



**New Jersey State Legislature
Office of Legislative Services
Office of the State Auditor**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

**DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES
DIVISION OF DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES
OLMSTEAD PLACEMENTS FROM NORTH JERSEY AND WOODBRIDGE
DEVELOPMENTAL CENTERS
July 1, 2011 to October 31, 2015**

We found the DDD completed the required procedures for relocating residents from the North Jersey and Woodbridge Developmental Centers into community-based homes per the Olmstead decision. We also determined the division monitored these clients in accordance with their policies after placement; however, we noted required visits were not always timely and recurring issues with client care or with provider services were not always resolved timely, as well as other matters.

AUDIT HIGHLIGHTS

We selected 40 clients (20 from Woodbridge and 20 from North Jersey) of the 204 clients that were placed in the community from the Woodbridge and North Jersey Developmental Centers as of November 10, 2014 and reviewed their case files. Our review focused on prior to placement activities and the monitoring of the clients and provider agencies by DDD personnel after placement. In addition, we reviewed clients' records to determine if there were recurring issues with client care or provider services.

- We found that all required case manager visits were conducted; however there were 29 client visits that were between 14 to 28 days late.
- We found 25 client records had recurring deficiencies documented that were not resolved in a timely manner. In these cases, the case managers had reported the same type of issue several times because the provider had not taken corrective action. The recurring deficiencies included the following: missing or broken durable medical equipment; lack of activities outside the home; providers not satisfying procedural and contractual documentation obligations to the division; missed doctor visits; group homes with provider staffing issues; medication administration and documentation issues; financial issues; client-specific dietary issues; and a lack of good client hygiene. Four examples are cited in the report.
- We found pre-placement meetings occurred more than 60 days prior to the placement of 17 of the 40 clients from the sample. For 15 of those 17 clients, the pre-placement meeting took place 100 days or more prior to the placement. While it is understandable that dates change, we found no evidence in the case records that suggested that the clients' needs were re-evaluated to ensure that they remained the same.

AUDITEE RESPONSE

The department generally concurs with our findings and recommendations.

For the complete audit report or to print this Executive Summary, click [here](#).