

# **Governor's Nonprofit Cabinet on Health and Human Services**

**January 11, 2018**

# Team 1 Update

## Human Resources | Collaboration and Technical Assistance

### Co-Chairs:

Cheryl Cepelak, Deputy Commissioner, Department of Correction

Jeannette Archer-Simons, Executive Director, The Open Door Shelter, Inc.

# Work Group Charges

- ▶ Strategies for recruitment, training, retention and career advancement
- ▶ Foundational components for effective collaborations
- ▶ Access to DECD capital and technical assistance
- ▶ Access to process improvement and technical assistance

# Guiding Principles

- ▶ Provide concrete deliverables that are no / low cost
- ▶ Build partnerships across sectors
- ▶ Increase communication and awareness across sectors

# Resources / Partnerships

- ▶ State Agencies
- ▶ Nonprofits
- ▶ Foundations
- ▶ Lyceum
- ▶ Chrysalis Center



# Team 1 – Recommendation 1

- ▶ Host a conference at a low/no cost designed to increase knowledge of Connecticut resources which will enhance nonprofit performance.
  - Target date: April 13<sup>th</sup> 9–3:30PM
  - Location to be confirmed:
    - DOC Academy in Cheshire
    - Or Rentschler in East Hartford
  - No cost if location and meal are sponsored
  - Keynote Speaker (proposed)

# Team 1 – Recommendation 1

- ▶ Conference Topics (proposed):
  - Using Data to Improve Performance and Reporting
  - Financial Resources to Support Nonprofit Service Development Initiatives
    - Department of Economic and Community Development
  - Leveraging the Connecticut Education System, a discussion of outreach to recruit interns and pilot of an empty seat program
    - Connecticut State Colleges and Universities and The Alliance

# Team 1 – Recommendation 1

- ▶ Conference Topics (proposed):
  - Using CORE/Enterprise Management Systems  
TBD
  - LEAN Partnerships  
OPM
  - TEAM #2 Presents

Will include resource area with information tables from organizations that may offer opportunities to learn/collaborate/improve performance

# Team 1 – Recommendation 2

Leverage partnerships with Connecticut Colleges and Universities to increase capabilities of organizations using unused classroom seats and internship initiatives

- ▶ Create a pilot project for an empty seat program with Connecticut Colleges and Universities
- ▶ Create tools for organizations to communicate internship opportunities that result in effective nonprofit/education collaboration

# Communication Recommendation

- ▶ Develop a list of resources which include a link to additional information from the work that has been completed by the two work groups. Examples include the Data Academy resources for training or data and the DECD Small Business Express Program.
- ▶ Draft a sentence or two describing the resource and value to nonprofits.
- ▶ Put on slides for the public presentation.

# Communication Recommendation

- ▶ Invite program officers in each State Department to share resources with their contractors
- ▶ Determine if there is a master “email list” that could be used to share links to resources
- ▶ Announce results and provide links in press release

# Communication Recommendation

- ▶ Consider team presentations on the joint work of state agencies and nonprofits to legislators (May require permissions)
- ▶ Provide simple information up to 4 times a year on resources.

# Team 1 Summary

## Expected Results:

- ▶ Develop opportunities for educational partnerships that advance organizations
- ▶ Increase awareness of resources and incentives for nonprofits from DECD and other CT agencies
- ▶ Create opportunities for accessing data which add value and effectiveness
- ▶ Advance understanding of resources from Connecticut Colleges and Universities and leverage internship learning programs

# Human Resources, Collaboration and Technical Assistance

QUESTIONS?



# Team 2 Update

## Data Collection | Rate Setting | Contract Management

**Co-Chairs:** Robert Dakers, Executive Finance Officer, Office of Policy and Management, and Barry Simon, President and Chief Executive Officer, Oak Hill

# Cabinet Charges to Team 2

## 1) Data Use/Reporting – Outcomes:

- Consistent, streamlined *set of data and reporting methods that can be used uniformly across state agencies is created.*
- *Cross-agency data management tools that show population level results are reviewed and recommendations made to the Cabinet.*

## 2) Rate Setting Office – Outcomes:

- *The true cost of doing business as a non-profit is defined.*
- *Research is completed on models for establishing a Rate Setting Office and recommendations made to the Cabinet.*
- *Policy changes are identified to prioritize paying for cost of services to ensure sustainability of the Nonprofit Health and Human Services system.*

# Cabinet Charges to Team 2

## 3) Best Practices in Contract Procurement

- *Best practices in contract procurement are identified.*
- *Three best practices are identified for implementation in cooperation with OPM.*

# Introduction

- ▶ Shall establish an ongoing process that focuses on population level results and enables collaborate continuous quality improvement in delivery of health and human services.
- ▶ The recommendations require regular communication among state agencies and providers geared toward refining and improving service delivery strategies.
- ▶ This is increasingly critical given the ongoing and potential growing budgetary and fiscal challenges facing the state and its providers.

## Introduction – Continued

- ▶ Data collection and use shall have a quality results vision for improving health and human services delivery and outcomes; aligning payment to value and putting the power of this information to work. Value-based programs are part of the larger strategy to reform how health and human services are delivered and paid for to support the triple-aim of: better care for individuals; better health for CT's population, and lower costs through improvements.

## Update: Data Use/Reporting – Outcomes

- ▶ Team 2 reviewed the data collection tools and outcome measures currently utilized by State POS agencies and the CSSD
- ▶ Team 2 discussed the Results–Based Accountability (RBA) Questions of: “How Much Did We Do?”, “How Well Did We Do It?”, “Is Anyone Better Off?”
- ▶ Reviewed the work and recommendations of the Cabinet’s 2013 Population Results Work Group

# Update: Data Use/Reporting – Outcomes

## Purpose of Data Collection and Outcome Measures:

- ▶ Measuring Outcomes for Individuals and Populations Served
- ▶ Continuous Improvement in Regard to Service Quality
- ▶ Contract Management
- ▶ Program Evaluation and Development
- ▶ Resource Allocation
- ▶ Individual Case Management

# Update: Data Use/Reporting – Outcomes

## Recommendations/Principles re Data Collection Systems:

State agency data collection systems should reflect best practices and facilitate the sharing of data. These practices include:

- 1) State contracting agencies shall seek to use on-line tools to enable providers to enter outcome and other data directly into state agency reporting systems.
- 2) Individual State agencies shall work with providers, to the extent feasible, to establish standards or tools that would enable providers to align and electronically transfer data from their systems into the State agency system.
- 3) Across State agencies, efforts shall be made to standardize, where possible, the definition of common data elements.
- 4) State agency reporting capabilities shall include aggregating service unit and outcome measure data across programs and, to the extent feasible, across state agencies.
- 5) Health and service information collected through POS contracts shall be considered for inclusion in the efforts underway at the State level in regard to Electronic Health Records (EHR) and sharing case management and client information across state agencies.

# Update: Data Use/Reporting – Outcomes

- ▶ Providers and government agree in advance and adhere to evaluation methods, which may include assessments by staff and consumers as well as other performance measures, and providers report on these annually.
- ▶ Reporting requirements are scaled to the amount of funding provided.
- ▶ Review requirements of data collection on a regular basis to assure that resources are not expended collecting data that isn't relevant or used.
- ▶ Program activity measures provide pertinent information about the services.

# Update: Data Use/Reporting – Outcomes

Principles re Outcome Measures in POS Contracts:

- ▶ *Outcome Measures* in contracts shall be focused on if the service is achieving the results for the individuals and populations served; The activities required by the contract (e.g. number of clients served) should be measured separately.
- ▶ State agencies and providers shall work together, in advance, to have a clear understanding of the outcome measures for services.
- ▶ The data collected shall be relevant to measuring outcomes and performance; non-relevant data should not be collected or required.
- ▶ The outcome data collected shall provide a basis for continuous improvement activities, program evaluation related to service types and models and resource allocations through the budget process.
- ▶ POS service types and outcome measures shall be based, to the extent possible, on evidence or research demonstrating a strong correlation of the service type/model and outcome measures to positive results for individuals and populations.
- ▶ For clients served by multiple State agencies or providers, sharing critical information about individuals is vital to effective care

# Update: Data Use/Reporting – Outcomes

## Recommendations re Implementation:

The Secretary of OPM convene a working group of representatives from the State POS agencies and an equal number of providers similar to the group that recently met on licensing issues, to meet and apply Lean process improvement methods re POS data collection tools and agency processes around developing and utilizing service level and outcome measures in POS contracts.

- ▶ This work group's group goal to establish a work plan to ensure: 1) that data collection methods reflect best practices; 2) that contract and program measures within POS Health and human service contracts reflect and demonstrate a contract or program's contribution to population indicators and results; and 3) that outcome measurers are used for continuous quality improvement of services and for resource allocation and contract management.
- ▶ As part of this effort, POS contracting agencies shall establish an intra-agency team (that includes staff from data, program and contracts divisions) to: 1) review data collection methods for best practices and 2) identify and support the inclusion of appropriate of appropriate outcome and performance measures into POS contracts.
- ▶ The plan should recognize that State agencies and providers need adequate resources/guidance/ assistance to develop, implement and use appropriate data collection tools and performance measures
- ▶ The 2013 Population Results work group's population indicator categories and measures should be revisited as a part of this effort; Work with the CT Data Collaborative to gain their assistance in this regard.

## Rate Setting Office

This charge reflects Cabinet's role as a vehicle to promote "best practices" in rate setting and contracting standards that can be used to ensure the sustainability of the Nonprofit Health and Human Services system while taking into consideration the State's budget realities.

# Rate Setting Office

These following principles are intended to help guide Policy changes for payment, as well as, the future establishment of a Rate Setting Office.

## Principles–Residential Rate Setting Systems

- ▶ State procurement, rate setting, and budgetary systems should enable the health and human service delivery system to achieve appropriate levels and models (a continuum/menu) of care
- ▶ Rate setting systems should have accurate methods of identifying and reimbursing providers for different levels of client acuity, and ensuring sufficient rates to comply with regulatory requirements.
- ▶ Rate setting systems should reflect increases in costs over time, and encourage efficiencies related to productivity improvements, shared services, and technological advances.

## Rate Setting Office–continued

- ▶ In rate setting, state agencies should work with providers to maintain the balance between service quantity (units of service), quality, and service needs.
- ▶ Payment for services is set in a fair and transparent fashion with clear methodology, and noting if there is a cost settlement component.
- ▶ Rate setting systems should have the following characteristics:
  - Be standardized across agencies and providers to the extent feasible in order to minimize administrative burden for providers and state agencies
  - Be transparent and understandable
  - Clearly identify expected outcome measures
  - Comply with federal and statutory requirements
  - Maximize federal or third party revenue
  - Support the principles outlined above

# Best Practices in Contract Procurement

- ▶ **Approach.** Team 2 will review the status of OPM's Procurement Standards, in general, and the changes made by the cabinet a few years back, and see how they are working for state agencies and providers.
- ▶ **Outcomes.** Team 2 has not yet had the opportunity to address this charge

# Human Resources, Collaboration and Technical Assistance

QUESTIONS?

