National Wraparound Strategies Initiative
Initial Meeting of the “Advisory Group”
June 25, 2003, Portland, Oregon
MEETING NOTES

I. Introduction and rationale for the meeting

The first meeting of the advisory group for the National Wraparound Strategies Initiative was opened with introductions from Barbara Friesen of the Research and Training Center for Children’s Mental Health and Family Support, Susan Stromberg of the SAMHSA Center for Mental Health Services (who read a greeting from Rolando Santiago of the CMHS Children, Youth and Family Branch), and Trina Osher from the Federation of Families for Children’s Mental Health. After these introductions, Eric Bruns presented the rationale for the meeting, which was to convene a team of Wraparound experts (as well as potential users of materials on Wraparound) to determine and oversee efforts to better describe and define the model in a way that would ensure high-quality service provision for families.

After these introductions to the meeting, John VanDenBerg briefly presented his perspective on the successes of and challenges to Wraparound, based on his many years providing training and technical assistance to the field. David Osher followed with a description of national technical assistance providers’ tremendous need for tangible materials such as specific strategies and standards for Wraparound, so that they could better accomplish their missions. Finally, Eric Bruns returned to present a Power Point presentation about the progress that has been made with respect to Wraparound in the past and the goal of the meeting today. Progress noted included the delineation of Wraparound’s essential elements and principles; the expansion of innovative and well-described practices by sites nationally; the tremendous advancement in the science of training, coaching, and provision of TA; the field’s movement towards “standards” of care; and the development of implementation and fidelity measures for Wraparound. Eric then described how these advances have led up to the current initiative. Major goals for the national Wraparound Strategies Initiative were described as (1) developing consistent indicators of high-quality Wraparound at multiple levels and (2) compiling specific strategies that can make such high-quality services happen.

II. Meeting attendees’ perspectives on Wraparound

The discussion was then turned over to the group. Participants were asked to describe developments that they have seen in the field, as well as the challenges that are still present.

Major progress and positive developments noted by the attendees are listed below:

- Bringing services up to scale by serving and growing beyond the program into systems of care and beyond the city into state and national policy
- Developing practice models and basic elements (“standards”)
- Having more data to show that Wraparound does work with children and families
- Wraparound teams enabling families to have a voice
- Having Parent Partners paired with Resource Facilitators as skilled additions to the team
- Changing the system from a school standpoint, such as through Positive Behavioral Support and “mini-interventions” in the schools
- The fact that this meeting is occurring
- Development of fidelity instruments
- Evidence from Wraparound Milwaukee, and its leading to Wraparound being included in the New Freedom Commissions report (as well as school-based MH being listed in the report)
- Wraparound moving from “philosophy” to treatment
- Coaching versus training and faith-based Wraparound
- Being one of the families that Wraparound has been successful for
- The move to more concrete definitions
- The roles of Parent Partners and other paraprofessionals being recognized
- The fidelity measures
- The new and old faces in this room
- The effort and energy at this meeting, the emphasis on outcomes, and the fact that Wraparound works
- People getting a sense that advancing Wraparound is “worth doing”
- The broad applications of the work and proficiency in more generic skills for different agency divisions
- That Wraparound has moved into juvenile justice as a topic
- That the TA Partnership and Macro are seeing Wraparound development as a worthwhile long-term effort
- That the core ideas (principles or elements) of Wraparound have survived and been widely adopted

**Major challenges for Wraparound** included:
- Similar to the developments, more work is still needed in serving and growing the scale of WA beyond the program and individual jurisdictions
- The need to develop an “industry standard,” so customers know what they are getting and are supposed to be getting
- The issue of adherence to the philosophy, and educating consumers on the services and the philosophy
- Teaching service providers basic information on how to facilitate a team meeting
- Finding out whether or not this really helps parents and increasing the precision of implementing interventions within Wraparound
- Increasing the precision of the interventions provided within WA and determining how to teach service providers to use good interventions
- Sorting out what Wraparound is and what it might be, and learning how we train people specifically enough on WA to make a difference for families
- Policing ourselves so others do not come in and do it
The challenges of wording, the need for an evidence-base, and the fact that there is too much emphasis on the team when we really need emphasis on the interventions delivered within Wraparound

Still not knowing exactly what the treatment is, which leads to the need to come together with an agreed upon set of methodologies and more precise definitions

“The evidence-based practice thing” – how to establish Wraparound’s standing within the EBP movement

State political and fiscal challenges

Challenging people to believe in the philosophy and structure of Wraparound

System challenges around eliminating creative innovations and more attention being paid to the practice and not the context

Determining what cultural competence means within a Wraparound context

Not knowing what terms mean, the trend towards clinical professionals instead of passionate professionals, and incorporating strengths-based caregiver measures

Agencies seeing the benefit of collaboration

The need to continue to associate fidelity with Wraparound

Helping communities get the necessary conditions in place to do Wraparound

The need to get information out to the field; the need to show outcomes in order to ensure funding and leverage to change systems

Moving toward Wraparound not being new but rather “business as usual”

The conservative climate and funding

The fact that we forget what it means to keep the child in the home and that families are the outcomes not just the child

The need for flexibility in how people think about their roles;

The division between mental health and child welfare and public systems generally blocking quality

The issue of how to define a process and then get people to do it and report on outcomes (and how do you do this in systems with different values)

Conceptual clarity and operationalization and the need for long term outcomes

The fact that there is no short way to talk about Wraparound

The need for a “moral authority” that refers to both a framework and a set of standards

III. A research-based framework for defining standards and compiling strategies

Next, Janet Walker presented a conceptual framework of necessary conditions for providing high-quality Wraparound. (See Figure 1 at the end of these notes.) The framework is the result of several years of data collection, interviews, and observations by her team at Portland State’s Research and Training Center. Janet presented the framework as a potential vehicle for achieving the long-term goals of the national Initiative.

The framework provides a way to accomplish a number of objectives:
1. Describe successful practices and implementation in a way that is “generic” enough to accommodate a variety of successful approaches (such as those that might be compiled in the course of the national Initiative),
2. Synthesize the accumulated expertise of providers, families, and trainers, as well as the existing theory and research on Wraparound,
3. Add to the existing theory and research base, and
4. Provide a means for accountability, both “upward” (providers and families assessing the level of support provided by programs and systems) and “downward” administrators and researchers assessing the level of quality of Wraparound being provided by practitioners).

The question was then placed before the group as to whether the framework of necessary conditions for high-quality Wraparound would be suitable for compiling strategies and defining standards or indicators. At this point, however, there was first some discussion on whether or not compiling specific strategies for Wraparound for dissemination to the field was the right place to start. The point was made that it may be more important to first identify the fundamental core of Wraparound, with compiling strategies being a parallel but not necessarily first step. After some discussion, the group came to some conclusion that compiling strategies for implementing Wraparound was not a final goal, but rather one of several activities that would be necessary to advance understanding of Wraparound.

Next, the use of the conceptual framework to advance this work was discussed, with many different viewpoints being shared. It was noted that there is value in both the components and the structure of the framework, but that it may suggest a rigid application of Wraparound, which is intended to be flexible and individualized for both families and programs/jurisdictions. An example provided of the implied rigidity is the use of “levels” in the framework; specifically, the depiction of necessary conditions for Wraparound at the team, provider, and system levels.

As discussion turned to how the framework might be used to describe the “fundamental core” of Wraparound as well as compile specific strategies to make Wraparound happen, it was brought to the attention of the group that maybe there was more clarification needed of what the expected outcome of the day’s meeting was. Eric Bruns attempted to clarify this by reminding everyone that the basic question for the day was: “how do you communicate what is needed to make the Wraparound philosophy happen in to the field?” The group then stepped back a moment to brainstorm what major components of the ultimate scope of work for the national Initiative might be:

1. **Compile strategies and innovations** to make Wraparound happen that people can use, and then organize and disseminate those strategies.
2. Communicate to the field that high-quality Wraparound and the Wraparound philosophy overall require thinking about supports at a continuum of levels, from the family and team to the program, local system, and national context
3. Contributing to **toolkits** being provided by CMHS to the new grant sites to be used in collaboration with the outcome measures used by ORC Macro, Inc.
4. Create something specific that provides **structure and observable indicators** for individual sites and personnel so they know whether they are achieving a minimum standard for Wraparound

The conversation was then brought back to the use of the framework of necessary conditions and its potential use as a framework for accomplishing some of the above components. First, it was noted that two additional areas of support (columns in the matrix) may need to be added to the existing framework under the Necessary Support Conditions: Family Support and Intervention Support. Intervention support would describe how to ensure that identified interventions and supports for a family are as efficacious as possible; for example, if identified as a part of a family’s plan of care, how to ensure that “horseback riding therapy” was truly therapeutic and not just riding a horse. (Such an example could also be applied to more traditional interventions, such as individual or group psychotherapy).

In general, however, the framework was observed to be a potentially good way of documenting the minimum standards for high-quality Wraparound and also to organize indicators of quality and specific strategies.

During this conversation, additional concerns were also brought up about the products and process for the national Wraparound Initiative:

- The need for a 30 second definition for the question “what is Wraparound,”
- How this discussion is similar to the early MST discussions,
- the question of whether “half Wraparound” is better than no Wraparound,
- the importance of “using thinking as a change agent” (??) and coming up with strategies first and then coming up with methods for raising the bar over time,
- the question of what unit of implementation do we want to focus on (i.e., the team, the program, the system, etc),
- the need for Wraparound to be integrated into the family context, and finally
- the importance of not losing the social justice piece of Wraparound, or the notion of Wraparound as a philosophy as well as a specific set of techniques.

A break was then taken for lunch and socializing.

IV. Small group work on identifying specific Wraparound strategies

After lunch, the group was split up into small groups with the task being:

1. Pick one area in which programs/providers need help to achieve high-quality Wraparound,
2. Brainstorm regarding strategies or interventions at the system, provider, and team levels, and
3. Pick one strategy or intervention and come up with indicators of how you know you have it or are doing it and a potential method of communication to the field.

The three areas for brainstorming groups had to choose from were: convening and maintaining teams, ensuring the use of a mix of community based and natural supports, or achieving interagency collaboration.

Each group chose to focus on ensuring the use of a mix of community-based and natural supports and each group’s responses were recorded on a flip chart. For the purposes of the discussion, formal supports were defined as time-limited, paid, specially trained services and natural supports was defined as being already in the community and
family life and being reciprocal. See the Appendix to these notes to see the results of small groups’ work.

After the small group discussion on what the small groups came up with, the discussion was turned to the challenge of completing this exercise, with the point being to use it as a small-scale “trial run” for the ultimate work of the Initiative. The following challenges of the process were noted:

It was noted that there are measurement issues in that how do you measure the strategies, and that different strategies would require very different approaches to measurement, with some not being amenable to measurement.

A second challenge was how to contend with the need to identify describe both strategies and tactics where tactics are operationalized and general strategies are not. For one group, it was identified that the need was for a well-described planning process that goes beyond natural supports and to other elements, which is not currently in practice.

A third challenge was the need for clear examples of supports.

A fourth challenge noted was that disseminating information will require multiple methods. One participant noted that three categories of information for the field could be imagined: 1) the strategies people actually did in practice, 2) the things people thought about doing, and 3) the things people would like to do.

V. Looking forward: Advancing the national “Wraparound Strategies Initiative”

The group then conducted some large group brainstorming about moving the Initiative forward. The group more or less agreed that the goals for the Initiative as presented by Eric and Janet aligned with the needs and challenges facing Wraparound as identified by the large group of attendees. The group also seemed to agree that the methods identified in the concept paper for the Initiative to achieve these goals seemed reasonable enough, but that they were not very fully described. Thus, the last segment of the meeting focused on moving forward.

The group agreed that there is a large body of existing products about Wraparound and that any attempt to compile strategies and identify standards for Wraparound should start by getting all the products together so that the effort is not starting from scratch. It was noted that the variety of products in the field is a strength and that we need to share them. However, it is important to not overlook the private nature of the tools and the entrepreneurship that goes along with that. This could be accomplished possibly by creating a compendium of existing manuals instead of one new manual. This would give communities options even though the trainings may be similar.

It was also noted that the members of the national advisory group as well as the field as a whole would benefit from some sort of effort to summarize the content of all the training and other materials on Wraparound and what people are doing and then compare and contrast the materials that exist to identify gaps. An effort could then be undertaken to fill these gaps. However, it would likely be necessary to determine ground rules and criteria for including specific variations on practices, such as by whether or not there is an empirical base, theory base, or “opinion base” about the specific practice being considered for inclusion.
An important question was raised regarding how you move from doing this with a few people to changing the system. In addition, the more concrete issue of products for sites that result from the Initiative was discussed. A poster that would summarize the main aspects of Wraparound’s philosophy and minimum standards was suggested. A suggestion was also made for a book titled “20 Bad Things Apt to Happen to You in the Next Six Months,” which would be a manual of strategies for how to deal with thorny issues that would also provide a sympathetic ear. The importance of creating methods for people to talk about their struggles was stressed (maybe even conferences of “how Wraparound messed up your life and how you got over it”). A suggestion was also made for a book or set of tools on all the ways to evaluate the quality at the team, provider, and system levels.

The question was then asked, “When would [materials] be too big and overwhelming to be helpful?” However it was noted that books are not sufficient for learning and that any such products should be aligned with methods for enabling “hands on” learning, coaching, and mechanisms for sharing what people have learned.

Attention was then brought back to the need for the bigger message about Wraparound to be communicated as well as the importance of doing more than talking about it. We need to have structures in place to ensure that both basic understanding about the philosophy of Wraparound happens as well as the potential to communicate fine-grained details about providing services via the Wraparound approach. This may partially consist of preliminary introductions to Wraparound before beginning training as well as distinguishing between ensuring the basic level of quality versus going beyond that. There are competing messages in the field and it may be necessary to distinguish a set of minimum standards about those things that are absolutely necessary to have in place in order for a service delivery endeavor to be called “Wraparound.” We need to have a good, quick definition of Wraparound as well as a good description of what is not Wraparound. The importance of visual examples was noted. Suggestions were made regarding possible studies that would be helpful, including a field epidemiological approach looking at good, bad, and horrible Wraparound, as well as a study that includes multiple perspectives, including the point of view of the youths saying what worked and what didn’t.

As the meeting drew to a close, there was a discussion on who would actually do the work after this meeting and the fact that all agree is the scope of work is a priority but that the work needs to be divided into manageable parts. The discussion then turned to funding for the Initiative. It was specifically noted that the full group needs to keep resources in mind so that what doesn’t happen is that nothing happens. Three group members made offers of tangible resources to fund the work of the Initiative. In addition, it was noted that CMHS would be interested in seeing a concrete proposal and budget for possible funding and that an important step may be having SAMHSA convene with the group in some sort of public-private partnership.

A discussion was also made of the importance of a means to maintain the group’s cohesion in the interim between now and the next convening of the advisory group, such as via a virtual discussion group. Such a mechanism could then allow the group to be kept up to date and to review materials that result from the work of the Wraparound Strategies Initiative. This could be done by creating a closed website that only members
of the group could view. David Osher volunteered to do this via a web portal at AIR, and Janet Walker also volunteered resources and webspace at the Portland State Research and Training Center. **Cindy Meyers** volunteered to help on the content end of the website. Finally, **Pat Miles** volunteered to contribute everything that she has authored to the effort of compiling materials and specific strategies for Wraparound.

The meeting closed with an agreement for the Portland State, Maryland, and Vermont folks to:

- Set up a mechanism for maintaining the group in “virtual space;”
- Revise the Wraparound Strategies Initiative plan to reflect the thinking that emerged from this first national meeting;
- Begin the execution of this plan, submitting materials and products to the national group for review along the way; and
- Follow up on potential mechanisms for funding the Initiative
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEAM LEVEL</th>
<th>ORGANIZATIONAL LEVEL</th>
<th>SYSTEM LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practice model</strong>&lt;br&gt;i. Team adheres to a practice model that promotes effective planning <em>and</em> the value base of ISP. &lt;br&gt;• Sub-conditions of practice model 1-7</td>
<td><strong>Practice model</strong>&lt;br&gt;i. Lead agency provides training, supervision and support for a clearly defined practice model. &lt;br&gt;ii. Lead agency demonstrates its commitment to the values of ISP. &lt;br&gt;iii. Partner agencies support the core values underlying the team ISP process.</td>
<td><strong>Practice model</strong>&lt;br&gt;i. Leaders in the policy and funding context actively support the ISP practice model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaboration/partnerships</strong>&lt;br&gt;i. Appropriate people, prepared to make decisions and commitments, attend meetings and participate collaboratively.</td>
<td><strong>Collaboration/partnerships</strong>&lt;br&gt;i. Lead and partner agencies collaborate around the plan and the team. &lt;br&gt;ii. Lead agency supports team efforts to get necessary members to attend meetings and participate collaboratively. &lt;br&gt;iii. Partner agencies support their workers as team members and empower them to make decisions.</td>
<td><strong>Collaboration/partnerships</strong>&lt;br&gt;i. Policy and funding context encourages interagency cooperation around the team and the plan. &lt;br&gt;ii. Leaders in the policy and funding context play a problem-solving role across service boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity building/staffing</strong>&lt;br&gt;i. Team members capably perform their roles on the team.</td>
<td><strong>Capacity building/staffing</strong>&lt;br&gt;i. Lead and partner agencies provide working conditions that enable high quality work and reduce burnout.</td>
<td><strong>Capacity building/staffing</strong>&lt;br&gt;i. Policy and funding context supports development of the special skills needed for key roles on ISP teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acquiring services/supports</strong>&lt;br&gt;i. Team is aware of a wide array of services and supports and their effectiveness. &lt;br&gt;ii. Team identifies and develops family-specific natural supports. &lt;br&gt;iii. Team designs and tailor services based on families' expressed needs.</td>
<td><strong>Acquiring services/supports</strong>&lt;br&gt;i. Lead agency has clear policies and makes timely decisions regarding funding for costs required to meet families' unique needs. &lt;br&gt;ii. Lead agency encourages teams to develop plans based on child/family needs and strengths, rather than service fads or financial pressures. &lt;br&gt;iii. Lead agency demonstrates its commitment to developing culturally competent community and natural services and supports. &lt;br&gt;iv. Lead agency supports teams in effectively including community and natural supports. &lt;br&gt;v. Lead agency demonstrates its commitment to developing an array of effective providers.</td>
<td><strong>Acquiring services/supports</strong>&lt;br&gt;i. Policy and funding context grants autonomy and incentives to develop effective services and supports consistent with ISP practice model. &lt;br&gt;ii. Policy and funding context supports fiscal policies that allow the flexibility needed by ISP teams. &lt;br&gt;iii. Policy and funding context actively supports family and youth involvement in decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Team maintains documentation for continuous improvement and mutual accountability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Lead agency monitors adherence to the practice model, implementation of plans, and cost and effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Documentation requirements meet the needs of policy makers, funders, and other stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX: Small group exercise notes:

### Group A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making every head of a community system volunteer to be a natural support and spend time with a child and family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate fixed contracting—any provider on a “level playing field”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move contracting/fiscal authority as close to the child/family/team as possible—family can “fire” providers—have ratings by providers. Providers in network go to training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed back to families how much it costs for each element on the plan-0- empowering families and choice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For every strategy, regular review on 1-5 scale of the extent to which the need is being met through the strategy—all services on level playing field- use of this strategy predicated on having determined needs and then relating strategies to needs.</td>
<td>Check team plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Incentivize” your replacement—matchmaking to community supports/natural supports</td>
<td>Length of relationships, number of incentivized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing mentoring through Medicaid so that it is not tied to family receiving intensive services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith community providing mentoring at different levels of commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy for 2 unpaid for every paid resource on a plan—don’t fund plan otherwise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing to respond to unmet needs e.g. care for time between end of school and caregiver returning from work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do a plan of care for the program and agency with needs and strategies—provides transparency on agency/program/system priorities and activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community resource network—database? Searchable by zipcode to see available community resources. Training to ask families better questions to elicit info on natural resources/supports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continually going back to consumer to ask about needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire people who act between the community and the system, not constrained by usual “boundary issues”</td>
<td>Person has community ties, is a consumer, has basic belief about people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educating people—including natural supports—about a non-blaming and family-driven perspective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Group B: Create and maintain a balance between types of supports, e.g. informal/formal

- Pre-work/first visit with family:
  - Always start alone with the family, “have a conversation”.
  - Tell the facilitator what to say at the outset and how to have the conversation – this conversation is the “make or break point”.
  - Components of pre-work- should be in place before family is engaged.
  - Methods of instructing to withhold judgment about family’s choices/desires.
  - Focus on the roles of the team members.
  - Need to do pre-work with the youth as well. Pick a person most likely to resonate with the kid (neutral is okay).
  - System issues related to this first step:
    - Job descriptions
    - Training issues
    - Flexibility of schedule to allow people to be on the team
    - Support
    - Resources

- Identifying “natural supports”
  - Start the conversation with identifying natural supports or,
  - Start with the facilitator who can ID natural supports
    - Conversation should happen with someone who is safe and appropriate for the family ID’d.
  - Specify the function of natural support. This conversation should be with someone the family feels comfortable with.
  - Ensure multiple examples are exposed to practitioners in an ongoing fashion.
  - Training on teaching that interventions can be “natural” or “informal”.
  - Interventions should be connected to strengths. If this happens, interventions are likely to be less formal.
  - Are having 50% natural supports on a team a goal? A requirement? More realistic to look at it like the team should have 50% of the services as informal.

- Supervision is an important piece to ensure that the team in including natural supports and informal services.
- Team monitoring is also another way to ensure the inclusion on natural supports and informal services. Should be built into organizational support.
- Important to have ongoing discussion with team on progress of the team – ask the family if they are satisfied.
- Ensure someone on the team is in a role of advocate/monitor.
- Data system needs to be in place to maintain info at multiple levels:
  - Team plan
  - Strengths/needs life domains
• Goals and progress towards those goals.
  ▪ Facilitators need specific training (beyond single initial conversation) and family needs coaching for family on how to be on teams, what wraparound is, and the value base.
  ▪ All team members need training in order to adapt practices in alignment with the family. (e.g. Beyond Blame approach).

  ▪ **Group C: Formal/informal support mix issues**
    ▪ “Therapauracy” – industry $ incentives.
    ▪ “Don’t try to label or define all parts of real life”
    ▪ “It can be helpful to educate about need for mix of formal and informal supports.”
    ▪ “Formal/natural language is a “western” concept.
    ▪ “Cultural/racial/linguistic disconnect between providers and family natural supports.
    ▪ Assumptions, context, definitions:
      • Mix of formal/informal leads to better outcomes, sustainable outcomes.
        o Formal – time limited, paid, specially trained
        o Informal
        o Natural – already in community and in family life, reciprocal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO GET MORE OF:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>System</strong></td>
<td><strong>Provider/organization</strong></td>
<td><strong>Team</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand responsibility of mix – not just formal.</td>
<td>Raise awareness if providers’ knowledge about need for mix and differences between needs and services.</td>
<td>Educate to possibility of mix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State policy and inventive for providers who achieve mix.</td>
<td>Help providers and partner organizations change “culture” of agencies to realize importance of “mix” – put in job descriptions train, celebrate.</td>
<td>Ask - “What would you do with no $?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop regulations, policies for use of natural supports (instruments, confidentiality, HIPPA, etc.)</td>
<td>Put “mix” into agency mission, vision, boards.</td>
<td>Teach team to identify needs vs. services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put “mix” in RFP or accreditation criteria.</td>
<td>Use parents to share where resources are.</td>
<td>Help families and all of team see we all have strengths and needs and families have been labeled blamed and shamed to minimize their strengths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop written materials that describe value of natural supports.</td>
<td>Develop written materials that describe value of natural supports.</td>
<td>Develop written materials that describe value of natural supports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships for students who work in places with mix; state uses fiscal clout to modify curriculum; family members and other experts as part of faculty (sustained); create cross-discipline incentives and for teaching “mix”.</td>
<td>Train providers about limitations if what they do to importance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Indicators to increase understanding and contribution of values of natural supports:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Provider/organization</th>
<th>Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of RFP’s, etc. with balance (mix) detailed and specifics of how mix will be achieved.</td>
<td>Growth in breadth of types of natural supports – sport leagues, neighbors, F-B, etc.</td>
<td>Teams will use and access more natural supports overtime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to include family QA and CQI as measures.</td>
<td>Trained to use QA and CQI by families</td>
<td>Use QA and CQI, collect info, use info.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Disseminating understanding** of value of natural supports
  - Web-based discussion groups for care coordinators and others.
  - Create cross-disciplined (APA, FFCMH, early adopters, NASW, SAMHSA, AAMFT, NAMI)
  - Priority focus on this issue:
    A. Create in-house advocates
    B. Build momentum
    C. Create consensus
    D. Tie in FB initiatives
  - “The Year of the Natural Supports”
  - Fund demonstration projects – show that this can be done.
  - Develop clear sample policy of how to use fiscal incentives and training to achieve mix.