

COLLABORATIVE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM - EXECUTIVE REPORT SUMMARY SFY 2006-2007 (Sect. 24 – 1.9 – 103)

This document provides a two-year summary of the Collaborative Management Program reports required in statute.

Item Reported	SFY 2005-2006	SFY 2006-2007
<p>a) The number of children and families served through the local-level individualized service and support teams and the outcomes of the services provided, including a description of any reduction in duplication or fragmentation of services provided and a description of any significant improvement in outcomes for children and families</p>	<p>Six counties: <u>4752 children served</u></p> <p>General reduction in number of children served in residential and DYC settings, increase in children served in home communities, increase in combined staffing of referrals</p>	<p>Ten counties: <u>9557 children served.</u></p> <p>Integrated (reducing duplicative) staffings of children referred for alternative care settings; reducing fragmentation with substance abuse providers; reducing referrals to and length of stay in high level institutional placements; reducing recidivism and increasing successful terminations of probation; increasing number of children remaining at home after discharge from out of home care settings; improved school attendance and reduction in truancy filings; increase in frequency of face to face visits between caseworkers and children in out of home care settings; increase in successful probation terminations; increase in outcome based services; moving away from funding “programs”, increase in funding outcome based services.</p>

Item Reported	SFY 2005-2006	SFY 2006-2007
<p>b) A description of estimated costs of implementing the collaborative management approach and any estimated cost-shifting or cost-savings that may have occurred by collaboratively managing the multi-agency services provided through the individualized service and support teams;</p>	<p>The six counties active for the first fiscal year report implementation costs in excess of \$600,000.</p>	<p>The ten active counties estimate cumulative implementation costs to be approximately in excess of \$2,000,000. Cost savings across the local and state level participating agencies are difficult to ascertain due to different accounting procedures, assorted diverse categorical funding streams, and data systems that do not interact in a way that permits uniform measurement.</p>
<p>c) An accounting of moneys that were reinvested in additional services provided to children or families who would benefit from integrated multi-agency services due to cost-savings that may have resulted or due to meeting or exceeding performance measures specified by the department of human services and elements of collaborative management established by rule of the state board;</p>	<p>The first year is a learning year for counties. Cost savings have been identified in the reduction in the number of children and youth placed into residential settings. Cost savings across the participating agencies are difficult to ascertain due to different accounting procedures, assorted categorical funding streams as well as data systems that do not interact in a way that permits uniform measurement.</p>	<p>The counties estimate approximately \$2,000,000 in moneys that were reinvested in additional services. Reinvestment/cost savings across the participating agencies are difficult to ascertain due to different accounting procedures, assorted categorical funding streams as well as data systems that do not interact in a way that permits uniform measurement.</p>

Item Reported	SFY 2005-2006	SFY 2006-2007
<p>d) A description of any identified barriers to the ability of the state and county to provide effective services to persons who received multi-agency services; and</p>	<p>Individual agency data systems that cannot “talk” to each other, lack of uniform juvenile information sharing , lack of overall program evaluation capacity, inadequate understanding of roles and responsibilities for participating agencies, low level of family participation at governance and operational levels, lack of unitary definition of “collaborative”.</p>	<p>Individual agency data systems that cannot “talk” to each other; lack of overall cross system program evaluation capacity. Please see collaborative reports for detail of this area.on”.</p>
<p>e) Any other information relevant to improving the delivery of services to persons who would benefit from multi-agency services.</p>	<p>Cross agency effort to address barriers noted in (d).</p>	<p>Please see collaborative reports for detail of this area.</p>