



**Arizona's Children's System of Care Practice Review  
Fiscal Year 2012 Statewide Report**

Debra Mowery, Linda Callejas, Wei Wang,  
Thomas Burrus, Jemal Gishe, and Mario Hernandez  
**University of South Florida**

Kevin Flynn  
**Arizona Department of Health Services/Division of Behavioral Health Services**

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary	2
Background	12
Methodology	16
Results Section	23
References	57
Technical Appendix	58
Index of Tables	60
Index of Figures	61

## Executive Summary

### Background

Research has identified that outcome evaluation is key to achieving and sustaining transformation initiatives in Systems of Care (Hodges, Hernandez, Nesman, & Lipien, 2002). The System of Care Practice Review (SOCPR) was implemented in FY2009-2010 as the Arizona Department of Health Services/Division of Behavioral Health Services (ADHS/DBHS) practice review method of choice in Arizona. It was developed at the University of South Florida (USF) by Dr. Mario Hernandez, Ph.D. Research has demonstrated high inter-rater reliability in the use of the tool, which is based on face to face interviews with multiple informants as well as file/record reviews (Hernandez et al., 2001). A total of 180 reviews were conducted across Arizona in FY2011-2012.

### *Methodology*

Interviews were drawn from a sample of children and families identified as having high/complex levels of need. Thus, the sample pool of cases contained all children and youth age 6 – 18 years who had scores of 4 or higher on the Child and Adolescent Service Intensity Instrument (CASII). Children aged 0-5 were included if they had met the criteria of being involved in two or more child-serving systems. These could include Child Welfare, Juvenile Justice, or the Department of Developmental Disabilities, in addition to Behavioral Health. In addition, selected cases had to be enrolled in services at least 90 days, and be currently active at the time the sample was drawn. For each agency under review, a case manager could have no more than 2 of their cases identified for the SOCPR review.

The SOCPR uses a case study methodology informed by caregivers, youth, formal providers, informal supports, and extant documents related to service planning and provision. The SOCPR tool itself is comprised of 4 domains and 13 sub-domains:

- *Child-Centered, Family-Focused (CCFF)*
  - *Individualized, Full Participation, and Case Management*
  
- *Community Based (CB)*
  - *Early Intervention, Access to Services, Minimal Restrictiveness, and Integration and Coordination*
  
- *Culturally Competent (CC)*
  - *Awareness, Sensitivity and Responsiveness, Agency Culture and Informal Supports*

- *Impact (IMP)*
  - *Improvement and Appropriateness*

SOCPR results include a combination of quantitative and qualitative data. Quantitative data are scored on a scale of 1-7. Scores from 1–3 represent lower implementation of a system of care principle, and scores from 5–7 represent enhanced implementation of a system of care principle. A score of 4 indicates a neutral rating, meaning a lack of support for or against implementation. Qualitative data are analyzed for themes that are identified in at least half of examined cases.

## *Results*

### *Quantitative Summary*

In addition to results related to the four domains, other areas of analysis included: *demographics*, *service system involvement*, and *receipt of services or treatments*. The demographic profile showed that males were more commonly represented, over 69% of the sample, with the overall average age at 9.9 years. With regard to ethnicity, over half of the sample was White (52%), while nearly 29% was Latino/Hispanic, and the remaining 19% of the sample was Black, Asian, Native American, and multi-racial groups. Ninety percent of the sample spoke English as their primary language. From a total range of 1-6 systems, the average number of child-serving systems involved per child was 2.04. Almost all 180 cases (99.4%) were recorded as showing behavioral health system involvement. A review of the services or treatments utilized showed 100% of the children received Support Services, with case management services being received by 100% of the families with Skills Development and training a distant second (44.1%). Treatment Services were utilized by 72% of youth while Medical Services were utilized 56.7%. The average number of services used per child or youth was 4.33.

Scores range from a low of 1 to a high of 7, with scores 5 and higher representing *enhanced implementation* of the item of interest. For the statewide sample of 180 cases, scores ranged from 5.01 to 5.49 for the four SOCPR domains, with an overall case mean score of 5.20. It should also be stated that because of the sample size variance between Geographic Service Areas (GSAs), comparisons between GSAs is not possible.

## SOCPR Overall Domain Scores

GSA (N=180)	Case Mean (SD)	CCFF Mean (SD)	CB Mean (SD)	CC Mean (SD)	IMP Mean (SD)
Statewide	5.20 (0.97) Min 2.04 Max 6.82	5.17 (1.10) Min 1.95 Max 6.82	5.49 (0.85) Min 1.96 Max 6.88	5.01 (1.04) Min 1.68 Max 6.97	5.12 (1.30) Min 1.00 Max 7.00

In Arizona, provider agencies performed best at including the Community Based system of care value when serving children and families. The Child-Centered Family-Focused and Impact domains followed next. Providers were most tested in the Culturally Competent domain.

While all of the SOCPR domain scores and most of the subdomain scores fell in the 5 range (representing enhanced implementation of a system of care principle), there were some scores that fell below that range. In the Community Based domain all subdomain and areas scored in the 5 range with the subdomains of Access to Services and Minimal Restrictiveness scoring 5.86 and 5.79 respectively. Both subdomains of the domain of Impact scored within the 5 range as well. These areas represent strengths in Arizona’s Children’s System of Care, as reviewed through these 180 SOCPR cases.

The data also revealed areas and subdomains with scores below 5. For example, within the Child-Centered Family-Focused domain, the Individualized subdomain scored below 5 as did three areas within this subdomain. These low scores may indicate the need for attention to an integrated service plan which includes a thorough assessment that identifies the needs of the child and family and incorporates their strengths into the goals. Attention also needs to be paid to the types of services and supports that are provided to the youth and family as well as the intensity of those services and supports. In the Culturally Competent domain, two subdomains, Sensitivity and Responsiveness and Informal Supports as well as the area Awareness of Providers’ Culture scored in the high 4 range. These scores may indicate the need for providers to not only be aware of the values, beliefs, and lifestyles of the child and family they are working with but also their own culture and how that may influence how they work with families. It should be noted that many of the lower scoring areas had higher standard deviation scores which suggest that variability exists across cases and that while some cases scored poorly, others were more exemplary.

A series of variables were tested to identify if there was a statistically significant relationship to the outcome of the SOCPR results. There were a variety of significant differences in SOCPR case and domain scores across the variables examined. None of the demographic variables, service systems, or systems categories measured showed significant differences.

Significant differences were found for SOCPR case and domain scores for Services only. Receiving Group Counseling, Family Support, Respite Support, Home Care training, and Skills Development and Training Services were associated with higher SOCPR scores. These findings indicate that children and youth who received Family Support and Respite Support, had significantly higher Community-Based domain scores. These findings indicate that some community based services are associated with better adherence to system of care values. Those children and youth with Family Counseling services showed significant differences in SOCPR case and domain scores.

### *Qualitative Summary*

Qualitative comments were derived from brief narratives developed by SOCPR reviewers to support final ratings to the Summative Questions which conclude the SOCPR. Themes derived from Summative Questions narratives are organized by SOCPR domain and subdomain. The frequency of responses to Summative Questions were examined and analyzed for emerging patterns/trends. Some notable strengths that were identified across case files include timely assessments, services provided at convenient locations and times, awareness of the family's culture, and improvements in the youth's functioning. Opportunities for improvement were also identified. Some of these include ensuring youth and family strengths are incorporated into service planning goals, increasing identification of informal supports for families, and ensuring the services and supports provided are appropriate for the youth and family.

This section presents a review of qualitative data compiled from responses to Summative Questions that SOCPR reviewers use to summarize and integrate the information gathered throughout the Document Review and the series of interviews completed with a particular child/youth and family to address each of the four SOCPR domains. The Summative Questions call for the reviewer to provide a rating for each statement and to give a brief narrative in support of that rating. Individual ratings serve as indicators of the extent to which the sub-domain elements (e.g., individualized services, full family participation) or SOC principles are being implemented within the System of Care under review. The narrative portion of each Summative Question response provides evidence for a given rating and is used to determine the presence or absence of system of care principles for each sub-domain. Where an overall summative rating relates to a reviewer's determination of completion of a thorough assessment, for instance, qualitative analysis examines the evidence provided to explain the rating.

In the final analysis, ratings for each item are clustered and considered in conjunction with the respective brief narrative provided to determine a general assessment for each sub-domain. The compiled narratives for all Summative Questions were coded and sorted to assess the degree to which System of Care principles were implemented in each SOCPR domain area (N=180). The

frequency of Summative Question responses were examined and analyzed for emerging patterns/trends. In order to be considered a trend, at least of half of the review responses had to provide similar information for a given sub-domain area. Trends in each sub-domain are then reviewed together to provide an overall assessment for the larger domain area. This report section also highlights particular successes and challenges with regard to implementation of System of Care principles for each of the SOCPR Domain Areas.

### *Qualitative Findings Summary*

#### *Domain 1: Child-Centered and Family Focused Services*

The first domain of the SOCPR is designed to measure whether the needs of the child/youth and family determine the types and mix of services provided within the System of Care. This domain reflects a commitment to adapt services to the child and family rather than expecting them to conform to preexisting service configurations. The review reflects the effectiveness of the site in providing services that are individualized, that families are included as full participants in the treatment process, and that the type and intensity of services provided is monitored through effective care coordination. The sub-domains, which reflect system of care principles and contain measurements of practice or system of care implementation, are: Individualized, Child-Centered and Family-Focused, Full Participation, and Care Coordination.

When considering whether youth and family received Individualized Services within the System of Care, reviewers noted that service plans generally reflect the needs and goals of the child/youth and family, and that providers reported informally acknowledging child/family needs and strengths even when these are not adequately documented in case files. Moreover, most raters indicated that the intensity of services reflects the needs of the children/youth and families receiving services. A key challenge related to this sub-domain area was reflected in discussion related to clear reflection of child/youth and family strengths in documented service plan goal statements. Although more than half of the ratings provided for Item 6 (The service plan goals incorporate the strengths of the child and family”) suggest reviewer concordance with this item (i.e. Agree slightly or moderately), descriptive comments reveal that most reviewers did not feel that service plans contained adequate documentation of child and family strengths. Reviewers also noted that parents/caregivers either could not identify their own/their children’s strengths or they felt that these were not adequately included in their treatment plans. Despite these findings however, narrative comments associated with Item 7 (“The service planning and delivery informally acknowledges/considers the strengths of the child and family”) suggest that child and family strengths are acknowledged informally within child and family team meetings and in other interactions with providers. This finding provides an opportunity for growth and training of providers to more clearly articulate strengths, and to develop strengths-based goals that can encourage active child/youth and family participation in service planning.

Overall, reviewers reported finding Full Participation on the part of children/youth and families in the development, implementation, and evaluation of service plans. In general, reviewers reported that children and/or youth, in particular, are participating actively in services and/or service planning meetings. In addition, reviewers noted that caregivers felt that they positively influenced the service planning process and that providers were receptive to hearing their concerns and/or input. In addition, reviewers noted that most caregivers appeared to understand the service plans developed for their children and families. In general, reviewers suggest that cases reflect adequate participation in service planning on the part of providers and caregivers who are working toward reaching common goals.

With regard to the Care Coordination sub-domain, reviewers generally reported that one individual appeared to be responsible for coordinating child/youth and family services and was doing so successfully. Overall, service planning appears to be responsive to the changing needs of the family and that service plans are updated in a timely fashion. Where challenges have been reported to exist, reviewers noted that family members reported experiencing long wait times when changing case managers or providers because of new or emerging needs. However, such challenges were reported for less than a quarter of reviewed cases.

In general, analysis of descriptive comments provided by SOCPR raters suggests that providers within the System of Care are providing child-centered and family-focused services. The overall review of cases using the measures associated with Child-Centered and Family-Focused Services suggests that assessments of youth in this sample were completed across multiple life domains. The main challenges identified for this domain were found in the Individualized Services sub-domain and reflected a need for improved identification and documentation of child/youth and family strengths (ideally, tied to child/family goals) within treatment plans.

#### *Domain 2: Community-Based Services*

The second SOCPR domain is designed to measure whether services are provided within or close to the child/youth's home community, in the least restrictive setting possible, and moreover, that services are coordinated and delivered through linkages between public and private providers. The sub-domains in this area are used to evaluate the effectiveness of the site in identifying needs and providing supports early (Early Intervention), facilitating Access to Services, providing less restrictive services (Minimal Restrictiveness), and integrating and coordinating services for families (Integration and Coordination).

When assessing whether child/youth and families received Early Intervention related to identified needs, reviewers overwhelmingly reported that child/youth and family needs were identified at intake and that services were provided within four weeks of intake. Where reviewers

indicated a challenge with early intervention, they noted that case documentation did not clearly show how soon needs were identified and addressed.

Reviewers reported overwhelmingly that case files demonstrated that the System of Care was ensuring Access to Services for children/youth and families. In general, reviewers noted that services were scheduled at convenient times for the child/youth and family, as reported by caregivers or shown in case file documentation. In addition, reviewers reported that services were most often provided within or close to the home community of the child/youth and in the preferred family language.

When assessing for Minimal Restrictiveness, raters reported that services appeared to be provided in environments that feel comfortable to the child/youth and family, in the least restrictive and most appropriate environment. SOCPR raters also noted that most case files reflected ongoing input from family members regarding the appropriateness of the environment(s) in which services are provided.

Reviewers generally reported that the services being provided within the System of Care reflected coordination of the providers working with a given child and family and continuity of services, as well as integration of service system components. In general, reviewers noted that case file documentation and key interviews reflect good communication between care coordinators and family members. Overall, reviewers reported that they detected smooth and seamless processes for linking children and families to additional services when they were identified. Challenges identified in this regard were focused primarily on discrepancies between the care coordinators' and caregivers' statements in this regard, as well as lack of documentation with regard to identification of additional needs and/or processes for linking families to additional services.

Analysis of descriptive comments provided by SOCPR raters suggests that providers within the System of Care are providing services within or close to the child's home community, in the least restrictive setting possible, and which are coordinated and delivered through linkages between all team members. Challenges identified in this area appeared to reflect lack of adequate documentation related to implementation of a particular SOC principle.

### *Domain 3: Culturally Competent Services*

The third domain of the SOCPR is intended to measure whether services are attuned to the cultural, racial, and ethnic background and identity of the child/youth and family. Ratings provided in each sub-domain are meant to evaluate the level of cultural awareness of the service provider, whether evidence shows that efforts are made to orient the family to an agency's culture, whether sensitivity and responsiveness is shown for the cultural background of families, and whether informal supports are included in services. The sub-domains associated with Culturally Competent

Services are: Awareness, Sensitivity and Responsiveness, Agency Culture, and Informal Supports.

Reviewers assessing for Cultural Awareness noted that providers generally understand the culture and community of the child/youth and family, and that such awareness is documented within case files. Reviewers noted that providers did not always clearly document or articulate that they were familiar with a child/youth and family's neighborhood or community context. Overall, raters reported little to no documentation related to youth and family concepts of health, although reviewers noted that some caregivers were clearly able to articulate their beliefs. Reviewers also generally reported that providers were aware of "family culture" and discussed its influence on a family's decision-making. Raters generally identified a lack of documentation with regard to the provider's culture and understanding of the impact of their own culture on the delivery of services.

When evaluating the Sensitivity and Responsiveness of the System of Care, raters reported that there was limited documentation indicating that providers translated awareness of family culture into action. However, a number of reviewers noted that caregivers reported via interviews that they felt their culture was understood by providers, and raters noted that families often felt that providers worked to respect their cultural values and traditions when recommending services.

Reviewers generally gave high ratings in Agency Culture Sub-Domain, suggesting that provider agencies are assisting families in understanding and navigating the service system(s) with which they have interaction. Raters noted that the majority of providers explained what families should expect from an agency, and in many cases offered additional assistance or resources.

With regard to Informal Supports, a majority of raters indicated that although case files lacked documentation of informal support participation in service planning there was some evidence that informal supports had been identified and recommended to families. A number of raters noted that many family members had declined offers to include informal supports in the service planning process.

#### *Domain 4: Impact*

The final SOCPD domain evaluates whether services have produced positive outcomes for the child and family. This domain includes two sub-domains: Improvement and Appropriateness of Services, which are meant to determine whether services have had a positive impact on the child/youth and family and if so, whether these services met the child/youth and family's identified needs.

Reviewers found services provided to children and families had produced a positive impact. When reflecting on the evidence provided for this sub-domain, raters noted that family members

were not always in complete agreement as to the degree of progress and improvement (“slight” versus “moderate” improvement, for instance) that they and their children had made as a result of services, when compared with providers’ responses. However, a review of most cases suggests that multiple team members in each case identified some improvement on the part of the child/youth and family. Similarly, raters generally indicated that the services provided to children/youth and families had been appropriate because they adequately met identified needs. In cases where caregivers reported that their family’s needs were less than adequately met, challenges identified were: dissatisfaction with medication regimens for children, staff turnover rates or lack of services, and difficult transitions when families changed providers. Overall, the services provided through the System of Care appear to have produced positive outcomes for the children and families served.

## Background

### *Arizona's Behavioral Health Care System*

The Arizona Department of Health Services/Department of Behavioral Health Services (ADHS/DBHS) is responsible for administration of Arizona's publicly funded behavioral health service system for individuals, families, and communities. As such, ADHS/DBHS provides services both to populations eligible for federal entitlement programs such as Title XIX and Title XXI of the Social Security Act, as well as those receiving State funding only. ADHS/DBHS funding is derived from a variety of sources: Title XIX (Medicaid), TXXI (Kids Care), federal block grants, state appropriations, and intergovernmental agreements.

### *Service Provision*

ADHS/DBHS' mission includes providing services to children and adults with substance use and/or general mental health disorders. Sub-populations include children with a serious emotional disturbance and adults with a serious mental illness. Children's Behavioral Health Services in the State of Arizona are delivered in accordance with the 12 principles of the Children's System of Care (see appendix), and delivered via the "Arizona Practice Model". This "System of Care" approach to service delivery in Arizona developed in response to the JK class action lawsuit, as part of the settlement agreement between ADHS/DBHS and the plaintiffs in the case.

The Arizona Practice Model is based on the "wrap-around" model (VanDenBerg, 2003), and includes formation of Child and Family Teams as a means of organizing and directing care. The Child and Family Team may be composed of family members, behavioral health service providers, and representatives of other child-serving agencies, as well as other identified helpers and "natural supports". Teams are typically facilitated by a case manager or other behavioral health representative, and are responsible for identifying the strengths and needs of children and families and identifying and monitoring treatment goals and tasks. Teams are also responsible for obtaining any and all covered behavioral health services *not* requiring prior authorization by the Regional Behavioral Health Authority (RBHA). Teams may also request services requiring prior authorization, which will be subject to medical necessity determination by the RBHA. Services requiring prior authorization include out of home care and psychological testing. Other ADHS/DBHS Covered Services include (for a comprehensive list refer to the ADHS/DBHS Covered Behavioral Health Services Guide):

- Treatment Services – behavioral health counseling and therapy
- Medical Services – medication services and laboratory
- Rehabilitation Services – living skills training
- Support Services – case management, home care training, respite, and transportation
- Crisis Intervention – ADHS/DBHS also oversees a statewide crisis system including crisis phones, warm lines, mobile teams, and inpatient psychiatric and detoxification facilities which operate seven (7) days a week.

ADHS/DBHS also oversees provision of prevention programs for children and adults. These services are funded separately, and are not included as Medicaid covered services.

In Arizona, services for children and adults have separate funding streams, and state law prohibits children's services from being funded with adult monies and vice versa. For purposes of this report, the focus will be on children/youth under the age of 18 (and their families) served by ADHS/DBHS. Quality improvement and evaluation activities related to services provided to adult populations are considered to be outside the scope of this report.

### *Contracting Process*

Contracts are bid on a 3-5 year competitive cycle. There are six Geographic Service Areas (GSAs) across the state. Currently four (4) Regional Behavioral Health Authorities (RBHAs) serve the 6 GSAs. In addition there are five (5) Tribal Regional Behavioral Health Authorities (TRBHAs) and Tribal Contractors. Each T/RBHA contracts with various provider agencies to deliver the full array of covered behavioral health services to children and families within its region. Augmenting the efforts of these service providers are Family Run Organizations, who partner with ADHS/DBHS and the T/RBHAs to promote family involvement as well as family and youth voice and choice across the system. Additionally, they are also providers of services to support youth and families.

### *Coordination of Care*

ADHS/DBHS works in tandem with a variety of potential stakeholders on behalf of youth and families. Child and Family Teams may include one or more of these stakeholders in addition to behavioral health system providers. These include:

- Physical healthcare providers
- Arizona Department of Economic Security (including):
  - Department of Developmental Disabilities
  - Rehabilitation Services Administration
  - Division of Children, Youth and Families (DCYF) (child welfare)
- Department of Juvenile Corrections
- Administrative Office of the Courts
- Arizona Department of Housing
- Arizona Department of Corrections
- Arizona Department of Education

Since Child Welfare, Developmental Disabilities, Education, and Juvenile Justice are funded separately in Arizona, a mixture of cooperative agreements and contractual relationships have been defined. Of the stakeholder organizations, only the Department of Developmental Disabilities has established a contract with ADHS/DBHS to provide behavioral health services for its eligible members. All other stakeholder agencies operate with collaborative agreements developed individually with each T/RBHA. These agreements define how the respective agencies are to work

together to provide services such as counseling, crisis intervention, and residential treatment on behalf of individuals and families “shared” by the systems. Each T/RBHA has regular meetings with representatives of these stakeholder agencies to coordinate their collaborative efforts. In addition, ADHS/DBHS maintains communication and collaboration through ongoing meetings involving stakeholders and state-level leadership.

### *Adoption of the SOCPR*

Research has identified that outcome evaluation is key to achieving and sustaining transformation initiatives in Systems of Care (Hodges, Hernandez, Nesman, & Lipien, 2002). This is illustrated by a five-year study of children’s mental health sponsored by the University of South Florida. In the study, researchers identified key elements for accomplishing goals and sustaining theory-based efforts at system change. These included the finding that organizations must have methods to ensure that service implementation is consistent with underlying theory, “regardless of the information source”. According to the authors, it is important that organizations have a means to confirm that their theory-based strategies are actually serving intended recipients, are providing intended services and supports, and are producing desired results. Finally, the authors conclude that as a consequence of such outcome evaluation, decision makers are better equipped to identify and to anticipate challenges to implementation and sustainability.

For ADHS/DBHS, research findings underscoring the need for outcome measures coincided with requirements of the settlement agreement entered into by ADHS/DBHS with plaintiff’s counsel in the Jason K. class action lawsuit. Under the terms of this agreement, ADHS/DBHS committed to undertake development of a process to evaluate the quality of practice throughout the state. The J.K. Settlement Agreement, provision VIII, under “Quality Management and Improvement System”, indicates that the measurement process will include as an integral component, “an in-depth case review of a sample of individual children’s cases that includes interviews of relevant individuals in the child’s life”. In response to this agreement, in its 5<sup>th</sup> Annual JK Action Plan, ADHS/DBHS established twelve objectives. One of these pertained to the implementation of the Practice Improvement Review process, and stipulated that ADHS/DBHS would settle on a practice review instrument for use statewide.

As of June of 2007, the practice review method in use by ADHS/DBHS was the Wraparound Fidelity Assessment Scale (WFAS), developed by Dr. Eric Bruns of the University of Washington. The WFAS, as implemented in Arizona, consisted of two components; the Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI), and the Document Review Measure (DRM). The WFAS was used to evaluate the degree to which services were being delivered according to the 12 Principles, and in keeping with Child and Family Team Practice. In October 2008, ADHS/DBHS implemented a taskforce to evaluate the efficacy of the WFAS as a performance improvement measure for Arizona’s System of Care. This taskforce, chaired by the ADHS/DBHS Medical Director for Children’s Services, included representatives from a number of ADHS/DBHS functional areas including Children’s System of Care, Children’s Networks, Quality Management, and Clinical Practice Improvement.

The taskforce recommendations included: 1. Finalizing the Arizona-developed “Low Needs Tool”, (henceforth referred to as the Brief Practice Review), and 2. Combining what had been separate moderate and high needs reviews into one process, to be referred to as the Practice Review for Children with Complex Needs. For purposes of implementing a practice review tool, ADHS/DBHS determined that it was not practicable to employ the same method for reviewing cases with a high level of complexity/acuity as for those with a lower level of complexity. The Child and Adolescent Service Intensity Instrument (CASII) was identified as a mechanism for providers to rate levels of need/acuity on a scale from 0-6, with 6 representing the greatest intensity of need. Thus, the initial sample pool of cases deemed “high complexity” contained all children and youth age 6-18 years who had scores of 4 or higher on the CASII. Children ages 0-5 were also included if they had met the criteria of being involved in two or more child-serving systems in addition to Behavioral Health. These might include Child Welfare, Juvenile Justice, or the Department of Developmental Disabilities. All other children not meeting these criteria were included in the sample for the Brief Practice Review.

In response to the taskforce’s first recommendation, a workgroup was formed, and subsequently developed “The Practice Review for Children with Standard Needs”. This tool, consisting of 15 questions, was to be administered telephonically with a child’s primary caregiver. To address the second objective, the taskforce consulted with a number of local and national experts in practice review and survey development, including Mario Hernandez, Ph.D., of the University of South Florida. Ultimately, the Committee determined that the System of Care Practice Review (SOCPR) methodology developed by Dr. Hernandez would satisfy its requirements for the Complex Needs review process in Arizona. Subsequently, the SOCPR was adopted by ADHS/DBHS as its practice review methodology with implementation beginning in FY2010.

#### *SOCPR and Quality Management / Practice Improvement*

SOCPR results constitute one of the many data sources utilized by the ADHS/DBHS Quality Management (QM) Department. These results are intended to be used as a mechanism to provide feedback to the Behavioral Health System regarding areas of strength and areas where improvement is needed in System of Care implementation. The feedback/improvement process occurs at two levels. The first is the individual provider agency level, where SOCPR feedback is utilized to develop individualized performance improvement plans. Second, as trends and common themes are identified across the state, these are incorporated into the ADHS/DBHS System of Care Planning and Development process as goals and objectives for the T/RBHAs for the coming year.

## Methodology

### *SOCPR Introduction*

The System of Care Practice Review (SOCPR) collects and analyzes information regarding the process of service delivery to document the service experiences of children and their families, and then provides feedback and recommendations for improvement to the system. The process yields thorough, in-depth descriptions that reveal and explain the complex service environment experienced by children and their families. Feedback is provided through specific recommendations that can be incorporated into staff training, supervision, and coaching, and may also be aggregated across cases at the regional or system level to identify strengths and areas in need of improvement within the system of care. In this manner, the SOCPR provides a measure of how well the overall system is meeting the needs of children and their families relative to system of care values and principles.

The reliability of the SOCPR has been evaluated, and high inter-rater reliability has been reported in its use (Hernandez et al., 2001). The validity of the protocol is supported through triangulating information obtained from various informants and document reviews. The SOCPR was found to distinguish between a system of care site and a traditional services site. Moreover, Hernandez et al. (2001) found in their study that the SOCPR identified system of care sites as being more child-centered and family-focused, community based, and culturally competent than services in a matched comparison site offering traditional mental health services. System of care sites were more likely than traditional service systems to consider the social strengths of both children and families and to include informal sources of support such as extended family and friends in the planning and delivery of services. In addition, Stephens, Holden, and Hernandez (2004) found that the SOCPR ratings were associated with child-level outcome measures. In their comparison study, Stephens and colleagues discovered that children who received services in systems that functioned in a manner consistent with system of care values and principles compared with traditional services had significant reductions in symptomatology and impairment one year after entry into services, whereas children in organizations that did not use system of care values demonstrated less positive change. The study also found that as system of care-based practice increased, children's impairments decreased.

### *SOCPR Method*

The SOCPR relies on data gathered from interviews with multiple informants, as well as through case files and record reviews. Document reviews precede interviews and provide an understanding of the family's service history, including the presence and variety of services from sectors outside of behavioral health care systems. These reviews also provide the chronological context of service delivery and help to orient the reviewer to the child and family's strengths, needs, and involvement with services.

The interviews are based on a set of questions intended to obtain the child and family's perceptions of the services they have received. Questions related to accessibility, convenience, relevance, satisfaction, cultural competence, and perceived effectiveness are included. These questions are open-ended and designed to elicit both descriptive and explanatory information that might not be found through the document review. The questions provide the reviewer with the opportunity to obtain information about the everyday service experiences of the child and family and thereby gain a glimpse of the life experience of a child and family in the context of the services they have received.

The SOCPH uses a case study methodology informed by caregivers, youth, formal providers, informal supports, and extant documents related to service planning and provision. The unit of analysis is the *family case*, with each case representing a test of the extent to which the system of care is implementing its services in accordance with system of care values and principles. The family case consists of the child involved in the system of care, the primary caregiver (e.g., biological parent, foster parent, relative), the primary formal service provider (e.g., behavioral health case manager, therapist), and if present, a primary informal helper (e.g., extended family member, neighbor, friend).

### *Domains*

The SOCPH assesses four domains relevant to systems of care: 1) Child-Centered and Family-Focused, 2) Community Based, 3) Culturally Competent, and 4) Impact.

Domain I, Child-Centered and Family-Focused, is defined as having the needs of the child and family dictate the type and combination of services provided by the system of care. It is a commitment to adapt services to children and families, as opposed to expecting children and families to conform to pre-existing service configurations. Domain I has three subdomains: 1) Individualized, 2) Full Participation, and 3) Case Management.

Domain II, Community Based, is defined as having services provided within or close to the child's home community in the least restrictive and most appropriate setting possible, and coordinated and delivered through linkages between a variety of providers and service sectors. This domain is composed of 4 subdomains: 1) Early Intervention, 2) Access to Services, 3) Minimal Restrictiveness, and 4) Integration and Coordination.

Domain III, Culturally Competent, is defined by the capacity of agencies, programs, services, and individuals within the system of care to be responsive to the cultural, racial, and ethnic differences of the population they serve. Domain III has four subdomains: 1) Awareness, 2) Sensitivity and Responsiveness, 3) Agency Culture, and 4) Informal Supports.

Domain IV, Impact, examines the extent to which families believe that services were appropriate and were meeting their needs and the needs of their children. This domain also examines whether services are seen by the family to produce positive outcomes. This domain has two subdomains: 1) Improvement and 2) Appropriateness.

Taken individually, these measures allow for assessment of the presence, absence, or degree of implementation of each of the domains and subdomains. Taken in combination, they speak to how close a system's services adhere to the values and principles of a system of care. The findings can also highlight which aspects of system of care-based services are in need of improvement. Ultimately, results provide the basis for feedback, thus allowing a system's stakeholders to maintain fidelity to system of care values and principles.

### *Organization of the SOCPR*

The SOCPR is organized into 4 major sections.

#### Section 1:

Includes demographic information and a snapshot of the child's current array of services.

#### Section 2:

Organizes the case records review and comprises the Case History Summary and the Current Service/Treatment Plan; the Case History Summary requires the reviewer to provide a brief case history based on a review of the file. It also provides information about all of the service systems with which the child and family are involved (e.g., special education, behavioral health, juvenile justice, child welfare). It summarizes major life events, persons involved in the child's history and current life, outcomes of interventions, and the child's present status. Review of the Individualized Service Plan provides information about the types and intensity of the services received, integration and coordination, strengths identification, and family participation. The Document Review is completed prior to any interview so that the information gathered through the documents can inform and strengthen the interviews.

#### Section 3:

Consists of the interview questions organized by the type of informant (primary caregiver, youth, formal service provider, informal helper); the interviews are designed to gather information about each of the four identified domains (Child-Centered and Family-Focused, Community Based, Culturally Competent, and Impact). Questions for each of the four domains are divided into subdomains that define the domain in further detail and represent the intention of the corresponding system of care core value. Questions in each of the subdomains are designed to indicate the extent to which core system of care values guide practice. Data are gathered through a combination of closed-ended questions (i.e., quantitative) that produce ratings and explanatory responses from participants through more open-ended questions and narrative responses (i.e., qualitative). The open-ended questioning provides an opportunity for the reviewer to probe issues related to specific questions so that answers are as complete as possible. In addition, direct quotes from respondents are recorded whenever appropriate and possible.

#### Section 4:

Consists of the Summative Questions, the section in which reviewers record their ratings and the evidence derived from the file review and interviews to support the reviewer rating for each summative question. These ratings represent the reviewer's belief of the extent to which system of care values and principles are actualized.

#### *Training of the Interview Team*

Training for the SOCPR follows strict procedural guidelines which are outlined below. These steps were implemented and followed by the ADHS/DBHS review team. Before data collection begins, the team conducting the SOCPR must be identified and trained. Case reviews may be conducted using single reviewers or paired review teams. The use of single reviewers allows for more cases to be reviewed at a lower cost. Pairing reviewers provides the advantage of being able to validate and discuss what is being learned through the review process. The use of paired reviewers is obviously more costly and may not always be feasible. However, when individual reviewers are conducting the SOCPR, it is recommended that reliability checks be conducted with another reviewer.

The didactic training includes a review of the values and principles of systems of care, an orientation regarding the purpose and objectives of the SOCPR, and practice sessions for interviewing and rating the summative questions within the SOCPR. In addition, because much of the useful information about a family is collected through interviews, it was important to train reviewers in the proper methods for conducting interviews and documenting information from the responses that emerge during the review. Without this part of the training, reviewers may not probe adequately, or they may overlook information that helps with both the summative ratings and with the feedback that is later provided to the system of care. In addition, interview training was important so that the reviews are respectful, effective at ensuring that all questions are answered, and able to create a comfortable experience for informants.

During the training of reviewers, it is recommended that each trainee be shadowed by the trainer or another person with experience using the SOCPR protocol. This hands-on training includes the shadowing of a trainee by an experienced reviewer who participates in all aspects of the case review. The trainee conducts the interviews and leads the case review, and the shadow is available to provide support, clarify procedures, answer questions, and complete a separate set of ratings for comparison. Once a training case is completed, the trainee and shadow debrief about the case. It is essential that the debriefing include a discussion of why the ratings were given and the ways in which the notes resulting from the review will be used to give feedback to system stakeholders. Trainees, shadows, and the primary trainer typically meet together for group debriefing.

The coaching/shadowing of two cases per trainee allows for an examination of the trainee's ability to conduct the SOCPR in an appropriate and reliable manner. The reliability of a trainee can be examined through the calculation of three different measures: 1) the percentage of summative question ratings that were exact matches between the trainee and the shadow; 2) the percentage

of summative question ratings that were scored in the same direction (i.e., positive or negative scores) by the trainee and the shadow; and 3) the discrepancy value between the trainee and shadow scores displayed as a percentage.

### *Selecting Cases and Informants*

Implementing the SOCPR involves the selection of cases for review and the selection of the key informants for interviews. The number and type of cases to be examined is determined by the agency or system of care using the SOCPR and should be tailored to meet the specific needs and interests of that agency or system. Cases are selected based on characteristics such as the child's age, gender, and the service sector with which the child is involved. For example, an agency or system may be interested in assessing its service delivery for young children who are not yet in school or for youth involved within the juvenile justice sector. A system of care should be purposeful in its approach to sampling to ensure the usefulness of the results. If a few cases are drawn from too large a pool of services and programs, it will be difficult to understand the results and to later know to whom and in what manner feedback should be provided. Determining the number of cases to be examined and the system's reason for implementing the SOCPR is critical to the usefulness of the results.

Arizona's sample of SOCPR cases could not be guided by examples from other communities who have used the SOCPR, as Arizona is the first state to implement the SOCPR in a systematic statewide manner. The sample pool of cases for this fiscal year contained all children and youth age 6-18 years who had scores of 4 or higher on the CASII. Children aged 0-5 were included if they had met the criteria of being involved in two or more child-serving systems; this might include Child Welfare, Juvenile Justice, or the Department of Developmental Disabilities, in addition to Behavioral Health. In addition, cases had to be enrolled in services for at least 90 days and at an entity currently open at the time the sample was drawn. At a specific agency, a case manager could have no more than two of their cases identified for the SOCPR review.

The next step involved examining the number of children who met this complexity designation at each Provider Network Organization or service agency in the state. No cases were chosen for the SOCPR from agencies who served fewer than 25 children who met the eligibility criteria. For agencies who served 26 to 300 eligible children, five cases from the agency were chosen for the SOCPR. For agencies who served 301 or more children who met the criteria, 10 cases were chosen. Agencies were contacted and asked to pull a random oversample based on the criteria described above. This oversampling was intended to provide substitute cases where families were not able to be located, chose not to participate in the process, or who upon review were found not to meet the "high complexity" designation. This process resulted in a total of 180 cases being completed in FY2011-2012.

### *SOCPR Data Analysis and Reporting*

The analysis of the SOCPR follows a sequential process, in which data are coded, sorted, rated,

and examined. Data are integrated, and ratings are determined for each question, embedded within a subdomain of one of the four main domains, with higher scores indicating that a family's experiences are more consistent with system of care principles. All of the interview questions in the SOCPR are organized into a predetermined coding scheme. This allows for questions to be sorted by interview (e.g., primary caregiver, child, formal provider) and by domain. Once all of the required data for the protocol have been collected, the information is integrated to rate the summative questions, each relating to a specific domain. The ratings specified for each subdomain are averaged to provide a global rating for that domain. In addition, the summative questions for each domain are clustered, with their average rating representing a measurement of the individual components in each domain. Finally, reviewers support their final ratings with a brief explanation and direct quotes from the interviews.

The SOCPR produces findings such as mean ratings that reveal the extent to which the services and/or system under review adhere to the system of care philosophy (i.e., the extent to which services are child-centered and family-focused, community based, and culturally competent). A mean rating is also completed that assesses the impact of services on children and their families. The ratings are supported and explained by reviewer's detailed notes and direct quotes from respondents to provide objective, evocative, and in-depth feedback. The findings are used to document the specific components of service delivery that are effective or that need to be further developed and improved to increase fidelity to the system of care approach. One of the strengths of the SOCPR derives from its production of both quantitative and qualitative data. The mean ratings provide a discrete number to indicate the level of system of care values and principles implementation that is present within the family case. The file review data, interview contents, and reviewer reasoning to support summative question ratings provide the "why" to support the mean ratings scores. In addition, overall themes can be gleaned from these writings to provide information about larger systemic issues, community resources or needs, or other unique events that affect system of care values implementation.

IBM SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences Version 20) software was used to analyze the quantitative data. The results of the SOCPR are organized and presented on the basis of the four domains: Child-Centered and Family-Focused, Community Based, Culturally Competent, and Impact. Each summative question is rated on a scale of -3 (disagree very much) to +3 (agree very much). These scores are then transformed on a scale from 1 (disagree very much) to 7 (agree very much) to eliminate the - and + signs. Thus, -3 is transformed to 1; -2 to is transformed to 2; -1 is transformed to 3, and so forth.

Thus, a rating ranging from 1-7 is derived for each of the domains and their embedded measurements. Scores from 1-3 represent lower implementation of a system of care principle, and scores from 5-7 represent enhanced implementation of a system of care principle. A score of 4 indicates a neutral rating, meaning a lack of support for or against implementation.

Means were calculated for the overall case, domains, subdomains, and individual items. The range of scores, minimum and maximum values, and standard deviations for each data point were

also examined. The total set of cases as well as groups of cases determined by GSA were “slices” of data used to examine the relationship between SOCPR scores and a variety of demographic variables, including age, gender, race/ethnicity, child’s primary language, service systems utilized, specific services accessed, and length of services at the agency. SOCPR quantitative score comparisons among GSAs were not made, as each GSA encompasses a unique set of children and families receiving services, and provider agencies providing services. Data are reported to provide state-level information to guide ADHS/DBHS planning and to assist provider agencies within a specific GSA to improve their services to best serve their children and families.

ATLAS.ti software was used to assist with the qualitative data analysis. Two methods of code development were used. The first, based on theoretical principles, were derived prior to coding. These codes were based on the structure of the SOCPR (domains and subdomains), the type of data (file review, interview, or reviewer reasoning), respondent (youth, caregiver, formal provider, informal helper), and case characteristics (GSA, reviewer). The second set of codes were more emergent codes, derived from the quantitative results (specific service types) and reviewer comments recorded in addition to summative ratings (keywords, emergent themes, strengths, challenges, concerns). The frequency of Summative Question responses were examined and analyzed for emerging patterns/trends. In order to be considered a trend, at least half of the cases had to provide similar information.

### *Data Quality*

Initial verification of data from SOCPR reports were conducted by the contractor who reviewed submitted SOCPR instruments, and identified any omissions or other obvious errors in recording. Subsequently, data were forwarded to ADHS/DBHS for entry into the SOCPR database. The quality of the SOCPR data was checked again as data entry was completed for each provider agency. A summary of each provider’s quantitative data was produced and reviewed again for errors. If errors were found, clarification was sought from the data collection team leader and corrected in the database. Quantitative data was also compared by reviewer and provided to the data collection team leader in order to ensure accuracy. As part of preparation for provider feedback sessions, data from each provider agency review was assembled into a report format, which was forwarded to the Children’s System of Care Bureau Chief and staff to review prior to sending to the contractor for final report preparation. Annually, various data reports were completed as part of the quality check process to assist with training and ensure continued data integrity needs were addressed.

Qualitative data derived from Summative Questions were monitored as follows. Summaries were reviewed for clarity and edited for consistency in of use of terms, spelling, jargon, and identifying information. Additionally, a sample of responses from each rater was reviewed for consistency between the rating and the narrative summary by the Project Manager with the individual rater. The scope and quality of these brief narrative responses can, however, vary.

## Results

### *Demographics*

The 180 SOCPR cases completed during FY2011-2012 were sampled from all six GSAs in Arizona. A summary of the demographic characteristics are presented in Table 1. Due to the sampling scheme employed by ADHS/DBHS (previously described in the Methodology section), different numbers of cases were completed in each GSA. The most populous area, GSA 6, provided the greatest number of case for the sample (n=70). The other GSAs provided between 10 and 35 cases.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of SOCPR Cases

Variable	State N=180	GSA 1 n=20	GSA 2 n=10	GSA 3 n=20	GSA 4 n=35	GSA 5 n=25	GSA 6 n=70
Age (years)	9.9	9.3	12.4	11.4	11.1	8.5	9.2
Gender (Male)	69.4%	60.0%	70.0%	70.0%	85.7%	72%	62.9%
Race:							
White	52.2%	65.0%	70.0%	50.0%	57.1%	48.0%	45.7%
Black	10.0%	5.0%	10.0%	5.0%	11.4%	8.0%	12.9%
Latino/Hispanic	28.9%	25.0%	20.0%	35.0%	25.7%	32.0%	30.0%
Native American	2.2%	0	0	5.0%	2.9%	0	2.9%
Multi-racial	6.7%	5.0%	0	5.0%	2.9%	12.0%	8.5%
Primary Language:							
English	90.0%	100%	90.0%	85.0%	88.6%	88.0%	90.0%
French	0.6%	0	0	5.0%	0	0	0
Spanish	8.3%	0	10.0%	10.0%	8.6%	12.0%	8.6%
Multiple Languages	0.6%	0	0	0	0	0	1.4%
No Linguistic Content/NA	0.6%	0	0	0	2.9%	0	0

As shown in Table 1, the overall mean age for the 180 cases was 9.9 years. The means for age across GSA ranged from 8.5 to 12.4. Over 69% of the sample was male, ranging from 60% in GSA 1 to almost 86% in GSA 4. Of the sample, 52% was White, and almost 29% was Latino/Hispanic. The remaining 19% of the sample was Black, Native American, or multi-racial. Statewide, 90% of the children and youth in the sample spoke English as their primary language, and Spanish was identified as being the primary language in over 8% of families. English was the only language reported in GSA 1. English was identified as a primary language in all six GSAs, while Spanish (5), French (1), and Multiple Languages (1) were also identified as primary languages in five of the GSAs. Chi-square analyses were used to look for demographic differences in cases by GSA, with age bands, gender, race, and primary language under consideration.

### *Service System Involvement*

Five different child-serving systems and an “Other” category were used to capture service system involvement as part of the services profiles of children and youth whose cases were chosen as part of the sample. Almost all 180 cases were recorded as showing behavioral health system involvement, as shown in Table 2. The SOCPR protocols documented that over 44% of the cases had child welfare involvement, followed by education, developmental disabilities, juvenile justice, and “Other”. The “Other” system category was documented by four of the GSAs. These services included emotionally disturbed, CASA (Court Appointed Special Advocate), Arizona EIP (Early Intervention Program), medical, behavior analysis, and neurologist.

Table 2. Child-Serving Systems Involvement

System	Statewide N=180	GSA 1 n=20	GSA 2 n=10	GSA 3 n=20	GSA 4 n=35	GSA 5 n=25	GSA 6 n=70
Behavioral Health	99.4%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	98.6%
Child Welfare	44.4%	30.0%	10.0%	60.0%	57.1%	64.0%	35.7%
Juvenile Justice	11.1%	5.0%	30.0%	15.0%	11.4%	8.0%	10.0%
Education	30.0%	35.0%	40.0%	30.0%	14.3%	24.0%	37.1%
Developmental Disabilities	15.6%	20.0%	10.0%	15.0%	11.4%	16.0%	17.1%
Other	3.9%	5.0%	0%	0%	8.6%	4.0%	2.9%

The results of the 180 cases were plotted by histogram to explore the distribution of cases for total number of systems involved. The results are seen in Figure 1. The horizontal axis displays the total number of services, while the vertical axis represents the number of cases with that total number of services. The 180 cases represent children and youth who either were receiving behavioral health system services or had recently completed services from the behavioral health system. In addition, cases were only chosen for SOCPR review if the youth was identified as having complex needs.

Overall, systems involvement ranged from 1 – 6, with the mean being 2.04. The shape of the histogram is symmetrical, resembling a normal distribution. One might expect that children and youth in this sample to be involved in a significant number of child-serving systems and thus expect the shape/distribution to skew to the right, towards a greater number of service systems. Explanations for this finding might include inadequate record documentation, differences in reviewer interpretations of how to record service system involvement, or data entry errors.




Figure 1. Histogram of child-serving system involvement.

*Receipt of Services or Treatments*

Similar to child-serving systems, the kinds of services or treatments children and youth in the sample received were also calculated. Fifteen named types of services as well as an “Other” category were used to identify service provision. These service types are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Services or Treatments Received by Children and Youth

Services or Treatment	Statewide N (%)	GSA 1 N (%)	GSA 2 N (%)	GSA 3 N (%)	GSA 4 N (%)	GSA 5 N (%)	GSA 6 N (%)
<b>Treatment Services</b>	130 (72.2)	12 (60.0)	8 (80.0)	15 (75.0)	25 (71.4)	18 (72.0)	52 (74.3)
• Individual Counseling	114 (63.3)	12 (60.0)	7 (70.0)	13 (65.0)	23 (65.7)	15 (60.0)	44 (62.9)
• Family Counseling	73 (40.6)	7 (35.0)	3 (30.0)	10 (50.0)	18 (51.4)	8 (32.0)	27 (38.6)
• Group Counseling	26 (14.4)	4 (20.0)	4 (40.0)	6 (30.0)	6 (17.1)	0	6 (8.6)
• Alcohol/Drug Counseling	6 (3.3)	0	0	2 (10.0)	2 (5.7)	1 (4.0)	1 (1.4)
<b>Medical Services</b>							
• Psychiatric Medication	102 (56.7)	12 (60.0)	8 (80.0)	15 (75.0)	17 (48.6)	13 (52.0)	37 (52.9)
<b>Support Services</b>	180 (100)	20 (100)	10 (100)	20 (100)	35 (100)	25 (100)	70 (100)
• Family Support	68 (37.8)	10 (50.0)	9 (90.0)	8 (40.0)	13 (37.1)	8 (32.0)	20 (28.9)
• Peer Support	16 (8.9)	1 (5.0)	0	3 (15.0)	2 (5.7)	3 (12.0)	7 (10.0)
• Respite Support	39 (21.7)	7 (35.0)	5 (50.0)	5 (25.0)	6 (17.1)	6 (24.0)	10 (14.3)
• Home Care Training	16 (8.9)	5 (25.0)	1 (10.0)	3 (15.0)	1 (2.9)	0	6 (8.6)
• Case Management	180 (100)	20 (100)	10 (100)	20 (100)	35 (100)	25 (100)	70 (100)
• Skill Develop & Training	55 (44.1)	16 (80.0)	4 (40.0)	9 (45.0)	9 (60.0)	10 (40.0)	7 (20.0)
<b>Inpatient Services</b>	18 (10.0)	0	1 (10.0)	2 (10.0)	5 (14.3)	4 (16.0)	6 (8.6)
• Psychiatric Hospitalization	12 (6.7)	0	1 (10.0)	1 (5.0)	4 (11.4)	1 (4.0)	5 (7.1)
• Level I Residential	8 (4.4)	0	0	1 (5.0)	2 (5.7)	3 (12.0)	2 (2.9)
<b>Residential Services</b>	5 (2.9)	0	0	0	2 (5.7)	2 (8.0)	1 (1.4)
• Level II Residential	4 (2.2)	0	0	0	2 (5.7)	2 (8.0)	0
• Level III Residential	1 (0.6)	0	0	0	0	0	1 (1.4)
<b>Other</b>	60 (33.3)	6 (30.0)	4 (40.0)	6 (30.0)	15 (42.9)	5 (20.0)	24 (34.3)

Across the state the most utilized service provision was Support Services (100%) followed by Treatment Services (72%). Residential Services (2.9%) was the least used service provision. More specifically, the most widely utilized service statewide, based on percentage of cases using the service, was Case Management (100%) followed by Individual Counseling (63.3%) and Psychiatric Medication (56.7%). Level III Residential and Level II Residential were the least utilized services (0.6% and 2.2% respectively) statewide. Across GSAs, Case Management was utilized in six out of six GSAs, and it was utilized across 100% of the cases. Level III Residential was utilized in only one GSA (only one

case), and Level II Residential was used in two GSAs (four cases).

Support Services were utilized equally (100%) across all 6 GSAs. As mentioned earlier in this report one specific support service, Case Management, was also utilized 100% by all GSAs. Treatment Services and Medical Services were documented most frequently in GSA 2 based on percentage of cases but GSA 2 had the smallest number of cases as a part of the overall statewide sample. Based on total number in the sample GSA (n=70) had the largest number of cases using services in all service provision categories except Residential Services.

Usage of some services *appears* to be unusually high; therefore, because GSAs vary widely in the number of SOCP/R cases completed, both number of cases and percentage need to be examined. For example, almost 43% of cases in GSA 4 had “Other” services, which represents only 15 youth, as only 35 total SOCP/R cases were completed for this GSA. Over 33% of the treatments or services reported were identified as “Other” (see Technical Appendix). Several of the services variables differed significantly by GSA and are shown in Table 4. Only statistically significant chi-square statistics are reported.

Table 4. Significant Associations between GSA and Specific Services

Treatment	Chi-Square Statistic
<b>Treatment Services</b>	
Individual Counseling	
Family Counseling	
Group Counseling	$\chi^2(5, N=180)=16.08, p=.007$
Alcohol/Drug Counseling	
<b>Medical Services</b>	
Psychiatric Medication	
<b>Support Services</b>	
Family Support	$\chi^2(5, N=180)=15.80, p=.007$
Peer Support	
Respite Support	$\chi^2(5, N=180)=9.7, p=.008$
Home Care Training (HCTC)	$\chi^2(5, N=180)=11.37, p=.04$
Case Management	
<b>Inpatient Services</b>	
Psychiatric Hospitalization	
Level I Residential	
<b>Residential Services</b>	
Level II Residential	
Level III Residential	
Other	
Skills Develop and Training	$\chi^2(5, N=125)=20.5, p=.001$

In order to examine the breadth of services used by children and youth in the sample, a simple summation was calculated for the 16 potential service categories. Thus, the possible range for this variable was from 0 to 16 services utilized. For the total 180 cases in the sample, the range of services used was 1 to 9. These data are displayed via histogram to examine the distribution of total number of services used. The results are displayed in Figure 2. Again, the histogram closely resembles a normal distribution, with a mean of 4.33 services per child or youth recorded. The number of services used during the time a case is open could vary greatly, depending on the needs of the child and family, the array of services that are available, and the length of time the case is open.




Figure 2. Histogram of service or treatment usage for youth.

## *Quantitative Analysis*

### *SOCPR Scores – Overall Case and SOCPR Domains*

Mean scores were computed for the overall case, as well as for each of the four SOCPR domains (Child-Centered Family-Focused, Community Based, Culturally Competent, and Impact). In addition, mean scores were computed for those subdomains contained within the domains. Finally, each summative question was examined individually. In general, the mean score for each item of interest was an important statistic to be examined. In addition, the minimum and maximum scores, as well as the standard deviation for each item of interest, were examined. Using these four statistics, an understanding of the range of scores, the average score, as well as an indication of the variability from case to case, could be examined. This section will report on the overall findings, and then report on specific items of interest which demonstrate extreme scores.

Table 5 shows the overall case scores as well as those for each SOCPR domain for the entire statewide sample of 180 cases, indicated by individual GSA. As explained in the Methodology section, SOCPR scores range from a low of 1 to a high of 7, with scores 5 and higher representing enhanced implementation of the item of interest. At the statewide level, SOCPR scores ranged from 5.01 to 5.49 with an overall case mean score of 5.20. While the SOCPR scores for the case and domains are not normally distributed and so the standard deviation is a less useful statistic, in conjunction with minimum and maximum scores, a more complete picture of the data emerges. The statewide overall case score suggests that, like all of the SOCPR domains, great variability exists across cases. The minimum and maximum scores are to their greatest possible extremes, representing exemplary cases of good and poor system of care values implementation. The means range from the high 4s to the high 5s, showing neutral to slightly enhanced implementation of system of care values. The scores indicate that across the state, behavioral health provider agencies included in the sample performed best at including the Community Based system of care value in service planning and provision. Behavioral health provider agencies were most challenged by providing culturally competent care.

Table 5. SOCPR Case and Domain Scores

GSA (N=180)	Case Mean (SD)	CCFF Mean (SD)	CB Mean (SD)	CC Mean (SD)	IMP Mean (SD)
Statewide	5.20 (0.97) Min 2.04 Max 6.82	5.17 (1.10) Min 1.95 Max 6.82	5.49 (0.85) Min 1.96 Max 6.88	5.01 (1.04) Min 1.68 Max 6.97	5.12 (1.30) Min 1.00 Max 7.00
1 (n=20)	5.68	5.67	5.88	5.30	5.89
2 (n=10)	5.31	5.34	5.46	5.09	5.38
3 (n=20)	5.29	5.21	5.59	5.14	5.21
4 (n=35)	5.12	5.04	5.48	4.91	5.05
5 (n=25)	5.08	4.98	5.36	4.91	5.08
6 (n=70)	5.10	5.12	5.42	4.96	4.89

Minimum and maximum values are not presented for GSAs, as they are a subset of the statewide scores. At the state level, the highest scoring SOCPR domain was Community Based. This was followed by Child-Centered Family-Focused, Impact, and finally Culturally Competent. The GSA data show similar patterns when compared with statewide scores. Additionally, standard deviation data are not presented at the GSA level because some of the GSAs had small sample sizes; therefore, presenting standard deviation data would not be statistically meaningful. Because of the sample size variance among the GSAs, comparisons between GSAs are not possible.

Histograms were drawn at the statewide level to better demonstrate the range of SOCPR scores for the overall case and the four SOCPR domains. These results are displayed in Figures 3 – 7. Scrutiny of these graphs shows a similar pattern for the overall average and each SOCPR domain. The data are not normally distributed and are skewed slightly towards the right, toward higher scores.




Figure 3. Histogram of SOCPR overall case mean scores.




Figure 4. Histogram of SOCPR child-centered family-focused domain mean scores.




Figure 5. Histogram of SOCPR community-based domain mean scores.




Figure 6. Histogram of SOCPR culturally competent domain mean scores.




Figure 7. Histogram of SOCPR impact domain mean scores.

*SOCPR Scores – SOCPR Subdomains*

Table 6 presents statewide SOCPR data for most levels of the instrument, including the total case mean score, SOCPR domain scores, and SOCPR subdomain scores. Because some of the GSAs had very small sample sizes, the standard deviation data are not statistically meaningful; consequently, SOCPR subdomains and their areas of interest are not reported at the GSA level.

Table 6. Arizona Statewide SOCPR Scores by Domain and Subdomain

<b>Overall Score – all cases: 5.20 (0.97)</b>			
	<b>Area</b>	<b>Subdomain</b>	
	<b>X</b>	<b>(SD)</b>	<b>X (SD)</b>
<b>Domain I: Child-Centered, Family-Focused: 5.17 (1.10)</b>			
Individualized			4.96 (1.10)
Assessment/Inventory	5.43	(0.78)	
Service Planning	4.87	(1.16)	
Types of Services/Supports	4.81	(1.55)	
Intensity of Services/Supports	4.75	(1.65)	
Full Participation			5.47 (1.02)
Case Management			5.06 (1.57)
<b>Domain II: Community-Based Domain Score: 5.49 (0.85)</b>			
Early Intervention			5.30 (1.29)
Access to Services			5.86 (0.77)
Convenient Times	5.79	(1.16)	
Convenient Locations	5.86	(1.00)	
Appropriate Language	5.92	(1.14)	
Minimal Restrictiveness			5.79 (0.95)
Integration and Coordination			5.04 (1.36)
<b>Domain III: Culturally Competent Domain Score: 5.01 (1.04)</b>			
Awareness			5.06 (1.06)
Awareness of Child/Family's Culture	5.08	(1.21)	
Awareness of Providers' Culture	4.86	(1.37)	
Awareness of Cultural Dynamics	5.23	(1.14)	
Sensitivity and Responsiveness			4.88 (1.35)
Agency Culture			5.21 (1.29)
Informal Supports			4.88 (1.60)
<b>Domain IV: Impact Domain Score: 5.12 (1.30)</b>			
Improvement			5.19 (1.33)
Appropriateness			5.06 (1.41)

As reported previously, the highest scoring SO CPR domain was Community Based. This was followed by Child-Centered Family-Focused, Impact, and finally Culturally Competent. While all of the SO CPR domain scores and most of the subdomain scores fell in the 5 range (representing enhanced implementation of a system of care principle), there were some scores that fell below that range. In the Community Based domain all subdomain and areas scored in the 5 range with the subdomains of Access to Services and Minimal Restrictiveness scoring 5.86 and 5.79 respectively. Both subdomains of the domain of Impact scored within the 5 range as well. These areas represent strengths in Arizona's Children's System of Care, as reviewed through these 180 SO CPR cases.

The data also revealed areas and subdomains with scores below 5. For example, within the Child-Centered Family-Focused domain, the subdomain Individualized scored below 5 as did three areas within this subdomain. These low scores may indicate the need for attention to an integrated service plan which includes a thorough assessment that identifies the needs of the child and family and incorporates their strengths into the goals. Attention also needs to be paid to the types of services and supports that are provided to the youth and family as well as the intensity of those services and supports. In the Culturally Competent domain, providers need to not only be aware of the values, beliefs, and lifestyles of the child and family but also have the provided services be responsive to them. Providers also need to be aware of their own culture and how their values, beliefs, and lifestyles may influence how they work with families. It should be noted that many of the lower scoring areas had higher standard deviation scores which suggest that variability exists across cases and that while some cases scored poorly, others were more exemplary.

### *SOCPR Scores and Tests of Significant Differences*

Because the SO CPR case and domain scores do not fit the pattern of a normal distribution, nonparametric statistical tests were performed to examine the data for differences between groups within a specific variable in relation to SO CPR scores. SO CPR scores are continuous data, while most of the other variables were categorical data. Thus, for statistical tests in which the variable to be examined in relation to SO CPR scores consisted of more than 3 groups, such as race, the Kruskal-Wallis test was performed. For variables with only 2 groups, such as gender, the Mann-Whitney U test was performed. Age was transformed into an Age Band variable with 3 groups: 0 through 5, 6 to 12, and 13 to 18. Table 7 shows the results of these statistical tests for a variety of variables. A value of .05 or lower indicates a significant difference between groups for the variables involved in the statistical test, with lower scores indicating a higher likelihood of true significant differences.

Table 7. SOCPR Scores and Significant Differences with Variables of Interest

Variable	Case	CCFF	CB	CC	IMP
<b>Demographics</b>					
Age Bands					
Gender					
Race					
Primary Language					
GSA					
Case Longevity					
<b>Service Systems</b>					
Behavioral Health					
Child Welfare					
Juvenile Justice					
Educational					
Developmental Disabilities					
Total Systems					
<b>Services Categories</b>					
Treatment Services					
Medical Services					
Support Services					
Inpatient Services					
Residential Services					
<b>Services</b>					
Individual Counseling					
Family Counseling	.015	.040		.011	
Family Support	.044		.010		
Respite Support	.040		.026		
Case Management					
Psychiatric Hospitalization					
Total Number of Services	.037	.030	.030		

There were a variety of significant differences in SOCPR case and domain scores across the variables examined. None of the demographic variables, service systems, or systems categories measured showed significant differences. Significant differences were found for SOCPR case and domain scores for Services only.

Receiving Group Counseling, Family Support, Respite Support, Home Care training, and Skills Development and Training Services were associated with higher SOCPR scores. These findings indicate that children and youth who received Family Support and Respite Support, had significantly higher Community-Based domain scores. These findings indicate that some community based services are associated with better adherence to system of care values. Those children and youth with Family Counseling services showed significant differences in SOCPR case and domain scores.

### *SOCPR Scores – FY2010-2011 and FY2011-2012 Comparison*

Table 8 shows a comparison of domain and subdomain scores across two administrations of the SOCPR. Two domain scores showed positive although not statistically significant improvements from FY2009-2010 to FY2010-2011. One subdomain, Informal Supports, showed positive and statistically significant improvements. Although all other domain and subdomains scores showed change, about three-fourths of them showed decreases in mean scores. Four of these decreases in mean scores were statistically significant. The Impact domain showed improvement across all subdomains and areas while the domain of Community-Based showed decreases across all subdomains and areas. It should be noted that the sample of children and families interviewed in FY2011-2012 had higher scores on the CASII (4 and higher) than those interviewed in FY2010-2011 (3 and higher). To determine if there is a difference in the samples based on these cutoff scores, additional analyses would need to be conducted.

Table 8. SOCPR Score Comparisons between FY2010-2011 and FY2011-2012

	2010-2011		2011-2012		Change	p-value*
	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)		
Overall Score	5.23	(0.83)	5.20	(0.97)	-0.03	0.76
<b>Domain I: Child-Centered, Family-Focused</b>	<b>5.27</b>	<b>(1.03)</b>	<b>5.17</b>	<b>(1.10)</b>	<b>-0.10</b>	<b>0.38</b>
Individualized	5.00	(1.06)	4.96	(1.10)	-0.04	0.73
Assessment/Inventory	5.54	(0.74)	5.43	(0.78)	-0.11	0.18
Service Planning	4.81	(1.14)	4.87	(1.16)	0.06	0.63
Types of Services/Supports	4.86	(1.57)	4.81	(1.55)	-0.05	0.76
Intensity of Services/Supports	4.80	(1.75)	4.75	(1.65)	-0.05	0.78
Full Participation	5.58	(1.05)	5.47	(1.02)	-0.11	0.32
Case Management	5.21	(1.50)	5.06	(1.57)	-0.15	0.36
<b>Domain II: Community-Based</b>	<b>5.71</b>	<b>(0.74)</b>	<b>5.49</b>	<b>(0.85)</b>	<b>-0.22</b>	<b>0.01*</b>
Early Intervention	5.37	(1.32)	5.30	(1.29)	-0.07	0.62
Access to Services	6.20	(0.76)	5.86	(0.77)	-0.34	0.00*
Convenient Times	5.99	(1.36)	5.79	(1.16)	-0.20	0.14
Convenient Locations	5.97	(1.20)	5.86	(1.00)	-0.11	0.35
Appropriate Language	6.62	(0.89)	5.92	(1.14)	-0.70	0.00*
Minimal Restrictiveness	6.17	(0.88)	5.79	(0.95)	-0.38	0.00*
Integration and Coordination	5.11	(1.36)	5.04	(1.36)	-0.07	0.63
<b>Domain III: Culturally Competent</b>	<b>4.92</b>	<b>(1.06)</b>	<b>5.01</b>	<b>(1.04)</b>	<b>0.09</b>	<b>0.42</b>
Awareness	5.10	(1.15)	5.06	(1.06)	-0.04	0.74
Awareness of Child/Family's Culture	5.14	(1.22)	5.08	(1.21)	-0.06	0.64
Awareness of Providers' Culture	4.89	(1.50)	4.86	(1.37)	-0.03	0.85
Awareness of Cultural Dynamics	5.26	(1.35)	5.23	(1.14)	-0.03	0.82
Sensitivity and Responsiveness	4.67	(1.61)	4.88	(1.35)	0.21	0.19
Agency Culture	5.46	(1.27)	5.21	(1.29)	-0.25	0.07
Informal Supports	4.44	(1.75)	4.88	(1.60)	0.44	0.01*
<b>Domain IV: Impact Domain Score:</b>	<b>5.02</b>	<b>(1.29)</b>	<b>5.12</b>	<b>(1.30)</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>0.47</b>
Improvement	5.14	(1.29)	5.19	(1.33)	0.05	0.72
Appropriateness	4.90	(1.42)	5.06	(1.41)	0.16	0.29

\* p-values were obtained through a two-sided two independent samples t-test.

There is consistency in Arizona's Children's System of Care as evident in the ranking of domain scores across both FY2010-2011 and FY2011-2012. The highest scoring SO CPR domain was Community Based across both administrations. This was followed by Child-Centered Family-Focused, Impact, and lastly Culturally Competent. Again, the subdomain of Access to Services was the highest scoring subdomain across both years and Appropriate Language was the highest scoring area. The subdomain of Minimal Restrictiveness scored high as well.

One of Arizona's Children's System of Care strengths is apparent in the overall positive change in the domain of Culturally Competent. The area of Informal Supports significantly improved from one administration to the next. This is an indication that service providers were more often purposely including informal supports when it came to service planning and delivery for youth and families. The area of Sensitivity and Responsiveness also showed positive change across administrations. This finding implies that service providers are aware of families' values, beliefs, and lifestyles and they are using this information to tailor services to meet the needs of children and families.

Another strength is evident in the domain scores of Impact. Not only is there an overall improvement across both administrations of the SO CPR, but there is positive change for both subdomains. These positive changes are an indication that the services and supports provided to children and families have not only properly met their needs but have also enhanced their overall situations.

A final strength is in the area of Service Planning in the domain of Individualized. The positive improvement in this area is an indication that the service plan is not only integrated across service providers but that it reflects the needs and strengths of the family. This is evident in how services are delivered to children and families and the development of strengths-based goals.

Some areas for opportunity of improvement can be seen in the downward trend of some the comparisons from FY2010-2011 to FY2011-2012. Four of these comparisons were statistically significant. All of these occurred in the Community-Based domain, which also happens to be the highest ranking domain for FY2011-2012. These decreases in scoring over time may be due to unavailability of settings that were acceptable to families, times or place that were not convenient for families, or language barriers that prevented appropriate coordination and delivery of services.

### *Trend Analysis*

The state of Arizona has utilized findings from the SOCPR since FY2009-2010 to document the specific components of service delivery that are effective or that need to be further developed and improved to increase fidelity to the system of care approach. Because of the amount of available SOCPR data, a trend analysis was conducted. A trend analysis looks at the aggregated data over a period of time to see if there are trends or patterns in the collected information.

Table 9.0 shows the overall trend analysis scores statewide and for each of the six GSAs for FY2009-2010 through 2011-2012.

Table 9.0. Trend Analysis of Overall SOCPR Scores FY2009-2010 through FY2011-2012 – GSAs 1-6

	2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		Slope	p-value
	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)		
Overall Score Statewide	5.16	(1.18)	5.23	(0.83)	5.20	(0.97)	0.02	0.74
Overall Score GSA1	5.27	(1.21)	5.32	(0.87)	5.68	(0.57)	0.19	0.16
Overall Score GSA2	5.44	(0.61)	5.56	(0.69)	5.31	(0.70)	-0.07	0.66
Overall Score GSA3	5.17	(1.27)	5.31	(0.55)	5.29	(0.88)	0.05	0.77
Overall Score GSA4	4.96	(1.20)	5.15	(0.76)	5.12	(0.88)	0.08	0.48
Overall Score GSA5	5.63	(0.97)	5.24	(0.75)	5.08	(0.91)	-0.28	0.02*
Overall Score GSA6	5.02	(1.23)	5.14	(0.95)	5.10	(1.13)	0.04	0.64

The overall data trend analysis indicates an increasing trend from Year 1 to Year 2 but then that trend becomes flat from Year 2 to Year 3. This is true for each GSA except GSA 1, which shows a consistent increase from Year 1 to Year 3, and GSA 5 which shows a consistent decreasing trend across all three years.

The data presented in Table 9.1 shows a comparison of the domain, subdomain, and area scores across all three years of collected SOCPR data statewide. Fifteen of 28 slope scores indicated downward trends. Both the Child-Centered Family- Focused and Community-Based domains showed decreasing slope changes across the three year analysis. The Culturally Competent and Impact domains showed a strong increasing trend.

Table 9.1. Trend Analysis of SOCPR Scores between FY2009-2010 and FY2011-2012, Statewide (n=555)

	2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		Slope	p-value
	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)		
<b>Overall Score</b>	5.16	(1.18)	5.23	(0.83)	5.20	(0.97)	0.02	0.74
<b>Domain I: Child-Centered, Family-Focused</b>	5.25	(1.35)	5.27	(1.03)	5.17	(1.10)	-0.04	0.50
Individualized	5.03	(1.32)	5.00	(1.06)	4.96	(1.10)	-0.03	0.58
Assessment/Inventory	5.46	(1.16)	5.54	(0.74)	5.43	(0.78)	-0.02	0.75
Service Planning	4.93	(1.39)	4.81	(1.14)	4.87	(1.16)	-0.03	0.62
Types of Services/Supports	4.96	(1.65)	4.86	(1.57)	4.81	(1.55)	-0.08	0.35
Intensity of Services/Supports	4.77	(1.83)	4.80	(1.75)	4.75	(1.65)	-0.01	0.91
Full Participation	5.57	(1.28)	5.58	(1.05)	5.47	(1.02)	-0.04	0.44
Case Management	5.15	(1.78)	5.21	(1.50)	5.06	(1.57)	-0.04	0.60
<b>Domain II: Community-Based</b>	5.68	(1.02)	5.71	(0.74)	5.49	(0.85)	-0.09	0.05
Early Intervention	5.12	(1.63)	5.37	(1.32)	5.30	(1.29)	0.09	0.22
Access to Services	6.25	(0.85)	6.20	(0.76)	5.86	(0.77)	-0.19	<0.01**
Convenient Times	6.03	(1.39)	5.99	(1.36)	5.79	(1.16)	-0.12	0.08
Convenient Locations	5.94	(1.32)	5.97	(1.20)	5.86	(1.00)	-0.04	0.49
Appropriate Language	6.78	(0.59)	6.62	(0.89)	5.92	(1.14)	-0.42	<0.01**
Minimal Restrictiveness	6.20	(1.02)	6.17	(0.88)	5.79	(0.95)	-0.20	<0.01**
Integration and Coordination	5.13	(1.67)	5.11	(1.36)	5.04	(1.36)	-0.05	0.53
<b>Domain III: Culturally Competent</b>	4.79	(1.46)	4.92	(1.06)	5.01	(1.04)	0.11	0.08
Awareness	4.89	(1.65)	5.10	(1.15)	5.06	(1.06)	0.09	0.21
Awareness of Child/Family's Culture	4.90	(1.69)	5.14	(1.22)	5.08	(1.21)	0.09	0.19
Awareness of Providers' Culture	4.83	(1.80)	4.89	(1.50)	4.86	(1.37)	0.01	0.86
Awareness of Cultural Dynamics	4.94	(1.78)	5.26	(1.35)	5.23	(1.14)	0.15	0.05*
Sensitivity and Responsiveness	4.59	(1.91)	4.67	(1.61)	4.88	(1.35)	0.14	0.09
Agency Culture	5.29	(1.59)	5.46	(1.27)	5.21	(1.29)	-0.03	0.66
Informal Supports	4.39	(1.79)	4.44	(1.75)	4.88	(1.60)	0.24	0.01**
<b>Domain IV: Impact Domain Score:</b>	4.94	(1.50)	5.02	(1.29)	5.12	(1.30)	0.09	0.21
Improvement	5.04	(1.48)	5.14	(1.29)	5.19	(1.33)	0.08	0.28
Appropriateness	4.85	(1.66)	4.90	(1.42)	5.06	(1.41)	0.10	0.19

Based on the information received from the overall and statewide data, individual trend analyses were conducted for each of the six GSAs. These data are presented in Tables 9.2 – 9.7.

Table 9.2. Trend Analysis of SOCPR Scores between FY2009-2010 and FY2011-2012 - GSA1 (n=83)

	2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		Slope	p-value
	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)		
Overall Score	5.27	(1.21)	5.32	(0.87)	5.68	(0.57)	0.19	0.16
<b>Domain I: Child-Centered, Family-Focused</b>								
Individualized	5.41	(1.30)	5.40	(0.91)	5.67	(0.77)	0.12	0.42
Assessment/Inventory	5.26	(1.28)	5.17	(1.10)	5.49	(0.68)	0.10	0.53
Service Planning	5.51	(1.19)	5.69	(0.76)	5.73	(0.79)	0.12	0.37
Types of Services/Supports	4.85	(1.51)	5.12	(1.15)	5.24	(0.89)	0.20	0.25
Intensity of Services/Supports	5.21	(1.56)	5.20	(1.35)	5.55	(1.00)	0.15	0.43
Full Participation	5.48	(1.39)	4.67	(1.79)	5.45	(0.94)	-0.09	0.67
Case Management	5.67	(1.25)	5.57	(0.90)	5.72	(1.00)	0.02	0.92
<b>Domain II: Community-Based</b>								
Early Intervention	5.29	(1.59)	5.45	(1.34)	5.80	(1.08)	0.25	0.21
Access to Services	5.86	(0.88)	5.69	(0.72)	5.88	(0.57)	-0.01	0.95
Convenient Times	5.26	(1.71)	5.53	(1.28)	5.72	(0.94)	0.24	0.23
Convenient Locations	6.39	(0.65)	6.17	(0.83)	5.96	(0.72)	-0.22	0.04*
Appropriate Language	6.18	(1.10)	6.00	(1.26)	5.85	(1.09)	-0.17	0.30
Minimal Restrictiveness	6.12	(0.92)	5.85	(1.20)	6.00	(0.93)	-0.08	0.58
Integration and Coordination	6.86	(0.38)	6.67	(0.48)	6.02	(0.92)	-0.40	<0.01**
<b>Domain III: Culturally Competent</b>								
Awareness	6.33	(0.58)	5.93	(0.94)	6.08	(0.57)	-0.15	0.14
Awareness of Child/Family's Culture	5.45	(1.52)	5.13	(1.22)	5.75	(0.68)	0.10	0.56
Awareness of Providers' Culture	4.71	(1.65)	5.00	(1.10)	5.30	(0.77)	0.29	0.11
Awareness of Cultural Dynamics	4.69	(1.82)	5.03	(1.15)	5.36	(1.07)	0.33	0.10
Sensitivity and Responsiveness	4.62	(1.88)	5.33	(1.09)	5.47	(0.95)	0.45	0.03*
Agency Culture	4.64	(2.00)	4.60	(1.54)	5.30	(1.17)	0.30	0.21
Informal Supports	4.82	(1.89)	5.17	(1.34)	5.30	(1.42)	0.25	0.26
<b>Domain IV: Impact Domain Score:</b>								
Improvement	4.30	(2.16)	5.05	(1.37)	4.95	(1.46)	0.36	0.14
Appropriateness	5.23	(1.79)	5.37	(1.11)	5.50	(1.04)	0.14	0.49
<b>Domain V: Overall Score</b>								
Improvement	4.64	(1.85)	4.57	(1.83)	5.40	(1.19)	0.34	0.16
Appropriateness	5.11	(1.50)	5.18	(1.29)	5.89	(0.64)	0.36	0.05*
<b>Domain VI: Overall Score</b>								
Improvement	5.17	(1.46)	5.37	(1.27)	5.88	(0.78)	0.34	0.06
Appropriateness	5.06	(1.69)	5.00	(1.43)	5.90	(0.58)	0.38	0.06

Similar to the Statewide analysis, Community-Based showed decreasing trends with significant findings for both Access to Services and Appropriate Language. Significant increasing trends were evident for the Impact Domain and for Awareness of Child's/Family's Culture.

Table 9.3. Trend Analysis of SOCPR Scores between FY2009-2010 and FY2011-2012 - GSA2 (n=29)

	2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		Slope	p-value
	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)		
Overall Score	5.44	(0.61)	5.56	(0.69)	5.31	(0.70)	-0.07	0.66
Domain I: Child-Centered, Family-Focused	5.88	(0.72)	5.54	(0.84)	5.34	(0.75)	-0.27	0.13
Individualized	5.26	(0.86)	4.83	(1.11)	4.95	(0.84)	-0.15	0.50
Assessment/Inventory	6.00	(0.37)	5.43	(0.82)	5.50	(0.59)	-0.24	0.11
Service Planning	5.03	(0.82)	4.18	(1.11)	5.10	(0.69)	0.05	0.82
Types of Services/Supports	5.11	(1.45)	4.80	(1.62)	4.80	(1.32)	-0.15	0.65
Intensity of Services/Supports	4.89	(1.54)	4.90	(1.91)	4.40	(1.71)	-0.25	0.53
Full Participation	6.38	(0.51)	6.08	(0.66)	5.86	(0.40)	-0.26	0.04*
Case Management	6.00	(1.00)	5.70	(1.18)	5.20	(1.34)	-0.40	0.15
Domain II: Community-Based	5.63	(0.94)	6.12	(0.55)	5.46	(0.65)	-0.09	0.60
Early Intervention	5.28	(1.25)	5.70	(1.51)	5.10	(1.24)	-0.10	0.75
Access to Services	5.72	(1.19)	6.53	(0.45)	6.03	(0.65)	0.14	0.47
Convenient Times	5.22	(1.99)	6.10	(1.20)	5.80	(1.14)	0.28	0.42
Convenient Locations	5.06	(1.98)	6.50	(0.53)	6.10	(0.39)	0.51	0.08
Appropriate Language	6.89	(0.33)	7.00	(0.00)	6.20	(1.30)	-0.35	0.07
Minimal Restrictiveness	5.67	(1.50)	6.50	(0.53)	6.15	(0.34)	0.23	0.29
Integration and Coordination	5.83	(1.20)	5.75	(1.38)	4.55	(1.46)	-0.65	0.05*
Domain III: Culturally Competent	5.21	(0.73)	5.27	(0.59)	5.09	(1.01)	-0.06	0.73
Awareness	5.23	(0.79)	5.54	(0.90)	5.10	(0.78)	-0.07	0.70
Awareness of Child/Family's Culture	5.48	(0.93)	5.73	(0.99)	5.10	(1.12)	-0.20	0.41
Awareness of Providers' Culture	5.11	(0.93)	5.10	(1.52)	5.10	(0.88)	-0.01	0.98
Awareness of Cultural Dynamics	5.11	(1.05)	5.80	(0.79)	5.10	(0.88)	-0.02	0.93
Sensitivity and Responsiveness	4.94	(1.24)	5.55	(1.23)	4.75	(1.21)	-0.11	0.70
Agency Culture	6.11	(0.96)	6.20	(0.67)	5.60	(1.29)	-0.26	0.27
Informal Supports	4.56	(1.51)	3.80	(2.35)	4.90	(1.79)	0.19	0.68
Domain IV: Impact Domain Score:	5.06	(1.29)	5.30	(1.25)	5.38	(0.74)	0.16	0.53
Improvement	5.11	(1.43)	5.60	(1.10)	5.45	(0.69)	0.16	0.52
Appropriateness	5.00	(1.20)	5.00	(1.55)	5.30	(1.21)	0.15	0.62

GSA 2 had decreasing trends that were equally scattered across all four domains. Two subdomains, Full Participation and Integration and Coordination, had findings which were significant.

Table 9.4. Trend Analysis of SOCPR Scores between FY2009-2010 and FY2011-2012 - GSA3 (n=40)

	2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		Slope	p-value
	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)		
Overall Score	5.17	(1.27)	5.31	(0.55)	5.29	(0.88)	0.05	0.77
<b>Domain I: Child-Centered, Family-Focused</b>								
Individualized	5.53	(1.23)	5.05	(0.75)	4.96	(1.33)	-0.27	0.25
Assessment/Inventory	5.87	(0.76)	5.57	(0.69)	5.25	(0.86)	-0.31	0.05*
Service Planning	5.55	(0.92)	5.03	(0.71)	4.75	(1.23)	-0.39	0.06
Types of Services/Supports	5.50	(1.58)	5.10	(1.20)	4.95	(1.64)	-0.26	0.37
Intensity of Services/Supports	5.20	(2.30)	4.50	(1.58)	4.90	(1.94)	-0.10	0.79
Full Participation	5.88	(0.99)	5.66	(0.38)	5.48	(1.01)	-0.20	0.25
Case Management	5.45	(2.10)	5.25	(0.95)	5.18	(1.50)	-0.13	0.66
<b>Domain II: Community-Based</b>								
Early Intervention	5.35	(2.07)	5.25	(0.86)	5.50	(1.05)	0.09	0.72
Access to Services	6.67	(0.53)	5.82	(0.64)	5.77	(0.73)	-0.41	<0.01**
Convenient Times	6.80	(0.42)	5.60	(0.97)	5.45	(1.57)	-0.63	0.01**
Convenient Locations	6.20	(1.57)	5.40	(1.24)	5.95	(0.69)	-0.06	0.77
Appropriate Language	7.00	(0.00)	6.45	(0.60)	5.90	(1.01)	-0.55	<0.01**
Minimal Restrictiveness	5.80	(1.87)	5.90	(0.21)	5.92	(0.78)	0.06	0.77
Integration and Coordination	5.65	(1.53)	4.90	(1.07)	5.15	(1.32)	-0.20	0.42
<b>Domain III: Culturally Competent</b>								
Awareness	3.80	(1.67)	4.93	(1.20)	5.19	(0.85)	0.65	0.01**
Awareness of Child/Family's Culture	4.10	(1.79)	4.60	(1.26)	5.27	(1.10)	0.59	0.02*
Awareness of Providers' Culture	3.50	(1.96)	4.80	(1.75)	4.85	(1.18)	0.62	0.04*
Awareness of Cultural Dynamics	3.80	(2.04)	5.40	(0.97)	5.45	(0.76)	0.75	<0.01**
Sensitivity and Responsiveness	3.15	(2.38)	4.05	(1.85)	4.92	(1.13)	0.89	0.01**
Agency Culture	5.60	(1.37)	5.40	(1.07)	5.35	(1.14)	-0.12	0.60
Informal Supports	3.80	(2.20)	5.60	(0.97)	5.10	(1.21)	0.55	0.07
<b>Domain IV: Impact Domain Score:</b>								
Improvement	5.10	(1.77)	5.48	(0.79)	5.21	(1.28)	0.03	0.91
Appropriateness	5.10	(1.73)	5.60	(0.66)	5.32	(1.27)	0.08	0.75
Appropriateness	5.10	(1.88)	5.35	(1.03)	5.10	(1.44)	-0.02	0.94

GSA 3 had six consistently increasing scores in the Culturally Competent domain that were significant. GSA 3 also had some steadily decreasing scores for Assessment/Inventory, Access, Convenient times, and Appropriate Language.

Table 9.5. Trend Analysis of SOCPR Scores between FY2009-2010 and FY2011-2012 - GSA4 (n=100)

	2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		Slope	p-value
	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)		
Overall Score	4.96	(1.20)	5.15	(0.76)	5.12	(0.88)	0.08	0.48
<b>Domain I: Child-Centered, Family-Focused</b>								
Individualized	4.77	(1.23)	4.89	(1.07)	4.90	(0.96)	0.06	0.62
Assessment/Inventory	5.30	(1.03)	5.49	(0.65)	5.50	(0.60)	0.10	0.29
Service Planning	4.81	(1.12)	4.75	(1.11)	4.79	(1.11)	-0.01	0.91
Types of Services/Supports	4.49	(1.70)	4.80	(1.63)	4.71	(1.66)	0.11	0.57
Intensity of Services/Supports	4.49	(1.80)	4.53	(1.76)	4.60	(1.59)	0.06	0.78
Full Participation	5.38	(1.22)	5.67	(0.85)	5.37	(0.95)	-0.01	0.96
Case Management	4.94	(1.64)	4.78	(1.62)	4.84	(1.64)	-0.05	0.80
<b>Domain II: Community-Based</b>								
Early Intervention	5.07	(1.48)	5.73	(1.01)	5.64	(1.00)	0.29	0.05*
Access to Services	6.01	(1.03)	6.35	(0.56)	5.74	(0.84)	-0.14	0.19
Convenient Times	5.86	(1.42)	5.90	(1.58)	5.86	(1.03)	0.00	1.00
Convenient Locations	5.51	(1.62)	6.45	(0.62)	5.56	(1.40)	0.02	0.90
Appropriate Language	6.67	(0.57)	6.70	(0.60)	5.81	(1.02)	-0.43	<0.01**
Minimal Restrictiveness	5.93	(1.23)	6.53	(0.52)	5.61	(1.11)	-0.16	0.22
Integration and Coordination	5.14	(1.57)	5.37	(1.21)	4.91	(1.25)	-0.11	0.48
<b>Domain III: Culturally Competent</b>								
Awareness	4.66	(1.57)	4.91	(1.13)	5.11	(1.00)	0.23	0.14
Awareness of Child/Family's Culture	4.73	(1.55)	4.99	(1.27)	5.29	(1.15)	0.28	0.09
Awareness of Providers' Culture	4.66	(1.68)	4.77	(1.61)	4.83	(1.38)	0.09	0.65
Awareness of Cultural Dynamics	4.60	(1.72)	4.97	(1.50)	5.23	(1.11)	0.31	0.07
Sensitivity and Responsiveness	4.36	(1.67)	3.97	(1.61)	4.94	(1.44)	0.29	0.13
Agency Culture	5.23	(1.32)	5.65	(1.29)	5.19	(1.29)	-0.02	0.89
Informal Supports	3.97	(1.65)	4.87	(1.59)	4.40	(1.74)	0.21	0.29
<b>Domain IV: Impact Domain Score:</b>								
Improvement	4.74	(1.58)	4.92	(1.38)	5.17	(1.27)	0.21	0.21
Appropriateness	4.66	(1.63)	4.37	(1.64)	4.93	(1.37)	0.14	0.47

GSA 4's data indicated a significant positive change in Early Intervention yet a significant decrease in Appropriate Language scores.

Table 9.6. Trend Analysis of SOCPR Scores between FY2009-2010 and FY2011-2012 - GSA5 (n=85)

	2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		Slope	p-value
	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)		
Overall Score	5.63	(0.97)	5.24	(0.75)	5.08	(0.91)	-0.28	0.02*
Domain I: Child-Centered, Family-Focused	5.71	(1.08)	5.33	(1.04)	4.98	(1.05)	-0.37	0.01**
Individualized	5.41	(1.16)	5.25	(0.90)	4.85	(1.18)	-0.28	0.06
Assessment/Inventory	5.94	(0.67)	5.56	(0.59)	5.28	(0.80)	-0.33	<0.01**
Service Planning	5.26	(1.14)	5.11	(0.96)	4.80	(1.29)	-0.23	0.14
Types of Services/Supports	5.30	(1.60)	5.23	(1.38)	4.68	(1.65)	-0.30	0.15
Intensity of Services/Supports	5.13	(1.76)	5.10	(1.67)	4.64	(1.73)	-0.24	0.30
Full Participation	5.85	(1.12)	5.41	(1.05)	5.28	(0.91)	-0.29	0.04*
Case Management	5.87	(1.26)	5.32	(1.56)	4.80	(1.55)	-0.53	0.01**
Domain II: Community-Based	6.07	(0.79)	5.68	(0.68)	5.36	(0.81)	-0.36	<0.01**
Early Intervention	5.75	(1.51)	5.58	(1.07)	5.14	(1.43)	-0.30	0.10
Access to Services	6.50	(0.56)	5.95	(0.77)	5.65	(0.66)	-0.43	<0.01**
Convenient Times	6.37	(1.03)	5.73	(1.44)	5.64	(1.11)	-0.37	0.03*
Convenient Locations	6.30	(0.94)	5.93	(1.27)	5.90	(0.71)	-0.21	0.14
Appropriate Language	6.83	(0.46)	6.18	(1.50)	5.40	(1.18)	-0.71	<0.01**
Minimal Restrictiveness	6.45	(0.70)	5.93	(0.89)	5.58	(0.81)	-0.44	<0.01**
Integration and Coordination	5.58	(1.40)	5.27	(1.41)	5.06	(1.36)	-0.26	0.16
Domain III: Culturally Competent	5.14	(1.35)	4.94	(0.88)	4.90	(0.94)	-0.12	0.41
Awareness	5.27	(1.66)	5.21	(1.01)	5.16	(1.07)	-0.06	0.75
Awareness of Child/Family's Culture	5.24	(1.68)	5.11	(1.11)	4.88	(1.27)	-0.18	0.33
Awareness of Providers' Culture	5.30	(1.86)	5.27	(1.11)	5.12	(1.39)	-0.09	0.66
Awareness of Cultural Dynamics	5.27	(1.57)	5.27	(1.28)	5.48	(0.96)	0.10	0.56
Sensitivity and Responsiveness	5.02	(1.90)	4.87	(1.34)	4.76	(1.19)	-0.13	0.53
Agency Culture	5.90	(1.23)	5.50	(1.14)	4.82	(1.34)	-0.54	<0.01**
Informal Supports	4.37	(1.59)	4.17	(1.74)	4.88	(1.54)	0.24	0.28
Domain IV: Impact Domain Score:	5.60	(1.27)	5.03	(1.15)	5.08	(1.08)	-0.27	0.09
Improvement	5.73	(0.96)	5.05	(1.21)	5.20	(1.06)	-0.28	0.06
Appropriateness	5.47	(1.69)	5.00	(1.20)	4.96	(1.23)	-0.26	0.17

The data for GSA 5 indicated consistent declining trends across all three years. The slope score which indicates change over time decreased for all areas except Awareness of Cultural Dynamics and Informal Supports. The Overall Score, Domain 1 score, and Domain 2 score all showed significant decreases across the three years.

Table 9.7. Trend Analysis of SOCPR Scores between FY2009-2010 and FY2011-2012 - GSA6 (n=218)

	2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		Slope	p-value
	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)		
Overall Score	5.02	(1.23)	5.14	(0.95)	5.10	(1.13)	0.04	0.64
Domain I: Child-Centered, Family-Focused	5.01	(1.48)	5.19	(1.19)	5.12	(1.23)	0.06	0.60
Individualized	4.83	(1.43)	4.87	(1.15)	4.88	(1.18)	0.03	0.80
Assessment/Inventory	5.25	(1.34)	5.49	(0.86)	5.40	(0.85)	0.08	0.34
Service Planning	4.81	(1.59)	4.61	(1.25)	4.82	(1.25)	0.00	0.98
Types of Services/Supports	4.85	(1.69)	4.50	(1.73)	4.64	(1.58)	-0.11	0.40
Intensity of Services/Supports	4.43	(1.92)	4.88	(1.81)	4.67	(1.72)	0.13	0.37
Full Participation	5.39	(1.42)	5.54	(1.31)	5.47	(1.15)	0.04	0.68
Case Management	4.82	(1.98)	5.16	(1.59)	5.00	(1.68)	0.10	0.49
Domain II: Community-Based	5.51	(1.03)	5.56	(0.86)	5.42	(1.00)	-0.04	0.60
Early Intervention	4.84	(1.65)	4.96	(1.53)	5.03	(1.46)	0.09	0.45
Access to Services	6.22	(0.86)	6.26	(0.82)	5.96	(0.81)	-0.12	0.07
Convenient Times	5.93	(1.54)	6.22	(1.33)	5.90	(1.13)	-0.01	0.95
Convenient Locations	5.98	(1.27)	5.82	(1.37)	5.89	(0.99)	-0.05	0.59
Appropriate Language	6.73	(0.74)	6.73	(0.84)	6.10	(1.22)	-0.31	<0.01**
Minimal Restrictiveness	6.26	(0.94)	6.21	(1.03)	5.77	(1.07)	-0.24	<0.01**
Integration and Coordination	4.73	(1.83)	4.82	(1.48)	4.93	(1.51)	0.10	0.44
Domain III: Culturally Competent	4.83	(1.51)	4.82	(1.21)	4.96	(1.20)	0.06	0.56
Awareness	5.01	(1.64)	5.11	(1.28)	4.86	(1.16)	-0.07	0.53
Awareness of Child/Family's Culture	4.98	(1.69)	5.12	(1.33)	4.89	(1.31)	-0.04	0.71
Awareness of Providers' Culture	4.94	(1.76)	4.88	(1.56)	4.63	(1.49)	-0.15	0.24
Awareness of Cultural Dynamics	5.11	(1.82)	5.33	(1.43)	5.07	(1.25)	-0.01	0.91
Sensitivity and Responsiveness	4.77	(1.85)	4.69	(1.75)	4.87	(1.45)	0.05	0.74
Agency Culture	5.00	(1.73)	5.29	(1.48)	5.19	(1.39)	0.10	0.41
Informal Supports	4.52	(1.86)	4.20	(1.71)	4.90	(1.71)	0.17	0.23
Domain IV: Impact Domain Score:	4.72	(1.49)	5.00	(1.33)	4.89	(1.53)	0.09	0.44
Improvement	4.85	(1.53)	5.03	(1.39)	4.91	(1.59)	0.04	0.77
Appropriateness	4.59	(1.64)	4.97	(1.43)	4.86	(1.61)	0.14	0.25

GSA 6 showed decreasing trends in some of its scores as well. Appropriate Language and Minimal Restrictiveness were both declining at significant levels.

Because of the multiple downward trends evidenced in GSA 5, a trend analysis was conducted utilizing the data obtained for GSAs 1-4 and 6 only to show what the statewide outcomes would be without the downward trends associated with GSA 5. Table 9.8 shows the results of the analysis. Compared to Table 9.1, nineteen of 28 scores indicated increasing upward trends across the three years. Community-Based continued to have the most decreasing scores which were significant. The Culturally Competent domain showed consistently increasing trends.

Table 9.8. Trend Analysis of SOCPR Scores between FY2009-2010 and FY2011-2012 – GSAs 1-4 and GSA 6 (n=470)

	2009-2010		2010-2011		2011-2012		Slope	p-value
	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)	Mean	(SD)		
<b>Overall Score</b>	5.08	(1.19)	5.22	(0.85)	5.22	(0.97)	0.07	0.24
<b>Domain I: Child-Centered, Family-Focused</b>	5.17	(1.38)	5.25	(1.02)	5.20	(1.11)	0.01	0.83
Individualized	4.96	(1.34)	4.95	(1.09)	4.98	(1.09)	0.01	0.90
Assessment/Inventory	5.38	(1.20)	5.53	(0.78)	5.45	(0.78)	0.04	0.47
Service Planning	4.87	(1.43)	4.75	(1.17)	4.88	(1.15)	0.00	0.98
Types of Services/Supports	4.90	(1.66)	4.78	(1.60)	4.83	(1.54)	-0.04	0.67
Intensity of Services/Supports	4.71	(1.84)	4.74	(1.77)	4.77	(1.65)	0.03	0.76
Full Participation	5.52	(1.31)	5.62	(1.05)	5.51	(1.03)	-0.00	0.94
Case Management	5.03	(1.82)	5.19	(1.49)	5.10	(1.57)	0.04	0.66
<b>Domain II: Community-Based</b>	5.61	(1.04)	5.72	(0.75)	5.52	(0.86)	-0.04	0.39
Early Intervention	5.02	(1.63)	5.32	(1.36)	5.32	(1.26)	0.16	0.05
Access to Services	6.21	(0.88)	6.25	(0.75)	5.89	(0.78)	-0.16	<0.01**
Convenient Times	5.98	(1.44)	6.05	(1.34)	5.82	(1.16)	-0.08	0.30
Convenient Locations	5.88	(1.37)	5.98	(1.19)	5.85	(1.04)	-0.01	0.84
Appropriate Language	6.77	(0.62)	6.71	(0.67)	6.01	(1.11)	-0.38	<0.01**
Minimal Restrictiveness	6.15	(1.06)	6.22	(0.87)	5.82	(0.97)	-0.16	<0.01**
Integration and Coordination	5.06	(1.70)	5.08	(1.35)	5.04	(1.36)	-0.01	0.90
<b>Domain III: Culturally Competent</b>	4.73	(1.47)	4.91	(1.10)	5.02	(1.06)	0.15	0.03*
Awareness	4.82	(1.65)	5.07	(1.19)	5.04	(1.06)	0.11	0.14
Awareness of Child/Family's Culture	4.84	(1.68)	5.15	(1.25)	5.11	(1.20)	0.14	0.07
Awareness of Providers' Culture	4.75	(1.79)	4.81	(1.56)	4.82	(1.36)	0.03	0.71
Awareness of Cultural Dynamics	4.88	(1.81)	5.26	(1.36)	5.19	(1.17)	0.16	0.06
Sensitivity and Responsiveness	4.52	(1.91)	4.63	(1.67)	4.90	(1.38)	0.19	0.04*
Agency Culture	5.18	(1.63)	5.46	(1.30)	5.28	(1.28)	0.05	0.50
Informal Supports	4.39	(1.82)	4.49	(1.75)	4.88	(1.62)	0.24	0.01**
<b>Domain IV: Impact Domain Score:</b>	4.83	(1.51)	5.02	(1.32)	5.13	(1.34)	0.15	0.05
Improvement	4.92	(1.52)	5.16	(1.31)	5.18	(1.37)	0.14	0.08
Appropriateness	4.74	(1.64)	4.88	(1.47)	5.07	(1.44)	0.16	0.05

## *Qualitative Analysis*

This section presents a review of qualitative data compiled from responses to Summative Questions that SOCPR reviewers use to summarize and integrate the information gathered throughout the Document Review and the series of interviews completed with a particular child/youth and family to address each of the four SOCPR domains. The Summative Questions call for the reviewer to provide a rating for each statement and to give a brief narrative in support of that rating. Individual ratings serve as indicators of the extent to which the sub-domain elements (e.g., individualized services, full family participation) or SOC principles are being implemented within the System of Care under review. The narrative portion of each Summative Question response provides evidence for a given rating and is used to determine the presence or absence of system of care principles for each sub-domain. Where an overall summative rating relates to a reviewer's determination of completion of a *thorough assessment*, for instance, qualitative analysis examines the evidence provided to explain the rating.

In the final analysis, ratings for each item are clustered and considered in conjunction with the respective brief narrative provided to determine a general assessment for each sub-domain. The compiled narratives for all Summative Questions were coded and sorted to assess the degree to which System of Care principles were implemented in each SOCPR domain area (N=180). The frequency of Summative Question responses were examined and analyzed for emerging patterns/trends. In order to be considered a trend, at least of half of the review responses had to provide similar information for a given sub-domain area. Trends in each sub-domain are then reviewed together to provide an overall assessment for the larger domain area. This report section also highlights particular successes and challenges with regard to implementation of System of Care principles for each of the SOCPR Domain Areas.

### *Qualitative Findings*

#### *Domain 1: Child-Centered and Family Focused Services*

The first domain of the SOCPR is designed to measure whether the needs of the child/youth and family determine the types and mix of services provided within the System of Care. This domain reflects a commitment to adapt services to the child and family rather than expecting them to conform to preexisting service configurations. The review reflects the effectiveness of the site in providing services that are individualized, that families are included as full participants in the treatment process, and that the type and intensity of services provided is monitored through effective care coordination. The sub-domains, which reflect system of care principles and contain measurements of practice or system of care implementation, are: *Individualized, Child-Centered and Family-Focused, Full Participation, and Care Coordination.*

When considering whether youth and family received *Individualized Services* within the System of Care, reviewers noted that service plans generally reflect the needs and goals of the child/youth and family, and that providers reported informally acknowledging child/family needs and strengths even when these are not adequately documented in case files. Moreover, most raters indicated that the intensity of services reflects the needs of the children/youth and families receiving services. A key challenge related to this sub-domain area was reflected in discussion related to clear reflection of child/youth and family strengths in documented service plan goal statements. Although more than half of the ratings provided for Item 6 (*The service plan goals incorporate the **strengths** of the child and family*) suggest reviewer concordance with this item (i.e. Agree slightly or moderately), descriptive comments reveal that most reviewers did not feel that service plans contained adequate documentation of child and family strengths. Reviewers also noted that parents/caregivers either could not identify their own/their children's strengths or they felt that these were not adequately included in their treatment plans. Despite these findings however, narrative comments associated with Item 7 (*The service planning and delivery **informally** acknowledges/considers the strengths of the child and family*) suggest that child and family strengths are acknowledged informally within child and family team meetings and in other interactions with providers. This finding provides an opportunity for growth and training of providers to more clearly articulate strengths, and to develop strengths-based goals that can encourage active child/youth and family participation in service planning.

Overall, reviewers reported finding *Full Participation* on the part of children/youth and families in the development, implementation, and evaluation of service plans. In general, reviewers reported that children and/or youth, in particular, are participating actively in services and/or service planning meetings. In addition, reviewers noted that caregivers felt that they positively influenced the service planning process and that providers were receptive to hearing their concerns and/or input. In addition, reviewers noted that most caregivers appeared to understand the service plans developed for their children and families. In general, reviewers suggest that cases reflect adequate participation in service planning on the part of providers and caregivers who are working toward reaching common goals.

With regard to the *Care Coordination* sub-domain, reviewers generally reported that one individual appeared to be responsible for coordinating child/youth and family services and was doing so successfully. Overall, service planning appears to be responsive to the changing needs of the family and that service plans are updated in a timely fashion. Where challenges have been reported to exist, reviewers noted that family members reported experiencing long wait times when changing case managers or providers because of new or emerging needs. However, such challenges were reported for less than a quarter of reviewed cases.

In general, analysis of descriptive comments provided by SOCPR raters suggests that providers within the System of Care are providing child-centered and family-focused services. The overall review of cases using the measures associated with *Child-Centered and Family-Focused*

*Services* suggests that assessments of youth in this sample were completed across multiple life domains. The main challenges identified for this domain were found in the Individualized Services sub-domain and reflected a need for improved identification and documentation of child/youth and family strengths (ideally, tied to child/family goals) within treatment plans.

### *Domain 2: Community-Based Services*

The second SOCPR domain is designed to measure whether services are provided within or close to the child/youth's home community, in the least restrictive setting possible, and moreover, that services are coordinated and delivered through linkages between public and private providers. The sub-domains in this area are used to evaluate the effectiveness of the site in identifying needs and providing supports early (*Early Intervention*), facilitating *Access to Services*, providing less restrictive services (*Minimal Restrictiveness*), and integrating and coordinating services for families (*Integration and Coordination*).

When assessing whether child/youth and families received *Early Intervention* related to identified needs, reviewers overwhelmingly reported that child/youth and family needs were identified at intake and that services were provided within four weeks of intake. Where reviewers indicated a challenge with early intervention, they noted that case documentation did not clearly show how soon needs were identified and addressed.

Reviewers reported overwhelmingly that case files demonstrated that the System of Care was ensuring *Access to Services* for children/youth and families. In general, reviewers noted that services were scheduled at convenient times for the child/youth and family, as reported by caregivers or shown in case file documentation. In addition, reviewers reported that services were most often provided within or close to the home community of the child/youth and in the preferred family language.

When assessing for *Minimal Restrictiveness*, raters reported that services appeared to be provided in environments that feel comfortable to the child/youth and family, in the least restrictive and most appropriate environment. SOCPR raters also noted that most case files reflected ongoing input from family members regarding the appropriateness of the environment(s) in which services are provided.

Reviewers generally reported that the services being provided within the System of Care reflected coordination of the providers working with a given child and family and continuity of services, as well as integration of service system components. In general, reviewers noted that case file documentation and key interviews reflect good communication between care coordinators and family members. Overall, reviewers reported that they detected smooth and seamless processes for linking children and families to additional services when they were identified. Challenges identified in this regard were focused primarily on discrepancies between

the care coordinators' and caregivers' statements in this regard, as well as lack of documentation with regard to identification of additional needs and/or processes for linking families to additional services.

Analysis of descriptive comments provided by SO CPR raters suggests that providers within the System of Care are providing services within or close to the child's home community, in the least restrictive setting possible, and which are coordinated and delivered through linkages between all team members. The main challenge found within this domain appeared to reflect lack of adequate documentation related to implementation of the SOC principle, *Access to Services*. The second suggests some discrepancy between ratings given and rater comments for Q.19, in particular ("*Services are scheduled at convenient times for the child and family*"). For this Summative Question, the overwhelming majority of cases were rated as "5" or higher. Although 24 percent of raters gave the highest rating of "7" for this question, their comments generally indicated that they had not found evidence within case file that meetings are scheduled at convenient times. As noted in training materials, the strength of a particular rating depends on the supporting data (e.g. rater comments available), which in turn determines the overall validity of the ratings and ultimately, the overall review.

### *Domain 3: Culturally Competent Services*

The third domain of the SO CPR is intended to measure whether services are attuned to the cultural, racial, and ethnic background and identity of the child/youth and family. Ratings provided in each sub-domain are meant to evaluate the level of cultural awareness of the service provider, whether evidence shows that efforts are made to orient the family to an agency's culture, whether sensitivity and responsiveness is shown for the cultural background of families, and whether informal supports are included in services. The sub-domains associated with Culturally Competent Services are: *Awareness, Sensitivity and Responsiveness, Agency Culture, and Informal Supports*.

Reviewers assessing for *Cultural Awareness* noted that providers generally understand the culture and community of the child/youth and family, and that such awareness is documented within case files. Reviewers noted that providers did not always clearly document or articulate that they were familiar with a child/youth and family's neighborhood or community context. Overall, raters reported little to no documentation related to youth and family concepts of health, although reviewers noted that some caregivers were clearly able to articulate their beliefs. Reviewers also generally reported that providers were aware of "family culture" and discussed its influence on a family's decision-making. Raters generally identified a lack of documentation with regard to the provider's culture and understanding of the impact of their own culture on the delivery of services.

When evaluating the *Sensitivity and Responsiveness* of the System of Care, raters reported that there was limited documentation indicating that providers translated awareness of family culture into action. However, a number of reviewers noted that caregivers reported via interviews that they felt their culture was understood by providers, and raters noted that families often felt that providers worked to respect their cultural values and traditions when recommending services.

Reviewers generally gave high ratings in *Agency Culture Sub-Domain*, suggesting that provider agencies are assisting families in understanding and navigating the service system(s) with which they have interaction. Raters noted that the majority of providers explained what families should expect from an agency, and in many cases offered additional assistance or resources.

With regard to *Informal Supports*, a majority of raters indicated that although case files lacked documentation of informal support participation in service planning there was some evidence that informal supports had been identified and recommended to families. A number of raters noted that many family members had declined offers to include informal supports in the service planning process.

Challenges identified in this domain relate to uneven detailing of evidence to support ratings provided. For instance, although very few cases received ratings of “7” for Questions 28 through 31, those that did receive the highest rating did not always note whether case file documentation supported understanding on the part of service provider(s) regarding the child and family’s culture, beliefs about health, and the degree to which cultural context reflects decision-making on the part of the child and family. Because the particular elements that comprise the Cultural Competence domain can be difficult to grasp in a “concrete” fashion for service providers and perhaps, even raters, it is important to start with case documentation to ascertain whether providers are formally incorporating cultural information about the children and families that they serve. If the case file does not include such evidence, it should be noted and the rating should reflect this lack of evidence.

#### *Domain 4: Impact*

The final SOCPR domain evaluates whether services have produced positive outcomes for the child and family. This domain includes two sub-domains: *Improvement* and *Appropriateness of Services*, which are meant to determine whether services have had a positive impact on the child/youth and family and if so, whether these services met the child/youth and family’s identified needs.

Reviewers found services provided to children and families had produced a positive

impact. When reflecting on the evidence provided for this sub-domain, raters noted that family members and providers were not always in complete agreement as to the degree of progress and improvement (“slight” versus “moderate” improvement, for instance) that they and their children had made as a result of services. However, a review of most cases suggests that multiple team members in each case identified some improvement on the part of the child/youth and family. Similarly, raters generally indicated that the services provided to children/youth and families had been appropriate because they adequately met identified needs. In cases where caregivers reported that their family’s needs were less than adequately met, challenges identified were: dissatisfaction with medication regimens for children, staff turnover rates or lack of services, and difficult transitions when families changed providers. Overall, the services provided through the System of Care appear to have produced positive outcomes for the children and families served.

## References

- Hernandez, M., Gomez, A., Lipien, L., Greenbaum, P. E., Armstrong, K., & Gonzalez, P. (2001). Use of the system of care practice review in the national evaluation: Evaluating the fidelity of practice to system of care principles. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 9*, 43-52.
- Hodges, S., Hernandez, M., Nesman, T., & Lipien, L. (2002). *Creating change and keeping it real: How excellent child-serving organizations carry out their goals*. Tampa, FL: Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, University of South Florida.
- Stephens, R.L, Holden, E.W., & Hernandez, M. (2004). System-of-care practice review scores as predictors of behavioral symptomatology and functional impairment. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 13*, 179-191.
- VanDenBerg, J. (2003). *The history of wraparound*. Retrieved from [http://www.vroonvdb.com/about\\_wraparound.html](http://www.vroonvdb.com/about_wraparound.html)

Technical Appendix

“Other” Category, Treatments and Services

59

*“Other” Category Treatments and Services*

Over 33% of the service provision treatments reported were identified as “Other”. Below is a list and frequency of the treatments or services identified as “Other”.

<b>“Other” Category Treatments and Services</b>	<b>N</b>
Anger Management Group	2
Art Therapy	1
Behavior Coach	9
Behavior Coach Family Support Partner	1
Behavior Coach Support Group for Caregiver	1
BH prevention, transportation	1
CPT	1
DDD Sensory Integration Care Coordinator	1
DDD Habilitation, OT, Respite	1
DDD, OT, Speech	1
Direct Support Services	2
Direct Support Services – Meet me where I am	1
Direct Support Services – Personal Care	1
Doctor follow-up no meds	1
Flex Funds	2
Habilitation Services - DDD	1
Living skills Group	1
Meet me Where I Am	1
Parent Partner	1
Parenting Skills Classes	2
Parenting support Group	1
Physical and Speech Therapy	1
Project Launch	1
Psychiatric Evaluation	2
Skills Development/Training	6
Specialized RAD Therapy	1
Speech and Occupational Therapy	2
Speech and Play Therapy	1
Translation	1
Transportation, Personal Assistance, BH prevention/health promotion	1
Transportation	8
Transportation, Nutrition, Nurse Practitioner	1
Transportation, Pre-job employment	1
Transportation, Substance Abuse	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>60</b>

## Index of Tables

Table 1 – Demographic Characteristics of SOCPR Cases	23
Table 2 – Child-Serving Systems Involvement	24
Table 3 – Services or Treatments Received by Children and Youth	26
Table 4 – Significant Associations between GSA and Specific Services	27
Table 5 – SOCPR Case and Domain Scores	30
Table 6 – Arizona Statewide SOCPR Scores by Domain and Subdomain	36
Table 7 – SOCPR Scores and Significant Differences with Variables of Interest	38
Table 8 – SOCPR Score Comparisons between FY2010-2011 and FY2011-2012	40
Table 9.0 – Trend Analysis of Overall SOCPR Scores FY2009-2010 through FY2011-2012 – GSAs 1-6	42
Table 9.1 – Trend Analysis of SOCPR Scores between FY2009-2010 and FY2011-2012, Statewide (n=555)	43
Table 9.2 – Trend Analysis of SOCPR Scores between FY2009-2010 and FY2011-2012 - GSA1 (n=83)	44
Table 9.3 – Trend Analysis of SOCPR Scores between FY2009-2010 and FY2011-2012 - GSA2 (n=29)	45
Table 9.4 – Trend Analysis of SOCPR Scores between FY2009-2010 and FY2011-2012 - GSA3 (n=40)	46
Table 9.5 – Trend Analysis of SOCPR Scores between FY2009-2010 and FY2011-2012 - GSA4 (n=100)	47
Table 9.6 – Trend Analysis of SOCPR Scores between FY2009-2010 and FY2011-2012 - GSA5 (n=85)	48
Table 9.7 – Trend Analysis of SOCPR Scores between FY2009-2010 and FY2011-2012 - GSA6 (n=218)	49
Table 9.8 – Trend Analysis of SOCPR Scores between FY2009-2010 and FY2011-2012 – GSAs 1-4 and GSA 6 (n=470)	50

## Index of Figures

Figure 1 - Histogram of Child-Serving System Involvement	25
Figure 2 – Histogram of Service or Treatment Usage for Children and Youth	28
Figure 3 – Histogram of SOCPR Overall Case Mean Scores	31
Figure 4 – Histogram of SOCPR Child-Centered Family-Focused Domain Mean Interest	32
Figure 5 - Histogram of SOCPR Community-Based Domain Mean Scores	33
Figure 6 - Histogram of SOCPR Culturally Competent Domain Mean Scores	34
Figure 7 - Histogram of SOCPR Impact Domain Mean Scores	35