

Entry Form

Deadline: All entries must be postmarked by Friday, February 26, 2010.

2010 ECCO Recognition Program

Celebrating Excellence in Community Communications and Outreach

Please include this form with one sample of each entry(s). Label each of your entries with the entry category, community name, and contact information.

Entry Procedures

Please see the Call for Entries for complete entry instructions. To access this form electronically, contact your Campaign technical assistance provider at 202-331-9816 or via e-mail.

Copy form and fill out entirely for EACH entry. Photocopy form as needed.

ECCO entries will not be returned; they will be added to the Campaign Resource Center to serve as examples of communications and social marketing for reference by other system of care communities.

★ **Category:** (For complete category descriptions, see the Call for Entries.)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> National Children's Mental Health Awareness Day | <input type="checkbox"/> Professional Outreach |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Media Outreach | <input type="checkbox"/> Partnership Development |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community Outreach: Parents and Caregivers | <input type="checkbox"/> Communications/Social Marketing Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community Outreach: Children and Youth | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Internal Communications |

★ **Title of entry:** (Please type or print clearly and keep to 10 words or less.)

Portfolio of Solutions for Family Voices Network of Erie County

★ **Submitted by:** (Note: The person submitting will be the point of contact.)

Name: David Monroe

Title: Community and Technology Development Specialist

Organization: Community Connections of New York

Address: 605 Niagara Street

City: Buffalo State: NY Zip Code: 14201

Telephone: 716-430-3395 Fax: 716-829-1549

E-mail: dmonroe@comconnectionsny.org

★ Please PRINT organization name exactly as it should appear on the recognition plaque:

Community Connections of New York

★ Was the entry created with or by an external consultant? Yes No

Approximate budget for entry: \$74,400 across the entire portfolio



Entry Questions

Please answer all of the following eight questions while adhering to the allowed maximum word count. Answers can either be typed on a separate sheet or completed electronically. (Individual descriptions that exceed the maximum word counts will not be considered beyond the number of words indicated for that section.)

1. Relevance to Category (30-word maximum) (5 points)

Why have you chosen this category for your entry?

Community Connections of New York's portfolio focuses on those internal stakeholders who serve families within the Erie County system of care including: care coordinators, vendor workers, and county administrators.

2. Planning (90-word maximum) (10 points)

What were the specific objectives of the entry? How does your entry relate to your social marketing plan and your overall program strategic plan? What overall strategy was employed to meet the objectives?

Our portfolio's objective was to both empower and inform stakeholders within the system of care in order to increase fidelity to the wraparound model. Creating products and services that generate positive outcomes for families is a foundational aspect of our strategic plan. Using the PDSA (Plan, Do, Study, Act) model for improvement, we designed these products based on research regarding model fidelity and family need. Each item of our portfolio markets best practices to internal stakeholders, which will in turn change family voice, choice, and outcomes.

3. Cultural and Linguistic Competence (70-word maximum) (10 points)

How did you ensure that your entry was culturally and linguistically competent? What resources or methods did you use?

We identified unique needs of stakeholders by continuously including families, care coordinators, family advocates, vendors, and county mental health administrators during every phase of its design: beginning, middle, and end. We sought their input, creativity, and involvement in the creation of our portfolio. For example, family advocates are the speakers during the 10 principles of wraparound interactive, online training. We simply asked them what the principle was and pressed record.

4. Youth, Family, and Partner Involvement (70-word maximum) (10 points)

How did you involve youth, families, and partners in the planning and execution of your entry?

Needs assessment of families and youth, and fidelity to wraparound principles research were the impetus for the creation of these products: family voice and choice needs were studied to create Family First; natural supports needs for LINKS; and vendor training gaps for internal training. Feedback was encouraged during every stage of the design process. In order to ensure continuous improvement, survey of families will be implemented this year.

5. Message (50-word maximum) (10 points)

Explain why the message of your entry is appropriate to your target audience.

Each portfolio sample was tested by both the potential audience and those affected by the changes in practice. For example, the Family First software is used by care coordinators to assist families in finding vendors workers based on demographics (age, race/ethnicity, and languages spoken). It was tested by both groups.

6. Execution/Presentation (70-word maximum) (15 points)

How was your entry implemented? How were unexpected circumstances—positive or negative—addressed, and how did they affect the overall presentation of your entry? Please note: To evaluate the written quality of a printed piece (brochure, poster, etc.) or video script, the judges will consider whether the writing is logical and concise.

Our expectation was that access to the internet and unsophisticated users would be barriers to its effectiveness. We asked focus groups of families and youth in the system of care whether access would be a barrier. We were surprised to find that access wasn't a problem as long as "[the product] is good." Our team focused on designing tools that were easy to understand and intuitive to use.

7. Creativity (70-word maximum) (15 points)

How was creativity used in the development of this product or activity? How does the design enhance or detract from the message? Please note: Given that all production components, including budget, are considered, the most expensive entry does not necessarily win.

We believe that quality design allows our products to be more accessible to our audience. If a user isn't attracted to our product and instinctively feel they know how to use it, then we believe the product is poorly designed. We use color, high-quality images, interactive activities and presentations, and creative solutions to process problems that enhance usability and enjoyment of our products.

8. Effectiveness and Evaluation (90-word maximum) (25 points)

What methods of evaluation were used? How well did the entry succeed in reaching its target audience and meeting other objectives?

We are implementing an evaluation of families who have been or are currently receiving wraparound services within the last 45 days to determine whether care coordination practice has changed as a result of using Family First. LINKS has a dashboard of metrics to follow usage. An average of 90 unique users has used it in Erie County every week. Our online training site will implement an improved evaluation instrument this summer. We believe it has been effective because vendor workers have been prepared and informed during the live, supplemental trainings.

Total Points Possible: 100



PLEASE MAIL ENTRIES TO:

Scott LaLonde
Caring for Every Child's Mental Health Campaign
c/o Vanguard Communications
2121 K Street, NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20037

District: Sample Agency
Funding Source: Blended

Agency name and funding source for cases in report

Frequencies and descriptive statistics for demographics and lengths of stay for agency and Family Voices Network overall (all care coordination agencies in Erie County)

	District	FVN
Number of cases in analysis	60	294
Demographic Information	District	FVN
% Male	45	43
% Female	55	57
% Other	0	0
Avg. age at open	14	13

Open cases only, matched by funding source.

Length of Stay Details	District	FVN
Avg. length of stay (mos.)	7	6
Number of cases over 14.9 mos.	6	24
% of cases over 14.9 mos.	10	8

Outcome and process indicators by race to catch potential disproportionate rates

Outcomes by Race of Youth

Race	Open Cases							Closed Cases					
	# and % of Open Cases			% Rec TANF		% Imp Total CAFAS		# DC'd in 2009		% Objectives Met		% Imp Total CAFAS	
	District #	District %	FVN %	District %	FVN %	District %	FVN %	District #	FVN #	District %	FVN %	District %	FVN %
Biracial (Specify)	6	10	9	17	19	25	71	6	30	50	67	83	90
Black or African American	20	33	31	5	6	81	68	16	81	38	56	88	78
Puerto Rican	3	5	6	0	11	100	64	3	12	100	83	100	83
White	31	52	50	13	5	82	79	21	111	71	73	81	86

Data drives conversations within agencies and across FVN as to the lower rate of successful discharges for African American youth, for example

Primary Care Coordinator

Worker A

After the overall agency page, each worker receives a summary for their open caseload. Data are used to delve into agency statistics and drive worker quality improvement plans

Process indicators and case timelines are presented by youth. Expectations that are not met (i.e., Plan of Care signed within 30 days from case assignment) are highlighted red.



Open Case Metrics

Last Name	Case #	Case Open	LOS	Assess w/in 15d of Assign	Date of First CFT	Days Until First CFT	Avg Days between CFTs	Days till First Crisis Plan	% CFT w/in 35d from last CFT	POC Signed w/in 30d from Assign	Code	Count
Client 1	08-1773	10/8/2008	10	Yes	10/16/2008	8	29	13	78	No	4060	1
Client 2	08-1759	10/6/2008	10	Yes	10/15/2008	9	21	10	82	No	4653	1
Client 3	08-1878	12/17/2008	8	No	12/31/2008	14	30	25	67	No	4655	4
Client 4	08-1904	1/5/2009	7	No	12/31/2008	-5	25	11	86	No	4657	1
Client 5	09-212	4/29/2009	4	Yes	4/27/2009	-2	24	14	67	Yes	4659	4
Client 6	09-297	6/8/2009	2	Yes	6/12/2009	4	12	14	100	No	5050	2
Client 7	08-1790	10/14/2008	10	Yes	10/16/2008	2	23	22	90	No	5100	3
Client 8	09-215	6/8/2009	2	No	7/31/2009	53		9		Yes	5101	1
Client 9	08-1613	7/17/2008	13	Yes	7/30/2008	13	30	5	73	Yes	5110	1
											5160	2
											5206	9
											5207	1
											5240	3
											5301	2
											5340	1
											5501	1
											5504	1
											5505	1
											5523	2
											5524	2
											5530	5
											5531	1
											5535	1
											5570	6
											6000	2

As a barometer of variety of service utilization, a summary of planned services used across the caseload is provided. If the list is short across many cases, it can flag use of a "cookie cutter" approach

Worker CAFAS Summary (% Improving)

Scale	n in scale	Worker	District	FVN
School	8	50	59	51
Home	8	63	50	49
Community	6	33	44	54
Behavior	8	25	51	45
Moods	8	63	40	35
Self-Harm	5	100	76	64
Substance Use	3	67	71	53
Thinking	1	0	50	49
Material	4	0	11	31
Support	6	67	26	26
Total	8	88	78	74

Worker Metric Summary

	Worker	District	FVN
Avg. days between all CFTs	24	24	25
Avg. % all CFTs within 35 days	80	85	83
Avg. of days until first crisis plan	14	15	20
Avg. of days until first CFT	11	12	20

Number Discharged in 2009, % Objectives Met

	Worker	District	FVN
Total DC	5	46	46
%	100	59	59

Overall rates across the caseload are displayed for a quick comparison to the agency and all of FVN

The last page in the worker's caseload summary offers Child and Adolescent Functionality Assessment Scale (CAFAS) data by client for baseline and most recent scores.

Information on Open Cases

Last CAFAS Date Included: 8/13/2009

Baseline scores above graphic and numeric change below graphic

Last Name	LOS	CAFAS #	School	Home	Comm.	Behavior	Moods	Self Harm	Substance	Thinking	Material	Support	Total	Current Total
Client 1	10	4	30 ↓ 20	30 ↓ 20	20 ↓ 20	30 ↓ 20	20 ↓ 10	0 =	30 ↓ 30	0 =	10 =	20 ↓ 20	160 ↓ 120	40
Client 2	10	4	30 =	30 =	20 ↓ 20	10 ↑ 20	20 ↓ 10	30 ↓ 30	0 =	0 =	0 =	0 =	140 ↓ 40	100
Client 3	8	3	30 ↓ 10	30 ↓ 10	0 =	20 =	20 ↓ 10	0 =	0 =	0 =	10 =	20 ↓ 10	100 ↓ 30	70
Client 4	7	3	30 ↓ 10	20 ↓ 10	0 =	30 =	20 ↓ 10	10 ↓ 10	0 =	0 =	0 ↑ 10	0 ↑ 10	110 ↓ 40	70
Client 5	4	3	30 =	30 ↓ 10	20 ↑ 10	20 =	20 =	10 ↓ 10	0 =	0 =	0 =	10 =	130 ↓ 10	120
Client 7	10	4	30 =	30 =	20 =	30 =	20 =	20 ↓ 20	30 ↓ 30	0 =	0 =	20 ↓ 10	180 ↓ 50	130
Client 8	2	3	20 ↑ 10	20 ↑ 10	30 =	20 ↑ 10	20 ↓ 10	0 =	10 ↑ 20	10 =	0 ↑ 20	0 =	130 ↑ 40	170
Client 9	13	5	20 ↓ 10	30 ↓ 10	0 ↑ 10	30 ↓ 10	20 =	20 ↓ 20	0 =	0 =	0 =	20 ↓ 20	120 ↓ 40	80

At first glance, a supervisor and worker notices the color of the arrows. Here, we see a decent amount of green (decrease in impairment), a handful of red (increase in impairment) and a good amount of blue equal signs (no change in impairment).

A closer look reveals the details – baseline total CAFAS score for this youth was a 180, and as of their recent measure they decreased in impairment by 50 points from where they started.

When we consider one subscale across the caseload, we can detect patterns. For example, all youth in this caseload began with some impairment in behavior yet only two improved. In fact, four have not changed in impairment. This informs the supervisor to have a discussion with the worker in supervision and promote a shared learning environment with staff who excel in this area.