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Rehabilitation, Empowerment, Natural Supports, Education and Work {RENEW}

- Developed in 1996: 3-year RSA-funded employment model demonstration project for youth with SED in Manchester NH
  - Initial promising results (Bullis & Cheney, 1999; Cheney, Malloy & Hagner, 1998; Malloy, Cheney, & Cormier, 1998)
- Provided by a non-profit community based agency in New Hampshire: 1998-2007
- Provided to youth in high schools as the tertiary level intervention in a 3-tiered PBIS model (2002- present) : NH, Illinois, Missouri, Pennsylvania, & Wisconsin
- Provided to youth as part of SOC projects in North Carolina
- Delivered by community mental health providers in New Hampshire (2008- present)
- Focus is on community-based, strengths-based, self-determined services and supports
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The APEX High School Model: Positive Behavior Interventions & Supports & RENEW
Malloy, Agorastou & Drake, 2009 Adapted from Illinois PBIS Network, Revised Sept., 2008 & T. Scott, 2004

Tier 3/Tertiary
- RENEW and Wraparound
- Simple Individual Interventions (Brief FBA/BIP, Schedule/Curriculum Changes, etc)

Tier 2
- Small Group Interventions (CICO, Social and Academic support groups, etc)
- Weekly Progress Report (Behavior and Academic Goals)
- Competing Behavior Pathway, Functional Assessment Interview,
- ODRs, Attendance, Tardies, Grades, Credits, Progress Reports, etc.

Universal:
- School-Wide Assessment
- School-Wide Prevention Systems
- Student Progress Tracker; Individual Futures Plan

Annual Event Dropout Rates: Schools in APEX III Project (2009-2013)
RENEW Theory of Change

RENEW Facilitators
Provide:
• Personal futures transition planning
• Individualized team development and facilitation
• Facilitation for career development and vocational supports
• Braided resource development
• Flexible education program
• Employment and work-based learning
• Mentoring
• Community connections

Shorter-Term Improvements In:

Self-Determination Capacity & Opportunity

Student Engagement Behavioral, Cognitive, & Affective

Social Support Source & Type

Longer-Term Outcomes
• Improved emotional & behavioral functioning
• School graduation
• Employment
• Community Integration
• Post-secondary Education

RENEW: Conceptual Framework

School-to-Career Transition

Youth, Family, RENEW

Education

Children’s Mental Health

Interagency Collaboration & Wraparound

Self Determination

Disability
RENEW PRINCIPLES

- Natural Supports
- Self-Determination
- Unconditional Care
- Flexible Resources
- Strengths-Based Supports

RENEW Phases

Phase 1: Youth Matched with facilitator
Futures Plan MAPPING Completed

Phase 2: Team Formed
Plan Developed

Phase 3: Implementation and Monitoring of Plan

Phase 4: Transition
**RENEW Implementation in NH**

**NH Transition Projects 1996-2004**
- # Youth = @300

**NH PBIS-HS Projects 2002-Present**
- # High Schools = 15
- # of Youth = 132

**Community Mental Health Projects- 2008-Present**
- # Agencies = 7
- # Trained Facilitators = 48
- # Youth = 189

---

**Peer Reviewed Publications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Youth re-entry Project - U.S. Department of Education</td>
<td>1999-2002</td>
<td>Youth with disabilities, ages 15-21 in juvenile detention or placement facilities</td>
<td>Community re-entry - Employment</td>
<td>Hagner, Malloy, Mazzone, &amp; Cormier, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APEX III PBIS Dropout prevention project - NH Department of Education</td>
<td>2009-present</td>
<td>7 NH high schools with high dropout rates among students with disabilities; RENEW to 72 students with disabilities</td>
<td>High school completion - Employment</td>
<td>Unpublished data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENEW I &amp; II Capacity Building Projects - Foundation funded</td>
<td>2009-present</td>
<td>6 community mental health centers - RENEW to 180 youth with EBD, ages 15-19</td>
<td>Improved behavioral functioning - High school completion - Employment</td>
<td>Unpublished Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RENEW OUTCOMES

Jesse C. Suter

Participants

• 89 students from 7 NH High Schools Fall 2006 thru Fall 2012
• 64% identified as male, 36% female
• Mean Age = 16.3 (SD=1.1), 14 to 19
• 78% identified as White, 13.5% Hispanic or Latino, 8% as African American
• 70% receiving disability related services
Analyses

Longitudinal multilevel models
Random intercepts & slopes MLM
(Hedeker, 2004; 2006)

Three semesters were analyzed:

Student Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before RENEW</th>
<th>1st Semester</th>
<th>2nd Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Days Absent</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexcused Days</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Behavior Problems

Office Disciplinary Referrals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before RENEW</th>
<th>1st Semester</th>
<th>2nd Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODRs</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suspensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before RENEW</th>
<th>1st Semester</th>
<th>2nd Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out of School</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In School</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academic Progress

Grade Point Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before RENEW</th>
<th>1st Semester</th>
<th>2nd Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Credits Earned (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Before RENEW</th>
<th>1st Semester</th>
<th>2nd Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credits %</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < .001
Limitations & Next Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limitation</th>
<th>Next Step</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No comparison group</td>
<td>Exploring possibility of historical comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No examination of school-level</td>
<td>Examining these in next analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>influences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not all data available for</td>
<td>Gather all available data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analyses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TEAM COMPOSITION, SERVICE SATISFACTION, & OUTCOMES

Mason G. Haber

Wraparound in Transition Services

• Wraparound teams have been widely used in serving transitioning adolescents

• There are many reasons why wraparound can be helpful for these youth:
  ➢ Parent support continues to be needed
  ➢ Teachers’ can help facilitate individualized school-to-career planning
  ➢ Mental health & VR professionals can help parents, teachers understand needs
  ➢ Coordination across sectors *even more* important for the age group
  ➢ Teams provide best opportunities for all to work together, and for youth to practice self-advocacy
Wraparound in RENEW

• Basic challenge: How can youth be self-determined in a team of adults?
• RENEW adapts wraparound to promote self-determination of older youth.
• Adaptations:
  – Teams are youth driven with family & other supports
  – Plan developed beforehand (Futures Plan)
  – Youth selects members and leads team
  – Team implements the futures plan

Preliminary Evidence

• Mixed evidence on age differences in wraparound “as usual” (Haber, Cook, & Kilmer, 2012; Walker et al., 2012)
• In RENEW:
  ➢ Youth perceived self-determination higher in RENEW vs. comparison teams (Haber & Burgess, 2011)
  ➢ Youth more satisfied when parents participate (LaPorte et al., 2013)
  ➢ Supports strengthen in RENEW programs, relating to other changes (Burgess & Haber, 2013)
Study Purpose & Questions

**Purpose:** to examine feasibility & associated outcomes of diverse teams in school-based RENEW programs.

**Questions:**
1) What types and combinations of supports regularly participate in RENEW teams?
2) How is this participation linked to youth satisfaction & outcomes?

Participants & Procedures

- 36 youth in 7 RENEW school-based programs; subsample of outcomes study
- Data were collected in one-on-one interviews by the 3rd author & local family organization director
- Interviews occurred in regularly scheduled meetings with youth from Fall 2011 – Spring 2012.
- Measure: *Youth & Family Involvement in Teams* (YFIT; Haber & Malloy, 2011)
  - Global, Team Satisfaction & Self-determination
  - Youth identified regular participants (> 50%) in meetings as parents/caregivers, school, outside professionals
  - Open response items allowed for further detail on members to be provided.
Analyses

• Patterns of participants and frequencies described

• Multivariate analyses of Covariance (MANCOVAs) used to assess group differences on YFIT scales
  – Covariates: age, perceived choice in members
  – Predictors: caregiver, school, outside professional vs. not; interactions of these

• Multilevel models used to examine relationships between MANCOVA predictors and:
  – YFIT scales
  – Outcomes

Team Composition Descriptives

• All meetings were attended by youth and RENEW specialists
• At least one of the three types of participants (i.e., parents, teachers, outside professionals) regularly participated in most (84%) of meetings.
• Participant types:
  ➢ Caregivers were in roughly half (47%) of teams, mostly biological parents, though some (<20%) foster parents and grandparents were identified.
  ➢ School professionals were in 66% of meetings, these were identified as teachers in all two cases
  ➢ Outside professionals were in 52% of meetings; details of these individuals were provided by only 3 of 15 youth.
  ➢ Nearly three-quarters (74%) of meetings including at least one formal support of any type (i.e., teachers or outside professionals).
  ➢ Informal supports were on less than a quarter (21%) of teams; few additional details were provided on these supports, and they were excluded from subsequent analyses.
• Roughly half of teams included regular participation from at least two types.

Overall, a diverse range of participant types regularly attended meetings, including caregivers, in school, and external supports
MANCOVA Findings  
(YFIT Service Satisfaction)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wilk's Lambda</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Adults (Flatness)</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adults by Scales (Parallelism)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wilk's Lambda</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver * Scale</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher * Scale</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP * Scale</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combinations of Adults (Levels)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wilk's Lambda</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver * OSP</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver * Teacher</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher * OSP</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combinations of Adults (Parallelism)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wilk's Lambda</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver * OSP * Scale</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver * Teacher * Scale</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher * OSP * Scale</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.465</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compensatory Two-way Interactions:

Caregiver * Other Professional

- Caregiver * Other Professional

- Caregiver * Teacher

- Teacher * OSP

Potentiating interactions:

- Caregiver*teacher

- Teacher*osp

Compensatory interaction:

- Caregiver*teacher

- Teacher*osp

p < .10 trend for higher scores on teams with outside professionals

Response Scale:
0 = strongly disagree, 1 = disagree, 2 = neutral, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree
**Potentiating** Two-way Interactions:
Other Professional * Teacher

**Potentiating** Two-way Interactions:
Caregiver * Teacher

Response Scale:
0 = strongly disagree, 1 = disagree, 2 = neutral, 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree
Multilevel Models: Analysis

• Outcomes:
  ➢ Engagement (Attendance)
  ➢ Behavioral (Disciplinary Referrals)
  ➢ Academic (Credits, GPA)

• Up to 4 semi-annual follow-ups:
  ➢ Fall 2009 – Spring 2012
  ➢ YFIT data collected last two time periods (retrospective)

• Design:
  ➢ Level 1 (random): Time
  ➢ Level 2 (fixed): roles, roles * Time, roles * roles (2 way interactions), roles * roles * time (3 way interactions)

Multilevel Models: Findings

• Engagement (excused, unexcused absences):
  ➢ non-significant

• Behavioral (ODRS, suspensions):
  ➢ Suspensions: non-significant
  ➢ ODRS:
    – Compensatory effects: 3 trend level ($p < .10$) interactions: caregiver * time, caregiver * outside professional, caregiver * outside professional * time
    – Potentiating effect: Significant teacher * outside professional * time ($p < .01$)

***As with satisfaction findings (MANCOVAs)***

...caregivers & outside professionals compensated for one another’s absence (with EITHER, youth got better)

...teachers & outside professionals were most effective in one another’s presence (youth did best with BOTH)***
Multilevel Models: Findings

• **Academic** (earned credits overall and as % of those attempted, GPA):

  ➢ Improvement was related to *participation by outside professionals* ($p$s < .10, .05, .05, respectively)

  ➢ Findings provide strong support for collaboration across settings in school-based programs

Discussion

• Collectively, these findings clearly highlight possible advantages of wraparound teams in transition services:

  ➢ **Compensatory effects**: other supportive adults can step in where caregivers do not

  ➢ **Potentiating effects** of *cross-setting combinations of professionals* (i.e., school, non-school)

  ➢ Participation by supports from outside of schools had the strongest associations with **ACADEMIC** improvement!!

• Should more transition programs be using teams??