Analysis of Case Management and Transition Planning Interventions for CaPROMISE youth

prepared by the CaPROMISE Research Team, Interwork Institute,
San Diego State University (August 7, 2018)

Preface

Guiding Principles for CaPROMISE Program Evaluation

Before enumerating the specific evaluation findings, here are guiding principles that the SDSU team uses in their approach to CaPROMISE Program Evaluation (PE):

1. Informs and guides Project activities and assesses outcomes. Every PE inquiry is initiated with the premise that the findings will provide useful guidance for efficiently implementing interventions, providing needed services and informing policies.

2. Insures all PE efforts are classified as either *formative* or *summative*. CaPROMISE *formative* evaluation findings document interventions, services, practices and staff approaches that are '*keeping the train on the tracks'* as well as practices and approaches that appear to be falling short of attaining the intended outcomes. CaPROMISE's *summative* evaluation findings determine the extent to which the goals were met after interventions and services.

3. Insures conformance in accordance with Institutional Review Board guidelines regarding access to youth and family evaluation data. The source of all data is based 100% on what is entered by the CSCs into the Data Management System (DMS). The good news is that this restriction of access preserves the confidentiality and the anonymity of the CaPROMISE youth and their family members. The caution regarding this restriction is that any incomplete and/or delayed data entry by the CSCs yields an underestimate of the volume and breadth of services and interventions as well as CaPROMISE goal attainment.

4. Recognizes the significant burden on CSCs to 'keep up' with the DMS data entries. The DMS was designed to be as 'user friendly' as it could be without sacrificing the 'richness in detail' of the entered data. CaPROMISE is about service delivery, not 'paperwork'. But this 'user friendly' aspect has a potential down side. For example, a checked box for 'Coaching' under the Core Service area of 'Parent/Guardian Training and Information' informs the Project that this specific intervention was provided. Certainly, this is a valuable piece of information that becomes a part of the family's data profile. While it is useful to have that depth and breadth of detail for each intervention, the reporting burden that it places upon the CSCs may be unreasonable. This is why the SDSU Interwork staff conduct a number of on-site interviews – to have conversations that furnish rich, qualitative details about the interventions implemented by the CSCs.

5. Documents and disseminates CaPROMISE Evaluation findings to all stakeholders in a clearly presented format and in a timely manner. To facilitate easy digestion of the reports, the descriptions of specific statistical tools and the analysis procedures are not generally included in the reports. These details are available upon request for those readers who express an interest.

Introduction

In this report, we are focusing on the Core Service area, Case Management and Transition Planning. The five interventions represented in this Core Service area are: (1) *Identification of needed services*, (2) *Coordination of services*, (3) *Transition-focused assessment*, (4) *School-based activities* and (5) *Person-driven planning*.

The same questions that were addressed in the previous reports will be used to structure the menu of analyses covered in this report. The data encompassed interventions provided through Year 4 (October 1, 2016 to September 30, 2017). The questions and findings for this PE inquiry are described in the next section.

Findings for PE Analyses of Case Management and Transition Planning Interventions

1. What were the number of *Case Management and Transition Planning* interventions logged into the DMS?

   Totals and averages. The total number of interventions for each of the five categories within this Core Service area, as well as the average number of interventions per youth, are shown in the table below. Each intervention log can include multiple categories under the Core Service area.

Interventions logged	Total Core Service	Identify needed services	Coordinate services	Transition-focused assessment	School-based activities	Person-driven planning
Average	46.41	25.53	33.27	1.66	5.67	3.66
Total	76391	42016	54770	2728	9332	6024

2. Were there **gender differences** associated with the average number of *Case Management and Transition Planning* interventions logged into the DMS?

   No. There were no remarkable gender differences observed for any of the five categories of interventions within this Core Service area. An interpretation of this finding is that there is an equitable treatment of CaPROMISE youth by CSCs and allied service providers. The following table lists the average numbers of interventions for each category of service for male and female CaPROMISE youth:

Gender	Total Core Service	Identify needed services	Coordinate services	Transition-focused assessment	School-based activities	Person-driven planning
Male	46.35	25.15	33.47	1.68	5.47	3.63
Female	46.54	26.32	32.86	1.61	6.10	3.73
Total	46.41	25.53	33.27	1.66	5.67	3.66

3. Were there differences in the average number of *Case Management and Transition Planning* interventions logged into the DMS associated with **age at enrollment**?

   Yes. For the service category of *School-based activities*, the 15-year old students received a significantly higher number of interventions than the 14-year old students and the 16-year old students received a significantly higher number of interventions than the 15-year old students. No remarkable differences among the three age groups were observed for the other four service categories within this Core Service area. This finding is curious and merits further scrutiny. Why would the students who were older at the time of enrollment receive more *School-based activity* interventions than the younger students? Would it not seem more probable that the students who were older at the time of enrollment would instead have received a greater concentration of Transition-based interventions? The table below lists the average number of interventions for each service category per the three age groups. Shaded cells indicate the low (blue) and high (yellow) values associated with this significant finding.

Age at Enrollment	Total Core Service	Identify needed services	Coordinate services	Transition-focused assessment	School-based activities	Person-driven planning
14	44.44	25.01	32.60	1.69	4.84	3.64
15	46.83	26.03	33.33	1.66	5.92	3.57
16	48.22	25.65	33.98	1.62	6.36	3.77
Total	46.41	25.53	33.27	1.66	5.67	3.66

4. Were there differences in the average number of *Case Management and Transition Planning* interventions logged into the DMS associated with **'disability'** as defined by OSEP (13 categories)?

   Yes. Within the category of *Coordination of services*, there were significant differences in the average number of interventions received across the 13 OSEP categories of CaPROMISE youth. There was also a significant difference in the Total average for this Core Service area. These findings should be interpreted with caution. One concern is that there is a large discrepancy in the size of the 13 groups, ranging from seven to 371 individuals. An even greater concern is the use of the OSEP 'disability' classifications. The OSEP taxonomy is generally considered to be held in less favor than other contemporary taxonomies that instead focus on one's capacity to function within the general structure of society, rather than 'clinical' terms that result in stigmatizing 'labeling'. A further concern about this taxonomy is that there appears to be no verifiable consistency in the source of information that was used to assign group labels for these youths. Based on these concerns, it is recommended that no inferences be drawn regarding the association between average numbers of

interventions received and 'disability' type. The table below enumerates the average numbers of interventions provided for each of the five categories within this Core Service area. The shaded areas represent the extreme high (yellow) and low (blue) averages that were associated with this significant finding.

OSEP disability classifications	Total Core Service	Identify needed services	Coordinate services	Transition-focused assessment	School-based activities	Person-driven planning
Autism	47.84	24.84	32.73	1.67	5.73	4.04
Deaf-Blindness	43.87	34.47	29.13	3.60	4.60	2.53
Deafness	42.76	22.71	28.71	2.62	5.86	6.38
Emotional Disturbances	56.16	31.23	43.07	2.06	6.03	3.72
Hearing Impairment	47.46	25.77	39.08	1.00	4.92	3.23
Intellectual Disability	45.52	25.28	33.38	1.40	5.52	3.74
Multiple Disabilities	43.41	23.46	30.68	1.41	4.93	3.43
Orthopedic Impairment	39.93	19.84	31.00	1.24	4.69	3.87
Other Health Impairment	42.78	25.10	30.64	1.74	5.89	3.56
Specific Learning Disability	52.20	28.04	37.46	1.98	6.67	3.34
Speech/Language Impairment	42.63	19.41	29.07	1.41	6.00	2.33
Traumatic Brain Injury	64.86	38.57	56.71	2.86	2.71	5.71
Visual Impairment	51.58	32.32	34.16	.63	3.42	3.63
Total	46.88	25.76	33.64	1.68	5.74	3.70

5. Were there differences in the average number of *Case Management and Transition Planning* interventions associated with 'disability' as defined by five areas of '**function**'?

Yes. Significant differences among the five groups were found for the Total Core Service area. Individuals in the 'Mobility/Health category received significantly fewer interventions than those in the Cognitive/Intellectual and Affective/emotional categories. High (yellow) and low (blue) scores are represented by shaded areas in the table below.

Function Classifications	Total Core Service	Identify needed services	Coordinate services	Transition-focused assessment	School-based activities	Person-driven planning
Sensory	45.31	25.97	31.39	1.81	5.08	3.64
Cognitive/Intellectual	48.22	26.46	35.17	1.63	5.92	3.61
Affective/Emotional	49.72	26.28	35.06	1.76	5.80	3.97
Mobility/Health	42.44	24.48	30.68	1.68	5.74	3.59
Multiple	43.41	23.46	30.68	1.41	4.93	3.43
Total	46.88	25.76	33.64	1.68	5.74	3.70

As was true for the findings from question 4, these results should be interpreted with caution. From a potentially positive perspective, collapsing the 13 OSEP 'Disability' categories into five 'Function' categories somewhat addresses the issue of disparity in group size. Group size for the above five categories ranges from 82 to 600. This is still a considerable disparity. Further, the five group labels suggest a taxonomy that *appears* to be based on how one is able to function in everyday settings. This is more in keeping with national and international taxonomies that are currently in use. The reality is however, that at this point in time, these five classifications are simply 'labels' that replace the 13 OSEP 'labels'. One parameter used to determine the nature and extent of 'disability' for this Project is SSI eligibility determination. Since all CaPROMISE students are SSI recipients, this classification provides no diagnostic/prescriptive power to suggest the most efficacious approaches to service provision for these youths. If it is of interest to assess the statistical association between 'disability' and other measures such as interventions provided, measures of progress and outcomes in attaining Project goals, it would seem essential to employ a procedure whereby service providers would be given the opportunity to assess each youth regarding one's capacity to function within the settings daily encountered and the barriers that these settings might present to CaPROMISE youth and service providers in their efforts to achieve Project goals.

6. Were there differences in the average number of *Case Management and Transition Planning* interventions associated with the status of parent/guardian employment at time of intake?

   Yes. There were significant group differences in the *Identify needed services* category as well as in the total for this Core Service. Youth received significantly more interventions in the *Identify needed services* category if parents reported they were unemployed or looking for work at the point of intake. On the other hand, youth received significantly less interventions in the overall Total Core Service area if parents reported full-time employment at the point of intake. The shaded areas in the table below indicate the extreme high (yellow) and low (blue) scores that lead to this significant finding.

Parent/Guardian employment status	Total Core Service	Identify needed services	Coordinate services	Transition-focused assessment	School-based activities	Person-driven planning
Part-Time	47.00	26.26	33.19	1.55	5.80	4.19
Full-Time	43.18	23.64	30.87	1.83	5.89	3.55
Unemployed/ looking for work	49.38	31.57	36.91	2.06	6.35	3.90
Homemaker	46.27	23.47	33.11	1.58	5.53	3.62
Retired	46.78	22.86	33.88	1.69	6.84	3.45
Other	51.75	29.16	36.56	1.46	5.02	3.40
Total	46.88	25.76	33.64	1.68	5.74	3.70

Regarding this finding, further analysis is needed to examine the possible underlying associations between these parent/guardian employment classifications and the interventions provided under the category of *Identification of needed services*.

7. Were there differences in the average number of *Case Management and Transition Planning* interventions associated with the status of parent/guardian's formal education at time of intake (highest degree completed)?

   No. There were no significant findings associated with the eight levels of parent/guardian education for any of the five categories of interventions that comprise this Core Service area. The table below contains the average number of interventions in each of the six categories.

Highest completed level of formal education	Total Core Service	Identify needed services	Coordinate services	Transition-focused assessment	School-based activities	Person-driven planning
Doctorate	54.67	35.00	18.33	2.33	8.00	6.67
Masters	47.00	22.50	32.61	1.22	7.22	4.56
Bachelors	43.57	26.56	28.77	1.51	5.98	2.87
Associate	46.93	25.10	34.46	1.71	5.64	3.63
GED	46.10	25.90	34.96	1.65	5.90	4.59
H.S. Grad.	47.41	27.19	33.77	1.54	5.58	3.82
Not a H.S. Grad.	46.64	24.66	33.70	1.73	5.77	3.50
None	46.51	22.84	33.84	2.76	6.34	4.15
Total	46.88	25.76	33.64	1.68	5.74	3.70

8. Were there differences in the average number of *Case Management and Transition Planning* interventions associated with the students' expressed expectations to attend college upon high school graduation?

   Yes. Regarding the service category of *School-based activities*, the youth who stated expectations to attend college received a significantly greater average number of interventions than those who did not. The shaded areas in the table below reflect the significant findings:

Youth expectation; attend college?	Total Core Service	Identify needed services	Coordinate services	Transition-focused assessment	School-based activities	Person-driven planning
No	45.61	25.50	32.75	1.62	5.24	3.67
Yes	47.96	25.99	34.39	1.73	6.17	3.73
Total	46.88	25.76	33.64	1.68	5.74	3.70

9. Were there differences in the average number of *Case Management and Transition Planning* interventions associated with the students' expressed expectations to seek employment upon high school graduation?

   Yes. The youth who stated expectations to seek employment after high school received a greater average number of interventions in the overall Core Service area

and in the specific categories of *Identification of needed services* and *Coordination of services*. The shaded cells in the table below indicate the significant findings:

Youth expectation; seek employment?	Total Core Service	Identify needed services	Coordinate services	Transition-focused assessment	School-based activities	Person-driven planning
No	44.99	24.35	32.25	1.56	5.94	3.62
Yes	48.62	27.06	34.91	1.79	5.56	3.78
Total	46.88	25.76	33.64	1.68	5.74	3.70

10. Were there differences in the average number of *Case Management and Transition Planning* interventions associated with the parent/guardians' expressed expectations for their student to attend college upon high school graduation?

    Yes. The students whose parents/guardians stated expectations that their youths would attend college after high school received a greater average number of interventions in the category of *School-based activities*. This finding is reflected in the shaded cells in the following table:

Parent/ Guardian expectation; Attend college?	Total Core Service	Identify needed services	Coordinate services	Transition-focused assessment	School-based activities	Person-driven planning
No	45.88	25.32	33.15	1.55	5.10	3.66
Yes	47.54	26.06	33.96	1.76	6.17	3.73
Total	46.88	25.76	33.64	1.68	5.74	3.70

11. Were there differences in the average number of *Case Management and Transition Planning* interventions associated with the parent/guardians' expressed expectations for their student to seek employment upon high school graduation?

    Yes. There were four significant findings that differentiated these two groups, as reflected by the shaded cells in the table below. While the students whose parents expected them to seek employment after high school received a lower average of *school-based services*, these students received a higher average number of interventions in the overall Core Service area and in the specific categories regarding *Identification of needed services* and *Coordination of services*.

Parent/ Guardian expectation; Seek employment?	Total Core Service	Identify needed services	Coordinate services	Transition-focused assessment	School-based activities	Person-driven planning
No	45.03	24.12	31.80	1.56	6.37	3.61
Yes	48.69	27.38	35.44	1.80	5.13	3.79
Total	46.88	25.76	33.64	1.68	5.74	3.70

Summary

The analysis of the interventions logged under the *Case Management and Transition Planning* Core Service area yielded several significant differences in relationship to specific demographic characteristics and post high-school expectations. The average number of interventions involving the *school-based activities* category increased significantly with the youth's age at time of enrollment. Significant differences based on disability were also identified in association with the average number of interventions for the overall Core Service area and in the *coordination of services* category. However, the evaluation team recommends caution in the interpretation of these results citing the limitations of the disability categories utilized. Youth whose parents/guardians reported their employment status as "unemployed/looking for work" or "other" at time of intake received significantly more interventions in the overall Core Service area and in the *Identify needed services* category compared to parents/guardians who were employed, retired, or homemaker.

Both youth's and parent/guardian's post high-school expectations for postsecondary education were significantly associated with interventions in the *School-based activities* category. Similarly, youth's and parent/guardian's post high-school expectations for employment yielded significant associations with interventions in the overall Core Service area as well as in the *Identification of needed services* and *Coordination of services* categories.

This PE analysis examined those factors associated with the provision of interventions in the Core Service area of *Case Management and Transition Planning*. It is conceivable that all interactions with youth and family involves an element of case management or transition planning. Therefore, further analysis of interventions in this Core Service area in combination with interventions in the four other Core Service areas may be worth exploring. Would the same factors identified in this report (i.e., age, disability, post high-school expectations) also yield significant findings? On the other hand, would there be significant differences for interventions that were solely classified as *Case Management and Transition Planning?* In regards to post high-school expectations, what can be done during the provision of *Case Management and Transition Planning* to elevate youth's and parents' expectations? Are there additional questions or areas of inquiry worth exploring that will add to the value of the research or practical application of the findings for CSCs, counselors, service providers, etc.? As always, we welcome your input, questions, and suggestions to enhance the relevance of the data analysis to your work and professional interests.

Please address correspondence about this document to: Mark Tucker, Ph.D., Department of Administration, Rehabilitation and Postsecondary Education, San Diego State University, email: mtucker@sdsu.edu; Mari Guillermo, Ed.D., Interwork Institute, San Diego State University, email: mari_g@interwork.sdsu.edu

Disclaimer: *CaPROMISE is funded through a cooperative agreement with the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Grant #H418P130003. The contents of this paper do not necessarily represent the policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.*