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Harris County TX: Third largest in USA
Over 1,000,000,000 children & adolescents
Diverse ethnicity & culture

Assumptions
Grant would function similar to previous multi-agency efforts

Challenges
Incorporating system of care principles, especially family voice

Program installation through Year 2
Conflict & miscommunication amidst sincere efforts

Year 2 site review recommendation
Governing board retreat to address the following:

Problems in Program Installation
Governance board structure & size
13 state & local agencies on original governing board
51% must be family members
Some family members represented family advocacy community organizations such as: CHADD, ADDA, FFCMH, NAMI
Governance structure: 16 monthly meetings of 3 Task Forces with 9 Workgroups & sub-committees
Governing board: N= 38

Problems in Program Installation
Governance structure & process
Within each of 3 task forces & 9 committees
Different interpretations of system of care values & principles
Structural recipe for miscommunication & duplication of effort
Blamed personalities as barriers to change
Increasing family representation slowed decision making
Agency executives commitment was strong
Family members were passionate
But family voice seemed to mean approving every decision
Additional complications
Multiple family advocacy groups
Multiple leaders
All trying to form a single group (Parent Empowerment Group)

Problems in Program Installation
Family members in the governance structure
Mistrust & misunderstanding
Many family members had previous negative experiences with agencies represented on board
Family advocacy groups operated in less formal manner
Agency executives worked together in other forums
Decisions were constantly “re-decided”
Blamed personalities as barriers to change

Problems in Initial Implementation
Organizational context & readiness
Implementation of wraparound
Agency executives commitment to use model was strong
But training events did not produce consistency or fidelity
Wraparound philosophy & process were not well understood
Attempts at transformation of practice were met with resistance
Agency-based wrap teams did not change agency practice
Problems in Program Installation

Mother nature & staff selection

Grant award occurred in close proximity to Hurricane Katrina

Massive influx of evacuees with mental health needs

Interfered with initial staff selection

Interim Project Director tasks:

Decrease number of governing board members

Increase diversity in governing board to include family members being served by grant

Simplify & unify workgroups including multiple family groups

Program Installation Decision-Making Forums

Governing Board (N=38)

Executive Committee

Fiscal Task Force

Operations Task Force

Membership Committee

Services Protocol & Procedures Committee

MIS Committee

Training Committee

By-laws Committee

Multiple family advocacy groups

Strategic Planning Task Force

Systems of Care Committee (community partnerships)

Sustainability Committee

Advocacy Committee

Youth Advocacy Council

Evaluation Advisory Council

Implementation Research

Implementation is a specified set of activities designed to put into practice a program of known dimensions.

Implementation processes are purposeful, described in sufficient detail so independent observers can detect presence & strength of a specific set of activities.

Implementation activities are described in sufficient detail so independent observers may detect their presence & strength.


Results

Meta-review of wraparound literature 1987-2008

Core implementation components  N= 61

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Context</td>
<td>6 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Readiness</td>
<td>12 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitative Leadership</td>
<td>6 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Stability Assessment</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Level Intervention</td>
<td>25 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Stability Assessment</td>
<td>20 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision or Coaching</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Selection</td>
<td>12 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Training</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Selection</td>
<td>0 (%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results

Meta-review of wraparound literature 1987-2008

Stages of implementation components  N= 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages of Implementation</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Economic &amp; Political Context</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration &amp; Adoption</td>
<td>4 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Installation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Implementation</td>
<td>3 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Implementation</td>
<td>4 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>6 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>6 (22%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theory Base for Team Development

NIDRR studies by five universities:
Elements of effective teamwork in developmental disabilities
(Eno-Heineman, 1997)

Applied in SAMHSA grants: Studies on wraparound theory base
(Bertram & Bertram, 2004; Malyskaik, 1997, 1998; Malyskaik-Bertram, 1998-2001)

Applied in Kansas City multi-system child welfare change efforts
(Bertram, 2008)

Team Composition

Differentiate!
One team with subsystems

Core
Those who best know the situation or who influence use of key resources

Extended
Those implementing plan strategies

They provide service & information but are not team decision-makers

Systemic Team Development

Power & challenge of collaborative models: differing perspectives

Team composition affects assessment & outcomes

Clear team structure maximizes team efficiency & efficacy

Team structure: 4 evolving, inter-related sets of agreements

Greater cohesion in agreements contributes to better performance

Shared goals & rules of operation are basis for collaboration

Assessment is ecological & systemic, summarized by team agreement on current status that is used with goals to develop plan of action


Team Structure

1. Ultimate goals
2. Rules of operation
3. Assessment
4. Action plan & evaluation

Information-sharing
Information needed
How to share it

Decision-making
How to make decisions when not all agree

Conflicts resolution

Systems of Hope Goals

Clarification & support of practice

Timely family-centered, youth focused care will be easily accessible, collaborative & integrated, individualized, flexible, effective, seamless & reflective of systems of care principles as we work toward family, youth & community safety & support

Systems Transformation

- Early response to needs of families
- Collaboration among community resources
- Families & youth are involved collaboratively at all levels
- Supported by centralized data sharing & open communication
- Joint training provided for direct service staff, families & community to enhance respect, collaboration & awareness
- In the process we embrace change of policy & procedures within an established infrastructure to sustain this effort

Information we must share

Clarification & support of practice

- Current info on family & youth, including presenting problems, strengths, engagement with formal services & informal natural supports, gaps and barriers to meeting needs
- Information regarding community resources & supports

Systems Transformation

- Are family & youth engaged with other agencies?
- Aggregate data to board on fidelity, outcomes, costs, satisfaction, gaps, barriers, & capacities
- Measures of collaboration & commitment
- Background info to guide decision-making on action items
- Currently, what can agencies & organizations do? What are their responsibilities & constraints?
How we share information

Clarification & support of practice
- Respectfully
- Help families organize, get copies of their info
- Centralized form for gathering & sharing info
- Strive not to use terms that make us defensive

Systems Transformation
- White papers on big issues (pros, cons, concerns, etc)
- Social marketing to agencies on benefits of SOC
- Aggregate, de-identified data that reveal progress toward achieving overall goals
- Memorandums of understanding between agencies & groups
- Defining terms so everyone understands
- We will respectfully advise others of terms that are offensive

How we share information

Governing board process
- Respectfully, with efficient use of time
- If you do not have enough information… ask for it
- Use work teams to clarify issues & generate pros & cons.
- Send these “white papers” within 5-7 days of board discussion & decision-making
- Families & staff will experience no ramifications from active participation

How we make decisions

Governing board process
- Refer all discussions to our overall goals
- Have we followed our information sharing rules?
- Fact based & data driven
- Dialog, within time limits, try to reach consensus
  (Consensus is group decision without strong dissent)
- If necessary vote
- Record decisions: Pro & cons & dissenting opinions
  When information dictates we may rethink previous decisions by first exploring the dissenting opinions, pros & cons

How we resolve conflict

Be Respectful & use a step by step process
- Identify if conflict is practice or systems level
- Do we have all of the information that we need?
- If not, table the issue and/or send it to a workgroup
- When things get emotional, what is the emotion about?
- Present viewpoints as objectively as possible
- Consider the tone of your presentation
- Listen to opposing views
- Look for similarities then look for differences
- Can it be resolved now?
  If not then use an ombudsman or workgroup

Ecological assessment

Assets & competencies

Experienced staff, families, & agencies
- History of collaboration using wraparound in TRIAD agencies
  We have many of the right people at the table

Community network of family organizations
- NAMI, CHADD, Federation of Families, & more are working together
  Commitment level & confidence of governance group
- Part of national movement of systems of care
- Systems change work group & opportunity for systems change
- Youth engagement & support

Informal social marketing is occurring
- We have passion & commitment
- We have an opportunity to breakdown service barriers

Diversity of the county
- Offers many informal supports

Ecological assessment

Assets & competencies

Direct practice: wraparound implementation

Some teams are well composed & aware of resources
- Flex funds for families
- Youth engagement & support

Children & Youth Services & Juvenile Justice transformation
- Juvenile Justice resources & willingness to engage
- Wraparound teams operate outside of Systems of Hope

Timeliness of grant
- Insurance companies are interested
- Funding sources want youth to remain in own homes
- Interest from business community
Ecological assessment
Constraints & challenges

Governing board process
Deficits in board development include a micro focus on operations
We have been polarized with unclear roles and processes
We need a smarter & more efficient structure
Work team roles, responsibilities & process aren’t clearly defined
We must refine & increase youth engagement & support
Need more diversity on Board
Gaps in knowledge base: Systems of care & wraparound

---

Ecological assessment
Constraints & challenges

Direct practice: wraparound Implementation
Depth of understanding & practice in the agencies
Gaps in knowledge & skills
Model fidelity is a concern in all agencies
Composition & structure of care teams
Cost benefit analysis
Family constraints are not being addressed such as transportation & childcare
More flex funds needed
Not using family advocacy groups
Greater cultural competence engaging families & their communities
Violence in community
Refining and increasing youth engagement and support

---

Ecological assessment
Constraints & challenges

Systems Transformation
Complexity, size and diversity of county
Large number of service organizations in community
We haven’t engaged schools, churches, small businesses & government
Individual agency climate & culture challenges
Implementing evidence based practices
Medicaid billing issues re: wraparound
Challenge of sustainability in a resource deficient State
PEG is in its infancy & must develop

---

Assessment summary
We’ve made tremendous efforts in a short period of time.
It’s like being in a tornado while trying to construct a road.
After this retreat we’re on the road to transformation.

Opportunities at multiple levels
We are part of a national movement with wealth of resources, experience, knowledge, passions & commitment (see asset assessment)
Positive things are happening with families & youth (see recent outcomes)

Challenges
We’ve been unclear about structures, roles & responsibilities.
We’re ready to clarify these with realistic expectations & effective governance
We’ve also not been as clear as we must about both wraparound and systems of care, within the grant, within agencies & the community
Along the way, some of us were hurt even though no one meant to hurt anyone. We now have a structure we created to move beyond this.

---

Plan of action

Board level
Grant director & staff will meet with co-leaders of work teams to:
Define role & responsibilities of each team
Prioritize & fit activities from action items
Identify pros & cons of this selection and then
Send a white paper summary to governing board for March meeting
Based on white paper, we will develop strategic plans to address practice & systems transformation activities to move Systems of Hope toward accomplishing our overall goals.
Unanimously accepted by governing board 1-26-2008

---

Action items

Systems Transformation
Define workgroup tasks & functions
Assure appropriate representation of families, youth & agencies
Develop team to work on sustainability & model fidelity
Identify team leaders committed to team effectiveness
Document activities in sufficient detail to inform governing board
Define Parent Empowerment Group’s role and responsibilities so it acts as an independent family service organization leading families to appropriate self sufficiency
Engage schools in the grant
**Action items**

**Systems Transformation**

Train board, agencies, & community on wraparound
   Each agency representative must:
   1. Educate their board on Systems of Care
   2. Identify practices & procedures that may need to be changed
to implement systems of care principles & wraparound

Create community alliances via social marketing of a clear message

Identify & link to grassroots community resources

Create funding streams for sustainability

---

**Action items**

**Direct practice level**

Define grant staff roles & responsibilities

Free grant staff to make operational decisions

Reorganize staff assignments from agency to geographic area

Establish ongoing training (wraparound vs. case management)

Clarify services, policies & procedures

Engage schools on wraparound teams

Use families in clarifying practices

Clarify roles of wrap teams & Parent Empowerment Group

Identify & implement evidence-based practices

Clarify expectations of referral sources

---

**Post-Retreat Governance Structure**

**Governing Board**  (N= 20)

Cultural & Linguistic Competency Work Team

Continuous Quality Improvement Team

Evaluation Advisory Council

Fiscal & Sustainability Work Team

Parent Empowerment Group

Social Marketing Work Team

Systems Change Work Team

Youth Advocacy Council

---

**Recommendations**

Program installation requires a well-composed, well-structured team

Establish practical initial agreements on:
   Ultimate goals & rules of operation
   Information necessary to achieve goals
   How that information should be shared
   How decisions should be made when not all agree
   Conflict resolution guidelines

Those agreements serve as basis for collaborative program installation

Deeper, broader community assessment is then possible

Plan development for initial implementation then has more buy-in

---

**Implications**

Value-based principles, relationships, charismatic leaders, & task forces guided by parliamentary procedure do not ensure collaboration, integration, efficiency, nor efficacy

Theory base that may better support collaboration & integration of efforts?

Systemic Team Development

Ecological Systems Theory