



MINUTES

Name of Organization: Nevada Commission on Autism Spectrum Disorders

Date and Time of Meeting: May 27, 2020 @ 12:00 p.m.

Due to the COVID-19 outbreak, Board members attended telephonically. Members of the public also participated via teleconference

Call to Order/Roll Call

Ms. Abbie Chalupnik proceeded with Roll Call: *Members Present:* Trisha Lozano, Antonina Capurro, Lenise Kryk, Julie Ostrovsky

Members Not Present: Korri Ward, Dr. Cori More

Ms. Abbie Chalupnik called the meeting for the Nevada Commission on Autism Spectrum Disorders to order at 12:01 pm.

A quorum was delayed due to absent Commission members. Declared at 12:05 PM.

Public Comment

Mr. Wesley Kikiuchi - A parent of an autistic 15-year-old child. He participated on the last call on May 13, 2020. He wants to clarify what he had stated previously, which was added to the meeting minutes. As a team it was not the RBT's or the BCBA's, it was the Speech Language and Occupational Therapist. Also, there was some confusion on services for ATAP with what is available. He had a meeting with his case manager Desiree and her manager Lisa. The reason why he assumed there was not OT and PT support is because they do not have one on the referral list. They never addressed that because there was never anyone to go to. If he had known that, then he could have referred a lot of OT's and PT's that they had seen to get on ATAP. A discussion came about that many of the therapists are not aware of ATAP or the process to get on ATAP takes too long, about six months. He has come across some therapists that they could use, but they do not take his insurance, whether it is private insurance or Medicaid. ATAP could be the default insurance though. He was able to get one Speech Language Pathologist to get on ATAP for Northern Nevada. The other confusion brought up was about social groups under ATAP for Autistic kids, there is a BCBA group, a Speech Language Pathologist group, as well as a Psychology group. The other issue the Mr. Kikuchi mentioned on the last call was that his son does not eat enough food. He has gone from eating 25 to 20 to 10 different foods over the last two years that he will eat. So, he is losing weight. There is not a current Dietician on ATAP that they could send him to in Northern Nevada. There is one Registered Dietician (RD) at Renown that they could use privately, but maybe ATAP could pay for the services, because this RD would be a private consultant and does not take private insurance or

Medicaid. So, there is probably a need for more Dietician's in Northern Nevada and could be something that ATAP look into.

Ms. Lenise Kryk – Not sure if this is something that should be part of Public Comment or be left for later. She had a question about the other members that would be a part of the Commission, it was supposed to be a CCSD. Has there been any progress and what is the status? Ms. Kryk wants to clarify to have a quorum, would it be a majority as a membership so three members. She just wants to make sure that we are all on the same page.

Ms. Lozano states that the Public Comment will be noted.

Approval of the Minutes from the May 13, 2020 Meeting

Ms. Trisha Lozano, Commission Chairperson. Do we have approval of the minutes from the May 13th meeting?

Ms. Kryk noticed a typo on the previous approval of minutes, which should have been for April 29, 2020, not April 15, 2020. This was also a typo on the agenda. There was also something in Korri Ward's comments, but since she is not present it cannot be verified. Korri had mentioned something about "peak", but it was IEP goals, not "peak."

Ms. Lozano asks Commission if they want to add the corrections from Public Comment?

Ms. Chalupnik advised we will look into that. She wants to also add her name to the roll call from the previous meeting minutes.

Ms. Lozano asks Commission if there is a motion to approve the minutes with the edits mentioned.

Ms. Kryk motions approval of the minutes with the corrections added.

Ms. Chalupnik is a second on the motion.

Ms. Ostrovsky seconds motion

Ms. Lozano motion passes

Finalizing subcommittees- members/objectives/ meetings process for getting members

Ms. Lozano reminds that during the last meeting we/ the Committee decided to have two subcommittees: Funding and Insurance and Workforce Development. She wants to know if there is anyone interested in taking the lead on either of the subcommittees.

Ms. Kryk states she is interested on being the lead for either one, but personally she has goals that might relate to the Funding and Insurance committee more, but she is flexible as both are important.

Ms. Lozano asks if there is anyone interested in taking the lead on Workforce Development.

Ms. Ostrovsky states she cannot take the lead on a subcommittee, but she is willing to work with someone on it. Personally, it is not something she can do at this time. Ms. Ostrovsky thinks that Lenise Kryk being on Funding and Insurance would be incredibly helpful because she has a different perspective on it and can advise the Committee what is going on. She also asks if the chairs must be one of the Commission members does it?

Ms. Lozano advises that Ms. Ostrovsky is correct.

Ms. Ostrovsky states that this may lead to the discussion of how other people can potentially look at becoming Chairs. Maybe some people from the call, as there were questions during the last meeting. They may not present today but may still be interested.

Ms. Lozano thinks that for now we could have her as the main contact so that she knows who is interested in taking the lead on the two subcommittees, and then moving forward that lead would organize the subcommittees from there. Thoughts?

Ms. Kryk sounds great; she is wondering how the contact information gets distributed. She is willing to assist with that if someone can tell her where the information should go.

Ms. Ostrovsky also agrees that the information needs to get out, because some people feel the Commission is exclusive, which is not the idea at all. The idea is to be inclusive. So, what are we doing to ensure the information gets out there and what are we doing to make sure the Chairs are able to chair and meet the requirements because it is a lot of work and takes dedication?

Ms. Chalupnik suggests that we have a Listserv and we could potentially publish the information from today there.

Ms. Lozano do we have a motion to move forward and publish that information on the Listserv?

Ms. Ostrovsky moves that job descriptions of some form be drafted and present them within the next 30 days to go over with the Commission.

Ms. Lozano wonders about the logistics of the job descriptions. Are we going to have someone willing to take the lead on drafting the job descriptions or are we going to do that as a Commission?

Ms. Ostrovsky is willing to take a look at our strategic plan. She does want to make sure that we have active groups.

Ms. Jennifer Frischmann wants to keep everyone on track, but doesn't believe that unless the job descriptions were part of the sub groups this was not agenized, so there cannot be a decision made on who is making job descriptions unless that is part on the sub group. The board or Commission would have to come together and vote in agreement on the job descriptions. But we can certainly place this as an item on the next agenda for next meeting.

Ms. Kryk agrees that it can be put on the next agenda, but she is wondering if “job descriptions” and “getting people to Chair subcommittees” should be under finalizing subcommittees as an objective. So, we could do some of this today or is it to lofty of a goal and just set it for next time?

Ms. Ostrovsky agrees and thought that is what finalizing subcommittees was for. She states that per the agenda members/objectives and process for getting members. She feels that we should talk about this now.

Ms. Chalupnik advises Commission that it was very hard to hear the last speaker.

Ms. Ostrovsky asks if she can be heard now. And continues with what she was saying before when she was not able to be heard clearly. She was agreeing with Ms. Kryk when she looks at the topic of this agenda item. She understands that she cannot take on the task of a job description, but now we should be able to discuss the objectives and since it is on the agenda. We have tried to bring this up at the last couple meetings, which is why we were specific on this agenda item. If we do not do job descriptions, maybe we just talk about the objectives of each of these subcommittees and what kind of members we want to recruit.

Ms. Kryk thinks that this would be a good idea, certainly trying to go with the objectives first. She knows that there are some Commission members missing today, so we might miss their input. Not sure how to address that though. Ms. Kryk stated that during Public Comment at the last meeting, there were several people interested in being part of the subcommittees, so how would we get them brought in. Do we want to reach out to them via email or ask them to speak today?

Ms. Chalupnik mentions that this would be appropriate to agendize for the next meeting, then invite those interested.

Ms. Ostrovsky says that we have not even mention how this information is going to be posted, so she thinks that right now on this call the Commission talks about the objectives because it is on the agenda. What do we want these subcommittees to do? We need to start working on these items, we cannot keep postponing it to the next meeting. She feels that this Commission is going nowhere fast, so if it is on the agenda, she is not understanding why we can't talk about it. If there are people on the phone that want to be members of these subcommittees, then we should see what the top three objectives are for each one. As it is on the agenda.

Ms. Chalupnik agrees that objectives can be discussed now.

Ms. Ostrovsky asks if members can be discussed as well.

Ms. Chalupnik as long as it is on the agenda, then yes you can discuss members.

Ms. Ostrovsky thank you.

Ms. Ostrovsky asks Ms. Lozano if we should pick a subcommittee to get started with what the basic objectives might be?

Ms. Lozano lets start with Funding and Insurance, she knows that there were focuses and objectives set before, so would you like me to review them?

Ms. Ostrovsky yes please review them and see if we need to update them.

Ms. Lozano objective #1 was to continue to actively engage with self-funded insurance plans to ensure the provisions of autism treatment benefits, including ABA and other evidence-based intervention. Objective #2 to continue to advocate for and gather data that will make clear the need for increased Medicaid reimbursement rates for ABA services, and we need to streamline the billing and collecting process for providers. Objective #3 continue to work with ASDS staff to ensure that ATAP resources are used publicly and efficiently to provide highly accessed to ABA and other evidence-based interventions, such as, speech therapy, occupational therapy, early start models. Objective #4 continue to work with federal representatives to ensure that Autism treatment provisions and ACA remains intact as congress works through legislation related to health care tax reform. Those were the objectives for Funding and Insurance in the 2019 report.

Ms. Kryk has a few things to look at, one is the Medicaid rates which is something we strongly focused on in the past, but it may be relevant now. She also thinks the ATAP access is relevant to address as well. Thinking about some objectives for the subcommittee, she was thinking about how to address the lifespan as that is definitely a concern. If we address ATAP and the Medicaid rates, that could be something that could cover the majority of them. She is not sure about the adult services part. Korri mentioned something about supportive living, so she wants to make sure that globally we are looking across all three groups. NEIS covers the younger kiddos, school-age is ATAP and school services, but adult services she is not sure where that would fall into. The first two previous objectives would fall under the support of all the lifespan groups.

Ms. Lozano do we want to add throughout the lifespan on those or have a separate objective?

Ms. Kryk knows that Ms. Ostrovsky is impacted by adult services and Korri is as well. She is not 100% sure. ATAP only covers to a certain age so that one probably would not work for that. She is not sure how Medicaid provides services for adults who are in transition. Ms. Kryk asks Ms. Ostrovsky if she knows or has any input?

Ms. Ostrovsky would love to provide help. With what Ms. Kryk just mentioned, and with ATAP it does not apply, Medicaid rates if they choose to expand over the lifetime, which at this point that is not going to happen. NEIS does not either. Maybe it needs to have it own category, she doesn't think it can just be added on through the lifespan, none of those will apply. It may be distracting when talking about ATAP services, then what are we doing for adults. Unless she is wrong, there is not anything right now. Maybe we can add a goal under Funding and Insurance for lifespan of adults. Ms. Ostrovsky asks Abbie how she worded lifetime?

Ms. Chalupnik does not recall.

Ms. Ostrovsky just now you said how we are wording lifetime, as opposed to just saying adults.

Ms. Kryk suggests the term lifespan was used across the board. The adult stuff was a little bit of a struggle, how to include that. The only thing she could reference was what Korri mentioned about supportive living. She was pulling some of the notes from last meeting. It was something about support assistance, but there was not enough funding to get adult support. She is not sure where to locate that information and how to support funding for that. If we go with the two previous objectives and add a third one specifically for adult services funding, that may work well.

Ms. Ostrovsky agrees as there may be someone interested from this particular subcommittee that are willing to look into that age group.

Ms. Chalupnik reminds Commission to announce their names before they speak for the meeting minutes.

Ms. Kryk it sounds like she is hearing the two previous objectives are advocate and gather data regarding Medicaid rates and billing. Do not quote her on that, she is going off some notes that she made. And then working with ADSD and ATAP funding and services as well as adding adult services. Sounds like those would be the three objectives under Funding and Insurance. She like those and wants to know what everyone else' opinion is. She realizes that we have a couple members missing, so she doesn't know how we would go about this. Ms. Kryk asks if we move forward with those without them, but still gather their input and make adjustments later?

Ms. Ostrovsky so treat it more like a living document or an evolving subcommittee?

Ms. Lozano thinks that makes sense to develop these objectives and then hopefully we will have our subcommittees soon. As they get into the work, they would be able to enhance or definitely add on to the objectives that we initially developed.

Ms. Ostrovsky she like that as well, this will give us a start. We need to start.

Ms. Lozano she is wondering if we could have an objective that is similar to the adult in transition services resource objective that talks about supporting measures that allows adult's impacted by Autism receive quality services. She is wondering if that would be an objective through funding that the group would work on.

Ms. Kryk asks if Ms. Lozano can repeat what it sounded like.

Ms. Lozano states one of the objectives was the support measures that allows adults significantly impacted by Autism to receive quality services that is performed by a trained and skilled workforce. She is wondering if part of the group objective could be that we are taking supportive measures to ensure that people with Autism get the services they need throughout their lifespan.

Ms. Kryk it sounds like that is something that we are going for. Would we be drafting these objectives in writing so that it is clear and then approve them at a later time, or do we draft them right now word for word?

Ms. Ostrovsky thinks that for now we go with broad objectives then when the subcommittee meets, they can target their goals from that. She does not want the objective to be too narrow and limit the subcommittee, but she does like the language if we can work within that and let the subcommittee run with it.

Ms. Lozano should we make a motion to approve the three objectives that we spoke about, which are continuing to advocate for and gather data that will make clear the need for increased Medicaid reimbursement rates for ABA services and then need to streamline the billing and collecting process for the providers? We also mentioned continuing to work with ASDS staff to ensure that ATAP resources are being used efficiently to provide timely access to ABA and other evidence based interventions, and support measures for adults significantly impacted by Autism to receive quality services.

Ms. Kryk was that a motion, because that was a lot of language, we are looking for a second.

Ms. Lozano yes that was a lot of language she just wanted to make sure we had it in our minutes regarding the three objectives for Funding and Insurance. Yes, she is looking for a second.

Ms. Kryk she would make a motion to have those be the three objectives.

Ms. Ostrovsky seconds

Ms. Lozano motion passes. We have our three objectives for Funding and Insurance. The other subcommittee was Workforce Development. Do we have any ideas around those objectives?

Ms. Kryk has a few ideas. She once again looks at across the lifespan as that is an important piece. What she thinks for us is that we not only think of quantity but another part of that should be quality. Getting the appropriate training, as far as workforce what children and young adults receive for services, ABA would be a big one with developing that workforce, such as RBT's, BCBA's etc., school-age would fall within basically CCSD or Washoe County, looking at the school district, especially because it seems like there would be Medicaid reimbursement for ABA resources in school. So that may be crucial to make sure we are directing the quality of the staff providing that service in another setting. As far as related services, she is not sure if this is where we put our main focus on transitions for adult services at supportive living assistance, that Korri was mentioning. That might be a goal, to see how that workforce for that population gets developed.

Ms. Ostrovsky likes that, even expanding on quality and even looking at the summary on that. She pauses to look at the goals.

Ms. Lozano is looking at the most recent 2019 report there was an objective to increase the number of training programs for Autism therapy for providers in our state, this is the licensed BCBA's, BCaBA's, and RBT's.

Ms. Kryk it addresses the area of ABA, but she is not sure it is increasing the training programs. What would need to be the perspective now? She knows that from being in the field, retention is a big one, having people come and go. And sometimes people just leave the field for various reasons. So not just focusing on the number, but what those training programs look like or how we as a Commission can recommend ways to support retention of staff. That might be something the subcommittee touches on and gets information from the community or services providers about what other concerns there might be as far as training and workforce development.

Ms. Lozano asks what if we add we must increase the number of training programs and retention for Autism therapy providers. Do we want to specify school-age and the different groups?

Ms. Ostrovsky on the 5-year strategic plan our goal number three was to expand the number of quality professionals providing services to individuals with ASD. We didn't put an age on that intentionally, it was established for credentials like RBT's, develop recruitment and retention plans for skilled and sufficient workforce throughout our state. We have a tendency not to focus on the Rurals and we should and there are a lot of challenges. Then for treating options, we left this a little broader. Then we go into how we are going to proceed. She thinks because it is a new world, and with diagnosis going up, then when we are talking about retention some of that is pay and how people are worked, like going into homes, schools, what kind of benefits are they getting. For Ms. Ostrovsky, she sees this as looking at three objectives: 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3, then 3.4 needs to go away. That might encompass it. A strategic plan was put in place after we went into the community to get a lot of the information. She doesn't mind adding specifics, but she is wondering about that. Ms. Kryk can tell us if that encompasses it, are you able to find people and keep people, or is that something that we need to continue to address?

Ms. Kryk retention continues to be the issue in our field. It is just the nature of the services that we provide because of the dynamics. She is wondering if the way the goal is written, if we keep it that way maybe the subcommittee can be the ones to develop the smaller objectives with in it.

Ms. Ostrovsky does not want to tie anyone's hands, if we have some people with great ideas or resources and if we get too narrow then we are going to limit that subcommittee.

Ms. Kryk agrees with Ms. Ostrovsky on that.

Ms. Lozano do we have a motion to go with broader objectives for the Workforce Development?

Ms. Kryk is wondering if we are going to give a platform like we did for the Funding and Insurance one, then let the subcommittee develop more specifics under those possible three objectives. What would be the ones we are going with for Workforce Development?

Ms. Ostrovsky has excused herself from the meeting for a few moments, hopes that we still have a majority to continue the meeting.

Ms. Lozano spoke about the objectives; we must increase the number of training programs and then she added the work retention for Autism therapy in our state. So, do you want to go with that objective or make it broader?

Ms. Kryk is thinking that because she is not sure who will be focusing on this subcommittee, that we go with something broader and maybe add expanding then number of professionals. She is not sure how to organize it, because without a person heading this subcommittee it is a little trickier. So, increasing training programs and retention is very valid and it does fall under expanding the number of and the quality of professionals. So maybe combining the two together and using some of the same language would be a good start.

Ms. Rique Robb asks that another quorum be taken, because we may not have enough people on.

Ms. Kryk how many do we need to have for a quorum, we have five members?

Ms. Chalupnik, we have six member and we need to have 4 for a quorum. So, she proceeded with another roll call to check. Madam Chair, Julie Ostrovsky, Lenise Kryk. Currently we do not have a quorum, so we will not be making a motion at this time.

Ms. Ostrovsky is this still in the minutes so that we can read it back and vote on it at the next meeting?

Ms. Chalupnik yes it will be included in the minutes

Ms. Lozano do we move on to the next agenda item?

Ms. Chalupnik we are working to get clarification on if we do not have quorum.

Ms. Jennifer Frischmann you can proceed with the meeting; however, you cannot take any action.

Ms. Robb advises to please hold on for just a moment.

Ms. Lozano are we able to continue?

Ms. Robb we are actually on the phone with our DAG getting clarification. Typically, when you do not have quorum you are not able to deliberate or discuss anything on the agenda. Please hold on for another minute and we'll get back to you. When you are in the middle of a meeting there are a few things that you need to follow. Please keep in mind that when you have quorum and you're in the middle of a meeting, if any of the members need to leave the meeting at any time it must be announced. Especially when we are barely meeting quorum. You need to have the 4 out of 6. If you go to three members, then you are at 50% and no longer have a quorum. Julie Ostrovsky did it right in announcing she had to step away for a moment, but we may have lost Dr. Capurro and then neither of the Korri's/Cori's were on the call. We shouldn't have to check at the meeting, but until everyone gets up to speed on OML

and the guidelines we will have to check. She asked to see if anyone had questions about OML before she has Abbie do roll call.

Ms. Kryk are we able to do Public Comment or anything at all?

Ms. Robb the only thing you can do is Public Comment, but you cannot comment on that comment. You can take Public Comment. The challenge is that if you were to continue a meeting just as if you were emailing, it is considered deliberating. That is why it is important to maintain quorum, so that when we have these discussions and you're actually deliberating or conducting Commission business, and were to put it on the minutes and then come back to vote on it. You have already deliberated on it and that would be outside of the OML. You can take Public Comment because you're not discussing the comment just hearing the comment.

Ms. Kryk thank you for the clarification Rique. She just wanted to see if there are people on the call that want to make public comment they can .

Ms. Robb turning it back to Abbie for roll call. Need to decide if we can proceed or not. If you have quorum you can proceed if not you need to decide if we are tabling, the rest of the agenda and then closing the meeting.

Ms. Chalupnik lets attempt another roll call, Ms. Lozano - present, Dr. Capurro – not present, Ms. Ostrovsky - present, Ms. Ward – not present, Ms. Kryk – present, Dr. More – not present. We do not have quorum at this time. Madam Chair will make the decision on how to proceed.

Ms. Lozano would like to move forward with Public Comment.

Public Comment

Ms. Kryk wanted to get this information into Public Comment, we as a Commission do not have a date scheduled until May 24th (should have been June 24th) and since it's one of the agenda items to confirm dates about future Commission meetings. Can someone advise how we are going to put that information out there? She thinks that waiting until the June 24th meeting is too long since we had to cut this meeting short.

Ms. Gwen Wiggins when we are talking about Workforce and Development, it was specific to ABA providers, but the context being for Autism services we also need to think about workforce development for Neuropsychologists and Developmental Pediatricians who are very scarce and that is a huge blocked access to look at.

Ms. Ostrovsky, Gwen it is lovely to hear your voice.

Ms. Jennifer Thomas wants to know if we have finalized how we are going about the meeting process for getting members. She was on the Adult Services subcommittee during the last legislative cycle and didn't know if she missed that in the call.

Ms. Chalupnik sorry to interrupt but can everyone mute their phones? We are hearing a lot of feedback.

Ms. Hutchinson wanted to make note that her last day with Nevada Medicaid is going to be June 5th. She will be leaving the Division, but she will communicate with the Commission who can take over for her.

Ms. Samantha Jayme with ATAP, wanted to do her presentation, so she is putting it on Public Comment. The ABA board met yesterday, and they made a statement regarding telehealth with one on one RBT services. Medicaid also released a statement stating as well for the allowance for the one on one code. ATAP will also be sending out a memo to allow telehealth for one on one telehealth for RBT services, we will also make sure that it is sent out through the listserv so that everyone sees it.

Adjournment

Ms. Lozano thank you everyone for your participation, time, and comment she has to adjourn the meeting early because we do not have a quorum. Adjourned the meeting at 1:07 pm.