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Choices History

- 12 Years
- Dawn Project
- Expansion to other states
  - Hamilton Choices
  - Maryland Choices
  - Washington, DC

Core Components: Successfully Managing Systems of Care

System of Care Implementation Factors
Hodges, et al. (2008)
1. Blended Funding
2. Champion for Change
3. Collaboration
4. Creating Neutrality
5. Customer Service Focus
6. Focus on Kids
7. Information Utilization
8. Leadership
9. Provider Network
10. Readiness and Willingness to Change
11. Self-Reflection
12. Strength-Based Approach/Emphasis
13. Tenacity

Choice Centered Care

- Organizational Management
- Supervision
- Practice
- Community Partnership
- Learning Organization and Staff Training
- Technology
System Context

- Catalysts for change
  - Rising costs
  - High utilization of out-of-home placements
  - Federal grants
- Champions for change
  - Leader(s) in the community
  - State vs. county infrastructure
  - Interest in wraparound and SOC framework

Collaboration

- Cross-system responsibility
  - Community partners
- Governance structure

Family Involvement

- Family Support Organization
- Advocacy
- Participation throughout the system

Blended Funding

- Cross-system funding
  - Multiple agencies commit money to system
  - System access
  - Flex funds
- Funding structure
  - Case rates
  - Risk level

Provider Network

- Contracting
  - Flexibility in identifying providers
- Inclusion of non-traditional supports
- Ongoing communication
- Development of new services
- Community Development Manager

Information Utilization

- The Clinical Manager (TCM)
- Child and Adolescent Needs and Strengths (CANS)
- Dedicated evaluation staff
- Multiple tools to distribute and make information useful
- Reports to partners and funders
Phrases that Pay

1. LISTEN, LISTEN, and then LISTEN!
2. What are the Strengths, the Strengths, and the Strengths?
4. Make the decision value driven.
5. With every decision who do we empower/disempower?
6. Families don’t fail - plans do.
7. A crisis is when the adults don’t know what to do.
8. Find the positive Intent and Reframe.
9. Be part of the solution, not the problem.

10. Incremental not instantaneous.
11. Time wounds all heels and you can’t fail without trying.
12. See with the magic eye, listen with the third ear.
13. How we voice our concern is as important as the concern being voiced.
14. You tell us!
15. If your service decision meets the Wraparound Values test, go ahead!
16. You can’t burn out if you’ve never been lit!
17. No Parents No Solutions - Know Parents Know Solutions
18. Change agents change first.

Training

• Identified training staff
• Choices Orientation
• Ongoing Training
• Cross-site collaboration

Supervision

• Low CC to Supervisor Ratio
• Regular individual and group supervision
• Field Supervision
• Strengths-Based Supervision

Care Coordination

• Low Youth to CC Ratio
• High Fidelity Wraparound
• Task Timeline
• Best practice guidelines
• Needs Aren’t Services
  – Low/no cost services
  – Natural supports
• Access to technology

Capturing Success: Measuring Outcomes Across Multiple Systems of care
Outcomes

• Strength Development
• Improved functioning
  – At Home
  – In School
  – In the Community
• Behavioral and Emotional Needs Addressed
• Caregiver Strengths and Needs

CANS

• Child and Adolescent Needs and Strengths
• John Lyons, University of Ottawa
  • www.praedfoundation.org

Why Use the CANS?

• Decision Support (e.g., level of care)
• Treatment Planning
  – Use strengths to design interventions
  – Address areas that require action
• Quality Improvement
• Outcomes Measurement

CANS Dimensions

• Child Strengths
• Life Domain Functioning
• Child Behavioral/Emotional Needs
• Child Risk Behaviors
• Caregiver Needs and Strengths

Ratings

• Items are rated on a 0 to 3 scale
• Needs
  0 or 1 = No action needed
  2 or 3 = Action needed
• Strengths
  0 or 1 = Used for strength-based planning
  2 or 3 = Used for strength building

Reliable Change

• 60-80% of youth are expected to improve in at least one of the dimensions
• 20-40% of youth will improve in a specific dimension
Living Environment
Maryland Choices
- 88.5% of youth remained in a low restrictive setting or moved to a less restrictive placement
- 94.8% of youth remained in the community during their enrollment

Hamilton Choices
- 82% of youth remained out of RTC/Hospitals for at least three months after discharge from Choices
- 87.3% of youth remained in a stable living arrangement for 6 months post discharge

Functioning in School
- Regular school attendance

CANS
- School Behavior
- School Achievement

Functioning at Home
- Remain in the community
- Return to the community after a residential placement
- Least restrictive placement
- CANS
  - Functioning in current living arrangement
  - Placement stability
  - Permanence

Functioning In School
- 81.6% of youth attended school regularly (i.e., at least 80% of the time) during their enrollment.
Functioning in School

- Attendance
- Behavior
- Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Youth</th>
<th>[No Change]</th>
<th>[Life]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliable Change: Life Domain Functioning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dawn Project</th>
<th>Hamilton Choices</th>
<th>Maryland Choices</th>
<th>DC Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Functioning in the Community

- Frequency and severity of juvenile justice involvement
- Juvenile Justice Module
  - CANS
    - Legal Domain
    - Safety/Crisis

Juvenile Justice Outcomes for Discharged Youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Youth</th>
<th>Improved</th>
<th>No Change</th>
<th>Declined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Juvenile Justice Treatment Needs Met

- No needs met
- Less than 50% met
- 50%–75% met
- Greater than 75% met
- 100% of needs met

Reliable Change: Child Risk Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dawn Project</th>
<th>Hamilton Choices</th>
<th>Maryland Choices</th>
<th>DC Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>110.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>110.0%</td>
<td>120.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.0%</td>
<td>110.0%</td>
<td>120.0%</td>
<td>130.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.0%</td>
<td>120.0%</td>
<td>130.0%</td>
<td>140.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130.0%</td>
<td>130.0%</td>
<td>140.0%</td>
<td>150.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.0%</td>
<td>140.0%</td>
<td>150.0%</td>
<td>160.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Behavioral and Emotional Needs

- CANS
- Ohio Scales

Youth with Behavioral and Emotional Needs at Intake

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Percent of Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Project</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Choices</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Choices</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Community Wrap</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC School-Based Wrap</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliable Change: Behavioral and Emotional Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Percent of Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Project</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Choices</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Choices</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Choices</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Caregiver Strengths and Needs

- Parenting Skills
- Caregiver Capacity
- Caregiver Functioning

Reliable Change: Caregiver Strengths and Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Percent of Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Project</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Choices</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Choices</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC Choices</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reliable Change in at Least One Functioning Dimension

Conclusion

- Core Components
- Ability to Adapt to Local Needs
- Outcomes
  - Over time
  - Across sites
  - Different service populations
  - Using different tools
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