

Statewide Wraparound Project

Sub-Committee Recommendation Template
 Data and Evaluation
Revised August 30, 2007

ACTIONABLE RECOMMENDATION	CATEGORY	LEAD	PARTNERS	DUE DATE	EXPECTED RESULT	RATIONALE
<p>Outcome selection and review committee: Create one or more committees at the state level to review and select measures and assessments and indicators at the service level and at the local project level. These will be used across the state to report on the project including elements as outlined below. This committee should</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. include 51% youth and families as well as representation from the state and local agencies that will be charged with collecting data and evaluating the Initiative. 2. Base its evaluation of “candidate” measures or assessments, etc. on the extent to which they conform to the Oregon system of care principles and the definitions laid out in the NWI document on 10 principles of wraparound (e.g. “voice and choice,” “strengths based,” Culturally competent,” etc.) 3. Focus on feasible and practical data collection and evaluation strategies, maximizing use of existing data systems and elements, and measures/assessments that present least burden to family/youth/child <i>and</i> other stakeholders 4. Focus on the usefulness of the data to ensure that services and supports 1) are being delivered to the intended population; 2) reflect the philosophy of SoC/wraparound 	<p>Policy (some funds also necessary)</p>	<p>“home” agency (collaborating state agencies select a “home” agency” to oversee data collection and evaluation for the project</p>	<p>All stakeholder groups</p>		<p>Statewide wraparound project efficiently gathers data that is <u>culturally</u> relevant to stakeholders’ needs for both “real time” data and retrospective/ ongoing evaluation Refer to CC standards #10 & 11</p>	<p>Data gathering must reflect the principles of SOC/ wraparound</p>

ACTIONABLE RECOMMENDATION	CATEGORY	LEAD	PARTNERS	DUE DATE	EXPECTED RESULT	RATIONALE
<p><i>and 3) are achieving intended outcomes</i></p> <p>This committee will coordinate its efforts with other similar efforts (eg CSCI, Oregon Progress Board)</p> <p>(It may be a useful first step for this committee to work out a logic model.)</p>						
<p>State agency data policies: Develop a mechanism to evaluate state agencies' (and their local representatives') collaboration with data needs of the project (i.e., After outcomes/assessments/indicators have been chosen, state agencies work with their local level people to provide needed data to the local entities implementing the project. Using feedback from this process, state level agencies consider implications for their own data gathering efforts and work to harmonize the needs of both.)</p> <p>Desegregate data and evaluations collected by race, ethnicity, gender and primary language. As reference please use the attached: Cultural Competency Guidelines, Strategies and Measures created by the PCF CC committee.</p>	Policy	"home" agency	State agencies		Wraparound initiative and state agencies create efficiencies and consistency by collecting and using the same data for reporting where appropriate. Ensures that data on individual client/consumer's race, ethnicity, gender and primary language are collected in client's records, confidentially maintained and integrated into the data system and update.	Long term coordination of data gathering efforts

ACTIONABLE RECOMMENDATION	CATEGORY	LEAD	PARTNERS	DUE DATE	EXPECTED RESULT	RATIONALE
<p>Standard data sharing agreements: State agencies will work together to develop standard agreements around how to share needed data while preserving youth/family rights. They will have access to legal consultation from the state and will seek guidance from the relevant federal agencies to ensure that everything is legal and that agencies are not being unnecessarily conservative in interpreting relevant laws. Comply with HIPPA and 42 CFR (a&D treatment) guidelines</p>	Policy	"home" agency	State stakeholder agencies, state atty. General office, federal agencies		Standard agreements so local entities and local agencies do not have to "reinvent the wheel"	Stakeholders need to feel safe/legal yet still be able to share data
<p>Key outcomes: Service level- child/youth and family: The outcome selection committee will choose key indicators in the following areas: Many of these data needs can be met through existing data currently gathered in various systems</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Educational/vocational progress (i.e. measures that indicate child/youth is attending/engaged at school and progressing toward educational and/or vocational goals). 2. Stable, homelike environment (i.e. measures show changes in living situation minimized and the result of child needs, with goal of permanent situation, community living and most home-like environment feasible). 3. Safety (Child/youth and family feel safe and do not experience abuse, neglect, trauma, etc.) 4. Out of trouble (i.e. child/youth does not have or reduces delinquent behavior) 5. Social/Interpersonal support: (Child/youth and family have positive and healthy attachments to each other and in the community; child/youth and family have the opportunity to engage in positive 	Policy Funding	Stakeholder group			State level policy on data that will be collected at local level and reported to the state Funding recognizes costs of data collection and is fair and equitable for all communities of color	

ACTIONABLE RECOMMENDATION	CATEGORY	LEAD	PARTNERS	DUE DATE	EXPECTED RESULT	RATIONALE
social/recreational activities) 6. Mental/Behavioral health: (Mental health/Substance use outcome measures) 7. Needs met: Individualized needs as identified in the care/treatment planning process are met to at least a satisfactory level						
Key outcomes: Service Level- Process: The outcome selection committee will choose indicators/measures that assess whether or not services and supports are being delivered in a manner that reflects SoC/wraparound principles <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Planning process reflects “voice and choice” (possible measures from Friesen/RTC) 2. Youth and family empowerment (possible measures Friesen/RTC) 3. Family/youth are satisfied 4. Service planning or coordination process (wraparound for families that need it) reflect fidelity to practice models and the SoC/wraparound values including “voice and choice,” “strength based,” “culturally competent,” “natural supports,” etc. (e.g. for families receiving wraparound could use Wraparound Fidelity Index or the Team Observation Measure) 5. Child/family have a single service/support plan. Services/supports in the plan are received without excessive delay. 6. Services/supports that are determined needed are provided, and funding is flexible enough to pay for what’s determined to be needed. 	Policy Funding	Stakeholder group			State level policy on data that will be collected at local level and reported to the state Apply CC standards #10 & 11 Funding recognizes costs of data collection	All local entities report necessary data
Data collection—Process and Outcomes: Service	Policy	Stakeholder			State sets	All local

ACTIONABLE RECOMMENDATION	CATEGORY	LEAD	PARTNERS	DUE DATE	EXPECTED RESULT	RATIONALE
<p>level: The data collection strategy for service outcomes and process will not rely exclusively on providers' assessments of key indicators, particularly process indicators. This data should come directly from families and youth though this may be done using a sample of project participants. (Possibly this portion of the evaluation could be done by the state and shared with local entities.) Outcome data should be objective when possible and should not just reflect service providers' subjective impressions. One strategy for obtaining subjective data would be for family/youth and providers (or, in the case of wraparound) to collaborate and provide joint responses.</p>	Funding	committee			<p>expectations that relevant perspectives on outcomes/indicators will be represented Apply CC standards # 9 & 14.</p>	<p>entities report necessary data</p>
<p>MIS/Data capacity: Local level: The local entity that administers the project (and presumably the blended/braided funding) has an MIS/data system that can</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Track family/youth outcome and process data in real time and coordinate with system partners to receive relevant data (e.g. get data on safety from child welfare; education data, juvenile justice data, etc.) 2. Track services and supports included in the plan and when/whether they are provided 3. Track costs and do billing 4. Report key cost/utilization data to the state as required 5. Meet federal reporting requirements 	Policy Funding	Local entity			<p>MIS with necessary capacity is developed</p>	<p>All local entities report necessary data</p>
<p>Key outcomes: Cost/ financial/ Utilization: Local Level: The local entity that administers the project will collect data on key indicators such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. child/youth placements and services reflect needs not other considerations (eg kids 	Policy Funding	Local entity			<p>Apply CC standards #8,10 & 11</p>	<p>All local entities report necessary data</p>

ACTIONABLE RECOMMENDATION	CATEGORY	LEAD	PARTNERS	DUE DATE	EXPECTED RESULT	RATIONALE
<p>placed in foster care to access services; kids stay in residential because there is no local foster home)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. services/supports received and their costs, length of delay, time in services 3. Cost per child per day; reduction rate of use of more restrictive placements 4. length of time in program 5. availability of array of services 6. utilization of natural supports and individualized services/supports as identified in plans 						
<p>Key outcomes: system development: local level: State will collect data to assess the extent to which the local entity that administers the project</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. demonstrates readiness to manage the project by putting structures/processes into place and developing capacity as identified by the local implementation subcommittee <i>and</i> by developing the MIS/data capacity described here. Local entity does not receive funds until readiness is demonstrated. 2. implements system of care principles at the community/local level (e.g. by having required levels of family/youth participation on decision making bodies). Possible use of Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory; other SoC measure. 	Policy Funding	"home" agency	Local entities		Implementation doesn't start until local entities are ready; System development reflects SOC/ wraparound principles	
<p>Capacity development: workforce: Evaluate state strategies to encourage</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. state-led and local-led programs of professional development to increase capacity of existing providers to work in ways that reflect soc/wraparound principles and 	Policy Funding	"home" agency	Local partners and educational entities		Increased workforce capacity to practice in ways consistent with project	

ACTIONABLE RECOMMENDATION	CATEGORY	LEAD	PARTNERS	DUE DATE	EXPECTED RESULT	RATIONALE
<p>practices</p> <p>2. state-led and local-led activities to work with educational entities to prepare students to work in ways that reflect soc/wraparound principles and practices</p> <p>3. state-led and local-led activities to work with providers and educational entities to prepare providers to provide high-quality services/supports—including empirically-supported and culturally appropriate services and supports—that are needed to fulfill treatment/care plans for children/ youth/ families that are part of the project</p>					philosophy and values	
<p>Evaluation: State level State agency that is serving as “home” for this project uses local data to assess whether or not services and supports 1) are being delivered to the intended population; 2) reflect the philosophy of SoC/wraparound <i>and</i> 3) are achieving intended outcomes. Reports on progress at service level, cost/utilization, and system development at the local level. State evaluation will include a focus on tracking key indicators that are available in state agency sources to see how children/youth fare over the long term, i.e., in the years after graduation from the program.</p>	Policy Funding	“home” agency	All stakeholders and partners			Evaluate project and its outcomes Refer to CC standard # 9
<p>Data systems reflect lifespan approach: Family/youth/child data persists and is not “closed out” so that if/when families need to re-enter services, either in same locality or elsewhere in the state, or when they need to move from one part of the state to another, needed information can be accessed. Possibly this will require creating some kind of unique identifier, also will require mechanisms for local entities to share data with each</p>	Policy					Data gathering needs to be efficient and targeted on shared goals and cultural relevant to providers and

ACTIONABLE RECOMMENDATION	CATEGOR Y	LEAD	PARTNE RS	DUE DATE	EXPECTED RESULT	RATIONALE
other. This is probably a more long term goal but short term actions should be taken with this in mind, and a strategy for reaching this should be planned.						communities of color