Welcome To...

The Fifth National Wraparound Initiative Advisors Meeting

Nashville, TN
July 15-16, 2008
Goals for our meeting

• Review progress and accomplishments by the NWI and its task groups
• Solicit feedback and input on works in progress
• Review and discuss feedback on the priorities and future direction(s) of the NWI
• Work in small task-oriented groups to set action plans for task groups and priority activities
Today’s Agenda

• Introductions
• Recap of the year
• Reports from workgroups
  - Wraparound Family Partner Task Force
  - Standards workgroup
  - Youth workgroup
  - Research and evaluation workgroup
• BREAK
• Review of needs sensing around priority activities of the NWI
• Small group work on how to undertake the priority activities
Tomorrow’s Agenda

• Reflections on day 1 and the NWI’s future
• Panel and discussion:
  – Priorities for the NWI
• Task groups and continuation of yesterday’s small group work
• BREAK
• Report out
• Summary of discussions about goals and priorities for next year and beyond!
• Next steps and wrap-up
Looking back:
A quick recap of our initial goals and recent activities
Looking back: “Our goals,” 2003

Describe successful practice and implementation in a way that is “generic” enough to accommodate the variety of successful approaches.

Synthesize
• Accumulated expertise +
• Existing theory and research evidence +
• New theory and research

Develop useful information and tools
Develop the research base
Goal statement from the 2003 meeting

- To bring together into a learning and sharing community individuals with expertise in Wraparound so we can *speak to the world with a common language*, to reduce confusion and promote understanding about the components of and benefits of wraparound
How to do this?

Engage stakeholders
- People with diverse perspectives
- People who have worked with successful teams or programs

Open membership

Use work groups for specific products

Consensus-building
- Transparent process- web-based
- Ratings and comments on tools
- Posting of drafts to build consensus
Foundational Documents (2003-2005)

- The “Ten Principles” document
  - Offers a description about what these abstract principles might mean in practice
  - Highlights important areas of concern
- The “Phases and Activities”
  - Model is a “skeleton” that can be “fleshed out” to be unique to a community
  - Distinct from any existing manual; however no completely novel activities
- The “Necessary Support Conditions”
More recent products (2005-2007)

- Compendium of tools, strategies, and techniques for wraparound
- Consultants page and tips for using consultants
- Measure of System Support - the *Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory*
- Article on the NWI: “Building on Practice-Based Evidence” (*Psychiatric Services*, October 2006)
- Brief summary of published studies and a listing of endorsements of wraparound as a promising, best, or evidence-based practice
Recap of the past year

• The Role of the Family Partner in Accomplishing the 10 Principles
• Why, and How, Does Wraparound Work: A Theory of Change
• Chapter for the System of Care Handbook (Stroul & Blau, now available!)
• Wraparound evidence reviews (in several formats) plus additional presentations and publications
Recap of the past year

- Revisiting and revising the wraparound principle of Persistence / Unconditional Care
- Completion of 10-year follow-up to the State Wraparound Survey
- Meeting of the Standards Workgroup of the NWI, Red Rocks, CO
  - Proposal for an Implementation Guide to Wraparound
- Completion of the Resource Guide to Wraparound
Revisiting and revising the principle of *Persistence / Unconditional*

Choose the option that best reflects your views about the proposed changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number of NWI advisors selecting the option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefer new version of &quot;Unconditional&quot;</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer previous version of &quot;Persistence&quot;</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither version is clearly better</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Revisiting and Revising the principle of Persistence / Unconditional

- From open-ended feedback, little disagreement with the content of the descriptions of either principle.
  - Advisors’ comments did not suggest disagreement either with the ideal of unconditional care or with the reality that systems are often not set up to provide care that is fully unconditional.

- The debate centered on the value-based title Unconditional vs the more practical or applied version expressed by the title Persistent.

- Feedback was used to try to make the definition and extended description of the principle as clear as possible in both of these areas and post a revision of the definition under the heading of Unconditional Care.
• Has its own website within the NWI website
• Accessible from NWI main page
• Also accessible from the easy-to-remember wrapinfo.org
1. Introduction and Basics.
   Introduction to and history of wraparound, the National Wraparound Initiative and the Resource Guide.

2. The Principles of Wraparound
   A description of the values that underlie wraparound and examples of what these values look like in practice.

3. Theory and Research
   A focus on key questions such as Why is wraparound expected to produce positive outcomes? What is the evidence of wraparound’s effectiveness? and How widely implemented is wraparound?

4. Wraparound Practice
   The NWI’s description of the phases and activities that make up the wraparound process, and descriptions of key roles in carrying out the process.

5. Supporting Wraparound Implementation
   A series of articles focusing on what organizations and communities need to provide to support and sustain wraparound: coaching and training, finance, accountability structures, data systems, and more.
More progress from the past year…

- Family partner task force
- Standards workgroup
- Youth Task Force
- Research and evaluation workgroup
Family Partner Task Force of the NWI

Report at NWI Advisors Meeting
July 15, 2008
Standards Workgroup of the NWI

Report at NWI Advisors Meeting
July 15, 2008
Research and Evaluation Activities of the NWI

Report at NWI Advisors Meeting
July 15, 2008
Research and Evaluation: priorities from 2006-2007

• Move community supports measure forward
• Continue to conduct and publish process and outcomes research
• New reviews – published research but also evaluation reports and stories from communities
• Develop an evaluation consortium
• Complete outcomes reviews for publication
• Conduct an implementation research review
• Propose/Conduct multiple case study projects that allow in-depth examination of wraparound practice
Research activities, 2007-2008

- *Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory*
- *Wraparound Fidelity Assessment System*
  - Pilot testing of tools, survey of users
- *Two new reviews of wraparound evidence base*
- *Review of wraparound implementation research*
- *State Wraparound Survey completed*
CSWI

• The 42 items are grouped within 6 themes:
  1. Community partnership
  2. Collaborative action
  3. Fiscal policies and sustainability
  4. Service array
  5. Human resource development, and
  6. Accountability

• Respondents complete the 42 items by rating the development of supports in their community or program on a 5 point scale
  - 0 = “least developed” and 4 = “fully developed”
CSWI: Pilot test

- Seven communities in different states, rural, urban and small city with environs
- Very strong interrater reliability: Mean average intraclass correlation = .78
- Strong factor structure that followed the themes, excellent internal reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's alpha</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme 1</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 2</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 3</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 4</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 5</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 6</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire CSWI</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CSWI Total Scores
(Maximum possible = 160)
Sample Site Feedback: Themes

Theme Means: Site and National Comparison

**Theme 1:** Community Partnerships

**Theme 2:** Collaborative Action

**Theme 3:** Fiscal Policies and Sustainability

**Theme 4:** Availability of Services and Supports

**Theme 5:** Human Resource Development

**Theme 6:** Accountability
Sample Site Feedback: Theme 1

Theme 1: Site and National Item Means

1.1: Community Team
1.2: Empowered Community Team
1.3: Family Voice
1.4: Youth Voice
1.5: Agency Support
1.6: Community Stakeholders
1.7: Community Representativeness

Legend:
- NWI Mean
- Site 2 Mean
Sample Site Feedback: Theme 1

Theme 1: Site and National Item Means

1.1: Community Team
1.2: Empowered Community Team
1.3: Family Voice
1.4: Youth Voice
1.5: Agency Support
1.6: Community Stakeholders
1.7: Community Representativeness

Least Developed | Midway | Fully Developed
--- | --- | ---
Reviews of wraparound evidence base

Theory and Research: Chapter 3.3
A Narrative Review of Wraparound Outcome Studies

Theory and Research: Chapter 3.2
The Evidence Base and Wraparound
Suter & Bruns meta analysis: Published controlled studies of wraparound (N=8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randomized controlled trial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non randomized comparison</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple baseline*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of publication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal article</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book chapter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child welfare</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile justice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Average “Effect sizes”

- Large = 0.8
- Medium = 0.5
- Small = 0.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N Studies</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functioning</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Justice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Env.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean ES</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Important notes about the meta analysis!

• All studies compared wraparound outcomes to treatment as usual, as opposed to no-treatment
• Averages effect sizes of all published controlled studies on wraparound (N=8)
  - Many studies published before efforts to fully specify or describe the wraparound model
  - Majority of these studies did not report how fully the wraparound model was implemented
  - Only one study measured fidelity
  - One study reported “there is no evidence that the content or the quality of the services were different for the Wraparound children” [versus the comparison group] (Bickman et al., 2003; p.151)
Review of Wraparound Implementation studies
State Wraparound Survey completed!

Theory and Research: Chapter 3.4

National Trends in Implementing Wraparound: Results from the State Wraparound Survey, 2007

Eric J. Bruns, Co-Director
National Wraparound Initiative

April Sather, Research Coordinator
Wraparound Evaluation & Research Team

Leyla Stambaugh, Research Psychologist
RTI International
State Wraparound Survey: Number of Programs & Youth Served

• 87.8% (n = 43) reported having some sort of wraparound program
  – Same as for 1998 survey
• Of the 43 states reporting a wraparound initiative, 42 gave estimates of the number of children served statewide
  – An estimated 98,293 children estimated to be served by wraparound, in a reported 819 unique programs across the United States
State Wraparound Survey: Positive trends?

• Greater number of agencies involved in wraparound implementation
• Greater diversity of child-serving systems taking a lead role
  – Child welfare, juvenile justice, and education
• Increasing availability of in-state resources for training and professional development
• More consistent measurement of fidelity
• More formal evaluation of wraparound
State Wraparound Survey: Other findings

• **Standards** are associated with more consistent evaluation, fidelity monitoring and availability of in-state professional development resources

• **Statewide initiatives** associated with greater use of standards and involvement by more agencies
State Wraparound Survey: Implications

• Wraparound is reported to be widely implemented – twice as prevalent as other intensive community treatment models combined
  - MST: 19,000 annually*
  - FFT: 30,000 annually*
  - MTFC: 1,000 annually*

*Source = Evidence Based Associates (2008)
Conclusion: Meeting the need
Each symbol = 10,000 youths with SED in U.S.

Estimated to receive
WA, MST, FFT, MTFC

Estimated to receive any service
Other NWI-Related News

• Wikipedia entry and talk page (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wraparound)
• Wraparound online course as part of the Florida Mental Health Institute certificate program in children’s mental health
  – For details about the certificate program: www.outreach.usf.edu/gradcerts/
• Other research- advisors?
• Publications
  – Advisors?
• Other things we all should know about?
Update: Wraparound Fidelity Assessment System

• Team Observation Measure pilot completed
  - TOM now available for use by communities

• Document Review Measure pilot attempted
  - Measure and training materials being revised for second round of piloting

• WFI-4 Online Data Entry and Reporting System (WONDERS) pilot tested and ready for use by WFI-4 user communities
## Results of WFAS quality improvement surveying

Mean rating (1-5) and percent agreeing at least “somewhat”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Captures strengths and weaknesses</th>
<th>Feasible for implementation</th>
<th>Site benefited from use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WFI-4</td>
<td>4.2 (100%)</td>
<td>3.8 (88%)</td>
<td>4.0 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM</td>
<td>4.2 (100%)</td>
<td>4.0 (100%)</td>
<td>4.0 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRM</td>
<td>3.5 (80%)</td>
<td>2.5 (50%)</td>
<td>2.5 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWI</td>
<td>4.3 (100%)</td>
<td>4.0 (88%)</td>
<td>3.7 (88%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Priorities for the Future Survey: Respondent Characteristics

- 99 Respondents
- Have you and/or your close family members ever received intensive services/interventions (wraparound or otherwise) from service systems (e.g., mental health, child welfare, juvenile justice, special education, etc.)? **44% YES**
- Role
  - Supervisor/Administrator 23%
  - Manager/Administrator/Policy Maker (authority over several programs) 21%
  - “Other” 21%
  - Wraparound trainer 14%
  - Wraparound staff 11%
  - Researcher/Evaluator 5%
People have suggested that the NWI should hold conferences. If it were DONE RIGHT (see next question), do you think it would be a good idea for the NWI to hold conferences?
What would it take to “do it right” or add value?
Certification for Individuals

People have suggested that the NWI should develop--and then oversee--national certification processes for key roles in wraparound (e.g. facilitator or family partner). Do you think it would be a good idea for the NWI to do this?
What would it take to “do it right” or add value?
Certifying Organizations

People have suggested that the NWI should develop --and then oversee-- certification for agencies/programs that provide wraparound. This would be something like standards. Do you think it would be a good idea for the NWI to do this?

![Bar chart showing the distribution of responses to the question about certifying organizations. The chart categorizes responses into five levels: really bad idea, pretty bad idea, ok idea, pretty good idea, and really good idea. The chart shows that the majority of responses fall into the 'ok idea' category.]
What would it take to “do it right” or add value?
People have suggested that the NWI should develop descriptions of essential skills for key roles in the wraparound process. Do you think it would be a good idea for the NWI to do this?
What would it take to “do it right” or add value?
Expectations and Tools for Supervision

People have suggested that the NWI should develop expectations for--and tools to support--supervision of key roles in wraparound. Do you think it would be a good idea for the NWI to do this?

![Bar chart showing responses to the idea of developing expectations and tools for supervision.](chart.png)
What would it take to “do it right” or add value?
People have suggested that the NWI should work to create a more sustainable and interactive "community of practice" to support sharing and peer-to-peer support at the individual and/or community level.
What would it take to “do it right” or add value?
People have suggested that the NWI should develop tools and or a process for assessing the quality or impact of training and consulting…
What would it take to “do it right” or add value?
Comparison...

Conferences

Certify Individuals

Certify Orgs

Skill Sets

Tools for Sup.

Comm. of Practice

Tools to Evaluate Training
Day 1: Small group work

• For each priority area please identify
  - What would be the most useful outputs that could be produced in this area?
    • Use the feedback from the survey and group discussion to characterize what it would take for these outputs to be “done right”
  - What could be done in the next year to make progress on creating these outputs?
  - What are the first steps? Formulate the beginnings of an action plan.
Wednesday Agenda

• Recap of day 1
• Panel and discussion:
  - Priorities for the NWI
• Task groups and continuation of yesterday’s small group work
• BREAK
• Summary of goals and priorities for next year and beyond!
• Next steps and wrap-up
NWI Work groups

• Goals
• Action steps
• By whom?
• By when?