

Please provide feedback on the wording of the "unconditional care" version of the principles.	Please provide feedback on the wording of the "persistence" version of the principles.	Please give any other feedback about the two versions.
see note on 4.	see note on 4.	Persistence leads one to think that the care will continue but does not imply conditions related to the care. Unconditional tells one that the care will be given regardless of circumstances but does not define length or endurance of care. Perhaps a compromise would be persistent unconditional care.
I like the term unconditional care better than persistence but am concerned that we have a shared understanding and agreement about what that means.	I have always thought the term persistence was too vague, and required too much explanation. The values should be clear upon first glance - with a brief description about what the value means and looks like in practice.	I think it's great that we are revisiting this principle. Kudos!
		Thanks - from one who was against the change in the first place.
We had long discussions about this. Unconditional care is not a reality when courts, child welfare, juvenile justice are engaged. The intent (to quote Karl Dennis) of this principle was "never give up"... "if the plan doesn't work change the plan". Persistence more closely approximated this, not unconditional care. Wraparound is a model for organizing multi-system response, not a religion.	See above	Where is this coming from? To simply say that the principle of persistence is being questioned does not inform discussion. There are many limitations in defining a model by consensus. It's time for us to move beyond this. If we are to remain with a consensus approach to model clarification then it is ESSENTIAL that proposed changes are identified by source and with a rationale rather than sending out a survey for "consensus"
I prefer the use of this terminology. It is much more user friendly.	I never liked this term	
	I never did like this wording.	
I would like wording added to indicate that each family member's safety will continue to be protected within the intended definition of unconditional care.	See above.	
This has always been my preference in terminology in spite of the fact it may not be possible to implement under all circumstances. It has always provoked a lot of meaningful conversations in trainings we conduct.	The explanation of "Persistence" is the saving grace in the previous version. And I always thought it implied that the team would persist in what it thought was right regardless of what the family wanted!	Thanks for bringing this up. I was not a part of previous discussions about this, but always wondered why the change was made from unconditional to persistence. It never made grammatical sense either!

<p>This principle is intended to guide the cft in assuming a no eject or reject stance even in the face of challenges or set-backs. This should be doable even if the broader system fails to provide unlimited services.</p>	<p>The abbreviated version of this principle doesn't fully encompass the notion of assuming a nonjudgemental, non-blaming or non-rejecting stance</p>	
<p>I'm in favor of the "unconditional care" wording because it reflects the intention of the team effort to go the distance needed to make change happen and it resonants with the original principle of an enduring relationship w/ the family.</p>	<p>I'm against the "persistence" version because of the history as a family partner and wraparound trainer in a failed system change effort, I believe language and intentions must be kept transparent and honest.</p>	
<p>I find the term "unconditional care" to be off-putting. It sounds institutional in framework. If it were up to me, I'd keep the TERM "persistence", but use the explanatory language in the paragraph you have under "unconditional care".</p>		

<p>This wording is far superior to the "persistence" wording. As a family member and someone who has worked in Wraparound for several years, I was very disappointed when "unconditional" was dropped in favor of persistence. It seemed like we were lowering the bar and were no longer striving for excellence by standing by families and youth through thick and thin. The ideas set forth that "unconditional" can be challenging and hard to achieve because of system mandates and families may be disappointed because others do not meet the family's definition of unconditionality is hard to swallow. First of all, families are often disappointed by services but that is no reason to lower the bar (expect poor services, get poor services). It is not up to others to "soften" the family's disappointment in services and seems a tad patronizing. I believe strongly that NWI must strive for professing the highest quality of commitment to families and youth because if we don't the bar will continue to get lowered.</p>	<p>Don't like the wording, never did.</p>	<p>I am pleased that this is being reconsidered and hopefully will be changed.</p>
<p>The title 'unconditional care' implies that services are unlimited. While team members do not give up on, blame or reject children --- the term 'unconditional care' in the context of wraparound systems of care is not sustainable and will cause some systems not to integrate wraparound into their services array.</p>	<p>I suggest that we stay with the 'Persistence' wording as a title. the explanatory text makes it the intent of not giving up on children.</p>	<p>Change the title and revise the brief definition: Persistence: (Start with positive language..A wraparound team does not blame children, youth and their families and despite challenges persists in working towards the goals in the wraparound plan until the team reaches agreement that</p>
<p>Keep Unconditional Care as proposed.</p>	<p>discard persistence version</p>	<p>I still support Unconditional Care!!!</p>
<p>Keep "Unconditional Care" as proposed</p>	<p>Discard "persistence"</p>	<p>Totally support "Unconditional Care"</p>
		<p>I feel strongly that NWI returns to "unconditional care."</p>
<p>This is the wording that I have heard more often when referring to wraparound.</p>		

<p>Wraparound is a philosophy, not a mandate. It unrelated to the funding of treatment. A such, I think it is preferable to unequivocally state that the highest fidelity to the wraparound philosophy is achieved when service recipients get their services "unconditionally" rather than "persistently." Your revised wording clearly says, with examples, how fidelity to the wraparound philosophical imperative for "unconditional" service can conflict with realities of funding. I don't think anything is gained by replacing a philosophical ideal like "unconditional" with a pragmatic term like "persistent." Let's keep the high ground.</p>	<p>You can be persistent without delivering help "unconditionally." "Persistence" is a poor substitute for "unconditional" in a philosophical system.</p>	<p>You can deliver "wraparound" services unconditionally. You may not be able to get FUNDING to deliver some specific services without complying with the rules of the funding agency, but it's worthwhile to note the difference, and strive for the highest fidelity to the wraparound philosophy no matter who funds your services.</p>
<p>My comments on only supportive. The addition of the paragraph addressing the occasional difficulty of providing unconditional care is the bridge that has been needed so that we don't have to use "persistence."</p>		
<p>I feel Unconditional Care is a principle that speaks more to the team.</p>		
<p>I think the wording of the "unconditional care" version of the principle is fine, but the title should not be "unconditional". I have always had a bit of a problem with the term "unconditional" when applied in this context. Whether we like it or not, there are always conditions to just about anything we do. The term itself, "unconditional" is so large in scope that it is difficult, if not impossible, to commit to in advance. I would like to see the title "persistence" (or a synonym of the word) retained, and, in place of its current explanatory sentences, use the proposed "unconditional" sentences. Also, to me, "persistence" has a positive connotation, not a negative one.</p>		

<p>The proposed commitment to Unconditional Care, in my view, more accurately reflects the appropriate spirit of the Wraparound Process; and will help to drive its effectiveness in supporting optimal outcomes for people. If there ever was, then now in the 21st century there no longer exists reason to carve out space for "exceptions" - children and families whose needs and challenges are so "complex" or "extraordinary" that they defy the promise of the wraparound process, and the application of the remaining wraparound principles. [That would, in a way, mirror the traditional habit of excluding "impossible clients" by incarcerating, hospitalizing or nstitutionalizing them - a regrettable tradition whose time, thank goodness, can remain behind in the millenium just ended. Highly complex needs should not excuse us from using our best methods, but instead demand that we do so! Our communities, and our human service systems, now have the "technology" and resources to imagine and create responsive, individualized approaches to address any set of needs. We will succ</p>		
<p>I continue to feel that using the term "unconditional care" sets up an preconcieved notion in the community of something that is unrealistic. I have also experienced that families that struggle with developmental delays struggle with the subtle differences in interpretation with this value.</p>	<p>I fully support the wording of "persistence" as the value of wraparound. It sets the tone that wraparound "sticks with it".</p>	
	<p>It dilutes the meaning of unconditional and may allow too many people to give up too quickly when faced with a specific challenge.</p>	
		<p>I think that it is important to remember that Unconditional Care is what families deserve, and what most of the families that we serve need.</p>

		As is traditionally the case, it is not the wording that we use, as the way that we teach the concept. "Unconditional care" or "persistence" both need to be explained and understood. Personally, I prefer "unconditional care" because it describes our commitment better than Persistence. Persistence has a more negative tone.
One of the main arguments is that families may suffer disappointment when 'the systems' do not support unconditional care. It appears that when this happens, the Wraparound community has an opportunity to persistently advocate for continued care for the family. Thus, keeping the value of unconditional care becomes even more urgent when systems do not meet the needs of our families.		
Your wording of the above question makes answering this question difficult. I believe that unconditional is the best wording because it truly speaks to doing whatever it takes.	Persistence to me means continuing to try hard but there is some sense of trying even though it is not working	I prefer unconditional
I believe this wording is easier for the family to understand.	This to me seems complicated, when it goes into describing persistence it gets too wordy. I think families would be saying "What?"	

<p>See below.</p>		<p>I believe that the term "unconditional care" is more consistent with the vision of wraparound as a child & family centered approach. If you compare unconditional care with the concept of "unconditional positive regard," empathizing with and considering the preferences of another does not equal agreeing with those preferences. That means that members of child & family teams will have different opinions about what needs to happen and in some cases systems (like child welfare) have the authority and responsibility to make decisions about children independent of the preferences of the family. I don't believe that "unconditional care" means that families always have the best ideas and that only their perspectives can be considered in planning. That is contrary to the participatory decision making process. All perspectives are considered with the understanding that the family's preferences carry more weight than the professionals involved despite the fact that some participants can have more authority to make decisions than others. "Unconditional ca</p>
<p>I think the basic definition needs to remain plain and simple with the more detailed definition following. I don't like the name of the principle, "Unconditional Care". I think it's misleading to families and can create resistance in system partners. We can't afford this set kind of setback.</p>	<p>The basic initial definition is simple, easy to read and understandable. The detailed definition that follows explains that wrap teams don't give up and adverse outcomes are not seen as a failure of the family or child.</p>	<p>I understand, and share, the concern that the word "Persistence" can evoke concerns that this process is going to be a "pain in the neck." I think a more appropriate name for this principle might be "Perseverance". This word provides a sense of hard work and dedication as opposed to "a pest, a nag, not a helper."</p>

<p>The wording of the proposed version seems much more strengths-based.</p>	<p>The wording of the "persistence" version would be better if the same as the unconditional wording was used.</p>	<p>I think both versions would be better if they explicitly addressed the difficulties of contacting families. If not in the wording itself, then in how the principle is carried out. If rules or funding limitations will not fund the type or mix of services determined most appropriate by the team, the team should take it back to the referral/care team and/or the community team for their suggestions. Using 'unconditional' may indeed make family members, advocates, wraparound experts and service providers nervous, but using the wording from the unconditional version in the persistence version would be a good way to get the point across. If there weren't significant challenges, the youth and families wouldn't be receiving wraparound services.</p>
<p>My response to unconditional care is that it is more feeling than doing. It is often more difficult for someone to feel a specific way about something or someone. I have found it challenging to teach the concept of unconditional care.</p>	<p>My response to persistence is that it is more doing than feeling. It speaks to leaving no stone unturned when it comes to meeting goals. The value of unconditional care underlies the activities of persistence. When one is trying again and again to find ways to achieve the goal, it seems essential to care unconditionally.</p>	<p>I recently asked a class of case management students which term they resonated most with ΓÇô most could identify with persistence and understood how to apply it in support of the family. Some found unconditional care to vague.</p>
<p>compassionate care</p>	<p>no suggestion</p>	<p>Maybe we could call it "compassionate care" and sort of blend the two concepts together as explained in my earlier e-mail.</p>
<p>An improvement; speaks closer to a team in my opinion</p>		
<p>The wording is accurate.</p>	<p>The wording describes the argument for changing the wording.</p>	<p>The last version makes it clear about the issue of the two phrases.</p>

<p>I really like the new wording. It better reflects the ideal for this principle, while acknowledging it is not an easy achievement. I do have some minor "picky" feedback: - I'd stay consistent with the use of the terms children and / or youth. Use both, or one or the other each time, rather than alternate. Most of the wording refers to how a single team should act toward a specific family, except at the very outset when it's stated, "team does not give up on, blame, or reject children." Sounds like this should be "teams" in general.(I told you they were picky :-)</p>	<p>Sounds fairly similar, but I agree that the words "unconditional" and "persistence" sound very different.</p>	<p>Great work! I think this is an important issue because it's one of the truly distinguishing features of wraparound compared to other community-based team planning processes.</p>
<p>I like the inclusion of the word reject in the first paragraph. The end of the second paragraph gets really muddy to me ... I would make it a little more straight-forward ... I do not see the need to apologize for "unconditional" ... it does not mean that we get everything we want but we stay in there anyway. A possible revision might be: "One such constraint is when funding limitations or rules will not fund the type or mix of services determined most appropriate by the team. In these instances the team must develop a plan that can be implemented in the absence of such resources without giving up on the youth or family. Providing unconditional care can be complicated in the context of child welfare where unconditional care includes the duty to keep children and youth safe. Regardless, team members as well as those overseeing wraparound initiatives must strive to achieve the principle of unconditional care for the youth and all family members if the wraparound process is to have its full impact on children, families, and communities.</p>	<p>I don't see unconditional care as unrealistic ... My son has put himself and his family in some frustrating situations ... sometimes there are unfortunate consequences for his choices and sometimes he doesn't like my responses, but my commitment to him is still unconditional. Its really being to work through it that has taught some of our greatest lessons.</p>	<p>The newer version sticks to the principle itself. I like unconditional over persistent.</p>

<p>I like it. I think we also have to note that sometimes we may need to take a break but the door is open. Also if one agency can not continue that doesn't mean that others might not be able to continue.</p>		<p>Just happy to see the careful consideration.</p>
<p>Even though this wording may present some challenge for "systems" and providers it is my belief that it best represents our commitment to children youth and families on their healing journey no matter what the issue might be. When we start changing work we open the opportunity for others to change the way we have been doing business in the "best interest of children youth and families. I have found very few families/youth who misconstrue or find unconditional care difficult to follow. We, as a team are caring unconditionally for a child youth or family.</p>	<p>i just simply do not like the implications of this version. It brings those I have shared this with back to the idea that at some point a family may be "kicked out" of a Wraparound Process.</p>	
<p>I love the wording and most of all, I love bringing back "unconditional". "Persistence" was the one area in the 10 Principles that I disagreed with. Unconditional Care is one essential area that sets Wraparound apart. "Persistence" seemed to be a slippery slope - unless we are absolute about "never giving up" there will be exceptions made with more and more frequency. Thank you!</p>	<p>I felt strongly that "persistence" watered down our intent to do whatever it takes to support children and families.</p>	<p>I think that's it. I would be thrilled to see this change.</p>
<p>this new version better describes the spirit of wraparound</p>		
		<p>I think we should combine the two. I think the principle should be Persistence but with the definition written with Unconditional Care.</p>

I think the following remains a hedge, unless language is added regarding the responsibility to be relentless in the effort to identify supports and to work for policy change to remove the systemic barriers." At the same time, it is worth noting that many wraparound experts, including family members and advocates, have observed that providing 'unconditional' care to youth and families can be challenging for teams to achieve in the face of certain system-level constraints. One such constraint is when funding limitations or rules will not fund the type or mix of services determined most appropriate by the team. In these instances the team must develop a plan that can be implemented in the absence of such resources but in a way that does not give up on the youth or family. Providing unconditional care can be complicated in other situations as well. For example, when wraparound is being implemented in the context of child welfare, protection of children's safety may require that care is unconditional primarily to the child or youth. Regardless, even in these circumstances

<p>I personally like the term unconditional commitment versus unconditional care but this is much better than persistence which never really captured the true intent of the value. I do think that the definition could be shorter but it is a big improvement.</p>	<p>This was always seen as a confusing term to define and I would define it as unconditional commitment despite the word persistence. It seems like it allowed an "out" if things got too hard.</p>	<p>One of the best thing about wraparound has been that it valued consistency and commitment to not bounce kids and families around from program to program and that you should change what you are doing instead. I remember the discussion about persistence versus unconditional commitment because nothing was seen as unconditional. I think that it was an attempt to address the mandated children, youth and families. But just because they are mandated to be there doesn't mean the team shouldn't provide an unconditional commitment to figure out what might work. Words can drive practice so this change seems necessary.</p>
<p>I find the language good but would add something to the effect of that the team should give attention to ensuring that the goals reflect the real goals of the family/youth. I have observed teams resort to blaming the family/youth when the plan does not work as the "team" envisioned. Often I have observed the source of this failure as the result of the team substituting their values and practice experience for the family/youth's real desires/goals. The teams vision overrides the individual's, the individual family/youth does not own the plan and their compliance is seen as limited. When goals are more aligned to values and cultural realities which do not match those of the family/youth the care becomes "conditional" upon changes the family/youth are expected to make. When there is no such change the team blames the family/youth rather than acknowledging the value or cultural conflict represented by the plan developed.</p>	<p>(See comments above) My problem with persistence goes back to the statements set out above. If there is no real ownership of the original plan due to cultural or values conflicts, persistence becomes either coersion and manipulation or rejection focusing on what the family/youth did not do. If the barrier is in truth a lack of resources as identified in the language most families/youth will be able to grasp the fact that best efforts toward a result have not resulted in the outcome desired and help create a new goal which may be obtainable. This new goal is now owned by the family/youth not imposed by team values or practice experience.</p>	

<p>The wording is good and I think more strength-based. Unconditional Care fits better into the Wraparound philosophy.</p>	<p>Can possibly reflect a negative connotation, as persistence can be both a strength and a weakness. It also begs the question, "Persistence of what?"</p>	
<p>With the power of semantics being what it is these days, I believe the term "unconditional" immediately sets the wrap family up for potential expectations that may not be able to be realized. If it is something we cannot promise without exception, we should not be standing by this particular phrasing.</p>	<p>Persistence does denote an uphill climb-endurance against "the odds"...which does suggest, rather overtly, a "battle" to overcome. The question is, even though this will often be the reality, do we want to use that terminology in a "strengths-based" focus with families? If I had to choose between the two wordings, this one, at least speaks of "sticktuitiveness" or perseverance in less than optimal circumstances and speaks a bit more clearly to the heart of the matter.</p>	<p>After personal deliberation, I believe that what both parties are trying to express is an exercise of "Ongoing Commitment" until a formal wraparound process is no longer required. What seems to be most important is to let families know the intent of wrap team philosophy-which is to be pledged (committed) to ongoing flexible service (regardless of circumstance)until goals are met and/or the team is no longer needed or appropriate.</p>
<p>I like the wording Unconditional</p>	<p>Persistent sounds like we are chasing families and it sounds devaluing.</p>	
<p>Unconditional is very difficult in the child welfare field. Other variables do not allow providers to operate within this principal value.</p>	<p>I think that this might be more relevant and practical especially in the word of child welfare where families are prematurely abandoned without any level of persistence to get it right.</p>	
<p>I have a problem with using team consensus rather than outcome achievement as a graduation criterion. I've been in lots of situations in which families that have the most complex needs are thrown out of the process because professionals find them "difficult". This consensus is often established in so-called sidebar sessions from which the family is excluded.</p>	<p>When we say unconditional, we get persistent. I hate to think what we'll get with this lesser word and therefore, weaker standard.</p>	<p>Is this wraparound or that Survivor TV show? I'm not sure any of these focus group/survey methods are working.</p>
		<p>I have struggled with Persistence as a principle and yet when faced with changing it to unconditional care I find that persistence is a more accurate description</p>

<p>I understand the concern about using "Unconditional care"- because some may see it as Unrealistic or impossible. But I think when you read the discription the intent of the principle is clear.</p>	<p>I also don't think it would be a problem to use persistence. I don't really view this as negative term. I see Persistence more like Perseverance- never quitting even when things become very difficult. I think when you read the discription regarding the intent of persistence it is also clear. Maybe the wording could be changed to Perseverance!</p>	
<p>I think of unconditional care as including unconditional respect. That as service providers we are respectful of individuality, non biased. Which can be thought of in family voice and choice, individualized, and culturally competent.</p>	<p>I like persistence. It encompasses persistence of the team, the family, the facilitating agency etc. It seems to offer energy when a team is struggling. It also includes the people working on this from the "outside" such as mobilization specialists to work to integrate systems and challenge barriers.</p>	
<p>... until the team agrees to discontinue the formal wraparound process.</p>		<p>very nice to see a return to this way of thinking...</p>
<p>n/a</p>	<p>n/a</p>	<p>It does not seem to be the wording that is problematic, but rather the constructs themselves. In somewhat rhetorical fashion, I would ask you to consider what would be lost if both were simply dropped. the gains seem more obvious... the would be both a streamlining of the principles and concomitant increase in clarity.</p>
<p>The wording is clear in the current form.</p>		
		<p>The setting of high standards, even in the face of obstacles should be a bedrock principle of Wraparound. When it comes to a matter of semantics I would always prefer the stronger language.</p>
		<p>I have no major problem with shifting back to UC from persistence, however I think that we in the field will have to explain the UC limitations as part of engagement, in the first session with the family. We will just say "Our commitment is that we won't give up, but sometimes systems give up due to funding limitations. If this happens, we will try to deal with it"</p>

<p>It might be helpful to, in the 2nd sentence of the first paragraph, clearly acknowledge that "challenges and setbacks" derive from providers and systems not just families. Doing this earlier in the text may help clarify the intent more than the longer examples at the end of the draft. It seems that the wording of the very last sentence could be stronger...." Team members as well as....must strive to assure that the focus of a wraparound effort includes all forms of family as a focus of care regardless of the youth's current living situation and custody status.."</p>	<p>2nd paragraph is better off not being used at all as it is not in the new draft.</p>	
<p>Clearer, more family friendly, family centered language. Reminds practitioners to stop judging, encourages more thinking out of the box to meet family needs which then meet program needs.</p>	<p>Sounded too 'programmatic', meet family need to fulfill program goals.</p>	<p>Both have good points. Just feel that "unconditional" does not mean "unrealistic" and better reflects why Wrap is different than other services.</p>
<p>I would suggest ending the definition with the first section that explains the principle. The next paragraph which begins with "At the same time" sounds like excuses. I work for a County operated system that can put up barriers just like every other State or County system can. People doing this work just need to know it is hard work and it is their job to keep being creative and doing what ever they can to break down barriers while maintaining safety for all. Families are smart. Let's give them the credit they are due for knowing when someone is doing all they can on their behalf.</p>		<p>Never understood why it was changed in the first place but thank you for asking for input. MJ Meyers, Wraparound Milwaukee</p>
<p>I very much appreciate the verbiage of the "Unconditional Care"; especially indicating that we do not give up on...</p>	<p>Too short, not as easy to understand when reviewing with those who are not educated on wraparound.</p>	<p>The "Unconditional Care" version is much more defined, giving specific information on our mission and our commitment to continuing the wraparound process no matter what.</p>
	<p>From my view I like this wording better it defines it to me a little better. I feel this is stronger wording.</p>	

<p>I agree that "unconditional" paints an unrealistic picture of the process as well as of the expectations that are placed on members of the team both internally and externally.</p>	<p>I believe that of the two, "persistence" provides a clearer description of the effort placed in team collaboration, however, "persistence" then becomes an expected standard of behavior or of the process and this could only be "required" of certain team members within the context of their "role" and of the team dynamic. Much of the practice of "persistence" must be clearly understood and owned by each team member and then defined within the context of the agreed upon outcomes.</p>	<p>I would suggest the use of the phrase "adaptability" and connect it to the teams commitment to adapt to varied circumstances as agreed upon and/or defined in order to reach the desired outcomes until the team determines that the desired outcomes have been reached. This is often a strength within families and/or individuals who have to make the best of a given situation in order to do what they think or feel they need or want to do. Understood in many levels of experience. With regard to the two versions, I think that persistence though potentially perceived as punitive is the better choice of the two.</p>
<p>not giving up is the key - It exemplifies the same level of committment from the team, despite what sometimes feels like impossible barriers, that we expect from families. We hope that families will stick with their children unconditionally...can we hang in there with them?</p>	<p>Better to cope with disappointment because the system couldn't come through with the actual services and supports, than to deal with being left to navigate through this complex situation without the support of the team "This revision reflects feedback from wraparound experts, including family members and advocates, that for communities using the wraparound process, describing care as 'unconditional' may be unrealistic and possibly yield disappointment on the part of youth and family members when a service system or community can not meet their own definition of unconditionality"</p>	<p>I appreciate the willingness of the NWI to revisit the concept of a committment to unconditional care as a principle to strive toward</p>
<p>The wording "unconditional care" in my mind is reserved for natural supports who will be a resource for a child over a life time. This concept does not pertain to a group of professionals representing a system of care on a CFT.</p>	<p>Persistence is a realistic and more accurate version of what I see happening with professionals committed to a child and family.</p>	
<p>I think the wording is clear and specific; the meaning can be easily conveyed;</p>	<p>For me, while providing training, persistence does not provide the full intent of the value.</p>	

<p>In our experience here in NYS, "unconditional" tends to scare folks off and has the hinting of a mandate that local (and state) delivery systems seem hesitant to commit to in writing.</p>		
<p>I believe that unconditional does create unrealistic assumptions despite the disclaimer. There are times when there are barriers beyond the control of the team that would conflict with this wording.</p>	<p>I first would like to offer that it should be persistent to have parallel construction with the other principles. I prefer persistence but the definition that was created does come across as negative. I would change it to 'persistent' and wordsmith the proposed definition.</p>	
<p>I think that the wording unconditional care is more universally understood as it's meaning is implied.</p>	<p>This wording is good but a little vague and is open to different interpretations.</p>	<p>It is tough to decide. Both are good but I think unconditional care does seem more "user friendly".</p>
		<p>I strongly prefer the new version which I believe better reflects the underlying value of the wraparound process and what communities are striving for.</p>
		<p>They basically say the same thing just using different language....either is fine.</p>
<p>Unconditional does not seem to fit System of Care. Because most times it is "conditional". I love the previous version, please do not try to fix what is not broken</p>	<p>Persistence is a negative word to me. When I see or here "persistence" it makes me feel like I will be "bugged" until I give in.</p>	<p>In my opinion the previous version works</p>
<p>I like unconditional care better. It is more clearly understood from a family/youth perspective. It seems to me that is what Wraparound is about at it's core.</p>	<p>Persistence isn't bad, but not as strong of a word related to the commitment made by team.</p>	
<p>The wording of unconditional care is more detailed and clearly described than persistence. I think unconditional as a word cause a lot of anxiety from providers and this makes it an easy target for push back--people attach a meaning to unconditional that is not intended. I think the term works better than persistence in the context of the definition so that it will be important to always reference the definition when talking about unconditional.</p>		

<p>I believe that for new front-line and agency leadership coming into this field, the term unconditional care</p>		<p>I believe that for new front-line staff or program or executive leadership the term unconditional care communicates a clearer message of expectations and better links with the 9 other principles.</p>
<p>The revised statement better reflects the intent of the Wraparound process and provides more clarity to the definition.</p>		
<p>I think that this term more clearly conveys the intention of the principle. The further clarification of it's meaning should help.</p>	<p>Persistence allows professionals an "out" as it may let us say "well, we've been persistent but..."</p>	<p>As defined "unconditional care" ensures that we never give up. If the plan fails then we must help develop a new one!</p>
		<p>I think the wording of both versions represent basically the same concept with different wording. While I like the "Unconditional Care" wording better, I think "Unconditional Commitment" better represents something that the team members have in their power to control. Each team member has the ability to decide and commit him or herself and his/her willingness of being there for a youth/family despite any of the challenges the team may face. As noted in the proposal, team members do not always have control over the system-level constraints, but they do have the control to stand by the youth/family through the challenges and support them so they are not facing it alone.</p>
<p>I like it and it should continue being the goal.</p>	<p>I think the word persistence has a real negative tone</p>	
<p>I have always supported the wording of "unconditional care" and believe that this is the most appropriate to use in the description and definition of wraparound. "Unconditional Care" is utilized in the ORIGINAL description and definition.</p>	<p>I believe that Unconditional care better describes and supports wraparound.</p>	
<p>There are times when the payor holds the card and requires that services be ended. Unconditional care is not possible.</p>		<p>I believe that persistence more accurately describes how care if offered.</p>

much better	I do not think persistence describes services that I would want to have for my child.	
This sounds hard and is not easy family language. (see below #3)	Persistant commitment would be better. I like the easy language here. We are looking at the words that will hold honesty, being non-judgemental, and hope at the same time	Family friendly language needs to be at the front of this. Please consider this.