

# Appendix E

Employment Recommendation A. 3.

Informed Choice Guidelines

## **DDD Ad Hoc Committee on Employment**

### **Sub-Committee on Informed Choice**

#### **Final Report**

**June 2, 2005**

Sub-Committee Membership: Bill Baesman (Arc of Colorado), Bruce Cline (Colorado Developmental Disabilities Council), Mike Davis (Colorado Division for Developmental Disabilities), Karen Farrington (Colorado Division of Vocational Rehabilitation), David Hunter (Self-advocate), Kristi Kane (Arkansas Valley Community Centered Board), Bob Lawhead, Sub-Committee Chair (Colorado Association for Persons in Supported Employment)

A definition of “Informed Choice” developed by the Sub-committee on February 4, 2005, re-analyzed by the Sub-Committee during their May 18, 2005 meeting and then revised slightly through Sub-Committee e-mail input the week of May 23, 2005. The final approved version is as follows:

“Informed choice requires that the person making a choice has an environment supportive of choice-making. That environment must include adequate information about a wide variety of options, including sufficient individualized experience as is necessary for the person to develop preferences. Information must be provided in a manner that reflects the person’s ability to understand and communicate. Additionally, that environment should include access to nonjudgmental advice and support to assist the person to analyze the information, including consideration of positive and negative consequences.”

The Sub-Committee agreed that an accompanying objective within the scope of our mission was to develop process guidance, that is, a process that would be used to implement the above definition. Draft process language was presented on May 18, 2005, and was re-worked by the Sub-Committee during that meeting. Committee members made a number of revision suggestions via e-mail during the week of May 23<sup>rd</sup>, resulting in the following:

“Informed choice implementation requires that some level of actual experience with multiple options, including community integrated options, be provided within any decision area. For people who have difficulty communicating their choices, there is an expectation that another person, able to provide nonjudgmental advice and support through nontraditional and/or creative communication, be present. Examples of actual experience would include visiting available residential locations, interviewing multiple service providers, or experiencing different day service opportunities. These experiences and the person’s reaction to these experiences must be reviewed and documented to assure the individual has an opportunity to make an informed decision.”

The Sub-Committee agreed that the informed choice definition and process guidance should be incorporated within the DDD Rules. This would include insertion of the above definition within Rule 16.120 – Definitions, and the above process guidance within Rule 16.440 – Individualized Plan (IP). Also reference to utilization of informed choice should be inserted within Rule 16.612 – Support Services General Provisions (section A.), 16.622 – Comprehensive Habilitation Services and Supports Description and General Provisions (section B.3.), and 16.624 – Individual Residential Services and Supports (IRSS) Specifications (section a.3.b.). Language would state, “A process for assuring informed choice consistent with 16.120 and 16.440 must be used to determine specific services and supports.”

This represents our final recommendation to the full DDD Ad Hoc Committee on Employment and Community Participation.