Theme no. 1: Fidelity measurement needs to be a broad-based endeavor.

- Group members reinforced that under-specification of the wraparound process and what is needed to support it is a greater danger than over-specification. As such, there is a multiplicity of areas of potential measurement.

- Though the process needs to be feasible and not overwhelming, there is a need to measure both “are we doing the process as it is described,” as well as “core competencies” of staff that may not be specific to wraparound, such as:
  - Listening
  - Teamwork and group/meeting facilitation skills
  - Being able to make connections
  - Knowing the local resources
  - Being able to fully partner with families

- Other places to look for core competency descriptions include:
  - Annapolis Coalition
  - Research and Training Centers
  - VVDB Supervision Tools and Users’ Guide
  - AZ draft tools
  - Job descriptions from partner provider organizations

- In addition, the endeavor of measuring quality and fidelity should be expanded to consider the outputs of the wraparound process, such as family members’ degree of social support, engagement in the process, and ability to serve as a leader in the community (e.g., Targeted Parenting Assistance stages). This was echoed in another group which nominated “Extent to which the family is finally empowered to advocate for the child and for itself” (check out the Family Functioning Matrix (Brad Norman has the URL). Another group also included funding mechanisms and the community context. Though these may seem more like outcomes than process, they are critical indicators of whether wraparound is being conducted properly and in keeping with the model. As one group put it, “A good process alone is of no value unless it leads to a better quality of life – kids who are living at home, are going to school, are safe in the community, and are not in trouble with the law”

- Similarly, it was agreed that there are certain perceptions of the family that are also indicators of implementation quality, such as:
  - the extent family members feel respected
  - that they are receiving the services and supports they want
  - the extent to which they are driving their team
  - Family and youth satisfaction with their role in the process and the outcome from it
However, it was also agreed that the measures should not look or function like satisfaction questionnaires.

- Ultimately, after discussing the complexity of the many domains that would need measurement, attendees also agreed there is a need for a comprehensive theory of change for wraparound that would guide fidelity measurement and research in this area.

**Theme no. 2: Types of measurement approaches**

- Participants agreed that the measures should include several components, including:
  - Direct observation of the work of the wraparound team
  - Direct observation by the supervisor of the facilitators’ skills and behavior
  - Direct, targeted interviews of the families receiving services and their team members – what is their experience?
  - Chart/plan of care reviews
  - Assessment of the organizational and system context

- At least one participant also suggested that the quality of individual treatments available and received was a key element of quality assessment within wraparound that should not be overlooked.

- Another group noted that “Outsiders” can help us better understand our own wraparound process because they observe it more objectively.
  - This underscores the need for externally driven program evaluation, as well as internal staff evaluation that can triangulate multiple perspectives on performance of personnel.

**Theme 3: Fidelity and quality measures should be aimed at practical problem-solving by programs and also be feasible.**

As one group put it, the measurement needs to be used to promote learning about the wraparound process and the outcomes that come from it. Measures need to be action oriented, leading the team or agency to a new level of skill.

- To ensure feasibility of data collection and utility of the data collected, team members discussed that fidelity/quality measurement should include a combination of (1) internal and ongoing quality assurance and (2) externally-conducted assessment.
  - For example, internal quality management resources should be used to ensure that there is review of all facilitators’ work and all plans of care.
  - At the same time, a sample of families may be interviewed by external fidelity assessors, as well as a sample of team meetings within a program or system.
- To ensure that data is used, participants agreed that ideally, supervisors would have caseloads and job demands that allowed adequate supervisory attention to reviewing data on wraparound implementation versus other activities.
• Another useful purpose for fidelity/quality measures: Readiness to Implement, including
  o Team dynamics and readiness to engage the important person – the youth
  o Systems preparation – the need to blended perspectives
  o Capacity to facilitate and support ongoing training
  o Engagement of system partners

**Theme 4: Creating measures**
Attendees provided some suggestions around how to create new fidelity and quality measures that meet the needs described above as well as align with the NWI model.

• One group suggested that the approach taken to defining the NWI model may be used, whereby a small group compiles indicators and existing technologies into a big “basket,” extracts the most promising approaches, and then uses a process such as the Delphi process to get feedback and select the best indicators and items.

• Another group suggested that we get input from Supervisors who serve as good coaches for both facilitators and for system transformation, Family members who serve as guides and mentors, and Community leaders who serve as cultural guides for staff

• 2 groups suggested that the team developing the measures should pilot different approaches in different sites and see which were most useful.