



SERVICES FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES – PERFORMANCE 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 Division of Services for People with Disabilities reported a six year history of performance measures and benchmarking information (when available). The division has updated this information and included two additional years. An eight year history of measures is included in the appendix. This brief highlights changes from information presented a year ago and identifies measures that have improved or declined by more than 5 percent.

LEGISLATIVE ACTION

No Legislative action is required. This brief is presented for informational purposes only.

HUMAN SERVICES OVERALL GOALS

As part of its FY 2014 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 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The Division of Services for People with Disabilities has added several new measures from those presented in the 2012 General Session: **measure number 3** (*% consumers involved in one or more injury accident*) and **measure number 23** (*% supported work independence (SWI) participants who are employed*). Measure number 3 was added in response to intent language passed in the 2012 General Session (H.B. 2, item 98) which stated: “*The Legislature intends the Division of Services for People with Disabilities (DSPD) develop several options to measure the safety of individuals in its care and bring these measures back to the Subcommittee for review and input during one of its 2012 interim meetings. After receiving input from the Subcommittee, DSPD begin to report the measure regarding safety of individuals in its care in the Output and Outcome Measures report provided annually to the Social Services Appropriations Subcommittee.*”

DSPD measures showing greater than 5% improvement

- #5 - **Service Delivery** - People receive supports in a family member's home rather than in a residential setting (national ranking) (+6%)
- #6 - **Service Delivery** - People receive supports in employment settings rather than day programs (National ranking) (+13%)
- #9 - **Developmental Center** - # (%) of apts. with 5 or fewer individuals (not counting medical complex) (+8%)
- #11 - **Dev. Center** - # (%) of direct care staff who have received outcome measures training in last 3 years. (+16%)
- #18 - **Physical Disability Waiver** - % of people who like their staff (+6%)
- #20 - **Physical Disability Waiver** - % of people who like their fiscal agent (+7%)
- #23 - **Non-waiver Services** - % supported work independence (SWI) participants who are employed (+18%)
- #24 - **Non-waiver Services** - % of people who like their fiscal agent (self-administered model) (+7%)

DSPD measures showing greater than 5% decline:

- #4 - **Service Delivery** – # of new people receiving DSPD services (-52%)
- #7 - **Developmental Center** – % of maladaptive behavior reduced from time of admission to discharge (-7%)

APPENDIX: SERVICES FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The table included in the appendix for the Division of Services for People with Disabilities shows an eight year comparison of performance measures along with a description of each measure and benchmarking where applicable. Measures are also associated with the dollar amount of appropriation involved.

Division of Services for People with Disabilities - Performance Measures - FY05 Through FY 12

FY10 Total Expenditures	FY11 Total Expenditures	FY12 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 FY 12	Measure can be benchmarked to performance by others?	If yes, who are you using to benchmark against?
\$203,799,156	\$199,380,800	\$202,120,200	SERVICES FOR PEOPLE W DISABILITIES:													
\$3,779,924	\$2,967,500	\$2,817,400	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%	97%	No	
					2 % providers meeting non-fiscal requirements of contracts	100%	99%	98%	98%	99%	99%	97%	97%	97%	No	
					3 % consumers involved in one or more injury accident		Not available. Lack of historical data.	7.2%	No							
\$9,161,701	\$6,988,400	\$5,722,000	KFB SERVICE DELIVERY													
					4 Number of new people receiving DSPD services	Not Applicable	171	262	399	236	103	42	216	104	No	
					5 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	Not released yet	Yes	This represents a 50 state + DC ranking.
					6 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	Not released yet	Yes	This represents a 50 state + DC ranking.
\$36,508,640	\$32,015,600	\$32,309,900	KFC STATE DEVELOPMENTAL CENTER													
					7 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%	93%	No	
					8 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%	100%	No	
					9 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%)	28 (65%)	No	
					10 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%)	121 (57%)	No	
					11 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%)	383 (85%)	No	
\$148,512,550	\$151,270,400	\$155,056,000	KFD COMMUNITY SUPPORTS WAIVER													
					12 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%	88.1%	Not presently	
					13 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%	92.7%	Yes	We use this measure to compare outcomes between support coordination providers (contracted providers.)
					14 Percent of people who like their fiscal agent (self-administered model)	90.0%	No data	88.0%	90.2%	91.5%	Yes	We use this measure to compare outcomes between fiscal agents (contracted providers.)				

FY10 Total Expenditures	FY11 Total Expenditures	FY12 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 FY 12	Measure can be benchmarked to performance by others?	If yes, who are you using to benchmark against?
\$2,567,150	\$2,793,900	\$3,058,300	KFE BRAIN INJURY WAIVER SERVICES														
					15	Percent of people who like their staff (provider model).	90%	No data	No data	No data	No data	87.3%	86.5%	86.8%	88.1%	Not presently	
					16	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%	92.7%	Yes	We use this measure to compare outcomes between support coordination providers (contracted providers.)
					17	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%	100.0%	Yes	We use this measure to compare outcomes between fiscal agents (contracted providers.)
\$1,968,978	\$1,920,300	\$1,961,500	KFF PHYSICAL DISABILITY WAIVER SERVICES														
					18	Percent of people who like their staff	100%	94%	96%	100%	100%	100%	91%	94%	100%	Not presently	
					19	Percent of people who like their nurse coordinator	90%	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	95.0%	92.0%	94.7%	Not presently	
					20	Percent of people who like their fiscal agent.	90%	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	91.7%	90.0%	97.4%	Yes	We use this measure to compare outcomes between fiscal agents (contracted providers.)
\$1,300,213	\$1,424,700	\$1,195,100	KFG NON WAIVER SERVICES														
					21	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%	88.1%	Not presently	
					22	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%	92.7%	Yes	We use this measure to compare outcomes between support coordination providers (contracted providers.)
					23	% supported work independence (SWI) participants who are employed		Not available. Lack of historical data.	43%	not applicable	35%	53%					
					24	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%	100.0%	Yes	We use this measure to compare outcomes between fiscal agents (contracted providers.)