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Features of Hawaii’s system
- Statewide system serving 2500 youth a year
- Serve youth who are SEBD
  - Medicaid Rehab Option Carve out
  - Medicaid FFS
  - Educationally disabled- MOA with DOE
- Incarcerated
- Comprehensive service array
- Intensive case-management provided through eight Family Guidance Centers

What makes us a little different
- Integrated system: Children’s MH and Educational System
- Focus on use of evidence-based approaches and practice development
- Managed Care Behavioral Health Plan
- Accountability systems- internal and interagency
- Grounded in system of care values and principles
  - How we have defined our system at various points in time have guided the way we have implemented the service system

A brief history of implementation
- 1993: Felix consent decree
  - Based on “gross negligence” by the State in providing mental health service to students
  - Key provisions:
    - Establish a system of care
    - Broad-based complex system development
    - Across mental health and education
    - Monitor and assure quality practices and results
- 1993-1995
  - Came to the table
  - Defined system requirements

Implementation (cont’d)
- 1996-1998
  - Rapid growth
  - Foundations of practice development: service planning
  - Mid-course evaluation-adjustments to system
- 1998-2000
  - Focus on practice development and managing performance
  - Began to build our measurement systems
  - EBS
- 2000-2004
  - Quality management infrastructure matured
  - Strategic plan
  - Annual Evaluation of cost, population, services
  - Clinical module-data driven clinical decisions
- 2006-present
  - Integrated accountability
  - Focus on family and youth-driven care
  - New Strategic Plan
  - Early warnings of system instability

Implementation Factors*
- Facilitating System:
  - Values and Beliefs
  - Goals
  - Information
  - Structure
- Core Principles
- Leadership
- Valuing Partnerships
- Willingness to Take Risks
- Accountability for Results
- Cross-system Training
- Open Management Development
- Core Practices
- Operational Plans
- Community Voice/Buy in

* Leveraging Change in Hawaii’s System of Care (2006)
Hodges, Ferreira, Israel & Mazza
Foundation: Hawaii CASSP Principles
1. Family-centered, culturally sensitive
2. Access to comprehensive service array
3. Family preservation and strengthening
4. Least restrictive environment
5. Coordinated services from any entry point
6. Family and youth participation
7. Early identification and intervention
8. Advocacy and protection of child rights

Binder: Strategic Goals
- Shared ownership of vision, mission, initiatives and achieved outcomes.
- Adhere to Hawaii Child and Adolescent Service System Program (CASSP) Principles.
- Apply the current knowledge of evidence based services (EBS) in the development of individualized plans.
- Routinely evaluate performance data and apply findings to guide management decisions and practice development.
- Business principles will ensure high quality and accountable operations.

A few additional values that define us:
- Team-based Decisions
- Achieving Results
- Excellence
- Empowerment
- Customer Service

System Definitions Connected to Results
- Results
- Measurement
- Practices
- Service Infrastructure
- Foundation: SOC Values

Why Did We Make the Choice to Measure Performance?
- Accountability
- Better results
- Transformative power

Early on:
- Started to build our reporting systems and accountability frameworks
- Defined what data would drive system performance
- Started to build the necessary partnerships

Quality Improvement is a core System of Care function
“System builders need to develop structures that measure quality, that provide feedback loops, and that have response (i.e., quality improvement) capabilities.”
(Building Systems of Care: A Primer, by Sheila Pires)
Our experience…
- We needed valid data to:
  - know how we are performing in the here and now as well as over time
  - to make decisions and program adjustments
- We needed to continuously monitor services and infrastructure
- Task:
  - Making performance data timely and useful
  - Assure that we are acting on what the data are telling us

Performance Improvement Structure
- Performance Improvement Steering Committee
- Credentialing Committee
- Grievance and Appeals Committee
- Compliance Committee
- Information Systems Design Committee
- Policies and Procedures Committee
- Evidence-based Services Committee
- Training Committee
- Safety and Risk Management Committee
- Utilization Management Committee

Reporting Structure
- Data Report
  - Example: Sentinel Events
  - Quality Committee
    - Example: Safety and Risk Management Committee
  - Recommendations to PISC
  - To many police calls
  - Recommendations to Management Team
  - Approval/Implement/Assign Monitor

Systematic Implementation
- QAP Work Plan
  - Example:
    - Length of Stay in Residential Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Outcome Type</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Manager</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Decrease utilization, LRE</td>
<td>Clinical</td>
<td>&lt;50% in CBR within standards</td>
<td>UMA Manager</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Core Methodologies
- Case-based Reviews
- Tools and monitoring protocols
  - Reduce bias
  - Help to give focus to feedback
  - Focus on practice/infrastructure to support practice
- Performance measures
- Results-based accountability
- Clinical Reporting Module/Dashboards
- Annual Evaluation

Definitions
- Child Status
  - Safe?
  - Learning?
  - Stable living situation?
  - Stable school setting?
  - Doing well emotionally?
  - Family satisfied?
  - Staying out of trouble?

Accountability for Results
- SOC Values
  - System Performance
    - Do we understand the youth’s needs?
    - Is there a functional service team?
    - Is there a service plan that addresses the youth’s needs?
    - Is the plan being implemented?
    - Are there adequate coordination?
    - Are parents involved?
    - Are there positive results?

Core Methodology:
- Case-based Reviews (Foster and Groves)
Case-based Reviews
- Conducted annually in every school complex (N=500+ youth)
- Includes EI, SEBD and SBBH
- Conducted across all provider agencies—level of care specific protocols
- Improvement plans generated
- Case-specific feedback generated to teams
- Focus on practice

Child Status
- Cases Rated as Acceptable in Child Status

System Performance
- Complexes Meeting Quality Standards for System Performance

Aspects of Evaluating Practice and Performance of Providers
- Safety
- Effective Practice
- Rights
- SOC Values
- Using EBS
- Training

Implementation Tool: Standardized Info Display
- Clinical Reporting
- Management Reporting
- Data Aggregation
- Case Studies

Performance Measures
- Have aligned the work of the system with desired results
- Afforded the ability to track performance and results over time
- Communicate data on outcomes, cost, service utilization patterns, adequacy of infrastructure and other important aspects of the service system
CAMHD Statewide Performance Measures

Infrastructure
- Personnel
  - Positions Filled
  - Casehead

- Fiscal
  - Timely Provider Payment
  - Within Quarterly Budget

Other Business Units
- FGC, Central Office, & Committee Processes

Services
- Service Planning
  - CSP Timeliness
  - CSP Quality

- Service Access
  - Service Gaps
  - Service Mismatches

- Child Status
  - CAFAS & CBCL
  - Case-Based Reviews

Service Environment
- In-State
- In-Home

Products
- System Performance
  - Internal Reviews
  - Provider Reviews

- Stakeholder Rights
  - Complaints
  - Satisfaction

Definitions

- Does each child have a current plan?
- Does that plan meet quality expectations?

Infrastructure adequacy
Measurement allows for early detection of erosion.

New Strategic Goals

- Decrease Stigma & Increase Access to Care
- Implement and Monitor
  - Resource Management Program
  - Publicly Accountable Performance Management Program
  - Practice Development Program
  - Strategic Personnel Management Plan
  - Strategic Financial Plan
  - Information Technology Program

Hawaii's Interagency Accountability Systems

Statewide Performance Measures

- Infrastructure Services Products
- Positions Filled (%)
- Caseload (N)
- Filled Positions (%)
- Statewide Average Caseload per F TE excluding Kauai F G C

- Fiscal Year and Quarter

- Definitions

- Coordinated Care
- Individualized Plans
- Family and Youth Participation
- Timely Access
- LTRIE
- Advocacy

- Does each child have a current plan?
- Does that plan meet quality expectations?

- Infrastructure adequacy
- Measurement allows for early detection of erosion.

- Definitions

- Coordinated Services
- Access/Early Identification
- Shared Ownership
- Team-based Decisions

- Operate the system through interagency partnerships and partnerships with families
- Defined the practices and infrastructure
- Defined the measurement systems
- Need: Technical Assistance
Hawaii’s report card

- An adaptive network of structures, processes and relationships guided in SOC values and principles that effectively provides access and availability of services and supports across administrative and funding boundaries

Lessons learned….

- Hawaii has found that integration is needed across:
  - System definitions and values
  - Policies
  - Practice expectations and supports
  - Skills of staff
  - Provider network and array
  - Well-defined practices for evaluating and managing performance are needed.
  - Don’t take sustainability of your system for granted.

For additional information:

- Or contact:
  - Mary Brogan
  - Performance Manager
  - State of Hawaii
  - Child and Adolescent Mental Health Division
  - mbrogan@camhmis.health.state.hi.us

Mahalo!!