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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
Broad Evaluation Aims

- Identify mechanisms and strategies for SOC implementation and expansion
- Examine the extent to which the planning and implementation efforts
  - Reflect SOC values
  - Result in true expansion of SOCs
  - Increase inter-sector collaboration at top administrative levels
  - Support SOC practice at the service level
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 Interviews

• 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 (web-enabled)
  – Based on conceptual framework
Stakeholder Interviews

- **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
    - Last quarter of 1st year of funding
    - Last half of final 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 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
• In which of the following ways are youth representatives involved in SOC management at the jurisdiction-level?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How fully implemented is each strategy?</th>
<th>Not planned</th>
<th>Planned but not started</th>
<th>Little implementation</th>
<th>Somewhat implemented</th>
<th>Moderately implemented</th>
<th>Extensively implemented</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members of system-of-care management team(s)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved in developing policies and procedures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed as jurisdiction-level staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved in training staff and system of care partners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
Network Analysis: Jurisdiction Level

• **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
Network Analysis: Jurisdiction Level

• Data used to generate estimates of
  – Network density
  – Centrality
  – Fragmentation
  – Coordination
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
System of Care Expansion Assessment (SOCEA)

• **Purpose**
  – Describe how local systems deliver services
  – Describe expansion efforts
  – Assess how well processes embody system of care principles and meet service system goals

• **Method**
  – Semi-structured interviews (web-enabled)
  – Ratings based on established criteria
  – Based on conceptual framework
SOCEA

• **Respondents**
  – Local system staff and practitioners involved in direct service delivery
  – Local system family and youth representatives
  – Youth receiving services and their caregivers

• **Data collection**
  – Interviews ranging from 30 to 90 minutes (most are an hour)
  – Conducted over phone, Skype, Google Chat, etc.
  – Administered in the second and fourth years of funding
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
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

Gather into groups of 4-6 and discuss the following:

1. Of the national evaluation components presented, which do you think will be helpful to local service systems evaluation and quality monitoring efforts?
2. What challenges can we anticipate in implementing the national evaluation in local service systems?
3. What can be done to reduce barriers to local service system participation in the evaluation?
4. How can the national evaluation partners help support full participation of families and youth in evaluation implementation at local level?
Steps

1. Clarifying research purpose and goals
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 2nd half of 2015)
10. Analyzing data
11. Reporting findings

Completed
Local-National Evaluation Collaboration

- Site Liaison assigned to each grantee as one central point of contact
- Email CMHleval@westat.com at any time with any questions/concerns/issues
- Toll-free number
- Training and technical assistance on evaluation processes