RESPONDENTS

- TOTAL = 41
- RESPONDENT INFORMATION
  - 34 = European American/Caucasian
  - 3 = African American
  - 2 = Hispanic/Latino
  - 1 = Native American/American Indian
  - 1 = Asian American
YEARS AND ROLES PARTICIPATED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Description</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>3-5</th>
<th>6-8</th>
<th>9-13</th>
<th>14 or more</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Response Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As family member or youth on my family team (N=8)</td>
<td>7% (2)</td>
<td>4% (1)</td>
<td>4% (1)</td>
<td>4% (1)</td>
<td>15% (4)</td>
<td>67% (18)</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a natural support or other teams (N=15)</td>
<td>7% (2)</td>
<td>20% (6)</td>
<td>13% (4)</td>
<td>10% (3)</td>
<td>7% (2)</td>
<td>43% (13)</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a parent advocate or parent partner (N=13)</td>
<td>6% (2)</td>
<td>10% (3)</td>
<td>10% (3)</td>
<td>6% (2)</td>
<td>10% (3)</td>
<td>58% (18)</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a wraparound facilitator or care coordinator (n=19)</td>
<td>14% (4)</td>
<td>31% (9)</td>
<td>3% (1)</td>
<td>14% (4)</td>
<td>3% (1)</td>
<td>34% (10)</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a team member who is a professional (N=19)</td>
<td>17% (5)</td>
<td>24% (7)</td>
<td>7% (2)</td>
<td>10% (3)</td>
<td>7% (2)</td>
<td>34% (10)</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a wraparound supervisor or coach in your local community (N=24)</td>
<td>8% (3)</td>
<td>22% (8)</td>
<td>28% (10)</td>
<td>6% (2)</td>
<td>3% (1)</td>
<td>33% (12)</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a trainer/consultant on wraparound in multiple communities (N=30)</td>
<td>8% (3)</td>
<td>33% (12)</td>
<td>14% (5)</td>
<td>19% (7)</td>
<td>8% (3)</td>
<td>17% (6)</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a program manager or administrator (N=30)</td>
<td>19% (7)</td>
<td>27% (10)</td>
<td>16% (6)</td>
<td>14% (5)</td>
<td>5% (2)</td>
<td>19% (7)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a higher-level (e.g., county or state) administrator or policy maker (N=19)</td>
<td>11% (4)</td>
<td>20% (7)</td>
<td>11% (4)</td>
<td>6% (2)</td>
<td>6% (2)</td>
<td>46% (16)</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a researcher on wraparound (N=11)</td>
<td>10% (3)</td>
<td>20% (6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7% (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63% (19)</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total respondents: 41
THEME 1: LEADERSHIP

Overall

For assessing community support for wraparound, overall these items are...

As currently worded, overall these items are...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Optional</th>
<th>Inadvisable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87.05</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>O.K.</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70.15</td>
<td>26.35</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THEME 2: COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS

Overall

For assessing community support for wraparound, overall these items are...

As currently worded, overall these items are...

![Bar chart showing essential, optional, and inadvisable ratings for community support.]

- Essential: 76.7%
- Optional: 20.9%
- Inadvisable: 2.36%

![Bar chart showing fine, O.K., and unacceptable ratings.]

- Fine: 82.96%
- O.K.: 15.24%
- Unacceptable: 1.76%
For assessing community support for wraparound, overall these items are...

As currently worded, overall these items are...

Overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Optional</th>
<th>Inadvisable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79.53</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>O.K.</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73.01</td>
<td>24.93</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THEME 4: FISCAL TRACKING & POLICIES

Overall

For assessing community support for wraparound, overall these items are...

As currently worded, overall these items are...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Optional</th>
<th>Inadvisable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73.44</td>
<td>21.93</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>O.K.</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>17.34</td>
<td>7.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THEME 5: COORDINATED & ACCESSIBLE RESOURCES

Overall

For assessing community support for wraparound, overall these items are...

Essential: 80.16%
Optional: 13.73%
Inadvisable: 6.1%

As currently worded, overall these items are...

Fine: 79.62%
O.K.: 14.82%
Unacceptable: 5.58%
THEME 6: HUMAN RESOURCES
DEVELOPMENT & SUPPORT
Overall

For assessing community support for wraparound, overall these items are...

As currently worded, overall these items are...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Optional</th>
<th>Inadvisable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86.38</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>O.K.</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78.25</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THEME 7: ACCOUNTABILITY

Overall

For assessing community support for wraparound, overall these items are...

- Essential: 77.28%
- Optional: 14.46%
- Inadvisable: 9.07%

As currently worded, overall these items are...

- Fine: 80.85%
- O.K.: 12.57%
- Unacceptable: 6.53%
THEME 8: STATE SUPPORT FOR WRAPAROUND

Overall

For assessing community support for wraparound, overall these items are...

As currently worded, overall these items are...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Optional</th>
<th>Inadvisable</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70.16</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>O.K.</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>10.98</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THEME 1: LEADERSHIP

Item 1.1 ~ Community Team

For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is...

As currently worded, this item is:

There is a formal Collaborative structure (e.g., a community team) for joint planning and decision making through which community partners take collective responsibility for development and implementation of wraparound.
THEME 1: LEADERSHIP

Item 1.2 ~ Empowered Team Members

For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is...

As currently worded, this item is:

The community team includes leaders who are empowered to make decisions and commit resources on behalf of their organization to support the development and implementation of wraparound.

Respondents = 37
Missing = 4

Respondents = 37
Missing = 4
THEME 1: LEADERSHIP
Item 1.3 ~ High Level Leadership

For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is...

As currently worded, this item is:

The system has high level leaders (e.g., senior administrators, elected officials etc.) who support system of care development and high-fidelity wraparound by forging partnerships among agencies and organizations, inspiring individual stakeholders, and tying all the processes and functions into and integrated system.

Respondents = 37
Missing = 4

Respondents = 34
Missing = 7
THEME 1: LEADERSHIP

Item 1.4 ~ Organized Family Leadership

For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is...

As currently worded, this item is:

Families are organized in a way (e.g., via family orgs., networks, or other groups) that ensures that they have active and influential representatives on the community team. Family representatives work within their groups or orgs. to understand members’ perspectives, and transmit these perspectives to the community team.

Respondents = 36
Missing = 5

Respondents = 36
Missing = 5
For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is:

As currently worded, this item is:

Essential: 81.8%
Optional: 15.2%
Inadvisable: 3%

Fine: 67.6%
O.K.: 29.4%
Unacceptable: 2.9%

Respondents = 33
Missing = 8

All public child-serving agencies, as well as major private provider organizations, participate actively in the wraparound effort.

Respondents = 34
Missing = 7
For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is...

Family members are influential members of the community team, organizational/agency boards, and other collaborative bodies, actively contributing to program planning, implementation, and evaluation.

As currently worded, this item is:

Respondents = 33
Missing = 8

Respondents = 32
Missing = 9
THEME 2: COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS
Item 2.3 ~ Full Youth Partnership

For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is...

As currently worded, this item is:

Respondents = 34
Missing = 7

Youth are influential members of a wraparound and system of care efforts, participating in leadership roles and actively contributing to program planning, implementation, and evaluation.

Respondents = 31
Missing = 10
THEME 2: COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS

Item 2.4 ~ Natural Supports

For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is:

As currently worded, this item is:

The community team includes leaders from faith-based, business, and service orgs., who partner in system design, implementation and evaluation and provide tangible resources (including human resources such as volunteers.)

Respondents = 34
Missing = 7

Respondents = 33
Missing = 8
THEME 2: COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS

Item 2.5 ~ Community Representativeness

For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is...

As currently worded, this item is:

The membership of the community team fully reflects the social, cultural, and economic diversity of the community and the families served by wraparound.

Respondents = 33
Missing = 8

Respondents = 34
Missing = 7
For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Optional</th>
<th>Inadvisable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As currently worded, this item is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>O.K.</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants in the wraparound effort have collectively developed statements of mission, principles, and outcomes that serve as foundations of system development and evaluation.

Respondents = 33
Missing = 8
Community stakeholders have engaged in a process to develop a strategic plan that describes the population of concern, goals of the wraparound effort and related projects, and mechanisms through which the community expects to achieve the goals.

Respondents = 33
Missing = 8
THEME 3: PHILOSOPHY, VALUES & STRATEGIC PLAN

Item 3.3 ~ Commitment to Principles

For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is...

As currently worded, this item is:

The community’s mission, and strategic plan demonstrate specific and tangible steps (e.g., signing MOUs, contributing resources etc.) toward achieving the principles of wraparound.
For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is:

- Essential: 75.8%
- Optional: 21.2%
- Inadvisable: 3%

As currently worded, this item is:

- Fine: 60.6%
- O.K.: 39.4%
- Unacceptable: 0%

High-level stakeholders (e.g., senior agency administrators, elected officials, and other influential stakeholders) are continually engaged in learning about and examining the wraparound philosophy and its implications for the delivery of services and development of the system.

Respondents = 33
Missing = 8
THEME 3: PHILOSOPHY, VALUES & STRATEGIC PLAN

Item 3.5 ~ Provider & Agency Staff Education

For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is...

As currently worded, this item is:

The wraparound effort continually educates providers and agency personnel about the wraparound philosophy and its implications for the design and delivery of services and supports.

Respondents = 32
Missing = 9
THEME 3: PHILOSOPHY, VALUES & STRATEGIC PLAN

Item 3.6 ~ Social Marketing & Public Engagement

For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is...

As currently worded, this item is:

Social marketing activities are conducted that result in improved public engagement and political support for the wraparound effort, system of care development, and the population of concern.

Respondents = 32
Missing = 9
Expenditures for behavioral health services and supports have been analyzed across funding streams and agencies and decision-makers understand what is being spent on the population of concern.
THEME 4: FISCAL TRACKING & POLICIES

Item 4.2 ~ Fiscal Analysis

For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is:

- Essential: 56.2%
- Optional: 37.5%
- Inadvisable: 6.2%

As currently worded, this item is:

- Fine: 71.9%
- O.K.: 21.9%
- Unacceptable: 6.2%

The impact of financing policy on the population of interest is evaluated at least annually by the community team.

Respondents = 32
Missing = 9
THEME 4: FISCAL TRACKING & POLICIES

Item 4.3 ~ Risk and Cost Management

For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is...

Key decision-makers and the community team monitor overall expenditures for the population of concern and work together to contain costs and manage risk.
THEME 4: FISCAL TRACKING & POLICIES
Item 4.4 ~ Flexible Funds

For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is...

As currently worded, this item is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Optional</th>
<th>Inadvisable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>O.K.</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents = 33
Missing = 8

Community (state/local) financing policies allow for use of funds in ways that support creative, flexible, and individualized care for children youth and families in wraparound.

Respondents = 32
Missing = 9
THEME 4: FISCAL TRACKING & POLICIES
Item 4.5 ~ Fiscal Support for Community Based Care

For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
<th>Optional</th>
<th>Inadvisable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As currently worded, this item is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fine</th>
<th>O.K.</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents = 33  
Missing = 8

Financing policies provide incentives to develop supports and services that are based in the community and consistent with the wraparound philosophy.

Respondents = 32  
Missing = 9
### THEME 4: FISCAL TRACKING & POLICIES

**Item 4.6 ~ Integrated Financing**

For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is:

- Essential: 68.8%
- Optional: 28.1%
- Inadvisable: 3.1%

As currently worded, this item is:

- Fine: 81.2%
- O.K.: 15.6%
- Unacceptable: 3.1%

Local agencies and orgs. have developed mechanisms to establish joint control and responsibility for financing (e.g., funds are blended, pooled, and/or braided) across agencies and orgs. to support wraparound.

Respondents = 32
Missing = 9
For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is...

As currently worded, this item is:

Respondents = 32
Missing = 9

Efforts are undertaken to ensure that federal funding is maximized and directed towards providing flexible and individualized care for the population of concern.

Respondents = 30
Missing = 11
For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is...

As currently worded, this item is:

There is a clear plan for sustaining fiscal support for programs that serve the population of concern and the wraparound effort.
For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is...

There is an efficient process for sharing information for individual children and families across agencies while preserving confidentiality.

Respondents = 33
Missing = 8

Respondents = 33
Missing = 8
For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is...

As currently worded, this item is:

Children and families who are eligible for wraparound are aware that it is available, and can choose to receive it if they wish.

Respondents = 32
Missing = 9

Respondents = 31
Missing = 10
For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is:

There is a broad and comprehensive array of community-based services and supports (including non-traditional services such as respite and family support) capable of meeting the needs of all children and families.

Respondents = 33
Missing = 8

As currently worded, this item is:

Respondents = 33
Missing = 8
Children and families have the opportunity to select among options to meet their needs, and to choose an alternate service/support provider if they are dissatisfied with a current provider.
THEME 5: COORDINATED & ACCESSIBLE RESOURCES

Item 5.5 ~ Skilled Provider Network

For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is...

As currently worded, this item is:

Providers are knowledgeable of and provide services and supports that are “research based” in that they a) conform to current information about best practices, b) are based in rationale derived from research and/or c) have research or evaluation data demonstrating their effectiveness.

Respondents = 33  
Missing = 8
Partner orgs. that serve the same child and family work with the child and family to develop a common integrated plan of care.
THEME 6: HUMAN RESOURCES
DEVELOPMENT & SUPPORT
Item 6.1 ~ Support to Wraparound Staff

For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is...

As currently worded, this item is:

The job expectations (duties and requirements from supervisors) of people with primary roles for carrying out wraparound (e.g., wraparound facilitators) encourage and allow them to fully implement a high-fidelity wraparound model.
THEME 6: HUMAN RESOURCES
DEVELOPMENT & SUPPORT
Item 6.2 ~ Support to Partner Agency Staff

For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is...

As currently worded, this item is:

The job expectations of people who serve on wraparound (e.g. providers and partner agency staff) encourage and allow them to participate fully in implementation of high-fidelity wraparound.

Respondents = 31
Missing = 10

Respondents = 32
Missing = 9
For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is...

As currently worded, this item is:

Caseload sizes for people with primary roles for carrying out wraparound (e.g. wraparound facilitators) allow them to consistently complete the phases and activities of the wraparound process.
Wraparound facilitators receive comprehensive training, shadow experienced workers prior to working independently, and receive ongoing coaching, including live observation and feedback from an experienced coach, that focuses on systematically developing their skills as a wraparound facilitator.
Compensation for people with primary roles for carrying out wraparound (e.g., wraparound facilitators) reflects their value and encourages staff retention and commitment. There is a career ladder such that highly experienced facilitators can advance to higher positions.
THEME 6: HUMAN RESOURCES
DEVELOPMENT & SUPPORT

Item 6.6 Supervision

For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is...

As currently worded, this item is:

Wraparound facilitators receive regular (weekly) individual and group supervision, and periodic “in-vivo” (observation) supervision (several times a month to start and at least quarterly thereafter).
Theme 7: Accountability

Item 7.1 ~ Community Population Assessment

For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is:

As currently worded, this item is:

Community assessment on the population of concern is conducted, with information about population characteristics, clinical profiles, and service histories available to inform ongoing strategic planning.

Respondents = 32
Missing = 9

Respondents = 31
Missing = 10
For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is...

As currently worded, this item is:

There is centralized monitoring of relevant outcomes for the population of concern that is used as the basis for funding, policy discussions and strategic planning.
For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is:

Essential 90.3
Optional 0
Inadvisable 9.7

As currently worded, this item is:

Fine 77.4
O.K. 16.1
Unacceptable 6.5

There is ongoing monitoring of the quality of wraparound provided, including live observation, plan review, and feedback from children and families. The methods used to assess quality are grounded in the principles of wraparound.
For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is...  

As currently worded, this item is:

There is centralized monitoring and analysis of the types of services and supports included in wraparound plans, whether or not planned services and supports are provided, and whether or not the goals/needs that appear on wraparound plans are met.
THEME 7: ACCOUNTABILITY

Item 7.5 ~ Services Quality

For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is...

As currently worded, this item is:

Data on the quality of services and supports supplied by individual providers are systematically collected and shared with stakeholders, including families receiving services and supports. These data include child/family perceptions of the helpfulness of the services/supports provided.

Respondents = 32
Missing = 9

Respondents = 32
Missing = 9
For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is...

As currently worded, this item is:

There is an ongoing process to determine the extent to which the overall wraparound effort reflects the principles of wraparound.

Respondents = 32
Missing = 9

Respondents = 26
Missing = 15
THEME 7: ACCOUNTABILITY
Item 7.7 ~ Satisfaction Monitoring

For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is... As currently worded, this item is:

There is an ongoing process to track satisfaction and buy-in among stakeholder groups, including youth and families and representatives of partner agencies and organizations.

Respondents = 31
Missing = 10

Respondents = 32
Missing = 9
THEME 7: ACCOUNTABILITY

Item 7.8 ~ Gaps Analysis

For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is...

As currently worded, this item is:

There is a centralized process for identifying shortages and gaps in the service/support array and acting to address these shortcomings.

Respondents = 32
Missing = 9
Theme 7: Accountability

Item 7.9 ~ Barrier Busting

For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is...

As currently worded, this item is:

There is an ongoing, systematic process for identifying and addressing barriers that prevent wraparound teams from implementing effective plans. Several central barriers have been successfully addressed through this process.
THEME 8: STATE SUPPORT FOR WRAPAROUND
Item 8.1 ~ State Interface

For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is...

As currently worded, this item is:

The community team has an active and productive partnership with state agencies that has resulted in alterations to state policies, regulations, or funding that support the wraparound effort.

Respondents = 30
Missing = 11

Respondents = 31
Missing = 10
For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is...

As currently worded, this item is:

State organizations practice collaboration and partnership by working together to provide cross-organization wraparound training education, and support for communities.
There is a state entity that supports cross agency outcome and process measurement around behavioral health issues at the state and local level.
THEME 8: STATE SUPPORT FOR WRAPAROUND

Item 8.4 ~ State Structure

For assessing community support for wraparound, including an item like this one is...

As currently worded, this item is:

There is a State Team that has and uses the authority to make policy and resource allocation decisions to support wraparound development across agencies.

Respondents = 31
Missing = 10

Respondents = 31
Missing = 10
State orgs. implement specific methods to gather information from families, youth and local community teams on barriers to effective wraparound and they help to remove these barriers.
OVERALL FEEDBACK

- I was shocked by this survey that used negative anchors and called itself ‘Wraparound Inventory’. What were you all thinking? It’s so disappointing that it’s not strengths based and needs driven.

- There seems to be a couple of duplicated items in here. Also might be helpful to clarify more explicitly the distinction between 'the community team' and 'the wraparound team'. Are they the same people? Is there overlapping membership? etc. Only other thoughts are that I'm not sure how much centralization and state-level involvement is needed or wanted? Are these standards based on any particular studies that I'm just not recalling at the moment?
OVERALL FEEDBACK

- I think it's pretty close, but would like to have less philosophy and more reality. But you probably noticed that. Excellent job, hard work. Onward!
- I think there should be some directed questions about parent partners on the team and how the play an essential part in forming community support.
- I do like the simplicity of the questions.
OVERALL FEEDBACK

- Please remember there are families all over and in rural/frontier areas there's more collaboration recruitment and retention of staff needed along with educating the public, current staff about the philosophical changes being made. I have been frustrated that the colleges and universities have little or no changes in curriculum to support the wraparound process. Thank you for this opportunity to participate as a parent and spouse of consumers, and an consumer myself!

- It is too long, tendency to force answers, tendency toward rhetoric, tendency to ignore individualization necessary for implementation.
OVERALL FEEDBACK

- Overall, I think there needs to be more clarity so the person using the rating scale have a clear context on which to evaluate 'systems.' I think this is a very important tool. Much needed in the field, particularly for policy makers.

- Need items to address: 1) supporting front-line staff and mid-level managers 2) need participation from other community organizations, law enforcement and community members. 3) specifically addresses confidentiality concerns 4) address workforce shortage 5) address transportation issues especially in rural areas where there is a higher level of poverty and lack of access to transportation 6) address education of community on research-based practices

- A few items could be combined. Some items were local system and service delivery while others were higher level infrastructure items. These items would be better for measuring a system of care rather than a wraparound service delivery model.
OVERALL FEEDBACK

- I think this is an incredibly important tool. So much effort is put into the practice of wraparound and not nearly enough on the conditions that support wraparound. I would like to work in the state that scores well on this tool!

- Would like to see a little more discussion about family empowerment, independence, family/youth able to facilitate team toward transition period etc.
OVERALL FEEDBACK

- Refine negative anchors, which in some cases seem to convey a judgment or bias. Provide more specific anchors from best administrative practices to better cue respondents (i.e. blended funding, categorical funding, redirect funds from high end care to community-based options, flexible arrays of services and support funded from blended or braided funding pools).

- Thanks for sending this out! I do have a concern that if we truly expect providers/communities to be able to do all this, Wraparound will be far too expensive administratively and we will encourage micro-management. I loved the inclusion of youth voice! Thank you.
OVERALL FEEDBACK

- The survey was long.
- Inclusion of a way to indicate how decision making and the role of parents is handled when state custody is ordered or there is drug court involvement. This looks great, good job!