Wraparound principles (phrased to represent team level activity)

Round Two for National Advisory Group Delphi

This is the task for the second round of the Delphi process on the wraparound principles. In the first round, participants were asked to consider each of the principles (original versions are included below) and to respond, using one of the three choices: fine (I endorse this principle as currently written), so-so (I could go along with this principle as currently written but minor changes would improve it), or unacceptable (I could not go along with this principle unless it were changed in a significant way). If they chose either of the latter two options, people were asked to explain what changes would be necessary before they could endorse the principle. People were also encouraged to include other comments specific to the principle.

Twenty-one people completed the task. We tabulated their “votes” and extracted themes from their comments. The round two task is presented below. The “old” version of each principle is provided (i.e., the version included in the first round), as well as the results of the first round “voting” for the principle. Below that, we provide a brief summary of themes that were represented across several respondents (where such agreement existed).

A recurring theme emerged in the comments to the individual principles and to the principles as a set, and thus influenced the reworking of the principles for the second round. This theme had to do with the tension between the idea that wraparound is an expression of the family’s views versus the idea that other “interests” and perspectives are often mandated to be included in the process, e.g. when the child is in non-family custody, involved with juvenile justice, etc., particularly when it is these agencies who are funding the wraparound program. The principles were criticized from both “sides” of this, i.e., for either over-stating or under-stating the degree of control families should have over the process. Our effort was to acknowledge both “sides” of this by focusing on the need for plans to be grounded in the family’s perspective, but also to ultimately be an expression of the blending of team members’ perspectives.

There were also a number of comments to the effect that the principles don’t specify how to go about realizing the values through practice. A collaborative effort is underway to specify the phases and activities that are necessary for wraparound, and first products from that effort will be circulated to you in the near future.

Several comments also focused on the need to further define key concepts, notably strengths and natural supports. If you have a good definition of either or both of these terms, please feel free to forward it to us.

We ask that you now consider the old and new versions, the tabulated responses, and the comments, and respond for each principle using the same choices as in round one. Type or write your responses in the spaces provided on the form. (Most people typed into the existing Word document, saved, and returned as an attachment.) Please return your responses to Janet Walker by email (janetw@pdx.edu) or by fax (503.725.4180) by WEDNESDAY, JUNE 2. If you anticipate that you will not be able to participate in this round, please let us know so that we will not pester you with reminders.
Feedback form for Round Two of the Delphi process. First line of each table contains ratings provided in the first round. Second line is for new ratings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brief name/description</th>
<th>Principle as expressed at team level</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>So-so</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Family voice (old version)</td>
<td>The wraparound process intentionally draws out the family’s perspectives regarding strengths, the definition and prioritization of needs and goals, and the service and support strategies that are most likely to meet needs and reach the goals. The team gives this information primary consideration during decision making.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new version “VOTE” at right</td>
<td>Family(^1) and child perspectives are elicited and prioritized during all phases of the wraparound process. Planning is grounded in the family’s perspectives yet collaborative, and the team strives to provide options and choices such that the plan reflects family values and preferences.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes made/rationale:

Several people pointed to the omission of the idea of choice from the original “voice and choice” principle. Several others commented that drawing out and considering family perspectives was not sufficiently strong—i.e. these perspectives could then be ignored when decisions are made—also there was not a clear sense of the family’s perspective being given the most weight in the collaboration. Several people commented on various omissions in the list of occasions when the family’s perspective was to be drawn out. Others pointed on the need to explicitly reference the youth/child perspective.

Your comments:

Rating: Comment:

So-so

Old version more strongly emphasizes the family’s voice upon which their investment and sense of ownership is predicated. These, in turn, make it more likely the resultant plan will attract their diligent commitment and will, hence, succeed.

Fine

I still hold to the importance of being able to “hear” the family voice when you “look at”

\(^1\) Family composition and structure and the legal status, age, and independence of the child can each have significant influence on who selects the wraparound team and how it functions. Families may be a single biological or adoptive parent and child, or may include grandparents and other extended family members as part of the central family group. If the court has assigned custody of the child to some public agency (e.g., child protective services or juvenile justice), the caregiver in the permanency setting and/or another person designated by that agency (e.g. foster parent, social worker, probation officer) takes on some or all of the roles and responsibilities of a parent for that child and shares in selecting the team and prioritizing objectives and options. As youth become older and more independent they begin to make more of their own decisions, including inviting members to join the team and controlling aspects of the wraparound process.
and read the family plan.

So-so I think the words “yet collaborative” seem misplaced/awkward in the second sentence. Are they needed? Hasn’t collaboration been addressed as another feature?

So-so Planning is grounded in the family’s perspectives and is collaborative. The team strives to provide options…

So-so Proposed language change to: “Family and child perspectives are intentionally elicited and prioritized during all phases of the wraparound process. Planning is primarily grounded…” Proposed language change to: “Family and child perspectives are intentionally elicited and prioritized during all phases of the wraparound process. Planning is primarily grounded…”

So-so This principle could be further reworked to emphasize the child’s evolving and hopefully maturing role in this process as time passes. Also, when biological families have temporarily surrendered custody to juvenile authorities, it does no necessarily mean they are no longer involved in the child’s care. How do you properly account for that in this statement of principle?

Unacceptable Child does not convey youth, except to adults “yet collaborative” is awkward, and appears to water down family and child input rather than complement it.
I don’t know what “grounded” means operationally.

So-so The idea is good, but the wording is repetitive. Do not need to use the word “perspectives” twice. See my suggested revision:
Family2 and child perspectives are elicited and prioritized during all phases of the wraparound process. Through collaborative planning, the team strives to provide options and choices such that the plan reflects family values and preferences.

So-so I think the words “yet collaborative” are pretty vague in the way they are inserted/used here. Needs some sort of additional wording regarding team.

So-so Family is who the child would be living with the minute funding for out of home care was discontinued, or who the child will be with when the court orders expire.
I would suggest that it is dangerous to substitute court agents as family. None of them will be taking the child home. Decision-makers need to have their status recognized, but not by being treated as family.

So-so Insert “regularly” in the first sentence after the word prioritized. Add to the last sentence after the word choices… “that reflect the family values and preferences such that the family

2 Family composition and structure and the legal status, age, and independence of the child can each have significant influence on who selects the wraparound team and how it functions. Families may be a single biological or adoptive parent and child, or may include grandparents and other extended family members as part of the central family group. If the court has assigned custody of the child to some public agency (e.g., child protective services or juvenile justice), the caregiver in the permanency setting and/or another person designated by that agency (e.g. foster parent, social worker, probation officer) takes on some or all of the roles and responsibilities of a parent for that child and shares in selecting the team and prioritizing objectives and options. As youth become older and more independent they begin to make more of their own decisions, including inviting members to join the team and controlling aspects of the wraparound process.
can agree to”. I think the key issue is about family’s getting options that fit their needs and strengths well enough that they can agree to and work together to implement the plan.

So-so
I’m not entirely comfortable with the clause “yet collaborative”. I would be more comfortable with the phrase “and collaborative”. I would also add that the Child and Family feel listened to and heard at all junctures of planning.

Unacceptable
As written, not sure what the phrase I boldfaced is trying to say…looks like word (s) is /are missing???

So-so
I don’t feel that this statement gives enough emphasis to the family’s central role in the process and it somewhat dilutes the family’s role.

So-so
“yet collaborative” is awkward.

So-so
The concept of permanent life-long connection as related to voice needs to be strengthened. An individual in a life connection to a youth, as determined by kinship, legal status or youth identification should be recognized differently than that of a temporary caregiver (foster parent, social worker, probation officer) on any topics other than those that are defined by mandate or regulation.

Unacceptable
Family members may know the end point or exit point of service, however not know how to get to that point. The new version allows for too much inefficiency or poor practice. Unless we are going to refer to the research base on services, providers of all types will continue to advocate for the same service mix. Service suggestions become nothing more than bias past on through cohorts of staff members and supervisors.

So-so
I think this one is too long and includes multiple principles. I think it should be simplified. This includes collaboration values which could be deleted with something like: Family and child perspectives are drawn out and empowered during all phases of the wraparound process and options and choices reflect family values and preferences. The rest of them look good.

Unacceptable
Needs to keep families perspective as primary priority (unless dangerous for the child).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brief name/description</th>
<th>Principle as expressed at team level</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>So-so</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Team based</td>
<td>The wraparound team consists of individuals agreed upon by the family and connected to them through natural, community, and formal support and service relationships.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new version “VOTE” at right</td>
<td>The wraparound team consists of individuals agreed upon by the family and connected to them through natural, community, and formal support and service relationships. (unchanged)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes made/rationale:

The effort in this principle was to strike a balance between having team members chosen by the family to the greatest extent possible and the acknowledgement that sometimes team members are mandated, and greatest benefit may well be realized by working collaboratively with these people—in fact, they may represent the agencies that are the funding source for wraparound. People commented on both “sides” of this (i.e. some said “agreed upon” gave too much power to families to leave people off, others said it did not reflect a strong enough statement that the family should determine team membership.). Others pointed to the difficulty when the family is not custodial. The footnote to principle 1 addresses this issue noting that sometimes an agency or other custodial person will act in place or jointly with the family, also that as the child gets older, she or he will take greater role in making decisions, including regarding team membership.

Your comments:

(So-so): Suggestion – adding the word “essential” to the development of planning. Example: In a current situation a parent did not want the school included in the team. The main are of need, however, was school. I did a great deal of work in discussing the process – that ground rules are established. I indicated that there is no blaming allowed, etc. I discussed with the parent that unless the school was a member we were limited in what we could do in regards to planning. The school member was essential to the development of the plan due to the domain area and the needs prioritized by the parent and team. We were unable to go any further unless a school member was on. The parents fear was being blamed. In setting firm ground rules and adhering to them the parent indicated that she felt comfortable including them. She did have to see how the ground rules worked and the team process before taking the step of including school on team. Again, they were essential to the planning in this situation and without them a true plan could not have developed.

Also – and this is an ongoing comment throughout I would replace plan of care with action plan. I think that it is more reflective of and also a reminder to teams that this is action based. I have walked into so many wraparound meetings where things are being updated vs. action being planned. When I have talked to team members who are involved in these meetings they state they came together and talked about the strengths therefore they did wraparound. It is a very difficult concept for many. The action piece does a lot in regards to give the team a format, accountability for team members, etc. It is an element that I think is so important. We discuss utilizing strengths and needs to develop plan but often they are not translated into action. Just a perspective.

(Fine): Referring to the term “in place” (8th line) in the “Changes made/rationale” section – When CPS or juvenile justice has legal custody of a child, the child’s own family should nevertheless SHARE responsibility to select the team members.
(So-so): Natural is always a difficult word – who, then, is unnatural? Also missing the point that being “team based” means this is where the decisions are made. This is more of a definition of “team.”

(So-so): The wraparound team consists of individuals identified by or agreed upon by….

(So-so): Again, there is inadequate definition of situations where the biological family has temporarily surrendered custody but wishes to remain active.

(didn’t rate): I think it is mistaken to try to combine those places where families and youth have formal choice and those in which they do not. This is mixing apples and oranges in order to say they both are fruit and in so doing I think that it would be better to distinguish between the two types of situations and address the ways that you best address each situation.

(So-so): 4 to 8 people who care about the welfare of the child and family are willing to commit themselves to collaborative action to help them have a better life, at least half of whom aren’t paid to be part of the process.

(Unacceptable): Add….
“Teams will always work to include natural family members regardless of custody status of the youth”. Over and over again I see the importance of teams working to address the involvement of natural family, including non-custodial parents, in the planning and implementation process. Kids do better when all the adults in their life work together. It is important for teams of professionals to acknowledge that they will not be in a youth or family’s life when the youth is 25 years old. Thus we must work to rebuild a network that will be there after helpers are gone.

(Unacceptable): See comments from first version. It reads in a manner mis-interpreted as “the family chooses the team”. What if it were worded something along the lines of what I wrote in the box? You already have family voice as a principle in number 1. It isn’t simply an issue of when the child is placed out of home… the value of “family voice” in shaping the team is important, but it can’t be interpreted in a manner that keeps those who best know or have significant influence upon the family situation off the team. I have seen teams in which the mother would not allow the step-father, or a care-providing aunt or grandmother onto the team. It’s not just an issue between families and service providers!

(Fine): I like that it includes formal and informal supports.

(So-so): The description could state “…family (including individuals with legal responsibility for the youth) and connected….”

(Unacceptable): The issue to me is not “connected” with the family. The reason for the team membership is to gather persons that have bi-directional influence with the family and youth. That the relationship with the family and youth means something to both, and the bi-directional nature of the relationship means that all have some deep commitment to each other that will sustain itself for a considerable time. Connection is not sufficient. Necessary yes.

(Unacceptable): Needs to express the closeness of the service representative. Does the staff know and work with the child and family or are they a warm body representing an agency? Families must be made aware that the team should be primarily comprised of persons familiar with their family.
### Changes made/rationale:

Idea of blending of perspectives seemed to be absent from the first version.

#### Your comments:

**Unacceptable:** The end phrase “and guides and coordinates each team member’s work with the family”, I would suggest altering it. It seems clinical. Suggestion “that guides and coordinates each team members work in meeting the identified (goal, outcome, overarching goal). Families are team members also so it is inclusive. Work may not always be directly with the family. For example it may be system oriented. I know that with is meaning in cooperation or similar word in this situation but I have a difficult time with it. When I have had teams often there have been system issues that need to be worked on so it is not directed at family but overarching goal established.

**So-so:** I don’t think addition was necessary b/c it was addressed in #1-2.

**Fine:** Also includes agency mandates; which is more than a perspective. I like how this definition flows and comes together.

**Fine:** Maybe add a piece about education of WA to team members to assure all are on the same page.

**So-so:** If family members of part of the team, then how do they “work with the family” there should be a better phase that fits the roles that family members play. Also it should be “with the child/youth and family”

**So-so:** One family, one team, one plan. Wraparound is when the team agrees to actively work to accomplish a common goal. Collaboration can be for communication, parallel planning or voluntary sharing or resources. Wraparound is when they share a single plan and a single pool of resources.

**Fine:** I worry that this sounds like finding the worst blending, a mediocre product, and the grand and ineffective compromise. Perhaps inclusion of language that emphasizes that “this blending has an overarching purpose, to improve the quality of life (safety, unity, access to community etc.) for those affected by the plan”, would help.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brief name/description</th>
<th>Principle as expressed at team level</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>So-so</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Collaborative and Integrative</td>
<td>Team members work together and share responsibility for developing, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating a single plan of care that guides and coordinates each team member’s work with the family.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new version “VOTE” at right</td>
<td>Team members work together and share responsibility for developing, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating a single plan of care that reflects a blending of team members’ perspectives and that guides and coordinates each team member’s work with the family.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Fine): Like the blending of team members ideas.

(So-so): added capitalized words “team members’ perspectives AND RESOURCES and coordinates” – added AND RESOURCES to recognize both formal and informal supports brought to the team process.

(So-so): Not all members of the team will be “working” with the family. Could say “…. guides and coordinates each team member’s involvement with the family to support the plan.”

(Unacceptable): Sounds like a knitting party in Nebraska. Everyone so polite.

(So-so): This is an unimportant add but I think it makes it too complex. I think this was inferred in the first version.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brief name/description</th>
<th>Principle as expressed at team level</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>So-so</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Community-Based</td>
<td>The wraparound team implements service and support strategies that take place in the most inclusive, most responsive, and least restrictive settings possible, and that foster child and family integration into home and community life and roles.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new version</td>
<td>The wraparound team implements service and support strategies that take place in the most inclusive, most responsive, most accessible, and least restrictive settings possible, and that safely promote child and family integration into home and community life and roles.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Changes made/rationale:**
Use of “foster” confusing in this context. Need to retain the idea that community based services/supports are located close to home. Need to ensure that strategies consider safety issues.

**Your comments:**
(So-so): Inclusive in my plans are steps to reach those points. If listed like this “service & support strategies” my fear is that it will be a list of recommendations vs. action – how do we get there. Often people have to take steps to reach these items being in place and sustainable and that is a great deal of work.

(Fine): This is also the normalized setting. Also, your community, like your family, are the people who know you best.

(So-so): …that take place in the most inclusive, most responsive, most accessible, and least restrictive settings possible that safely promote the most normative child and family integration…

(So-so): The wraparound team implements service and support strategies that take place in the most inclusive, most normative, most responsive.

(So-so): Need to clarify what is meant by “roles” or delete this word from the description. The rest makes perfect sense.

(Fine): Does this clearly state the child will be in the community the family chooses to call home? It doesn’t seem like it to me. I see too often a child placed in a community that is not the family’s home community. Maybe add “and that safely promote child and family integration into the family’s home and community life and roles.”

(So-so): Promote is equally vague—how about “support”

(So-so): I’m thinking community-based means it happens in the community. We may be mixing up community-based and family-centered.

(Fine): I like the change.
(So-so): I think the values described need to be prioritized or something. Responsive to what? Inclusive to what?

I think the concept is about having access to the same opportunities and resources as any other youth or family would have that typically support healthy development, family integration and assumption of preferred roles and (something????), while at the same time limiting reliance on “specialized” care that by its very nature limits access to those things.

I would be willing to bet there is language in the Recovery language about “choose, get, keep philosophy of individuals having access to the living, work (school), social environments of their choice.

(Unacceptable): Least restrictive is a term that was originally used to determine physical restrictiveness. No work has been done on the term in the last 15 years (one exception). Accessible to what? Definitions are necessary before we can even agree at this conceptual level.
**Brief name/description** | Principle as expressed at team level | Fine | So-so | Unacceptable
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
5. Culturally Competent (old version) | The wraparound process, as well as the services, supports, and strategies included in the plan of care, build on the values, preferences, beliefs, and racial and cultural identity of the family and its community. | 12 | 6 | 3

**New version “vote” at right** | The wraparound process demonstrates respect for and builds on the values, preferences, beliefs, and racial and cultural identity of the family and its community. | 21 | 7 | 3

**Changes made/rationale:**

The new version reflects several comments about the need for the interpersonal processes within the team (not just service and support strategies) to demonstrate respect for culture. Also it is shorter.

**Your comments:**

(Fine): I’d like to see the plan back in the definition.

(So-so): I like old version better. I believe the strategies (which are supports, services, and interventions) should also demonstrate cultural competency (not just the process used to get to strategies).

(So-so): The plan of care incorporates culturally traditional approaches.

(Unacceptable): Both versions have significant meaning. Neither is sufficient. Consider combing the two.

(Unacceptable): I would delete racial. Cultural is adequate to cover the “identity” of the family and child, and would include those differences that one might to assign to racial status. This also recognizes that within racial groups (such as “Hispanics”) there are significant cultural differences. I would also add “child” in the phrase “identity of the family....”

(So-so): The goal stated in the rationale is not conveyed in the rewrite. If you want to say it, say it.

(Fine): Better! I prefer concise.

(So-so): I think some mention of the services, supports, and strategies needs to be in the definition. I would vote for a blending of the two in that “The wraparound process, as well as the services, supports, and strategies included in the plan of care, demonstrates respect for and builds on the values, preferences, beliefs, and racial and cultural identity of the family and community.”

(So-so): We’re pretty far from being culturally competent as long as we say, “this process is the one you have to use to get help.” What if our culture doesn’t involve a bunch of people sitting around a table and discussing our problems?

(Fine): Culture is an important source of identifying strengths to build on in plans. However I do not think this needs to addressed in this item.
(So-so): Still think it is not simply the “process” that must be culturally competent. Team composition or in wraparound language, “team membership” is a measure of cultural competence.

(So-so): “Wraparound process respectfully recognizes and builds on the cultural identity of the youth and family that includes values, preferences, beliefs, and experiences as well as racial and sexual identity.” I added concepts of youth, experiences and sexual identity since issues of gender identity creates such a high risk for youth and needz to be included in any consideration of culture.

(Unacceptable): The rationale does not seem to be associated with the new version. Unfortunately, not all cultural differences are accepted as non-harming. Try “do no harm”.

(did not rate): Changed wording to: The wraparound process demonstrates respect for and builds upon the values, preferences, beliefs, and racial and cultural identity of the family and its their community.
Changes made/rationale:

People commented that the phrasing in the original seemed to set up a division between the team and the family by saying, basically, that the team undertakes planning to meet family goals. People also pointed out the need to explicitly include the needs and aspirations of the child/youth in the statement.

Your comments:

(So-so): I like the definition I just worry about needs. People struggle with concept of needs vs. services. If this is not outlined in parameters or criteria somewhere it would be very concerning. For example many see respite as a need. To me the need would parents need time for themselves and a way that this could be achieved is through respite. Defining respite as a need discourages the brainstorming process that is so essential to this process. Needs and how they define often stop the process because of this. I am comfortable with the definition if parameters are established to differentiate between needs and services.

(So-so): The statement still implies a dimension between the team and the family.

(didn’t rate): I would feel better about “strength based strategies”, which also reflects individualized planning and support.

(So-so): ....implements in response to the unique needs, preferences and aspirations of the child and family.

(So-so): It still seems to read that the team plans for, not with, the family.

(So-so): Don’t the plans also reflect the strengths of the child and family? If so include it.

(So-so): But isn’t the point of all of this to reach certain goals? Perhaps I am too socialized by my profession, but these are, after all, services aimed at improving functioning. Maybe I am too worried services won’t get funded, but I can’t imagine seeing individualized services aimed to meet “aspirations” rather than “goals”.

Aspirations are lovely, but I prefer the concrete language of goals for the clarity, generalized understanding of what a goal is (vs. an aspiration), and because I believe the services should be individualized in the service of meeting goals, not aspirations.

My suggested revision, taking into account the concern about division (changes in italics):
The plan of care includes strategies, services, and supports that the family and team develops and implements in response to the unique needs and goals of the child and family.
(So-so): I don’t like the wording “in response to” given the above rationale. However I hadn’t thought about that originally and don’t have any suggestions for how it could be changed.

(So-so): This one may be mixing up individualized and creative, both of which are important. We use wraparound when we want to create a unique response to a unique situation. Individualized means that if we look at 10 plans all 10 will be different. Creative means that the option in the plan is one no one has seen before, it is fashioned as part of the team process. As opposed to the team gets together and picks from a list of pre-existing services.

(Unacceptable): All plans in any service process can be said to do this…. Individualization in wraparound derives from two places as I understand it. First from the unique understanding of the strengths and culture of the family, and second from the commitment to arrange a plan that consists of more than existing services from the community array. In other words individualization comes from the fact that an effective wraparound team “plans” for ways to address identified and prioritized needs through multiple avenues. One of these avenues is service provision, more important is the ability of the team to devise uniquely crafted actions, built on strengths and connections of the team, that assure that support and help are regularly delivered across time outside of (beyond) the traditional service environment. Consider, please, using some of the language from this last sentence to differentiate individualization in wraparound from individualization in typical service and support environments.

(So-so): The plan of care includes strategies, services and supports developed and implemented by the team according to agreed upon goals that address the family’s needs and aspirations.

(So-so): Adequate, how this will be interpreted or applied is a significant question. Where is the theory base?? It is a missing piece to this “committee process” of defining principles. I have data that demonstrates if the team is focused in a single system (family, or school, or community), they invariably stumble or fail.

(Unacceptable): Aspirations seems unclear as to meaning in this context.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brief name/description</th>
<th>Principle as expressed at team level</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>So-so</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Strengths based</td>
<td>The team develops and implements a plan of care that identifies, incorporates, and enhances the strengths of the family, its community, and other team members.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new version</td>
<td>Team members develop and implement a plan of care that identifies, builds on, and enhances the strengths of the child and family, their community, and other team members. Throughout this process, team interactions demonstrate appreciation for each member’s competencies.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Changes made/rationale:**

Several comments pointed to need to include child explicitly as having strengths. Several others focused on needing to emphasize that the plan builds on family and team strengths (rather than merely “incorporating”—this stresses the need to develop strategies that use strengths effectively). It was also noted that it is not just the plan that needs to be strengths-based, but the interactions among team members as well.

**Your comments:**

(Fine): People don’t know how to functionally use strengths in planning. I am not sure what your experience is but I have worked with coordinators that have been in the field years and still cannot do this. I was just asked to come in and do a training for individuals who have coordinated for over 5 years and still struggle with this.

(So-so): New version too long. I prefer the original statement.

(So-so): We need to be doing more than “demonstrating appreciation…” throughout the process.

(So-so): Proposed language change to: “…Throughout this process, team interactions capitalize on each member’s competencies.”

(Fine): (I’m quoting from my dissertation):
The strengths perspective is a particular departure from the medical model’s reliance on deficit language, and is a “backlash against deficit model counseling approaches that label and pathologize” (Laveman, 2000, p. 18). This perspective looks at individuals and families in light of their “capacities, talents, competencies, possibilities, visions, values, and hopes, however dashed and distorted these may have become through circumstance, oppression, and trauma” (Saleebey, 1996, p.297). In the strengths approach, language is transformed to transcend problems and to acknowledge wisdom, abilities, and resources. There are four key ways in which a strengths orientation is identified in wraparound: child and family talents, child and family resilience, child and family possibilities, and available family and team resources.

(So-so): You could put something about utilizing the expertise of team members and expanding on their strengths and culture. I do not like the use of the word competencies and have had families state that it assumes they were incompetent.
(So-so): At the first level, strength-based means that the point of the plan is not to eliminate deficits but to increase competencies. At the second level, it means that the team takes the time to recognize and validate the skills, knowledge, insight and strategies that each member of the team has used to survive the challenges they have faced prior to coming to the team. At the third level, it means that every key component of the plan is designed to build upon specific functional strengths of the people enacting the plan.

(Fine): Small suggestion… in addition to the words “builds on” could we insert “uses and builds on” or “utilizes and builds on” for the purpose of a little more clarity at the cost of only one word.

(So-so): I’m afraid that the second sentence will simply serve to set up an impossible standard. I’ve seen lots of team that have individual members that fail to demonstrate appreciation for each member’s competencies. How about “team members develop and implement a plan of care with interventions that build on and enhance the strengths of the child and family, community & other team members.”

(Fine): Well stated. It speaks to the full ecology of strengths. This has what principle 6 is missing.

(So-so): Don’t really like the last line, sounds to artificial, I like the concept stated in the rational- but not the wording.

(So-so): I prefer the original version.

(Fine): I would just be repeating myself. Definitions…………
**Changes made/rationale:**

Several comments pointed out the need to develop a formal definition of natural supports. Thoughts?

**Your comments:**

(Fine): Natural supports – “supports that are self sustaining once the team dissolves and originate from the community.”

(So-so): Do not include definition.

(Fine): Although still needs definition of natural supports.

(So-so): This again describes how you use them, not what they are. Pat Miles has a 3 tiered definition.

(Fine): I always define natural supports as people that already exist in the families life (neighbors, friends, family) that the family can reach out to for support, help, etc.

(So-so): I don’t agree that we need a definition for natural supports.

(Unacceptable): I agree with the critics. Natural supports are not defined. Legs? Stools? Guy wires? The committee needs to better define its jargon.

(Fine): Natural Supports: Also known as “informal supports.” People or organizations that can be accessed by families whether or not they are enrolled in “formal” systems. There are two types of natural supports: community supports, and interpersonal supports. Examples of community supports would be the YMCA, church, a local community center. Examples of interpersonal supports would be their pastor, neighbor, extended family, or family friend.

(Fine): Natural supports are not only people, but also activities and experiences; as examples: a soccer team, a part time job, mainstream school, playing with a dog. I intentionally did not say “soccer coach” or “boss or co-workers” or “favorite teacher or friends”; it is the activities and experiences that are supportive to a person and are “natural.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brief name/description</th>
<th>Principle as expressed at team level</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>So-so</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Natural Supports</td>
<td>The team actively seeks out and welcomes natural supports, and integrates their perspectives fully into the team process. The plan of care reflects activities and interventions undertaken by natural supports.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new version “VOTE” at right</td>
<td>The team actively seeks out and welcomes natural supports, and integrates their perspectives fully into the team process. The plan of care reflects activities and interventions undertaken by natural supports. (unchanged)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The expressed principle implies natural supports can only be people, a “part-time job” gives structure, exposure to typical experiences, and a sense of having purpose; the job is a natural way to realize these benefits. Maybe this slightly re-worded expression of the principal addresses this concern:

The team actively seeks out and welcomes people who are natural supports and integrates their perspectives fully into the team process. The plan of care reflects activities and interventions undertaken as being naturally supportive.

(So-so): We have limited our use the term “natural supports” based on some feedback from families. They have been pretty consistent that they don’t like the term natural supports….“who talks about people that way”. Families have stated to use the term friends, family, kin, etc and not categorized natural and other supports. We also talk about sustainable supports….those people that will be there when the system folks are not. Just some thoughts.

(So-so): “natural supports” is awkward when talking about individuals. Also there can be natural supports that are not human, but are part of the community (e.g., the child’s church).

(Fine): Individuals who the child and family finds to be sources of support and who are not paid professionals.

(No rating): Formal supports are people paid specifically to help this child and family, such as the in-home aide. Informal supports are folks paid to provide services in general in the community, such as the Y. Natural supports are part of the specific social network of the child and family, including relatives, friends and neighbors. Wraparound plans are successful to the degree that they are able to transition necessary support from paid providers to informal and natural sources of help.

(Fine): Definition proposal…“Natural supports are those people in a child and family’s life who are a part of their interactive network by nature of association rather than professional affiliation”. Too wordy I know …. But it seems to get to the point relatively efficiently. I appreciate the wording of this not withstanding the definition challenge.

(Fine): Natural supports involve those people who are connected to family members by relationship. These might include relatives, neighbors, friends, co-workers or church members.

(So-so): OK, but “natural supports” needs definition. Definition should be linked to theory base.

(Fine): I think of natural support as extended family and friends that are connected through caring relationships and not paid to care. I think of formal supports as people paid to care and a relationship based in services. Additionally, I have informal supports that may be paid or not paid to care and could have relationships that tied to services or funding, and/or there like an extended support network that is community based, i.e., school bus driver, youth mentor or neighbor.

(So-so): The team actively seeks and welcomes the perspectives and full participation of individuals whose involvement is the result of informal relationships or extension of a formal relationship beyond the typical role boundaries of that person’s paid position (e.g., a teacher serving as a mentor). The plan of care actively incorporates activities and interventions provided by natural supports. (A natural support is not dependent on payment for the relationship.)

(Fine): Natural supports were described to me as being anyone/anything that I could possibly think of that could/might support my child and my family. These are not “services” or professional, but rather, exist in the community or extended family system. Friends, neighbors, church members, teachers, coaches, and programs within the community are examples.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brief name/description</th>
<th>Principle as expressed at team level</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>So-so</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Persistence</strong></td>
<td>Regardless of the child’s behavior or placement setting or the family’s circumstances, the team is persistent in working with the family toward the goals in the plan of care until the team reaches agreement that a formal wraparound process is no longer required.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>new version</strong></td>
<td>Regardless of the child’s behavior, legal status, or service setting; the family’s circumstances; or the services available in the community; the team is persistent in working with the family toward the goals in the plan of care until the team reaches agreement that a formal wraparound process is no longer required.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Changes made/rationale:**

Various additions to the list of “regardless of…” were offered.

**Your comments:**

(So-so): Excellent! I really appreciate this definition and believe many others will. Much better that unconditional which is a set up to many individuals. The once concern is “required” sounds equivalent to mandated. Maybe a suggestion would be self sustaining – or process has assisted in meeting outlined goals. Just a thought. If required was removed I would place my 1 in Fine area. Awesome though – unconditional caused so many difficulties. This is much better way to capture “unconditional” and makes more sense.

(So-so): Unsure of the need to list circumstances. It is probably sufficient to state that the team is persistent despite challenges.

(Fine): This statement rocks! Amen to this one! Puts the control on the team!

(Unacceptable): Substitute unconditional for persistent. (Unconditional care has been one of the primary elements of wraparound. This is a fundamental change.)

(No rating): Persistence is not strong enough. I would use unconditional care. Also, start with the positive statement - The team is persistent unconditional in working with the family toward the goals in the plan of care until the team reaches agreement that a formal wraparound process is no longer required. This is regardless of…

(So-so): In the interest of consistent criticism, I would again insert child after family in the phrase “…working with the family … toward …”

(Unacceptable): If this is about “zero eject” and a commitment to providing the supports to promote success (e.g., crisi plans), it does not convey it.
(So-so): The way it is worded almost sets up a dichotomy between team and family; that the team works with the family until the team decides, not until the team including the family decide.

(So-so): Wraparound is a mission-driven approach. The team documents movement toward the accomplishment of the chosen mission through objective mechanisms such as scaling. As the identified goal is approached, the degree of formal support is titrated until a maintenance level or none is needed. The team continues to support for alternative strategies to accomplish this until sustained progress is documented.

(Fine): I think one of the persistence issues related to a community system’s preparedness to keep going on the community based service track in the face of extreme challenges to system capacity. The “services available” wording points to or hints at this but does not say it explicitly.

(So-so): I’m not sure that the team always maintain it’s commitment but often the facilitator does. I’m not sure that changes the principle but it does bring up the question of “if the facilitator continues to be persistent but the rest of the team drops off, is it still wraparound?”
Does this mean the parent can refuse services and the team continues to try and engage the family? When the principle was Unconditional Care that’s what it used to mean?

(Fine): OK but still think “or the services available in the community” … takes some of the onus off family/kids and also reflects reality.

(So-so): I don’t use goals. I would say the team is persistent in working together until the family’s/youth/child’s needs are met – good enough – and the team reaches agreement that the formal wraparound team should begin transitioning out.

(So-so): Required for what? Maybe it just needs an edit….
Regardless of the child’s behavior, legal status, or service setting; the family’s circumstances; or the formal service array available in the community; the team is committed and will persist in working with the child and family until the team agrees that further progress toward the goals in the plan of care does not require the formal wraparound process.

(So-so): Wraparound should ALWAYS be in place for these children. I agree that “formal” wraparound can be discontinued at some point, but the process should be utilized throughout development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brief name/description</th>
<th>Principle as expressed at team level</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>So-so</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Outcome based</td>
<td>The team ties the goals and strategies of the plan of care to observable indicators of success, monitors progress toward these indicators, and revises the plan accordingly.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new version</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“VOTE” at right</td>
<td>The team ties the goals and strategies of the plan of care to observable or measurable indicators of success, monitors progress in terms of these indicators, and revises the plan accordingly.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Changes made/rationale:**

Several people pointed out that certain kinds of indicators (eg ratings of extent to which a need is being met) are not observable but nonetheless measurable.

**Your comments:**

(No rating): This is very hard for me to comment on. I have overarching goals for teams – it is usually families’ vision. “For son to return home and be able to go to public school” then we break it down and prioritize needs. Action steps are developed and this has assisted me in determining if team moving forward. Also a feedback loop at end of meeting. All this is qualitative though vs. quantitative. My fear is not losing the “Vision” and making it look like other “treatment plans”. One thing that occurred when we were attempting to implement our training is that we got hooked up on this. What occurred is very “treatment oriented statements” vs. vision statements or needs. I can’t offer any suggestions so don’t want to place a vote. If that makes any sense.

(Fine): Maybe something about being meaningful to the family.

(Fine): To “observable or measurable,” I would also add “or tangible.”

(Fine): I guess I jumped the gun in the last comment.

(Fine): Outcome monitoring and management also assists teams in maintaining a much needed sense of progress. Teams that manage toward outcomes they have selected and defined have the opportunity to regularly assess the status and effectiveness of the plans they are implementing. This review can serve an important team function around keeping hope, keeping the team together, and helping the family know things are changing, though, not always enough, fast enough, for it to be easy.

(Fine): Rethought my previous version comment. This is fine.

(Fine): Is this where it is recognized that the ‘wraparound process’ may require attention to outcomes and potential ‘limitations or requirements of funding’?

(So-so): It doesn’t matter which it is as long as they are defined. The team ties the goals and strategies of the plan of care to defined observable or measurable indicators of success; monitors progress in terms of these indicators; and then revises the plan accordingly.
(So-so): I have concerns about the wraparound process being considered an “intervention”. It should be an approach to supporting a child and family throughout development. The challenges that these children and their families face are lifelong and pervasive. While I agree that with monitoring improvement and following up on team decisions as the purpose for ongoing “outcomes”, I dislike the language “outcome based”. That is unless the “outcome” is successful transition into adulthood!

(Fine): What about frequency of monitoring? Monthly? Quarterly? Yearly? A monitoring schedule should be identified by the team with responsible parties identified.
OVERALL RATINGS:

Taken as a group, do these principles serve to describe wraparound well?

First Round Ratings:
5  = Yes, as written

13 = More or less, but minor changes would improve them (use space below to make any comments beyond what you have already written)

3 = No, significant changes must be made before I could endorse the principles as a definition of wraparound (use space below to make any comments beyond what you have already written).

VOTE here for the second round principles as revised:

8  = Yes, as written

20 = More or less, but minor changes would improve them (use space below to make any comments beyond what you have already written)

4 = No, significant changes must be made before I could endorse the principles as a definition of wraparound (use space below to make any comments beyond what you have already written).

Comments:
(More or less): These are some of the best definitions of values I have seen. Awesome work. I have hope for the job I do with this being worked on.

(More or less): Add principles for:
   1. Best practices
   2. Promote independence.

(More or less): Nice job presenting the results and describing how you used them to change the descriptions. Keep the references to the kids perspective!

(More or less): The principles are actually pretty well outlined, but I would go to greater pains to remind the reader that we are ultimately serving the child by bringing the family into play in this process, as ultimately, it is the child whom we (and the family!) are trying to help. Through this process, we are ultimately empowering the child every bit as much as we are empowering the family. I would also get away from the racial language, as mentioned earlier, and couch it in terms of culture, rather than ethnicity.

(Yes): This process is yielding an improved expression of this process, thanks for your time and effort.

(No): As written this is neither child, youth, and family driven.

(More or less): I think it would help to put wraparound into context along with other family-centered practice models, so people can see how it is similar and how it differs.
See comments above.

An overall observation on my part is that many of the language changes between the first and second round are moving to acknowledge youth voice, choice, and preference. I hope that we are not seeing a move away from the importance of parent voice, participation, acknowledgement that has been a critical element of this field from the beginning, in my humble opinion. I hope that this does not reflect a move in the field to act like youth are in charge of their teams when family is not easily present in the process. I, and others, have seen teams go down the road of substituting youth voice for family voice in those circumstances when efforts to engage the parent or other family member have been incomplete or unsuccessful. In those instances the principle of family involvement needs to reach beyond voice in the process to an assurance that the principle is directed at including family, up to and including developing and implementing outreach and engagement efforts that would be considered extraordinary in most service system settings.

Thanks for the opportunity to review and provide input. I regret not having done so in the first round and will be glad to do more at any point in the future.

(No): Number 1 is missing some language and number 2 is still stated in a manner that offers little guidance to clarify the misinterpretations being made in practice…Number 1 already addresses wraparound value “family voice”…adding it into principle two will lead to confusion. I have data that demonstrate this confusion. My concern about principle 2 as well as some of the questions you’ve raised about language in other principles may be addressed if/when this process gets to discussing theory-base for the values in these principles. Otherwise, the rest of the principles are ok or “good enough to test drive”…

By design this “committee process” builds off the Duke focus group’s attempt to get greater clarity and consistency. However, won’t greater clarity and consistency also require identifying the theory-base for these value-based principles? And shouldn’t we be discussing theory of change, linked to the theory-base and principles? Might not that develop greater operational clarity?

It sounds like from here you’ll take this to a small group that has already pre-determined the next step is to identify stages of wraparound team process? Where is the theory base? It would shape definition of stages. If you identify the theory base it will help clarify language about “strengths”, “natural supports”, and so much more.

(No): You did no offer any definitions of wraparound.