Possible Imperatives for Wraparound Supervision
Aggregate Feedback

Overall comments:
1. Supervision is more than just overseeing professional development and performance of wraparound facilitators (and family partners?). But that is where we are focusing for now.
2. It would be really handy to have a list of skill sets or competencies, both at the level of facilitator and supervisor.

Things that there seem to be agreement on as far as necessary elements of supervision for wraparound:

1. Supervisor and supervisee work together collaboratively to develop and implement an Individualized Professional Development Plan or Individualized Practice Improvement Plan.

   Comments on this (is it essential, a good idea, a bad idea, etc.), including whether or not there needs to be more specificity: ie plan is updated at least quarterly or something like that.
   - **An Individualized Professional Development Plan is a good idea.** It assists everyone in keeping on track, enhances continuous improvement and supports a learning environment/organization. I support IPDP, not IPIP. The concept of “development” supports a strength-based approach and a coaching paradigm; “improvement” means something different to most people and implies “teaching” and “correction.”
   - **Yes we should do this.** This is a standard of practice in many agencies regardless of the job. Typically this is called a performance goals set at the time one is hired. We can do better in Wraparound supervision by making it very individualized.

2. The process of developing the IPIP must start with strengths, needs, culture exploration.

   Comments on this (is it essential, a good idea, a bad idea, etc), including what might be included in this exploration:
   - **Excellent; and each of the examples below should be included in the IPDP.**
   - **Great idea! Do it!**
Possible examples:
What talents do you bring to the job?
Needs and concerns about the job
Type of learner you are
How best to offer supervision/support/coaching
What are your work ethics/values?
What styles of interaction do you rely on/prefer: humor, story telling, offering information, etc.

3. The process of developing the IPIP would also include a discussion of culture of the organization.

Comments on this (is it essential, a good idea, a bad idea, etc), including what might be included in this discussion:

- **It is common** that a program, unit and/or division have their own subculture within the organization. Bringing unspoken values into the light in an IPDP is an essential part of supervision because these values sometimes interfere with honesty, transparency, relationships, etc. On the other hand, these unspoken values/practices can also aid in development. So, I would add to the examples:
  - In what ways does the program support the organization’s values?
  - Are there values within the program that differ in practice from those of the organization? If so, how might we see this in daily practices?

- **Yes, it should definitely incorporate** the culture of the agency. There are limitations that could be encountered depending on what type of agency (i.e. Child Welfare agencies may have other training requirement other than Wraparound). Supervision vs. coaching should also be clarified in situations where the supervisor and the Wrap coach are two different people. Clarify who does what and who reports to whom. We also need to identify common values.

Possible examples:
What are the organization’s values?
What are the rules/procedures that govern the supervision process?
What are the expectations for interpersonal interaction around supervision, both individual and group?
4. The IPIP would include individualized goals and strategies for improvement, as well as objective indicators for evaluation.

Comments on this (is it essential, a good idea, a bad idea, etc), and exactly how does the data fit in—are all goals to be assessed with data/indicators, or just at least some of them? Does data get gathered before any plan is developed, or is the initial plan developed on the basis of some data?:

- **Initial plan developed based on supervisee/supervisor current understanding of directions, then revised, similar to a Wrap plan.**
- **I think we should start with a good assessment tool that determines areas of strength and weakness. Do a pre and post assessment. Assessment tool can have the domains that we want to evaluate (i.e. knowledge base). Then we can gather data for pre –post results.**

5. Supervisees’ self-assessment also is part of plan development.

Comments on this (is it essential, a good idea, a bad idea, etc), including what form this self-assessment would take, and is it relative to goals already selected for the plan, or does it come before the goals are developed?:

- **Supervisees should set their own goals for growth, in their own words. The supervisor can encourage the area of development based upon the surveys and WFI, etc., but the supervisee, perhaps in partnership with the supervisor, has to define the goal and make suggestions for strategies about how to get there, just as in a Wraparound plan. Data can define skills/objective indicators, but can’t drive the goals/strategies themselves. The “team” of supervisor/supervisee has to define these.**
- **Similar to the above or incorporated with the initial assessment tool.**

5. Data is used in the supervisory process. Data must include observation, feedback from families and youth (eg surveys, WFI) and plan review. Yes

Comments on this (is it essential, a good idea, a bad idea, etc), including are all of these three types essential? Is there any further guidance on how often this data should be collected or reviewed (eg observation at least every 6 months?):

- **Feedback from other staff members who have worked with the supervisee may be important also. (similar to a 360 degree type survey) Observation timing will depend on the stage of development of the supervisee (newbies may need more often) with a minimum general standard of every six months.**
- **The three areas should give us a good comprehensive picture. Just a note, not all site implementing Wraparound are doing the WFI or maybe too new in the implementation to use it.**
6. The data used in supervision must include information on the extent to which each of the principles are in place. This could be from fidelity measures, satisfaction surveys, plan review.

Comments on this (is it essential, a good idea, a bad idea, etc), including any specifics about how this would be assessed:
- Are you suggesting that the evaluation or plan should address each of the 10 principles? I read a document not too long ago on how the 10 principles apply in supervision. This is a good basis but may not be too realistic to account to all of the principles just to come up with an evaluation or a plan.

7. Strategies on the IPIP should build on strengths of the supervisee and strengths of co-workers and others in the organization. eg if one has difficulty staying on top of documentation, some mentoring from someone who is efficient/effective in this area.

Comments on this (is it essential, a good idea, a bad idea, etc), including any specifics about how this would be assessed:
- Yes! The strategies should build on strengths. Of course, those strategies should also be individualized to the supervisee’s style of interaction, learning style, etc.
- Good idea.

8. In addition to individual supervision, group supervision is also provided, and gives co-workers the opportunity to mentor one another, share, consult, and identify areas where the group could improve --eg use of natural supports.

Comments on this (is it essential, a good idea, a bad idea, etc), including any specifics like whether or not there should be group-level practice improvement plans (eg the group is working on increasing use of natural supports or making sure certain documentation is complete):
- Good idea.
- I do not want to do group level improvement plans. I think providing group supervision, workshop, training, etc are ways we could incorporate as action items in the IPIP. Lets not make this too complicated.
Any other comments, including other possible imperatives to include on the list, or reflections on the idea of making things imperative.... Also would this process be the same for anyone with a key role in wraparound (eg facilitator, family partner, youth partner...)

- This process should be for all participating in Wraparound, including the supervisors of the supervisors and the directors. And, ideally, the value of the individualized professional plan development permeates the organization.
- A feedback survey or something directly from families we serve is one we should use. Nothing like hearing it directly from families how we are doing!