DHS Recommendation

Backgrounds Sample

A | Independent appeals board
B | Website directory or database for resources
C | Customer feedback loop

The following documents are samples that demonstrate DHS's review once a recommendation is made, including collecting background data, consulting with internal teams or subject matter experts, and conducting studies of various models for service. These papers serve as an example of work that commences when a recommendation is submitted to DHS.

From recommendations submitted 04/19/19
Recommendation A
Independent Appeals Board for all mill levy funding decisions

Summary
Set up an independent, volunteer appeals board to review and hear appeals from mill levy eligible individuals and families who wish to dispute decisions made by contractors. The board may reverse the decision and fund the request with DHS mill levy dollars.

Goal/ Outcome
Create access to vital services which are otherwise unavailable. Ensure families receive due process by providing a clear and unbiased alternative to review funding denials.

Background
- Case study: Board of Adjustments for Zoning Appeals operates 4 FTE at $360k/year
- Heightened administrative costs for unknown impact on access to services
- Overlap and accountability across programs to determine the resources already accessed
- High potential for either conflicts of interest or unacquainted community members reviewing requests

DHS considerations
- How would the appeals board validate original caps or 'denials'?
- How does the appeals board ensure all other resources are exhausted first? What is the accountability here?
- How does an appeals board support equity and access to funding - is it possible this could complicate or decrease access for some families? Are we really ensuring fairness?
- How does DHS ensure services are not denied by contractors so that they might program dollars towards other needs, knowing there is an additional mill levy resource?
- How would we measure success? [outcomes vs. outputs vs. program performance]
- What is the last stop and/or last resort? Is there another appeal option once the board has reviewed?
- How does the appeals board stay on budget while fairly assessing denials?
- Would we still need caps for certain services or categories? How would the caps be set?
- How might shifting regulations and environments across Colorado’s state level (CFCM, Waiver redesigns, etc.) inform the need, structure, and processes for an appeals board down the road?
- Is there overlap with other recommendations for direct service funding, or would we move forward with multiple models/contracts to meet various direct service needs (i.e. respite, home modifications, emergency fund)?
- What would DHS need to appropriately staff the appeals board? How frequently would they meet?
- What kind of governance is needed?
Resources

- Denver Budget Book – Board of Adjustments for Zoning Appeals (pg. 584)
  https://www.denvergov.org/content/dam/denvergov/Portals/344/documents/Budget/2019/2019_Budget%20Book_V2-OnlineVersion-compressed.pdf (see below)

- Legal and finance consults

- 2018 RMHS annual report – denied funding requests:
  From Sept 1, 2018 to Dec 31, 2018 (the time in which RMHS imposed new limitations to stay in budget), RMHS reports of 3,866 requests received, 59 completed requests were not funded:
  - 11 for individuals residing outside Denver or not confirmed to have an IDD
  - 27 due to availability of other resources
  - 21 for services or supports that either did not directly benefit the individual with IDD or were not allowable

  - From 2018 Needs Assessment: nearly half of those who applied for mill levy funding reported that it exceeded their expectations. Roughly 5% who had applied for mill levy funding reported negative experiences.

Questions for council

- What is your greatest concern as it relates to contractor funding decisions?
- What do you hope an appeals board will achieve beyond current practices? (anticipated outcomes)
- Based on information given, share a scenario that you envision not being funded that would result in a reversal of the original funding decision?
- Are there additional independent efforts that might support this goal?
### Budget Detail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board of Adjustment - Zoning (0910000)</th>
<th>2017 Actuals</th>
<th>2018 Appropriated</th>
<th>2019 Recommended</th>
<th>$ Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures by Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>330,974</td>
<td>337,317</td>
<td>347,583</td>
<td>10,266</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and Supplies</td>
<td>5,611</td>
<td>12,770</td>
<td>12,770</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures by Type Total</strong></td>
<td>336,585</td>
<td>350,087</td>
<td>360,353</td>
<td>10,266</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures by Activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>289,538</td>
<td>297,683</td>
<td>299,266</td>
<td>1,583</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearings</td>
<td>47,046</td>
<td>52,404</td>
<td>61,087</td>
<td>8,683</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures by Activity Total</strong></td>
<td>336,585</td>
<td>350,087</td>
<td>360,353</td>
<td>10,266</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Program Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>336,585</td>
<td>350,087</td>
<td>360,353</td>
<td>10,266</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel Complement (Budgeted)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearings</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel Complement (Budgeted) Total</strong></td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel Complement</strong></td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges for Services</td>
<td>47,786</td>
<td>26,900</td>
<td>26,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Programmatic Changes

There are no significant budget changes.

Source: Denver Budget Book – Board of Adjustments for Zoning Appeals (pg. 584)
Recommendation B
Website directory or database for resources/services

Summary
Commission the creation of an independent, centralized website-based directory of providers/services in the Denver area with service review or ratings system

Goal/Outcome
Empower individuals and families to discover and navigate service options; support transparency on quality of services

Background
- Additional programs/resources doing this work, including a $62k mill levy funded project with DRCOG in 2018
- Liability concerns related to ratings model for community providers
- Long-term systems and content maintenance costs, staffing requirements, compliance requirements
- Potential coordination with city Tech Services

DHS Considerations
Partnership models/opportunities
- How can we leverage current resources or programs into partnerships?
- How might the mill levy, DHS and/or the Mill Levy Advisory Council support I/DD systems education and resource sharing across organizations/platforms?
  - No Wrong Door
  - Mile High United Way 2-1-1
  - Denver Regional Council of Governments Network of Care (2018 Mill Levy project)
  - Denver Human Services client facing portal project
  - Denver Human Services website – resource and announcements pages linked to IDD Mill Levy Program/Advisory Council pages
- What are the barriers that impede access to existing resources?

Resources
- Visits to Mile High United Way 2-1-1 and DRCOG (Network of Care)
- Meetings with various DHS teams to discuss immediate opportunities (incl. internal resource hub)
- Research on universal design, plain language, and tech accessibility practices

Questions for council
- Does the above stated goal/outcome appropriately identify the motivations for this recommendation?
- Why are current services/platforms not fulfilling this need? What are the holes, gaps, or opportunities?
- How else could the mill levy facilitate or improve overall I/DD and related systems navigation?
Aging and Disability Resources

Find Services

Search here to find programs and services for older adults, adults with disabilities, and their caregivers. Have questions or want to talk to an Aging and Disability Resource Specialist? Call us at 303-480-6700.

Listings in the Service Directory can be added and updated by clicking on “Add New Agency” and “Update Listing” on the left.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Program/Agency Name</th>
<th>Keyword</th>
<th>Advanced Search</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filter:</td>
<td>Select popular topic: Include distance from this zip code:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>▼</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Choose a Category:

- Abuse & Protection Services
- Adult Day Programs, Caregiving & Respite
- Advocacy
- Benefits & Public Assistance
- Clothing & Furniture
- Counseling & Mental Health Services
- Disability Related Resources
- Employment & Volunteer Opportunities
- Home Care & Case Management
- Home Repairs, Modifications & Accessibility
- Housing & Shelter
- Information & Referral/Assistance
- Legal Services
- LGBTQ
- Long Term Care Communities
- Pet Care
- Senior Centers & Recreation
Recommendation C
Customer feedback loop

Summary
Create a feedback loop for recipients to report on mill levy funded contracts and services, separate from contractor reporting mechanisms

Goal/ Outcome
Provide a voice for the customer and receive independent reporting on contracted mill levy programs; measure outcomes, not outputs

Background
- Council concern that metrics and reporting from agencies tell one half of the story
- Challenge of meeting all expectations in feedback given limits on manpower, resources, department influence
- Need to explore further potential contractual impacts and liability, as well as potential staffing needs
- Opportunity to leverage tools already at DHS’ disposal to survey, gather information

DHS considerations
- Do individuals and families currently feel like they do not have the opportunity to provide feedback to DHS on mill levy programs? How can we improve?
- What are we seeing in current contractor reporting?
- What responsibility does DHS have to respond to feedback? What does this look like?
  - What resulting action, if any, would DHS take based on feedback?
  - How would DHS ensure feedback is legitimate before taking potential legal action related to a contract?
  - If so, would DHS need to staff for this type of investigation?
  - Are there models for this in other city programs?
- If DHS must validate complaints to take action, how does this impact staff capacity?
- Would DHS need to consider requesting an ordinance change to support a heightened level of oversight?
- How do we reassure the community we are addressing any issues raised through the feedback loop? What role does the Mill Levy Advisory Council play in inviting feedback?
- Could DHS adjust reporting requirements from contractors to further incorporate client feedback? What accountability measures are critical to the success of this model?
- What kind of impact does this recommendation have for individuals/families?
- What other models could be considered?

Resources
- Legal consult on liability issues related to potential contract impacts; further research needed
- Exploring Public Input, other feedback tools, resources, and best practices
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Harnessing the Power of Feedback Loops -
https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/blog/2017/01/03/harnessing-power-feedback-loops

Questions for council

- Does the above stated goal/outcome clearly capture the Council’s intent related to this recommendation?
- What does not seem to be working with current contractor reporting?
- What do you believe is needed to support and enhance the Council’s role in fostering community feedback?
- What kind of action do you envision might take place as a response to community feedback?