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Goals for our Session

• Learn how the wraparound practice model and theory of change and how these form a basis for Quality Assurance
• Review methods for collecting and using data to support implementation of wraparound.
• Introduce specific wraparound implementation measures, including:
  – The Wraparound Fidelity Index, version 4
  – The Wraparound Team Observation Measure
• Hear examples of how wraparound fidelity data collection is achieved in Allegheny County, PA
• See a sample administration of the Wraparound Fidelity Index, version 4.
• Learn about the kinds of information generated from fidelity instruments and how these data can be used, including an in-depth example from Allegheny County
• Learn how to use the Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory
• Participate in a planning exercise for your program or community that forms the basis for a strategic plan.
Many online resources available from The National Wraparound Initiative

www.nwi.pdx.edu

Of particular interest to today’s participants: The Resource Guide to Wraparound

• Section 3: Theory and Research: Five Chapters
• Section 4: Wraparound Practice: Sixteen Chapters
The National Wraparound Initiative

• In 2004, stakeholders—including families, youth, providers, researchers, trainers, administrators and others—came together in a collaborative effort to better specify the wraparound practice model, compile specific strategies and tools, and disseminate information about how to implement wraparound in a way that can achieve positive outcomes for youth and families.

– www.nwi.pdx.edu
the national wraparound initiative

In 2004, stakeholders—including families, youth, providers, researchers, trainers, administrators and others—came together in a collaborative effort to better specify the wraparound practice model, compile specific strategies and tools, and disseminate information about how to implement wraparound in a way that can achieve positive outcomes for youth and families. The NWI now supports youth, families, and communities through work that emphasizes four primary functions:

- Supporting community-level planning and implementation
- Promoting professional development of wraparound staff
- Ensuring accountability
- Sustaining a vibrant and interactive national community of practice

The NWI is membership supported. You can join the NWI to help continue this important work!!

wraparound resources
- The always-useful Resource Guide to Wraparound
- NWI webinar slides and recordings
- NEW! Summary of evidence for wraparound

upcoming trainings & events
- NWI presents at California Wraparound Institute - June 7, 2010
- Webinar: Accountability and Quality Assurance in Wraparound - June 15, 2010

top news & new research
- KDCS radio featured a story on Washington State and the National Wraparound Initiative as the second feature of a two part series "Cruel Choices."
- Wraparound Milwaukee in 2009 Visionaries video

members & affiliates section
- NWI members and affiliates can log in here to access job postings, bulletin boards, the NWI blog, members and providers directories, "beta" versions of new resources, archived materials, and more...
"The NWI works to promote understanding about the components and benefits of wraparound, and to provide the field with resources to facilitate high quality and consistent wraparound implementation."

The NWI is membership supported. You can support this important work!!

- Supporting community-level planning
- Promoting professional development
- Ensuring accountability
- Sustaining a vibrant and interactive community

The NWI presents at California Wraparound Institute – June 7, 2010

KBCS radio featured a story on Washington State and the National Wraparound Initiative as the second feature of a two part series "Cruel Choices."

NWI members and affiliates can log in here to access job postings, bulletin boards, the NWI blog, members and providers directories, “beta” versions of new resources.
Three Big Ideas

- We need to move from principles to **practice** in doing wraparound
  - i.e., people who have the **skills** to accomplish the tasks that have been found to achieve outcomes
- The better we implement the practice, the better the outcomes will be for youth and families
- Measuring the quality of practice can help us accomplish both these goals:
  - Better fidelity
  - Better outcomes!
Implementing wraparound... as hard as...?
...brain surgery?
...landing a passenger plane on the Hudson?
Success!

Captain Sullenberger attributed it to:

- Teamwork
- Preparation
- Strict adherence to protocols
What leads to success in health care?

- **Knowledge** – Research and experience has provided us with information on “what works”
  - Evidence-based practice
  - Practice-based evidence
- **Competence** – Research and experience provide a solution, and we apply it correctly
  - Collecting and organizing information
  - Using information to make decisions
Wraparound Knowledge

Applying the Wraparound Principles

1. Family voice and choice
2. Team-based
3. Natural supports
4. Collaboration
5. Community-based
6. Culturally competent
7. Individualized
8. Strengths based
9. Persistence
10. Outcome-based

Walker, Bruns, Adams, Miles, Osher et al., 2004
Implementing the practice model:
The Four Phases of Wraparound

- Phase 1A: Engagement and Support
- Phase 1B: Team Preparation
- Phase 2: Initial Plan Development
- Phase 3: Implementation
- Phase 4: Transition

Time
Focus on Knowledge: How does wraparound work?

Wraparound Principles:
- Family voice and choice
- Team-based
- Culturally competent
- Natural supports
- Collaboration
- Community-based
- Individualized
- Strengths based
- Persistence
- Outcome-based

Positive Outcomes!

Then a miracle occurs...
**Knowledge: How does wraparound work?**
What research tells us about practice, process and outcomes

---

**Theory of change: Outline**

- **Skillful practice**
  - Grounded in strengths
  - Driven by needs
  - Determined by Families
  - Invested in team accountability and results

- **Process “package”**
  - Services/supports match needs
  - Fidelity
  - Engagement
  - Focus: needs and natural family strengths and needs
  - Creative, individualized strategies

- **Services and supports work better, individually and as a “package”**
  - High quality, high fidelity wraparound process

- **Participation in wraparound builds family capacities**

- **Phases and activities**

---

- **Ten Principles**
  - Effective, values-based teamwork

---

- **Services and supports work better, individually and as a “package”**
  - Increased self-efficacy
  - Increased assets/resilience
  - Needs met/outcomes achieved
  - Improved quality of life
  - Safe, stable, home-like living situation
  - Improved functioning in school/vocation, community

---

**Positive child/youth and family outcomes**

---

**Optimism:**

- Improved access, engagement, retention, commitment

---

**Engagement:**

- Coherent, holistic impact on family
- Focus on sustainable community and natural support

---

**Longer-term outcomes**

- Creative, individualized strategies
Wraparound Knowledge
Major “routes” to outcomes and implications

- Effective team process means team is more likely to meet its goals
- Good, value-driven wraparound process leads to outcomes because
  - Services and supports work better
  - Family gains in self-efficacy, self-perceptions, and coping
Effective Wraparound Implementation Requires…

- State Support
- Community or County Context and Readiness
- Staff Selection
- Program Evaluation
- Organizational Supports
- Training
- Performance Management
- Supervision and Coaching
So... What types of data might we need at a local level?

- **Implementation Processes:**
  - Are we really achieving high-quality practice? Are our systems and organizations supporting wraparound?
- **Family input:**
  - Is what we are doing really leading to better services? Family Engagement? Self-efficacy? Youth and families connected to community and natural supports?
- **Youth and Family Outcomes:**
  - Are young people at home, in school, and out of trouble? Are they achieving their hopes and dreams?
- **Community outcomes**
  - Are we relying less on out of community placements? Are we getting kids to permanency? Etc.
Group Exercise 1

• Briefly discuss the experiences your communities have had in using data to assess wraparound outcomes, implementation, quality, or fidelity.
  – What information do you currently collect?
  – How well do the data you collect meet your information needs?
  – What challenges have been encountered?
  – What additional information do you need?
  – Where might you get those data?
How Do We Measure Competence?

• Example: Surgical Safety
  – 234 million operations each year
  – Many surgery complications and deaths are preventable
Deaths due to Medical Errors: U.S.

Measuring implementation in Surgery

- **Examples:**
  - Before the induction of anesthesia, members of the team orally confirm that:
    - The patient has verified his identity, surgical site, procedure, and consent
    - The surgical site is marked if appropriate
  - Before incision, the entire team orally:
    - Confirms that all team members have been introduced by name and role
    - Confirms that all essential imaging results are displayed in the room
  - Before the patient leaves the operating room, the nurse reviews items aloud with the team:
    - That the needle, sponge, and instrument counts are complete
    - The team reviews aloud the key concerns for recovery and patient care
## Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complications</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
<th>$p$ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surgical site infection</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implications

• What did the checklist accomplish?
  – Ensured similar information for all team members
  – Improved team communication
  – Improved consistency of care across teams
Why do we need implementation quality checks in Wraparound?

Studies indicate that Wraparound teams often fail to:

- Incorporate full complement of key individuals on the Wraparound team;
- Engage youth in community activities, things they do well, or activities to help develop friendships;
- Use family/community strengths to plan/implement services;
- Engage natural supports, such as extended family members and community members;
- Use flexible funds to help implement strategies;
- Consistently assess outcomes and satisfaction.
Why else do we need to achieve model adherent implementation?

- Families who experience better outcomes have staff who score higher on fidelity tools (Bruns, Rast et al., 2006)

- Wraparound initiatives with positive fidelity assessments demonstrate more positive outcomes (Bruns, Leverentz-Brady, & Suter, 2008)
### Relationship between WFI fidelity and outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Wraparound Fidelity</th>
<th># of Youth with at least one WFI &amp; CANS outcomes</th>
<th>% with Reliable Improvement In CANS score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High (&gt;85%)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate (75-85%)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borderline (65-75%)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Wraparound (&lt;65%)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effland, McIntyre, & Walton, 2010
How might we measure implementation of wraparound???

- Have facilitators and team members fill out activity checklists
- Look at plans of care and meeting notes
- Sit in on and observe team meetings
- Interview the people who know—parents, youth, facilitators, program heads
Wraparound Fidelity Assessment System

www.wrapinfo.org or
http://depts.washington.edu/wrapeval

TOM – Team Observation Measure

CSWI – Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory

WFI-4 – Wraparound Fidelity Index

DRM - Document Review Measure
The Wraparound Fidelity Index, version 4

- Assesses implementation of the wraparound process through “brief” (20-30 min) interviews with multiple respondents
- Found to possess good psychometric characteristics
  - Test-retest reliability
  - Inter-rater agreement
  - Internal consistency
- Used in research on wraparound
- Even more widely as a quality assurance mechanism by wrap programs
The WFI-4

- The WFI-4 measures how well both the principles and core activities are implemented.
- It is organized by the 4 phases of wraparound.
- The WFI-4 is composed of four respondent forms:
  - The Caregiver form (CG),
  - The Youth form (Y),
  - The Wraparound Facilitator form (WF), and
  - A Team Member form (TM).
    - There is also a demographic form that can be completed by the WF or CG.
### Wraparound Fidelity Index, 4

**Number of items per phase and principle**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Family V&amp;C</th>
<th>Team-based</th>
<th>Natural Suppts</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>Comm.-based</th>
<th>Cultural comp</th>
<th>Individualized</th>
<th>Strengths-based</th>
<th>Persistence</th>
<th>Outcome based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engagement (6)</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning (11)</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation (15)</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transition (8)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total items**: 44
• Items on the principles and core activities, organized by the 4 phases of wraparound
  
  - **Engagement**: At the beginning of the wraparound process, did you have a chance to tell your wraparound facilitator what things have worked in the past for your child and family?
    - Principle = Strengths based
  
  - **Planning**: Does the plan include strategies for helping your child get involved with activities in the community?
    - Principle = Community based
  
  - **Implementation**: Does the team evaluate progress toward the goals of the plan at every team meeting?
    - Principle = Outcome based
  
  - **Transition**: Will some members of your team be there to support you when formal wraparound is complete?
    - Principle = Unconditional care
Role of the Interviewer

- In administering the WFI-4, the interviewer or administrator is not intended to merely ask each of the questions verbatim and ask for a response on the “Yes – Sometimes – No” scale.

- The interviewer is intended to conduct the WFI-4 interview like a conversation.
  - Begin each section of the WFI-4 interview by asking the respondent about that part of the wraparound process, what kinds of things occurred, and so forth.
    - Cues are provided on the form at the beginning of each phase
  - Score the items as best as possible from information provided; ask follow-up questions as needed
  - If there is any uncertainty about scoring, state the item directly and ask the respondent to provide a rating
    - E.g., “would you say yes, no, or in between?”
Sample Report: Total Scores

“High fidelity”

“Adequate”

“Borderline”

“Not wraparound”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>WF</th>
<th>CG</th>
<th>Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site 1 (n=37)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 2 (n=23)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Mean</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reports from the WFI: Individual items (Engagement phase)

Q1. Were you given time to talk about your family’s strengths, beliefs, and traditions?
   True - 10   Partly True - 3   Not True - 2

Q2. Did your facilitator fully explain wraparound & the choices you could make?
   True - 9    Partly True - 4    Not True - 2

Q3. Did you have a chance to tell your wraparound facilitator what has worked in the past for your child and family?
   True - 7    Partly True - 4    Not True - 4

Q4. Did you select the people who would be on your wraparound team?
   True - 7    Partly True - 4    Not True - 4

Q5. Is it difficult to get team members to meetings when they are needed?
   True – 9   Partly True – 3   Not True - 3

Q6. Did you go through a process of identifying what leads to crises for yr family?
   True – 8   Partly True – 3   Not True - 4
Using the WFI-4 in Allegheny County

Jessica Chambers, Research Specialist
Cherrie’ Russell, Family/Consumer Evaluator
Learning Objectives

• Learn innovative and effective ways to implement the WFI-4 at a community level

• Identify means of cross-unit collaboration to collect data and monitor processes

• Explore lessons learned in implementing a fidelity assessment tool such as the WFI-4
Implementing the WFI-4

- Training
- Interviewing and Data Collection
- Data Entry and Reporting
Training

- Interview Coordinator
- Group Review of WFI Interviewer
- Training Toolkit
- Self-Training
Training

Interview Coordinator:

- Manages training of interviewers, consent process, scheduling of interviews, tracking, completion and data entry of interviews
Group Review of Training Toolkit:

- Reviewed entire toolkit as a group
- Developed WFI Fact Sheet
- Questions and concerns
Examples of Questions and Concerns:

• How do we introduce ourselves in interview?

• What if a family (or interviewer) is not familiar with the wraparound process?

• Is it more important for us to have multiple interviews from one case, or to have more cases with only one interview?
Self-training:

- 3 sample interviews
- Self-scored
- Initial interview(s) in pairs
Next Steps for Training

- Interview Coordinator leads group trainings
- Sample interviews and scoring
- Additional training options
- Debrief with trainees
INTERVIEWING
&
DATA COLLECTION
Interviewing/Data Collection

- Consent Forms
- Interviewers
- Scheduling Interviews
- Interviewing
Interviewing/Data Collection

Consent Forms:

• Development of consent forms
• Consent training with staff
• Obtaining consent
Interviewing/Data Collection

Interviewers:

- Family and evaluation staff
- Full-time and part-time
- Student interns
Interviewing/Data Collection

Scheduling Interviews:

- Interviewers located in 3 separate DHS offices
- Development of interview database
- Assignment of interviews
- Interviewer script for initial call
- Contacting families
Interviewing/Data Collection

Interviewing:

- Youths age 14+
- Families between 3-15 mos. of service
- Interview all who consent
- Raffle and gift card incentives
Next Steps for Interviewing/Data Collection

- Addition of youth/family interviewers
- Assigning vs. selecting interviews
- Random sampling
- Interviewing by individual vs. by case
- Development of Face Sheet for tracking contacts
- Excel vs. Access database
- Continue with gift card incentives
DATA ENTRY & REPORTING
Data Entry and Reporting

- Data entry performed by one person
- Knowledge of WFI and WFI scoring
- Training on WONDER data entry information system
- Managing multiple agencies under one site ID
- Entry at time points vs. ongoing entry
- Reports by agency and aggregated
Next Steps for Data Entry & Reporting

- Continue with ongoing data entry
- Separate IDs for each agency
- Individual reports
Lessons Learned

• Internal Standards
• FAQ of WFI to include with consent
• Formalized interviewer training
• 3 offices with joint responsibility transitioned to coordination through one office
Sample WFI-4 Administration
### Engagement and Team Preparation Phase

#### Phase 1: Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When you first met your wraparound facilitator, were you given time to talk about your family's strengths, beliefs, and traditions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Circle one:</em> YES NO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did this process help you appreciate what is special about your family?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Circle one:</em> YES NO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before your first team meeting, did your wraparound facilitator fully explain the wraparound process and the choices you could make?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At the beginning of the wraparound process, did you have a chance to tell your wraparound facilitator what things have worked in the past for your child and family?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you select the people who would be on your wraparound team?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it difficult to get agency representatives and other team members to attend team meetings when they are needed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before your first wraparound team meeting, did you go through a process of identifying what leads to crises or dangerous situations for your child and your family?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Utilization of WFI-4 Data in Allegheny County
WFI Data in Allegheny County

- Utilization of data at program level
- Utilization of data at county level
Data at Program Level

- Supervisory tool
- Improve service delivery/outcomes
- Caregiver and youth reports
Example of WFI-4 Report

Fidelity Scores by Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Percent Fidelity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Program
- National Mean
Example of WFI-4 Report

Fidelity Scores by Principle & Respondent

[Bar chart showing fidelity scores for different principles and respondents.]
Data at County Level

- Combined with other High Fidelity
- Wraparound data in Allegheny County
- Informs systems change
Using Data to Improve Outcomes County-wide
High Fidelity Wraparound Projects

Systems of Care
- 9/2007

Joint Planning Teams
- 9/2008

FAST
- 6/2009

Child Welfare
Service Durations

- less 30 days: 36%
- 30-59 days: 8%
- 60-179 days: 16%
- 180 - 269 days: 14%
- 270 - 359 days: 3%
- 360 days +: 23%
Percent in the HFW Process

- Child Welfare: 100%
- FAST: 40%
- Joint Planning Teams: 90%
- CCF: 0%
- Partners for Youth in Transition: 0%
- Starting Early Together: 70%

System of Care
Fidelity to the model

- Wrap Around Fidelity Assessment System
  - Wraparound Fidelity Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/Youth Support Partner</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total interviews completed</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Fidelity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Allegheny County</th>
<th>National Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wraparound Facilitator</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/Youth Support Partner</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fidelity Scores by Principle

- Family voice and choice: Allegheny County 94, National Mean 83
- Team based: Allegheny County 86, National Mean 72
- Natural supports: Allegheny County 60, National Mean 64
- Collaboration: Allegheny County 87, National Mean 85
- Community-based: Allegheny County 70, National Mean 71
- Culturally competent: Allegheny County 93, National Mean 91
- Individualized: Allegheny County 72, National Mean 69
- Strengths based: Allegheny County 84, National Mean 83
- Persistence: Allegheny County 88, National Mean 82
- Outcome based: Allegheny County 64, National Mean 67
Allegheny County Department of Human Services
Office of Behavioral Health
System of Care Initiative
Pittsburgh, PA

Jessica Chambers
Jessica.Chambers@AlleghenyCounty.US

Cherrie’ Russell
Cherrie.Russell@AlleghenyCounty.US
• Wraparound Online Data Entry and Reporting System
• Allows users to enter data via a web portal
• Compiles data from WFI and TOM in one database
• Creates a range of reports from Demographics to Fidelity and Qualitative Reports.
• Allows export of all data variables for further analysis.
When you first met with the family, were they given ample time to talk about their strengths, beliefs, and traditions? At the first team meeting, were these strengths, beliefs, and traditions shared with all team members?

- 1.1 CC: Yes to only first question

Before the first team meeting, did you fully explain the wraparound process and the choices the family could make?

- 1.2 FVC: Yes

At the beginning of the wraparound process, was the family given an opportunity to tell you what things have worked in the past for the youth and family?

- 1.3 SB: Yes

Did the family members select the people who would be on their wraparound team?

- 1.4 TB: No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report 1: Summary of Respondents</th>
<th>Report 7: Fidelity Scores by Principle and Respondent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report 2: Youth Information and Demographics (Demographic)</td>
<td>Report 8: Fidelity Scores by Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report 2: Youth Information and Demographics (Wrap Facilitator/Caregiver)</td>
<td>Report 9: Percent Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report 5: Overall Fidelity</td>
<td>Report 12: Relative Weaknesses by WFI Item and Respondent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report 8: Fidelity Scores by Phase

Date of Report: Monday, March 30, 2009
Date Range of WFI-4 Data: - Till Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phase 1: Engagement</th>
<th>Phase 2: Plan Development</th>
<th>Phase 3: Implementation</th>
<th>Phase 4: Transition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ingrid SaddlerWalker</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dee Booth</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Mean</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Measures of the Wraparound Fidelity Assessment System

Team Observation Measure
Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory
The Team Observation Measure (TOM) is employed by external evaluators to assess adherence to standards of high-quality wraparound during team meeting sessions. It consists of 20 items, with two items dedicated to each of the 10 principles of wraparound. Each item consists of 3-5 indicators of high-quality wraparound practice as expressed during a child and family team meeting. Internal consistency very good. Inter-rater reliability found to be adequate (Average 79% agreement for all indicators).
### Sample TOM report:

**Most frequently observed TOM indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Pct.</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20a</td>
<td>The team’s mission and/or needs support the youth’s integration into the least restrictive residential and educational environments possible</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Parent/caregiver is a team member and present at meeting</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12e</td>
<td>Members of the team use language the family can understand</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18d</td>
<td>Serious challenges are discussed in terms of finding solutions, not termination of services or sanctions.</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>There is a written agenda or outline for the meeting, which provides an understanding of the overall purpose of meeting</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11e</td>
<td>Talk is well distributed across team members and each team member makes an extended or important contribution</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18e</td>
<td>There is a sense of openness and trust among team members</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20d</td>
<td>Serious behavioral challenges are discussed in terms of finding solutions, not placement in more restrictive residential or educational environments</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>.332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Sample TOM report: Least frequently observed TOM indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Pct</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8a</td>
<td>In designing strategies, team members consider and build on strengths of the youth and family</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13b</td>
<td>The team assesses goals/strategies using measures of progress</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d</td>
<td>The facilitator leads a robust brainstorming process to develop multiple options to meet priority needs.</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c</td>
<td>Community team members and natural supports have a clear role on the team</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14a</td>
<td>The team conducts a systematic review of members' progress on assigned action steps</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19a</td>
<td>The team is actively brainstorming and facilitating community activities for the youth and family</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b</td>
<td>The plan of care represents a balance between formal services and informal supports</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>Key natural supports for the family are team members and present</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>.362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What does it take to get high fidelity scores?

- Training and coaching found to be associated with gains in fidelity and higher fidelity
- Communities with better developed supports for wraparound show higher fidelity scores
The implementation context

Hospitable System
* Funding, Policies

Supportive Organizations
* Training, supervision, interagency coordination and collaboration

Effective Team
* Process + Principles + Skills
Defining “necessary” elements of the implementation context

- Initial research using a “backward mapping” strategy, qualitative approach
- Stakeholder consensus building through the NWI to generate items, refine, group
- Pilot study in seven communities—279 participants—to assess reliability, validity
- Study with ten additional communities underway
- Designed as an efficient, low-cost way to provide useful information to communities while also yielding high quality data for research purposes.
Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory: What is it?

- Web-based stakeholder survey comprising ~40 items grouped within six implementation themes (factors)
- Each item has two descriptions that anchor each end of a Likert scale
  - One anchor describes “least development”—what conditions in a community look like in the absence of a collaborative effort to provide comprehensive care
  - The other anchor describes “fully developed”—what conditions look like when there is an effective, collaborative effort in place
- Locally-nominated stakeholders rate each item on a scale from “least developed” to “fully developed”
## Sample Items

### Item 1A. Collaborative Oversight
**Fully developed**

There is a collaborative body ("collaborative oversight team") for joint planning and decision making through which community partners oversee the development and implementation of the transition project.

- [ ] Fully Developed
- [ ] Almost there
- [ ] Midway

**Least developed**

There is no collaborative group that brings together community partners to design or implement services, change policies, or create infrastructure so that they can better serve transition-aged young people.

- [ ] Beginning
- [ ] Least developed
- [ ] Don't know

### Item 1C. Influential Youth/Young Adult Voice
**Fully developed**

Youth and young adults with significant experience in systems and/or services are influential members of the collaborative oversight team, and they take active roles in decisions and discussions.

- [ ] Fully Developed
- [ ] Almost there
- [ ] Midway

**Least developed**

Youth and young adults are not actively involved in decision-making, or are uninformative or "token" members of community-level groups that plan or oversee efforts to serve transition-aged young people.

- [ ] Beginning
- [ ] Least developed
- [ ] Don't know
Types of program and system support for Wraparound

1. **Community partnership:** Do we have collaboration across our key systems and stakeholders?

2. **Collaborative action:** Do the stakeholders take concrete steps to translate the wraparound philosophy into concrete policies, practices and achievements?

3. **Fiscal policies:** Do we have the funding and fiscal strategies to meet the needs of children participating in wraparound?

4. **Service array:** Do teams have access to the services and supports they need to meet families’ needs?

5. **Human resource development:** Do we have the right jobs, caseloads, and working conditions? Are people supported with coaching, training, and supervision?

6. **Accountability:** Do we use tools that help us make sure we’re doing a good job?

Key resource: Resource Guide section 5, 20 chapters:

“This is an initiative that must continue. I believe that the impact of NWI has only just begun to spread, and stopping now would severely hamper the progress that has been made.”

—NWl Impact Survey Respondent

Implementation

This section provides a basic overview of wraparound implementation, and to introduce you to the core areas of implementation support that are offered in this “Implementation Support” section of the NWI website.

1. What are the main things to plan for during implementation?

Every community implements wraparound in their own unique local conditions. However, each community also needs to plan and accomplish implementation tasks in various areas, including delivering wraparound in its own way, training and supporting staff, tracking outcomes, and so on. There are no rules about where a community or initiative must start in terms of building wraparound infrastructure; however, research and experience tells us that it is critically important that a core set of supports gets put in place.

This “Implementation Support” resource is structured around six implementation areas or “themes” that have been identified in research.
human resource development and support

As conceived by the National Wraparound Initiative, implementation of wraparound requires attention to six types of community supports. One of these areas is **Human Resource Development and Support**.

According to the **Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory**, Human Resource Development and Support in wraparound is achieved when the policy and funding context supports wraparound staff and partner agency staff to work in a manner that allows full implementation of the wraparound model.

Wraparound projects require a thoughtful and deliberate approach to building staff and personnel capacity. Effective human resource development requires both organizational alignment and individual accountability to assure effective operations. The resources in this section provide information on how stakeholders involved in the wraparound effort can achieve such alignment and effective operations. Questions addressed include:

1. **What represents adequate staffing in a wraparound project?**
2. **What are key areas to consider in building human resource development and support?**
3. **What are key human resource development cautions?**
4. **What is the “take-home” message?**

1. **What represents adequate staffing in a wraparound project?**

The first concern that leadership in a wraparound project should consider is the allocation of staff resources. Certain functions must be carried out within wraparound, and it is important that the...
CSWI Report to community includes:

- Highlights of findings
- Response rate
  - Employees (facilitators, parent partners, supervisors)
  - “Key” respondents
  - People with particular roles in the project
- Characteristics of respondents (race, sex, service experience)
- Total score (and how this compares to the mean of the comparison communities) and “grand mean”
- Theme means (and comparison)
- Individual item means (and comparison)
- Particular areas of strength and challenge
- Respondent comments
Overall and Theme Means: Site 8 and Comparison

**Overall Mean**

- **Theme 1:** Community Partnerships
  - Site 8: 1.97
  - Comparison: 1.42

- **Theme 2:** Collaborative Action
  - Site 8: 1.94
  - Comparison: 1.19

- **Theme 3:** Fiscal Policies and Sustainability
  - Site 8: 2.18
  - Comparison: 2.07

- **Theme 4:** Availability of Services and Supports
  - Site 8: 2.83
  - Comparison: 0.00

- **Theme 5:** Human Resource Development
  - Site 8: 0.00
  - Comparison: 2.00

- **Theme 6:** Accountability
  - Site 8: 1.00
  - Comparison: 3.00

Least Developed | Midway | Fully Developed
Sample report: Item means

Theme 5: Site 5 and Comparison Item Means

- 5.1: Wraparound job expectations
- 5.2: Agency job expectations
- 5.3: Caseload sizes
- 5.4: Professional development
- 5.5: Supervision
- 5.6 Compensation for wraparound staff

- Least Developed
- Midway
- Fully Developed
The How of Wraparound: Summary

- Implementing wraparound requires that practitioners and community members understand and embrace its principles.
- Full implementation, however, requires that teams undertake some basic activities.
- Implementing the phases and activities, and ensuring adherence to the principles, requires support from the host agency and the overall system.
Resources and Websites

- [www.nwi.pdx.edu](http://www.nwi.pdx.edu)
- [www.wrapinfo.org](http://www.wrapinfo.org) – Portal to
  - The Resource Guide to Wraparound
  - Website of the National Wraparound Initiative (NWI)
  - Wraparound Evaluation and Research Team (WERT) – wraparound fidelity tools
- Other wraparound resources:
  - [www.Paperboat.org](http://www.Paperboat.org)
  - [http://www.milwaukeecounty.org/WraparoundMilwaukee7851.htm](http://www.milwaukeecounty.org/WraparoundMilwaukee7851.htm)
  - [www.tapartnership.org](http://www.tapartnership.org)
  - [www.systemsofcare.samhsa.gov](http://www.systemsofcare.samhsa.gov)
The **National Wraparound Initiative** is based in Portland, Oregon. For more information, visit our website:

**www.nwi.pdx.edu**

The National Wraparound Initiative is funded by the Center for Mental Health Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, United States Department of Health and Human Services.