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What do we mean by the “sustainability” of systems of care?

System of Care Concept

Defining Sustainability

• Maintenance of systems of care over time
  Services, Infrastructure, and Philosophy
• Maintenance of systems of care after federal funding has terminated

Array of Effective Community-Based Services & Supports

Cultural & Linguistic Competence
Social Marketing

Youth & Family Involvement

State Infrastructure
Local Infrastructure

Sustainable Systems of Care Have:

Policies, practices, structures, finances and philosophy in place in order to provide the services and supports that increase the capacity for children with serious emotional disturbances and their families to live, work, learn and participate fully in their community.
How can sustainability be assessed?

Special Study on Sustainability in National Evaluation

- Explore extent to which systems of care are maintained after federal funding
- Identify features more likely to be sustained and those less likely
- Identify factors that affect sustainability
- Identify successful strategies for sustainability

Methodology of Sustainability Study

- Literature review, focus groups
- Web survey
  - Current or former project director
  - Mental health system rep
  - Family member
  - Rep of another child serving system
- Telephone interviews
  - Current or former project director
  - Family member
  - State children's mental health director

Array of Services and Supports

Comparison of:
- Degree to which each of the services and supports in the array was available during the grant period
- Degree to which each of the services and supports is available during the current period (last 12 months)

System of Care Philosophy

- Individualized care
- Interagency coordination - system and service levels
- Service accessibility
- Family involvement - system and service levels
- Cultural competence - system and service levels

System of Care Goals

Comparison of goal achievement during the grant period and during the current period:
- Minimizing need to leave the community for services
- Reducing services in overly restrictive settings
- Ensuring sufficient service capacity
- Using evaluation to inform policy and program decisions
- Maintaining focal point for system management
- Maintaining an active family organization
- Achieving general acceptance of system of care philosophy among system managers/leaders and service providers

Presented at the 17th Annual RTC Conference, Tampa FL, 2/29 – 3/3 2004. For more information, contact Beth Stroul: bethstroul@aol.com
What do we know about sustainability in “graduated” communities?

Sustainability of Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increased Availability from Grant to Current Period</th>
<th>Decreased Availability from Grant to Current Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medication treatment/monitoring</td>
<td>Inpatient/individual family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case management</td>
<td>Professional consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic group homes</td>
<td>Inpatient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse treatment</td>
<td>Flexible funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent living</td>
<td>Hospice care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-school/summer programs</td>
<td>Family preservation/home-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition to adult services</td>
<td>Family support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral aides</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition - residential to community</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most Available Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Grant Period</th>
<th>Current Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient individual</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case management</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis and evaluation</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient family</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medication treatment</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional consultation</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency/trauma</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sustainability of Philosophy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Grant Period</th>
<th>Current Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family involvement – service level</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergency coordination – service level</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual care</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural competence – service level</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural competence – system level</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support accessibility</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family involvement – system level</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergency coordination – system level</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared administrative processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Achievement of Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increased Achievement from Grant to Current Period</th>
<th>Decreased Achievement from Grant to Current Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimizing need to leave community for services</td>
<td>Ensuring sufficient service capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing services in overly restrictive settings</td>
<td>Using evaluation data to inform program and policy decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving general acceptance of SOC philosophy among system/program managers</td>
<td>Maintaining a focal point for management of the system of care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving general acceptance of SOC philosophy among service providers</td>
<td>Supporting and maintaining an active family organization in the community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factors Affecting Sustainability

Factors most present in sites:
- Local commitment to the SOC approach
- Increased utilization/reliance on Medicaid
- Existence of ongoing administrative leadership
- Intergency partnerships
- Inclusion of key stakeholders at all levels
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Impact of Factors on Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Impact Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existence of key stakeholders at all SOC levels</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interagency relationships and partnerships</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local commitment to SOC approach</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of ongoing administrative leadership</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of ongoing training</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of constituency advocating for SOC approach</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of a “champion” with power/influence</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infusion of SOC into larger system and separate</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of evaluation data on effectiveness of SOC</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State commitment to SOC approach</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State involvement in the SOC</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategies for Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Percent Using</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobilizing resources</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positioning in SOC approach</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>building stakeholders</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing public/private level support</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>establishing strong interagency relationships</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using evaluation results</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating an advocacy base</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating an ongoing focal point for managing SOC</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing a strong family organization</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making policy/legislative changes for SOC</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realigning the MH system into broader systems</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financing Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Percent Using</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increasing ability to obtain Medicaid reimbursement</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growing more efficiently</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building partnerships with non-MH systems</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building sustainable revenue streams</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balancing costs of MH systems</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining new/increased state funds</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage funding sources</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redirecting from higher to lower cost services</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing fees for services</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeing or blending funds from several agencies</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using or finding new funding options</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financing Strategies, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Percent Using</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leverage money saved by negotiating or reducing</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growing non-covered state funds</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining new/increased federal funds</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund sharing</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing new/increased state funds</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative sharing</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing new/increased private or corporate funds</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>re-investing</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generating new revenue through mainstream activities</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are the implications for currently funded communities?
Implications for Systems of Care

- Need for greater focus on maintaining supportive services (respite, home-based, family support, mentoring, flexible funds)
- Greater attention to increasing service capacity
- Increased emphasis on maintaining principles at the system level (family involvement and interagency coordination) as well as service level

More Implications

- Attend to infrastructure elements in sustainability planning (e.g., focal point for system management, evaluation, maintaining family organization)
- Maximize factors that enhance sustainability (e.g., nurture state partnerships)
- Use multiple sustainability strategies (e.g., create a viable focal point, forge interagency partnerships, include key stakeholders, create a strong family organization, infuse SOC into larger system, partner with state to make needed policy/regulatory changes)
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