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Why A Crisis Continuum of Care for Children?

• When children, youth and young adults experience a behavioral health crisis, parents and caregivers may not know what to do, or who is available to help meet the family’s needs.
Why A Crisis Continuum of Care for Children?

• A crisis continuum of care – designed specifically to meet the needs of children, youth and young adults, and their parents/caregivers – is necessary to deescalate and ameliorate a crisis before more restrictive and costly interventions become necessary, and to ensure connection to necessary services and supports.
Comprehensive Crisis Continuum Components

• A comprehensive crisis continuum includes:
  – screening and assessment, ideally using a validated screening tool
  – mobile crisis response
  – crisis stabilization services and residential crisis, where necessary
  – psychiatric consultation
  – referrals and warm hand-offs to home- and community-based services ongoing care coordination
Mobile Response and Stabilization Services (MRSS) Within a Crisis Continuum

• Can effectively *deescalate, stabilize, and improve treatment outcomes*.

• Are specifically designed to *intercede before urgent behavioral situations become unmanageable emergencies* and are *instrumental in averting unnecessary emergency department visits, out-of-home placements and placement disruptions, and in reducing overall system costs*.

Why Include MRSS In a Crisis Continuum?

- Children, youth, young adults and families can initiate care based on a self-defined crisis.
- Engaging families in a culturally and linguistically competent crisis response is essential not just for reducing risk in the current crisis and preventing future crises but also for developing trust.

Emergency Department (ED) Data

• Pediatric psychiatric ED visits nationwide increased from an estimated 491,000 in 2001 to 619,000 in 2010.

• ED usage rates for publicly insured children and children without any health insurance are four-fold above those who are privately insured.

The Historical Response to Crisis

• Emergency Departments (ED):
  – Lack specialized expertise to respond to pediatric psychiatric emergencies leads to “boarding”
  – Expensive for payers
  – Time consuming and traumatic for parents and children
Better outcomes in both cost and quality of care are achievable through community-based initiatives that redefine the meaning of ‘crisis’ and address and stabilize behaviors prior to escalation to the level of requiring inpatient care.
Goals of Comprehensive Crisis Continuum

1. Diverting unnecessary ED admissions

2. Instituting evidence-based home- and community-based services that provide meaningful alternatives to inpatient treatment

Federal Guidance

• 2013 CMCS/SAMHSA Joint Informational Bulletin Medicaid reimbursable home and community-based services for children and youth with complex behavioral health needs.
  – Named several services critical to developing a high-quality crisis continuum, including *mobile crisis response and stabilization* and *residential crisis stabilization*
Federal Guidance

• Interdepartmental Serious Mental Illness Coordinating Committee Charter (ISMICC) first report to Congress (2107) recommended:
  – Defining and implementing a national standard for crisis care
  – Developing an integrated crisis response system to divert people with SMI and SED from the justice system
  – Crisis intervention team training for those in criminal justice
The Value of MRSS within a Crisis Continuum

• Designed to intercede upstream, before urgent behavioral situations become unmanageable emergencies
• Instrumental in averting unnecessary ED visits, out-of-home placements and placement disruptions, and in reducing overall system costs.*
• Keep a child, youth or young adult safe at home, in the community, and in school whenever possible.
• Viable alternative to acute care and residential treatment because they consistently demonstrate cost savings while simultaneously improving outcomes and achieving higher family satisfaction.

Examples of Cost Savings and Avoiding Unnecessary Care

• Connecticut
  – Evaluation of the state’s Emergency Mobile Psychiatric Services (EMPS) found the 2014 average cost of an inpatient stay for Medicaid-enrolled children and youth was $13,320 while the cost of MRSS was $1,000, a net savings of $12,320 per youth.
  – In FY2013, EDs referred to EMPS 1,121 times and 553 referrals were coded as “inpatient diversions.” Of the 553 referrals, approximately 60% (or 332) were Medicaid-enrolled for a cost savings of over $4 million.
Examples of Cost Savings and Avoiding Unnecessary Care

• King County, WA
  – Since October 2011, the Children’s Crisis Outreach Response System (CCORS) has served 4,445 unique youth with a total of 5,438 service records. Out of the 5,438 total service records, only 15 (<1%) indicated that the CCORS encounter ended with a foster care placement.
  – Between 2013 and 2015, CCORS was successfully able to divert 91-94% of hospital admissions.
  – An evaluation of CCORS estimated that it saved $3.8-7.5 million in hospital costs and $2.8M in out-of-home placement costs.
Examples of Cost Savings and Avoiding Unnecessary Care (cont.)

- Pima County, AZ
  - CRC opened in 2011 and provides 24/7 services, including MRSS, family and youth peer support, and a crisis hotline.
  - Pima County Sheriff’s Office & Tucson Police Dept. receive crisis intervention training, including how to contact the Mobile Acute Crisis (MAC) teams.
  - In FY14, 4,433 adult and juvenile law enforcement transfers saved 8,800 hours of law enforcement time, the equivalent of four full-time officers.
  - In FY15, 1,101 adults and children were transferred from the ED to the CRC after initial stabilization to receive additional crisis services, rather than being admitted, saving $456,138.
Examples of Cost Savings and Avoiding Unnecessary Care (cont.)

• Texas
  – 2007 MRSS initiative resulted in declining hospitalization which translated into direct and measurable cost savings of $1.16 to $4.51 return on every dollar invested.
Crisis Continuum: Infrastructure, Components, and Functions

- Single Point of Access
- No Wrong Door
- Crisis Hotline
- Electronic Health Record
- Triage
- Mobile Response and Stabilization Assessment
- Crisis Intervention and Initial Identification
- Crisis Stabilization
- Residential Crisis Stabilization
- Recovery and Reintegration
Crisis Continuum: Infrastructure, Components, and Functions

MRSS Common Elements:

• Crisis is defined by the caller
• Services are available 24 hours a day, seven days a week
• Able to serve children and families in their natural environments, for example, at home or in school
• Include specialized child and adolescent trained staff and do not rely on predominantly adult-oriented crisis response workers
• Build on natural support structures and reduce reliance (and therefore costs) on hospitals and formal crisis response systems.
• Connect families to follow-up services and supports, including transition to needed treatment services
Crisis Continuum: System Coordination and Community Collaboration

• Strategies for encouraging coordination and collaboration include:
  – co-location and locating in community
  – use of crisis text lines, warm lines, and suicide hotlines;
  – use of paraprofessionals
Crisis Continuum: System Coordination and Community Collaboration (cont.)

- Primary and Psychiatric Care Providers
- Child Welfare
- Law Enforcement
- Schools/Education
- Emergency Departments
- Juvenile Justice and Family Courts
- Community Organizations
Crisis Continuum: System Coordination and Community Collaboration (cont.)

• Schools/Education

• Emergency Departments

• Juvenile Justice and Family Courts

• Community Organizations
Workforce Strategies

• Telehealth
• Co-location
• Satellite Locations
• Broad-based Teaming
Financing a Crisis Continuum of Care

• Potential sources include:
  – Medicaid,
  – commercial insurance,
  – local and state educational funds,
  – child welfare,
  – mental health state general funds,
  – and/or federal grants.

*Often used in combination*
Financing a Crisis Continuum of Care

• Strategies to build a continuum include:
  – braided
  – blended funding
  – re-prioritizing where funds are used.

• States and localities may elect to blend or braid to address the needs of children, youth, and young adults.
Financing a Crisis Continuum of Care: Blended (or Pooled) Funding

• Precludes the ability to report which funding stream incurred a specific expense.

• Funders must accept reports on services provided across the population served, rather than services provided to specific children, youth, and young adults using their stream of dollars.

• Federal and state statutes prohibit the blending of some funds.
Financing a Crisis Continuum of Care: Braided Funding

- Brings funding streams together under a coordinated agency or single entity.
- Streamlines service provision by eliminating the need for an individual to enter separate programs to obtain each component identified in a single plan of care. Although a single entity oversees all expenditures, each stream is maintained to allow for the careful accounting of how every dollar from each stream is spent.
Financing a Crisis Continuum of Care: Braided Funding (cont.)

• Most federal funding streams require careful tracking of staff time, with requirements for allocation of personnel hours and other revenue-specific accounting and allocation requirements. Consequently, when multiple funding streams are paying for a single program or system, the system needs to be carefully designed and monitored to ensure compliance with all applicable federal and state statutes and regulations.
Department of Children and Families
Division of Children’s System of Care (CSOC)

Trauma Informed SOC, Utilizes an Integrated Approach to Care Embedded in System of Care Approach (values and principles)
Policy Authority, Funding Agency
Approves and manages the Provider Network
(BH carve out; Providers bill on fee for service basis)

Contracted System Administrator (ASO+)
Single Point of Entry and Access to Care
24/7 Triage, Utilization Management
Care Coordination
Authorizes Services
Non risk based
Hosts CSOC’s MIS (EHR and Data)

Family Support Organizations
Family-led peer support and advocacy for parents/caregivers and youth group

Care Management Organization
Utilizes Wraparound model to serve youth and families with moderate and complex needs; designated health home entity

Children’s Interagency Coordinating Council (CIACC)-One per county (21)-local planning bodies

Mobile Response & Stabilization Services
Crisis response and planning; 24/7/365 within 1 hour

Populations Served are youth (and their families) with one or more of the following:
• Behavioral health challenges
• Substance use challenges
• Intellectual/developmental disabilities
• Autism
**Youth with multisystem involvement: child welfare and/or juvenile justice

Other Authorized Services includes but is not limited to:
• Biopsychosocial Assessments
• In home Clinical/Therapeutic
• Out of Home Care (OOH)
• Partial Hospitalization/Partial Care
• Substance Use Services
• In home Behavioral for I/DD youth
• Family Support Services for I/DD Youth
• Non Medical Transportation
• Interpreter Services
• Outpatient
• Assistive Technology

- 1115 Waiver-Children’s Supports Waiver, I/DD and SED
- State Plan Amendments
  • Targeted Case Management-CMO
  • Psych under 21 Benefit-OOH Programs
  • Rehabilitative Option-MRSS, IIC/BA, Out of Home
- State Option to Provide Health Homes
- Flex Funds

State and Federal Appropriations
Title XIX and Title XXI

State of New Jersey
Division of Children and Families
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