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National SOC Expansion Evaluation Leadership Team

- Dr. Kristin Williams-Washington, COR-SAMHSA
- Dr. Garrett Moran, Project Director-Westat
- Dr. Daksha Arora, Project Manager-Westat
- Dr. Ana Maria Brannan, Principal Investigator-Indiana University

Evaluation Team

- Federation of Families for Children's Mental Health (Lynda Richard, Marie Niarhos)
- Youth M.O.V.E. National (Brianne Masselli, Lacy Kendrick Burke, Logan Nalker)
- Westat project team

Evaluation Team: NFFCMH

About National Federation of Families for Children’s Mental Health
- The only national advocacy organization with the sole mission of advocating for children with serious social, emotional, and behavioral challenges and their families
- Participated in a variety of national evaluation studies & has served as TA partner for SOC grantees

NFFCMH’s Role in the National SOC Expansion Evaluation
- Ensure that the evaluation tools and design:
  - Include the “voice” of the family
  - Are family friendly and
  - Elicit fuller family participation
- Help families understand the importance of evaluation

Evaluation Team: Youth M.O.V.E.

About Youth ‘Motivating Others through Voices of Experience’ (M.O.V.E.) National
- Unite the voices and causes of youth while raising awareness around youth issues
- Advocate for youth rights and voice in mental health and other systems that serve them
- Help guide the redevelopment of the systems so that no youth falls through the cracks

Youth MOVE’s Role in the National SOC Expansion Evaluation
- Assuring that evaluation tools and protocols are youth friendly and that implementation is youth guided.
Evaluation Team

- University of Washington (Michael Pullmann)
- DMA Health Strategies (Richard Dougherty, Wendy Holt)
- Walter R. McDonald and Associates (Kurt Moore, Keri Jowers)
- George Mason University (Allison Evans-Cuellar)

Purpose of Evaluation

- Evaluate two new initiatives to expand SOC scope and reach to larger geographic regions
  - System of Care Expansion Planning Grants
  - System of Care Expansion Implementation Cooperative Agreements
- Provide more detailed information on how to successfully bring SOCs to scale and sustain them

CMHI Expansion Planning & Implementation Awards (2011-2013)

Evaluation: Multi-level Approach

- Jurisdiction Level
  - As defined by grantee (e.g., states, multi-county, Tribal area)
- Local System Level
  - Communities within the jurisdiction directly delivering services to children/youth and their families within the local system of care
- Child and Family Level
  - Children, youth, and families served through local systems of care
Jurisdiction Level

- Planning and Implementation Grantees
  - Stakeholder interviews
  - Web-based self-assessment

- Implementation Grantees Only
  - Network analysis
  - Financial mapping and benchmark studies
  - Geographic information system (GIS) analysis

Stakeholder Interview

- Purpose
  - Describe how system of care is organized at the jurisdiction level
  - Identify jurisdiction-level mechanisms and strategies to implement and expand SOC

- Method
  - Semi-structured interviews
  - Based on conceptual framework

Stakeholder Interview Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System of Care Principles</th>
<th>System Components</th>
<th>Management, Policies, Procedures</th>
<th>Support of Local Service Delivery</th>
<th>Geographic Data Covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family-driven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth-guided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-supported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally &amp; linguistically competent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interagency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative/Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least restrictive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Components</th>
<th>Management, Policies, Procedures</th>
<th>Support of Local Service Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth-guided</td>
<td>What strategies are in place to support youth involvement in management decision-making?</td>
<td>What efforts are being made to ensure that a full range of youth services and supports are available in the service array across?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interagency</td>
<td>What strategies are in place to support interagency collaboration in local service systems within the jurisdiction?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stakeholder Interview

- Respondents
  - Project director of grant
  - Heads of child-serving agencies and organizations
  - State-level directors of family and youth organizations

- Data collection
  - Interviews lasting 60 to 90 minutes
  - Conducted once in last quarter of 1st year of funding

Self-Assessment of Implementation

- Purpose
  - Identify jurisdiction-level mechanisms and strategies to implement and expand SOC
  - Assess SOC development over time

- Method
  - Web-based survey
  - Indicators identified through the conceptual framework used for stakeholder interviews
Self-assessment Framework

System of Care Principles
- System Components
- Operational Management, Policies, Procedures
- Support of Local Service Delivery
- Geographic Area Covered

Examples of Indicators

Management, Policies, Procedures
- Support of Local Service Delivery

Interagency
- Key child/family agencies are involved in management of the SOC at the jurisdictional level (e.g., development of policies and procedures)

Accessible
- Jurisdiction-level strategies are in place to ensure access to services

Self-assessment of Implementation

• Respondents
  - Grant leadership
  - Administrators of child-serving agencies and organizations
  - State-level directors of family and youth organizations

• Data collection
  - Online survey that takes about 30 minutes
  - Conducted annually in last quarter of each funding year of funding

Network Analysis: Jurisdiction Level

• Purpose
  - Depict inter-agency linkages at top administrative level
  - Describe change in linkages over time

• Method
  - Web-based network analysis survey

Example Question

To what extent does your agency or organization collaborate with this other agency/organization to improve access to services across the jurisdiction?
Network Analysis: Jurisdiction Level

- Data used to generate estimates of
  - Network density
  - Centrality
  - Fragmentation
  - Coordination

Respondents
- Upper to mid-level administrators of child-serving agencies and organizations
- Upper to mid-level staff of family and youth organizations
- Other system of care partners

Data collection
- Online survey that takes about 30 minutes
- Conducted in the first and third years of funding

Financing Study

- Financial mapping
  - Describe how services are funded at state-level
  - Depict change over time
  - Interviews with one or two financial officers
  - Conducted annually

- Benchmarking study
  - Describe shifts in service use and expenditures across funding sources over time
  - Analysis of State, block grant and Medicaid dollars

Geographic Information System (GIS): Jurisdiction-level

- To depict geographic spread of jurisdiction-level partners involved in system of care implementation and expansion efforts
- Based on work addresses of participants in meetings, webinars, events related to
  - Governance
  - Management
  - Training

Local System Level

- Implementation Grantees Only
  - System of Care Expansion Assessment (SOCEA)
  - Network analysis
  - Geographic information system (GIS) analysis

SOCEA

- Purpose
  - Describe how local systems deliver services
  - Assess how well processes embody system of care principles and meet service system goals

- Method
  - Semi-structured interviews
  - Ratings based on established criteria
  - Based on conceptual framework
SOCEA: Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management and Operations</th>
<th>Service Array</th>
<th>Quality Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family-driven</td>
<td>Youth-guided</td>
<td>Individuated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-supported</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Culturally and linguistically competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>Least restrictive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOCEA: Service Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry into Services</th>
<th>Service Planning</th>
<th>Service Delivery and Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family-driven</td>
<td>Youth-guided</td>
<td>Individuated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-supported</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Culturally and linguistically competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible</td>
<td>Community-based</td>
<td>Least restrictive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Small Group Activity

Network Analysis: Local

- **Purpose**
  - Depict inter-agency linkages among local agencies involved in direct service delivery
  - Describe change in linkages over time

- **Method**
  - Web-based network analysis survey

- **Respondents**
  - Local mid-level administrators
  - Supervisors of practitioners

- **Data collection**
  - Online survey that takes about 30 minutes
  - Conducted in the first and third years of funding

Network Analysis

To what extent does your agency or organization collaborate with this other agency or organization to improve access to services across the jurisdiction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/Organization 1</th>
<th>Agency/Organization 2</th>
<th>Agency/Organization 3</th>
<th>Agency/Organization 4</th>
<th>Other Agency/Organization (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>Don't Know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please respond for each organization/agency.
Geographic Information System (GIS): Local System Level

- Depict geographic spread of partners involved in:
  - Local implementation of system of care
  - Activities and events related to direct service delivery
- Based on work addresses of participants in meetings, webinars, events related to:
  - Management
  - Training

Child and Family Level

- Implementation Grantees Only
  - Up to two local service systems within broader jurisdiction
  - Purpose
    - Describe client population served
    - Track outcomes over time
    - Assess youth and caregiver appraisals of service experience

Child and Family Level

- Sample
  - Caregivers of children and youth served through the local SOC
  - Youth 11-21 years old who are receiving services
- Data collection
  - Data collected by local SOC staff
  - Augmented SAMHSA’s TRAC system
  - Entry into services, 6 months, 12 months, discharge
  - While child, youth, or family is receiving services

Child and Family Level

Instrument Package

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographics, background info</td>
<td>Caregiver, youth, record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services received in past 6 months</td>
<td>Record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatric Symptom Checklist – 17 items</td>
<td>Caregiver, youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia Impairment Scale – 13 items</td>
<td>Caregiver, youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver Strain Questionnaire – 13 items</td>
<td>Caregiver</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local-National Evaluation Collaboration

Small Group Activity

Steps

1. Clarifying research purpose and goals  [Completed]
2. Refining evaluation questions and design
3. Developing data collection tools
4. Identifying types of respondents
5. Establishing data collection procedures
6. Obtaining Federal Office of Management & Budgets (OMB) Clearance (Application, Revision, Approval)
7. Developing electronic data collection and management systems
8. Training data collectors and other staff
9. Collecting data (plan to begin in first half of 2015)
10. Analyzing data
11. Reporting findings
**Local-National Evaluation Collaboration**

- Site Liaison assigned to each grantee as one central point of contact
- Project mail box for grantees to contact project team by email at any time with any questions/concerns/issues
- Toll-free number
- Training and technical assistance on evaluation processes

**Grantee Next Steps**

- Assign one point of contact for the evaluation team
- Assign a back-up contact
- Assess your technology needs (computers, internet connection, phone lines, etc.)
- Assess your current data collection procedures
- Assess, estimate, and plan for resources for evaluation (time, staff, budget)
- Prepare your partners and collaborators for participation in the evaluation
- Work with evaluation team to resolve barriers
- Volunteer to test the initial data collection tools