

COLLABORATIVE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM - EXECUTIVE REPORT SUMMARY SFY 2007-2008 (Sect. 24 – 1.9 – 103)

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

| Item Reported | SFY 2006-2007 | SFY 2007-2008 |
|---|--|--|
| <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>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> | <p>Seventeen counties: <u>10,290 children served</u></p> <p>Integrated staffings, increase in use of System of Care models, reducing length of stay in institutional settings, improved school attendance and reduction in truanancies, increase in successful probation terminations and reduction in recidivism, increased child and family involvement in case planning, reduction in use of inpatient services, increase in measured level of functioning, reduction in substance abuse, reduction in unplanned moves in placement, increase in number of children remaining at home after service delivery completed, further development and expansion of outcome based services, reported improvement in interagency collaborative processes.</p> |

| Item Reported | SFY 2006-2007 | SFY 2007-2008 |
|--|--|--|
| <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 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>The seventeen counties estimate cumulative implementation costs to be approximately \$2,900,000. Cost savings across the local and state level agencies continues to be difficult to ascertain due to different accounting procedures, diverse categorical funding streams, and inability of data systems to interact in a way that permits uniform measurement. One county is estimating a recapture of school district per pupil operating revenues (PPOR) of \$400,000. This will be further evaluated in the upcoming year.</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 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> | <p>The counties estimate approximately \$5,000,000 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 2006-2007 | SFY 2007-2008 |
|--|---|---|
| <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 overall cross system program evaluation capacity. Please see collaborative reports for detail of this area.</p> | <p>Cross systems information sharing, multiplicity of assessments, integration of service information, paucity of certain services (Medicaid providers and sex offender) in rural areas, education of mid-level and line staff in collaborative management/System of Care principles, family engagement at governance and operational levels, engagement of partners, staff turnover.</p> |
| <p>e) Any other information relevant to improving the delivery of services to persons who would benefit from multi-agency services.</p> | <p>Please see collaborative reports for detail of this area.</p> | <p>Co-location of integrated teams shows positive outcomes, pilot implementation of data warehouse (SMART-PHR in El Paso) to track data across systems, family support partner program, family options model (Nothing About Me Without Me) and CORE services placed at disposal of governance group, outcomes research guiding practice (Larimer), High Fidelity Wraparound reducing institutional care, single entry point and single service plan, integration of TANF/CW service approach, recapturing PPOR funds, pilot development of common assessment form (Weld CANS), engagement of family members at governance and operational levels, development of high quality collaborative processes, implementation of state-wide Program evaluation.</p> |