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Themes from Small Group Discussions on Tools for Wraparound

Themes that emerged across two or more of the breakout groups:

**Can we/should we collect tools, and if so, what should the process look like?**
It seems like a viable idea to collect tools. People would also like to see great examples of plans, crisis plans, strengths discoveries, etc. Requests for people to submit tools could be made first (by email) to advisory group, and request should be for a specific kind or type of tools, possibly by phase (e.g. beginning with tools that are used during the engagement phase) or by type of tool (e.g. fidelity, implementation, etc.).

When people submit tools, they should also provide additional information such as: their contact information (for follow-up), what the purpose of the tool is, where the tool originated, how it is used, what sort of training it requires to use, costs that may be incurred with use, whether there is an evidence base associated with the tool, etc.

**Should we try to evaluate the tools, and if so, what should that process look like?**
Tools should be at least minimally “vetted” to make sure that they are consistent with wraparound philosophy. A workgroup could review a subset of tools—this would eliminate duplication and maybe draw focus to the best ones. Then posted on the web in an interactive site so that people could give feedback about how the tool worked and rate it, so that future visitors to the site would have that additional information to go on.

**Concerns:**
Tools are not sufficient for high quality wraparound, and it’s possible that people will think that by using the tools they are necessarily doing the process—this can lead to “shallow” wraparound that is a process but does not feel like help. A tool is not a replacement for good coaching.

At some point need to grapple with the skills required for wraparound—describe? Evaluate quality?

Somehow there needs to be consistency in approach so that the tools fit with the model and are tied to fidelity.

**Overall** there was quite a lot of similarity in suggestions across groups.