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Overview of the Rosie D. Lawsuit

- A class action lawsuit filed in 2001 on behalf of youth with serious emotional disturbance.

- MassHealth was found to be out of compliance with “reasonable promptness” and “Early and Periodic Screening Diagnosis and Treatment” provisions of federal Medicaid Law.

- The court ordered MassHealth to improve screening services and to cover certain diagnostic and treatment services for children under the age of 21 with MassHealth Standard and CommonHealth benefits.
Overview of the Rosie D. Lawsuit

- In July 2007, the Court entered a Remedial Plan, which established six new services referred to as Children’s Behavioral Health Initiative (CBHI) services:
  - Intensive Care Coordination (ICC) using “Wraparound” model
  - Family Support and Training (“Family Partners”)
  - In-Home Therapy
  - In-Home Behavioral Services
  - Therapeutic Mentoring
  - Mobile Crisis Intervention

- In 2009, all MassHealth Managed Care Entities (MCEs) collectively contracted and began reimbursing for the provision of CBHI services for youth under age 21
Description of Intensive Care Coordination (ICC)

Intensive Care Coordination includes:

- Care planning and coordination according to the Wraparound process (a family driven, team-based process for planning and implementing individualized services and supports)

- Care planning team meetings that include service providers and natural supports (family friends, clergy, coaches, neighbors, etc.)

- Team creation of plans geared toward meeting the unique and holistic needs of youth and families with complex needs

- Inclusion of a Family Partner, who works to improve the capacity of the caregiver through coaching and linking to supports and services

- Services provided by a care coordinator with a degree in a human service field and experience working with youth and families or navigating child/family serving systems

- Services delivered by Community Service Agencies (CSAs)
  - 32 CSAs across the state
What is Fidelity?

- Typically, we define *fidelity* as the degree to which a program is implemented as intended by its developers.

- *Wraparound fidelity*, as measured by the Wraparound Fidelity Assessment System, is defined as **the degree to which intensive care coordination teams adhere to the principles of quality Wraparound and carry out the basic activities of facilitating the Wraparound process.**
Wraparound Fidelity Measurement

- Fidelity monitoring lays the groundwork for measuring long-term outcomes of Intensive Care Coordination by gauging whether Wraparound is being carried out according to plan.

- Monitoring is also important given the link between high fidelity scores and better outcomes for youth and families.

- Massachusetts Wraparound fidelity data for the 32 Community Service Agencies (CSAs) was captured from July 1, 2010 to 2016 using two tools, the Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI-4) and the Team Observation Measure (TOM).
Wraparround Fidelity Index

- Set of four interviews that measure the nature of the Wraparround process that a family receives
- Interviews consist of 40 items linked to each of the 10 principles of Wraparround, and are organized by the four phases
- Data result in Overall Fidelity, Fidelity by Phase, & Fidelity by Principle
- Tool has strong internal consistency, test-retest reliability, and inter-rater agreement
- Massachusetts elected to use the caregiver form and contracted a consumer-focused organization to conduct interviews
- Intended to assess both to the Wraparround practice model and adherence to the principles of Wraparround in service delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 3: Implementation</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Sometimes Somewhat</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 FVC Are important decisions ever made about the child or family when they are not there?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>666 777 888 999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supervisors observe team meetings to assess adherence to standards of high-quality Wraparound

Tool consists of 20 items linked to the 10 principles of Wraparound

Trained raters indicate whether or not each indicator was in evidence during the team meeting

Data result in Overall Fidelity and Fidelity by Principle scores

Internal consistency is strong, and inter-rater reliability is adequate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Score (Circle 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Creative Brainstorming and Options</td>
<td>a. The team considers several different strategies for meeting each need and achieving each goal that is discussed.</td>
<td>Y N N/A</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized</td>
<td>b. The team considers multiple options for tasks or action steps.</td>
<td>Y N N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. The facilitator leads a robust brainstorming process to develop multiple options to meet priority needs.</td>
<td>Y N N/A</td>
<td>666 888 999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Massachusetts fidelity generally trended higher over time, eventually surpassing the National Mean (NM)
From June 2009 – June 2012, consultation from Vroon VanDenBerg (VVDB) consisted of:

- Large-scale and seminar-style training on Wraparound
  - Developing a system of care
  - Team meeting facilitation
  - Training implementation and curriculum
  - Impact of Family Partners
  - Engaging youth and natural supports in the process

- Wraparound implementation support for CSA leadership

- Individual coaching for CSAs

Transition to MA-based coaching took place July 2013
Using Data for Change
Data used to make change at both aggregate and individual provider levels

- Aggregate data presented at annual statewide meeting
  - Includes trends over time, strengths, and areas for improvement.

- Individual Wraparound Provider Practice Analysis reports produced for each CSA
  - Include total Fidelity scores, principle Fidelity scores, and individual item scores compared with the state and national means.

- Individual CSA meetings conducted to review Analysis report
  - Review individual fidelity results including comparative data
  - Obtain feedback from CSAs on interventions, policies, and procedures implemented to achieve high scores
  - Collaborate with providers regarding interventions to improve areas with low scores
  - Develop and monitor fidelity plans to improve quality of services
Individual Provider Report Example: TOM Data

MA TOM Total Fidelity Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOM Item</th>
<th>CSA Percentage Score (Item Score)</th>
<th>National Mean Percentage Score (Item Score)</th>
<th>State Mean and Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Team Membership and Attendance</td>
<td>93% (3.7)</td>
<td>86% (3.42)</td>
<td>77% (3.06) SD: 1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/caregiver is a team member and present at meeting</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth (over age 9) is a team member and present at the meeting</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key school and/or other public stakeholder agency representatives are present.</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Individual Provider Report Example: WFI Data

### MA WFI-4 Total Fidelity Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CSA Score</th>
<th>State Mean</th>
<th>National Mean</th>
<th>State SD</th>
<th>National SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WFI Questions and Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WFI Item</th>
<th>WFI Question</th>
<th>CSA Score</th>
<th>National Mean</th>
<th>National SD</th>
<th>State Mean</th>
<th>State SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 (CC)</td>
<td>When you first met with the family, were they given ample time to talk about their strengths, beliefs, and traditions?</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 (FVC)</td>
<td>Before the first team meeting, did you fully explain the wraparound process and the choices the family could make?</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 (SB)</td>
<td>At the beginning of the wraparound process, was the family given an opportunity to tell you what things have worked in the past for the child and family?</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 (TB)</td>
<td>Did the family members select the people who would be on their wraparound team?</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 (TB)</td>
<td>Is it difficult to get team members to attend team meetings when they are needed?</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aggregate Level

- Improving Transition Scores
- Improving Overall Scores
Using Data for Change: Transition

- Improving transition item scores remains an ongoing area for improvement statewide

- CSAs have implemented a variety of interventions, including the following:
  - Use of transition indicator forms
  - Training staff on transition indicators
  - Sharing best practices in regional forums
In 2013, Massachusetts-based coaching was implemented and consisted of:

- ICCs and Family Partners employed at CSAs across the state providing coaching to assigned CSAs
- Individualized coaching based on each CSA’s Fidelity data, focusing on challenges specific to each program
- Regional learning collaboratives and CSA meetings
- Bi-monthly Family Partner leadership forums

Using Data for Change: Coaching

Global increase in scores after implementing in-state coaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fidelity Score</th>
<th>MA 2013</th>
<th>MA 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOM NM:</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFI-4 NM:</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05 (and 8/10 Principles were significantly increased)
** Total fidelity not significant (3/10 Principles increased p<.05)
Individual Provider Level

- Improving Outcomes Based scores
- Improving Natural Supports scores
One CSA set a goal to improve all Outcomes Based scores in 2013

The following interventions were implemented:

• Held refresher trainings on planning for transition with families

• Focused on preparing families for transition during individual supervision

• Created series of questions for use during case presentations to help presenters think creatively about new interventions
Using Data for Change: Improving Outcomes Based Scores

Outcomes Based scores improved overall from 2013-2014

MA WFI-4 Principle 10: Outcome-Based

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>State Mean</th>
<th>National Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MA TOM Principle 10: Outcome-Based

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>State Mean</th>
<th>National Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using Data for Change: Increasing Natural & Community Supports scores

• One CSA set a goal to improve natural and community supports scores in 2015

• The following interventions were implemented:
  • Held brainstorming session around how to get natural supports involved earlier in the Wraparound process
  • Family Partner coaching focused on how to recruit and encourage natural supports starting at the first meeting
  • Group coaching focused on barriers to involving natural supports and how to overcome them

Natural Supports WFI scores increased overall between 2015-2016

- 2014: 59%
- 2015: 53%
- 2016: 71%
After 2014, fidelity scores plateaued at the national mean. Two new fidelity tools were adopted for use in 2016:

- **WFI EZ**
  - Reduced to 25 process-based questions; added four satisfaction and nine outcomes-based questions
  - Greater consistency in scores and higher response rates due to ease of the survey
  - Survey has three options for administration – electronic, paper (submitted via mail), and interview via phone

- **TOM 2.0**
  - Revised to be more streamlined, easier to administer, and more practice-oriented
  - Reduction in number of indicators from 71 (TOM) to 40 (TOM 2.0)
  - Companion tool to the WFI EZ, sub-scales line up with Key Elements
Lessons Learned

Important factors to consider when implementing systematic Wraparound Fidelity monitoring:

1. Ensuring a comprehensive, organized roll out of data collection and dissemination
   - Use of both aggregate and individual provider data to identify trends and areas for improvement

2. Ensuring inter-rater reliability of interviewers gathering the data

3. Working with an academic organization for data interpretation and recommendations
Questions?
Thank you!