMHSPs within the consolidated application meet the criteria. To be referred for scoring of the proposal, applicants must have substantial or provisional certification for each participant CMHSP within the region at the time of application.

MDCH shall review the applicant’s status regarding MCLA 330.1232a (6); Recipient Rights System. In order to assure adequate specialty services network and capacity, applications will be reviewed to assure all CMHSPs within the region have overall assessment scores of substantial compliance. To be referred for scoring of the proposal, applicants must be determined to have scores of substantial compliance with Recipient Rights System standards.

1.7 ☒ Assessment scores meet substantial compliance.

Because MDCH continues to value and promote community involvement, there must be documentation that individuals who receive services, family members, and/or advocates representing each service area of the region, if applicable, and all populations served, including, adults with serious mental illness, children with serious emotional disturbance, children and adults with developmental disabilities, and children and adults with substance use disorders were involved in the development of this application.

1.8 ☒ In Attachment 1.8 is a signed statement attesting to consumer/stakeholder involvement.

1.9 ☒ In Attachment 1.9 is a narrative of no more than three pages that defines the vision and values of the stand-alone applicant, or of the UCA/regional entity. Include within the narrative a description of how the affiliation arrangement will actualize this vision and build upon the existing strengths of member CMHSPs. Explain how the PIHP will bring any members with deficits up to standard or acceptable performance.
1.10  □ In Attachment 1.10 is a curriculum vitae for the executive director of the applicant organization that verifies that the executive director of the applicant organization meets or exceeds the qualifications of an executive director as specified in Section 226(1) (k) of the Mental Health Code.

**OR**

1.11  □ The executive director of the applicant organization is unknown at the time of the submission of this application. The name and curriculum vitae will be submitted to MDCH no later than 5 p.m. on July 1, 2013.

1.12  □ All text boxes are completed and all attachments required to be submitted are included with this Application for Participation response.

**OR**

1.13  □ Not all text boxes are completed and/or not all required attachments are being submitted with this AFP but will be submitted no later than 5 p.m. on July 1, 2013. It is understood that this is considered an *incomplete application*.

**1.14  □ Name of contact person who can answer questions about this application:**

Kelly VanWormer, telephone number: 810-966-7808, E-mail address: kvanwormer@scccmh.org

**Additional Governance Responses Required of Wayne County:**

MDCH seeks a stable transition and the least disruption possible from County oversight to the newly authorized Authority beginning October 2013. No sooner than six months, but no later than nine months, after the Authority begins oversight and operations of the existing MCPN system, the Authority shall submit a written Plan (the Plan) for approval by MDCH, for the re-procurement and implementation of specialty provider networks that will be administered by two or three Managers of Comprehensive Provider Networks (MCPNs). To achieve better integration and efficiency of administration, the Plan shall include requirements for at least two but no more than three MCPNs to oversee specialty networks that will provide a comprehensive array of services for each of the two primary target populations: (1) people with mental illnesses, substance use disorders, and serious emotional disturbance and 2) people with intellectual/developmental disabilities. Each of the MCPNs shall deliver person-centered, behavioral health or I/DD services, and coordinate those services with the physical health services to be delivered by Integrated Care Organizations in the State’s demonstration for people with Medicare and Medicaid eligibility. The Plan shall be reviewed by the MDCH. MDCH shall approve the Plan once the MDCH is confident in the stability of Authority’s operations and has ensured that the Plan meets the requirements of this document.

1.14.1 □ The Wayne County applicant attests that it will submit, within the time frame noted above, the written Plan for re-procurement of MCPNs that includes all of the following:

- a. A description of the process to ensure that there is always a choice of MCPNs (not less than two) for eligible recipients from the two population groups. The Plan shall also include policies and procedures that allow individuals the opportunity to move between MCPNs if they choose.
b. The proposed scope of services for the MCPN contract and procurement. It shall describe the structure and functions of the MCPNs, any legal requirements for corporate status, governance requirements, individual and family representation, financing and reimbursement, and other elements described below. The Plan shall describe the process for re-procurement of the MCPNs to achieve efficiency and care integration goals. The Plan shall include standards for MCPNs and their specialty provider networks on enrollment, person centered planning, care management, clinical service and utilization review standards, provider standards and physical and behavioral health service coordination and integration. The Plan shall also describe required administrative functions including provider network management, accounting, claims, data systems, reporting, after-hours coverage, quality improvement, member services and any other delegated responsibilities. Evidence (copies of public comment) that The Plan was made available for public review prior to submission to the MDCH shall be provided. This shall include review by consumers, families and other advocacy groups. The Plan shall be approved by the CMHSP Board of Directors and any other applicable Boards and Authorities.
c. Evidence that the MCPNs shall be governed by provider members, members of the community or individuals with specialized experience. The Plan shall also include plans for involving people with lived experience (either as consumers and or family members) in the governance of the PIHP, the MCPNs and perhaps in an advisory role for the specialty provider networks. The Plan shall also outline how the applicant and the MCPNs will employ people who have lived experience in key positions.

d. Identification of the functions that will be provided by the applicant, other public agencies and those delegated to the MCPNs. Specifically this shall include general management/administrative, financial management, information systems management, provider network management, utilization management, customer services, and quality management. The applicant shall demonstrate that it has examined the effects of this decision on care coordination, quality, cost, and availability. Particular attention will be paid to ways to minimize overall administrative costs. The applicant has also examined the implications of these plans for apparent or real conflicts of interest and has adjusted its policies and procedures as needed to minimize conflict.

e. Assurance that each MCPN or its provider network provides coverage to its target population a comprehensive and similar set of services for the entire geographic service area. The Plan may exempt MCPNs from providing certain highly-specialized or culturally-specific services (that may be provided centrally by the applicant or through other contracts) in order to ensure access to unique providers. The Plan shall outline steps to ensure that similar services and management activities are provided across the MCPNs while allowing for innovative approaches by each MCPN. This will include a common set of benefits and consistent policies for credentialing, care coordination, and access to care.

f. A description of the applicant’s procedures for reimbursing the MCPNs, including how rates will be established for services for each population group and what incentives will be used to reimburse MCPNs and providers. This will also include a process for assessing the financial soundness of rates that are set on a capitated or case rate basis. MCPNs shall manage a population that is of sufficient size so that the rates are actuarially sound. The Plan shall also address how financial solvency of the MCPNs will be assessed upon selection and during their contract.

g. The process for MCPN oversight and monitoring. This shall include the implementation of sanctions, including corrective action plans, termination of MCPN enrollment, financial sanctions and contract termination, when the MCPN or its provider network no longer meets the applicant’s requirement or standards.

h. Standards for MCPN reporting of data and a uniform set of performance measures and quality improvement protocols. These shall support all of the reporting that are consistent with the requirements for the PIHPs reporting to the MDCH.
i. A description of how substance abuse (SA) services will be delivered to people in the service area. Specifically the Plan shall include language about the SA services that will be delivered by the MCPNs that focus on the behavioral health population, and those that may be delivered by other organizations within the CMHSP and the PIHP.

j. Non-Compete terms that do not restrict the rights of MCPNs to contract with any qualified provider for their specialty networks if they meet the standards and criteria established by the applicant. Similarly, the Plan and MCPN contract terms shall ensure that no provisions of an MCPN’s contracts shall restrict otherwise qualified providers from participating in more than one MCPN. However, providers may not have an ownership interest or governance relationship in more than one MCPN in which they also provide services.

k. Assurance that all provisions of the MDCH’s Application for Participation for procurement of Medicaid Specialty Prepaid Inpatient Health Plans (PIHP) are either retained as the responsibility of the PIHP or explicitly delegated by contractual terms to the MCPNs. Assurance that each of the re-procured MCPNs will be fully operational not later than January 1, 2015.

l. The competitive procurement methodology which assures best value. The Plan shall outline a proposed process for a re-procurement of the existing MCPNs. The actual re-procurement shall be subject to MDCH approval and will be implemented in the first year of this AFP. The re-procurement shall include policies and procurement criteria that ensure an adequate provider network, stakeholder and community input, and adherence to public policies and service standards that are unique to the needs of each target population.

1.14.2 □ Until the Plan is implemented, the Wayne County Authority applicant will have executed contracts with the existing MCPNs so that they are fully operational on January 1, 2014.
2. **Administrative Functions**

Descriptions and activities of the managed care administrative functions may be found in the document “Establishing Administrative Costs within and across the CMHSP System, December 2011” located at this site: www.michigan.gov/documents/mdch/Establishing_Admin_Costs_12-11_374192_7.pdf

Instructions: check the box provided to attest to the fact. Enter narrative in text boxes where instructed. Attach documents with labels as instructed at the end of the application.

2.1 General Management Functions

The four chief officers below shall be 100% dedicated to the general management functions of the applicant PIHP only. In other words, they may not have a concurrent role at a CMHSP. It is understood that a chief officer might have dual roles within the PIHP, such as managing the finance function AND the information systems function; or may be responsible for the operations function AND provider network management. Likewise the applicant may choose not to have a Chief Operating Officer.

MDCH prefers that the chief officers are direct employees of the applicant PIHP. However, MDCH will not prohibit arrangements that lease the officer from another entity, or that contract with a staffing agency. In such cases, MDCH requires assurances that the officer is accountable solely to the applicant PIHP for purposes of fulfilling PIHP executive functions, and that there are protections against conflict of interest when decisions are made by the officer that impact the entity from which he/she is leased or contracted. The Regional Entity/UCA accepts full responsibility for managing conflicts and compliance with all laws and regulations including but not limited to those of the Internal Revenue Service. The Regional Entity/UCA accepts full responsibility for any and all liabilities resulting from a PIHP executive whose employer of record is a member CMH in the region.

In the boxes below the applicant shall attest that each chief officer is 100% dedicated to the applicant PIHP; that the CEO will be hired, supervised, and terminated, as necessary, by the PIHP governing board; and other chief officers will be hired, supervised, and terminated, as necessary, by the CEO.

2.1.1. Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

2.1.1.1 ☑ The chief executive officer is 100% dedicated to the applicant PIHP functions

2.1.1.2 ☐ The chief executive officer is known and his/her name is: and is:

1. ☐ Employed (or will be employed) by the applicant PIHP

OR

2. ☐ Leased or contracted from: and in Attachment 2.1.1.2.2 are the policies and procedures to be used by the PIHP governing body to assure that there are no conflicts of interest between the PIHP CEO and the entity from
2013 Application for Participation

whom he/she is leased or contracted. The PIHP governing board will annually certify to MDCH that it monitors the CEO and assures there are no conflicts of interest in decision-making and that it understands it maintains full responsibility for compliance with all laws and regulations including IRS and any consequences or liabilities resulting from the leased or contracted arrangement.

2.1.3 The chief executive officer is unknown at the time of this application, but his/her name, employer of record, and conflict of interest policies and procedures, if applicable, will be submitted to MDCH no later than 5 p.m. on July 1, 2013.

2.1.2 Chief Operating Officer (COO)

2.1.2.1 ☑ There will be no chief operating officer (if box is checked, applicant may skip to #2.1.3).

2.1.2.2 ☐ The chief operating officer is 100% dedicated to the applicant PIHP functions.

2.1.2.3 ☐ The chief operating officer is: % FTE; if less than 100%, identify the other functions that the chief operating officer will perform:

2.1.2.4 ☑ The chief operating officer is known and his/her name is: and is:

1. ☐ Employed (or will be employed) by the applicant PIHP

OR

2. ☐ Leased or contracted from: and in Attachment 2.1.2.4.2 are the policies and procedures to be used by the PIHP governing body to assure that there are no conflicts of interest between the PIHP COO and the entity from whom he/she is leased or contracted.

2.1.2.5 ☐ The chief operating officer is unknown at the time of this application, but his/her name, employer of record, and conflict of interest policies and procedures, if applicable, will be submitted to MDCH no later than 5 p.m. on July 1, 2013.

2.1.3 Chief Financial Officer (CFO)

2.1.3.1 ☑ The chief financial officer is 100% dedicated to the applicant PIHP functions.

2.1.3.2 ☐ The chief financial officer is: % FTE; if less than 100% identify the other functions that the chief financial officer will perform:

2.1.3.3 ☐ The chief financial officer is known and his/her name is: and is:

1. ☐ Employed (or will be employed) by the applicant PIHP

OR

2. ☐ Leased or contracted from: and in Attachment 2.1.3.3.2 are the policies and procedures to be used by the PIHP governing body to assure that there are no conflicts of interest between the PIHP CFO and the entity from whom he/she is leased or contracted.

2.1.3.4 ☑ The chief financial officer is unknown at the time of this application, but his/her name, employer of record, and conflict of interest policies and
procedures, if applicable, will be submitted to MDCH no later than 5 p.m. on July 1, 2013.

2.1.4. **Chief Information Officer (CIO)**

2.1.4.1 ☑️ The chief information officer is 100% dedicated to the applicant PIHP functions.

2.1.4.2 ☐ The chief information officer is: % FTE; if less than 100% identify the other functions that the chief information officer will perform.

2.1.4.3 ☐ The chief information officer is known and his/her name is: and is:

1. ☐ Employed (or will be employed) by the applicant PIHP

OR

2. ☐ Leased or contracted from: and in Attachment 2.1.4.3.2 are the policies and procedures to be used by the PIHP governing body to assure that there are no conflicts of interest between the PIHP CIO and the entity from whom he/she is leased or contracted

2.1.4.4 ☑️ The chief information officer is unknown at the time of this application, but his/her name, employer of record, and conflict of interest policies and procedures, if applicable, will be submitted to MDCH no later than 5 p.m. on July 1, 2013.

2.1.5. **Other Executive Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Management of PIHP</th>
<th>% FTE Dedicated to the PIHP Function</th>
<th>Names (if known)* or “Unknown”</th>
<th>Employer of Record (If not PIHP, indicate whether leased or contracted by PIHP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical Director</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Use Disorder Prevention &amp; Treatment Director</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Director</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance Officer/Program Integrity</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*☒ The name(s) is “unknown,” it will be submitted to MDCH along with the Employer of Record no later than 5 p.m. on July 1, 2013.

2.1.5.1 ☑️ In Attachment 2.1.5.1 is an organizational chart that depicts the lines of supervision of each position from the PIHP Board and/or CEO.

2.1.5.2 ☑️ The applicant attests that it will adopt one set of common General Management function policies and procedures that will be used throughout the region (among member CMHSPs, MCPNs, or Core Providers).
2.1.5.3 ☑️ The applicant attests that the General management policies and procedures used throughout the region will include Program Integrity and Compliance components outlined in 42 CFR 438.602 and 42 CFR 438.608.

2.1.5.4 ☑️ If a common policy or procedure is based on one or more from any existing (FY’13) PIHP, the Attachment 2.1.5.4 lists the General Management policies and procedures and the PIHP(s) from which they were adopted.

OR

2.1.5.5 ☑️ The common policies and procedures are in development at the time of application, and the Attachment 2.1.5.4 will be submitted to MDCH no later than 5 p.m. on July 1, 2013.
2.2 Financial Management Functions
Financial management functions typically include: 1) budgeting – general accounting and financial reporting, 2) revenue analyses, 3) expense monitoring and management, 4) service unit and recipient-centered, 5) cost analyses and rate-setting, 6) risk analyses, risk modeling and underwriting, 7) insurance, re-insurance and management of risk pools, 8) supervision of audit and financial consulting relationships, 9) claims adjudication and payment, and 10) audits. The responses below should take into account those functions, and any other the applicant has identified.

2.2.1 In Attachment 2.2.1 is an organizational chart that depicts the lines of supervision from executive staff and oversight of each of the ten Financial Management Functions above and any others the PIHP will be adding.

2.2.2 The applicant attests that it will adopt one set of common Financial Management function policies and procedures that will be used throughout the region (among member CMHSPs, MCPNs, or Core Providers).

2.2.3 If a common policy or procedure is based on one or more from any existing (FY’13) PIHP, the Attachment 2.2.3, lists the Financial Management policies and procedures and the PIHP(s) from which they were adopted.

OR

2.2.4 The common policies and procedures are in development at the time of application, and the Attachment 2.2.4 will be submitted to MDCH no later than 5 p.m. on July 1, 2013.
2.3 Information Systems Management

Overview

The PIHP must have an information management system that supports the core administrative activities of the region including:

a. The ability to accept on behalf of entire region of CMHSPs/CAs, enrollment and revenue files, in HIPAA compliant formats, from the State of Michigan.

b. The ability to accept clinical, financial, utilization, demographic, quality and authorization information from CMHSP/CA sources (including providers) in standard electronic formats (i.e., HIPAA Administrative Simplification X12N). Note if the CMHSP/CA/provider source is capable of sending in standard electronic formats, the PIHP must receive via standard electronic means versus requiring direct entry or non-standard format.

c. The ability to accept clinical, financial, utilization, demographic, quality and authorization information through clearinghouses and other viable, secure and efficient means when requested by CMHSP/CA sources and providers.

d. The ability to analyze, integrate and report clinical, financial, utilization, demographic, quality and authorization information.

e. The ability to submit QI and encounter data in compliant formats as specified by MDCH. Data must pass all required data quality edits prior to being accepted into CHAMPS before it is sent to the warehouse.

f. The ability to identify, analyze and report costs and revenues for service components, including, but not limited to, analysis and reporting by regions and CMHSP/CA sources and providers.

g. The ability to detect and correct errors in data receipt, transmissions and analyses. This includes screening for completeness, logic, and consistency; and identifying and tracking fraud and abuse.

h. The ability (within limits of law) to safely and securely send and receive data to and from other systems. This includes, but is not limited to, the State of Michigan, health plans and providers systems including physical health and non-healthcare support systems of care. (Note: If the PIHP region is selected to participate in Medicaid Health Homes and/or Integrated Care For Dual Eligibles demonstrations, the PIHP must be able to interface with health plans and provider systems).

For new entities representing multiple CMHSPs in a state-defined region:

a. The Information Technology Policies, Procedures and systems from one of the existing hub-PIHP/CMHSPs may be utilized as the foundation of the system for the new entity. (Note: this will allow former hub-PIHP/CMHSP performance as verified by MDCH and external quality review organization to be considered in review of application submission).

b. The PIHP must have the ability to directly transmit and receive data from and to all individual CMHSP/CA sources without the additional step of going through
former hub-PIHP/CMHSP systems for sub-groups of CMHSPs in that same region. If more time is required for smooth transition to a single PIHP IT system supporting all CMHSPs/CAs in the region, then the applicant will list target date for completion. Award and contract with the PIHP entity will include successful transition by target date as a condition of the award and continuing contract past target date.

Response Criteria

Note: For PIHPs representing regions containing more than one CMHSP for each separate response below list the specific name of the former hub PIHP/CMHSP whose policies, procedures, processes and technologies are being adopted as the foundation for the new entity to be deployed region wide. This will allow past performance (as determined by MDCH monitoring and/or third party reviewer) of a hub CMHSP as PIHP to be considered in review of application submission. This is expected to significantly decrease the length of response needed in this application submission and decrease additional information that may be requested by MDCH during review of submission.

2.3.1 In Attachment 2.3.1. is an organizational chart that depicts the lines of supervision from executive staff and oversight for each Information Systems function.

2.3.2 The applicant attests that it will adopt one set of common Information Systems Management function policies and procedures that will be used throughout the region (among member CMHSPs, MCPNs, or Core Providers).

2.3.3 If a common policy or procedure is based on one or more from any existing (FY’13) PIHP, the Attachment 2.3.3., lists the Information Systems Management policies and procedures and the PIHP(s) from which they were adopted. OR

The common policies and procedures are in development at the time of application, and the Attachment 2.3.3. will be submitted to MDCH no later than 5 p.m. on July 1, 2013.

2.3.4 In the text box below is a two-page description, of the applicant’s process detailing how behavioral health and I/DD data (clinical, encounter, claims, demographics, quality, outcomes) aggregated from all CMHSP/CA sources and providers will be:

a. Tested for accuracy and completeness prior to submission to MDCH. Also, describe the process of that submission.

b. Submitted in a timely fashion to MDCH.


2.3.4 Basic demographics including MDCH QI elements will be initially collected by Access. Updates, including QI and TEDs data, will be sent electronically by CMHSPs and contracted providers per contract, when they have the ability to do so, and within the standards and regulations available. Some providers do not have the ability to send electronically, so they will be given access to directly enter the data. Note that direct data
entry will not be required. Data will be subject to edits for completeness, accuracy, and validity. Current PIHP processes for accuracy and completeness of QI and TEDs data, which have been reviewed and approved through the External Quality Review Process, will be duplicated within the new regional PIHP.

Encounters will be electronically transmitted from the CMHSPs to the PIHP and processed through various data checks, including maximum units per procedure code and validity standards such as duplicate service checks and required authorizations. 837 claims will be electronically transmitted by contracted providers and CMHSPs, dependent on funding model utilized. Direct data entry of claims will be allowed for providers without the means to transmit electronic files. A small number of paper claims may be accepted and data entered. All encounters and claims will be subject to the same adjudication and edit rules. Current PIHP processes for accuracy and completeness for encounters and claims, which have been reviewed and approved through the External Quality Review Process, will be duplicated within the new regional PIHP.

Performance Indicators, Critical Risk Events, will be submitted to the PIHP by CMHSPs and contracted providers. Information will be validated through comparison to demographics, encounters/claims, QI and TEDS data. Summary and detail information will be required per contract requirements with specific deadlines.

A schedule of submission dates will be developed and followed for CMHSP submission to the PIHP, and PIHP submission of QI, TEDS, Encounter and other data and reports to MDCH. Data will be submitted on an ongoing basis throughout each month. Data Certification meetings to review the data will include both CMHSP and PIHP staff, and will be held just prior to submission to MDCH. Contract requirements with CMHSP and providers will detail deadlines for demographic, QI, TEDS, encounter/claim and PI submission to the PIHP. Timeliness of submission by CMHSPs and individual providers will be monitored by PIHP, as will the PIHPs own timeliness of submission to MDCH. Results of accuracy, completeness and timeliness of data submission will be reviewed through the QAPIP process. Relevant goals will be tracked and reported on an ongoing basis.

2.3.5 More time is needed for transition, the date by which full transition from former PIHPs to new PIHP will be completed is: 12/31/13. In the one-page text box below are the action steps and milestone dates toward achieving a consistent region-wide process:

2.3.5. Action steps and dates to develop work flow and PIHP Software:
2/19/13 – 4/1/2013: Initial meetings of core regional IT/Finance group
• Determined will use common software vendor PCE
• Will meet regularly, including with other stakeholders, to continue to
design processes, flow and software
2/20/13: Initial meeting with software vendor
• Began outlining PIHP functions that will need to be included with
software functions
4/1/13-9/30/13: Meetings with software vendor re: specific development of
PIHP software functions
10/1/13 -12/1/13: Testing functionality of data transfers/uploads
10/1/13 -12/1/13: Subject matter expert testing
11/1/13 -12/1/13: Provider testing of QI/encounter/837 uploads to PIHP
12/1/13 - 12/31/13: Finalizing software, including data conversion from
current PIHP systems
1/1/14 - 9/30/14: Continue to work with software vendor to enhance new
PIHP software and finalize reporting for Genesee PIHP/Thumb Alliance PIHP
through 12/31/13
The complete plan for PIHP transition is included in Attachment 1.3, including
the transition for software.

2.3.6 In the text box below is a one-page description of the protection and security
features of the PIHP's information management system to ensure confidentiality,
data integrity and protection from intrusion. It includes:
a. The risk mitigation and management procedures for a loss of confidential data or
security breach to include notification of affected consumers.
b. Confirmation that this will be a consistent region-wide process by January 1,
2014. If more time is needed for transition, list date by which full transition
from former PIHPs to new PIHP will be completed: (date)

Region 10 will contract with PCE Systems, the current EMR software
vendor for Genesee and Thumb Alliance, to develop a PIHP Information
System. This new system will also be a fully-hosted solution accessed using a
secure, encrypted, and integrity protected a dedicated circuit direct to PCE,
and an optional Secure Socket Layer internet connection. Confidential patient
information will be maintained in this hosted environment and not stored on
individual local workstations/computers.
PCE systems are compliant with all applicable security standards including
HIPAA. In addition to the assignment of unique user names, passwords and
implementation of related policies, automatic log-offs, and other standard
features, users will also be assigned roles and groups enforcing separation of
duties, appropriate function access limitations, and consumer privacy
requirements. PCE's security procedures as well as system development and
maintenance methodologies and technology infrastructure are subject to an annual SAS-70 Type II audit.

PCE’s system also includes the following services, functions, and processes: System Security Control, Record Audit, Security Audit, Automated Data Integrity Review and Audit, Redundant Hardware, Infrastructure, and Communications Architecture, Secured Network Design including Firewall and Intrusion Monitoring, Multi-Layered Host Data Center Physical Security and Access Control, Daily, encrypted backups with off-site storage, Disaster Recovery Services (including real-time Hot Site data replication).

PCE includes a breach notification process through which potential breaches are first reviewed and investigated for validity, then Region 10 will be notified in compliance with its Business Associate Agreement. If determined necessary per the HIPAA Breach Notification Rule, affected consumers will be notified. Finally, PCE and Region 10 will investigate to determine the root cause of the breach, and what, if any, steps can be taken to prevent future breaches.

Region 10 will also utilize a SQL data repository and data reporting system currently housed at Genesee PIHP. Network hardware will be physically located in a locked and monitored room with climate-controlled environment, battery backup, and a generator, with limited access secured by both network and software. Industry standard controls, including firewalls, secure connections and password authentication, intrusion detection/prevention systems, anti-virus protection, and Microsoft workstation security will be used to prevent unauthorized access.

Region 10 plans for the security described above to be system wide by January 1, 2014. Each CMHSP plans to continue to using the PCE secure environment, the PIHP system we develop will also use this environment, and the security applied to the data warehouse and reporting system housed at Genesee will be applied to all.

2.3.7 In Attachment 2.3.7. is a process/information flow diagram(s) and in the text box below is a one-page narrative explaining the following:

d. How individual information will be aggregated, stored and compiled by the PIHP from CMHSP/CA and provider network sources.

e. How data completeness, validation, timeliness and accuracy will be confirmed and coordinated with CMHSPs/CAs to ensure accurate and timely submission to MDCH (QI, encounter).

f. How eligibility/enrollment information will be received from the State and then parsed by the PIHP for use by the CMHSP(s)/CAs in the region.
2.3.7 Region 10 will work with PCE (the current EMR vendor for all Region 10 CMHSPs) to develop an information system with the ability to accept and process enrollment and revenue files, encounter and 837, QI, TEDS and other information in HIPAA / EDI and other standardized formats. Eligibility data will be received from MDCH will be received from MDCH via MPHI and PCE (as is currently done in the existing systems), and parsed for each sub-entity in the PCE PIHP system. All data will be transferred using industry-standard, HIPAA-compliant secure transport mechanisms including Secure FTP, Secure Web Services, and use of the Direct Messaging protocol.

Data validation will include PIHP system edits, and file and data submission edits (both to the PIHP and from the PIHP to MDCH), CMHSP and provider contract requirements. The PIHP will monitor the timeliness of CMHSP and provider submissions, and maintain a schedule of PIHP submissions to MDCH. Additionally, Region 10 will utilize a SQL centralized database and data reporting system currently housed at Genesee PIHP, which will be populated from the PIHP information system, and as determined necessary by the collective group, from the CMHSP systems, as well as other systems we will exchange data with. This database and reporting system has the capacity to securely store and manage the anticipated large amount of data. (System specifications are available if needed.) The PIHP will import and normalize data coming from its sub-entities (such as CMHSPs, CA and contracted providers) into the centralized database system using industry standard and peer reviewed methods. This system will then process and aggregate the data for analysis and reporting for administrative and departmental needs, to the PIHP, CMHSPs, contracted providers and other partners as needed.

For data that may not have clearly defined, industry-accepted data exchange formats with sufficient specification to allow the information to be reliably exchanged by information systems, Region 10 may condition its acceptance of such electronic data on exchange partners’ compliance with a published, standard implementation guide. Such an implementation guide will use industry standards (such as IHE, HL7, C-CDA, etc.) as much as possible under the circumstances, with the implementation guide filling in gaps and clarifying where necessary.

Region 10 anticipates that the efforts of the CIO Forum and TSG will help to guide this process, and may ultimately eliminate the need for such implementation guides. When standards and guidance are issued by these
groups, Region 10 will work with its technology vendor to implement updates into Region 10's systems and processes to ensure compliance. Region 10 will also seek to develop exchange relationships with relevant entities such as the State of Michigan, health plans, provider systems, and non-healthcare support systems, and Region 10 will seek to ensure that its technology is not the source of any impediment. The authorization and utilization process will be standardized, with common policies in effect.

FUNCTIONS SUPPORTING INTEGRATED CARE (Physical, Behavioral/ID/DD Supports and Services):

2.3.8 In the text box below is a one-page description of the steps that will be taken to exchange behavioral healthcare data with local/community partners, Sub-state HIEs (health information exchange), and/or MiHIN/NwHIN (Michigan Health Information Network/Nationwide Health Information Network) that includes:

a. Whether the PIHP will maintain a role in the exchange of HL7 CCD formats on behalf of CMHSPs in the region. If so, there is a description of the process to be used and how consent management will be engaged.

b. How the PIHP will use state and national standards for the transfer and interface of behavioral healthcare data (MI/DD/SUD clinical, encounter, claims, demographics, outcomes) between disparate systems (e.g., Care Bridge, Sub-state HIEs/MiHIN/NwHIN, health plans, providers, etc.).

2.3.8 Region 10 seeks to engage existing and currently-developing Health Information Exchange (HIE) technology and infrastructure to facilitate the meaningful and effective movement of clinical data across the community. The current technology vendor of all Region 10 CMHSPs, PCE, is strongly engaged in this area within Michigan, with a focus on the additional necessary controls to comply with the legal and regulatory privacy requirements that attach to behavioral health and substance use treatment information. PCE has been approved as the first Virtual Qualified Organization for Behavioral Health Information Exchange with the statewide MiHIN backbone, and has been working with various Sub-State HIEs to enable integrated health data exchange. PCE is currently engaged in pilots with MiHIN to begin the two-way exchange of health data across the behavioral health and physical health communities, and has been collaborating with another major Michigan behavioral health software vendor to create frameworks in which their disparate software platforms can communicate.

Part of this cross-community exchange is the implementation of a robust consent-driven data sharing model. PCE has implemented such a consent-driven model, incorporating input from various stakeholders including attorneys, recipient rights advocates, clinicians, technologists, as well as other organizations such as SAMHSA and the National Council for Behavioral Health. PCE was recently asked to
participate in a CIO Forum workgroup to develop HIE standards, including a CCD format, for Michigan behavioral health.

Clinical data that are available in the system can be aggregated into a CCD format using the Consolidated CDA. In addition, Region 10’s systems will accept a CCD from exchange partners. Region 10 anticipates that, depending on the particular use case, a CCD may be received only for “view” or may be received for consumption (which may require additional specification and limitation on data formats). Consent management for this process will be either on a manual, transactional level (manual sending and receiving of CCDs using a point-to-point protocol such as Direct) or on an automated, ongoing basis (using an automated consent management system such as the one offered by PCE).

Region 10 PIHP, CMHSPs and PCE intend to use industry standards (such as EDI/HIPAA, HL7, CCD/C-CDA, IHE Profiles, etc.) wherever applicable, available, and feasible. Where industry standards are not available, or are insufficient to ensure reliable data processing, Region 10 may need to condition participation in data exchange upon the use of a standard implementation guide, which will clarify and make more detailed specifications to ensure proper data processing. When available, Region 10 will seek guidance from—and apply the adopted standards of—the CIO Forum and TSG.

Current HIE efforts by Region 10 CMHSPs include exchanging lab data with Quest and with Hurley Medical Center, exchanging data with Michigan Health Connect and Trinity Health Systems, clinical data transfers between contracted providers using the PCE HIE solution, and exchanging demographic and primary care physician data with Medicaid Health Plans (MHPs).

2.3.9 In the text box below is a half-page description of the PIHP’s capability and/or plan to conduct population-level data analytics from multiple healthcare sources (both primary and behavioral). This includes dashboard indicators and other data mining capabilities that facilitate population management (historical and predictive capacity for assessing cost/risk), utilization management, and care coordination activities.

2.3.9 Region 10 will develop a PIHP data warehouse, which will then be shared collaboratively between the PIHP, CMHSPs and contracted providers. This SQL database will include data from the PIHP as well as data from the CMHSPs, contracted providers and MDCH (eligibility, encounters and 837s, QI, TEDS, etc.). The MDCH data will include that provided by MDCH claims data warehouse as recommended by the MDCH Data Analytics Work Group and pilot. MDCH has indicated that access to aggregate data and standard metrics will be available after the June evaluation of the pilot.

We will build on the current knowledge base and reporting capability of The Thumb Alliance and Genesee PIHPs to develop a robust data analytics system, including a dashboard of common indicators. Genesee is currently partnering with The University of Michigan and MDCH to develop a Patient Registry pilot with the intent to share critical health indicators between
various health care providers with disparate systems. We will incorporate the results of this pilot into our PIHP level system.

We expect that these efforts will result in health care providers having a broader understanding of the health conditions of our populations at both an aggregate and consumer levels, and this increased knowledge will facilitate better care coordination at all levels.

2.3.10. In the text box below is a half-page description of the planned actions for engaging standards (statewide/national) that improve care coordination, reduce error, eliminate duplicative data entry efforts, and behavioral healthcare data access to the consumer (promoting meaningful use).

2.3.10 The PCE software solution currently used by Region 10 is certified under the applicable “Meaningful Use” regulations. Region 10’s technology vendor will be seeking re-certification under Meaningful Use’s 2014 Certification Criteria in calendar year 2013. Where applicable, Region 10 will encourage the adoption of Certified EHR Technology by its constituent CMHSPs and network providers.

In addition, as it relates to the application of national and statewide standards in the exchange of healthcare information, Region 10 will seek to adopt and implement standards that are currently available as well as partner with its technology vendor to continue to evolve as additional standards are issued and adopted across the state and the nation.

Region 10 will use the implementation of these standards, particularly as they relate to HIE, to improve care coordination, reduce error, and reduce or eliminate unnecessary duplicate data entry. This will include both enabling data exchange between the PIHP, CMHSPs and providers, and also sharing health data between various health care providers – as standards and laws allow.

PCE software includes a patient portal module, which St. Clair CMH is currently piloting. The PIHP will encourage all the regional CMHSPs and providers to adopt a similar patient portal, as required under Meaningful Use.

2.3.11. In the table below, name the CMHSPs and core providers who are utilizing EHRs. The name of the EHR software in use at each and whether purchased or developed in-house, and whether nationally certified should also be entered in the third column.

*Note: It is not required to have a certified EHR at the PIHP level, but if one is available to the CMHSPs for use, owned by the PIHP, please make note. It is also understood that EHR certification standards are still evolving for purposes of behavioral health.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CMHSP, MCPN, Core Provider Utilizing EHRs</th>
<th>EHR Software Used</th>
<th>Purchased or Developed In-House, and note if Certified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesee CMHSP</td>
<td>PCE Systems - PCE Care Management 7.1/CHIP</td>
<td>Purchased - ONC 2011 Edition Certified EHR Technology for Eligible Providers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2013 Application for Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>EHR Technology</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lapeer CMHSP</td>
<td>PCE Systems - PCE Care Management 7.1/OASIS</td>
<td>Purchased - ONC 2011 Edition Certified EHR Technology for Eligible Providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanilac CMHSP</td>
<td>PCE Systems - PCE Care Management 7.1/OASIS</td>
<td>Purchased - ONC 2011 Edition Certified EHR Technology for Eligible Providers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2013 Application for Participation

2.4 Provider Network Management

Provider Network Management typically includes the functions of 1) network development and procurement (and re-procurement), 2) provider contract management (including oversight), 3) network policy development, 4) credentialing, privileging and primary source verification of professional staff, and 5) background checks and qualifications of non-credentials staff. The “provider network” of the PIHP includes as applicable, the member CMHSPs, MCPNs, Core Providers, or any other provider with which the PIHP has a direct contract to deliver a covered service. It is the responsibility of the PIHP to perform the functions above, and to assure that its provider network performs these functions in the management of any providers it procures.

In the text boxes below, provide a half-page description of how the PIHP will oversee the five functions listed above:

2.4.1 Network development and procurement.

Region 10 PIHP will perform a formal gap analysis, including an examination of information from past gap analysis performed by Genesee PIHP and Thumb Alliance PIHP. Additionally, any needs assessments or gap analysis performed at the CMH local level will also be considered. The analysis will provide insight into the sufficiency of the current provider network with focus upon access, choice of providers, and availability of the services covered by the benefit plan. Identification of potential gaps will occur through this process.

Procurement for services within the region will be led by Region 10 Provider Network. Collaboration from each CMH will be included throughout any RFP process.

Examination of the gap analysis results, need for network development, and procurement will occur through the QAPIP process. Input from the CMHs will be gathered through this process.

2.4.2 Provider contract management and oversight.

The Region 10 will develop standard contract language that will be utilized throughout the region. Additionally, the structure of rates per service code will be analyzed with the intention of identifying an acceptable range of payment rates for all providers.

The Region 10 will monitor providers who contract for service provision. Performance monitoring will occur at least once per year, per policy, with additional monitoring as necessary. Monitoring review tools will be standardized throughout the region. Delegation of provider monitoring may be granted to CMHs for any sub-contracts that they hold. All processes of monitoring will be reviewed by Region 10 CEO or designee. Results of reviews will also be compiled by the PIHP and shared through the QAPIP structure. Any provider found in non-compliance through the monitoring process, or
through other means, may be required to follow corrective action steps as determined by the PIHP or CMH.

2.4.3. Network policy development.

   The Region 10 PIHP will maintain common policies for the entire network. A policy addressing the function of developing and reviewing of policies will be in place. Policies will cover all areas of the PIHP including, but not limited to, Administrative, Access to Services, Compliance, Governance, Service Delivery, Recipient Rights, Human Resources, Fiscal Management, Information Management, Utilization Management, and Quality Management. Policies and procedures will be reviewed on an annual basis and updated as necessary.

   Providers who contract directly with the PIHP as well as any providers who enter into sub-contract arrangements are required to comply with Region 10 policies, as indicated.

2.4.4. Credentialing, privileging and primary source verification of professional staff.

   The Region 10 PIHP will utilize common policies related to credentialing, privileging and primary source verification of professional staff. Procedures include details of the required background and exclusion checks. The privileging and credentialing of professional staff will be delegated to the CMH or respective SUD provider for completion. A Region 10 CEO or designee will provide oversight to the policy and procedures in this subject area. Additionally, the Region 10 CEO or designee will complete the privileging of organizational providers. Oversight of this function will occur during the monitoring process of network providers.

2.4.5. Background checks and qualifications of non-credentialed staff.

   The Region 10 PIHP will utilize common policies related to the background checks and qualifications of non-credentialed staff. Background checks must be completed prior to the hiring of the staff.

2.4.6. In Attachment 2.4.6. is an organizational chart that depicts the lines of supervision from executive staff and oversight for each function.

2.4.7. The applicant attests that it will adopt one set of common Provider Network Management function policies and procedures that will be used throughout the region (among member CMHSPs, MCPNs, or Core Providers).

2.4.8. If a common policy or procedure is based on one or more from any existing (FY'13) PIHP, the Attachment 2.4.8., lists the Provider Network Management policies and procedures and the PIHP(s) from which they were adopted.

OR

2.4.9. The common policies and procedures are in development at the time of application, and the Attachment 2.4.9. will be submitted to MDCH no later than 5 p.m. on July 1, 2013.

2.4.10. In the text box below is a one-page description of how the applicant will assure that the capacity of the provider network is sufficient to make available all the specialty services and supports in the entire region. Include how capacity will be measured. Include how the applicant will assure that existing standards for
geographic access and timeliness of access to the services will be met within the region in accordance with 42 CFR 438.206.

2.4.10. The PIHP will monitor timeliness of assessment and service start date(s) as defined in the Michigan Mission Based Performance Indicator System (MMBPIS). The compliance expectation will be that individuals begin assessment within 14 days of first request, and ongoing services within 14 days of assessment. Claim and encounter data, as well as ancillary information from the clinical record, will be used to identify the relevant points in time and other data elements such as MMBPIS exceptions in a uniform manner across the network.

The process of integration should be assisted by the fact that both Genesee Health System and the Thumb Alliance use similar data systems; and by the clear definitions MMBPIS provides, which are implemented statewide. Both PIHP’s have historically strong performance in External Quality Review of Access standards and validation of performance measures, so we will have a base of effective processes to work from. The PIHP will review timeliness data monthly at the network, CMHSP, and provider level to ensure compliance is maintained. Standards not met by providers will be addressed immediately. We expect contractual language to be in place requiring providers to meet MMBPIS standards, and other standards as defined by the PIHP. Should timeliness performance drop network-wide or within one section of the network, related to increased need or decreased availability of resources, this would be evident quickly, and the PIHP could take action to address the need.

2.4.11. In the text box below is a one-page description of how the applicant will perform oversight of its provider network to assure the health and welfare of the region’s service recipients.

2.4.11. The PIHP oversight of an individual’s general health and well being is interwoven throughout our processes. Provider contracts will reference the required clinical protocols, any policy manual, and the Medicaid Provider manual. Audits will assess the individual’s acuity and assign/approve supports/services to meet the identified need. The Region 10 oversight will assure the appropriate number of staff/providers to deliver services to those in our care. Audits will be conducted to determine a provider’s compliance with applicable standards, rules, and regulations. Providers that miss benchmarks will have a corrective action plan (CAP) which will be monitored by the PIHP. Enhanced monitoring is assigned to providers that need extra assistance.

There will be required trainings for staff at various levels. Trainings are developed based on federal, state, and other governing body directives and offered live, by DVD, and on-line to ensure compliance and meet the needs of the network. Meetings will be conducted where information is shared from the PIHP/CMH to its network of care providers. PIHP and CMH staff will address actual risk through Root
Cause Analysis (RCA) for critical incidents and sentinel events. PIHP staff investigates cases, determines follow-up, directs care, develops clinical practice guidelines, and ensures proper monitoring. Training, discipline specific mentoring, case level mentoring, or process specific mentoring occurs as needed. Aggregate data and outcomes from trend analyses are reported to various PIHP/CMHs Committees.
2.5  **Utilization Management**
Utilization management typically includes the following functions: 1) access and eligibility determination, 2) utilization management protocols, 3) service authorization, and 4) utilization review. The functions may be fully or partially-delegated to the PIHP’s provider network.

2.5.1. ✖ In Attachment 2.5.1. is an organizational chart that depicts the lines of supervision from executive staff and oversight for each function.

2.5.2. □ The function will not be delegated.

OR

2.5.3. ✖ The function will be fully or partially delegated. In the text box below is a one-page description of each function that will be delegated and to what entity it will be delegated; and how the governing structure and CEO will provide monitoring and oversight of the delegated functions.

**2.5.3 The PIHP will retain responsibility for centralized development, adoption, modification and dissemination of Practice Guidelines/Clinical Protocols, Medical Necessity Criteria, Policy and other standards used by the local CMHSP/CA’s related to Utilization Management functions.**

CMHSP delegations will occur as follows:

1) Access and eligibility determination will be delegated to each CMHSP, including grievance and appeals, and second opinion management, coordination and notifications.
2) Utilization Management protocols will be defined and standardized by PIHP policy which will be implemented at the CMHSP level. Communication with consumers regarding UM decisions, including adequate and advance notice, right to second opinion and grievance and appeals will be delegated to the CMHSP.
3) Initial and ongoing service authorizations for all community and inpatient/partial hospitalization services will be delegated to the CMHSP.
4) Utilization reviews (including concurrent, retrospective, and prospective) will be delegated to the CMHSP.

The PIHP will monitor CMHSP adherence to all Utilization Management related policies through a combination of oversight activities to include but not limited to performance and compliance monitoring, QAPIP Committee report reviews, and direct PIHP performance reviews. As depicted in the organizational chart 2.5.1., adherance to Utilization Management functions will be overseen by the PIHP Board and CEO.

2.5.4. ✖ The applicant attests that it will adopt one set of common Utilization Management function policies and procedures that will be used throughout the region (among member CMHSPs, MCPNs, or Core Providers).
2.5.5. ☐ If a common policy or procedure is based on one or more from any existing (FY’13) PIHP, the Attachment 2.5.5., lists the Utilization Management policies and procedures and the PIHP(s) from which they were adopted.

OR

2.5.6. ☒ The common policies and procedures are in development at the time of application, and the Attachment 2.5.5. will be submitted to MDCH no later than 5 p.m. on July 1, 2013.
2.6  Customer Services

Customer services functions are typically: 1) information services that are compliant with 42 CFR 438.10, 2) maintenance and annual provision of the Customer Services Handbook that has been approved by MDCH, 3) facilitation of consumer empowerment and participation in PIHP planning and monitoring, 4) customer complaint, grievances and appeals, and 5) community benefit. While functions number one and two are the responsibility of the PIHP, the other three functions may be delegated in part or in full.

2.6.1.  In Attachment 2.6.1. is an organizational chart that depicts the lines of supervision from executive staff and oversight for each function.

2.6.2.  The functions will not be delegated.

OR

2.6.3.  The function will be fully or partially delegated. In the text box below is a one-page description of each function that will be delegated and to what entity it will be delegated; and how the governing structure and CEO will provide monitoring and oversight of the delegated functions.

2.6.3. Customer Services (CS) will operate under a centralized management model comprised of Direct-Operated functions and Delegated functions. The Customer Services functions as well as the Due Process functions will be monitored under the CEO and Board of Directors, as indicated in the Organizational / Function Chart, per attachment 2.6.1. CS functions delegated to each CMHSP shall be delineated in a Delegation Agreement contained in the sub-contract agreement between the PIHP the CMH / SUD provider organization. Delegations, based upon assessed capability and capacities, will be accomplished per three (3) Monitoring and Oversight mechanisms: 1) Pre-Evaluation (prior to any delegation of a Customer Services function, the PIHP shall conduct a pre-evaluation to assess the CMHSP’s capability to perform the delegated function), 2) Delegation Agreement (functions shall be specified in a Delegation Agreement located in the sub-contract agreement between the PIHP and the CMHSP), 3) Annual Evaluation (the PIHP shall conduct an annual evaluation of all delegated CS functions for administrative efficiency). CMHSP sub-delegations to provider organizations shall adhere to the same administrative mechanism. The annual evaluation process will be coordinated with the PIHP’s contract monitoring process. CS functions will be accountable to the PIHP CEO.

1 Information services: Non-delegated. Most information is located in the Customer Services Handbook.

2 Customer Services Handbook: Non-delegated (however, CMHSP / SUD add their own personalized information i.e. provider list, phone number, etc.).
The handbook has two parts, 1) PIHP information and 2) CMHSP / SUD specific information, as approved by the PIHP.

3 Consumer empowerment/ participation: Delegated to the CMHSP / SUD. The CSU conducts oversight per a consistent reporting mechanism in place for all provider network entities to report to the CSU on a quarterly basis. This section includes the Ombudsmen activities per the centralized management model.

4 Customer complaints/grievances: Complaints/grievances delegated to the CMHSP / SUD, with monthly monitoring by the CSU and monthly reporting by the network entities. The CSU performs random audits of grievances, to ensure required regulations are followed.

5 Community benefit: Delegated to the local CMHSP, with the oversight from the CSU per monitoring on a quarterly basis. Reporting to the PIHP includes community based activities, outreach activities, partnership arrangements, cross training with community service personal, participation in community planning bodies, system of care initiatives, i.e. any activity designed to promote wellness and healthy communities.

2.6.4. ☒ The applicant attests that the Customer Services Handbook that reflects the applicant region will be submitted to MDCH for approval no later than October 1, 2013, and that it will be ready for delivery to the beneficiaries no later than January 1, 2014.

OR

2.6.5. ☐ The applicant attests that the PIHP region is not changing in 2014 and that the current Customer Services Handbook is up-to-date and has been approved by MDCH.

2.6.6. ☒ The applicant attests that it will adopt one set of common Customer Services policies and procedures that will be used throughout the region (among member CMHSPs, MCPNs, or Core Providers).

2.6.7. ☐ If a common policy or procedure is based on one or more from any existing (FY’13) PIHP, the Attachment 2.6.7, lists the Customer Services policies and procedures and the PIHP(s) from which they were adopted.

OR

2.6.8. ☒ The common policies and procedures are in development at the time of application, and the Attachment XX will be submitted to MDCH no later than 5 p.m. on July 1, 2013.
2.7 **Quality Management**

Quality Management typically includes the following functions: 1) developing an annual Quality Assessment and Performance Improvement Program (QAPIP) plan and report, 2) standard-setting, 3) conducting performance assessments, 4) conducting on-site monitoring of providers in the provider network, 5) managing regulatory and corporate compliance, 6) managing outside entity review processes (e.g., external quality review, PIHP accreditation), 7) conducting research, 8) facility quality improvement process, 9) facility provider education and oversight, and 10) analyzing critical incidents and sentinel events. MDCH expects that the PIHP will not delegate these functions and understands that some of the functions will be performed in addition by the provider network (member CMHSPs, MCPNs, or core providers).

2.7.1. ☒ In Attachment 2.7.1. is an organizational chart that depicts the lines of supervision from executive staff and oversight for each function.

2.7.2. ☒ The functions will not be delegated.

OR

2.7.3. ☐ The function will be fully or partially delegated. In the text box below is a one-page description of any of the ten functions that will be delegated and to what entity it will be delegated; and how the governing structure and CEO will provide monitoring and oversight of the delegated functions.

2.7.4. ☒ The applicant attests that the QAPIP plan that reflects the applicant region will be submitted to MDCH no later than October 1, 2013, and that it will be ready for implementation by January 1, 2014.

OR

2.7.5. ☐ The applicant attests that the PIHP region is not changing in 2014 and that the current QAPIP plan is up-to-date and has been submitted to MDCH.

2.7.6. ☒ The applicant attests that it will adopt one set of common Quality Management policies and procedures that will be used throughout the region (among member CMHSPs, MCPNs, or Core Providers).

2.7.7. ☐ If a common policy or procedure is based on one or more from any existing (FY’13) PIHP, the Attachment 2.7.7., lists the Quality Management policies and procedures and the PIHP(s) from which they were adopted.

OR

2.7.8. ☒ The common policies and procedures are in development at the time of application, and the Attachment 2.7.7. will be submitted to MDCH no later than 5 p.m. on July 1, 2013.
ACCREDITATION STATUS
As evidenced by developments in federal and Michigan policy, the ability to perform managed care functions to industry standards while also assuring program integrity with federal and state funds is an expectation for the Regional Entity or Urban Cooperation Act PIHPs. MDCH will determine by October 1, 2013, the specific accreditation requirements including NCQA or URAC category options for PIHPs. It is recognized that accreditation is neither quick nor easy; nor inexpensive. Given these realities MDCH is carefully considering the best course of action and required timeframes for accreditation of PIHPs. It should be noted that the “health plan” categories of accreditation for both NCQA and URAC provide the closest match to federal and state requirements for managed care organizations including PIHPs.

3.1. ❌ In the text box below is a half-page description of the status of any URAC or NCQA accreditation of current (2013) PIHP(s) in the applicant’s region.

3.1 Neither Genesee PIHP or Thumb Alliance PIHP has pursued accreditation at this time.

3.2. ❌ In the text box below is a half-page description of the status of activity, viewpoints, options or plans in this applicant’s new region to obtain URAC or NCQA accreditation. Make note of specific categories or programs within NCQA or URAC being considered or evaluated. (examples of categories: URAC-Health Plan, URAC-Health Network, NCQA-MBHO, NCQA-Health Plan). Include target application date if known.

3.2 Accreditation will be considered after January 1, 2014 as well as after any future MDCH clarification. Various options will be examined including URAC or NCQA accreditation.
3. **EXTERNAL QUALITY REVIEW**

Beginning January 1, 2015, the external quality review organization (EQRO) will a) review the new PIHPs’ compliance with the Balance Budget Act (BBA) standards; b) validate the performance measures; and c) validate the new mandatory performance improvement project that will commence January 1, 2014. Until then, MDCH will rely on the performance, as measured by the EQRO, of existing PIHP(s) in each new region. Where there are weaknesses in an existing PIHP, MDCH expects that applicant to address how performance will be improved. Below is the applicant’s assessment of the performance of existing PIHP(s) in the applicant’s region.

4.1.1. ☑ All BBA standards in FY’11-12 were determined by Health Services Advisory Group (HSAG) to meet or exceed 95% compliance in any current (FY’13) PIHP in the new region.

**OR**

4.2. ☐ In the text box below is any BBA standard(s) for which, in FY’11-12, there was less than 95% compliance by one or more current PIHPs in the new region; AND a description of the plan with action steps, responsible staff, and timeframes for the applicant achieving a minimum of 95% compliance with every BBA standard by January 1, 2015.

4.2

4.3. ☐ All Performance Measures were designated “fully compliant” in FY’11-12 for all current PIHPs in the new region.

**OR**

4.4. ☑ In the text box below is any Performance Measure that, in FY’11-12, received an EQRO audit designation of less than “fully compliant” by one or more current PIHPs in the new region; AND a description of the plan with action steps, responsible staff, and timeframes for the applicant achieving a minimum of fully compliant on all performance measures by January 1, 2015.

4.4 **Genesee PIHP did not meet one performance measure related to access of Medicaid substance abuse (91.41%).** The SUD Treatment and Prevention Director will be responsible to ensure access performance measures will be met by January 1, 2015. Action steps include: Review past performance of SUD providers on this specific standard by 1/1/2014; Review of contract requirements with SUD providers by 1/1/2014; Request action plan from SUD providers who did not previously meet the standard (under 95% during FY 2013) by 2/1/2014; Monitor performance related to FY 2014. Goal will be monitored through the QAPIP structure throughout FY2014.

4.5. ☐ All current PIHPs in the new region scored 100% the Performance Improvement Project Validation for FY’11-12 on Evaluation Element Met and Critical Elements Met.

**OR**

4.6. ☑ In the text box below is any EQRO score of less than 100% on the Evaluation Elements *Met*, and any score of less than 100% on Critical Elements *Met* on the Performance Improvement Project validation for FY’11-12 by any current PIHP in
the new region; AND a description of the plan with action steps, responsible staff, and timeframes for the applicant achieving a minimum of 100% Met on both Evaluation Elements and Critical elements by January 1, 2015.

4.6 Genesee PIHP achieved 91% of the Evaluation Elements and 100% of the Critical Elements. Thumb Alliance PIHP achieved 73% of the Evaluation Elements and 90% of the Critical Elements. The Region 10 CEO will be responsible to ensure improvement with the Performance Improvement Project validation scores. Thumb Alliance staff previously held a technical assistance session with HSAG staff to review and resolve issues. For all past PIPs, all elements indicated as "Not Met" will be examined. A comparison of current PIP studies will be completed. In the future, staff will utilize HSAG through a consultation call prior to final submission of PIPs.
5. **PUBLIC POLICY INITIATIVES**

The public policy initiatives outlined below reflect MDCH’s need to certify to CMS that the PIHP assures the full array of specialty services and supports is available and that it maintains adequate provider network capacity to serve the region’s Medicaid beneficiaries (42 CFR 438.207). In addition, these public policies address the need to protect the vulnerable people served and at the same time to offer them opportunities to successfully live in the community, to work, and to develop and maintain meaningful relationships.

5.1 **Regional Crisis Response Capacity**

Crisis Response Capacity comprises three concepts: 1. Ongoing tracking and trending of critical incidents\(^1\) and sentinel events;\(^2\) 2) employing strategies to prevent critical incidents and sentinel events; and 3) having in place the capacity to regionally respond to behavioral or medical crises. The first concept is not new to Michigan’s public mental health system, and it is expected that the applicant is in compliance with the Quality Assessment and Performance Improvement Program (QAPIP) standards where those activities are required and are measured by the External Quality Review and the Medicaid Site Review.

For the past few years MDCH has provided tools to the public mental health system for prevention of, and early intervention in, crises. [See MDCH/PIHP FY’13 Contract Attachment 1.4.1 Technical Requirement for Behavior Treatment Plan Review Committees; Prevention Guide, June 2011 at www.michigan.gov/Mental Health and Substance Abuse (page); Transition Guide for Placement into AFCs; and Center for Positive Living Supports www.positivelivingsupport.org].

Thus the applicant attests that in the region there are common established processes which demonstrate that the provider network effectively:

5.1.1. Evaluates the systemic factors involved in any occurrence of critical incidents and at-risk health conditions, and behavioral and medical crises.

5.1.2. Identifies any individual precursors to potential behavioral or medical crises that can serve as a warning to caregivers and staff.

5.1.3. Identifies and implements actions to eliminate or lessen the risk that critical incidents, sentinel events, and behavioral crises will occur.

For this new AFP, it is expected that the applicant describe the crisis response capacity that will be fully available in each PIHP region by January 1, 2015. Crisis response capacity includes clinical expertise that can be immediately accessed for mental health or behavioral crises. That expertise may be a team or teams of clinicians who are available for telephonic consultation and on-site observation and consultation, and have the training and experience to address the needs of children and adults with serious mental illness (SMI/SED) and children and adults with intellectual/developmental disabilities (I/DD), and children and adults with co-occurring SMI/SED and I/DD. This crisis response capacity

---

1 Critical incidents as defined by the FY’13 MDCH/PIHP contract Attachments 6.5.1.1 and 6.7.1.1
2 Sentinel event - an unexpected occurrence involving death or serious physical or psychological injury, or the risk thereof. Serious injury specifically includes loss of limb or function. The phrase “or the risk thereof” includes any process variation for which a recurrence would carry a significant chance of a serious adverse outcome. Such events are called “sentinel” because they signal the need for immediate investigation and response.
must also have a residential or inpatient component to which an individual can be transported, reside for a short period, and receive treatment or intervention until his/her crisis stabilizes. This capacity could be **intensive crisis stabilization or crisis residential services** in a free-standing licensed adult foster care facility and a free-standing licensed children’s foster care facility, staffed with clinicians and workers who are specially trained to respond effectively to behavioral crises exhibited by adults or children with SMI/SED or adults with I/DD. This capacity could alternatively be an agreement with a regional inpatient psychiatric unit that is willing and able to receive any individual (SMI, SED or I/DD, adult or child) who is exhibiting a behavioral crisis. This capacity must include emergency admission.

5.1.4. ☐ In table 5.1.4 below is a regional analysis of people who are at risk with answers to the five questions following.

OR

☐ The table below will be completed, with the five questions answered, and submitted to MDCH no later than 5 p.m. on July 1, 2013.

Identify the number of individuals identified as at-risk of crisis placement as determined by experiencing within the last six months: more than one 911 call for police intervention, more than one temporary placement in a crisis home, an on-site visit from the CPLS mobile team, more than one visit to the ER for behavioral episode, an admission to a psych inpatient unit, one or more requests for inpatient admission to a state psychiatric facility. Sort by age (child, adult 18-64, 65+) and disability designation (SED, SMI and I/DD).

**Table 5.1.4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>911 calls</th>
<th>Temporary placements in crisis home</th>
<th>On-site visit by CPLS mobile team</th>
<th>ER visit</th>
<th>Admission to psych inpatient unit</th>
<th>Request for inpatient admission to state facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child with SED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult with SMI 18-64</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1197</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult with SMI 65+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child with I/DD*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### 2013 Application for Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>911 calls</th>
<th>Temporary placements in crisis home</th>
<th>On-site visit by CPLS mobile team</th>
<th>ER visit</th>
<th>Admission to psych inpatient unit</th>
<th>Request for inpatient admission to state facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult with I/DD* 18-64</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult with I/DD* 65+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Count people on the Autism Spectrum Disorder or people with co-occurring SMI/SED and I/DD in this category

5.1.5. **In text box below are the numbers of individuals who have:**

5.1.5.1. A current (within the last 12 months) behavioral treatment plan with restrictive or intrusive interventions approved by the Behavior Treatment Plan Review Committee: **35**

5.1.5.2. Experienced (within the last 12 months) an injury requiring emergency room visit or hospital admission due to an intervention that occurred during a behavioral episode: **0**

5.1.6. **Beds are available in secure settings (e.g., psych unit in a community or private hospital) in the region and organizations “owning” the beds are willing to make them available to people with SMI, SED or I/DD with behaviors.**

5.1.7. **In text box below is percent of staff in the region who have participated in the Culture of Gentleness Working with People training:**

5.1.7.1. Direct care workers: **63%**

5.1.7.2. Group home managers: **52%**

5.1.7.3. Supports coordinators/case managers: **81%**

5.1.7.4. Or other more advanced training such as Culture of Gentleness Practicum or Mentor Training: **0.5%**

5.1.8. **In the text box below is a two-page description of:**

a. The identification of at least one point person in the region who is available 24/7, 365 days/year to respond to crises that require immediate attention and who has the authority to arrange for temporary placement, regional crisis team or CPLS team consultation or visit.

b. Agreement(s) between the PIHP and hospitals or licensed AFCs in the region that will be available for short-term crisis placement.

c. Any plans for developing crisis residential programs.

d. Target dates for achieving full crisis response capacity by January 1, 2015.

**5.1.8. a. Identification of at least one point person in the region who is available 24/7, 365 days/year to respond to crises that require**
immediate attention and who has the authority to arrange for temporary placement, regional crisis team or CPLS team consultation or visit.

The PIHP Chief Executive Officer or designee is the point person who has the regional authority to immediately respond to crises by arranging for and authorizing services pertaining to temporary placement and / or crisis team consultation / visit. The PIHP Chief Executive Officer or designee manages all these eligibility / referral / authorization activities for the region. Per MDCH requirement, the Access System operates on a 24/7, 365 day/year basis.

b. Agreement(s) between the PIHP and hospitals or licensed AFCs in the region that will be available for short-term crisis placement.

The two PIHPs merging into the new Region 10 PIHP are bringing into the new region existing services agreements with hospitals and licensed AFCs. These are service agreements operating within each of the four CMHs that comprise the new regional entity and, as such, each CMH has current agreements with both hospital and licensed AFC providers, which also include current contracts with both in-county and out-county hospitals and in-county CRU. Capacity is currently deemed sufficient to meet needs, and existing service agreements will be contractually overseen by the new PIHP.

c. Any plans for developing crisis residential programs.

Each CMH comprising the new Region 10 PIHP provides Crisis Residential (CR) programming. Recent MDCH audit findings for the Thumb Alliance PIHP have identified Plans of Correction (POCs) in connection with 1) ensuring dedicated units for CR as well as for 2) ensuring the enrollment of currently operational Intensive Crisis Stabilization Teams. These POCs are being addressed. Genesee Health System has sufficient CRU capacity for mentally ill adults, as per recent MDCH audit findings. The prospective need to develop crisis services options which may include a CR for developmentally disabled adults and children will be assessed as the new region becomes operational.

d. Target dates for achieving full crisis response capacity by January 1, 2015.

The two Thumb Alliance POCs are being addressed for completion within the required date.
5.2 Health and Welfare

5.2.1. Health

One of MDCH four main strategic priorities for MDCH is to “Improve the Health of the Population”. This includes promoting 4x4 wellness activities to reduce obesity and targeting chronic care “hot spots” in population and geography. The public mental health system serves people who are among the most vulnerable of Michigan’s citizens. It is well documented that longevity for persons with mental illness is 25 years shorter than persons without mental illness. MDCH is seeking greater integration of systems of care to promote healthy behaviors and management of chronic conditions and all aspects of health: physical health, behavioral health, and habilitation.

Primary behavioral health conditions and disabilities frequently are complicated by co-occurring disabilities (e.g., a developmental disability plus epilepsy, swallowing disorder, respiratory or bowel issues), and by co-occurring chronic diseases (e.g., asthma, hypertension, obesity). These conditions, disabilities and diseases usually require frequent and ongoing intervention, treatment and monitoring by health care professionals.

In the absence of ambulatory and preventive care, treatment and monitoring, people use expensive emergency room services or are hospitalized for acute episodes of their conditions. [Please review the Health Services Advisory Group’s “2010-2011 Coordination of Care/Medical Services Utilization Focused Study Report, March 2012” at www.michigan.gov/documents/MDCH/MI2010-11_FocusedStudy_SMI-DD_Report_F1_382152_7.pdf] While PIHPs are not paid to provide primary health care, it is expected that PIHPs assure that individuals being served receive appropriate, culturally-relevant and timely healthcare; that medical care providers are knowledgeable in how to approach and treat individuals with mental illness and/or intellectual/developmental disabilities; and that the PIHPs’ provider networks are partners on the health care team for health care planning and monitoring purposes.

The applicant attests to the following:

5.2.1.1 ☒ Reporting on Health Conditions (MDCH/PIHP FY’13 Contracts, Attachment 6.5.1.1, Quality Improvement Reporting, Elements #39 through 41) is currently at 95% or more completeness for all populations served in the region.

OR

5.2.1.2 ☑ A plan that has action steps, responsible staff, and timeframes has been developed for achieving 95% or more completeness by January 1, 2014.

5.2.1.3 ☑ By January 1, 2014, person-centered planning (as documented in the individual plan of service) for each beneficiary will address:
   a. Current physical health conditions.
   b. Existence of health care practitioners that are treating any physical health conditions.
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c. Any assistance (e.g., referral, coordination, transportation) that the beneficiary needs in accessing health care practitioners.

5.2.1.4 In Attachment 5.2.1A, is a description of no more than 4 pages, of how the applicant plans to assure coordination between the provider network and the beneficiaries’ primary care practitioners to assure that appropriate preventative and ambulatory care are provided; existing health care conditions are treated and monitored by the health care team; and incidents of emergency room visits (for physical health or mental health crises) and hospital admissions (for physical health or mental health episodes) are immediately communicated among the health care team members; and that medical care providers are knowledgeable in how to approach and treat individuals with mental illness and/or intellectual/developmental disabilities. The description includes:

a. Any electronic methodology(ies) that will be used to share information among the health care team members.

b. How follow-up care (to emergency room visits and hospitalization) will be coordinated among the health care team members.

c. Steps to be taken to reduce or prevent recurrence of the issue(s) that have required avoidable emergency room visits and hospital admissions, including staff training and professional(s) identified for monitoring and oversight.

d. Plans for assuring adequate capacity to serve individuals with high medical needs, including the ability to assure smooth and timely transitions for individuals being discharged from the hospital.

OR

5.2.1.5 The plan noted in number 5.2.1.4 above is in development, and will be submitted to MDCH no later than 5 p.m. on July 1, 2013.

5.2.2 Welfare

Many individuals served by the public mental health system are victims of abuse, neglect, and exploitation intermittently or for long periods throughout their lives. These traumatizing events have a profound impact on an individual’s ability to recover, to learn new skills to improve functioning, to develop and maintain relationships, and to live and work successfully in the community. For many years, MDCH has provided leadership on evidence-based trauma-informed care.

There are many legal obligations to report abuse, neglect and exploitation to various law enforcement and public entities that will not be repeated here. Assuring welfare goes beyond reporting incident as they occur and includes a robust process for analyzing risk factors and reported incidents by individual beneficiary, population, and provider entity, if applicable. There must be close monitoring and oversight to prevent incidents of abuse, neglect, exploitation and other critical/sentinel events from occurring in the first place whenever possible. Monitoring should include information from other sources, such as licensing reports for group homes where individuals served by the PIHP reside [see Office of Inspector General Report on Home and Community-Based Services in Assisted Living Facilities on the MDCH web site at Mental Health and Substance Abuse page]. Assuring welfare also includes seeing to the immediate safety of the individual and others, as well as
acting promptly and decisively when an incident is substantiated to prevent future occurrences for that individual or others.

The applicant attests to the following:

5.2.2.1 A signed agreement between each CMHSP in the region and their local Department of Human Services office and the Bureau of Child and Adult Licensing (BCAL) will be in effect on 1/1/14 to coordinate investigations as applicable.

5.2.2.2 Percent of staff in the region who have participated in the Trauma-Informed Care training:
   a. Direct care workers: 3%
   b. Group home managers: 50%
   c. Supports coordinators/case managers: 59%
   d. Other: 49%

5.2.2.3 In Attachment 5.2.2.3., is a description of no more than four pages, of how the applicant plans to assure the welfare of beneficiaries. The description includes how the applicant assures that its provider network will:

   a. analyze risk factors and reported incidents by individual beneficiary and provider entity if applicable to identify patterns and trends;
   b. provide close monitoring and oversight, including the staff responsible and frequency of monitoring and oversight;
   c. assure the immediate safety of the individual and others who may be affected when incidents occur, e.g., provisions for the immediate transfer of recipients to a different provider if their health or safety is in jeopardy.

OR

5.2.2.4 The plan described above is in development and will be submitted to MDCH no later than 5 p.m. on July 1, 2013.
5.3 Olmstead Compliance

5.3.1 Community Living

Title II’s integration mandate of the Americans with Disabilities Act requires that the “services, programs, and activities” of a public entity be provided “in the most integrated setting appropriate to the needs of qualified individuals with disabilities.” 28 CFR 35.130(d). Such a setting is one that “enables individuals with disabilities to interact with nondisabled persons to the fullest extent possible.” 28 CFR 35, App. B at 673. [Please refer to the recent activities of the Civil Rights Division of the U.S. Department of Justice that has been working with state and local governmental officials to insure ADA and Olmstead compliance: www.ada.gov/olmstead/index.htm]

A state or local government must eliminate any eligibility criteria for participation in programs, activities, and services that screen out or tend to screen out persons with disabilities, unless it can establish that the requirements are necessary for the provision of the service, program, or activity. The state or local government may, however, adopt legitimate safety requirements necessary for safe operation if they are based on real risks, not on stereotypes or generalizations about individuals with disabilities. Finally, a public entity must reasonably modify its policies, practices, or procedures to avoid discrimination. If the public entity can demonstrate that a particular modification would fundamentally alter the nature of its service, program, or activity, it is not required to make that modification.

Michigan has been a long-time leader in developing community-based living supports and services, so the provisions of the Olmstead decision related to community living and working are not new to the public mental health system.

Respond with the applicant’s assurances to the attestations below:

5.3.1.1 □ The applicant has a written policy defining the standards the region’s provider network will follow in releasing people from institutions. The provider network’s treatment professionals must determine that the placement is appropriate; the individual must not object to being released from the institution; and the provider is able to provide supports and services that enable them to live successfully in the community.

OR

5.3.1.2 □ The written policy is in development and will be completed by this date: 7/1/2013

5.3.1.3 □ The applicant has a written regional policy in place that calls for treatment professionals to respect and support the housing preferences and choices of people with disabilities and truly fulfill the mandates of the ADA with respect to community integration.

OR

5.3.1.4 □ The written regional policy is in development and will be completed by this date: 7/1/2013
5.3.1.5 There will be a regional plan commencing no later than January 1, 2014 to establish partnerships with local housing agencies and housing providers. The goal of these collaborations should be to develop interagency strategies that increase affordable, community-based, integrated housing options for people with disabilities that meet their preferences and needs.

5.3.1.6 In the three tables below are regional analyses of the numbers of people served who at the time of application live in the settings noted.

OR

5.3.1.7 The tables below will be completed and submitted to MDCH no later than 5 p.m. on July 1, 2013.

**Table 5.3.1.6 A**
Number of all individuals by children (up to age 18), adults (18-64) and seniors (65+) and primary disability – serious mental illness, serious emotional disturbance, and intellectual/developmental disability living in any licensed setting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># in licensed setting &lt;6 beds</th>
<th># in licensed setting – 6 beds</th>
<th># in licensed setting 7-12 beds</th>
<th># in licensed setting 13+ beds</th>
<th># in Skilled Nursing Facilities</th>
<th>Total # per population</th>
<th>Percent of Total Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children w/ SED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults SMI 18-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults SMI 65+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children w/ I/DD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults I/DD 18-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults I/DD 65+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: If a beneficiary lives in a group home licensed for six beds but that home is located on a campus with other group homes, report the total number of licensed beds for that provider at that campus location.*
Table 5.3.1.6 B
Number of individuals by children (up to age 18), adults (18-64) and seniors (65+) and primary disability – serious mental illness, serious emotional disturbance, and intellectual/developmental disability living in a licensed setting outside the PIHP region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># in licensed setting &lt;6 beds</th>
<th># in licensed setting 6 - 12 beds</th>
<th># in licensed setting 13+ beds</th>
<th>Total # per population</th>
<th>Percent of Total Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children w/ SED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults SMI 18-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults SMI 65+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children w/ I/DD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults I/DD 18-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults I/DD 65+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3.1.6 C
The number of adults who live independently, with or without supports, with or without house/roommates. Home/apartment is not a licensed facility and is owned or leased by the individual.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Independent without supports</th>
<th>Independent with supports</th>
<th>Independent with house/roommates</th>
<th>Independent without house/roommates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults SMI 18-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults SMI 65+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults I/DD 18-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults I/DD 65+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.1.8 □ In the text box below is a narrative of no more than two pages that describes:

a. How informed choice of type of setting, provider, roommates/housemates are guaranteed in the annual person-centered planning process.

b. The transition planning process undertaken to assure that there is the right match between the individual and the licensed setting.
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c. How individual opportunities for community integration and inclusion, and productivity are addressed and guaranteed in licensed settings (See Keys Amendment at 1915.1616(e) of the Social Security Act that pertains to social security income recipients living in facilities (e.g., group homes, congregate living arrangements).

d. The determinants of the frequency of PIHP monitoring of individuals living in licensed settings differentiated by Specialized Residential settings, and General AFCs. Include how issues or deficiencies are addressed when noted.

e. Plans with action steps, responsible staff, timeframes and numbers of people for developing increased regional alternative (to licensed AFC) residential capacity.

5.3.1.8

OR

☒ The narrative description above will be submitted no later than July 1, 2013.

5.3.1.9 ☐ In Attachment 5.3.1.10., is a plan with action steps and timeframes for developing capacity for bringing [the number] of people currently living out of the region, or transitioned to another PIHP if chosen by the person, back to live within the region. This may be a phased-in approach, but must commence October 1, 2014.

OR

5.3.1.10☒ The plan described above is in development and will be submitted to MDCH no later than 5 p.m. on July 1, 2013.
Olmstead Compliance:

5.3.1 Employment and Community Activities

CMS underscores that the competitive, integrated employment in the community for which an individual is compensated at or above the minimum wage, but not less than the customary wage and level of benefits paid by the employer for the same or similar work performed by individuals without disabilities is the **optimal** outcome of Pre-Vocational/Skill-building services. All pre-vocational and supported employment service options should be reviewed and considered as a component of an individual plan of services (IPOS) developed through a person-centered planning process, no less than annually, more frequently as necessary or as requested by the individual. These services and supports should be designed to support successful employment outcomes consistent with the choice and preferred outcomes of the individual's goals and reflected in the IPOS. [Center for Medicaid and CHIP Service (CMCS) Informational Bulletin, September 16, 2011. Also see MDCH Employment Works! Policy, revised July 2012.]

Work is a key component to recovery through Evidence-based Practice/Individual Placement Supports. MDCH also strongly recognizes that employing Peer Specialists and Peer Mentors can help organizations improve their service delivery systems.

MDCH is initiating an employment data dashboard to track various employment settings (individual, group, Ability One, Clubhouse, and other employment) by wages per hour, and hours per month as well as expected movement toward competitive, integrated community employment. Accurate, timely, and effective federal and state benefits planning related to working is a key to acquiring and maintaining employment.

MDCH expects that each PIHP will embrace the above tenets and encourage its provider network to provide services in the most integrated setting appropriate to the needs of qualified individuals with disabilities.

**Respond with the applicant’s attestations below:**

5.3.2.1 □The applicant will have a regional policy in place no later than January 1, 2014 that assures consistency across the applicant’s service area in the provision of competitive, integrated employment services for the individuals served. This policy will be available for review prior to that date.

5.3.2.2 □The applicant will have in place no later than January 1, 2013 a regional policy that assures there are affirmative efforts are in place to increase agency and subcontractor employment of individuals with disabilities including recruitment, placement and development of pay scales including fringe benefits and training. Applicant has individuals who have disclosed they have disabilities on staff: **49.77** FTEs.

5.3.2.3 □The applicant assures that its provider networks will link beneficiaries to accurate and timely information about the continuation of federal and state benefits in preparation for and while they are competitively employed.

5.3.2.4 □In the two tables below are regional analyses of the numbers of people served who at the time of application are engaged in the ways noted.
OR

5.3.2.5 ☑ The tables below will be completed and submitted to MDCH no later than 5 p.m. on July 1, 2013.

**Table 5.3.2.4 A**

In this table is a regional analysis of the number of adults in age ranges and with disability designation below who are in each activity solely. If in multiple activities, count the activity where the most time per year is spent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sheltered Workshop</th>
<th>Supported Employment*</th>
<th>Integrated Employment*</th>
<th>Volunteer job</th>
<th>No volunteer or paid work activity, includes retired</th>
<th>Total served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults SMI 18-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults SMI 65+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults I/DD 18-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults I/DD 65+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refer to the FY13 MDCH/PIHP Contract for definitions of supported and integrated employment

**Table 5.3.2.4. B**

In this table is a regional analysis of the number of adults in age ranges and with disability designation below who are involved in the community activities with the general public below at least once a month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clubs, Social events, visiting friends/relative</th>
<th>Continuing Education, Classes</th>
<th>Athletic/recreational participant</th>
<th>Attendance at sporting, arts, theater, movies</th>
<th>No extracurricular activity</th>
<th>Total served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults SMI 18-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults SMI 65+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clubs, Social events, visiting friends/relative</th>
<th>Continuing Education, Classes</th>
<th>Athletic/recreational participant</th>
<th>Attendance at sporting, arts, theater, movies</th>
<th>No extra-curricular activity</th>
<th>Total served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults I/DD 18-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults I/DD 65+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.2.6 In the text box below Attachment is a narrative, of no more than two pages, that describes:

a. How informed choice of a) the type of work and b) community activities are guaranteed in the annual person-centered planning process.
b. How individual opportunities for community integration and inclusion, and productivity are addressed and guaranteed as a result of person-centered planning.
c. The determinants of the frequency of PIHP monitoring of individuals who participate in segregated activities that include day programs, workshops. Include how issues or deficiencies are addressed when noted.

OR

The narrative description is being developed and will be submitted to MDCH no later than 5 p.m. on July 1, 2013.

5.3.2 In Attachment 5.3.2.8. is a regional plan with action steps, responsible staff, timeframes and numbers of people for developing increased regional alternatives to segregated day programs and workshops. This may be a phased-in approach, but must commence October 1, 2014.

OR

The regional plan is in development and will be submitted to MDCH no later than 5 p.m. on July 1, 2013.
5.4 **Substance Use Disorder Prevention and Treatment**

Michigan's publicly funded Substance Use Disorder (SUD) Service System is committed to a transformational change that promotes and sustains wellness and recovery for individuals, families, and communities. This change to a recovery-oriented system of care (ROSC) employs strategies to:

- prevent the development of new substance use disorders.
- reduce the harm caused by addiction.
- help individuals make the transition from brief experiments in recovery initiation to sustained recovery maintenance via diverse holistic services.
- promote good quality of life and improve community health and wellness.


To develop a holistic and effective SUD Service System that promotes recovery and resilience, PIHPs shall implement a ROSC. In addition, PIHPs shall implement recent Mental Health Code changes, per Public Acts 500 and 501 of 2012, to incorporate SUD administrative functions. Accordingly, the applicant attests to the following:

5.4.1 **Adoption of ROSC's sixteen guiding principles** (pages 14-16 of ROSC Implementation Plan).
5.4.2 **Lead person** named for transition of SUD administrative functions into the PIHP by April 1, 2013. The lead person's name is: **Michael McCartan**
5.4.3 **Implementation plan** made no later than October 1, 2013, for merger of SUD functions into the PIHP to be completed by October 1, 2014. For reference see the, Coordinating Agency contract ([http://egrams-mi.com/dch/user/categoryprograms.aspx?CategoryId=SA&CatDesc=Substance%20Abuse](http://egrams-mi.com/dch/user/categoryprograms.aspx?CategoryId=SA&CatDesc=Substance%20Abuse)).
5.4.4 **Adherence of federal Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grant (SAPT BG) requirements** and maintain staff to support.
5.4.5 **Acceptance of fiduciary and local oversight for federally funded discretionary grants.**
5.4.6 **Adherence to PA 258 of 1974, Mental Health Code, section 287** by:
   - Establishing an SUD Oversight Policy Board by October 1, 2014.
   - Providing a list of members and criteria used to make selection.
   - Developing procedures for approving budget and contracts by October 1, 2014.
   - Attesting to maintaining provider base (as of December 28, 2012) until December 28, 2014.
5.4.7 **Development of a three-year SUD prevention, treatment and recovery plan** to be submitted by August 1, 2014, for fiscal years (FY) 2015 to 2017.
5.4.8 **Implementation of evidence-based prevention, treatment, and recovery services.**
5.4.9 **Maintenance of a separate Recipient Rights process for SUD service recipients.**
5.4.10 Submission of timely reports on annual budget boilerplate requirements, including:
   a. Legislative Report (Section 408), FY2013 due by January 31, 2014
   b. Mental Health and Substance Use Disorder Services Integration Status Report (Sections 407 and 470), FY2013 due by January 31, 2014

Note: boilerplate requirements and due dates are subject to change with appropriations
5.5 Recovery

The vision in the Description of a Good and Modern Addictions and Mental Health Service System addresses elements necessary for a recovery environment including determinants of health, health promotion, prevention, screening, early intervention, treatment system and service coordination, resilience and recovery support to promote social integration, health and productivity. A good and modern system provides a full range of services to meet the needs of the population with strong integrated efforts between behavioral health and primary care. Integration must be based in a model of community participation, inclusion, and integration with the foundation of trauma informed and recovery oriented supports. The Michigan plan of Bringing Recovery Support to Scale vision for health and wellness includes every person with substance use disorder and/or mental illness will having equal access to and opportunity for person-centered, recovery based services which respect that there are multiple pathways and sources of engagement and support that are dependent on each individual’s preference and learning style.

The new working definition published by the federal Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) discusses recovery as a process of change through which individuals improve their health and wellness, live a self-directed life, and strive to reach their full potential. SAMHSA has delineated four major dimensions and ten guiding principles that support a life in recovery:

- **Health**: overcoming or managing one’s disease(s) or symptoms—and making informed, healthy choices that support and promote physical and emotional wellbeing.
- **Home**: a stable and safe place to live;
- **Purpose**: meaningful daily activities, such as a job, school, volunteerism, family caretaking, or creative endeavors, and the independence, income and resources to participate in society; and
- **Community**: relationships and social networks that provide support, friendship, love, and hope.

**Guiding Principles of Recovery**

- **Recovery emerges from hope**: The belief that recovery is real provides the essential and motivating message of a better future – that people can and do overcome the internal and external challenges, barriers, and obstacles that confront them.
- **Recovery is person-driven**: Self-determination and self-direction are the foundations for recovery as individuals define their own life goals and design their unique path(s).
- **Recovery occurs via many pathways**: Individuals are unique with distinct needs, strengths, preferences, goals, culture, and backgrounds including trauma experiences that affect and determine their pathway(s) to recovery. Abstinence is the safest approach for those with substance use disorders.
- **Recovery is holistic**: Recovery encompasses an individual's whole life, including mind, body, spirit, and community. The array of services and supports available should be integrated and coordinated.
Recovery is supported by peers and allies: Mutual support and mutual aid groups, including the sharing of experiential knowledge and skills, as well as social learning, play an invaluable role in recovery.

Recovery is supported through relationship and social networks: An important factor in the recovery process is the presence and involvement of people who believe in the person’s ability to recover; who offer hope, support, and encouragement; and who also suggest strategies and resources for change.

Recovery is culturally-based and influenced: Culture and cultural background in all of its diverse representations including values, traditions, and beliefs are keys in determining a person’s journey and unique pathway to recovery.

Recovery is supported by addressing trauma: Services and supports should be trauma-informed to foster safety (physical and emotional) and trust, as well as promote choice, empowerment, and collaboration.

Recovery involves individual, family, and community strengths and responsibility: Individuals, families, and communities have strengths and resources that serve as a foundation for recovery.

Recovery is based on respect: Community, systems, and societal acceptance and appreciation for people affected by mental health and substance use problems – including protecting their rights and eliminating discrimination – are crucial in achieving recovery.

5.5.1 In the text box below is a two-page explanation of how the applicant’s mission and vision support the dimensions and principles of recovery according to the SAMHSA working definition. Explain how substance use disorder and mental health recovery are both supported by the mission and vision.

5.5.1 Region 10 has developed an agency mission and vision statement which promotes SAMSHA Recovery principles: Themes are consistent with SAMSHA Major Dimensions and the guiding principles as illustrated below.

Major Dimensions:

Health: overcoming or managing one’s disease (s) or symptoms – and making informed, healthy choices that support and promote physical and emotional wellbeing.
Mission: Promoting opportunities for Recovery, Discovery, Health, and Independence and also in the Vision statement: designed to promote choice and responsibility

Home: a stable and safe place to live;
Vision: Foster an improved quality of life

Purpose: meaningful daily activities, such as a job, school, volunteerism, family caretaking, or creative endeavors, and the independence, income and resources to participate in society; and
Mission: Promoting opportunities for Recover, Discovery, Health, and Independence for individuals receiving services through ease of access, high quality of care and best value.
Community: relationships and social networks that provide support, friendship, love, and hope.
Vision: Provide hope by recognizing each individual’s unique self and respecting his/her individual choices as they pursue their dreams and by encouraging family and individual support.

Guiding Principles of Recovery:

Recovery emerges from hope: The belief that recovery is real provides the essential and motivating message of a better future—that people can and do overcome the internal and external challenges, barriers, and obstacles that confront them.
Vision: Provide hope by recognizing and respecting each individual’s unique self and their choices in pursuit of their life goals.

Recovery is person-driven: Self-determination and self-direction are the foundations for recovery as individuals define their own life goals and design their unique path(s).
Vision: ...and their choices in pursuit of their life goals...
Evidence based, person centered practices ....

Recovery occurs via many pathways: Individuals are unique with distinct needs, strengths; preferences, goals, culture, and backgrounds including trauma experiences that affect and determine their pathway(s) to recovery. Abstinence is the safest approach for those with substance use disorders.
Vision: ...behavioral health including substance use disorder...and
...improved quality of life for the individuals and families we serve by facilitating equal access to superior, integrated, trauma-informed supports and services....

Recovery is holistic: Recovery encompasses an individual’s whole life, including mind, body, spirit, and community. The array of services and supports available should be integrated and coordinated.
Vision: Access to superior, integrated supports and services....

Recovery is supported by peers and allies: Mutual support and mutual aid groups, including the sharing of experiential knowledge and skills, as well as social learning, play and invaluable role in recovery.
Vision: ....a network which includes experiential, knowledgeable ad dedicated staff

Recovery is supported through relationship and social networks: An important factor in the recovery process is the presence and involvement of people who believe in the person’s ability to recover; who offer hope, support, and encouragement; and who also suggest strategies and resources for change.
Vision: provide hope by recognizing and respecting each individual’s unique self...

Recovery is culturally -based and influenced: Culture and cultural background in all of its diverse representations including values, traditions, and beliefs are keys in determining a person’s journey and unique pathway to recovery.
Vision: ...facilitating equal access.....tailored to the strengths and needs of each individual.
Recovery is supported by addressing trauma: Services and supports should be trauma-informed to foster safety (physical and emotional) and trust, as well as promote choice, empowerment, and collaboration. 
Vision: ....trauma informed supports and services....

Recovery involves individual, family, and community strengths and responsibility: Individuals, families and communities have strengths and resources that serve as a foundation for recovery. 
Vision: ...empowering families and communities to support respect and advocate...

Recovery is based on respect: Community, systems, and societal acceptance and appreciation for people affected by mental health and substance use problems— including protecting their rights and eliminating discrimination—are crucial in achieving recovery. 
Vision: empowering families and communities to support respect and advocate...

5.5.2 The applicant will select a region-wide behavioral health recovery survey tool as a Continuous Quality Improvement project in partnership with a group of stakeholders that includes providers and users of services with a majority of members being people with lived experience. By January 2014 the tool will be submitted and approved by MDCH.

5.5.3 The applicant assures that its provider network employs a sufficient workforce of individuals with lived experiences throughout all levels of the agency who are paid fair and competitive wages, have multiple opportunities for a balance of full and part-time positions and are offered a viable career ladder.

5.5.4 By January 1, 2014, applicant’s provider network’s position descriptions for all paid employees and volunteers contain language of recovery. Job responsibilities will outline recovery-based, person-centered and culturally competent practices. Job qualifications will specify that lived experiences with behavioral health issues are desired.

5.5.5 By October 1, 2013, the applicant will present to MDCH a plan for sustaining positions currently supported by federal Mental Health Block Grant funding after the grant has ended. The plan specifically identifies positions that are supporting SUD prevention and Women’s Specialty Services for SUD.

5.5.6 By January 1, 2014, the applicant will have region-wide policies, procedures and a process in place that support and encourage the opportunity to for individuals with serious mental illness to participate in a self-determined arrangement.

5.5.7 By January 1, 2014, the applicant’s provider network will have region-wide explicit policies and procedures for admission, discharge, referral, collaborative care that supports individual choice, person centered, culturally competent, trauma informed practice and the attainment of self-directed goals. The policies and procedures will incorporate SUD provider/recovery networks into the service delivery system.

5.5.8 By January 1, 2014, the applicant will develop and implement region-wide policies and procedures to support the provision of collaborative work between substance use, mental health and primary care providers resulting in an integrated care plan for individuals.