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Overview
- Study Using Administrative Data
- Consumer Service Reviews
- Uniform Assessment Tools/Outcome Quality Management
- Standardized Fidelity Measure

Predictors of Improvement for Children Served in Developing Systems of Care
Walton, 2006

Context: 30 CMHC provide Continuum of Care
Local SOCs developed over 10 years

Question: How do outcomes for children who are served by systems of care differ from outcomes for children who are served by usual public mental health services?

Methodology
- Used Administrative Data
- 2 samples of 386 youth matched by baseline functioning, time between assessments, age, race, ethnicity
- Mixed Methodology: Qualitative Fidelity Measure & Logistic Regression Models

FIDELITY MEASURE
Based on Change Theory
(Rogers, 2003; Procheska, Norcross & DiClemente, 1992)

Measures “Level of Development” (LOD)
of System of Care Service Delivery
(Wraparound Teams) (Effland, 2004)
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LEVEL OF FUNCTIONING
Hoosier Assurance Plan Instrument for Children (HAPI-C)

Psychosocial FACTORS
(A) Affective Disorders
(B) Thinking (Community Functioning)
(C) Family Functioning
(D) School Functioning
(E) Disruptive Behavior

Contextual FACTORS
(C) Abuse
(D) Neglect
(L) Reliance on Mental Health Services

METHODOLOGY
9 LOGISTIC REGRESSION MODELS

CRITERION VARIABLES:
Improvement in Functioning

PREDICTOR VARIABLES:
Service in System of Care
Level of Development of SOC
Baseline Functioning
Controls (Age, Race, Gender, Ethnicity, Living Environment, Baseline Substance Use) Interactions between Services & other variables

CONCLUSIONS
- Target child & family wraparound services to children who are most likely to benefit
- Monitor fidelity – related to improvement for children & families
- Need a useful & accurate functional assessment tool
- Integrate effective practice (outcome measures & EBPS) into the SOC
- Multiple Strategies Needed
Tools for Transformation

- Community Services Review
- Child & Adolescent Needs & Strength (CANS) Implementation Across Service Systems
- Wraparound Fidelity Index

Measuring and Improving Practice and Results
2006 CSR Baseline Results

Ivor Groves, PhD
Human Systems & Outcomes, Inc.

The Community Service Review

- Is a CASE STUDY technique that relies on a guided professional appraisal.
- Uses various sampling strategies to “SPOT CHECK” daily front-line practice performance working conditions.

Sample by Age and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-13 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14+ years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Race/Ethnicity Adult Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number of Cases Reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Euro-American</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino-American</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biracial</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Child Level of Functioning (GAF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Functioning</th>
<th>Number of Cases Reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 - 5 Serious Impairment</td>
<td>42% 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 6 - 7 Moderate Impairment</td>
<td>42% 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 6 - 10 Mild Impairment</td>
<td>12% 38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Child Involvement with Other Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Welfare</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Justice</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Cases Reviewed

Child Case Review Outcome Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status of Child/Family in Individual Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1:</td>
<td>Good status for child/family; ongoing services acceptable.</td>
<td>Acceptability of Service System Performance in Individual Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2:</td>
<td>Poor status for child/family; ongoing services minimally acceptable but limited in reach or efficacy.</td>
<td>Acceptability of Service System Performance in Individual Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3:</td>
<td>Good status for child/family; ongoing services mixed or unacceptable.</td>
<td>Acceptability of Service System Performance in Individual Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 4:</td>
<td>Poor status for child/family; ongoing services unacceptable.</td>
<td>Acceptability of Service System Performance in Individual Cases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Child and Adolescent Needs and Strengths (CANS) Assessment

Decision Support, Quality Improvement & Outcomes Monitoring

John S. Lyons, Ph.D.
Northwestern University

Overall Practice Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Practice Performance</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Functioning 1-5, n=60</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Functioning 6-7, n=60</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Functioning 8-10, n=17</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOC vs. Usual Services

In nearly all counties in which a System of Care was functioning, stakeholders reported greater satisfaction with the access to services and the results being achieved. Consistent with the CSR ratings of children in the System of Care compared to children who were not in the System of Care.

TCOM Grid of Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family &amp; Youth</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision Support</td>
<td>Service Planning</td>
<td>Eligibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Improvement</td>
<td>Case Management &amp; Supervision</td>
<td>Accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Monitoring</td>
<td>Service Planning &amp; Celebrations</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Incremental Implementation
- Cross System Implementation Team
- Multisystem Tools and Decision Models
- Interactive Web Based Training/Certification & New Data Collection, Analysis & Reporting System

Wraparound Fidelity Index
Janet McIntyre, MPA
Indiana’s Technical Assistance Center for Systems of Care & Evidence Based Practice for Children & Families Choices, Inc.

WFI
- WFI 3.0 pilot administered in 2006
- 18 Care Coordinators
- 31 Caregivers
- 10 Youth
- N=41 different families
- 15 different Indiana SOCs
- Benchmarks for total WFI 3.0 scores:
  - 65% Minimum standard for wraparound
  - 75% Adequate wraparound
  - 85% High fidelity wraparound
- Indiana = Adequate wraparound (75.1%)

Discussion

?
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