

Background

- Over the past 2 decades the development of comprehensive systems of care (SOC) for children with severe emotional and behavioral challenges has become an important priority.
- The push for SOC grew from the recognition that services were often inaccessible, restrictive and fragmented (Knitzer, 1982; Stroul & Friedman, 1986).
- SOC are designed to provide a comprehensive spectrum of mental health or other necessary services which are organized into a coordinated network (Stroul & Friedman, 1986).

Background

- A recent report (Foster et al, 2006) found that one in five students are referred by schools for mental health services and that the majority of these services are performed by community-based agencies.
- While the need to link families, schools and community providers to work collaboratively to address the needs of youth with severe emotional and behavioral challenges is clear (Ebert & Keenan, 2004).
- Many systems of care struggle to get schools to the table (Leaf, Shultz, Kiser & Pruitt, 2003). PARK: 45.5% of families had school staff at CST meeting vs 18.9% in our CMHS cohort.

Building a System that Cares: The **PARK** Project, Bridgeport, CT The Partnership for Kids, or The PARK Project, is a new way to help children and adolescents, with behavioral and mental health challenges. and their families get needed services that allow them to remain at home, in school and in their own community It is a school-based System of Care, our staff members are located in

the schools we target

What is the **PARK** Project?

- The Partnership for Kids or PARK Project is an innovative approach to community-based service delivery through partnership with local schools, families, providers and state agencies, for the purpose of producing positive outcomes for children and youth with serious emotional and behavioral challenges.
- PARK is the first CMHS system of care site in CT which was the 48th state to receive a SOC grant.
- PARK is first system of care community funded for starting a system of care in the school system and working out into the community rather than starting in the community and later going into the schools

What is the **PARK** Project?

The **PARK** Project offers programs in collaboration with local agencies and the Bridgeport Board of Education in 7 Bridgeport Schools: Barnum, Paul Lawrence Dunbar, Luis Munoz Marin, Bridgeport Learning Center at Sheridan School, Wilbur Cross, Garfield and Harding High School.











Social Marketing PARK Project website www.themarkproject.org over 90,000 hits since November 2005. Billboards (in Spanish and English) seen by 35,000 people daily for six months (over six million total vecks (based on estimated two million viewings) Movie slide ads seen by 25,000 people daily for 14 weeks (based on estimated two million viewings) Newsletter (News & Views) is distributed in English and Spanish versions to target audiences twice a pediatricians' offices, and mental health facilities. Estimated 3000 calls to local 211 help line for mental health services during 2005-2006. More than 218.



Behavioral Health Services Image: Service and the service service and the service ser

Outcome Evaluation

- Enrollment criteria:
 - Attending targeted school
 - DSM IV diagnosis
 - In need of multi-agency services
 - At risk for or in out-of-home placement
 - Impairment in school, home and/or community that has lasted longer than 1 year

Sample

- 151 families included in this study.
 - All families enrolled into the PARK Project are invited to participate in outcome study, 71.6% have consented.
 - Data collected from primary caregiver and youth (age 11 and older) by trained interviewers half of whom were parents of children within the system of care.
 - Data on school incidents are collected from schools as part of PBIS evaluation; individual data for youth in outcome study was pulled from PBIS dataset.
 - Families receive a \$40 gift card for participation in each interview.

Measures Measures Child and family demographic characteristics: ÷. Child outcomes: Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL; Achenbach & Edelbrock, • Age, gender, race, SES, residential status. 1993), total score. Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale-2 (BERS; Epstein 2004), total score - parent and youth report. • Child and family risk factors: School Incidents: Frequency of office referrals for behavioral • Child: history of child maltreatment, inpatient stay infractions. or substance abuse. Parent/Caregiver Outcomes: Caregiver Strain Questionnaire (CGSQ; Brannan, Heflinger & Bickman, 1997). • Parent/caregiver: history of mental illness, felony Parenting Stress Inventory – Short Form (PSI-SF; Abidin, 1995). Utilization/Cost Outcomes: conviction, domestic violence or substance abuse. Hours and cost of all PARK funded wrap-around services.

Domographic Characteristics of Youth		
Demographic Characteristics of Youth		
 64% of the youth are male. 		
The average age is 11.7 year	rs (SD=3.5):	
 Under 7 years 	8.6%	
7-9 years	19.9%	
10-12 years	19.9%	
13-15 years	39.7%	
 Over 15 years 	11.9%	
 The majority of the youth a 	re children of color:	
 African American 	33.1%	
 Caucasian 	11.7%	
 Latino 	53.1%	
Other	1.5%	

Family Context

- 75% meet the Federal Poverty Guidelines; 89% are Medicaid Eligible.
- Fifty-six percent of the youth are in the custody of their mother only; 15 percent are in the custody of 2 parents.
- Twenty-five percent of the parents identify Spanish as their primary language.



linical Status	
89 percent of the youth have clear or sig functioning as measured by the CGAS	gnificant impairment in 0=51.33)
DSM Primary Diagnosis (n=151)	
Adjustment Disorders	14.9%
Anxiety Disorders	3.4%
Attention Deficit Hyperactivity	34.1%
Behavior Disorders	42.6%
Learning Disorders	2.8%
Mood Disorders	26.7%
Psychotic Disorders	8.0%
Substance Abuse Disorders	1.7%
Pervasive Developmental Disorders	3.4%
Personality Disorders	0.6%
Other	3.2%



Hypothesis 1 – Youth Measures

BERS2 Youth Report, BERS2 Parent Report, CBCL

Predicting Baseline

• Service Costs & Hours will be predictive of youth measures after controlling for child and family risk factors

Predicting Change over time

 Service Costs & Hours will be predictive of change in youth measures over time (slope), after controlling for child and family risk factors







Hypothesis 2 – Family Measures

Caregiver Strain Questionnaire

Predicting Baseline

 Service Costs & Hours will be predictive of family measures after controlling for child and family risk factors

Predicting Change over time

 Service Costs & Hours will be predictive of change in family measures over time (slope), after controlling for child and family risk factors

Hypothesis 2 – Results: Caregiver Strain Predicting Change in CGSQ Over Time Global Strain Scale (15.50% variance explained) Therapeutic Mentoring Costs (p < .05)

- After-school Costs (p < .05)
- Total Costs (p < .05)



Hypothesis 3 – School Measures

Predicting Baseline

Service Costs & Hours will be predictive of school
measures after controlling for child and family risk factors

Predicting Change over time

 Service Costs & Hours will be predictive of school measures over time (slope), after controlling for child and family risk factors



Summary

- Universal intervention has helped to improve climate at schools so that overall behavioral problems are reduced.
 - This has enabled cleared identification of youth with serious emotional and behavioral challenges.
- School-based wrap-around has increased the participation of school staff in service planning for individual youth and families.
 - This result is consistent with research that showed that there is a higher level of interconnectedness within school based systems of care (Nordess, 2003).



Limitations

- No comparison group.
- Assessments only provider by youth and parent/caregiver.
- Not able to capture utilization of services not funded by the system of care.

Implications

- This paper gives a beginning understanding of the impact of particular services for families within a school-based system of care.
 - Within our system of care these results are helping to inform our sustainability planning.
- Continued research to understand what families receive in a system of care and how these services impact them are needed for program and policy decision-making.