Quality Improvement Center on the Privatization of Child Welfare

Improving Outcomes for Children in Out-Of-Home Care Through Performance-Based Contracting and Enhanced Quality Assurance Processes
Historical Context

• 1996 – Florida Legislature passes legislation to begin privatization of child welfare services for the Department of Children and Families (DCF)
• 2003 – Kids Central awarded transition contract to provide child welfare services in the DCF District 13 five-county area (Lake, Marion, Hernando, Citrus, and Sumter Counties)
• 2004 – Kids Central signs “service contract” to serve as the lead community-based care agency in District 13 and becomes responsible for the provision of protective, foster care and adoption services for at-risk children and families identified by Child Protective Investigators in the District
• 2005 – Kids Central serving more than 4200 children and their families
• December, 2005 – Kids Central transitions from a provider-based board to a community-based board of directors
• 2006 – Kids Central Implements Initial Performance-Based Contract for Case Management Services with Case Management Agencies (CMAs)
Project Focus

To demonstrate the affect of:

– the use of an inclusive and comprehensive planning process in the development of a performance-based contract for case management services which includes performance incentives and disincentives; and

– the enhancement and alignment of the quality assurance process with the performance-based contract expectations on child welfare outcomes.
Joint Public Private Partnership

• Kids Central, Inc.
  – Lead Community-Based Care Agency District 13

• Department of Children & Families, District 13

• Jean K. Elder & Associates
  – Local Evaluator
Target Population and Scope

• Targeted population
  – Children in out-of-home care

• Scope of performance-based contract to be developed includes:
  – Case management services provided by CMAs under contract to Kids Central in District 13
    • Harbor Behavioral Health Institute (Citrus & Hernando)
    • Lifestream Behavioral Center (Lake)
    • Camelot Community Care (Marion)
    • The Centers (Marion)
    • Children’s Home Society of Florida (Sumter)
Project Logic Model

Logic Model: Performance Based Contracting and Quality Assurance Systems Demonstration Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Short Term Outcomes</th>
<th>Medium Term Outcomes</th>
<th>Long Term Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Orientation to Project</td>
<td>Initiate Dialog Related to Outcomes with Providers</td>
<td>Staff Engagement</td>
<td>Services Driven by Defined &amp; Measurable and Meaningful Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training of Partner Organizations and Agency Staff</td>
<td>Staff Awareness</td>
<td>Outcome Measures Incorporated into Contracts</td>
<td>Staff Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Meetings</td>
<td>Improved Understanding of Promising Practices</td>
<td>Refined Outcome Measures Incorporated into QA Process</td>
<td>Contractors Held to Measurable Standards and Outcome Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify and Clarify Project Initiatives and Outcome Expectations</td>
<td>Synthesis of Research Data and Development of Expectations</td>
<td>Practice Revisions</td>
<td>Improved Cost Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QIC Meetings</td>
<td>Define &amp; Measurable and Meaningful Contract Measurements Established</td>
<td>Appropriate service referrals</td>
<td>Systematic Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify Trends</td>
<td>Use of less restrictive placements</td>
<td>Increased reunification</td>
<td>Decreased time to permanency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop Outcome Measurements</td>
<td>Reduced case loads</td>
<td>Increased kinship placements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporate Measurements into Outcome Based Contracts</td>
<td>Appropriate use of funds</td>
<td>Improved client satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create Evaluation Tools and Processes</td>
<td>Assess service needs and referrals through Utilization Management</td>
<td>Tools to Address Safety Permanency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>Establish Research Model for Evaluation of Project Initiatives</td>
<td>Outcomes and Successful Practices Documented and Shared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison of Experimental Group Data to Control Group Data</td>
<td>Identify and Refine Approach to Effective Practice Revisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome Evaluation and Report Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Key Project Implementation Dates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2007</td>
<td>Formation of the project intervention and control groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February – May 2007</td>
<td>Performance-based contract outcome measures developed through Intervention Group Work that includes Case Management Agency (CMA), Kids Central and DCF District 13 Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop local and cross-site evaluation process and begin implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2007</td>
<td>Formation of Local Project Advisory Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2007</td>
<td>Finalize contract outcome measures and create contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initiate development of quality assurance process which integrates new outcome measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2007</td>
<td>Performance-based contracts in place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Based Contract Outcome Planning Group (Intervention Group)

- Planning group includes:
  - Contract Case Management Agencies (CMAs)
  - District 13 staff (administrative and legal)
  - Kids Central staff (administrative, contract, and QA)
- Neutral facilitator utilized to allow all parties the opportunity to provide input in an inclusive collaborative manner
- Local evaluators present to document process and procedures
- Materials developed and distributed
- Initial meetings held January 16 & February 6, 2007
- Next 4 meetings scheduled
  - February 27, 2007
  - March 13, 2007
  - March 20, 2007
  - April 10, 2007
Establishment of the Local Project Advisory Council

• Potential advisory council members identified
  – Includes (at minimum):
    • Court representation
    • Community representation
    • Legislative representation
    • Consumers
    • State Agency
    • Kids Central Board of Directors
    • Florida Coalition for Children

• Introduction letter and invitation to participate in the Local Project Advisory Council

• Introductory meeting set for March 15, 2007
Anticipated Outcomes of the Performance-Based Contracting and QA System Initiative
Short Term Project Outcomes

- Staff awareness and participation
- Understanding of performance based measurements and contracts
- Performance based measurements and outcomes reviewed and redeveloped
Intermediate Term Project Outcomes

• Staff engagement

• Incorporation of performance-based measurements into contracts with CMAs

• Revise Kids Central quality assurance process to reflect revised outcome measurements

• Changes to practice
Long Term Project Outcomes

• Staff understanding and acceptance
• Improved cost effectiveness
• Tools and strategies to improve services
• Improved outcomes for children and families
Current Kids Central Performance Measures

• Tier 1 - Kids Central contract with the State of Florida
  – The DCF Contract Performance Report
• Tier 2 – Kids Central contract with CMAs
  – CBC Report Card
  – FY 2006 – 2007 Incentive Measure Workbook
  – Vacancy – Case Load Report
Current Kids Central Contract Linkages between Performance and Incentives/Disincentives

• Incentive
  – $1,000.00 per measure up to $5,000.00 per month or $60,000.00 per year

• Disincentive
  – Financial penalty for late submission of invoice
  – No outcome performance disincentive is built into the current Kids Central contract process
    • In the event providers do not meet performance objectives they may be placed on a Performance Improvement Plan
    • If the Performance Improvement Plan is not successful, the contract may be terminated by Kids Central
Key Local Project Evaluation Concept Questions

• Does establishing a shared vision that drives practice result in improved outcomes for children and families?

• To what extent does establishing the “shared vision” require inclusive planning and contract negotiations?
  – What are the most salient activities to achieving this objective?
  – Who are the critical stakeholders and customers and how can they best become engaged in this process?
  – How does the inclusive planning and negotiation process improve stakeholder buy-in and contract performance?

• To what extent does a formalized contract monitoring and evaluation process affect contract outcomes?
  – What are the critical activities in a formalized contract monitoring and evaluation process?

• What are the critical activities that promote recognition, operational implementation and usage of evidence based practices?
  – Are these evidence based practices cost effective?
  – Do these activities improve outcomes?
Local Project Process Evaluation

• Assessment of:
  – What change occurred,
  – How change happened,
  – To what degree changes were achieved,
  – Where changes were achieved, and
  – Who participated in the change process
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>What will be measured</th>
<th>Method(s)</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Participant engagement       | Participant expectations (pre-discussion)   | Interview / focus group and / or survey | • Determine participants expectations of modification to contract and associated outcome expectations  
• Identify if they feel that modifications to contracts will improve performance outcomes  
• Ascertain their level of understanding related to the overall process (what will happen, how and when will it happen) |
| Participant impressions (post-discussion) | Interview / focus group and/or survey | • Find out if participants feel that positive change occurred  
• Determine if they feel that their voice was heard throughout the process and their input was taken seriously  
• Identify what was done correctly and what could be done differently; how can the process be improved, did problems arise, what was done to remediate issues |
| Participant impressions (implantation) | Interview / focus group and/or survey | • Ascertain whether the process outcome meet participant’s expectations  
• Obtain feedback on participants impression of the process, information distribution, and transfer of knowledge  
• Determine if participants feel that the implementation of changes to contracts and QA process is having a positive impact on outcomes  
• Obtain feedback as to whether various aspects of the project should be approached differently or changes |
| Program environment          | Relationship between CBC (Kids Central and CMAs) | Interview and observations | • Provide documentation related to overall relationship and cooperation between agencies, identify the various environmental factors and identify their potential or actual influence on the PB Contracting process  
• Maintain historical record of happenings – identify who initiated change, what discussion occurred surrounding potential changes, document how concurrence was reached  
• Develop a comprehensive description of the process, methodologies and implementation plan used throughout the project  
• Determine impact of external influence or changes outside the process |
|                             | Process documentation                        | Collect, compile and maintain documentation related meeting agendas, attendees, minutes, planning processes outcomes |  
• Maintain historical record of happenings – identify who initiated change, what discussion occurred surrounding potential changes, document how concurrence was reached  
• Develop a comprehensive description of the process, methodologies and implementation plan used throughout the project  
• Determine impact of external influence or changes outside the process |
|                             | Changes to service modalities                | Documentation of changes to service provision models and |  
• Maintain historical record of happenings – identify who initiated change, what discussion occurred surrounding potential changes, document how concurrence was reached  
• Develop a comprehensive description of the process, methodologies and implementation plan used throughout the project  
• Determine impact of external influence or changes outside the process |
Local Project Outcome Evaluation

- **Assessment of:**
  - Were outcomes affected,
  - Were the expected outcomes achieved,
  - Did the intervention cause the observed change,
  - Were revised outcome expectations reasonable and achievable
  - Did incentives / disincentives provide appropriate motivation to improving outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>What will be measured</th>
<th>Method(s)</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome data (Digital Dashboard)</td>
<td>Pre / Post comparison of State-mandated outcome measurements</td>
<td>Data comparison</td>
<td>• Determine if mandated outcomes are being achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised contract measures</td>
<td>Ability of providers (CMAs) to meet objectives over time</td>
<td>Data collection, analysis and comparison</td>
<td>• Determine if outcome expectations are reasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison of State-mandated outcomes across the experimental and control group</td>
<td>Data comparison</td>
<td>• Conclude whether incentives / disincentives appropriately motivate and lead to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-site comparison</td>
<td>Comparison of State-mandated outcomes across the experimental and control group</td>
<td>Data comparison</td>
<td>• Determine if change occurs at a different rate within the experimental group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Near-Term Evaluation Tasks and Timeframe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Proposed Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research and develop evaluation tasks and develop process document:</td>
<td>1/1/07 – 1/31/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create forms, questionnaires, and data collection processes</td>
<td>1/31/07 – 2/28/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-process expectation interviews with CMA lead staff persons (intervention group):</td>
<td>1/25/07 – 2/15/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with QIC PCW staff to validate local evaluation process and ensure its coordination with the cross-site evaluation</td>
<td>1/31/07 – 2/28/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with control group to discuss process and data access</td>
<td>By: 2/20/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend and document all performance-based contract outcome planning group meetings</td>
<td>1/13/07 – 5/31/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect historical outcome data from both the intervention group and control group. Begin building data library of outcome measurements for continuing evaluation process</td>
<td>2/1/07 – 2/28/07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>