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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction The American Bar Association Commission on Law and Aging (ABA-COLA), aided by the National Center for State Courts (NCSC), is conducting a project to establish, expand, and enhance state Working Interdisciplinary Networks of Guardianship Stakeholders (WINGS). The project is funded by a generous grant from the Administration on Community Living, US Department of Health and Human Services (ACL-DHHS). The goal is to strengthen the capacity of WINGS to avoid unnecessary guardianship, prevent and address abuses, develop protections less restrictive than guardianship, and advance guardianship reforms to enhance the self-determination, health, and safety of individuals who need decision-making support.

The project solicited sub-grant proposals from all state court systems interested in establishing a WINGS or enhancing an existing WINGS. Eight states were awarded sub-grants. One, because of changed circumstances, did not move forward as planned, leaving Alabama, Alaska, Florida, Idaho, Indiana, Oregon, and Utah as the “project WINGS.”

Building on its 2015 assessment of the seven original WINGS, NCSC conducted an evaluation of the project WINGS. The evaluation addressed seven topics:

- The issues addressed
- The focus of training offered
- The factors contributing to and hindering effectiveness
- Future challenges
- The measures utilized to assess success
- The value of the technical assistance and training provided by ABA-COLA and NCSC, and
- The likely sustainability of each project WINGS.

Approach The evaluation included four data-gathering efforts: two web-based surveys, one early in the project (“baseline survey”) and the second after about 20 months of project-related activities; interviews of the project WINGS coordinators; and a review of the program reports and strategic plans submitted by each project WINGS. This report presents the integrated results of these data-gathering efforts for each of the evaluation topics, followed by a set of observations and recommendations.

Results Issues Addressed: All the project WINGS have sponsored training during the project period. Four have taken steps—including supporting legislation—to facilitate use of supported decision-making. Another set of four have developed websites and/or written materials to better inform members of the public about guardianship and less restrictive options. Two have taken steps to improve monitoring.

Unsurprisingly, the issues addressed by the project WINGS differed, to some extent, from those rated very or extremely important in the baseline survey. These differences are a positive result of the extensive fact-gathering, consultation, and prioritization conducted by each of the WINGS.

Focus of Training Offered: During the course of the project, the project WINGS used a variety of methods for determining the issues to be addressed and who should receive training. The types of individuals who received training were largely similar to those identified in the initial baseline survey.

Factors Contributing to and Hindering Effectiveness: Six coordinators cited strong leadership and staff as a significant factor facilitating the effectiveness of their WINGS. Four also noted the importance of previous interagency relationships. The WINGS in one of these four states had been operating for several years before the initiation of the project. In two of the others, the WINGS grew out of a previously established task force. Three coordinators indicated that their WINGS were aided by the urgency of the issues, and one stated that the national attention and funding provided by the project generated needed commitment and action.

A key concern for all the WINGS was keeping stakeholders engaged and active. The stakeholders that did not participate or act as observers varied across the states.
Other challenges encountered and addressed during the project included: the difficulty in securing participation by a state or regional liaison from the Social Security Administration (SSA) (5 states); gaining bar association support for use of supported decision-making and other less restrictive options (2 states); and public lack of understanding of what guardians and conservators can and cannot do (1 state).

**Future Challenges:** Coordinators also were asked about what challenges they expected in the coming years. Not unexpectedly, the most common was sustainability. For most, the challenge of sustainability is a mix of issues about funding, organization, and maintaining the relationship among the stakeholders. Other anticipated challenges cited included:

- Obtaining and analyzing data regarding guardianships/conservatorships and the use of less restrictive options
- Setting priorities among the myriad of current and evolving issues
- Dealing with the increasing volume of cases as the population ages
- The differing practices and attitudes in rural and urban areas of the state, and
- Getting the courts, legislature, and public to place protection of vulnerable adults at the same level of importance as the protection of vulnerable children.

**The Measures Used to Determine Success:** Each coordinator considered their WINGS to have been successful. As part of their strategic plans, the WINGS were asked to include measures for each strategic objective. The measures listed were almost all “process measures” – i.e. measures seeking to answer the question “have we done what we said we would do.” A few instances “outcome measures” were included, but none of the evaluation components addressed impact.

The reliance on process measures is entirely understandable. Most of the project WINGS were focused on getting organized, setting priorities, and/or demonstrating their capacity to use the funds and energy generated through the grant to produce something tangible. Besides, designing outcome and especially impact evaluations is difficult, and the data needed for such evaluations was often not available. Technical assistance by the project was provided to some of the states on developing evaluation criteria, but they were not able to develop the necessary data-gathering capacity within the project period.

**The Value of the Technical Assistance and Training Provided by ABA-COLA and NCSC:** Formal technical assistance and training was more limited than was anticipated. This was due, in part, to the types of requests received and, in part, to the departure mid-stream of the initial NCSC project director who was primarily responsible for providing technical assistance on outcome measurement and strategic planning. However, the WINGS requested and were provided information throughout the project. The coordinators’ view of the assistance correlated with the amount of assistance received. That is, those receiving the most, rated it highly. Those receiving the least rated the usefulness of the assistance negatively, and those who received some, but not a lot, were neutral. The mixed ratings did not diminish the desire for additional assistance.

**The Likely Sustainability of Each Project WINGS:** Four of the project WINGS have secured at least some on-going funding. In another, appropriations and staffing have been shifted to the court visitor program that was a major focus of the state’s WINGS, and the WINGS’ member agencies are being asked to take responsibility for overseeing on-going WINGS’ activities.

The coordinators of all but one of the project WINGS anticipate that their WINGS and other WINGS will continue indefinitely, although the intensity of activity may ebb and flow. This expectation is based on the number and complexity of guardianship issues and their constant evolution.

**Observations and Recommendations** Citing a 2011 article by John Kania and Mark Kramer, the 2015 assessment of the initial set of WINGS noted that coordinated cross-sector

---

1 ABA-COLA was responsible for providing information and assistance in other areas.

2 Richard Van Duizend & Brenda K. Uekert, *Assessment of the Impact and Efficacy of*
action is far more effective in creating systemic change than interventions by a single agency or organization. Kania and Kramer term the result of such coordinated action as “collective impact” and state that five conditions must be present in order for such impact to result:

• A shared vision for change
• Shared measurement systems
• Mutually reinforcing activities
• Continuous communication, and
• Backbone support.  

The following recommendations are based on the degree to which the project WINGS are meeting these conditions and on the support required to assure continued success by all current and future WINGS.

• 1: A more detailed WINGS-specific strategic planning guide should be prepared and distributed to enable WINGS to more easily develop, use, and update strategic plans. The guide should build on the outline and materials produced during the project by including specific suggested exercises for creating vision and mission statements, a detailed discussion of the various types of measures with suggested exercises for developing evaluation criteria directly related to the WINGS’ goals and strategies, and instruction on utilizing the results of the evaluation to establish a continuous improvement process.

• 2: An effort should be undertaken to develop a practical, meaningful, and valid set of measures regarding the impact on vulnerable individuals, their caregivers, and the courts of the changes implemented through WINGS, such as the use of less restrictive options to guardianship, including supported decision making. The development effort should include the full range of guardianship stakeholders.

• 3: The changing structures and memberships of state WINGS should be tracked to identify and share the various models, their effectiveness, their impact upon the level of mutually reinforcing activities, and the lessons learned.

• 4: The ABA Commission on Law and Aging or some other entity should host periodic on-line networking calls among all WINGS coordinators willing to participate, to provide an opportunity to exchange information on new developments, programs and legislation and discuss common current and anticipated issues.

• 5: The ABA Commission on Law and Aging or some other entity should receive funding to provide continued technical assistance, training, networking, informational, and advocacy support to state WINGS.

In conclusion, the past six years have proven that WINGS are a highly effective means for bringing the disparate guardianship stakeholders together in a state to address key issues regarding guardianship and generate significant legislative and programmatic change. They have accomplished much, but as the list of issues in the project WINGS’ strategic plans demonstrate, there is much left to do, particularly in the areas of changing everyday practices and determining the impact of the changes. A solid foundation has been laid, but the building needs to continue. The speed and strength of this construction can be greatly aided by the provision of the tools, information, networking, and other back-up support recommended above.

---


4 https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/law_aging/2017_strtgc_%20actn_plnn_%20fntl_%20wth_pp.pdf
INTRODUCTION

The American Bar Association Commission on Law and Aging (ABA-COLA), aided by the National Center for State Courts (NCSC), is conducting a project to establish, expand, and enhance state Working Interdisciplinary Networks of Guardianship Stakeholders (WINGS). The project is funded by a generous grant from the Administration on Community Living, US Department of Health and Human Services (ACL-DHHS). The goal is to strengthen the capacity of WINGS to avoid unnecessary guardianship, prevent and address abuses, develop protections less restrictive than guardianship,\(^5\) and advance guardianship reforms that will enhance the self-determination, health, and safety of individuals who need decision-making support.

The project invited all state court systems to submit sub-grant proposals to establish a WINGS or enhance an existing WINGS. Eight states were awarded sub-grants. One, because of changed circumstances, move forward as planned. Four states formed new WINGS partnerships, in some cases building on existing stakeholder groups:

- Alabama Administrative Office of the Courts (AL)
- Alaska Court System (AK)
- Florida Office of the State Courts Administrator (FL)
- Idaho Supreme Court (ID)

Three states enhanced WINGS that had been operating for several years:

- Indiana Supreme Court (IN)
- Oregon Judicial Department (OR), and
- Utah Administrative Office of the Courts (UT).

These seven WINGS are referred to in this report as the “project WINGS.”

Building on its 2015 assessment of the seven original WINGS, NCSC conducted an evaluation of the project WINGS. The evaluation addressed seven topics regarding each project WINGS:

- The issues addressed,
- The focus of training offered,
- The factors contributing to and hindering effectiveness,
- Future challenges,
- The measures utilized to assess success,
- The value of the technical assistance/training provided by ABA-COLA and NCSC, and
- The likely sustainability of each project WINGS.

\(^5\) Throughout this report, the terms guardianship and guardian are intended to include both guardians of person and guardians of property, in many states called conservatorship and conservator.
APPROACH

The evaluation included four data-gathering efforts:

1. A web-based survey was sent to the coordinator of each of the project WINGS early in the project period (June 28, 2017). This initial survey was intended to establish baseline information and identify areas in which technical assistance and information would be helpful. Although only a single response was requested from each participating state, the coordinators were urged to consult with members of their steering committee in formulating their answers to the survey questions. Complete responses were received from each state. The survey instrument is contained in Appendix A.

2. A second web-based survey was sent to each coordinator after about 20 months of project-related activity (March 7, 2019). The second survey sought information on the structure, effectiveness, impact, and future of the project WINGS and the technical assistance and training provided by NCSC and ABA-COLA. The survey instrument is contained in Appendix B.

3. The project evaluator reviewed the program reports and strategic plans submitted by each project WINGS to identify the topics addressed, the activities undertaken, and the assessment measures used.

4. Finally, the seven project-WINGS coordinators were interviewed in-person or via telephone. The interviews sought in-depth explanations of the processes used by each WINGS, their achievements and challenges, the factors contributing to their effectiveness, and their plans and needs for the future. The interview protocol is contained in Appendix C.

This report presents the integrated results of these data-gathering efforts for each of the evaluation topics, followed by a set of observations and recommendations.

---

6 The respondents to the surveys and interviews were promised that their answers were not for attribution.
RESULTS

1. **Issues Addressed:** In the baseline survey, the coordinators of each of the project WINGS were asked to indicate the level of importance in their state of 12 guardianship-related issues using a five-point scale with 1 equaling “Not Important” and 5 equaling “Extremely Important.” Unsurprisingly, the issues subsequently identified in their strategic plans and then acted upon differed, to some extent, from those rated very or extremely important in the baseline survey. These differences are a positive result of the extensive fact-gathering, consultation, and prioritization conducted by each of the WINGS. Table 1 sets forth the issues rated the highest at the outset of the project, those subsequently listed in each of the Strategic Plans, and which of the Strategic Plan issues were addressed during the project period.

*Table 1 Guardianship-Related Issues Identified at the Beginning of the Project and in the Strategic Plan Developed by Each WINGS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Issues Rated Most Important on Baseline Survey</th>
<th>Issues Identified in WINGS Strategic Plan (* indicates action taken)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Alabama| Collaboration Among Guardianship Stakeholders | Training on Less Restrictive Options*  
Developing & Disseminating Information to the Public*  
Tracking Guardianships*  
Certifying Guardians*  
Recruiting Persons to Serve as Guardians  
Identifying & Addressing Abuse and Exploitation  
Improving Monitoring |
| Alaska | Use of Less Restrictive Options  
Identifying & Tracking Existing Guardianships  
Identifying Abuse and/or Exploitation  
Providing Training & Information | Training on Less Restrictive Options*  
Promoting Statewide Uniformity of Practice*  
Strengthening Tracking of Guardian/Conservator Expenses*  
Increasing Communication & Coordination Among Stakeholders*  
Implementing Supported Decision-making*  
Improving Monitoring |
| Florida| Identifying & Tracking Existing Guardianships  
Providing Public Guardians  
Providing Training & Information | Training on Less Restrictive Options*  
Developing Tools to Encourage Use of Less Restrictive Options*  
Recruiting Qualified Examiners*  
Developing & Disseminating Information to the Public*  
Promoting Statewide Uniformity of Practice  
Improving Monitoring  
Enhancing Coordination with SSA  
Improving Tracking of Restoration of Rights |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Issues Rated Most Important on Baseline Survey</th>
<th>Issues Identified in WINGS Strategic Plan (* indicates action taken)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identifying &amp; Tracking Existing Guardianships&lt;br&gt;Availability of Less Restrictive Options&lt;br&gt;Use of Less Restrictive Options&lt;br&gt;Identifying Abuse and/or Exploitation&lt;br&gt;Assuring Quality Representation</td>
<td>Training on Less Restrictive Options*&lt;br&gt;Improved Monitoring*&lt;br&gt;Implementing Supported Decision-making*&lt;br&gt;Developing Tools to Encourage Use of Less Restrictive Options&lt;br&gt;Recruiting Persons to Serve as Guardians&lt;br&gt;Establishing Public Guardians&lt;br&gt;Certifying Professional Guardians&lt;br&gt;Provide ADR opportunities for higher conflict cases&lt;br&gt;Enhancing representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Use of Less Restrictive Options&lt;br&gt;Addressing Abuse and/or Exploitation&lt;br&gt;Identifying Qualified Guardians</td>
<td>Training on Less Restrictive Options*&lt;br&gt;Implementing Supported Decision-making*&lt;br&gt;Improving Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Use of Less Restrictive Options&lt;br&gt;Identifying &amp; Tracking Existing Guardianships&lt;br&gt;Providing Training &amp; Information&lt;br&gt;Effectively Monitoring Existing Guardianships&lt;br&gt;Identifying Abuse and/or Exploitation</td>
<td>Developing &amp; Disseminating Information to the Public*&lt;br&gt;Implementing Supported Decision-making*&lt;br&gt;Training on Less Restrictive Options*&lt;br&gt;Tracking Guardianships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Availability of Less Restrictive Options&lt;br&gt;Identifying &amp; Tracking Existing Guardianships&lt;br&gt;Addressing Abuse and/or Exploitation&lt;br&gt;Providing Training &amp; Information</td>
<td>Training on Less Restrictive Options*&lt;br&gt;Improving Monitoring*&lt;br&gt;Developing &amp; Disseminating Information to the Public*&lt;br&gt;Increasing Representation*&lt;br&gt;Tracking Guardianship&lt;br&gt;Promoting Statewide Uniformity of Practice including in the Tribal Courts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In sum, all of the project WINGS have sponsored training during the project period. Four have taken steps including promoting legislation to facilitate use of supported decision-making (AK, ID, IN, OR). Another set of four have developed websites and/or written materials to better inform members of the public about guardianship and less restrictive options (AL, FL, OR, UT). Two have taken steps to improve monitoring (ID, UT).

2. **Focus of Training Offered:** In the baseline survey, the WINGS coordinators were asked for whom training should be provided. During the course of the project, the project WINGS used a variety of methods for determining the issues to be addressed and who actually should receive training. These included:
   - Public Forums/Town Halls/Listening Sessions/Focus Groups (AL, AK, FL, OR)
   - Surveys (AL, AK, FL, OR)
   - Interviews (OR)
- Stakeholder Summits (FL, OR)
- Steering Committee Review (AL, AK, FL, ID, IN, UT)
- Full WINGS Review (AL, AK, FL, ID, OR, UT)

As shown in Table 2, the initial projections were largely confirmed by the subsequent information-gathering and analysis.

### Table 2 Anticipated and Actual Training Recipients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Anticipated Priority Training Recipients</th>
<th>Actual Training Recipients During the Project Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Court Visitors/Investigators/Examiners, Potential Guardians, Appointed Guardians, Judges, Aging &amp; Disability Professionals</td>
<td>Newly appointed Guardians &amp; Conservators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Judges, Persons under Guardianship/Self Advocates, Law Enforcement/First Responders/Medical Professionals</td>
<td>Judges, Attorneys, Family Guardians, Law Enforcement/First Responders/Medical Professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Attorneys in Guardianship Proceedings, Judges, Aging &amp; Disability Professionals</td>
<td>Attorneys in Guardianship Proceedings, Judges, Social Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Appointed Guardians, Judges, Guardians ad litem, Attorneys in Guardianship Proceedings, Aging &amp; Disability Professionals, Adult Protective Services Personnel</td>
<td>Judges, Attorneys, Guardians ad litem, Aging &amp; Disability Professionals, Adult Protective Services Personnel, Volunteer Guardians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Court Visitors/Investigators/Examiners, Attorneys in Guardianship Proceedings, Judges</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Planning for extensive training of trainers about less restrictive options was underway.

3. **Factors Contributing to and Hindering Effectiveness**: In the second survey, the coordinators were asked what factors facilitated the effectiveness of their WINGS. Six cited strong leadership and staff support. Four also noted the importance of previous interagency
relationships. The WINGS in one of these four states had been operating for several years before the initiation of the project. In two of the others, the WINGS grew out of a previously established task force. Three coordinators indicated that their WINGS were aided by the urgency of the issues (e.g., supported decision-making, the need for coordination), and one stated that the national attention and funding provided by the project generated needed commitment and action.

A key concern for all the WINGS was keeping stakeholders engaged and active. The stakeholders that did not participate or act as observers varied across the states. Coordinators used a number of approaches to maintain and increase stakeholder involvement including:

- Sending periodic e-mail or hosting conference call updates
- Ensuring that meetings are tightly run and do not stray beyond the time scheduled
- Contacting stakeholders individually to obtain their input
- Accommodating members' schedules to the greatest extent possible, and
- Engendering discussions of current trends and litigation.

Other challenges encountered and addressed during the project period were:

- The difficulty of securing participation by a state or regional liaison from the Social Security Administration (SSA) (5 states)
- Gaining bar association support for use of supported decision-making and other less restrictive options (2 states), and
- Public lack of understanding of what guardians and conservators can and cannot do (1 state).

One state secured SSA participation by asking the state office to discuss the representative payee and other programs. In another, a regional SSA representative attended a WINGS meeting. Bar association concerns were addressed by offering educational workshops, consultation, and discussion with practitioners and bar leaders. Public understanding is being enhanced through the production and broad distribution of explanatory pamphlets and the creation of public information websites concerning guardianship.

4. Future Challenges: Coordinators also were asked about what challenges they expected in the coming years. Not unexpectedly, the most common was sustainability (five states). In most, the challenge of sustainability included a mix of issues regarding funding, organization, and maintaining the relationship among the stakeholders.

With regards to funding, one state has created a replicable approach, by increasing fees on the filing of guardianship and conservatorship cases and reports and allocating the funds from
the fee increase to support its WINGS and its guardianship reform activities. An innovative long-term solution being pursued in another state is the planned creation of a Commission on Guardianship that, among other responsibilities, would provide training and certification for guardians, conservators, and guardians ad litem, charging a fee for these services. The membership of the Commission would include many of the stakeholders on the state’s WINGS, but the extent to which it would function like a WINGS as a body to develop and promote changes in the state’s guardianship processes and practices is not clear. In the short term, the WINGS in that state has obtained grant funding from a bar foundation.

The organization issue includes the size of the WINGS – e.g., in one state a 50-person stakeholder group has proven to be both expensive and unwieldy. In another, adding representatives from each judicial district is seen as way of facilitating implementation and broadening understanding of the issues and solutions. In a third state, the organization question is whether implementation activities will be controlled centrally by WINGS-based staff, or whether stakeholder agencies will take on the responsibility for specific projects.

One state, because of pending changes in stakeholder representatives, is attempting to address the relationship challenge by conducting “facilitated leadership training” to build teamwork, collaboration, and leadership skills among WINGS members as the current set of leaders and representatives retire or move on to other responsibilities.

Other anticipated challenges were cited during the interviews, but none by more than one state. They included:
- Obtaining and analyzing data regarding guardianships/conservatorships and the use of less restrictive options
- Setting priorities among the myriad of current and evolving issues
- Dealing with the increasing volume of cases as the population ages
- The differing practices and attitudes in rural and urban areas of the state, and most intriguingly,
- Getting the courts, legislature, and public to place protection of vulnerable adults at the same level of importance as the protection of vulnerable children.

5. The Measures Used to Determine Success: Each of the coordinators considered their WINGS to have been successful. The most common response was “We got things done” followed by a list of the very significant accomplishments (e.g., legislation) and products (training, toolkits, bench cards, websites) produced during the project period. As part of their strategic plans, each WINGS was asked to include measures for each strategic objective.
Corresponding to their answer to the question about success, the measures listed were almost all “process measures” – i.e. measures seeking to answer the question “have we done what we said we would do.” For example:

- Informational materials on decision-making options produced and distributed to judges
- Toolkits on identifying and reporting abuse, neglect, and exploitation produced and distributed to first responders
- Supported decision-making legislation passed and signed
- Training sessions conducted
- Volunteer monitoring program established or expanded.

In a few instances “outcome measures” were included – i.e. measures seeking to assess the short-term results of the actions taken. Examples include:

- The number of individuals attending a town hall meeting
- The number of judges and attorneys attending training
- The number of views on a WINGS website
- The number of cases investigated by volunteer monitors

None of the evaluation components in the WINGS’ plans addressed impact – i.e. what difference have the results of the activities made – e.g.:

- Change in the number of limited guardianship orders issued
- Change in the number of reports of possible abuse or exploitation by guardians
- Change in the proportion of the eligible population that is under full guardianship, and most importantly
- The impact of reforms and programs on the well-being of persons under guardianship and using less restrictive options has improved

The reliance on process measures is entirely understandable. Most of the project WINGS were focused on getting organized, setting priorities, and/or demonstrating their capacity to use the funds and energy generated through the grant to produce something tangible; the WINGS that had been operating prior to the project were in the midst of major legislative or programmatic efforts during the project period. Besides, designing outcome and especially impact evaluations is difficult, and the data needed for such evaluations was often not available. Technical assistance by the project was provided to some of the states on developing evaluation criteria, but they were not able to develop the necessary data-gathering capacity within the project period. Going forward, however, it will be essential for institutionalizing the reforms and improvements that WINGS are seeking to implement to determine and demonstrate how, for example, supported decision-making is affecting the well-being of vulnerable adults, what changes in practice have resulted from training, and how those changes are affecting the process and those involved in the process.
The coordinators recognized this need. Table 3 displays the responses received on the second survey regarding whether they are planning to measure the impact of their WINGS’ accomplishments in five critical areas:

### Table 3 Planned Areas of Evaluation of the Impact of WINGS’ Accomplishments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons Alleged to Need Guardianship</th>
<th>Persons Subject to Guardianship</th>
<th>Use of Less Restrictive Options</th>
<th>Court Processes</th>
<th>Legal Practice Related to Guardianship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 states</td>
<td>4 states</td>
<td>7 states</td>
<td>7 states</td>
<td>3 states</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The impediments they see in being able to carry out these impact evaluations are:

- The lack of an accurate centralized database (whether at the state or county level) including the difficulty of convincing state supreme courts and state court administrators to add data points to statewide court information systems and persuading clerks to enter more detailed information about guardianship cases, and
- The lack of in-house expertise in designing a valid impact evaluation and analyzing the data.

6. **The Value of the Technical Assistance and Training Provided by ABA-COLA and NCSC:** Formal technical assistance and training was more limited than anticipated at the inception of the project. This was due, in part, to the types of requests received from the project WINGS, and, in part, to the departure mid-stream of the initial NCSC project director who was responsible for providing technical assistance on outcome measurement and strategic planning.\(^7\) However, the WINGS requested and were provided information throughout the project. The topics on which information, technical assistance, and/or training were provided included:

- Data collection
- Development and implementation of evaluation criteria
- Securing participation from a Social Security representative
- Activities of other WINGS
- Federal legislative developments regarding guardianship issues
- The potential liability of doctors examining the subject of a guardianship petition
- Use of less restrictive options.

The coordinators’ view of the assistance correlated with the amount of assistance received. That is, those receiving the most rated it highly. Those receiving the least rated the usefulness

\(^7\) ABA-COLA was responsible for providing information and assistance in other areas.
of the assistance negatively, and those who received some, but not a lot, were neutral. Table 4 displays the ratings given in the second survey.

**Table 4 How Helpful was the Technical Assistance/Training**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) NOT HELPFUL</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5) VERY HELPFUL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mixed ratings did not diminish the desire for additional assistance. Table 5 provides a list of the issues specifically mentioned during the interviews or on the second survey.

**Table 5 Issues for Which Additional Technical Assistance is Needed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Number of States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creation of a court improvement-like funding program for guardianship</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing impact measures</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative funding sources for WINGS and programs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating periodic networking calls among WINGS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement to the Social Security Administration to engage with WINGS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach to and participation by the public</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools for defining the appropriate balance between autonomy and safety</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported decision-making</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for clerks</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping court leadership informed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued provision of information, e.g., on pending federal legislation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. The Likely Sustainability of Each Project WINGS: Four of the project WINGS have secured at least some on-going funding. In another, appropriations and staffing have been shifted to the court visitor program that was a major focus of the state’s WINGS, and the WINGS’ members are being asked to take responsibility for overseeing on-going WINGS’ activities.
The other two project WINGS are in an existential quandary. One is determining whether to continue, re-examining its structure, and exploring whether it should continue to be hosted by the courts or by one of its member agencies. Five priorities remain in its strategic plan and there is substantial support for addressing them. The remaining WINGS plan to continue meeting without specific funding, but undertaking new programmatic initiatives will be difficult.

The coordinators of all but one of the project WINGS anticipate that their WINGS and other WINGS will continue indefinitely despite the funding and other challenges identified, although the intensity of activity may ebb and flow. This expectation is based on the number and complexity of guardianship issues, their constant evolution, and the resulting need for diverse stakeholders to combine their knowledge to avoid unnecessary guardianship, prevent and address abuses, develop less restrictive options than guardianship, and advance guardianship reforms to enhance the self-determination, health, and safety of individuals who need decision-making support.

OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Citing a 2011 article by John Kania and Mark Kramer, the 2015 assessment of the initial set of WINGS\(^8\) noted that coordinated cross-sector action is far more effective in creating systemic change than interventions by a single agency or organization. Kania and Kramer term the result of such coordinated action as "collective impact" and state that five conditions must be present in order for such impact to result:

- A shared vision for change
- Shared measurement systems
- Mutually reinforcing activities
- Continuous communication, and
- Backbone support.\(^9\)

As suggested in the 2014 WINGS replication guide, "[t]he uneven practice of adult guardianship and inadequate use of less restrictive decision-making options is exactly" the complex type of social/legal change issue that Kania and Kramer address, and broadly-based

---


WINGS have the potential to generate “collective impact.” How do the current set of project WINGS compare to the initial group of seven WINGS in meeting the conditions for generating social change?

Shared Vision for Change

Like their earlier counterparts, the current set of project WINGS have been remarkably successful in creating new, less restrictive options and creating significant new programs and materials. Most notably, four of the seven WINGS (AK, ID, IN, OR) have facilitated enactment of legislation encouraging use of supported decision-making, a concept that was close to visionary less than a decade ago. Idaho has also developed a differentiated case management process for determining the level of monitoring required in individual cases. Utah has enhanced its statewide volunteer guardianship monitoring program, securing ongoing funding from the legislature. Florida is developing toolkits for first responders to assist them in identifying and reporting abuse, neglect, and exploitation of elderly individuals and persons with disabilities, including those under guardianship. It also brokered a partnership between a leading law school elder law center and the National Judicial College to create a legal-judicial curriculum on guardianship and alternatives. And, Alabama is moving forward toward creation of a Center and Commission on Guardianships and Conservatorships that could provide sustainable financial support for guardianship improvement and reform without the need for annual legislative appropriations.

However, unlike the original set of WINGS, most of the project WINGS have developed strategic plans that set out a vision, a series of strategies for achieving that vision, and actions to carry-out those strategies. These plans are the result of a project requirement. While they vary considerably in the extent to which they contain all the elements of a formal strategic plan (vision or goals, strategies, actions, timelines, and designation of responsibility), they have enabled the WINGS to establish priorities and more easily shift focus when initial goals have been accomplished. This is particularly important for the states that do not yet have continued funding for their WINGS. The set of priorities not yet accomplished provides a strong incentive to keep going using available member resources.

It was evident from the variation in the structure and completeness of the plans and the interviews that some of the WINGS, particularly those that did not receive in-person technical assistance, had difficulty with the strategic planning process. Moreover, the paucity of outcome and income data together with the relatively brief project period did not offer an opportunity to utilize the results of an evaluation to update and refresh the strategic plans as part of a continuous improvement process.11

**Recommendation 1:** A more detailed WINGS-specific strategic planning guide should be prepared and distributed to enable WINGS to more easily develop, use, and update strategic plans. The guide should build on the outline and materials produced during the project12 by including specific suggested exercises for creating vision and mission statements, a detailed discussion of the various types of measures with suggested exercises for developing evaluation criteria directly related to the WINGS' goals and strategies, and instruction on utilizing the results of the evaluation to establish a continuous improvement process.

**Shared Measurement Systems**

The 2015 assessment recommended that “each WINGS should develop a set of agreed upon measures of performance and impact and periodically review the results.”13 Development of measures was a component of the plans each project WINGS was required to produce, but all of the states struggled to do so. As reported above, most were able to create a set of process measures, a few included some outcome measures, but none were able to formulate impact measures, despite recognition of the importance of doing so. The difficulty of gathering the data required to support use of impact measures was a major impediment.

Developing and utilizing impact measures is essential to the long-term success of WINGS and the system improvements they seek to implement. Such an evaluation can highlight success stories. Equally important, it can put failures into context. For example, encouraging use of alternatives to guardianships and supported decision making will have positive effects, but inevitably, something bad will happen to someone who could have been placed under full guardianship. When it does, simply pointing out that bad things happened to people with a

---

plenary guardian too, will not be enough to defend the new balance between safety and autonomy established by the WINGS-supported options. Having a valid, understandable impact evaluation will enable WINGS to demonstrate that while the particular incident is terrible, it is by far the exception and most persons relying on supported decision-making or another alternative are safe and doing well.

Child protection cases present an analogous problem – how do you measure the impact of the court process and foster care on a child’s well-being. Sets of measures were developed a decade ago and are proving practical and useful.14

**Recommendation 2**: An effort should be undertaken to develop a practical, meaningful, and valid set of measures regarding the impact on vulnerable individuals, their caregivers, and the courts of the changes implemented through WINGS, such as the impact of the use of less restrictive options to guardianship, including supported decision making. The development effort should include the full range of guardianship stakeholders.

**Mutually Reinforcing Activities**

Kania and Kramer emphasize the importance of mutually reinforcing activity for achieving systemic change.

Collective impact initiatives depend on a diverse group of stakeholders working together, not by requiring that all participants do the same thing, but by encouraging each participant to undertake the specific set of activities at which it excels in a way that supports and is coordinated with the actions of the others.15

As shown above (Results § 2), a majority of the project WINGS have established strong relationships among their members. Looking toward the future, several of the WINGS are modifying their structures to facilitate greater interactive activity. Florida is seeking ways to alter its structure in order to establish a somewhat smaller but more interactive group of stakeholders. Utah will rely more heavily in the future on stakeholders working together with a lesser level of central staff support. Idaho is planning to add representatives from each judicial district to facilitate statewide implementation of WINGS’ programs. Alabama is seeking to transform its WINGS into a permanent Commission. Going forward, it is important to recognize

---

15 Kania & Kramer, *supra*, note 9, at 8.
that the WINGS model envisioned at the 2011 Third National Guardianship Summit is merely a starting point, and that the structures and membership of WINGS will evolve over time to better conform to the dynamics and needs of their states.

**Recommendation 3:** The changing structures and memberships of state WINGS should be tracked to identify and share the various models, their effectiveness, their impact upon the level of mutually reinforcing activities, and the lessons learned.

**Continuous Communication**

Each of the coordinators recognized the importance of frequent communication to keep stakeholders involved and active. Most are continuing to experiment with combinations of communications approaches including conference call updates; regular e-mail updates; more frequent short or single-focus meetings; and use of sub-committees and work groups.

One marked change from the practice of the initial group of WINGS has been the level of communication among the project WINGS. Whereas the 2015 Assessment Report noted that “there was not a high volume of exchange among the grant-supported WINGS,” the current project WINGS have exchanged materials, corresponded about issues, and collaborated on research. The periodic ABA-COLA networking calls and in-person forums were seen as very helpful and energizing – “not only did they provide us with feedback from those in a comparable position, but they provided needed assurance that we are not alone.” Coordinators anticipated continuing to be in touch with each other one-to-one and expressed hope that the networking opportunities would continue.

**Recommendation 4:** The American Bar Association Commission on Law and Aging or some other entity should host periodic on-line networking calls among all WINGS coordinators willing to participate to provide an opportunity to exchange information on new developments, programs and legislation, and discuss common current and anticipated issues.

**Backbone Support:**

As reported above, six of the seven coordinators cited strong leadership and staff as a major factor facilitating the success of their WINGS. All anticipate that staff support will continue as an

---

element of the WINGS structure to a greater or lesser extent depending on organization and funding.

It was clear that the project provided key “backbone support” as well. While the funding and national recognition was important, the networking, information, and advocacy provided by the ABA-COLA and NCSC staff members was highly valued and significantly helpful. Comments included: “The materials were phenomenal; we did not have to reinvent the wheel.” All the coordinators expressed hope that this type of informational and technical support could continue.

In addition, several indicated that national-level advocacy assistance is needed in at least two areas. The first is to encourage the Social Security Administration (SSA) to have its state and/or regional representatives constructively engage with State WINGS regarding communication and coordination between state courts with guardianship jurisdiction and the SSA representative payee system. The second area in need of national advocacy is to promote authorization and implementation of a federal program similar to the child protection-focused Court Improvement Program, that would address the protection and well-being of vulnerable adults.

**Recommendation 5: The American Bar Association Commission on Law and Aging or some other entity should receive funding to provide continued technical assistance, training, networking, informational, and advocacy support to state WINGS.**

In conclusion, the past six years have proven that Working Interdisciplinary Networks of Guardianship Stakeholders are a highly effective means for bringing the disparate guardianship stakeholders together in a state to address key issues regarding guardianship and generate significant legislative and programmatic change. They have accomplished much, but as the list of issues in the project WINGS’ strategic plans demonstrate, there is much left to do, particularly in the areas of changing everyday practices and determining the impact of the changes. A solid foundation has been laid, but the building needs to continue. The speed and strength of this construction can be greatly aided by the provision of the tools, information, networking, and other back-up support recommended above.
PROJECT TO ESTABLISH, EXPAND, AND ENHANCE STATE WORKING INTERDISCIPLINARY NETWORKS OF GUARDIANSHIP STAKEHOLDERS (WINGS)

INITIAL WINGS ASSESSMENT SURVEY

This survey is part of the ACL WINGS Project conducted by the American Bar Association Commission on Law and Aging and the National Center for State Courts to establish, expand, and enhance state Working Interdisciplinary Networks of Guardianship Stakeholders. It is intended to establish a baseline of information now that the Project is underway and identify areas in which technical assistance and information will be helpful. Please note that for purposes of this survey, the word “Guardianship” includes both guardians of a person and of an estate.

We encourage you to consult with members of your Steering Committee in responding to this survey. Please contact: Dick Van Duizend at rvanduizend@gmail.com if you have any questions regarding the survey or difficulty in completing it.

Please send your response, no later than JULY 7, 2017, to:

Your responses will NOT be for attribution.
1. I am from: Alabama    Alaska    Florida    Idaho    Indiana    New Mexico    Oregon    Utah

2. Please Indicate the Level of Importance of the Following Guardianship-Related Issues in Your State:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>1 NOT IMPORTANT</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 EXTREMELY IMPORTANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Availability of Less Restrictive Alternatives to Guardianship</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Use of Less Restrictive Alternatives to Guardianship</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Identifying and Tracking Existing Guardianships</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. More Effective Monitoring of Existing Guardianship?</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Identifying Abuse and/or Exploitation</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Effectively Addressing Instances of Abuse and/or Exploitation</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Preventing Abuse and/or Exploitation</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Assuring Quality Representation in Guardianship Proceedings</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Providing Public Guardians</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Identifying Qualified Guardians</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Collaboration Among Guardianship Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ISSUE

1. Providing **Training and Information** to
   a. **Attorneys** in guardianship proceedings
   b. **Court Visitors/Investigators/Examiners**
   c. **Court Screeners**
   d. **Potential Guardians**
   e. **Appointed Guardians**
   f. **Judges**
   g. **Aging and Disability Professionals**
   h. **Others (Please Specify)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC AREA</th>
<th>1 (NOT IMPORTANT)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (EXTREMELY IMPORTANT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Strategic Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Effective Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Public Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Developing &amp; Using Outcome Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Addressing Disadvantaged Populations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Collecting Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Facilitating Smooth Leadership Transitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Enhancing Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. On a scale of 1 to 5, please indicate in which areas technical assistance/training will be most helpful:
4. What would be “success” for your state’s WINGS three years from now?

5. FOR THE FOCUS WINGS (IN, OR, UT), What do you anticipate will be the three greatest challenges in achieving your specific focus objectives?
   1) 
   2) 
   3) 

Please send your response, no later than JULY 7, 2017, to: 
Thank you for participating in this survey!
APPENDIX B

WINGS ASSESSMENT SURVEY
This survey is part of the ACL WINGS Project conducted by the American Bar Association Commission on Law and Aging and the National Center for State Courts to establish, expand, and enhance state WINGS (Working Interdisciplinary Networks of Guardianship Stakeholders). The purpose of this assessment is to provide guidance to current WINGS and assist other states to establish effective guardianship/conservatorship improvement efforts. Please note that for purposes of this survey, the word “Guardianship” includes both guardians of a person and of an estate. If you have any questions regarding the survey or difficulty completing it, please contact Richard Van Duizend at ryan@duizend.com.

Your responses will NOT be for attribution, names of interviewees will not be listed in the assessment report.

A. ADMINISTRATIVE QUESTIONS

6. I am from: ○Alabama ○Alaska ○Florida ○Idaho ○Indiana ○Oregon ○Utah

2. I would like a copy of the Assessment Report:    Yes    No
   ○    ○

   If yes, Please provide email address: ________________________________

B. WINGS’ STRUCTURE

3. Which stakeholders have been particularly active in WINGS efforts?
   [COMMENT BOX]

4. Which stakeholders have been largely absent from WINGS activities? How has this affected the ability to accomplish your WINGS’ goals?
   [COMMENT BOX]

C. WINGS’ EFFECTIVENESS/IMPACT

5. What factors facilitated the effectiveness of your WINGS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NOT AT ALL</th>
<th>TO A VERY SMALL EXTENT</th>
<th>TO A LIMITED EXTENT</th>
<th>TO A LARGE EXTENT</th>
<th>FULLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Previously established interagency relationships</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The urgency of the issues</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The perceived need for coordination</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Strong and effective leadership</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Strong and effective staff support</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other (please specify below)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[COMMENT BOX]

6. How have you used the results obtained from the performance measures listed in your Strategic Plan?
7. Are you planning to attempt to measure the impact of your WINGS’ accomplishments on:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONS ALLEGED TO NEED GUARDIANSHIP</th>
<th>PERSONS SUBJECT TO GUARDIANSHIP</th>
<th>USE OF LESS RESTRICTIVE OPTIONS</th>
<th>COURT PROCESSES</th>
<th>LEGAL PRACTICE RELATED TO GUARDIANSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Are you planning to measure the impact of participating in WINGS on WINGS’ member organizations (e.g., more referrals, increased cross training, instances of inter-agency collaboration, etc.)?

Yes ☐      No ☐

C. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE & TRAINING

9. On what topics/issues/problems did you receive training or technical assistance from the project?

10. How would you rate the usefulness of this assistance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) NOT HELPFUL</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5) VERY HELPFUL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

11. On what topics/issues/problems would additional training or technical assistance be helpful?

E. LOOKING FORWARD

12. Has your WINGS secured on-going funding?  
Yes ☐  No ☐

13. How long do you anticipate your WINGS will continue to be active?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 YEAR</th>
<th>2 YEARS</th>
<th>5 YEARS</th>
<th>INDEFINITELY</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Are there any activities you would like to highlight or additional comments you would like to share?

15. Is there anything you would do differently if you were starting again?

Thank you for participating in this survey!
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL – WINGS EVALUATION
A. Issues Addressed

Background info: The response to the initial survey, identified ___________________,
______________________,   _____________________,
as the most important Guardianship-Related Issues in _____.
Thus far, the WINGS has focused on __________________, _________________,
______________________.

1. How did you go about deciding on what issues your WINGS would address first?

2. Why were _____ chosen as the initial issues to be addressed?

3. In coming years Do you think the WINGS will address the other issues you identified as important in the initial survey?

B. Definition of Success/Measures

Background info: Definition of success in initial survey _____________________
___________________________________________________________________
Performance measures listed in strategic plan____________________________
___________________________________________________________________

4. Do you feel your WINGS is on the way to being successful? In what ways?

5. What has led to the changes in your definition of success over time?

6. How are the performance measures you listed in your strategic plan helping to demonstrate that success?

7. What has been the hardest part of trying to implement the measures you developed?

8. What are you doing to address these difficulties?
9. What successes have you had in changing practice?

10. What practice changes seem to be the most difficult to address. How might a WINGS get at problems in current practices?

C. What Factors Have Contributed to Effectiveness

11. The survey suggested that _______________________________ were important factors in enabling your WINGS to be effective. Can you offer a couple of examples of how these factors played into your success?

12. How about other factors such as _______________________________?

D. Challenges –

(for IN, OR, UT) Background Information – Challenges anticipated on initial survey ____________________, ____________________, ____________________.

13. At the beginning of this project, you anticipated that ________, would be a challenge, but you did not list them in your progress report.

   Why do you think it did not materialize?

14. What steps did you take to avoid it becoming an issue?

(For all states)

15. What, if any challenges do you anticipate arising over the next year?

16. What steps are you taking or do you anticipate taking to address them?
17. What changes may be necessary in the way your WINGS operates to be able to address these changes/concerns?

E. Public Involvement & Input
18. From your experience, can you think of some effective ways of making WINGS activities and recommendations more widely known and obtaining input from the public?

F. Looking to the Future
19. Do you plan on interacting with other WINGS in the future?

20. Are you seeking on-going funding support? What steps are/will you be taking?

21. What, if anything, can the ABA Commission on Law & Aging in the immediate future and long-term do to keep your WINGS going?

22. Is there a shelf-life for WINGS or is the need for this type of coordination/collaboration on-going?

23. Has anything else occurred to you how you might do things differently if you had it to do over again?