STATE OF CONNECTICUT





GOVERNOR

DDS Council Monthly Report

March 2010

Meetings held and/or attended

0	March Ist	-Met with CO Utilization Nurse
0	March 4 th	-Met with Commissioner and CO Psychologist re: Nursing Home closure
0	March 5 th	-Met with CO Utilization Nurse
0	March 5 th	-Met with Facilities Management Director
0	March 8 th	-Met with DDS' Council meeting Chairperson
0	March IO th	-CHRO meeting
0	March 10 th	- LOB Breakfast North region
0	March 15 th	-Met with CO Utilization Nurse
0	March 18 th	-Met with CO QI Director
0	March 26 th	-GCYD Scholarship meeting

Concerns\ Issues

• Person called Office stating she had taken-in one of our consumers for a couple of weeks and was seeking reimbursement for expenses incurred. Upon reviewing issue, I found that consumer was their own Guardian, had their own apartment and had v a budget for individual staffing. The person took the consumer in voluntarily, but after a couple of weeks the consumer wanted to return to her apartment. The consumer was coerced by said person "not to do so". The situation peaked when the local police department had to go to where she was living and assist her in moving back to her apartment - against this person's wishes. Since then, this person has made many calls to the department demanding to be paid for services. She had been told that she invited the consumer to stay with her and accordingly will not be paid for this because she never had a contract to do so. This person has since made numerous complaints to several agencies. During conversations with this woman it became very obvious that she took the consumer in for the money that she thought she could demand..

A probate hearing was held and Aunt was made Conservator.

• Received a call regarding placement of DDS consumer. Consumer needs placement due to incident that happened in family home. Consumer had been living in a CTH, however due to an incident, consumer returned to live at home. Now, consumer needs to find permanent placement and family believes the Department is not doing enough to find appropriate and timely placement. Spoke with Assistant Regional Director and discussed situation at length. We determined that instead of making multiple moves from respite to temporary placements, a permanent placement needed to be made because many moves from short term placement would not benefit individual. We also determined that a face-to-face between consumer and private provider would benefit consumer, due to her engaging personality. Mom's biggest concern was that her daughter would end up in a women's shelter. I ensured mom that placement was the Region's priority and that a women's shelter would not be an option for her daughter. Told mom to call my toll-free number with any other concerns.

• Received a call from individual who is co-guardian for his brother. Individual is very dissatisfied with Case Manager and refuses to attend any meetings where Case Manager is present. Individual refuses to make timely decisions regarding medications and does not trust the Region's decisions that are being made on behalf of his brother's medical issues. Region sought a second opinion for a medication because brother had read in *Time Magazine* that several side effects are prevalent. Doctor Came to same conclusion that was initially made. Individual still objected to medication and refused to answer phone Or answer Letters and paperwork that needed to be signed.

A guardianship hearing was held because brother needed someone that could be easily contacted to make judgments. The Judge determined that this individual was not acting on brother's best interest and removed him as co-guardian. Consumer now has Guardian who can make timely medical decisions.

- Executive Director of a Private provider called office with the question about abuse/neglect. Seems that consumer packs a lunch because they have Special dietary needs that precludes them from eating certain foods. At lunchtime the staff sometimes goes to a fast food drive in or eats in a restaurant With consumer. Someone from the private provider agency made a complaint that this can construed as abuse because he is able to be what ever he likes while the consumer looks on. Called the abuse neglect edition who stated they referred it to me. Called several individuals infield and made calls to developmental disability agencies throughout the Northeast. Conclusion: while this can seem to be torturous it is not abuse. There are other ways for staff to plan lunch and include consumer. However, there are instances where he or she may not be able to plan lunch and unfortunately this is just how it is. Executive Director told me that he thought my decision was exactly what he had concluded but did not want to direct anyone to do something without first researching it. In addition, our abuse neglect division came to the same conclusion.
- Received a call from a woman who had lived in Connecticut for many years, but moved out of state permanently a few years ago. She now wants to return to Connecticut with her daughter who was a DDS consumer. She inquired how long will it take for her daughter to receive services. Currently her daughter is n school and is getting services from the school district; she will be graduating in three years. I told mom that she needed to re-apply through the Eligibility Unit and that a time-table could not be guaranteed. Also, as for services that she would qualify for, that also depends on Eligibility. Mom is also looking for transition from school to work-study. Currently, School staff goes to the consumer's home and has asked the mom to fill out forms regarding transitions to her "next step". The choices vary from full-time college to training for work-study. Mom chose work-study. School staff believes that mom can get state staff in the home to support this concept (like what they are receiving now to support the goals of the IEP). States are not mandated to fulfill any such requirements. Any programming they do is limited and not mandated by any law. Also, continued funding is not mandated either. I encouraged Mom to do A lot more research before committing to move back to Connecticut. I also told her that from what she had told me it seems that the school district had been very amenable to all the requests that she had made and that by the time she ages out in three years I could not guarantee what type services would still be available To her.

March 2010

- Day Program 2
- o Eligibility 8
- o Funding/Budget 5
- Guardianship 4 Health & Safety I
- HIPAA 2
- Information/Referral 23
- Placement 4

ISSUES/CONCERN TOTAL - 58

DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL SERVICES OFFICE OF THE OMBUDSPERSON 460 CAPITOL AVENUE HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06106 PHONE: VOICE 860.418.6047 TDD: 860.418.6079 TOLL FREE: 866.737.0331 FAX: 860.418.8707 Web http://www.dds.state.ct.us/centralofc/ombud.htm Email: Ed.Mambruno@ct.gov