

# SERVICES FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES – OUTPUT AND OUTCOME MEASURES

SOCIAL SERVICES APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE  
STAFF: STEPHEN JARDINE

ISSUE BRIEF

## **SUMMARY**

As part of a Human Services In-depth Budget Review (found at <http://le.utah.gov/interim/2010/pdf/00001613.pdf>), the Department of Human Services reported a five year history of output and outcome measures and benchmarking information if it existed. The department has updated this information and included an additional year. A six year history of measures is included in the appendix. The brief highlights any changes from information presented a year ago and identifies measures that have improved or declined by more than 5 percent. Fiscal Analyst recommendations for Legislative action are also included.

## **LEGISLATIVE ACTION**

The Fiscal Analyst recommends:

1. DSPD report additional measures for the Community Supports Waiver that comply with the general principles of performance measurement where you measure things that matter, measure outcomes first, and measure internally and against other states. For example, DSPD should consider reporting to the Legislature a meaningful measure regarding the safety of those in residential settings.

## **HUMAN SERVICES IN-DEPTH BUDGET REVIEW RECOMMENDATION REGARDING OUTCOMES**

The Human Services In-depth Budget Review (found at <http://le.utah.gov/interim/2010/pdf/00001613.pdf>) was assigned by the Executive Appropriations Committee (EAC) and later heard by EAC and the Social Services Appropriations Subcommittee. The in-depth review included 15 major recommendations and 14 other additional recommendations. The subcommittee passed intent language to have Human Services report back on the progress and status of the review's recommendations during the 2012 General Session. One of the major 15 recommendations was:

*All department divisions [should] follow best practices for performance measures:*

- *Measure things that matter*
- *Focus on outcomes, then outputs*
- *Compare internally and against other states*

The in-depth budget review identified the best internal department examples for outcome measures. The review stated, "For outcome measures of state provided services, DCFS [Division of Child and Family Services] is the best example. They have meaningful measures, compare different regions, publish them on their public website, and benchmark against other states. . . For outcome measures of contract-provided services, DSAMH [Division of Substance Abuse and Mental Health] is the best example in the department. They have meaningful measures, compare different providers, publish them on their public website, and benchmark against other states."

## **HUMAN SERVICES OVERALL GOALS**

As part of its FY 2013 budget submission, the Department of Human Services provided the following four department-wide goals:

- *collaborate with community partners and within the Department on issues that cut across divisions*
- *maintain and improve transparency regarding Department finances and operations in the community*
- *foster creativity, innovation and adoption of best models and practices*
- *improve outcomes and results by using measures which lead to good decisions that drive success*

## **ANALYSIS OF DIVISION OF SERVICES FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES OUTPUT AND OUTCOME MEASURES**

DSPD has made a number of changes to the measures presented in the fall of 2010 as part of the in-depth budget review. Analysis at that time regarding the output and outcome measures of DSPD stated, "DSPD provided the LFA with 21 measures for the in-depth budget review . . . . Nine of the 21 measures are output measures representing in each instance the number served in various programs. Of the remaining 12 measures, four represent a calculation regarding

average annual savings resulting from an individual receiving services in a community placement compared to a nursing home setting. . . . There are no outcome measures for the primary population housed at the USDC (\$36.5 million in FY 2010). . . . Other than a measure for the percent satisfied, no outcome measures were reported for the Community Supports Waiver, the largest budget component of the department (\$148.5 million in FY 2010)."

DSPD has eliminated from its current presentation all nine of the "number served in various program" measures along with the four "average annual savings resulting from an individual receiving services in a community placement compared to a nursing home setting" measures. The Utah State Developmental Center (USDC) has added three measures that would apply to all individuals residing there. With regard to the Community Supports Waiver, the largest budget component of the department, there are still only measures that represent "percent satisfied." The Fiscal Analyst recommends DSPD develop additional measures for the Community Supports Waiver that comply with the general principles of performance measurement where you measure things that matter, measure outcomes first, and measure internally and against other states. For example, DSPD may look to find a meaningful measure regarding the safety of those in residential settings.

### **DSPD measures showing greater than 5% improvement**

#6 - USDC - percent of maladaptive behavior reduced from time of admission to discharge (+22%)

#7 - USDC - percent of symptom-related medical diagnosis reduced from time of admission to discharge (+30%)

### **DSPD measures showing greater than 5% decline:**

#8 - USDC – percent of apartments with 5 or fewer individuals (-28%)

#9 - USDC – percent of individuals with private bedrooms (-18%)

## **APPENDIX: SERVICES FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES AGENCY OUTPUT AND OUTCOME MEASURES**

As part of the Department of Human Services In-depth Budget Review, agencies within Human Services were asked to provide a six year history of accountability measures along with any indications if benchmarking was being used, and if so, who was being used to benchmark against (see the Department of Human Services In-depth Budget Review Appendix 3, pages 65 through 74 found at: <http://le.utah.gov/interim/2010/pdf/00001615.pdf>). The table included in the appendix updates information from the in-depth review for the Division of Services for People with Disabilities, including eliminating some measures and adding others, and adds measures for one additional year.

## Department of Human Services - Output and Outcome Measures - FY05 Through FY 11: DSPD

FY10 Total Expenditures	FY11 Total Expenditures	Appropriation Unit	Unit		Performance Measure	Measure Target	Measure FY 05	Measure FY 06	Measure FY 07	Measure FY 08	Measure FY 09	Measure FY 10	Measure FY 11	Measure can be benchmarked to performance by others?	If yes, who are you using to benchmark against?
\$203,799,156	\$199,380,800	SERVICES FOR PEOPLE W DISABILITIES:													
\$3,779,924	\$2,967,500	KFA PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES ADMINISTRATION													
			4163 DHS DSPD CONTRACTS OFFICE	1	% providers meeting fiscal requirements of contracts	100%	99%	95%	98%	99%	99%	98%	98%	No	
				2	% providers meeting non-fiscal requirements of contracts	100%	99%	98%	98%	99%	99%	97%	97%	No	
\$9,161,701	\$6,988,400	KFB SERVICE DELIVERY													
				3	Number of new people receiving DSPD services	Not Applicable	171	262	399	236	103	42	216	No	
				4	People receive supports in a family member's home rather than in a residential setting (National ranking)	Target is to be ranked #1 nationally	32	32	32	32	34	Not released yet	Not released yet	Yes	This represents a 50 state + DC ranking.
				5	People receive supports in employment settings rather than day programs (National ranking)	Target is to be ranked #1 nationally	Not available. Lack of historical data.	Not available. Lack of historical data.	7	8	9	Not released yet	Not released yet	Yes	This represents a 50 state + DC ranking.
\$36,508,640	\$32,015,600	KFC STATE DEVELOPMENTAL CENTER													
				6	USDC: % of maladaptive behavior reduced from time of admission to discharge	80%	Not available. Lack of historical data.	Not available. Lack of historical data.	Not available. Lack of historical data.	100%	91%	82%	100%	No	
				7	USDC: % of symptom-related medical diagnosis reduced from time of admission to discharge	80%	Not available. Lack of historical data.	Not available. Lack of historical data.	Not available. Lack of historical data.	85%	92%	77%	100%	No	
				8	Number (%) of apartments with 5 or fewer individuals at the Developmental Center (not counting medical complex)	66%	31(66%)	29(64%)	28(62%)	28(62%)	31 (68%)	36 (69%)	26 (56%)	No	
				9	Number (%) of individuals at the Developmental Center with private bedrooms	60%	119(50%)	126(54%)	125(53%)	120(51%)	141 (63%)	141 (63%)	116 (54%)	No	
				10	Number (%) of direct care staff who have received outcome measures training within the last 3 years.	80%	No data	No data	No data	No data	305 (68%)	345 (87%)	331 (83%)	No	
\$148,512,550	\$151,270,400	KFD COMMUNITY SUPPORTS WAIVER													
				11	Percent of people who like their staff (provider model).	90.0%	No data	No data	No data	No data	87.3%	86.5%	86.8%	Not presently	
				12	Percent of people who like their support coordinator (provider model)	90.0%	No data	No data	No data	No data	89.0%	93.7%	96.4%	Yes	We use this measure to compare outcomes between support coordination providers (contracted providers.)
				13	Percent of people who like their fiscal agent (self-administered model)	90.0%	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	88.0%	90.2%	Yes	We use this measure to compare outcomes between fiscal agents (contracted providers.)
\$2,567,150	\$2,793,900	KFE BRAIN INJURY WAIVER SERVICES													
				14	Percent of people who like their staff (provider model).	90%	No data	No data	No data	No data	87.3%	86.5%	86.8%	Not presently	

				15	Percent of people who like their support coordinator (provider model)	90%	No data	No data	No data	No data	89.0%	93.7%	96.4%	Yes	We use this measure to compare outcomes between support coordination providers (contracted providers.)
				16	Percent of people who like their fiscal agent (self-administered model)	90%	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	97.5%	100.0%	Yes	We use this measure to compare outcomes between fiscal agents (contracted providers.)
\$1,968,978	\$1,920,300	KFF PHYSICAL DISABILITY WAIVER SERVICES													
				17	Percent of people who like their staff	100%	94%	96%	100%	100%	100%	91%	94%	Not presently	
				18	Percent of people who like their nurse coordinator	90%	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	95.0%	92.0%	Not presently	
				19	Percent of people who like their fiscal agent.	90%	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	91.7%	90.0%	Yes	We use this measure to compare outcomes between fiscal agents (contracted providers.)
\$1,300,213	\$1,424,700	KFG NON WAIVER SERVICES													
				20	Percent of people who like their staff (provider model).	90.0%	No data	No data	No data	No data	87.3%	86.5%	86.6%	Not presently	
				21	Percent of people who like their support coordinator (provider model)	90.0%	No data	No data	No data	No data	89.0%	93.7%	96.4%	Yes	We use this measure to compare outcomes between support coordination providers (contracted providers.)
				22	Percent of people who like their fiscal agent (self-administered model)	90.0%	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	92.9%	92.9%	Yes	We use this measure to compare outcomes between fiscal agents (contracted providers.)