

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

Preparation Cont.

- 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 consortiums 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

St. Louis region




Permanency Cont.

- 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




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



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 meet the performance standard.

Meeting Performance Benchmarks*



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**