
QUALITY ASSESSMENT AND IMPROVEMENT: COMPREHENSIVE REPORT

Pennsylvania Office of Developmental Programs

Superior Home Services

9/27/2017

Table of Contents

Introduction

The purpose of the Comprehensive report is to compile the official findings from the desk and onsite reviews, face-to-face interviews and self-assessments, as applicable, that were completed for your agency as part of ODP's QA&I Process. This report will:

- Highlight those areas where the Provider is doing well related to person-centered services delivery and promising practices;
- Analyze performance in ODP's quality focus areas for the current QA&I cycle;
- Compare results of the desk and onsite reviews with the entity's self-assessment;
- Summarize those instances of non-compliance that were remediated during the onsite review;
- Outline issues of non-compliance expected to be remediated within 30 calendar days of report receipt;
- Recommend PPRs where compliance is below established thresholds of 86%; and
- Recommend improvement activities to be addressed during the remainder of the QA&I cycle, including systemic quality improvement projects to incorporate into QM Plans.

The mission of the Office of Developmental Programs (ODP) is to support Pennsylvanians with developmental disabilities to achieve greater independence, choice and opportunity in their lives.

ODP's vision is to continuously improve an effective system of accessible services and supports that are flexible, innovative and person-centered.

The Quality Assessment & Improvement Process is a way for ODP to evaluate our current system and identify ways to improve it for all individuals.

QA&I Summary

Superior Home Services, Inc submitted their Self-Assessment and forwarded it to the Administrative Entity (AE) on August 18, 2017. Additionally, as required, Superior Home Services submitted their Quality Management (QM) Plan, Restrictive Procedure/Intervention Policy and their Annual Staff Training Curriculum to the AE. These policies as well as the Self-Assessment were reviewed as part of the QA&I desk review process. During the desk review it was noted that the QM Plan and the Restrictive Procedure/Intervention Policy were not completed as per Chapter 51 requirements.

The on-site review was scheduled for and occurred on September 20, 2017. At the entrance meeting the AE explained the QA&I onsite process for the day, including expected timeframe. The AE also discussed focus areas of community participation, staff training on the individual's ISP, and overall improvement of services through the Quality Management Plan. The Human Resource Director for Superior Home Services reviewed with the AE the filing system for the staff files. The Private Duty Director explained that she is somewhat new to the ID services that the agency provides. She expressed her desire to have a very customer focused service. One practice that she has in place is that her and the assigned staff meet with the individual and their family prior to the first scheduled service provision. She wants each to be familiar with the other hoping that this will make the individual more comfortable attending an outing with the staff. She encourages the individual to express what they want to do and what they might want to learn, in addition to what is identified in the outcomes in their ISP. She encourages all staff to have the mind set of "every moment is a teaching moment" regardless of how insignificant it may seem to them, it is important to the individual. She also explained her process of having the lead staff shadow with new staff to ensure that the new staff is a good fit for the individual being served at that time.

There were three individuals in the sample. One individual was new to the agency and was scheduled to have her first activity the next day. One individual participated in the interview process.

Data Analysis and Performance Evaluation

During the onsite review, Superior Home Services staff were available to the AE for questions and were able to obtain any needed information. They presented the AE with their QM Plan that met all the requirements as per the Chapter 51 regulations. What they had initially sent to the AE was the "Annual Agency Evaluation Policy", not the plan itself. They were not able to provide a compliant Restrictive Intervention Policy.

Superior Home Services had arranged for one individual to be available for the interview portion.

Findings:

Highlights and Provider Strengths:

- It was very apparent to the AE that Superior Home Services is a provider who genuinely cares about the individuals who they provide services to. The Private Duty Director, who was the primary contact during the on-site visit, was very eager to learn about the process.
- The feedback from the individual being interviewed was very positive. He spoke highly of the service that he receives. He expressed that he wants to "get a job, maybe at the mall". He likes that while on outings with his staff they help him to put applications in where he wants. Superior Home Service assists him with this even though they do not provide employment services.

Recommendations for system improvement:

Superior Home Services provides services through departments/funding streams not associated with ODP/ Home and Community Based Waiver Services. To better ensure compliance with regulations associated with providing services to waiver participants, Superior Home Services should separate their processes. For example, the provider does not have separate policies in compliance with the Chapter 51 regulations. Instead they have incorporated some information into their existing policies, such as Restrictive Interventions. This could cause confusion when training employees. Additionally, training dates for employees who provide services through both departments that Superior Home Services provides are not distinct.

While completing the onsite review the provider had a difficult time with providing the AE with individual progress notes. The notes were completed by employees each time a service was provided for a week. At the end of the week a picture of the report was taken by the employee, the photo was then emailed to the Private Duty Director. The photos were not easily accessible electronically nor were they able to be printed for hard copies. The AE was ultimately able to review the documentation. The AE and Provider did have a conversation regarding this.

Superior Home Services was not providing training to the employees on the most current ISP available in HCSIS. The provider was not aware that they had access to the ISP in HCSIS.

Appendices

- Superior Home Services, Inc. QA&I Tool
- Superior Home Services, Inc. CAP