Youth and Family Training Institute

High Fidelity Wraparound: Continuous Quality Improvement – Soup to Nuts!

June 7, 2016
1:00-2:30pm
Introductions!

- **Youth and Family Training Institute**
  - Monica Walker Payne, Ph.D. (ABD) – Evaluation Director

  [Youth and Family Training Institute banner]

  [http://www.yftipa.org]

- **Allegheny Family Network**
  - Maria Silva – Senior Supervisor, Credentialed Coach, and Family Partner Tri-Chair of the State-wide Evaluation Subcommittee

  [Allegheny Family Network banner]

  [http://www.alleghenyfamilynetwork.org]
Who is in the room today?

- Family Members?
- Youth?
- Wraparound Practitioners?
- Administrators or Policy Makers?
- Researchers or Evaluators?
- Others?
• Youth and Family Training Institute

  ▶ PA High Fidelity Wraparound
    - Background and Team Structure
    - Training
    - Coaching
    - Credentialing

  ▶ Evaluation and Continuous Quality Improvement
    - High Fidelity Wraparound Process – Standardized Chart Forms
    - Fidelity
    - The Continuous Quality Improvement Process
    - Preliminary Outcomes
Learning Objectives

1. Participants will understand how YFTI’s training, coaching, credentialing, and monitoring program provides a comprehensive continuous quality improvement process.

2. Participants will learn how standardized wraparound chart documentation pinpoints areas for coaching and program improvement.

3. Participants will practice using data and critical thinking skills to identify program strengths and challenges.

4. Participants will be able to connect continuous quality improvement practices to improved wraparound fidelity and outcomes.
• YFTI has been in existence for 8 years.

• YFTI trains, coaches, and credentials High Fidelity Wraparound (HFW) workforce members, which (in Pennsylvania) consist of: Coaches, Facilitators, Family Support Partners and Youth Support Partners.

• YFTI ensures the HFW workforce has the knowledge and skills to provide HFW consistently, with accountability, and fidelity to the process.

• YFTI provides technical assistance and helps prepare counties and system partners interested in implementing HFW.
Funding

• Youth and Family Training Institute
  ▶ Office of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services (OMHSAS)
  ▶ Community Care Behavioral Health Organization
  ▶ University of Pittsburgh Department of Psychiatry

• Commonwealth of Virginia (training)

• SAMHSA Grants
  ▶ System of Care Cooperative Agreement (HFW Implementation and Evaluation)
  ▶ System of Care (State-wide) Expansion Implementation Grant (Training and Evaluation)
  ▶ Healthy Transitions Grant (Evaluation)
  ▶ Behavioral Health Alliance of Rural Pennsylvania (BHARP) System of Care Project (Evaluation)
  ▶ Philadelphia System of Care Project (Training)
A process for supporting youth and families that

... is defined by Ten Principles of how the process is implemented.

... is done in Four Phases and related activities that describe what is to be done.

... fits the four components of the Theory of Change (TOC) that explains why it works.
In Pennsylvania, the recommended HFW workforce team for every 50 youth/families is:

• One Coach/Supervisor
• Four HFW Facilitators
• Two Family Support Partners
• Two Youth Support Partners
The focus is on learning the High Fidelity Wraparound Model, more specifically, the Ten Principles, the Four Phases (activities and skill-sets), Theory of Change and workforce roles to effectively practice the model.

Our trainings were adapted from the Vroon VanDenBerg.LLP Model
All HFW workforce members must attend:

- Five Day HFW Team Training
- 2 Day Coach Training
- Online Transition Training
- Chart Form Training
- Evaluation Training
- Advanced Training and Credentialing Renewal
  - Web Based Skill Training and Topics
  - Approved Agency required learning
- Train the Trainer Program (optional)
A High Fidelity Wraparound (HFW) Coach uses the Coach Circuit to support the Facilitator, the Family Support Partner and the Youth Support Partner in role skills to do their work in the team process.

The Coaching Circuit is a research informed teaching progression (‘learn, watch, practice, do, teach’) that builds knowledge and skills creating fidelity to the process and positive outcomes for youth and families.
Coaching Circuit

- Targeted Professional Development Plan w/Goals
- Coaching on Topic/Family Presentation
- Modeling
- Behavioral Rehearsal
- Live Coaching
- Peer-to-Peer Coaching
The **credentialing process** for High Fidelity Wraparound refers to the skill attainment each HFW workforce member must reach in order to become credentialed in their HFW role. All skills are scored on a tool with scoring rubric. Local coaches and YFTI coaches achieve inter-rater reliability as a part of the Coach Credentialing process.

The **credentialing process** ensures that all HFW workforce members are receiving the same knowledge and education. This leads to consistency in the HFW process and fidelity to the process.
Professional Development Continuum

Training
- Coach Prepares Staff for Training
- Team Training

Coaching
- Data, Coaching Agreement, PDP
- Coaching Circuit
- Credentialing

Evaluation and Quality Control
- Fidelity and CQI
- ATCR

Youth and Family Training Institute support is ongoing
Evaluation and Continuous Quality Improvement

- **High Fidelity Wraparound Process Data**
  - Statewide Chart Form data from our 2015 4th Quarter Coaching Report
  - Data from 294 families across 16 counties implementing High Fidelity Wraparound

- **Fidelity Data**
  - 339 youth and families across 16 counties implementing High Fidelity Wraparound
  - Longitudinal Sample - 38 youth and families across 12 counties implementing High Fidelity Wraparound
  - Montgomery County – 21 youth and families at 90 days after intake and 15 youth and families at Transition

- **Outcomes Data**
  - 6, 12, 18, and 24 month outcomes on 120 youth and families from 13 System of Care counties
  - *Note: This evaluation is currently in progress and the sample size varies depending on the length of time that youth and families have been enrolled.*

---

Data was collected from October 2012 – January 2016 from the CMHS National Evaluation - Longitudinal Outcomes and Satisfaction Study; from November 2013 – January 2016 from the Wraparound Fidelity Index – Short Form (WFI-EZ); and from September – December 2015 from the Youth and Family Training Institute HFW Chart Forms.

The Data Profile Report (DPR) for the PA SOC Partnership is produced by the CMHS National Evaluation Team and adapted by the PA System of Care Partnership Evaluation Team. The report is based on data collected by PA SOC Partner Counties as part of the evaluation of the Comprehensive Community Mental Health Services for Children and Their Families Program. Data collection for the program is still ongoing; thus, results presented in this report do not represent final results and should not be interpreted as such. The DPR serves to provide a periodic update on the children and families served in the PA SOC Partnership.

This report was developed under grant number SM061250 from the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). The views, policies, and opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of SAMHSA or HHS.
HIGH FIDELITY WRAPAROUND
PROCESS DATA...
Can we standardize an individualized process??

• We wanted to dig deeper into the process to understand:
  ▶ When and how changes were happening
  ▶ How the roles on the team worked together
  ▶ How the skills were implemented differently by each role
  ▶ How the plan was matching up with what was actually happening throughout the process
  ▶ How much time was spent by each role on the team
  ▶ How long the phases (and the whole process) typically last – connected to the number of needs and the complexity of issues
  ▶ Benchmarks to strive toward while implementing the process
• Forms were designed to standardize how all counties/providers document information about the HFW process.

✓ The process itself will be unique for each family, but the information that is categorized, recorded, and tracked during the process will be the same.

✓ The forms will not increase the burden on youth and families because they are completed by staff.

✓ The forms do not have the expense of interviewers and participant payments so the data collection is sustainable.
A Collaborative Process with Many Stakeholders

- The Evaluation Team met with the “chart form group” at the YFTI to design and refine the forms (coaching/training/family/youth).

- Coaches from 3 HFW counties came for a 2-day workshop retreat and participated in follow-up calls to refine the forms and discuss buy-in and roll-out of this method.

- System partners from the YFTI Advisory Board, System of Care State Leadership Team, and Evaluation Subcommittee reviewed the forms and gave feedback and suggestions about how data should be best collected and reported to their systems.

- Youth and families from the YFTI Advisory Board and Evaluation Subcommittee reviewed the forms and offered feedback and suggestions about what is important to collect and track from their perspectives.

- We presented the idea to state leaders and got approval to start piloting the forms in 5 counties (Bucks, Montgomery, Northumberland, and Crawford, and Venango) for 5 months (December 2013 – April 2014)

- We made changes based on Pilot feedback and rolled out the Chart Forms state-wide on January 1, 2015.
HFW Process and Outcomes Tool

High Fidelity Wraparound Chart Forms

- Referral to HFW
- Enrollment to HFW
- First Team Meeting
- Team Meeting
- Team Meeting
- Team Meeting
- Transition Meeting

*Data CutOff is 45 days from Enrollment
The HFW Chart Forms

- Engagement Form
  - Referral info
  - Demographics (including expanded cultural, linguistic, and disability information following new CLAS standards)
  - Living Situations
  - Trauma
  - Core Family Information
  - Supports
  - Community Involvement

- Contact Note
- Needs /Goals Form
- Team Meeting Cover Sheet /Updates
- Transition Cover Sheet /Updates
- Post Comparison Form
We purchased a software package that allows us to scan paper forms or PDF files directly into our database to cut down on the burden of data entry.

All of our data is de-identified - It is important that providers fill out the ID number clearly on the teleforms and mark each answer within the circle or square so they are processed accurately.
County providers have options for how they can get data to us...

- Copies of completed paper forms can be mailed to the Evaluation Team in large self-addressed postage paid envelopes.

- PDF forms that were either completed on paper and scanned or typed into via Adobe Professional can be uploaded to us securely through the YFTI Registration Website.

- Some counties have built the forms into their electronic medical record systems and do monthly data dumps.

- We are currently building a web interface that allows users to log into their provider’s portal and complete all of the forms securely online. Forms can then be saved in PDF format or printed for local agency use.
• Quarterly or Bi-annual CQI Reports

- **Descriptive** – (Ex. Referral source, system involvement, presenting issues, mental health diagnoses, custody, people involved in the planning/treatment process, etc.)

- **Demographic** – (Ex. Race, ethnicity, gender identity, sexual orientation, income, education, language, disability status, etc.)

- **Coaching** – (Ex. Days in each phase, Time spent, Types of Supports, Primary Purpose of Contact, Content Domains, Skill Utilization, Goal Progress, etc.)

- **Outcomes** – (Ex. Changes in system involvement, services, functioning, living situations, natural supports, community involvement, family, etc.)

- **Data Dashboards!** – We are currently developing a web-based dashboard system where all of our providers can interact with their own data and statewide comparisons in real time!
• 294 families were enrolled in the 4th Quarter of 2015
• 16 Counties
  ▶ Allegheny
  ▶ Bucks
  ▶ Chester
  ▶ Crawford
  ▶ Delaware
  ▶ Erie
  ▶ Fayette
  ▶ Greene
  ▶ Lehigh
  ▶ Luzerne
  ▶ Montgomery
  ▶ Northumberland
  ▶ Philadelphia
  ▶ Venango
  ▶ Wyoming
  ▶ York
## Average Days Spent in Each Phase

### Contact Note

#### Days in Each Phase

by Phase and Role

### 2015 Q4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Youth:</th>
<th>294</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Averages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days to 1st Team Mtg.</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Imp</th>
<th>Trans</th>
<th>Days Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>127.4</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>157.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Standard deviation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Imp</th>
<th>Trans</th>
<th>Days Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>111.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Range:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Imp</th>
<th>Trans</th>
<th>Days Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 148</td>
<td>1 - 396</td>
<td>1 - 434</td>
<td>1 - 329</td>
<td>1 - 509</td>
<td>1 - 470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

1. This report includes data from all youth enrolled in the program during the reporting quarter.
2. Phase calculations are based on the earliest Contact Note date for that phase and the latest Contact Note for that phase. This combines the contact notes of all roles.
3. Days Overall is calculated by Enrollment and Transition Dates, unless the Youth has not Transitioned, then the calculation uses the Enrollment Date and the most recent Contact Note (during that quarter).

### Questions:

1. How long are families spending in engagement? Are we getting to 1st team meeting/planning phase within 30-45 days?
2. Does the number of days in each phase make sense related to the work being done? For example does the number of days in engagement phase match the days to 1st team meeting? If not why? This could be caused by a few things. This calculation takes into account the notes of all roles. Are the workforce members on the same page with the phase the youth/family is in? Did someone indicate the wrong phase?
## Contact Note
### Time Spent (Hours)
by Phase and Role

#### 2015 Q4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>FAC</th>
<th>FSP</th>
<th>YSP</th>
<th>Coach</th>
<th>Missing Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Hours by Role:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>1,752.0</td>
<td>1,502.1</td>
<td>1,416.3</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>477.5</td>
<td>543.7</td>
<td>468.8</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>827.0</td>
<td>693.4</td>
<td>658.7</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>401.1</td>
<td>219.1</td>
<td>243.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data-driven Coaching

- Individual staff performance
- Team Professional Development Plans (PDPs)
- Trends in the data
- Comparisons to the state averages
- Program management and oversight
# Life Domains by Phase and Team Member

## Contact Note:
Domains
by Role and Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth Support Partner</td>
<td>1402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Phase Totals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Imp</th>
<th>Trans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Behavioral/Emotional/Clinical</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Drug and Alcohol</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Educational/Vocational</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Financial</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Health</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Home/Family</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Legal</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Multi-system Involvement: At-risk</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Multi-system Involvement: Current</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Natural Supports/Community Building</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Safety</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Transportation</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Trauma</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Other</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Skills Utilized by Phase and Team Member

### 2015 Q4

| Family Support Partner | 1282 |

### Phase Totals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Eng</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Imp</th>
<th>Trans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Skills

1. Introduced/oriented new team members to HFW
2. SNCD development/review
3. Identified new strengths
4. Identified new areas of need
5. Educated professional and community members about HFW
6. Prepared for meeting
7. Provided support for family
8. Provided support for youth
9. Met with team
10. Brainstormed new ideas for progress
11. Assisted with access to necessary resources
12. Identified support for action steps
13. Identified supports to help with assigned tasks
14. Progress update
15. Followed up on HFW plan
16. Monitored plan revision
17. Functional Assessment
18. Crisis prevention/development/review
19. Crisis Stabilization
20. Updated team on needs/strengths
21. Evaluated progress: Team Mission
22. Checked on/Reevaluated Family Vision
23. Celebrating Successes
24. Other:
Teaching Self-efficacy through the HFW process

Percentage of Contact Notes by Phase

- **Engagement (n=403)**
  - Doing For: 36.6%
  - Doing With: 4.5%
  - Cheering On: 1.2%

- **Planning (n=693)**
  - Doing For: 36.1%
  - Doing With: 26.8%
  - Cheering On: 4.9%

- **Implementation (n=245)**
  - Doing For: 24.2%
  - Doing With: 19.9%
  - Cheering On: 8.3%

- **Transition (n=57)**
  - Doing For: 6.1%
  - Doing With: 10.2%
  - Cheering On: 20.4%

*Facilitator Q4 2015*
• Do For, Do With, Cheer On!

Teaching Self-efficacy through the HFW process

**Percentage of Contact Notes by Phase**

- **Doing For**
  - Engagement (n=370) 46.8%
  - Planning (n=657) 29.2%
  - Implementation (n=211) 17.3%
  - Transition (n=39) 6.5%

- **Doing With**
  - Engagement (n=370) 51.6%
  - Planning (n=657) 29.2%
  - Implementation (n=211) 46.9%
  - Transition (n=39) 7.7%

- **Cheering On**
  - Engagement (n=370) 6.5%
  - Planning (n=657) 8.7%
  - Implementation (n=211) 8.1%
  - Transition (n=39) 2.6%
Teaching Self-efficacy through the HFW process

**Percentage of Contact Notes by Phase**

- **Engagement (n=403)**
  - Doing For: 5.2%
  - Doing With: 11.4%
  - Cheering On: 43.2%

- **Planning (n=693)**
  - Doing For: 14.6%
  - Doing With: 26.0%
  - Cheering On: 37.8%

- **Implementation (n=245)**
  - Doing For: 17.5%
  - Doing With: 22.9%
  - Cheering On: 32.2%

- **Transition (n=57)**
  - Doing For: 5.3%
  - Doing With: 11.8%
  - Cheering On: 35.1%

**Youth Support Partner Q4 2015**
FIDELITY TO THE MODEL...
• 339 families were enrolled in the Wraparound Fidelity Index-Short Form (WFI-EZ)
• 16 Counties
  ▶ Allegheny
  ▶ Bucks
  ▶ Chester
  ▶ Crawford
  ▶ Delaware
  ▶ Erie
  ▶ Fayette
  ▶ Greene
  ▶ Lehigh
  ▶ Luzerne
  ▶ Montgomery
  ▶ Northumberland
  ▶ Philadelphia
  ▶ Venango
  ▶ Wyoming
  ▶ York
Developed by the Wraparound Evaluation and Research Team (WERT) at the University of Washington

A set of questionnaires completed with key informants who are involved in High Fidelity Wraparound (HFW)

Parallel forms can be given to:

- **Youth (11 years or older)**
- **Caregivers**
- **HFW Facilitators**
- **HFW Team Members (Youth Support Partners, Family Support Partners, Other Family Members, Natural Supports, System Partners, etc.)**

Each questionnaire is a brief, self-administered survey that measures adherence to the HFW principles.

Taken together, these forms measure the quality or “fidelity” of HFW implementation in a community or program.
• Context of Fidelity
In Pennsylvania, all HFW participants in all HFW counties are to be given the WFI-EZ to fill out at two times during the HFW process:

(1) 90 days after enrollment
(2) At transition

*Because some families are in crisis, refuse the assessment, drop out of the process before 90 days, or are unable to schedule within the time window(s), we do not receive data from 100% of enrolled families.*
### HFW Team Perspectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Caregiver</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th>Team Member</th>
<th>Total Forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PA 90-Day (223 families)</strong></td>
<td>154</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PA Transition (116 families)</strong></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean Total Fidelity Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA 90 Day (n=223)</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA Transition (n=116)</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Mean</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Mean is based on the Caregiver National Mean established in February 2015. National Means range from 69.3% - 73.6% depending on the team role.
Effective Teamwork | Natural/Community Supports | Needs-based Strategies | Outcomes-Based Plan | Strength-and-family-driven
---|---|---|---|---
PA 90 Day (n=223) | 68.6% | 66.8% | 75.2% | 70.2% | 82.9%
PA Transition (n=116) | 70.6% | 72.5% | 77.0% | 80.5% | 85.5%
National Mean | 67.8% | 65.6% | 73.8% | 75.3% | 77.6%

National Mean is based on the Caregiver National Mean established in February 2015.
### County Mean Fidelity Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>90 Day Mean Fidelity Score</th>
<th>Transition Mean Fidelity Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County 1</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 2</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 3</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 4</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 5</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 6</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 7</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 8</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 9</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 10</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 11</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 12</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 13</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 14</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 15</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

National Mean is based on the Caregiver National Mean established in February 2015. National Means range from 69.3% - 73.6% depending on the team role.
How we take a closer look at the questions to identify strengths and challenges...
B5. With help from members of our HFW team, my family and I chose a small number of the highest priority needs to focus on.

B6. Our Action Plan includes strategies that address the needs of other family members, in addition to my child.

B8. At every team meeting, my HFW team reviews progress that has been made toward meeting our needs.

B13. My family was linked to community resources I found valuable.

B23. I worry that the HFW process will end before our needs have been met.

---

### Needs-based Strategies – Item Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PA 90 Day</th>
<th>PA Transition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B5.</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6.</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8.</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13.</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B23.</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B19. I am confident that our HFW team can find services or strategies to keep my child in the community over the long term.

B20. Because of HFW, when a crisis happens, my family and I know what to do.

B21. Our HFW team has talked about how we will know it is time for me and my family to transition out of formal HFW.

B24. Participating in HFW has given me confidence that I can manage future problems.

B25. With help from our HFW team, we have been able to get community support and services that meet our needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PA 90 Day</th>
<th>PA Transition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## County Mean Satisfaction Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>90 Day Mean Satisfaction Score</th>
<th>Transition Mean Satisfaction Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County 1</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 2</td>
<td>87.5% 77.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 3</td>
<td>85.7% 86.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 4</td>
<td>85.3% 72.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 5</td>
<td>83.3% 87.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 6</td>
<td>83.2% 88.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 7</td>
<td>82.4% 88.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 8</td>
<td>80.0% 89.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 9</td>
<td>78.8% n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 10</td>
<td>77.5% 84.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 11</td>
<td>76.3% 85.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 12</td>
<td>74.8% 83.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 13</td>
<td>71.1% 83.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 14</td>
<td>71.1% 81.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 15</td>
<td>69.0% 81.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**National Mean Satisfaction Scores:**
- Caregivers: 79.96%
- Youth: 76.69%
Successes to Celebrate!

• **8 counties** increased their 90-Day Mean Fidelity Scores from 2014 to 2015

• **7 counties** increased their Transition Mean Fidelity Scores from 2014 to 2015

• **8 counties** were above the National Mean for the 90-Day Mean Fidelity Scores in 2014 and 2015

• **8 counties** were above the National Mean for the Transition Mean Fidelity Scores in 2014 to **10 counties** above the National Mean in 2015
THE CONTINUOUS QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROCESS
Our Tri-Chairs presented a workshop at the June PA System of Care Partnership Learning Institute

“Data through the eyes of youth, family, and system partners”

June 18-19, 2015 at the Penn Stater in State College, PA

Learning Objectives:

− What do youth, family, provider, and system partners look for in data slides?
− What data is most meaningful to each group?
− What critical questions can we ask from different partner perspectives? (i.e. potential next steps in the CQI process)
− How can data be used for the continuous quality improvement of HFW/SOC?
− How can we use data to spark discussion at County Leadership Team Meetings?

The subcommittee also made several Tip Sheets about using data that are available on the PA SOC Partnership website:

http://www.pasocpartnership.org/resources/evaluation
Tip: Choose a reason to look at data and how to focus the discussion.

• Reasons to look at data...
  - Strengths-based – look at positive things, discuss possible strengths of your program that may have led to the positive results, and celebrate successes around the work that your program has done that has made a difference.
Data reported were collected using the Living Situations Questionnaire (LSQ). This instrument collects data on the status of the child/family in the 6 months prior to the interview.
Tip: Choose a reason to look at data and how to focus the discussion.

- Reasons to look at data...
  - **Challenges** – look at barriers to positive change, discuss what possible challenges your program has that may have led to the results, discuss the elephant in the room, and identify areas for improvement.
In the past 6 months have you been . . .

Data reported were collected using the Delinquency Survey–Revised (DS–R). This instrument collects data on the status of the youth age 11 years and older in the 6 months prior to the interview. Because participants may have had multiple criminal justice contacts, percentages may sum to more than 100%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Questioned by the Police</th>
<th>Arrested</th>
<th>Told to Appear in Court?</th>
<th>Convicted of a Crime?</th>
<th>On Probation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Months</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Months</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tip: Choose a reason to look at data and how to focus the discussion.

- Reasons to look at data...
  - Outcomes – focus on one particular part of the program and look at a small number of outcomes to see how the program is functioning and what is working/not working.
    - Bring in staff and/or family/youth who have participated to help think about the outcomes.
Decreased Internalizing and Externalizing Behaviors

Data reported were collected using the Child Behavioral Checklist 6–18 (CBCL 6–18). This instrument collects data on the status of the child/family in the 6 months prior to the interview. Internalizing and externalizing scores 64 or above are in the clinical range. Scores on the eight narrow band syndrome scale 70 or above are in the clinical range.
Tip: Choose a reason to look at data and how to focus the discussion.

• Reasons to look at data...
  
  - Confusing/conflicting information - spark discussion from different perspectives around the table (family, youth, systems, providers, community, etc.) - ask critical questions and reflect about why some information is mixed or conflicting.
Data reported were collected using the Education Questionnaire–Revision 2 (EQ–R2). This instrument collects data on the status of the child/family in the 6 months prior to the interview.
Tip: Choose a reason to look at data and how to focus the discussion.

- Reasons to look at data...
  - Lack of information – identify areas where there is a need for more data and brainstorm ways that you could obtain more information about the topic.
    - How do you build relationships with different systems, providers, or managed care companies to get data?
    - Can you hold Community Cafes to gather information?
    - Focus groups?
Tip: Develop a plan about next steps.

1. Identify what you are doing well and make sure that the good work continues.
2. Choose and prioritize areas that you want to improve or adjust.
3. Discuss whether you have all the information you need or if you need to brainstorm more ideas/sources of data, etc.
4. Discuss who, what, when, where, how, why the plan will be developed around CQI.
5. Decide when updates will be made to the group and how the group will be informed of progress.
PRELIMINARY OUTCOMES...
120 youth/caregivers enrolled in the Longitudinal Outcomes and Satisfaction Study

13 Counties
- Chester
- Crawford
- Delaware
- Erie
- Fayette
- Greene
- Lehigh
- Luzerne
- Montgomery
- Northumberland
- Philadelphia
- Venango
- York
Data reported were collected using the Multi-Sector Service Contacts–Revised (MSSC–R) questionnaire. This instrument collects data on the services received by the child/family in the 6 months prior to the interview.
Data reported were collected using the Multi-Sector Service Contacts–Revised (MSSC–R) questionnaire. This instrument collects data on the services received by the child/family in the 6 months prior to the interview.
Youth and Family Training Institute:

Monica Walker Payne, Ph.D. (ABD) – Evaluation Director
walkermm@upmc.edu
(412) 856-2890

Allegheny Family Network

Maria Silva – Senior Supervisor
msilva@alleghenyfamilynetwork.org
(412) 238-6111
• Discussion

• Any questions or comments?
• Thank you so much for your attendance and participation!

Thank you to the PA SOC Partnership for funding and support.

Pennsylvania System of Care Partnership

www.pasocpartnership.org

This presentation was developed [in part] under grant number SM061250 from the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). The views, policies, and opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of SAMHSA or HHS.