Performance Measurement
Learning Collaborative

Massachusetts Levels of Organizational Integration
Collaboration is a powerful strategy to achieve a vision otherwise not possible when independent entities work alone.

However, it’s a hard term to grasp.

The MA Lifespan Respite Caregiver Needs Assessment. In 2014, the MA Lifespan Respite Coalition distributed an online survey (2014) to caregivers. Total of 380 caregivers completed the survey.

Survey results:

• **Access**: 36% of caregivers did not know where or how to access services

• **Effect on employment**: 46% of caregivers were often late or needed to leave work early; 41% used vacation or personal time; 11% reduced their hours; and 27% changed their career or position to accommodate caregiver demands

• **Financial burden**: 59% paid for respite services out of pocket (opc). Annual opc exceeded $5,000.
Prior research (2017) of policies and programs for state and federally funded respite services across Massachusetts’ state agencies included, an environmental scan of state programs and key informant interviews with state program staff.

The researchers explored current delivery practices and potential gaps in Massachusetts’ long-term services and supports (LTSS) respite programs and options.

The results demonstrated the variability in Massachusetts’ state policies and program practices in four primary areas:

1) The types of respite services offered by state agencies,

2) The agencies definition of respite services,

3) Variability in the ability of families to access services, and

4) The methods employed to track the delivery and outcomes of services. This study concludes with recommendations to enhance the delivery of respite as an integral part of long-term services and supports in Massachusetts

https://escholarship.umassmed.edu/commed_pubs/55/
Advancing State Lifespan Respite

Caregiver Respite State Action Group:
Executive Office of Health and Human Services (EHS),
Department of Children and Families (DCF),
Department of Developmental Services (DDS),
Department of Mental Health (DMH),
Department of Public Health (DPH),
Executive Office of Elder Affairs (ELD),
MassHealth (MH)
Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission (MRC),
University of Massachusetts Medical School (UMMS)
1. Pre-survey of state respite program managers

2. Evaluate the outcomes of the state action group using LOIR during 3-phases: initial, mid-grant, final:

   Research questions:
   a) What is the current level of collaboration?
   b) What is the needed level of integration?
   c) What is the expected outcome for the state action group?
MLRP evaluation team conducted an initial survey of the six primary state agencies that provide respite services (DDS, DMH, DPH, ELD, MH, MRC). Four (67%) of the agencies responded. The results show:

- Definitions of respite varies across programs
- Respite is predominantly available for individuals with disabilities
- There are four types of respite: Planned, Emergency, In-Home and Out of Home/Facility Based
- There are no standardized respite training requirements across agencies
- Tracking of respite referrals and utilization is inconsistent
- Only one agency had respite-specific public facing materials/information
Collaboration depends on positive relationships

Collaboration develops in stages
Collaboration is an imperative

Collaboration is a process rather than an end-point

Strategic alliances are intentionally created to benefit the partners and ultimately the stakeholders they serve

Low          Formal Integration          High
Attributes of Collaboration

- Shared Purpose
- Complex
  - Inter-organizational
  - Intra-organizational
Attributes of Collaboration

Developmental Stages

- Forming, storming, norming, performing, transforming
Attributes of Collaboration

- Levels of integration
- Cycles of inquiry
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Integration</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Strategies and Tasks</th>
<th>Leadership and Decision Making</th>
<th>Inter-professional Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independent (none) 0</td>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>Shared strategies and tasks do not exist</td>
<td>No shared leadership or decision-making structures</td>
<td>Nonexistent or very infrequent and unplanned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network 1</td>
<td>Create a web of communication Identify and create a base of support to explore interests</td>
<td>Loose or no shared structures Flexible, roles not defined Few clear tasks</td>
<td>Nonhierarchical Flexible</td>
<td>Very little inter-professional conflict Communication among members is planned, but infrequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating 2</td>
<td>Work together to ensure tasks are done Leverage or raise money</td>
<td>Member links are advisory in nature Few structures and shared tasks Distinct organizational missions</td>
<td>Nonhierarchical, decisions tend to be low stakes Facilitative leaders, often voluntary Several people form a ‘go-to’ hub</td>
<td>Some degree of personal commitment and investment Minimal inter-professional conflict Communication among members is clear, but largely informal Some inter-professional conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnering 3</td>
<td>Share resources to address common issues Organizations remain autonomous but support something new to reach mutual goals together</td>
<td>Strategies and tasks are developed and maintained Tasks are delegated Documented overlaps in organizational mission</td>
<td>Central leadership group identified Partners share equally in the decision-making process</td>
<td>Communication system and formal information channels developed Evidence of problem solving and productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unifying 4</td>
<td>Extract money from existing organizations and merge resources to create something new Commitment for a long period of time to achieve short- and long-term outcomes</td>
<td>Formal structure to support strategies and tasks Specific short- and long-term strategies and tasks are identified A shared organizational mission</td>
<td>Decision-making mechanisms are in place Strong, visible leadership Committee and subcommittees formed Roles and responsibilities are clear and designated</td>
<td>High degree of commitment and investment Possibility of inter-professional conflict is high Communication is clear, frequent and prioritized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Woodland and Hutton (2012)*
Levels of Organization Integration Rubric (LOIR) to measure the level of collaboration across the State Action Group. The LOIR pinpoints attributes across five levels from zero to four:

0. Independent, the group operates independent of one another

1. Network, the group begins to network

2. Cooperating, the group enters into a stage of cooperation

3. Partnering, the group begins to share ideas and resources, and

4. Unifying, the group begins to transform and produces real change

The value of this tool enabled the State Action Group to understand the level of communication and collaboration needed to meet the goals of the project.
Planned or emergency support to provide family/primary caregivers with a short break from the exceptional demands of caring for individuals with complex needs across the lifespan.

Each agency further defines:

✓ Emergency
✓ Support
✓ Caregiver
✓ Special needs
✓ Exceptional
## SWOT Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agencies and organizations alignments already exist</td>
<td>Caseworkers/advocates need to be educated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create system and blend rules: NWD</td>
<td>Loss of state funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of sustainability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attributes of Collaboration

Developmental Stages

Forming, storming, norming, transforming

1. Assemble and Form
2. Storm and Order
3. Norm and Perform
4. Transform and Adjourn

### Levels of Organizational Integration Recording (LOIR) Results

**MA Caregiver Respite State Action Group**  
**January 28, 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELD</th>
<th>EHS</th>
<th>DMH ADULTS</th>
<th>DMH CYF</th>
<th>DCF</th>
<th>DPH C&amp;Y</th>
<th>DPH E.I.</th>
<th>DDS</th>
<th>VET</th>
<th>MRC</th>
<th>MH</th>
<th>UMMS (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VET</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMMS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current (C) and Projected (P) Levels of Integration 0-4**

**Average Current Levels of Integration by Agency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Current Level</th>
<th>Projected Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELD</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHS</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMH ADULTS</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMH CYF</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCF</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPH C&amp;Y</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPH E.I.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDS</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VET</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRC</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Projected Level of Integration Across the Group**

**Average Current Level of Integration Across the Group**

**Respite Action Group-Participating Agencies**

ELD=Executive Office of Elder Affairs  
EHS=Executive Office of Health and Human Services  
DMH=Department of Mental Health  
DCF=Department of Children and Families  
DPH=Department of Public Health  
DDS=Department of Developmental Services  
VET=Veteran’s Administration  
MRC=Mass. Rehabilitation Commission  
MH=MassHealth  
UMMS = University of Mass. Medical School

*Level of Organizational Integration Rubric (LOIR)*

0=Independent  
1=Network  
2=Cooperating  
3=Partnering  
4=Unifying
In year 1, the initial State Action Group LOIR score was 1.81; demonstrating the group was in a level of networking.

In year 2, the State Action Group experienced changes in membership. Some state managers left their position and new managers assumed their role. CWM repeated the assessment and found the LOIR score dropped to 1.54, remaining in the level of networking.

The State Action Group continues to project that they need to achieve the level of Cooperating-Partnering in order to accomplish their goal.
If the Projected level of collaboration for the MA Respite State Action Group is ‘Cooperating-Partnering’:

- What’s the evidence that would indicate we reached this level of collaboration? (LOIR rubric)

- What actions are needed to accomplish this?
SWOT Analysis: Future Vision

A centralized place to access respite information supported by a live person

Full-service website

A respite system where all programs are aligned and knowledgeable about each other

Knowledge of (state) provider services

Sufficient staff in agencies and organizations that can respond and support

More access to respite providers

Well informed, excited respite workers

A common view of the respite workers as a valued and acknowledged role in the community

More formalized training for respite workers

Cultural and regional representation in the respite workforce
In 2019, the MLRC future vision included a respite system where all programs are aligned with and knowledgeable about each other.

In response to this vision, the MLRP is working with CWM Disability and Community Services to develop an online training for state staff across EOHHS programs.

**Goal:** Develop an online training video to inform state agency staff of family caregiver respite services across Massachusetts State agencies and increase access to services through the MassOptions program.
Thank you!

Leanne Winchester  
Direct Care Workforce Development  
Caregiver Respite  
One Ashburton Place Rm 1109  
Boston, MA 02108  
(508) 856-8421  
Leanne.Winchester@state.ma.us

Amy Korstvedt Nazaire  
Director of Family Support & Children’s Services  
Department of Developmental Services – Northeast Region  
PO Box A, 450 Maple Street  
Hathorne MA 01937  
978-774-5000 x386  
amy.nazaire@state.ma.us