



Community / State Supports For Transition Inventories

Assessing the state/local implementation context for comprehensive transition support

Janet Walker & Nancy Koroloff

Presented at the Children's Mental Health Research and Policy Conference

March 3, 2014



Overall Project

- Create and test an assessment of the state and community systems/policy contexts for transition projects
 - Designed to improve outcomes for emerging adults with serious mental health conditions
 - Provide services that are comprehensive, individualized, strengths based, driven by young people's priorities and perspectives
- Use the tool to
 - assess systems change
 - identify what works/doesn't work
 - contribute to theory development



Background

- CSTI was adapted from the *Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory*, a measure with evidence for both reliability and validity (CSWI, JCFS Dec 2011 20, 6)
 - Adapted and new items created by the research team
 - Several rounds of stakeholder review—policy makers, researchers, young people and families
- CSTI is strengths-based, and built on the idea that communities need to develop certain capacities to support their transition efforts.
- Web-based survey of stakeholders with three modules

Three Modules

- CSTI: Community Stakeholder
 - Respondents are people who know something about project implementation, including
 - Quality of the collaboration (Are stakeholders clear about who they are serving and how, do they have a plan for accomplishing shared goals?)
 - Human resource issues (How are we doing with hiring, training, defining roles, caseloads, adequate pay, etc.?)
 - Accountability (Are we measuring the right outcomes adequately?)
- SSTI: State
 - Respondents know about what the state is doing to support transition projects across the state, in areas including workforce, financing, collaboration, etc.
- Youth/Young Adult
 - Respondents know about services offered through the project

Basics about the Modules

- Each begins with questions about background and role, then a series of items arranged into themes
- Each item has a “least developed” and “fully developed” anchor, and is rated on a 5-point scale
- Different modules have different numbers of items/themes:
 - Stakeholder 44/8
 - Youth/Young Adult 18/5
 - State 25/6

CSTI/SSTI Themes

| CSTI | SSTI |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Community Partnership | Partnerships |
| Collaborative Action | Collaborative Action |
| Practice Quality and Support | |
| Workforce | Workforce |
| Fiscal Policies and Sustainability | Fiscal Policies and Sustainability |
| Access to Supports and Services | Access to Supports and Services |
| Accountability | Accountability |
| State Support | |

Data

- Seven Healthy Transition Grantee states
- Ten communities within those states
- Data collection for T1 in 2010.
- T2 data was collected in Spring 2013
- Response rate

CSTI Sample

| | Total | T1 | T2 |
|-----------------------------|-------|-----|-----|
| Overall | 260 | 131 | 129 |
| Race/Ethnicity | | | |
| African-American | 45 | 27 | 18 |
| Caucasian/European-American | 189 | 94 | 95 |
| Other | 26 | 10 | 16 |
| Current Role | | | |
| Direct Service Provider | 93 | 46 | 47 |
| Employee of the Project | 104 | 60 | 44 |
| Other Community Member | 29 | 15 | 14 |
| Other | 34 | 10 | 24 |
| Intensive Service Status | | | |
| Yes | 77 | 36 | 41 |
| No | 179 | 92 | 87 |



SSTI Sample

| | Total | T1 | T2 |
|-----------------------------------|-------|----|----|
| Overall | 170 | 97 | 73 |
| Race/Ethnicity | | | |
| African-American | 21 | 8 | 13 |
| Caucasian/European-American | 140 | 83 | 57 |
| Other | 9 | 6 | 3 |
| Current Role | | | |
| State Mental Health Administrator | 66 | 37 | 29 |
| Other State-Level Administrator | 39 | 25 | 14 |
| Other Role | 65 | 35 | 30 |
| Intensive Service Status | | | |
| Yes | 51 | 26 | 25 |
| No | 119 | 71 | 48 |



Scale/theme reliabilities: Cronbach's α

| | Whole Scale | Themes |
|------|-------------|-----------|
| CSTI | | |
| T1 | .98 | .81 - .94 |
| T2 | .98 | .88 - .94 |
| SSTI | | |
| T1 | .95 | .83 - .88 |
| T2 | .92 | .63 - .85 |

Fit Indices

| Model | χ^2 (DF) | CFI | RMSEA (CI) | SRMR | TLI |
|-------|----------------|-------|-----------------------|-------|-------|
| CSTI | 1582.653 (913) | 0.909 | 0.054 (0.05 – 0.058) | 0.056 | 0.901 |
| SSTI | 446.391 (284) | 0.913 | 0.058 (0.048 – 0.068) | 0.067 | 0.9 |

Note: χ^2 , chi-square (degrees of freedom); CFI, comparative fit index; RMSEA, root mean square error of approximation; CI, confidence interval; SRMR, standardized root mean square residual; TLI, Tucker Lewis Index.

CSTI T1 and T2 means, and slopes

| | All Sites | | | A | | | B | | | C1 | | | C2 | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------|--------------|--------------|--------|--------------|--------------|----------|--------------|--------------|---------|--------------|--------------|--------|
| | T1 \bar{x} | T2 \bar{x} | Slope | T1 \bar{x} | T2 \bar{x} | Slope | T1 \bar{x} | T2 \bar{x} | Slope | T1 \bar{x} | T2 \bar{x} | Slope | T1 \bar{x} | T2 \bar{x} | Slope |
| CSTI | 2.58 | 2.76 | 0.17 | 2.86++++ | 2.88 | 0.02 | 2.25---- | 2.65 | 0.40++++ | 2.79++ | 3.02++ | 0.23++ | 2.68 | 2.88 | 0.21+ |
| Community Partnership | 2.60 | 2.69 | 0.09 | 2.90++++ | 2.82+ | -0.08 | 2.25---- | 2.51-- | 0.26+++ | 2.74 | 2.79 | 0.05 | 2.64 | 2.80 | 0.16 |
| Collaborative Action | 2.52 | 2.71 | 0.18 | 2.89++++ | 2.90++ | 0.01 | 2.10---- | 2.55- | 0.45++++ | 2.63 | 2.79 | 0.16 | 2.50 | 2.76 | 0.25++ |
| Practice Quality and Support | 3.09 | 3.15 | 0.06 | 3.19++ | 3.28+++ | 0.09 | 2.83---- | 2.87---- | 0.04 | 3.17 | 3.30+++ | 0.13+ | 3.06 | 3.13 | 0.07 |
| Workforce | 2.62 | 2.76 | 0.14 | 2.95++++ | 2.89 | -0.06 | 2.26---- | 2.74 | 0.48++++ | 2.81+ | 3.00++ | 0.19+ | 2.72 | 2.88 | 0.16 |
| Fiscal Policies and Sustainability | 2.30 | 2.59 | 0.29+ | 2.56+++ | 2.67 | 0.11 | 1.99---- | 2.54 | 0.55++++ | 2.55++ | 2.89++ | 0.34++ | 2.49+ | 2.78+ | 0.29++ |
| Access to Supports and Services | 2.59 | 2.75 | 0.16 | 2.85+++ | 2.83 | -0.01 | 2.21---- | 2.62- | 0.41++++ | 2.84++ | 3.05++ | 0.20+ | 2.70 | 2.90 | 0.20+ |
| Accountability | 2.51 | 2.77 | 0.26+ | 2.77++++ | 2.99++++ | 0.22++ | 2.39-- | 2.71- | 0.32+++ | 2.68++ | 3.03++++ | 0.35+++ | 2.55 | 2.85 | 0.30++ |
| State Support | 2.57 | 2.52 | -0.05 | 2.73++ | 2.68++ | -0.05 | 2.09---- | 2.12---- | 0.03 | 2.83++ | 2.79++ | -0.04 | 2.82++ | 2.68 | -0.14- |

| | D | | | E1 | | | E2 | | | F1 | | | F2 | | | G | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|----------|--------------|--------------|--------|--------------|--------------|----------|--------------|--------------|--------|--------------|--------------|----------|
| | T1 \bar{x} | T2 \bar{x} | Slope | T1 \bar{x} | T2 \bar{x} | Slope | T1 \bar{x} | T2 \bar{x} | Slope | T1 \bar{x} | T2 \bar{x} | Slope | T1 \bar{x} | T2 \bar{x} | Slope | T1 \bar{x} | T2 \bar{x} | Slope |
| CSTI | 2.63 | 2.68 | 0.05 | 3.11++++ | 3.43++++ | 0.32++++ | 2.41 | 2.62 | 0.22+ | 2.34 | 2.28---- | -0.06 | 3.06++++ | 3.12+++ | 0.05 | 2.58 | 2.88 | 0.31+++ |
| Community Partnership | 2.76++ | 2.73 | -0.03 | 2.94++++ | 3.25++++ | 0.31+++ | 2.56 | 2.65 | 0.09 | 2.26- | 2.22-- | -0.04 | 2.93++ | 2.95++ | 0.02 | 2.72 | 2.84 | 0.12 |
| Collaborative Action | 2.66+ | 2.69 | 0.03 | 2.85+++ | 3.23++++ | 0.38++++ | 2.35 | 2.56 | 0.21+ | 2.01-- | 2.14-- | 0.13+ | 2.92++ | 2.95+ | 0.02 | 2.60 | 2.81 | 0.21++ |
| Practice Quality and Support | 2.88---- | 2.95---- | 0.06 | 3.34++++ | 3.50++++ | 0.17++ | 2.84---- | 2.84---- | 0.00 | 2.60---- | 2.46---- | -0.13- | 3.16 | 3.22 | 0.06 | 3.03 | 3.13 | 0.10 |
| Workforce | 2.73+ | 2.71 | -0.02 | 3.11++++ | 3.42++++ | 0.31+++ | 2.43 | 2.72 | 0.29++ | 2.53 | 2.33- | -0.2---- | 3.14+++ | 3.10++ | -0.04 | 2.63 | 2.89 | 0.27+++ |
| Fiscal Policies and Sustainability | 2.42+ | 2.49 | 0.07 | 2.88++++ | 3.46++++ | 0.58++++ | 2.20 | 2.52 | 0.32++ | 2.18 | 2.03-- | -0.14-- | 2.90++++ | 3.14++++ | 0.24+ | 2.32 | 2.87++ | 0.56++++ |
| Access to Supports and Services | 2.61 | 2.69 | 0.08 | 3.18++++ | 3.43++++ | 0.25+++ | 2.38 | 2.59 | 0.22+ | 2.39 | 2.35- | -0.04 | 3.09+++ | 3.10++ | 0.01 | 2.56 | 2.87 | 0.31+++ |
| Accountability | 2.53 | 2.69-- | 0.16+ | 3.06++++ | 3.46++++ | 0.41++++ | 2.42 | 2.64 | 0.22+ | 2.18-- | 2.27---- | 0.08 | 2.91++++ | 3.16++++ | 0.25++ | 2.51 | 2.83 | 0.32+++ |
| State Support | 2.52 | 2.15---- | -0.37---- | 2.89++++ | 2.99++++ | 0.10 | 2.26-- | 2.27- | 0.01 | 2.42 | 2.32 | -0.10 | 2.80+ | 2.84++ | 0.04 | 2.56 | 2.57 | 0.01 |

'+' indicates that value is greater than the respective grand mean (for T1 and T2 means) or greater than 0 (for slopes). '-' indicates that value is less.

- $p < .1$ + or -
- $p < .05$ ++ or --
- $p < .01$ +++ or ---
- $p < .001$ ++++ or ----



SSTI T1 and T2 means, and slopes

| | All Sites | | | A | | | B | | | C | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------|--------------|--------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------|--------------|--------------|---------|
| | T1 \bar{x} | T2 \bar{x} | Slope | T1 \bar{x} | T2 \bar{x} | Slope | T1 \bar{x} | T2 \bar{x} | Slope | T1 \bar{x} | T2 \bar{x} | Slope |
| SSTI | 1.45 | 1.64 | 0.18 | 1.23- | 1.56 | 0.33++ | 1.41 | - | - | 1.72+ | 1.77 | 0.05 |
| Partnerships | 2.00 | 2.02 | 0.03 | 1.98 | 2.01 | 0.03 | 1.97 | - | - | 2.08 | 2.11 | 0.03 |
| Collaborative Action | 1.90 | 2.05 | 0.15 | 1.63- | 1.93 | 0.30++ | 1.79 | - | - | 2.14+ | 2.17 | 0.04 |
| Workforce | 1.43 | 1.67 | 0.24+ | 1.25 | 1.62 | 0.37+++ | 1.57 | - | - | 1.74++ | 1.89+ | 0.15 |
| Fiscal Policies and Sustainability | 1.37 | 1.51 | 0.14 | 0.93- | 1.33 | 0.41+ | 1.16 | - | - | 1.62 | 1.45 | -0.16-- |
| Access to Supports and Services | 1.33 | 1.50 | 0.17 | 1.29 | 1.53 | 0.25++ | 1.46 | - | - | 1.71++++ | 1.81+++ | 0.10 |
| Accountability | 1.37 | 1.57 | 0.20 | 1.17 | 1.49 | 0.32++ | 1.27 | - | - | 1.54 | 1.64 | 0.09 |

| | D | | | E | | | F | | | G | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------|--------------|--------------|-------|--------------|--------------|-------|--------------|--------------|--------|
| | T1 \bar{x} | T2 \bar{x} | Slope | T1 \bar{x} | T2 \bar{x} | Slope | T1 \bar{x} | T2 \bar{x} | Slope | T1 \bar{x} | T2 \bar{x} | Slope |
| SSTI | 1.4 | 1.63 | 0.23+ | 1.75++ | 1.78 | 0.03 | 1.57 | 1.70 | 0.14 | 1.31 | 1.59 | 0.28+ |
| Partnerships | 1.92 | 1.95 | 0.03 | 2.30++++ | 2.33++++ | 0.02 | 2.20+++ | 2.22+++ | 0.03 | 1.75--- | 1.78--- | 0.03 |
| Collaborative Action | 1.94 | 2.08 | 0.14 | 2.24++ | 2.22 | -0.02 | 2.08 | 2.14 | 0.07 | 1.57- | 1.91 | 0.33++ |
| Workforce | 1.34 | 1.67 | 0.33++ | 1.82++++ | 1.93++ | 0.11 | 1.58 | 1.80 | 0.22+ | 1.41 | 1.71 | 0.29++ |
| Fiscal Policies and Sustainability | 1.22 | 1.38 | 0.16 | 1.54 | 1.44 | -0.10 | 1.18 | 1.38 | 0.20 | 1.07 | 1.36 | 0.29 |
| Access to Supports and Services | 1.37 | 1.58 | 0.21++ | 1.61++++ | 1.73+++ | 0.12+ | 1.58++ | 1.72++ | 0.14 | 1.42 | 1.62 | 0.20+ |
| Accountability | 1.31 | 1.54 | 0.24 | 1.62++ | 1.67 | 0.04 | 1.41 | 1.58 | 0.17 | 1.24 | 1.52 | 0.28+ |

'+' indicates that value is greater than the respective grand mean (for T1 and T2 means) or greater than 0 (for slopes). '-' indicates that value is less.

$p < .1$ + or -

$p < .05$ ++ or --

$p < .01$ +++ or ---

$p < .001$ ++++ or ----



Discussion: CSTI

- Measure performed quite well
 - High alphas, good fit, did not appear to have ceiling effect
 - So may be helpful for theory development
- Overall mix of rising slopes and flat slopes means all-sites slopes non-significant; however, overall picture is pretty positive
- Trend toward significance across sites, and several individual sites, in positive gains for *fiscal policies* and *accountability*.
- State support is a challenge from the local perspective
- Scores are high in comparison to wraparound measure—maybe aspirations there are greater, particularly in terms of blending funding

Discussion: SSTI

- Means are lower vs. CSTI
- Fewer significant slopes
 - May be a function of smaller sample size
- State level change may be more difficult
 - Do not see change even in first two themes, which involve organizing parthers; other themes have to do with state-wide change
- Communities did not see increases in state support to them

Acknowledgments/Funders



The development of the contents of this presentation were supported by funding from the National Institute of Disability and Rehabilitation Research, United States Department of Education, and the Center for Mental Health Services Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, United States Department of Health and Human Services (NIDRR grant H133B090019). The content does not represent the views or policies of the funding agencies. In addition, you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.

