Evaluating the Implementation of Business Process Mapping for Tribal Child Welfare Practice Model Development

Nancy M. Lucero, Ph.D., LCSW
Butler Institute for Families, University of Denver

Maria Scannapieco, Ph.D., LMSW Director
Mountain & Plains Child Welfare Implementation Center
University of Texas at Arlington, SSW

Lee Collins, Director
Osage Nation Social Services

A member of the National Training and Technical Assistance Network
A service of the Children’s Bureau, U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services
Implementation Centers and National Resource Centers

Funded by the Children’s Bureau to provide States and Territories, Tribes, and Tribal Consortia individualized training and technical assistance (T/TA) to:

- Improve child welfare administration and practice
- Support program improvement and implement effective programs
- Pursue sustainable and positive systems change
- Improve outcomes for children, youth & families
Implementation Centers: Filling the Gap

• States and Tribes are sometimes without the resources necessary to implement comprehensive strategic plans
• Implementation Centers provide in-depth and long-term consultation and peer networking opportunities to States and Tribes
# Project Partner Roles

## Building Capacity to Implement Sustainable Systems Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Center</th>
<th>Child Welfare Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conduct organizational and readiness assessment to identify potential barriers to implementation</strong></td>
<td>Develop and implement strategies to address organizational barriers and improve readiness for implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guide planning process</strong></td>
<td>Develop project plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide and coordinate technical assistance resources to support organizational change and facilitate implementation</strong></td>
<td>Provide and coordinate organizational/human resources to manage change and support implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide technical assistance to promote best practices in organizational and child welfare systems change</strong></td>
<td>Utilize best practices to align people, process, structure, measurement/rewards, and technology around the desired systems change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitate implementation</strong></td>
<td>Implement plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop methodology (e.g., benchmarks, tools) to monitor implementation progress</strong></td>
<td>Collect project data; use data reports to monitor implementation and inform/refine implementation strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluate project outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Use findings and lessons learned to inform future implementation efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Center</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast &amp; Caribbean Implementation Center (NCIC)</td>
<td>University of Southern Maine, Muskie School of Public Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic Coast Child Welfare Implementation Center (ACCWIC)</td>
<td>University of Maryland School of Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest Child Welfare Implementation Center (MCWIC)</td>
<td>University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Center on Children, Families &amp; the Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountains &amp; Plains Child Welfare Implementation Center (MPCWIC)</td>
<td>University of Texas at Arlington, partnering with the University of Denver and The Native American Training Institute (NATI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western &amp; Pacific Child Welfare Implementation Center (WPIC)</td>
<td>American Institutes for Research, partnering with National Indian Child Welfare Association, Center for the Study of Social Policy, National Technical Assistance Center for Children’s Mental Health at Georgetown University, and the Florida Mental Health Institute at the University of South Florida</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mountains and Plains Child Welfare Implementation Center
MPCWIC

Geographical Service Area
Region 6: Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas
Region 8: Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming
MPCWIC Projects

• **The Skun-eyah (Garden) Project** – collaborative project of two tribes, Three Affiliated Tribes (Mandan, Hidatsa and Arikara Nations) and Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa.

• The **Osage Nation** implementation project goal is three-fold: develop a business mapping model, develop and articulate a culturally based family centered practice model, and create a decision support data system to support practice.

• **Colorado Department of Human Services, Division of Child Welfare** – **Child Welfare Practice Model**. Three-year project to explore, define and implement a Colorado practice model, inclusive of specific practice strategies, methods and tools to improve outcomes for children and families.

• **New Mexico Pinon Project**: Child Welfare Practice Model – focused on the development and implementation of a clearly articulated practice framework, inclusive of vision, mission, values and operating principles, to guide the change initiatives underway in the State.
MPCWIC Projects

• AR C.I.R.C.L.E.S. (Creating Informed Results through Competent Leadership and Empowered Supervision), Little Rock, Arkansas: The focus of the project is the development and implementation of supervisor capacity strategies that will result in sustainable system and organizational change at the direct service supervisory staff level and ultimately to field staff to improve outcomes.

• Shawnee Child Protection Team (SANACPT) Culturally Responsive Foster Parent Training Model, Shawnee, Oklahoma. SANACPT is comprised of six Native American Tribes: Absentee Shawnee Tribe, Citizen-Potawatomi, Kickapoo Tribe of Oklahoma, Sac-Fox, Seminole and Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma. The project will focus on developing a culturally appropriate foster parent training curriculum and training model.
Process for Implementing Change

Analyze the strengths and needs of the system. Align organizational culture, policies, practices, and resources with identified values. Act strategically to effect desired change.

Methodology

Business Process Mapping

- Business process mapping was the facilitative tool used to walk agency staff through the current child welfare practice and to identify where child welfare practice might be strengthened.
Standard Mapping Symbols

- Identify Start / End Points
- Identify Decision Points
- Identify Tasks and Roles
- Page Connectors
- Represent Forms / Templates
- Represent Data Systems
Building the Bridge from Policy to Service Delivery...
Methodology: From High Level Components to Detailed Steps to Data Elements

1. Process
2. Business Process Map
3. Process Steps in the Map:
4. Forms / Templates
The Impact and Value for the Agency

The Process

• Open Discussion
• Wealth of Knowledge at the Table
  • Policy and Concepts
  • Actual “as is” Service Delivery / Practice
  • Identify Gaps in Service
• Creating a solid understanding for the ENTIRE TEAM
  • “to be” Service Delivery / Practice
  • Roles and Responsibilities

The Product

• Process Maps
• Forms and Templates (updated and/or created)
Osage Nation

Lee Collins, Director
Osage Nation Social Services Agency
Evaluating BPM in Tribal Settings

- BPM was the major implementation activity for Phase I of the MPCWIC tribal projects.
- BPM originated in corporate world and information technology field.
- Modified by Mary Iannone for use with child welfare programs.
- MPCWIC is first to formally evaluate the use of BPM with tribal child welfare programs.
Evaluating BPM in Tribal Settings

- Tribal programs and communities are looking to utilize process and interventions that:
  - are congruent with Native ways
  - have been developed or adapted specifically for tribal settings

- Gap in the availability of these processes/interventions

- We need to explore:
  - What characteristics give a non-Native intervention a good “fit” in a tribal setting?
Goals of the Evaluation

- Assess the appropriateness of using BPM to develop tribal child welfare practice models
- Recommend culturally-specific adjustments to the BPM process to increase its acceptability and adoption in tribal settings
- Begin to identify “cultural fit” elements that should be considered when importing mainstream processes and interventions into tribal child welfare work
Theoretical Foundation

- Good “cultural fit” will increase acceptance and adoption of a process or intervention being implemented in a tribal child welfare setting
- Cultural fit will increase fidelity of implementation and improve penetration and sustainability
- There is an approach to doing child welfare work that is related to culture and context and that should be articulated in tribal child welfare practice models
Operationalizing “Cultural Fit”

- Congruence with tribal/cultural:
  - Learning/cognitive style
  - Communication style
  - Interpersonal style
  - Decision-making style
  - Worldview
  - Values

- These areas are subtle and nuanced elements of the psychological schemas of individuals and tribal groups.

- They are also a part of how tribal people may perceive themselves to be distinct from non-Natives.
Methodology

Guiding questions:

- What are tribal people’s perceptions of the appropriateness of using Business Process Mapping with tribal child welfare programs?
- What modifications might be necessary to increase its fit in the tribal setting?
- How likely are tribal child welfare staff to incorporate into their work the practice model developed through BPM?
Methodology

- 36-item instrument administered to staff members from the three MPCWIC tribal child welfare programs
- Responses on a 6-point Likert scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree)
- 3 open-ended questions (what worked well; what did not work well; what would you change about BPM)
Methodology

- Qualitative interviews with tribal child welfare staff who had participated in BPM sessions

- Used qualitative interviews to:
  - clarify and provide detail on survey responses
  - create a space where respondents could “be Native”
  - address social desirability and resistance/accommodation dynamics that were present
Methodology

- Areas of inquiry
  - Cultural Fit—15 items
  - Map development process—7 items
  - Facilitation and content delivery of BPM sessions—4 items
  - Practice model uptake (from Butler Institute’s COHA)—10 items
Methodology

Each item also assessed one of Proctor, et al’s (2010) implementation outcomes:

- acceptability
- adoption
- appropriateness
- feasibility
- fidelity
- implementation cost
- penetration
(note: did not look at sustainability)
Relevant Findings

- Small sample (n=31 for survey; n=6 for qualitative interviews)
- Reporting and analyzing frequencies and means and emerging qualitative themes
- Using results to inform implementation and intervention development
- Building a foundation for ongoing assessment of BPM in additional tribal settings
Findings—Cultural Fit Items

- **Learning/cognitive style**

  “I typically figure out how things work in a way that is similar to the BPM process.”

  - 90.3% agreed to some degree (29.% agree slightly; 58.1% agree; 3.2% strongly agree)

  At the same time, 63.3% agreed with the statement:

  “The BPM process required me to use a different way of thinking than I normally do.”
Findings—Cultural Fit Items

- **Communication style**

  45.2% agreed to some degree with the statement:

  “I had to communicate with the BPM facilitator in a different way than I do with people from our tribe.”
Findings—Cultural Fit Items

- Decision-making style

“The decision-making process used in the BPM sessions was similar to the way people from our tribe usually decide on things”

60.0% disagreed to some degree; another 26.7 only slightly agreed with the statement (total 86.7%)
Findings—Cultural Fit Items

- **Worldview/values**

  “The BPM process is based on seeing the world in a way similar to how people from our tribe do.”

- While 61.3% of respondents agreed to some degree, more than 1/3 of respondents (38.7%) disagreed with the statement.

- More than half of the respondents (54.8%) fall near the mid-point (either agreeing slightly or disagreeing slightly).
Findings—Cultural Fit Items

- **Worldview/values**

  “The values upon which the BPM process is based are similar to our tribal values.”

- Again, 58.6% of respondents cluster near the mid-point (37.9% agreeing slightly and 20.7% disagreeing slightly)
Findings—Cultural Fit Items

- Appropriateness to tribal setting

  “The BPM process worked well in our tribal setting.”

  - 92.9% of respondents agreed to some degree
    (28.6% agreeing slightly; 53.6% agreeing; 10.7% agreeing strongly)

  - No respondents disagreed strongly with the statement
Findings—Cultural Fit Items

- Appropriateness to tribal setting

  “I would recommend that other tribal child welfare programs use BPM.”

  - 96.8% agreed to some degree (9.7% agreeing slightly; 58.1% agreeing; 29.0% agreeing strongly)

  - Only 1 respondent disagreed slightly, and no respondents disagreed strongly with the statement.
Qualitative Themes—Cultural Fit

- Accommodating to the process and facilitator style
- Making the process our own
  - “pushing back”
  - “speaking up”
  - “We probably frustrated the facilitator”
- Melding tribal and mainstream child welfare process
  - “BPM allowed for the way we work besides following the standards”
- Coming to see all that is involved in the work
- Encouraging other tribes to use BPM
Proctor’s Implementation Outcomes

- High means in all areas (appropriateness; adoption; acceptability; feasibility; fidelity; implementation cost; penetration)
  - Cultural fit appears to be reflected in appropriateness; adoption; acceptability; and feasibility
Practice Uptake

“At this point in time, I’m still doing some things in my work in a way that is different from the BPM maps.”

- 45.2% disagreed to some degree; 54.8% agreed to some degree (m=3.48; sd=1.180)

“The BPM maps won’t really change our tribal child welfare practice that much.”

- 77.4% disagreed to some degree (different from directors’ beliefs that the maps captured current practice)
Practice Uptake

- Strong agreement on practice uptake questions:
  - “If I follow the BPM maps, it will lead to better outcomes for the children and families I work with.” (m=4.97; sd=.605)
  - “I will be more effective in my job with the BPM maps as a guide.” (m=4.87; sd=.562)
  - “I’m motivated to make any changes I need to so that I’m following the BPM maps.” (m=4.84; sd=.820)
  - “I have the skills to do my job in the way the BPM maps require me to.” (m=.490; sd=.790)
Map Development

- Strong agreement on map development questions:
  - “The BPM maps are a good representation of our tribal child welfare program’s vision and mission.” (m=5.10; sd=.539)
  - The BPM process identified areas where our team might approach its work differently.” (m=4.77; sd=.728)
  - The BPM process gave me the ‘big picture’ view of all that our tribal child welfare program does.” (m=4.81; sd=.883)
Discussion/Implications

- In the end, participants saw the worth of the process and were pleased with the outcome (BPM maps)
- Would recommend that other tribes use the process, but with the caveat that they:
  - “keep the process their own” by not simply accepting what the facilitator suggests
  - speak up or “push back” when elements of a map don’t reflect the way things are done in their approach to tribal child welfare
  - “resist” accepting a map that “simply captures doing mainstream child welfare processes” from within a tribal context
Discussion/Implications

- Tribal people are continually adapting or accommodating to non-Native processes (e.g., communicating, decision-making, interpersonal)
- However, there can be an emotional/psychological cost to adaptation
Discussion/Implications

- Among BPM participants, this adaptation was experienced as:
  - frustration
  - shut down
  - sense the process was very hard—“excruciating”, “exhausting”

- Decision-making, interpersonal and communication dimensions of BPM process may benefit from closer examination and possible modification to lessen amount of adaptation needed
BPM can benefit from examining how it can better articulate:

- differences in the approach of tribal child welfare practice as compared to that of mainstream child welfare
- cultural values, norms, and/or processes that underlie the tribe’s approach
- what makes a tribal child welfare practice model distinct from that of a mainstream model
Discussion/Implications

- Decision-making, interpersonal and communication dimensions of BPM process may benefit from closer examination and possible modification.
- BPM can benefit from examining how it can better articulate:
  - differences in the approach of tribal child welfare practice as compared to that of mainstream child welfare.
  - cultural values, norms, and/or processes that underlie the tribe’s approach.
  - what makes a tribal child welfare practice model distinct from that of a mainstream model.
Discussion/Implications

- Facilitation of BPM process is an important factor in cultural fit and acceptability.
- Quality of relationship between staff members and facilitator appears to facilitate cultural fit of BPM.
- Participants recommend that facilitation take into account:
  - tribal distinctiveness
  - different degrees of acculturation/cultural engagement among both individuals and tribal groups
  - tribal-specific decision-making, communication and interpersonal processes
Discussion/Implications

- Strengths of participants were that they:
  - were committed to completing the process and "100% participation"
  - kept goal of developing their practice model in forefront
  - stayed with the process even though it may have been unfamiliar, difficult, and at times uncomfortable
  - made communication, decision-making, and interpersonal accommodations in order to use the process to accomplish their goal
  - developed skills in articulating their tribal child welfare practice
  - increased team cohesiveness and sensitivity to the work responsibilities and skills of each team member
Questions?

• For further information:
  • [http://www.mpcwic.org](http://www.mpcwic.org)
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