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CANS is one of many assessments of youth functioning used in SOCs

• Developed by Dr. John Lyons
• Often customized for each site
  – Comprised of 40-50 core items, divided into 5-6 domains
  – In-depth modules can also be used for more information on topics relevant to the particular youth
• A professional administers the tool based on their knowledge of the youth and family, typically every 3-6 months from enrollment
  – Needs are rated from 0, “No evidence” to 3, “Immediate/Intensive Action Needed”
  – Strengths are scored from 0, “Centerpiece Strength” to 3, “No Strength Identified”
CANS and Wraparound are being implemented in nearly every state.

Statewide implementation of both the CANS and Wraparound

Implementation of both the CANS and Wraparound in at least some jurisdictions

Statewide contract with the National Wraparound Implementation Center

[Map showing states with yellow indicating implementation of both CANS and Wraparound, blue indicating state-wide contract with the National Wraparound Implementation Center, and stars indicating implementation in at least some jurisdictions.]
CANS and Wraparound: Points of connection

• Focus on the whole family, not just the “identified child”

• Base planning on presence of Needs and Strengths rather than symptoms or deficits

• Aim to identify issues that demand action (Needs) or that could be leveraged into productive strategies that bolster the family’s existing capacities (Strengths)
CANS and Wraparound: Points of connection

• Data-informed planning
• Measurement-based treatment to target
• Accountability
• Promoting transparency
• Teamwork
• Individualization of care
## Decision support promoted by CANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Family and Youth</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision Support</strong></td>
<td>• Care planning</td>
<td>• Eligibility</td>
<td>• Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Effective practices</td>
<td>• Step-down</td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Selection of EBPs</td>
<td>• Transition</td>
<td>• Right-sizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Monitoring</strong></td>
<td>• Service transitions</td>
<td>• Evaluation of Outcomes</td>
<td>• Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Celebrations</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provider profiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Plan of care revision</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>contracting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality Improvement</strong></td>
<td>• Care management</td>
<td>• Continuous quality improvement</td>
<td>• Transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supervision</td>
<td>• Program redesign</td>
<td>• Business model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*From Lyons, 2012*
Use of CANS in Wraparound

Phase 1: Engagement and Support

CANS used for eligibility/authorization

“Immediate action” items prioritized for crisis plan

CC uses CANS to help engage family, learn their story, and discover strengths and needs in a comprehensive, ecologically based way

Phase 1A

Engagement and Support

Phase 1B

Team Preparation

CC uses CANS data to:
- Research options for strategies, supports, and evidence based treatments to be discussed at first team meeting
- Consider who may be critical to invite to first team meeting
Use of CANS in Wraparound

Phase 2: Plan Development

- CANS used as a basis for exploring/expanding on family strengths and needs at first team meeting
- CANS is used as one basis for brainstorming services and supports for Plan of Care
- CANS is considered as an option for monitoring progress toward needs and achieving priority outcomes

Phase 2

Initial Plan Development
Use of CANS in Wraparound

Phase 3: Implementation

- CANS data are reviewed in team meetings as one way of monitoring progress toward meeting needs, achieving outcomes.
- CANS data are reviewed against strategies in the Plan of Care.
- CANS data are used to evaluate whether to begin transition.

Phase 3
Use of CANS in Wraparound

Phase 4: Transition

CANS data are used as one basis for beginning transition out of formal wraparound

History of CANS scores are included in the documentation prepared for the family as they exit formal wraparound
# Decision support promoted by CANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Family and Youth</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision Support</strong></td>
<td>• Care planning</td>
<td>• Eligibility</td>
<td>• Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Effective practices</td>
<td>• Step-down</td>
<td>• Right-sizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Selection of EBPs</td>
<td>• Transition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Monitoring</strong></td>
<td>• Service transitions</td>
<td>• Evaluation of Outcomes</td>
<td>• Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Celebrations</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provider profiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Plan of care revision</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Performance contracting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality Improvement</strong></td>
<td>• Care management</td>
<td>• Continuous quality improvement</td>
<td>• Transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supervision</td>
<td>• Program redesign</td>
<td>• Business model design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National CANS and Wrap data project: provide guidance for program and system-level CANS usage

• What are the typical strengths and needs of wraparound-enrolled youth and families?
• What services are needed in service arrays in care management entities (CMEs) and wraparound initiatives?
• What are “benchmarks” for trajectories of improvement on CANS over time?
• What is the variation in CANS profiles across states and sites?
2843 Wraparound youth from 5 states with Baseline and 6 Month CANS

- Average age of 12.2 years
- Assessments done within 45 days (on either side) of Wraparound enrollment date and 6-months
- Majority of items appear in all four datasets, but may be listed under different domains or modules, therefore data analyzed at an item-level
Most prevalent strengths (rated 0 or 1) at Baseline and 6 Months

% with Strength

Baseline 6 Months

- Involvement with Care
- Access to Services
- Organization
- Cultural Spiritual Ritual
- Knowledge
- Educational
- Social Resources
- Youth Involvement
- Relat. Permanence
- Supervision
Most prevalent needs (rated 2 or 3) at Baseline and 6 Months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>6 Months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impulsivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppositional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Functioning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Functioning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At 6 months, the top 5 most prevalent needs are met for 12-16% of youth

Change from Baseline to 6 Months for Top 5 most Prevalent Needs (n=~2800)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>Newly Identified</th>
<th>Continuity of Need</th>
<th>Need Met</th>
<th>Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impulsivity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Control</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppositional</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Functioning</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgement</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 10-20% of youth get at least one need met within 6 months
- 7-9% of youth have newly identified needs at 6 months, compared to baseline
Males have significantly higher needs scores at baseline than females.
Younger youth who enter Wraparound have significantly more intense needs.
Black and multiracial youth enter Wraparound with significantly lower levels of needs.
Despite demographic differences, site/state predicts scores a lot more

• Preliminary regression analyses indicate that site/state explains more variance in CANS scores than race, age, or gender, combined
  – Differences in CANS implementation may impact scores

• Analysis on data from the three states with the largest samples
  – Each had 700-900 youth with matched baseline and 6-month CANS data; total n = 2581
There are significant differences in intensity of needs by state.
Top strengths are also significantly different across implementation contexts

- Access to Services
- Involvement with Care
- Organization
- Cultural Spiritual Ritual
- Knowledge

State A (n = 951)
State B (n = 855)
State C (n = 775)
What is driving state-level differences?

**States A & C**
- **Population?**
  - Data from all youth receiving Wraparound in state, regardless of funding stream
- **Timeframe?**
  - Data from 2014 & 2015
- **Implementation?**
  - External reviewer responsible for completing baseline CANS for authorization (and often reauthorization)

**State B**
- **Population?**
  - Data from youth receiving Wraparound through 1915i waiver
- **Timeframe?**
  - Data from 2008-2012
- **Implementation?**
  - Staff internal to the Wraparound provider organization (often the facilitator) responsible for completing the CANS
Initial implications for systems

• Analyze demographic trends locally to explore and remedy underlying dynamics
  – Is the system racially biased? Are the algorithms? Are there less-intensive alternatives?

• Monitor and foster data integrity
  – Have consistent, possibly external, CANS administrators
  – Consider how CANS implementation and use may impact data
  – Encourage meaningful use of data for practice
    • Feed information back at all levels
    • Incorporate into supervision
Still a lot of un-answered questions and analyses needed

• Can national benchmarks be established?
  – Especially given state-level differences
• What accounts for the most variance in scores?
• What amount of change can be expected at 12 months?
• What predicts change over time?
  • Are there particular needs and strengths that are more easily resolved?
• Can youth be categorized into different profiles based on their needs and/or strengths?
  – Do those need/strength clusters predict change?