

Goals	Outcome Objectives	Study Questions	Measures/Indicators	Source	Time Point	Analysis
-------	--------------------	-----------------	---------------------	--------	------------	----------

<i>System Level</i>						
1. The community-wide care system will be transformed so that resources from all levels will be integrated for the efficient and effective delivery of family-driven, youth-guided services and supports that promote the overall well-being of children and families.	<i>Infrastructure Development</i>					
	Sufficient targeted, comprehensive effective services and supports across public and private providers	Do families perceive that mental health needs are being met?	Multi-sector Services Contacts-Revised (MSSC-RC)*	Caregiver and/or Staff-as-Caregiver reports	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	
			Youth Services Survey for Families (YSS-F)*	Caregiver reports	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	
			Youth Services Survey (YSS)*	Youth >11 reports	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	
	Effective collaboration/cooperation between families, public and private providers, and supports	Is there increased collaboration/cooperation within the Governing Board?	Collaboration Functioning Scale (adapted from University of Wisconsin) Satisfaction and group functioning Subscales	Governing Board Members and members of SOH work teams report	Year 3, Year 5	Descriptive (f & %) t-tests Repeated measures
			Is there increased collaboration/cooperation between families, service providers, and supports?	Wraparound Fidelity Index	Wraparound participants report	Year 5 & Year 6
		Description of collaborative events and involved participants	Program Staff Website	Year 5		
			Description of family and youth roles in agencies (current and former clients, other concerned citizens)	Each Agency Board of Directors composition, SOH Governing Board composition, Publicity materials, information on websites	Year 5	Use the SOH website to develop a checklist to use for all agencies
	Real-time record sharing	Are service providers able to share records efficiently and effectively?	Evidence of integrated MIS and common data sharing protocol	Project Director	Years 5 & 6	
			Signed data use agreements between service providers	Project Director	Years 5 & 6	
Signed parental consents for shared data use			Project Director	Year 5		

<sup>1</sup> Follow-up every six months for up to 36 months, starting at intake

\* Measured by the National Evaluation

Goals	Outcome Objectives	Study Questions	Measures/Indicators	Source	Time Point	Analysis
-------	--------------------	-----------------	---------------------	--------	------------	----------

		What data are service providers sharing?	Shared data records	Project Director	Years 5 & 6	
	Enhanced community capacity to disseminate information on best practices related to children with SED	How is information about SOC principles shared with the community?	Number of trainings, presentations at universities, newspaper articles, presentations at local, state, and national conferences, co-authored journal articles each year, by years 2-5	Project Director Social Marketer	Years 5 & 6	
	Organizational readiness and capacity to adopt SOC principles and practices	Are agencies ready and do they have the capacity to adopt SOC principles and practices?	Organizational Readiness and Capacity Assessment (ORCA)		Year 4	Descriptive Statistics
	<i>Service Delivery</i>					
	Community-wide adoption of wraparound as routine practice	Is wraparound implemented with fidelity?	Wraparound Fidelity Index 4.0 (Bruns, Ermold, & Burchard, 2001)	Wraparound participants report	Year 5 & Year 6	Submit data to Wraparound Eval. & Research Team
	Increased efficient use of services across SOC	Are families able to access public and private providers and supports in a timely manner?	Multi-sector Services Contacts-Revised (MSSC-R)*, Youth Services Survey for Families (YSS-F)*	Caregivers	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	
		Are there procedures to handle re-entry into System of Care?	Protocol for intermittent service use	Policies and procedures Project Director	Year 5	
		What are the procedures for making referrals among and across service providers? Where are the referrals coming from?	Description of procedures	Project Director	Years 2-5	
		How cost effective is service use within SOC? Are services more cost effective over time? Does cost vary across the system?	Services and Costs Study*	HCPS staff, Evolv	Years 5 & 6	Cost effectiveness analysis conducted by National Evaluation

<sup>1</sup> Follow-up every six months for up to 36 months, starting at intake

\* Measured by the National Evaluation

Goals	Outcome Objectives	Study Questions	Measures/Indicators	Source	Time Point	Analysis
-------	--------------------	-----------------	---------------------	--------	------------	----------

	<i>Advocacy</i>					
	Increased and coordinated provider, family, and youth advocacy capacity for child mental health at the local and state levels	Is there increased advocacy capacity for child mental health at local and state levels?	Number and type of presentations each year in years 2-5, legislative representation and changes in the law	Project Director and Lead Family Evaluation Partner	Year 5	
		(a) Is there collaboration among different local advocacy groups? (NAMI, PEG, Federation of Families)		Interview key stakeholders	Year 5	
	Increased community acceptance of children with SED	Have children and their families participation level in the communities increased over time?	Social Capital Benchmark Survey	Caregivers	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptive Repeated measures; Time series
	<i>Sustainability</i>					
	Development of funding streams to sustain SOC after funding ends.	How many different sources of funding are supporting SOC? What funding streams have been developed to sustain SOC?	Number of co-developed grants and their requirements, documentation of funding received and requirements	HCPS, Project Director	Year 5	
	Increased connection to the local business community	How much money/in kind has been offered/collected to date per year?	Amount of money collected per year	HCPS, Project Director	Years 5 & 6	

<sup>1</sup> Follow-up every six months for up to 36 months, starting at intake

\* Measured by the National Evaluation

Goals	Outcome Objectives	Study Questions	Measures/Indicators	Source	Time Point	Analysis
-------	--------------------	-----------------	---------------------	--------	------------	----------

<i>Practice/Support Organization Level</i>						
2. Increased capability to serve children with SED and their families	<i>Service Delivery</i>					
	Has the service provider adopted wraparound as a routine practice?	Are all service providers who are actively involved with the family present at the first wraparound meeting?	Wraparound Sign-in Sheet	Wraparound participants report	Intake; on-going	Composition of attendees
		Are care plans individualized and reflective of SOC principles?  Are relationships between parents and providers collaborative?	Wraparound Fidelity Index selected scales	Wraparound participants report	Year 5 & Year 6	Submit data to Wraparound Eval. & Research Team
	<i>Workforce Development</i>					
	Delivery of effective trainings relevant to SOC services	What training is being offered?	Schedule of Training & description	SOH staff; Project Director	Annual	
Is training effective?		Professional Development Model of Training Effectiveness (Kirkpatrick & Gusky) (add question about booster training or mentoring)	Trainees; Project Director	Year 5		
Family involvement and choice will be expected and respected	<i>Service Delivery</i>					
	Active family involvement in care planning/decision-making	Are families actively involved in children's care planning? Do families feel they direct the care planning process? Are the needs of the entire family addressed? Was there follow-up on every item in the care plan?	Wraparound Fidelity Index	Wraparound participants report	Year 5 & Year 6	Submit data to Wraparound Eval. & Research Team

<sup>1</sup> Follow-up every six months for up to 36 months, starting at intake

\* Measured by the National Evaluation

Goals	Outcome Objectives	Study Questions	Measures/Indicators	Source	Time Point	Analysis
	Increased provision of culturally and linguistically appropriate services	<p>Do the providers, administrators, and clients report that care/services received are effective, understandable, and respectful of cultural health beliefs and language preferences?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) demographic characteristics of staff</li> <li>(b) CLAS education and training</li> <li>(c) language assistance</li> <li>(d) culturally appropriate materials</li> <li>(e) consumer involvement in CLAS activities</li> <li>(f) grievance procedures</li> <li>(g) agency written strategic plans for CLAS</li> </ul>	Cultural competency self-assessment	Agency leaders and staff Clients Agency policies and procedures	Year 3 and Year 5	Descriptive results in the aggregate; Cultural and Linguistic Coordinator make recommendations

<sup>1</sup> Follow-up every six months for up to 36 months, starting at intake

\* Measured by the National Evaluation

Goals	Outcome Objectives	Study Questions	Measures/Indicators	Source	Time Point	Analysis
-------	--------------------	-----------------	---------------------	--------	------------	----------

<i>Family Level</i>						
3. Families will experience positive and satisfying relationships that provide mutual support and encouragement of their individual development	<i>Family Life</i>					
	Better communication, decision-making, support, and bonding within the family	To what extent does family social climate improve over time? What factors mediate social climate?	Family Life Questionnaire (FLQ)*	Caregiver	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, Paired t-tests, repeated measures
		(a) How does social capital mediate outcomes?	Social Capital Survey (adapted from the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey)		Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Linear Regression
		(b) What are the differences in social climate between racial/ethnic groups?	EDIF*		Intake	Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)
		(c) How does parenting style affect outcomes?	Adult and Adolescent Parenting Inventory (AAPI-2)		Follow-up <sup>1</sup> : Data through year 3	Descriptives, Linear Regression
	Increased community connectedness	To what extent do families feel more connected to their community over time?	Social Capital Survey (adapted from the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey);		Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, Paired t-tests, repeated measures
		What factors mediate, connect, or correlate family connections to the community?	Social Support Survey (adapted from the Medical Outcomes Study Social Support Survey Instrument and the Duke Social Support Index)			Descriptives, Linear Regression
	Fewer negative effects related to caring for child with SED	Do caregivers experience fewer negative effects over time? What factors mediate caregiver strain?	Caregiver Strain Questionnaire (CGSQ)*		Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, Paired t-tests, repeated measures
		(a) How does social support mediate caregiver strain?	Social Support Survey (adapted from the Medical Outcomes Study Social Support Survey Instrument and the Duke Social Support Index)			Linear Regression
		(b) Is employment status impacted by caring for a child with SED?	(CIQ)* selected items - 13d, 13e EDIF			Logistic Regression

<sup>1</sup> Follow-up every six months for up to 36 months, starting at intake

\* Measured by the National Evaluation

Goals	Outcome Objectives	Study Questions	Measures/Indicators	Source	Time Point	Analysis
-------	--------------------	-----------------	---------------------	--------	------------	----------

	<i>Symptomatology</i>					
	Improved mental health functioning in caregivers	How has mental health functioning improved in caregivers over time?	Center for Epidemiological Studies – Depression Scale	Caregiver	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, Paired t-tests, repeated measures
Caregiver Information Questionnaire (CIQ)* selected items - 22, 22a, 22b, 22c, 23, 23a, 23b, 23c, 25, 25a, 25b, 25c			Descriptives, chi-square			
CAGE-AID			Descriptives, Paired t-tests, repeated measures			
	<i>Service Delivery</i>					
	Improved cultural and linguistic competency in services received	Do families feel that services are culturally competent? What factors affect perceptions of culturally competent services?	Cultural Competence and Service Provision (CCSP)*	Caregiver	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, Trend analysis
Youth Services Survey for Families (YSS-F)*			Youth >11	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, Trend Analysis	
(a) Does race/ethnicity affect perceptions of culturally competent services?		EDIF*	Caregiver	Intake	Descriptives, ANOVA	
	Satisfaction with, access to, and participation in services	Are families satisfied with their ability to access and participate in services?	Multi-sector Services Contacts-Revised (MSSC-RC)* Multi-sector Services Contacts-Revised (MSSC-RS)*	Caregiver, Staff-as-Caregiver	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives
Youth Services Survey for Families (YSS-F)*			Caregiver	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives	
Are caregivers satisfied with their Wraparound meetings; Wraparound process?		Wraparound Fidelity Index	Wraparound participants report	Year 5 & Year 6	Submit data to Wraparound Eval. & Research Team	

<sup>1</sup> Follow-up every six months for up to 36 months, starting at intake

\* Measured by the National Evaluation

Goals	Outcome Objectives	Study Questions	Measures/Indicators	Source	Time Point	Analysis
-------	--------------------	-----------------	---------------------	--------	------------	----------

<i>Child Level</i>						
4. Children will demonstrate positive behaviors and social competencies that will contribute to their successful development and functioning	<i>Family Life</i>					
	Stable living situation in the least restrictive environment	Are children/youth living in a stable living situation in the least restrictive environment? What factors affect youth living in a stable living situation in the least restrictive environment?	Living Situations Questionnaire (LSQ)*	Caregiver or Staff-as-Caregiver	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, trend analysis
		(a) Is CPS involvement associated with children living in a stable living situation in the least restrictive environment?	EDIF*	Caregiver	Intake	Descriptives, logistic regression
		(b) Does family economic status affect children living a stable living situation in the least restrictive environment?	Caregiver Information Questionnaire (CIQ)* selected items - 12, 13c	Caregiver or Staff-as-Caregiver	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, logistic regression
		(c) Is parental employment status associated with children living in a stable living situation in the least restrictive environment?	Caregiver Information Questionnaire (CIQ)* selected items - 13,13a,13b	Caregiver	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, logistic regression
	<i>Symptomatology</i>					
	Improved social competency	To what extent do child/youth outcomes in social competency improve over time? What factors contribute to child/youth outcomes in social competency?	Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale (BERS-2C)*	Caregiver or Staff-as-Caregiver	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, paired t-tests, repeated measures ANOVA, MANOVA
			Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale (BERS-2Y)*	Youth > 11		
			Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL 6–18)*	Caregiver or Staff-as-Caregiver		
			Columbia Impairment Scale (CIS)*			
(a) Does social competency differ by age?		EDIF*	Caregiver	Intake	Descriptives, cross tabs, chi-square	

<sup>1</sup> Follow-up every six months for up to 36 months, starting at intake

\* Measured by the National Evaluation

Goals	Outcome Objectives	Study Questions	Measures/Indicators	Source	Time Point	Analysis
		(b) Is social competency affected by the number and quality or type of children's friendships?	Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL 6–18)* selected items - V.1, V.2, VI.b, 25, Youth Information Questionnaire (YIQ)* selected items - 4, 6, 8, School Climate Questionnaire (DCC developed; adapted from Add Health) selected items - 1,2,4,7	Caregiver, Youth > 11	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, linear & logistic regression
		Do children perceive a sense of belonging in their community? Change over time?	Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale (BERS-2Y)* selected scales Youth Information Questionnaire (YIQ)* selected items - 2, 2a, 2b, 3, 3a, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22	Youth > 11	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, paired t-tests, repeated measures ANOVA
	Reduced disruptive and aggressive behaviors	Do children/youth disruptive and aggressive behaviors decrease over time?	Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL 6–18)* selected scales	Caregiver or Staff-as-Caregiver	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	
Delinquency Survey-Revised (DS-R)*			Youth >11			
	Overall improved mental health functioning	To what extent do child /youth outcomes in mental health functioning improve over time? What factors affect mental health functioning?	Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale (BERS-2Y)*	Youth > 11	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	
Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale (BERS-2C)*			Caregiver or Staff-as-Caregiver			
Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL 6–18)*						
Columbia Impairment Scale (CIS)*						

<sup>1</sup> Follow-up every six months for up to 36 months, starting at intake

\* Measured by the National Evaluation

Goals	Outcome Objectives	Study Questions	Measures/Indicators	Source	Time Point	Analysis
-------	--------------------	-----------------	---------------------	--------	------------	----------

		(a) Is mental health functioning associated with school performance?	Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL 6–18)* selected items - VII. 1,2,3,4 Education Questionnaire – Revised (EQ-R)*	Caregiver	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, linear & logistic regression
		(b) Is mental health functioning mediated by school climate?	School Climate Questionnaire (DCC developed; adapted from Add Health)	Youth > 11	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	
	Less anxiety	Do children/youth experience less anxiety over time? What factors influence anxiety over time?	Revised Children’s Manifest Anxiety Scales (RCMAS)*	Youth > 11	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, paired t-tests, Repeated measures ANOVA
		(a) What is the influence of medication on anxiety?	Caregiver Information Questionnaire (CIQ)* selected items - 39, 39a; Youth Information Questionnaire (YIQ)* selected items - 23, 23a	Caregiver	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, linear & logistic regression
		(b) Do interpersonal/intrapersonal factors affect outcomes?	Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale (BERS-2C & 2Y)* selected scales	Caregiver & Youth > 11	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, linear & logistic regression
		(c) Does the number and quality of children’s friendships affect outcomes?	Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL 6–18)* selected items - V.1, V.2, VI.b	Caregiver	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, linear & logistic regression
			Youth Information Questionnaire (YIQ)* selected items - 4, 6, 8	Youth > 11	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	
	Less depression	Do children/youth experience less depression? What factors influence child depression?	Reynolds Adolescent Depression Scale (RADS-2)*	Youth >11	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, paired t-tests, repeated measures ANOVA

<sup>1</sup> Follow-up every six months for up to 36 months, starting at intake

\* Measured by the National Evaluation

Goals	Outcome Objectives	Study Questions	Measures/Indicators	Source	Time Point	Analysis	
		(a) What is the influence of medication on child depression?	Caregiver Information Questionnaire (CIQ)* selected items - 39, 39a Youth Information Questionnaire (YIQ)* - 23, 23a	Caregiver, Youth > 11	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, linear & logistic regression	
		(b) Do interpersonal/intrapersonal factors affect child depression?	Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale (BERS-2Y & BERS-2C)* selected scales	Caregiver, Youth > 11	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, linear & logistic regression	
		(c) Does the number and quality of children's friendships affect child depression?	Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL 6-18)* selected items - V.1, V.2, VI.b Youth Information Questionnaire (YIQ)* selected items - 4, 6, 8	Caregiver, Youth > 11	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, linear & logistic regression	
	Enhanced self-management (affect and behavior)	To what degree are children/youth able to self-manage affect and behavior?	Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale (BERS-2C)* selected scales	Caregiver or Staff-as-Caregiver	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, trend analysis	
Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale (BERS-2Y)* selected scales			Youth >11	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>			
Youth Information Questionnaire (YIQ)* selected items - 23f, 23g, 23h, 23i, 23j			Youth > 11	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>			
	<i>Functioning</i>						
	No entry/re-entry into juvenile justice system	Have children/youth entered/re-entered into the juvenile justice system? What factors affect entry/re-entry into the juvenile justice system?	Delinquency Survey-Revised (DS-R)*	Youth >11 Juvenile justice records	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, trend analysis	
			(a) Is entry/re-entry correlated with criminal history of family members?	Caregiver Information Questionnaire (CIQ)* selected items -24, 24a	Caregiver		Follow-up <sup>1</sup>
				Caregiver Information Questionnaire (CIQ)* selected items - 24, 24a	Staff-as-Caregiver		Follow-up <sup>1</sup>
			(b) Is entry/re-entry associated with feelings of social belonging?	Youth Information Questionnaire (YIQ)* selected items - 4, 6, 8	Youth > 11		Follow-up <sup>1</sup>
	Improved school attendance and achievement	Do children/youth have improved school attendance and achievement?	Education Questionnaire – Revised (EQ-R)*	Caregiver or Staff-as-Caregiver	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, trend analysis	
			Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale (BERS-2C)* selected scales	Caregiver or Staff-as-Caregiver	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, trend analysis, paired t-tests	

<sup>1</sup> Follow-up every six months for up to 36 months, starting at intake

\* Measured by the National Evaluation

Goals	Outcome Objectives	Study Questions	Measures/Indicators	Source	Time Point	Analysis
-------	--------------------	-----------------	---------------------	--------	------------	----------

			Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale (BERS-2Y)* selected scales	Youth >11		
			Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL 6–18)* selected items - VII. 1,2,3,4	Caregiver or Staff-as-Caregiver		
	No/reduced alcohol, tobacco or other drug (ATOD) use	Are children/youth using alcohol, tobacco or other drugs (ATOD)? Has use reduced over time? What factors affect alcohol, tobacco, or other drug use?	GAIN Quick-R (GAIN)*	Youth >11	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, trend analysis, chi-square
			Substance Problem – Revised (SUS-R)*			
		(a) Is child/youth ATOD use affected by family member use?	Caregiver Information Questionnaire (CIQ)* selected items - 25, 25a, 25b, 25c,	Caregiver	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, logistic regression
			Caregiver Information Questionnaire (CIQ)* selected items - 25, 25a, 25b, 25c,	Staff-as-Caregiver	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, logistic regression
			CAGE-AID	Caregiver	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, logistic regression
		(b) Does ATOD use vary by racial/ethnic group? (c) Does ATOD use vary by age?	EDIF*	Care Coordinators & Parent Partners	Intake	Descriptives, cross tabs, ANOVA
	<i>Service Delivery</i>					
	Improved cultural and linguistic competency in services received	Do children/youth feel that services are culturally competent?	Youth Services Survey (YSS)*	Youth >11	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, trend analysis
		Do perceptions of cultural competency differ by types of services (meet needs)?	Services and Costs Study*	HCPS Staff, Evolv	Year 5 & 6	Cost effectiveness analysis conducted by National Evaluation
	Satisfaction with, access to, and participation in services	Are children/youth satisfied with their ability to access and participate in services?	Youth Services Survey (YSS)*	Youth >11	Follow-up <sup>1</sup>	Descriptives, trend analysis
		Does satisfaction with, access to, and participation in services differ by types of services (meet needs)?	Services and Costs Study*	HCPS Staff, Evolv	Year 5 & 6	Cost effectiveness analysis conducted by National Evaluation
		Are youth satisfied with their Wraparound meetings: Wraparound process?	Wraparound Fidelity Index	Wraparound participants report	Year 5 & Year 6	Submit data to Wraparound Eval. & Research Team

<sup>1</sup> Follow-up every six months for up to 36 months, starting at intake

\* Measured by the National Evaluation