Strengths Model Fidelity Scale

Domain 1. *Caseload Ratios*					
	1	2	3	4	5
1) Average caseload size for the team.	≥ 32	28-31	24-27	20-23	≤ 19
Domain 2. *Community Contact*					
	1	2	3	4	5
2) Percentage of client contact that occurs in the community.	$\leq$ 49% or information cannot be determined	50-64%	65-74%	75-84%	$\geq 85\%$

Domain 3. *Strengths-Based Group Supervision*

	1	2	3	4	5
3a) Group supervision occurs once a week lasting between 90 minutes and 2 hours.	Does not occur	< 1 hour per week, or less than once per week	1 hour, once per week	90 minutes, once per week	$\geq$ 2 hours, once per week
3b) Group supervision focuses primarily on discussion of clients rather than administrative tasks.	$\leq$ 40% client-focused	41-50% client-focused	51-69% client-focused	70-79% client-focused	$\geq$ 80% client-focused
3c) A specific set of clients are presented using the formal group supervision process.	Formal group supervision not used		1 client presented	2 clients presented	$\geq$ 3 clients presented
3d) Strengths Assessments are distributed to each team member for all presentations.	Never		Occasionally		Always
3e) The direct service worker clearly states the client's goal(s) during the presentation.	Never		Occasionally		Always
3f) The direct service worker clearly states what they want help with from the group during the presentation.	Never		Occasionally		Always
3g) The team asks constructive questions based on the client's Strengths Assessment during the presentation.	No questions are based on the client's SA		Minority of questions are based on the client's SA		Majority of questions are based on the client's SA
3h) The team brainstorms constructive suggestions related to the Strengths Assessment to help the client achieve their goal or help the direct service worker engage with the client and/or develop a goal.	0-4 ideas per presentation	5-9 ideas per presentation	10-14 ideas per presentation	15-19 ideas per presentation	$\geq$ 20 ideas per presentation

3i) At the end of each presentation, the presenting staff person will: • State when they will see the person next or their plan to contact the person (and) • State what ideas they will present to the person or what strategy they will use to engage with the person	No plan, next steps, or strategy clearly stated in any presentation		Clear plan, next steps, or strategy stated in some presentations		Clear plan, next steps, or strategy clearly stated in all presentations

Domain 4. *Supervisor*					
	1	2	3	4	5
4a) Supervisor spends at least 2 hours per week providing a quality review of tools related to the Strengths Model (i.e. Strengths Assessments and Personal Recovery Plans) and integration of these tools into actual practice.	$\leq$ 29 minutes	30-59 minutes	60-89 minutes	90-119 minutes	$\geq$ 2 hours
4b) Supervisor spends at least 2 hours per week giving direct service workers specific and structured feedback on skills/tools related to the Strengths Model of case management.	$\leq$ 29 minutes	30-59 minutes	60-89 minutes	90-119 minutes	$\geq$ 2 hours
4c) Supervisor spends at least 2 hours per week providing field mentoring for direct service workers.	$\leq$ 29 minutes	30-59 minutes	60-89 minutes	90-119 minutes	$\geq$ 2 hours
4d) Ratio of direct service workers to supervisor.	$\geq$ 9:1	8:1	7:1	6:1	$\leq$ 5:1

Domain 5. *Strengths Assessment*					
	1	2	3	4	5
5a) There is evidence that the Strengths Assessment (SA) is used regularly in practice.	$\leq$ 60% used and updated at least monthly	61-70% used and updated at least monthly	71-80% used and updated at least monthly	81-90% used and updated at least monthly	91-100% used and updated at least monthly
5b) Client interests and/or aspirations are identified with detail and specificity.	$\leq$ 60% identified at least 3	61-70% identified at least 3	71-80% identified at least 3	81-90% identified at least 3	91-100% identified at least 3
5c) Client language is used (e.g. "I want more friends" rather than "increase socialization skills") and it is clear that the client was involved in developing the SA.	$\leq$ 60% demonstrate predominant use of client language	61-70% demonstrate predominant use of client language	71-80% demonstrate predominant use of client language	81-90% demonstrate predominant use of client language	91-100% demonstrate predominant use of client language
5d) Talents and/or skills are listed on the SA in some detail and specificity.	$\leq$ 60% identified at least 6	61-70% identified at least 6	71-80% identified at least 6	81-90% identified at least 6	91-100% identified at least 6
5e) Environmental strengths are listed on the SA in some detail and specificity.	$\leq$ 60% identified at least 6	61-70% identified at least 6	71-80% identified at least 6	81-90% identified at least 6	91-100% identified at least 6
5f) Percent of clients who have a Strengths Assessment.	$\leq$ 60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%

Domain 6. *Integration of Strengths Assessment with Treatment Plan*

	1	2	3	4	5
6) Strengths Assessment is used to help clients develop treatment plan goals.	$\leq$ 60% of treatment plan goals link directly to the SA	61-70% of treatment plan goals link directly to the SA	71-80% of treatment plan goals link directly to the SA	81-90% of treatment plan goals link directly to the SA	91-100% of treatment plan goals link directly to the SA

Domain 7. *Personal Recovery Plan*

	1	2	3	4	5
7a) Agency uses the Personal Recovery Plan (PRP) as a tool for helping clients achieve goals.	Not used	1-25% of clients used a PRP in the last 90 days	26-50% of clients used a PRP in the last 90 days	51-75% of clients used a PRP in the last 90 days	$\geq$ 76% of clients used a PRP in the last 90 days
Only rate items 7b through 7e if the agency stated they use the Personal Recovery Plan; otherwise, the rating for 7a will serve as the final rating for this item.					
7b) Goals on the PRP should use the client's own language, the actual passion statement, and state why the goal is important to the person.	$\leq$ 44% of goals use client's language	45-59% of goals use client's language	60-74% of goals use client's language	75-89% of goals use client's language	$\geq$ 90% of goals use client's language

7c) Long-term goal on the PRP is broken down into smaller, measurable steps.	$\leq$ 44% of steps on the PRP are broken down and measurable	45-59% of steps on the PRP are broken down and measurable	60-74% of steps on the PRP are broken down and measurable	75-89% of steps on the PRP are broken down and measurable	$\geq$ 90% of steps on the PRP are broken down and measurable
7d) Specific and varying target dates are set for each step on the PRP.	$\leq$ 44% of dates on the PRP are specific and have variation	45-59% of dates on the PRP are specific and have variation	60-74% of dates on the PRP are specific and have variation	75-89% of dates on the PRP are specific and have variation	$\geq$ 90% of dates on the PRP are specific and have variation
7e) There is evidence that PRPs are used during nearly every contact with the client.	$\leq$ 44% of PRPs are used nearly every contact with the client	45-59% of PRPs are used nearly every contact with the client	60-74% of PRPs are used nearly every contact with the client	75-89% of PRPs are used nearly every contact with the client	$\geq$ 90% of PRPs are used nearly every contact with the client

Domain 8. *Naturally Occurring Resources*

	1	2	3	4	5
8a) Direct service workers help clients access naturally occurring resources to help people achieve goals.	$\leq$ 10% of goals have evidence of the direct service worker helping to access at least one naturally occurring resource	11-25% of goals have evidence of the direct service worker helping to access at least one naturally occurring resource	26-40% of goals have evidence of the direct service worker helping to access at least one naturally occurring resource	41-75% of goals have evidence of the direct service worker helping to access at least one naturally occurring resource	$\geq$ 76% of goals have evidence of the direct service worker helping to access at least one naturally occurring resource
8b) Direct service workers use more naturally occurring resources than formal mental health resources to help people achieve goals.	$\leq$ 10% of goals clearly reflect a trend toward the use of naturally occurring resources	11-25% of goals clearly reflect a trend toward the use of naturally occurring resources	26-40% of goals clearly reflect a trend toward the use of naturally occurring resources	41-75% of goals clearly reflect a trend toward the use of naturally occurring resources	$\geq$ 76% of goals clearly reflect a trend toward the use of naturally occurring resources

Domain 9. *Hope Inducing Practice*

	1	2	3	4	5
9a) Direct service workers' interactions with people are directed toward movement on a goal that is meaningful and important to the person.	Direct service worker actively detracts from movement on a goal that is meaningful and important to the person	Direct service worker discourages movement on a goal that is meaningful and important to the person	Direct service worker is neutral relative to movement on a goal that is meaningful and important to the person	Direct service worker is accepting and supportive of movement on a goal that is meaningful and important to the person	Direct service worker actively contributes to movement on a goal that is meaningful and important to the person
9b) Direct service workers' interactions with people are directed toward expanding the person's autonomy and choice.	Direct service worker actively detracts from or denies client's perception of choice or control	Direct service worker discourages client's perception of choice or responds to it superficially	Direct service worker is neutral relative to client autonomy and choice	Direct service worker is accepting and supportive of client autonomy	Direct service worker adds significantly to the feeling and meaning of client's expression of autonomy in such a way as to markedly expand client's experience of own control and choice

Team Fidelity Ratings over Time

Team	Baseline	6 months	12 months	18 months	24 months	36 months
A.1	17.94	21.81	21.26	33.19	22.03	31.58
A.2	24.57	27.67	30.93	30.02	30.86	31.88
B	24.81	29.03	31.06	34.29	33.01	34.11
C	23.63	29.54	32.22	37.07	36.29	37.07
D	14.00	17.22	22.64	18.42		
E.1	14.50	18.61	25.98	23.80	26.76	33.49
E.2	14.50	19.61	27.42	27.72	25.55	32.02
E.3	15.50	22.01	27.48	29.04	29.16	31.24
E.4			28.00	26.67	26.96	30.97
E.5	31.07	29.47				
F.1	19.50	27.66	28.59	27.13	28.22	31.02
F.2	14.50	26.59	29.91	28.39	26.05	32.03
F.3	24.84	29.33	28.39	28.37	26.82	30.57
G	27.85	34.40	37.40	32.71	34.60	36.49

Notes. Total fidelity scores are presented for each team and time point, for the seven sites (A to G). Total scores can range from 8 to 40. A score of 32 or higher indicated high fidelity. Domain scores were the mean of that domain's items. Domain scores were summed for a total fidelity rating (based on 8 domains since Domain 6 was excluded). Site D dropped out of the study early; hence, fidelity scores are missing for 24 months and 36 months. In Site E, the teams were re-organized in the middle of the study; hence, missing fidelity assessments for some Site E teams.