

Meeting Summary

Following is a summary of issues discussed at the DHR Stat on February 11, 2011. Analysis is provided by StateStat and the Governor's Delivery Unit (GDU).

Follow-Up

- **The Lewin Report.** DHR was asked to provide an update on their thoughts on the Lewin Report. DHR submitted the following information in the follow-up to StateStat and they elaborated on their thoughts during the Stat:
 - *DHR agrees with the findings of the Lewin Group's report. Although Lewin did not conduct a thorough inventory of DHR's strategies or interview DHR leadership or staff, a DHR representative was present for the editing of the report and added information to the report, which is summarized as follows:*
 - *The existing Supervisory Review System is inadequate for identifying eligibility errors in time to correct them. Moreover, the additional burden of larger caseloads and fewer case managers to process them has caused many supervisors to forego supervisory reviews in order to assist in processing cases.*
 - *A more efficient and effective model of review is "pre-review," which involves a peer, lead worker or supervisor examining a case before it is finalized so that errors can be corrected efficiently. DHR's existing review automation is cumbersome and does not provide enough detail about errors that are identified. Therefore, DHR is in the process of designing an automated "pre-review" system as part of its PIRAMID (Program Integrity, Reporting and Management Information Database). DHMH will provide representation for the design workgroup.*
 - *The other principal way that DHR can reduce improper payments for Medicaid is by processing quickly and correctly all data matches, particularly those received from PARIS (Public Assistance Reporting Information System). DHR staff process more than 500 Medicaid matches per month; however, more than four times that number are awaiting action by staff. Staff shortages at the LDSS level and at DHR Central (for monitoring the matches) have contributed to the backlog.*
- **"Ready by 21" Program.** DHR stated at the previous Stat that they are working on tracking measures to provide to StateStat. At today's Stat, DHR stated that they will convene a work group consisting of a cross-section of local department Directors and staff to develop a statewide set of performance measures with which to assess the Ready by 21/Youth Matter Program. DHR will present this idea and recruit local participants at the Social Service Directors' Affiliate meeting scheduled for March 2, 2011.

Audit

- The table below the article highlights a few findings from a recent audit of DHR. DHR was asked to be prepared to discuss the audit findings at today's meeting.

Accountability and control over equipment:

The DHR Deputy Chief of Administrative Operations Cynthia Smith was in attendance today and she reported on progress made to address Audit Finding 9: Adequate accountability and control was not established over equipment.

Monitoring grant expenditures:

The Department agreed that grant expenditures were not adequately monitored. In addition to the steps outlined in the audit report, the DHR Office of Grants Management (OGM) has undertaken the following corrective actions:

- By March 1, 2011, amend instructions to sub-recipients requiring that supporting documentation be submitted with each expenditure report. Provide amended instructions to each sub-recipient upon contract renewal.
- Beginning in March 2011, provide technical assistance training to sub-recipients on providing documentation that reflects approved budgets and is traceable to specific program area cost codes.
- Expenditure reports and supporting documents will be maintained for three years after each contract expires.
- During calendar year 2011, conduct site visits for a sample of programs for Homeless Women Crisis, Domestic Violence, Access and Visitation, Fatherhood, and Temporary Emergency Food Assistance. Sample sizes are set by COMAR and State law.

Audit Findings

Federal Expenditures Disallowances of \$9.6 Million Were Paid with General Funds
Adequate Procedures Were Not in Place to Ensure the Propriety of the Payments to Legal Firms
Grant Expenditures Were Not Adequately Monitored
State Procurement Regulations Were Circumvented with the Purchase of 450 Computers
Deposit Verification Procedures Were Not Adequate
DHR Had Not Established Effective Monitoring Controls Over Certain Users' Access
Access and Monitoring Controls Over Critical Production Programs and Data Were Inadequate
DHR's Internal Network and the Vendor Network Hosting Critical DHR Systems Were Not Adequately Secured
Adequate accountability and control was not established over equipment.

Social Services Administration (SSA)

- **Adoption Goal.** StateStat was recently informed that because of the fact that adoption goals were adjusted in Montgomery County, Howard County, and Talbot County, **the statewide goal for Maryland for FY 2011 is now 539.**

DHR stated in their follow up that they recognize that the adoption goals set for 2011 are very aggressive; however they will not be making adjustments to the goals. DHR is asking locals to evaluate their particular circumstances relative to their adoption goals and to identify the barriers to be overcome in order to meet their goals.

Current Measures	Baseline		FY 2011 Goal		Sep-10	Oct-10	Nov-10	Dec-10	Source
	Date	Data	Goal	Target	for Baseline and Results				
Children in Out-of-Home Placement **	6/30/2010	8,013	Reduce by 9%	7,292	7,905	7,889	7,774	7,703	State Stat
Children in Group Homes (% of all placements)	6/30/2010	11.4%	11% or less	11.0%	11.0%	10.8%	10.9%	10.9%	State Stat
Children in Family Homes (% of all placements) (includes children in trial home visits)	6/30/2010	76.5%	76% or more	76.0%	76.2%	76.0%	75.5%	76.0%	State Stat
Adoptions	Not Applicable, depends on Plan of Adoption at end of prior Fiscal Year		Goal	562	PROGRESS TO DATE DURING FY 2010, as of				State Stat
					Dec-10	% of Target	Expected	50%	
					248	44%	Actual	44%	
					REPORTING PERIOD: Point in Time				
					9/30/10	12/31/10	3/31/11	6/30/11	
Children Placed in their Home/ Adjacent Jurisdiction ***	6/30/2009	81.5%	Increase by 3%	85.2%	Pending	Pending			MD CHESSIE
	12/31/2009	83.1%							
	6/30/2010	82.1%							
	Average	82.2%							

Family Investment Administration

- **Overall Statewide Compliance.** The data below shows the overall statewide compliance rates for Temporary Cash Assistance (TCA), The Food Supplement Programs (FSP, also known as Food Stamps) for Regular and Expedited compliance, Medical Assistance-Family and Children (MA-FAC), and the Maryland Children's Health Program (MCHP). DHR reports that, statewide, the upward trend in monthly compliance rates for all of the aforementioned programs continued through January of 2011. The data below the monthly report is through the week the ending before February 7, 2011. DHR provided an update on this data.

Approved or Denied Trends							
Compliance Rate (Approved or Denied)	TCA	FSP	Ex-FSP	MA-FAC	MCHP	All Benefits	Goal
December-09	83.3%	82.1%	91.6%	82.6%	76.1%	83.4%	100%
January-10	80.9%	77.3%	91.6%	80.4%	72.2%	80.5%	100%
February-10	80.5%	77.9%	91.8%	81.8%	72.8%	80.9%	100%
March-10	82.5%	77.9%	93.1%	84.4%	75.8%	82.5%	100%
April-10	88.7%	83.2%	93.1%	86.5%	79.7%	86.0%	100%
May-10	92.8%	89.2%	94.1%	90.5%	85.9%	90.6%	100%
June-10	92.7%	89.8%	94.5%	92.5%	89.7%	91.7%	100%
July-10	93.8%	93.6%	95.9%	94.3%	93.2%	94.2%	100%
August-10	94.0%	92.5%	95.4%	95.1%	92.7%	94.0%	100%
September-10	96.3%	94.0%	95.4%	96.6%	95.1%	95.3%	100%
October-10	96.3%	94.5%	95.9%	97.1%	96.1%	95.9%	100%
November-10	97.1%	96.7%	97.0%	98.4%	97.8%	97.4%	100%
December-10	98.5%	97.0%	98.2%	98.6%	98.1%	98.1%	100%
January-11	98.4%	96.5%	98.4%	98.3%	97.9%	97.8%	100%

Approved or Denied Trends							
Compliance Rate (Approved or Denied)	TCA	FSP	Ex-FSP	MA-FAC	MCHP	All Benefits	Goal
3/22/2010	84.6%	79.9%	91.6%	87.3%	78.1%	84.3%	100%
3/29/2010	82.2%	75.3%	93.2%	82.1%	77.0%	81.1%	100%
4/5/2010	85.5%	76.8%	93.0%	86.4%	79.8%	83.5%	100%
4/12/2010	90.5%	81.0%	94.1%	84.7%	80.6%	85.1%	100%
4/19/2010	87.6%	82.9%	91.3%	87.1%	82.3%	86.0%	100%
4/26/2010	85.8%	83.4%	93.1%	85.0%	76.5%	82.5%	100%
5/3/2010	89.0%	85.8%	92.8%	87.1%	73.9%	86.5%	100%
5/10/2010	92.0%	88.4%	95.1%	90.2%	82.4%	90.0%	100%
5/17/2010	92.6%	90.8%	93.9%	91.7%	84.2%	91.3%	100%
5/24/2010	92.1%	88.7%	92.4%	88.8%	72.4%	88.2%	100%
5/31/2010	93.8%	89.0%	95.2%	90.6%	85.7%	90.8%	100%
6/7/2010	92.8%	87.7%	92.5%	92.2%	86.9%	90.6%	100%
6/14/2010	92.5%	90.7%	95.4%	92.5%	88.3%	92.1%	100%
6/21/2010	93.6%	89.6%	93.7%	93.1%	90.5%	91.9%	100%
6/28/2010	94.7%	93.5%	95.8%	95.9%	95.5%	95.0%	100%
7/5/2010	94.7%	93.5%	95.8%	95.9%	95.5%	95.0%	100%
7/12/2010	93.1%	93.1%	95.9%	93.3%	94.7%	93.8%	100%
7/19/2010	93.0%	93.5%	96.2%	94.5%	91.9%	94.3%	100%
7/26/2010	93.0%	93.1%	95.3%	93.5%	90.0%	93.5%	100%
8/2/2010	93.0%	93.1%	95.3%	94.2%	93.9%	93.9%	100%
8/9/2010	92.4%	92.0%	96.1%	92.6%	91.3%	93.0%	100%
8/16/2010	94.7%	92.9%	95.5%	95.8%	94.0%	94.4%	100%
8/23/2010	93.8%	91.6%	95.0%	96.0%	93.3%	93.8%	100%
8/30/2010	94.5%	93.6%	95.1%	96.1%	94.7%	94.7%	100%
9/6/2010	94.5%	93.6%	95.1%	96.1%	94.7%	94.7%	100%
9/13/2010	96.3%	94.2%	95.4%	95.2%	94.1%	95.0%	100%
9/20/2010	96.1%	94.4%	95.7%	96.3%	94.4%	95.4%	100%
9/27/2010	95.7%	93.9%	94.5%	96.5%	95.2%	95.0%	100%
10/4/2010	94.5%	93.5%	94.2%	96.7%	96.0%	95.1%	100%
10/11/2010	96.5%	93.9%	96.8%	96.8%	96.2%	95.8%	100%
10/18/2010	95.9%	94.8%	95.9%	96.5%	94.4%	95.6%	100%
10/25/2010	96.8%	94.5%	96.1%	97.8%	96.5%	96.2%	100%
11/1/2010	97.0%	95.0%	94.9%	97.7%	97.7%	96.2%	100%
11/8/2010	97.9%	94.8%	96.9%	98.3%	97.9%	97.0%	100%
11/15/2010	97.0%	97.1%	97.6%	98.8%	98.3%	97.8%	100%
11/22/2010	97.1%	97.9%	97.6%	98.3%	97.8%	97.9%	100%
11/29/2010	97.0%	97.2%	96.9%	97.8%	95.7%	97.2%	100%
12/6/2010	98.0%	96.8%	96.2%	98.8%	98.7%	97.6%	100%
12/13/2010	98.5%	97.2%	98.6%	98.5%	96.8%	98.0%	100%
12/20/2010	99.1%	97.0%	98.3%	98.7%	98.3%	98.2%	100%
12/27/2010	98.1%	97.3%	98.6%	98.7%	98.8%	98.2%	100%
1/3/2011	98.4%	94.9%	96.8%	98.7%	97.3%	97.2%	100%
1/10/2011	98.8%	96.9%	98.9%	98.7%	98.4%	98.3%	100%
1/17/2011	98.5%	96.3%	98.6%	98.4%	96.5%	97.7%	100%
1/24/2011	97.2%	96.3%	97.3%	97.6%	97.9%	97.1%	100%
1/31/2011	98.5%	95.6%	98.7%	98.1%	98.0%	97.5%	100%
2/7/2011	98.9%	96.9%	98.7%	99.2%	99.0%	98.4%	100%

Compliance Rate for Approved or Denied TCA, FSP, Ex-FSP, MA-FAC, MCHP

