

Multnomah County Homeless Youth Continuum Fidelity Scale – Results from Year One Implementation Review

CRITERION		RATINGS / ANCHORS				
AE Team Approach		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
TA1 Point-in-Time Progress Report	SMALL CASELOAD: youth/AE team member ratio of 10:1.	> 30 youth per AE staff	21 – 29 youth per AE staff	16 – 20 youth per AT staff	11 – 15 youth per AE staff	< 11 youth per AE staff
TA2 Chart Review	SHARED CASELOAD/TEAM APPROACH: Although individual staff has individual caseloads, AE staff function as team.	Fewer than 20% of youth in AE have face-to-face contacts involving more than one person.	21 – 40%.	41-60%.	61-80%.	>= 80% of youth in AE have face-to-face contact with more than one AE staff.
TA3 Team survey	TEAM COMMUNICATION: Information about youth is seamlessly and routinely shared between AE staff team members.	<50% of staff agree	<60% of staff agree	<70% of staff agree	<80% of staff agree	>= 80% of staff agree
TA4 Supervisor Survey	AVAILABILITY OF AE TEAM: Flexible hours for services offered. Team offers 7-day/week coverage with some hours in morning, afternoon and evening times.	Program provides services less than 5 days a week with limited hours and no weekend or evening coverage.	Program is strictly 5 days with limited hours between 9-5.	Program offers weekly coverage including limited evening and some weekend coverage.	Program provides support most hours and days but relies on emergency back-up services during non-business hours	AE staff provides 24-hour coverage

AE Team Approach (continued)		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
TA5 Meeting Schedule and Attendance	TEAM MEETING FREQUENCY: AE team participants meet frequently to plan, review and coordinate services for each youth.	Team meets less than once a month where almost all of the team members are present	Team meets only once a month where almost all of the team members are present	Team meets twice a month where almost all of the team members are present	Team meets three times a month where almost all of the team members are present	Team meets weekly or more almost all of the team members are present
TA6 Team Survey	TEAM MEETING CONTENT: Teams used meetings to plan, review and coordinate services for each youth.	< 20% of AE team members agree that meeting time is used to coordinate services for each youth	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	>= 80% of AE team members agree that meeting time is used to coordinate services for each youth
TA7 Chart review	AE TEAM USE OF FLEXIBLE SERVICE FUNDS: Funds are used to help meet the goals of individual youth as directed by their engagement plans.	< 20% of youth have been granted flex funds to meet personal goals.	21%-40% ¹	41-60%	61-80%	>= 80% of youth have been granted flex funds to meet personal goals.

¹ This score was based on the information found primarily in client charts regarding flexible service fund usage. However, not all organizations consistently track flexible service fund usage in the charts.

Services provided in the community		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
SC1 Chart Review/ Youth Survey	COMMUNITY-BASED SERVICES: Works with youth in community rather than in agency buildings in order to facilitate the develop of community living skills	Less than 20% of youth have services provided in the community ²	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	>= 80% of youth have services provided in the community
SC2 Chart Review	ENGAGEMENT STAGE FREQUENCY OF CONTACT: High number of interactions with youth	Average of less than 1 face-to-face contact / week or fewer per youth	1 – 2 / week.	2 – 3 / week.	3 – 4 / week.	Average of 4 or more face-to-face contacts / week per youth.
SC3 Chart Review	ASSERTIVE CONNECTION STAGE FREQUENCY OF CONTACT: Moderate number of interactions with youth	Less than one contact a month	1 contact a month	2-3 contacts a month	1 contact per week	Average 2 contacts a week per youth
SC4 Chart Review	TRANSITION STAGE FREQUENCY OF CONTACT: Infrequent contacts- client has been integrated into community and no longer needs HYC	Client still has moderate to high contact and not ready to transition out of HYC	3 or more contacts a week	2 contacts a week	Contact once a week	Two or less contacts a month, may only contact by telephone, open but integrated into the community

² Note: The chart review only measured whether staff met with youth in community settings, not whether services in general were provided in the community.

Model Integrity		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
MI1 Interviews	PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY: Agency is committed to a clearly articulated philosophy consistent with model including 1) Executive Director, 2) Supervisor, 3) Team, and 4) Youth	No staff within the organization understand or embrace the model	Some staff within the organization understand the model	Most staff at most levels of the organization understand the model	Most staff at most levels of the organization understand and embrace the model	All staff at all levels of the organization understand and embrace the model
MI2 Team Survey	TRAINING³: All new team members receive standardized training in model (at least a 2-day workshop or equivalent) within 2 months after hiring. Existing team members receive annual refresher training (1-day workshop or equivalent)	< 20% of team members receive standardized training annually	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100% of team members receive standardized training annually
MI3 Team Survey	SUPERVISION CONTENT: Team members receive supervision that is youth centered and explicitly addresses the model and its application to specific youth situations.	<20% of team members report that supervision is youth centered and explicitly addresses the model and its application to specific youth situations	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	81-100% of team members report that supervision is youth centered and explicitly addresses the model and its application to specific youth situations

³ Could be centralized training provided by the county once/quarter.

MI4 Team Survey	SUPERVISION FREQUENCY: Team members receive structured, weekly supervision (group or individual) from a team member experienced in the model.	<20% of team members receive weekly structured supervision	21-40% of team members receive weekly structured supervision OR All team members receive informal supervision	41-60% of team members receive weekly structured supervision OR All team members receive monthly supervision	61-80% of team members receive weekly structured supervision OR All team members receive supervision twice a month	81-100% of team members receive weekly structured supervision
MI5 Team Survey	MOTIVATIONAL INTERVIEWING: Team members have received training in motivational interview techniques.	< 20% of team members have completed or are scheduled to complete MI training	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	>= 80% of team members have completed or are scheduled to complete MI training
MI6 Youth Survey	TEAM MEMBERS HAVE HIGH EXPECTATIONS TOWARD YOUTH: Youth feel that AE team members have high expectations for them.	<20% of youth feel that their AE team member has high expectations for them	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	>=80% of youth feel that their AE team member has high expectations for them

Youth Development Approach/Assertive Engagement		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
YD1 Youth Survey	MEANINGFUL YOUTH PARTICIPATION⁴: Assertive Connection Stage and Transition Stage youth have multiple and ongoing opportunities to engage in the community with the support of caring adults	< 20% of youth report having multiple opportunities to participate in meaningful projects	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	>= 80% of youth report having multiple opportunities to participate in meaningful projects
YD2 Youth Survey	LEADERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH: Assertive Connection and Transition Youth are participating in opportunities for leadership growth	Less than 20% of youth are participating in leadership experiences.	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	>= 80% of youth are participating in leadership experiences
YD3 Chart Review	INDIVIDUALIZED ACTION PLAN: Goals are individualized to youth and match goals of the model and it is updated every 3 months ⁵	<20% of charts have individualized goals that have been updated within 3 months	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	>= 80% of charts have individualized goals that have been updated within 3 months
YD4 Chart Review	STRENGTHS BASED ENGAGEMENT: Assets/strengths approach reflected in engagement, assessment, planning, and transition	<20% of the charts illustrate that assets and strengths have been assessed and have been updated within 3 months	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	>= 80% of the charts illustrate that assets and strengths have been assessed and have been updated within 3 months

⁴ Insufficient data was available on this measure. Additional questions will be added to the youth survey in the future in an effort to better capture this measure.

⁵ It was not possible to determine whether some action plans had been updated every three months based on chart review information.

Relationship Building		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
RB1 Service Point	LOW DROPOUT RATE: Few youth stop participating in services before completing at least half of action plan ⁶	Less than 20% of exited caseload completes half of action plan goals	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	>= 80% of exited caseload complete half of action plan goals
RB2 Chart Review	WORK WITH INFORMAL SUPPORT SYSTEM: AE team provides support and skill building for youth's community support network such as: family, landlords, and employers	AE team works with informal support system for <20% of caseload	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	AE team works with informal support system for >80% of caseload
RB3 Supervisor Survey	CONTINUITY OF STAFFING: Keeps the same staff over time	Greater than 80% turnover in 2 years	60-80% turnover in 2 years	40-59% turnover in 2 years	20-39% turnover in 2 years	Less than 20% turnover in 2 years ⁷
RB4 Chart Review	ECO-MAP: An eco-map has been created and is updated every 3 months ⁸	Less than 20% have current eco-map	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	>= 80% have current eco-map
RB5 Youth Survey	YOUTH HAS DEVELOPED MEANINGFUL RELATIONSHIPS IN THE COMMUNITY: Youth report having meaningful relationships with positive adults outside of HYC ⁹	Less than 20% have meaningful relationships outside of HYC	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%	>= 80% have meaningful relationships outside of HYC

⁶ Insufficient data was available in Service Point to assess this measure.

⁷ Turnover was measured from July 1, 2009 to March 20, 2010.

⁸ The assessment did not measure whether Eco-Maps were updated every three months because it is so early in the implementation process.

⁹ This measure was based on the Youth Survey rather than the Eco-Maps. It was not always possible to determine the types of relationships reflected in the Eco-Map because youth only listed names, not roles for each relationship.