

**Department of Education (DOE)
School Based Behavioral Health Services
FY 2005-2007 Final Report**

**Agency: FullCircle, LLC
Contract No: EDN 150-2006-01-09**

Overview of Delivery of Services:

Client population served (ie: age range)

Clients ranged from age 4 to 21. All of whom were enrolled as students eligible to receive DOE services.

Client population identification (ie: race, geographic areas)

Clients were all classified as included in the geographic area of the Honolulu District.

How was client referred to agency

All clients were referred by the DOE for specific assessment services.

Types of services delivered by the agency

The agency provided services deemed as "Assessment Services" in accord with the contract definitions.

Average length of stay, duration of treatment

FullCircle, LLC (FC) provided only assessment services. Therefore, the duration of treatment was the time to complete the assessment service. All assessment services were completed in accord with contract timelines based upon a start date defined as receipt of the assessment authorization and required documentation.

Unique Qualities of Program:

Distinguishing characteristics of program that sets it apart from similar programs administered by other agency providers

FC was often available to perform "rush" or expedited assessments. FC only used licensed Clinical Psychologists to provide the assessment services to insure that the DOE received the highest quality assessment product to begin the planning for the student's academic needs.

How was the agency able to integrate services with schools, agencies, and other contracted providers

Assessments were provided in a rapid and timely manner so that the DOE could maintain its regulatory timelines in assessing and developing academic plans for its students. FC developed a close rapport with the DOE providers of specialized student populations (ie., HCDB). Given FC provided only assessment services, FC's involvement after the assessment phase was limited.

Areas Needing Improvement:

FC advised the DOE to consider using single agencies to provide specific types of services to decrease the contract costs to the DOE. Perhaps the largest area requiring improvement would be the DOE's rethinking how they will utilize community resources to supplement their own personnel when working to meet the needs of the student population. Using a single agency per district to provide a specific service array would cut contracting costs while allowing the DOE to use these funds to build and strengthen their internal resource array.

Barriers to Providing Services:

At times there were delays in providing necessary materials prior to initiating the assessment process.

Additionally, the DOE's contracting process in which there is no set amount of work to be completed during the contract period serves as a barrier to providing service as it is difficult to retain qualified personnel on a PRN or "as needed" basis. Typically, if a qualified provider does not have work, they find work elsewhere. This is what happened at FC as we began the contract period with three Psychologists but by the end of the contract period only one Psychologist remained as there was not sufficient work to justify participating in the redundant annual training requirements or to leave time to complete work on the off chance that work might be referred by the DOE.

It is recommended that the DOE develop contracts with minimum levels of work to be referred to insure that high quality providers are available to complete the work if the DOE desires to continue using community resources.

Quality Management Activities:

Describe quality management activities during the FY05-07 and its compatibility with District QAP plans

FC would review each assessment product to insure that it met the contract requirements. Furthermore, FC would track the time to completion of each assessment work product to insure that the timelines and quality indicators established by the DOE were incorporated at the agency level by FC. This insured integrated and congruent QAP activities.

The goals for FY05-07

FC set the goal of completing 90% or more of the assessment work products within the timelines established by the contract with the DOE. Additionally, FC established a criteria to review 90% of assessment products to insure that they would comport with the contract requirements. Both of these goals were attained.

Measurable objectives which include:

- Parent, student and school satisfaction with the services as was delivered

FC received feedback indicating that the vast majority of parents, students, and school personnel were satisfied with the assessment products delivered by FC through its subcontracted providers.

- Treatment progress and outcome measures related to overall academic achievement and behavioral successes

Given FC only provided assessment services, there were no objectives related to measuring future academic performance and the impact the assessment had as this data was not available to the FC. Conceptually however, it would make sense if a student received a high quality assessment that the subsequent services which could be provided to meet any deficit areas would enhance the students overall academic performance.

Timeliness of services, including:

- Percentage of assessments completed and submitted within the 60 day timelines as established under IDEA;

FC returned all assessment products within the 60 day timeline and over 75% within 30 days.

- Percentage of monthly/quarterly treatment and progress summary reports and progress notes submitted during the required timelines as established under the contract terms;

N/A. This item applied only to therapeutic service providers not assessment service providers.

- Time from authorization of service to initiation of service.

FC typically initiated service within 5-10 days depending in part upon how long it took to receive all the necessary data from the DOE. Some assessments services were initiated within 72 hours from the date of receipt of authorization.

Staff Summary and Types of Services Provided:

List of employees and subcontractors employed during FY, including their credentials and types of service each provided.

David Roscoe (Licensed Psychologist) July 1, 2005 - June 30, 2007
Services provided - 01 & 05

John Wingert (Licensed Psychologist) July 1, 2005 - June 30, 2006
Services provided - 01

Carol Nowak (Licensed Psychologist) July 1, 2005 - June 30, 2006
Services provided - 01

List of all new employees (hired after 07/01/05) and volunteers showing status and completion date of mandatory background checks

Not applicable. New staff were not brought on, rather as the work referred decreased staff no longer desired to remain contracted.

Client to Staff Ratio

FC maintained a 1:1 client to staff ratio (1 student being evaluated by 1 evaluator)

Recruitment efforts and results

FC did not make recruitment efforts as there was insufficient work to keep the subcontracted staff working based on the number of referrals from the DOE (under 60 assessments in total)

Pay scale in relation to market value

FC paid its Psychologists a rate of approximately \$75-\$90 per hour (assessment services were paid at a fixed rate but based upon the time it is expected to take the typical provider to complete the assessment tasks the hourly rate was devised). This is similar to the Medicaid rate paid to Psychologists in the community. Although it is on the low end of the pay scale in the community, the DOE is a state agency and in many ways is offering a service similar to Medicaid. Private insurers are paying Psychologists around \$120 per hour in the community. Pay rates did not appear to be a factor under this contract in terms of retaining staff.

Retention problems, issues

It was very difficult to retain staff who already felt they were accepting a rate of pay at the low end of the community rate when assessments were not available to the staff. As a result of the very low number of referrals (far less than what had been suggested in the RFP) 65% of the Psychologists that began with FC in FY2005 did not renew their contract in FY2006. The DOE's requirement of having training on the same information each year and comprising 40 hours of unpaid time to the licensed Psychologists was a very large factor in their decision to not participate with the DOE. FC would suggest that some form of IDEIA/504 knowledge certification be completed every 2-3 years and that once a provider completes the knowledge test they are then allowed to perform services for the DOE. This could be implemented for both community providers and DOE personnel and would insure uniform and high quality services.

Staff Training:

List of staff trainings and workshops during FY

06/05 24 hour training held covering all required topics for FY05-06

06/06 24 hour training held covering all required topics for FT06-07

Number of hours employees or subcontractors spent in training

All subcontractors reported a minimum of 40 hours per fiscal year of completed training per the contract requirements.

Evaluation of Staff and Subcontractors:

Evaluation schedule, frequency

FC evaluated every work product submitted by Subcontractors within 72 hours of submission.

Evaluation methodology/criteria

FC evaluated each assessment product based upon the criteria established in the RFP & contract governing such services. This was a straight forward methodology as it allowed a one to one comparison of work product material with work product requirements.

Personnel involved in the evaluation process

The Program Director was responsible for evaluating all assessment work products as they were submitted. The Program Director was also responsible for the final submittal of all work products to the DOE. In this way, FC established a systems flow that would not allow products not meeting the contract standards to be submitted to the DOE.

Future Plan of Action for Next Fiscal Year:

Anticipated personnel changes

Proposed client to staff ration for upcoming year

Program improvements

Accreditation plans

FC does not anticipate being able to afford to contract with the DOE for the next fiscal year due to the dramatic rate reductions established by the DOE in the most recent RFP for assessment services coupled with the significantly diminished need for assessments. FC would be required to use staff with the minimum requirements allowed under the contract in order to find willing staff to complete the assessments. Even with this strategy, FC would not have enough money left over with the limited number of referrals to keep the program fiscally viable. Therefore, it is expected that at the end of this contract, FC will not be available to perform assessment services unless the requirements and rates are drastically modified by the DOE. As for accreditation, when the DOE is willing to build the \$20,000 cost of accreditation into the unit rate (assessments would then likely cost about \$3000 each with the current referral quantity) then FC could consider accreditation. However, the real question is what purpose does accreditation serve? It certainly does not insure that the quality of providers is any better. The quality of providers is already addressed at numerous levels including State licensure, annual training, DOE registration, criminal background checks, educational verification, and internal agency QA activities. It would appear that accreditation serves some other purpose unbeknownst to this particular agency. It is recommended to the DOE that if it desires to keep service costs to a minimum then any encouragement or requirement for agencies to be accredited be reconsidered by the DOE as these additional costs will be "passed on" to the DOE under the current contracting terms.

Submit updated (most recent) agency annual report

FC does not generate separate annual reports. Please refer to this contract final report in lieu of a separate report.

Submit updated (most recent) agency financial audit, if applicable

Not applicable

Disclose any pending litigation to which they are a party, including disclosure of any judgments, if applicable

FC is not and has not been a party to any litigation