The Road to Performance Based Case Management Contracts

Missouri’s Experience

September, 2011
Presenters

- LeAnn Haslag, MSW, LCSW
- Dr. Jerrie Jacobs-Kenner, Chief Executive Officer
  Jkenner@ma-cf.org
  (P) 573-338-5258    (F) 573-632-2761
- Ryan Dowis, Chief Operating Officer/Vice President
  ryan.dowis@cornerstonesofcare.org
  (P) 816-508-6201    (F) 816-508-1750

Contact information for Missouri Children’s Division:
Susan Savage, MSW
Susan.K.Savage@dss.mo.gov
(P) 573- 751-2502    (F) 573-526-3971
Agenda

• History of public/private partnership
• Preparation for Awards
• Model Overview
• Unique Characteristics
• Cost/Benefits/Outcomes
• Partnership/Quality Assurance
History of Partnership

• Historically relied on private sector to deliver services
  – Mental health and residential treatment
• 1988- adoption recruitment/assessment
  – Limited adoption case mngt included
• 1994- foster recruitment/assessments
  – Case mngt services included
Partnership History Cont.

• 1997- Foster care case management became stand alone contract
• 2000- Case mngt contract re-bid
  – Significant growth of case mngt in private sector
  – Emphasis on permanency-adoption case mngt added
Preparation for PBC

• Literature Review (2002)
  – 9 states
• Visits to other states
  – Illinois & Kansas
• Consultation with Illinois (2 yrs)
• Stakeholder involvement
• Staff preparation
• Stakeholder Involvement
  – Statewide meetings
    • Began in February, 2003
  – Regional meetings
    • Began in January, 2004
    - St. Louis, Kansas City, Springfield
  – Sub-committees
    • Provider/personnel qualifications (February 2004)
    • Outcomes (March, April & June 2004)
    • Enrollment issues (April 2004)
  – Local meetings
Preparation Cont.

• Staff preparation
  – CD staff with direct involvement
    • Adoption Specialists
    • Residential Care Screening Team
  – Oversight Specialists
    • Training to prepare for new role
    • Statewide/regional meetings on-going since 2005
    • Approx one specialist per 70 cases until recent budget cuts
Lessons Learned

• Community stakeholders must be present at local meetings to prepare for implementation.
  – Courts

• All staff need information regarding PBC.
  – Case transfers/loss

• Oversight specialists have on-going training needs.
  – Movement of case carrying staff to a contract oversight role is a difficult transition requiring specialized skills.
Awards

• Performance based foster and adoption case mngt contracts awarded 6/1/05
  – Competitive bid
    • Supervision and QA plans heavily weighted
    • Accreditation required within 2 yrs
      – Caseloads etc at COA accreditation standards
  – Services did not begin until 9/1/05
    • Start up funding
  – 7 provider consortiums
Awards

• 2nd PBC awarded to the initial seven consortia effective 8/11/08
  – 3 additional contracts were awarded 9/1/08
    • 12 counties in the central, south central and southwestern portions of the state
  – Foster care population served through the private sector has varied from 28%-38%
Awards

• St. Louis region
  – 4 counties; Base caseload=1,241

• Kansas City region
  – 4 counties; Base caseload=531

• Springfield region
  – 6 counties; Base caseload=465

• Central, South Central, Southwest regions
  – 12 counties; Base caseload=315
Model Overview

• Includes all case management duties:
  – Assessment
  – Case planning
  – Placement planning
  – Service planning
  – Permanency planning
  – Resource development
Overview Cont.

• Reward/Risk
  – Paid for base caseload
    • All inclusive case rate
      – Flexibility
      – Continuum of care
  – Monthly referrals to replace those expected to move to permanency, which are not paid for
  – Base caseload is not rebuilt until the end of the contract year
  – Re-entries into care within 12 months served for free
Lessons Learned

• Time for implementation needs to be considered as PBC expands geographically.
• Adoption services require specialized training.
• Annual rebuilds and re-bids disrupts case mngt
  – At rebid cases will be replaced on a one-for-one basis
• Post permanency work needs to be considered in design.
• Financial risk needs to be monitored on-going.
  – Re-entries into care
Unique Characteristics

• Financial
  – Actuary Study

• Evaluation
  – Equalization of caseloads
    • Age, race, sex, length of time in care, placement type
  – Pilots
    • Provides opportunity to explain conditions necessary to produce outcomes
    • Opportunity for early detection of problems w/ design
Unique Characteristics Cont.

• Matched criteria for pilots
  – Type of caseload served
  – Caseload size
  – Supervisory ratios
  – Staff Development
  – Random assignment/replacement cases

• Differences
  – Education/experience
  – Salaries
  – Funding for special expenses and purchased services
  – Flexibility in type of service purchased
  – Counties served
Lessons Learned

• The actuary needs to understand the business they are setting the rates for.
  – Labor intensive

• The actuary may consider some information proprietary.
Lessons Learned Cont.

• Equalization is difficult to achieve and maintain.
  – Siblings
  – Movement of cases
  – Increased privatization as entries into care decrease
    • Majority of cases privatized in St. Louis City
      – Majority of new cases assigned to contractors
Lessons Learned Cont.

- Pilots are difficult to establish/maintain.
  - Staff buy in (co-workers with higher loads)
  - Worker turnover
  - Matched criteria
    - Area served
      - Region vs county
      - Out of county placements (ex. Residential)
    - Adoption services
- Comparisons are helpful & harmful.
Cost

• Must be evaluated in terms of cost effectiveness

• Administration is difficult to compare
  – Economies of scale
    • Costs for state spread across multiple programs and thousands of employees
    • Contractors focused on one program and often times less than 100 employees
Benefits

• Legislative Advocacy/Shared responsibility
  – Multiple systems to address complex issues
  – Share what works

• Accreditation/Lower caseloads
  – Improved services to children

• Healthy competition
  – Improved accountability for public and private

• Improved outcomes for children
Permanency Outcome

• % of children moving to permanency within 12 months

• Different targets for each region based on historical data
  – Local variables impact performance
    • Courts ultimately decide when permanency is achieved
    • Local initiatives
St. Louis region

![Bar chart showing percentage changes in Yr 1, Yr 2, Yr 3, and Yr 4 for the St. Louis region.](image-url)
• None of the contractors met performance standards in Years 1, 2, and 3
  – Performance standard was not weighted to consider % of cases from each county
    • Majority of cases come from the lowest performing county.

• Two of the three contractors met standard in Year 4
Kansas City region

Kansas City region

Yr 1  Yr 2  Yr 3  Yr 4

Contractors
Pilot

26
Permanency Cont.

• Contractors & pilot exceeded target in Years 1, 2 and 3
  – Performance standard was not weighted to consider a unique, sub-set of their population which has higher permanency rates
• Contractors met target in Year 4 but pilot did not
• Overall performance has declined.
  – Children under supervision only has declined
Springfield region

Springfield region

Yr 1  Yr 2  Yr 3  Yr 4

Contractors
Pilot
Permanency Cont.

• Springfield Pilot
  – Permanency rate declined by 12% from Year 2 to Year 3
  – Significant worker turnover during the same time period
    • Caseloads went above 15 several months in a row
• Performance of contractors has continued to increase
Re-entries into Care

- % of children re-entering care within 12 months of previous exit
  - As number of children served and amount of time for re-entries into care increases performance expected to decline
    - Pattern seen from Year 1 to Year 2; All but one of the pilot groups still met target
    - All met the target in Years 3 & 4
Stability

• % of children with 2 or fewer moves
  • Target based on total number of moves for a population, not moves for the year
  • Performance in Year 1 artificially inflated
  • Outcomes show an overall decrease in performance, declining each year as expected
  • With rebid and expansion, pattern would repeat so measure has been removed
Safety

• % of children who were not abused/neglected by alternative caregiver
  • Trend difficult to evaluate as 3 contractors and 1 pilot achieved 100% in Year 1
  • In Year 3 all contractors and pilots met the performance expectation
  • In Year 4 one contractor did not met the performance standard.
Meeting Performance Benchmarks

- Permanency:
  - Year 1: 50%
  - Year 2: 57%
  - Year 3: 57%
  - Year 4: 86%
  - Year 5: 86%

- Safety:
  - Year 1: 83%
  - Year 2: 71%
  - Year 3: 86%
  - Year 4: 86%
  - Year 5: 100%

- Re-Entry:
  - Year 1: 100%
  - Year 2: 100%
  - Year 3: 100%
  - Year 4: 100%
  - Year 5: 71%
Overall Contracted Performance

• Permanency has continued to improve.
• Two contractors did not meet the re-entry target in Year 5.
  – Target increased
• Performance on safety declined slightly in Year 4 and Year 5.
  – All but the smallest contractor met the standard.
  – Target increased
Lessons Learned

• Calculation of outcomes in child welfare arena is complicated.
  – Cases transfer during a reporting period
  – Performance targets are difficult to establish
  – Longitudinal data is needed to clearly identify trends
  – Local variables can impact outcomes
  – SACWIS conversion can delay outcome data
Missouri’s Partnership

• Local
  – CQI; initially problem resolution focused

• Regional
  – CQI; now includes QA specialists

• State
  – Program Manager; time set aside for best practice discussion
  – CEO
Partnership Cont.

• Joint QA
  • Data/reports
    – Worker visits
  • Case reviews
    – Peer Record Reviews
  • QA Summits
    – Sharing tools
• Practice Summits
  – Sharing best practice
• CFSR/PIP
Lessons Learned

• Problem resolution needs to begin at local level.
• QA activities need to be joined to have the greatest impact.
• COLLABORATION=PARTNERSHIP