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**Defining Integration**

*integer* (circa 1508) means whole, intact or entire, and is defined as the combining and coordinating of separate parts or elements into a unified whole.

**Seminal**: a network of organizations that provide or arrange to provide a coordinated continuum of services to a defined population and who are willing to be held clinically and fiscally accountable for the outcomes and the health status of the population being served (Shortell et al., 1993, 1994)

**World Health Organization** (2002): Integrated care is a concept bringing together inputs, delivery, management and organization of services related to diagnosis, treatment, care, rehabilitation and health promotion. Integration is a *means* to improve services in relation to access, quality, user satisfaction and efficiency.
Definition: Human Services Integration

Human services integration (HSI) refers to the coordination of the comprehensive range of services for a specific population (e.g. children & youth) from multiple sectors (i.e. health, education, community and social services, correctional services, housing) at multiple levels of the system (i.e. professional or provider, organization, region, ministry)

(Grdisa, 2007)
What does the integration evaluation evidence tell us?
Human Service Integration Evaluation Framework
(Grdisa, 2007)
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## Defining the Dimensions of Integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Structure refers to the nature, patterns and relations of entities such as individuals, teams, service or community support providers, educators, regional programs, or systems | Process refers to the procedures, activities, methods and actions that entities such as individuals, teams, service or community support providers, educators, regional programs, or systems implement for service provision | Leadership refers to a process of social influence to engage, organize, and motivate others at multiple levels to accomplish common goals or responsibilities and meet expected outcomes/outputs | Collaboration refers to the interpersonal process by which two or more individuals work together to solve a problem or deliver services. This process occurs at multiple levels:  
• Children or youth  
• Interprofessional  
• Within or between teams, organizations, sectors  
• Regional  
• System |

(Grdisa, 2009)
Elements of Integration being Implemented and Measured Globally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Scope/extent of services</td>
<td>• Referrals</td>
<td>• Champion vision</td>
<td>• Mutual trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Human Resources Plan</td>
<td>• Single-entry point</td>
<td>• Build &amp; maintain shared culture</td>
<td>• Mutual respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Co-location</td>
<td>• Case management</td>
<td>• Inspire innovation</td>
<td>• Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information systems</td>
<td>• Case coordination</td>
<td>• Manage inter-organizational relationships</td>
<td>• Shared goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Funding and/or other resources</td>
<td>• Shared standards or protocols</td>
<td>• Lead &amp; manage human resources</td>
<td>• Understanding roles &amp; responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Performance Indicators</td>
<td>• Joint planning</td>
<td>• Foster trust &amp; respect and coordinate communication</td>
<td>• Willingness to collaborate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accountability Agreements</td>
<td>• Knowledge transfer/exchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incentives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Grdisa, 2009)
Focus on the Through-put: Measuring Integration

How do through-puts relate to outcomes & outputs?

Integration: A Means to an End

Throughputs

Improve integration, coordination and accountability of service delivery

Outputs

Increase local system efficiency

Improve quality of local service delivery

Improve access to local services

Outcomes

Improve Outcomes

(Framework built from MOHLTC Local System Strategy Map)
Service Delivery Integration Index of home care for older persons: Application in several European cities
(Henrard et al, 2006)

Measure: Service Delivery Integration Index

**STRUCTURE**
- 24 hour service provision
- Instrumental ADLs (e.g. shopping)
- ADLs (e.g. feeding)
- Wound Care program
- Four therapies (e.g. OT, PT, RT, SLP)
- Technical nursing care

**PROCESS**
- Standardized geriatric assessment
- MDT assessment
- Case coordination
- Case management
- Hospital discharge management
- Single entry point

**Throughputs**

**Outputs**

**Outcomes**

Home Care Quality Index
Measures of Network Integration: Several studies examining interorganizational network effectiveness: CDPM programs, Diabetes, Mental Health & Addictions (Provan & Milward et al, 1990s+)

Measure: Measure of Network Integration

**Process**
- Referral pathways (i.e. received & sent)
- Case coordination
- Joint Planning

**Structure**
- Service Contracts
- Network Structure

**Collaboration**
- Trust
- Attitudes

**Leadership**
- Foster trust & respect
- Manage inter-organizational relationships

- Resource utilization
- Satisfaction levels (patient/client & family)
- Wait times
- Quality of Life
- Clinical Outcomes
- Diabetes Control

**Throughputs**
- Outputs
- Outcomes

Measure: Partnership Self Assessment Tool

Throughputs

PROCESS
- Efficiency
- Non-financial resources

STRUCTURE
- Financial Resources

COLLABORATION
- Synergy

LEADERSHIP
- Leadership
- Administration & Management

Outputs

Community-related challenges

Satisfaction levels (partnership level)
Duration of partnership

Outcomes

LEADERSHIP
- Administration & Management

Throughputs

Efficiency
Non-financial resources

Outputs

Community-related challenges
Satisfaction levels (partnership level)
Duration of partnership

Outcomes
Integration of Human Services Measure: Several studies examining intersectoral integration: Children & Youth, Children with disabilities, seniors, HIV population (Browne et al, 2000s+)

Measure: Integration Human Services Measure

- **PROCESS**
  - Efficiency
  - Non-Financial Resources

- **STRUCTURE**
  - Financial Resources

- **COLLABORATION**
  - Scope, extent, depth, reciprocity & congruence of integration
  - Network or partnership synergy

- **LEADERSHIP**
  - Quality of Leadership
  - Administration & Management

Throughputs

- Service Volumes
- Satisfaction levels (patient, family, & provider)
- Wait Lists/Times

Outputs

- Clinical Outcomes (Client & Family)

Outcomes
Child & Youth Services: Complexity & Multiplicity

- Ministry of Health & Long-Term Care
- Other Ministries
- Ministry of Children & Youth Services
- Municipal Governments
- LHIN
- Regional Programs
- Non-LHIN funded Providers Physicians
- Other Sector Partners Public Health

HSP₁, HSP₂, HSPₖ
Network: 93 Service Providers – 6 Sectors
Peel Integration Project: Purpose & Study Sample

Purpose:
To measure service integration for child & youth services in Peel Region
To determine correlation/association between integration scores and outputs or outcomes

Setting:
• Peel Region, 300,000 children or youth
• 10,000 access (~42,000)

Sample:
• Clinicians, Educators, Managers

Sampling strategies:
• QUAN & QUAL
• Purposive sampling – criterion sampling
Peel Integration Project: Dimensions & Levels

System
Sector
Dyadic
Organization

(Grdisa, 2010)
**Data collection & analysis**

**Data collection measures:**
- HSI measures: MNI, PSAT, IHSM, SDII (response rate ranged from 83-89%)
- Selected output measures: FTEs, service volumes, admissions, waitlists, wait times

**Data analysis:**
- SLRU team to conduct data analysis
- *Diverse analytic techniques* implemented: descriptive stats, inferential stats, social network analysis, qualitative description

**Study Timeframe:**
Feb 18, 2009 survey distribution → July 10, 2009 data collection closed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HSI Dimension</th>
<th>HSI Measure</th>
<th>Level of Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>IHSM</td>
<td>Egocentric, dyadic, sociocentric (3 levels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSAT (synergy)</td>
<td>Sociocentric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>PSAT (leadership, admin/management)</td>
<td>Sociocentric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>PSAT (efficiency, non-financial resources)</td>
<td>Sociocentric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDII (10 process)</td>
<td>Egocentric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>PSAT (financial res.)</td>
<td>Sociocentric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDII (structure)</td>
<td>Egocentric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MNI</td>
<td>All three levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Integration of Human Services Measure©
(Browne, et al., 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY/SERVICE</th>
<th>Rate (0-4)</th>
<th>Do not rate your own agency/service – leave blank</th>
<th>Rate (0-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health-Mental Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Youth Services of Peel - Children's Mental Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Youth Services of Peel - Youth Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central West Community Care Access Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child &amp; Adolescent Mental Health Services, Trillium Health Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMHA Peel, First Assessment Clinical Team (FACT) Peel+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMHA Peel, Youth Net</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Valley Hospital, Child &amp; Family Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distress Centre Peel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton Healthcare Services - Child &amp; Youth Mental Health Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Canadian Legal Clinic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Fry Society of Peel Halton – Youth Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Howard Society of Peel-Halton-Dufferin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinark Child &amp; Family Services – Syl Apps Youth Justice and Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel Regional Police, Youth Crime Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe City Mississauga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Brampton Safe City Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Rating Scale**

- **0 = No awareness:** Your agency/service is not aware of the other agency/service
- **1 = Awareness:** You have knowledge of the other agency/service although no effort is taken to organize activities according to any principles except those that conform to individual agency/service missions.
- **2 = Communication:** You and the other agency/service have an active program of communication and information sharing.
- **3 = Cooperation:** You and the other agency/service each use your knowledge of the other’s agency/service to guide and modify your own service planning in order to obtain a better set of links between services.
- **4 = Collaboration:** You and the other agency/service jointly plan the offering of service and actively modify service activity based on advice and input from mutual discussions.

*Note: N/A = Not applicable: Agency/service is not applicable to your service.*
Example of Integration Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
<th>Group Reported Depth of Integration (0-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency</strong> 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency</strong> 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency</strong> 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency</strong> 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency</strong> 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column Total</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent ARE YOU/SHOULD YOU (your service) (be) involved with the following agencies/services?

Self-Reported Depth of Integration (0-4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Reported Depth of Integration (0-4)</th>
<th>1.25</th>
<th>1.75</th>
<th>0.75</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>1.55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Baseline

Number of Agencies in Region = 5
Number of Respondent Agencies = 5
100%

Number of Agencies in Region = 5
Number of Respondent Agencies = 5
100%

Self Reported Observed & Expected Depth of Integration Scores (column)

Group Observed & Expected Depth of Integration Scores (row)

Observed or Expected Group Total Integration Score (0-4)
Total Integration Scores: System Level

This figure shows the total group integration scores, which include the highest possible score, the expected (should be) score and the observed (are now) score at baseline.

**FIGURE 1: Total Integration Scores**
Comparing Sectors: Degree of Collaborative Involvement

Observed & Expected within Sectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Observed Score</th>
<th>Expected Score</th>
<th>Highest Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health-Mental Health</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Services</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Observed Score
- Expected Score
- Highest Possible
Health-Mental Health

[Network Diagram with various health services represented as nodes and connections]

- HHS-C&YMHS
- CMHA-YouthNet
- YMCA-PeelYSAP
- AYSP-MH
- DistressCP
- CAMHS-Trillium
- CVH-C&FS
- RoP-FamilyHealth
- KinarkC&FS-ISSP
- RapportYS&FS
- MH-CCAC
- WOHC-C&A
- CMHA-FACTPeel
- CW-CCAC
- RoP-SchoolHealth
- NexusYS
- Thistletown-Adol.S
- HHS-EDP
Health-Mental Health: Observed Reciprocity

Figure 4: Observed Reciprocity

- Self Reported
- Group Reported

Integration Scores vs Agencies/Programs
Health-Mental Health: Expected Reciprocity

Figure 5: Expected Reciprocity

![Graph showing expected reciprocity between self-reported and group-reported integration scores for agencies/programs. The x-axis represents agencies/programs, and the y-axis represents integration scores. The graph includes data points for both self-reported and group-reported scores.](image)
**Partnership Self-Assessment Tool**  
(Weiss et al., 2002)

Sample of Questions from *Synergy* Section

Please think about the people and agencies/organizations that provide a broad range of services representing multiple sectors for children and youth in the Peel Region. **By working together**, how well are these system partners able to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Extremely Well</th>
<th>Very Well</th>
<th>Somewhat Well</th>
<th>Not So Well</th>
<th>Not Well at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Identify new and creative ways to solve problems.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Include the views and priorities of the people affected by the Partnership’s work.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Develop goals that are widely understood and supported among members/partners.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Identify how different services and programs in the community relate to the problems the Partnership is trying to address.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Respond to the needs and problems of the community.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Implement strategies that are most likely to work in the community.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Obtain support from individuals and organizations in the community that can either block the Partnership’s plans or help move them forward.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Carry out comprehensive activities that connect multiple services, programs, or systems.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Clearly communicate to people in the community how the Partnership’s actions will address problems that are important to them.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SYSTEM: 4 Dimensions of Integration

FIGURE 1: All Services
Partnership Assessment: Subscale Mean Scores

Category Scores:
1.0-2.9 Danger Zone: this area needs a lot of improvement
3.0-3.9 Work Zone: more effort is needed in this area to maximize the partnership’s collaborative potential
4.0-4.5 Headway Zone: the partnership is doing pretty well in this area but has potential to progress even further
4.6-5.0 Target Zone: the partnership currently excels in this area and needs to focus attention on maintaining its high score
LEADERSHIP by Sector

Figure 2: The Score of Leadership Partnership Assessment: Subscale Mean Scores

Category Scores:

1.0-2.9 Danger Zone: this area needs a lot of improvement
3.0-3.9 Work Zone: more effort is needed in this area to maximize the partnership’s collaborative potential
4.0-4.5 Headway Zone: the partnership is doing pretty well in this area but has potential to progress even further
4.6-5.0 Target Zone: the partnership currently excels in this area and needs to focus attention on maintaining its high score

p-value < 0.001
**ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT by Sector**

*Figure 4: The Score of Administration and Management Partnership Assessment: Subscale Mean Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Scores</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0-2.9</td>
<td>Danger Zone: this area needs a lot of improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0-3.9</td>
<td>Work Zone: more effort is needed in this area to maximize the partnership’s collaborative potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0-4.5</td>
<td>Headway Zone: the partnership is doing pretty well in this area but has potential to progress even further</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6-5.0</td>
<td>Target Zone: the partnership currently excels in this area and needs to focus attention on maintaining its high score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P-value = 0.039
Areas for improvement

**Leadership Scale Items:**

- Empowering people involved in the partnership
- Resolving conflict among partners
- Combining the perspectives, resources and skills of partners
- Recruiting diverse people and organizations into the partnership
## Service Delivery Integration Index

(Henrard et al., 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does your agency or program provide?</th>
<th>Present (1)</th>
<th>Absent (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-entry point (one number to call)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common e-record and accessibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive assessment (physical, developmental, mental health, educational, family)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-disciplinary/professional team approach for assessment and coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team meetings for individual case planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation of primary care providers (e.g. family physician) in team meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Management (i.e. structured case coordination)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night service provision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend service provision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition management between different sectors (e.g. hospital &amp; developmental services or child welfare &amp; education)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does your agency or program provide the following funded services?</th>
<th>Present (1)</th>
<th>Absent (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child &amp; Youth Counsellor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietician</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Care (other specialty areas)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing Care (e.g. public health, home visiting)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiotherapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation/Justice Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech &amp; Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for informal caregivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organization Level: Process & Structure

P-value: 0.018

P-value: 0.028
Measuring Networks

Self-Governed Network

Lead Organization Network

Network Administrative Organization

- Network members that are collectively involved in network governance
- Stronger relationship
- Weaker relationship

Measure of Network Integration (Provan & Milward, 1990s+)

### SECTION A

Please provide the following information for your respective agency or program (i.e. some agencies are reporting on multiple programs within one agency).

*Please provide the data for time period: April 1, 2008 – December 31, 2008*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of FTEs/agency or program:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency or program service volumes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of admissions/agency or program:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your agency or program have a waitlist?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, what is the number on the wait list?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the average wait time in weeks?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION B

Please go through the list of agencies/programs and indicate which agencies/programs your organization has been involved with in providing services to children and youth in the Peel Region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agencies/Services</th>
<th>Referrals Received</th>
<th>Referrals Sent</th>
<th>Case Coordination</th>
<th>Joint Programs</th>
<th>Service Contracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health-Mental Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Youth Services of Peel - Children's Mental Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Youth Services of Peel - Youth Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central West Community Care Access Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child &amp; Adolescent Mental Health Services, Trillium Health Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMHA Peel, First Assessment Clinical Team (FACT) Peel+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMHA Peel, Youth Net</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Valley Hospital, Child &amp; Family Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distress Centre Peel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton Healthcare Services - Child &amp; Youth Mental Health Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton Healthcare Services - Eating Disorders Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinark Child &amp; Family Services – Intensive Support and Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga Halton Community Care Access Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Network Structure: Referrals Received

Density - 16.1%
Network Structure: Joint Programs

Density - 5.7%
Peel Integration Project  (Grdisa & Browne, 2009)

Input  Throughputs  Outputs  Outcomes

FTEs

PROCESS
• PSAT
• SDII

STRUCTURE
• PSAT
• SDII
• MNI

COLLABORATION
• PSAT
• IHSM

LEADERSHIP
• PSAT

Service Volumes
# Admissions

Wait Lists
Wait Times

Throughputs

Output

Outcomes
Vision:
In Peel, All Children & Youth Thrive

Peel Children & Youth Initiative:
Mission, Values
Common Language
FTEs

Provincial Ministries

Municipal Programs/Networks
Regional Programs/Networks

Funded Providers/Educators
Voluntary Providers or Groups

Professions/Teams

Collaboration
Leadership
Structure
Process

Outputs:
Service Volumes
Admits
Wait Lists
Wait Times

(Grdisa, 2009)
Questions
Health System Integration Framework

Vision
Common Language

Strategic Goals:
Better Health,
Better Care,
Better Value
Needs-based Population Health

Governance + shared accountability

Ministry of Health & Long-Term Care
LHIN Regional Programs
LHIN-funded HSPs
Non-LHIN funded providers
Interprofessional Teams

Outputs
Outcomes:
Improved Population Health
Access
Quality
Efficiency
Patient Satisfaction

Full Segregation Linkage Coordination in Networks Cooperation Full Integration

(Grdisa, 2010)
Transforming Health: From Silos to Systems...