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- Organizational Social Context (culture and climate)
- Research: Impact of Organizational Social Context (OSC)
- ARC model of organizational effectiveness
- Research findings
- Next steps
  - Practice
  - Research
“Many of these parents are just too stupid to be helped.”

“I felt so bad for her. She wasn’t able to fully comprehend what was happening to her child.”
WHAT WE KNOW

- Organizational Social Context (OSC) impacts client, staff, and organizational outcomes significantly.

- Organizational Social Contexts can enhance or diminish success with new innovations (EBPs, assessments, processes, system changes).

- OSC can be improved and changed.
Organizational Social Context: How is it Measured

- **Culture**
  - System norms and values
  - “The way things are done”
  - What is expected and rewarded

- **Climate**
  - Perceptions of the work environment’s psychological impact on employees
  - Affective response
  - “Is this place good or bad for me?”
Organizational Social Context Measurement System (OSC)

Organizational Culture

1. Proficiency – expectation that service providers will be competent, have up-to-date knowledge, and place the well-being of clients first

2. Rigidity – expectation that service providers will have limited discretion and flexibility, and closely follow extensive bureaucratic rules and regulations

3. Resistance – expectation that service providers will show no interest in change or new ways of providing services
RIGIDITY:
CENTRALIZATION
“Thanks, Brian, for your thoughtful and constructive proposal. Without further ado, we’ll now dive into malicious, envy-based criticism, character assassination and petty bickering!”
ORGANIZATIONAL SOCIAL CONTEXT MEASURE

Organizational Social Context Measurement System (OSC)

Organizational Climate

1. Engagement – service providers’ perceptions of their personal accomplishment, involvement with and concern for clients

2. Functionality – service providers’ perceptions of the level of cooperation and support they receive to do their jobs

3. Stress – service providers’ perceptions that they are emotionally exhausted and overloaded in their work
Research: Impact of OSC
PAST YEAR THERAPIST TURNOVER AS A FUNCTION OF CLIMATE

Hierarchical models analysis of job satisfaction (n=20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t ratio</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conditional</strong></td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>47.24</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NYC location</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational level</strong></td>
<td>Number of clinicians</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget ratio</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSC profile</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual level</strong></td>
<td>FSS</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years of experience</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.82</td>
<td>.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.89</td>
<td>.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td>-.89</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSC Profile x FSS</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEW PROGRAM SUSTAINABILITY AS A FUNCTION OF CULTURE

### Spearman Correlations between OSC (Profiles and Dimensions) and Program Level and Individual Level QI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OSC LPA Profiles- Weighted (N=21)</th>
<th>Program Level QIs (12 items+)</th>
<th>Individual Level QIs (27 items)</th>
<th>Sum of 27 Individual FPA Level QIs</th>
<th>Total Level QI and Individual Level QIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sum of 27 Individual FPA Level QIs</td>
<td>- .406</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Level QI and Individual Level QIs</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| OSC Dimensions (N = 21) | |
|-------------------------||
| Culture: | |
| Proficiency | |
| Spearman’s rho | .440 |
| Sig. (2 tailed) | .046 |
| | - .120 |
| | .604 |
| | .006 |
| | .008 |
| | .547 |
| | .010 |
| Rigidity | |
| Spearman’s rho | - .465 |
| Sig. (2 tailed) | .034 |
| | .284 |
| | .213 |
| | .026 |
| | .032 |
| | - .511 |
| | .018 |
| Resistance | |
| Spearman’s rho | - .489 |
| Sig. (2 tailed) | .025 |
| | .459 |
| | .036 |
| | .011 |
| | .012 |
| | - .557 |
| | .009 |
| Climate: | |
| Engagement | |
| Spearman’s rho | .450 |
| Sig. (2 tailed) | .041 |
| | - .197 |
| | .437 |
| | .046 |
| | .050 |
| | .481 |
| | .027 |
| Functionality | |
| Spearman’s rho | .416 |
| Sig. (2 tailed) | .061 |
| | - .347 |
| | .123 |
| | .000 |
| | .000 |
| | .684 |
| | .001 |
| Stress | |
| Spearman’s rho | - .352 |
| Sig. (2 tailed) | .118 |
| | .401 |
| | .072 |
| | .043 |
| | .045 |
| | - .467 |
| | .033 |
TOP AND BOTTOM ORGANIZATIONAL SOCIAL CONTEXT (OSC) QUARTILES

STUDIES TO DATE LINK ORGANIZATIONAL SOCIAL CONTEXT TO:

- New program sustainability
- Job satisfaction and commitment
- Staff turnover
- Service quality
- Client well-being
- Individualized care
TOOLS FOR BUILDING SOCIAL CONTEXTS

- **OSC measurement system**
  - Nationally normed measure of climate and culture that can profile your organization

- **The ARC process**
  - 18 to 24 month, intensive and empirically-proven strategy for building top-tier organizational social contexts

- **Intensive ARC Leadership Workshops**
  - 2 to 3 day workshops to understand your organization’s social context, your role in creating it, targets for change, and tools to begin change
ARC ORGANIZATIONAL INTERVENTION

- Availability
- Responsiveness
- Continuity
ARC Interventions Include

Internal Resources
- Informed, committed, actively involved upper leadership
- Dedicated ARC liaison who assumes central ARC implementation role
- Vertically integrated Organizational Action Team (OAT)

External Resources
- Trained ARC Specialist
- Onsite monthly training
- Structured ARC materials
- Video-feedback and ongoing phone consultation
- OSC and client outcome feedback systems
**ARC Strategies to Improve OSC’s**

- Embeds 5 principles of organizational effectiveness
- Installs and improves key component tools and processes to help line-level and administrators remove service barriers
- Develops positive mental models and beliefs among leadership and clinicians that support improvement and implementation efforts (e.g., psychological safety)
ARC Guiding Principles

- **Mission-driven** vs. **rule-driven** — all staff and administrative actions and decisions contribute to children’s well-being

- **Results-oriented** vs. **process-oriented** — measure staff and program performance by improvements in children’s well-being

- **Improvement-directed** vs. **status quo-oriented** — staff and administrators continually seek to be more effective

- **Relationship-centered** vs. **individual-centered** — staff and administrators focus on consumer and stakeholder relationships

- **Participation-based** vs. **authority-based** — include line-level staff and community stakeholders in key program decisions
ARC Principles: Implementation Examples

- Concept Training (multiple levels)
- Examining External/Internal drivers
- Identifying barriers and targets for change
- Organizational systems and processes compatibility
- Consultant observations (data-based) on decision and action patterns
- Linkages of ARC principles and OSC scores
Installing ARC component tools, skills, processes

Ten ARC Component Tools

- Leadership development
- Personal relationships
- Network development
- Team building
- Information & training
- Feedback
- Conflict resolution
- Goal setting
- Continuous improvement
- Job redesign
Skill and efficacy development for data usage, problem solving, meeting and teamwork facilitation, action planning...(e.g., Team building, goal setting)

Establishing and/or enhancing processes to identify and eliminate barriers (CQI, Job redesign)

Exercises and consultation to enhance communication (lessen conflict, foster effective communication (e.g., conflict management)

Introduce mechanisms for cross-level information sharing, cross-level problem solving, and increased participation of front-line (e.g., Network development)
DEVELOPING AND ENHANCING MENTAL MODELS THAT SUPPORT EFFECTIVE ORGANIZATIONAL SOCIAL CONTEXTS

- Ongoing exploration and analysis of underlying beliefs and assumptions driving staff event interpretations, decisions, rules, and behaviors of leadership

- Testing alternatives: examining ripples

- Core concept exercises, training and action planning to engender positive mental models
  - Psychological safety
  - A.R.C. to build trust
  - Feedback that drives intrinsic motivation for improvement
Foster psychological safety

“An environment in which employees at all levels feel safe to raise concerns or problems, surface mistakes made, and express new ideas. The focus is on early prevention of problems, not self-protection, impression management or punishment”
Foster psychological safety

- Provide conceptual training at all levels of staff for psychological safety
- Connect the dots: the impact and linkage of psychological safety on learning and improvement
- Explore and implement specific behaviors that promote psychological safety
- Explore fully psychological safety’s influence to organizational systems (discipline, performance appraisal, quality improvement, etc.)
- Explore deeply held beliefs that underlie psychological safety
Provide contrasting feedback models: Feedback for control versus for development

Analyze external demands that push towards ineffective feedback

Focus heavily on the meaning given to feedback (existing beliefs and norms)

Focus closely on mental models and deeply held beliefs driving one’s feedback system
Feedback model 1: Context in a motivating organization

- **Leadership/Management Behaviors:**
  - Data is shared collaboratively and safely with staff to foster improvement
  - Support is provided to help staff reach feedback goals

- **Quality of Data:**
  - Frontline staff gets feedback on client well-being that is accurate, important, and useful

- **Attitudes, Beliefs and Norms:**
  - Psychological safety exists around feedback data so that errors, mistakes, and problems at all levels are openly addressed

- **Time Perspective:**
  - Feedback about errors and problems is used to stimulate personal and organizational improvement going forward

- **Purpose/Mission:**
  - Feedback helps the organization stay focused on client well-being and creates organizational pride in reaching client success

- **Organizational Congruence:**
  - Training, discipline, rewards, and performance appraisal systems all use client feedback data to drive desired staff and organizational development

- **Goal of Feedback:**
  - The primary goal of client-based feedback is learning, improvement, and mastery

- Feedback that drives learning and improvement
  - Taps into intrinsic motivation
Feedback model 2: Context in a controlling organization

Feedback that drives control and monitoring

- Extrinsically driven with a lost sense of purpose

Leadership/Management Behaviors:
- Leaders provide minimal discretion, control, or collaboration with staff regarding feedback data
- Data is used to monitor and control staff behavior

Time Perspective:
- Feedback about errors and mistakes is used primarily to focus on the past and punish poor performance

Purpose/Mission:
- Feedback data is primarily gathered to address funder, regulatory, or other external stakeholders’ needs

Goal of Feedback:
- The primary goal of client-based feedback is to monitor and control the behavior of staff

Organizational Congruence:
- Training, discipline, rewards, and performance appraisal systems are not tied to client well-being outcomes

Attitudes, Beliefs and Norms:
- Errors and poor results are hidden, ignored or used to blame others. Poor results lead to more rules that increasingly restrict staff discretion

Quality of Data:
- Frontline staff receives little feedback on client well-being or the feedback received isn’t important to leadership, isn’t accurate, or leads to goals that can’t be achieved

OAT
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SUMMARY: WHAT IS ARC DOING?

- Embedding empirically supported ARC principles to guide organizational effectiveness
- Identifying and addressing conflicts, system failures, and core problems, as well as underlying beliefs and norms that prevent positive change
- Applying on-the-job tools, processes, and proven organizational components that guide organizational improvement and change
- Altering and expanding mental models, beliefs, decisions, and practices to achieve increased effectiveness
- Changing the framing, expectations, perceptions, and way staff and leaders think and behave
- Enhancing norms, practices, and climates to match highly effective organizational social contexts
Results of ARC Intervention

- ARC reduced turnover (39%) vs. control (69%)
- ARC improved climate in both urban and rural teams
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARC</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34% (52/152)</td>
<td>22% (31/139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20% (34/169)</td>
<td>16% (22/136)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27% (86/321)</td>
<td>19% (53/275)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HLM analysis of MST x ARC interaction effect on problem behavior at 6 months

**Theoretical Model: ARC Linking Mechanisms**

**ARC**
- Proficiency Culture
- Engagement Climate

**Organizational Level**
- Job-related EBP Barriers
- EBP Adoption

**Individual Level**
- EBP Intentions
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STUDY TIMELINE

Time 1
Baseline

ARC Intervention Period

Time 2
24 months
Proficiency Culture
Engagement Climate

Time 3
36 months
EBP Intentions
ARC Fidelity

Time 4
48 months
T&W barriers
P&P barriers
EBP adoption
% clients treated using EBPs
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**ARC Main Effects on EBP Antecedents and EBP Adoption**

- **Time 1** Baseline: No difference in OSC Profile between ARC and control.
- **ARC Intervention Period**
  - **Time 2** 24 months: ARC clinicians report more improved proficiency cultures ($d = .96$).
  - **Time 3** 36 months: ARC clinicians report higher EBP intentions ($d = .48$).
  - **Time 4** 48 months: ARC clinicians report:
    - lower policy and procedure EBP barriers ($d = -.62$),
    - higher odds of adopting 1 or more EBPs (OR = 3.94), and
    - greater use of EBPs with clients (81% vs. 55%).
A modified model of ARC linking mechanisms

- Individual Level
  - EBP Intentions
  - Job-Related EBP Barriers
- Organizational Level
  - ARC
  - Proficiency Culture
  - EBP Adoption
CMHSRC ONGOING DIRECTIONS

- Partnering with researchers
  - ARC and EBP implementation, study design and analysis
  - Organizational Social Context measurement system

- Partnering with practitioners
  - OSC measurement and consultation
  - Leadership training workshops (ARC Leadership Institute)
  - ARC interventions