

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

*Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)*

---

## **THEME 1: LEADERSHIP**

### Item 1.1 Community Team

- Essential = 91.9
- Optional = 8.1
- Inadvisable = 0
- Wording Fine = 62.2
- Wording O.K. = 35.1
- Wording Unacceptable = 2.7

There is a formal Collaborative structure (e.g., a community team) for joint planning and decision making through which community partners take collective responsibility for development and

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

#### I. Comments

- For a strength based program such as wraparound such a survey should not be used.
- Family & Youth Driven
- The word 'community team' initially is confusing with 'wrap team' but as the survey progresses it is clear

#### II. Suggested wording changes

- Add 'individual and' before collective responsibility
- Change 'bust barriers' to 'blend funding and services'
- Revise to res' . . . responsibility for development and ongoing implementation, oversight /monitoring, and evaluation of wraparound.'
- It is desirable as intro to positive anchor, 'bust barriers' on negative anchor should be 'negotiate barriers'...we're not bullies nor super heroes

#### III. Suggested general changes or additions

- Might reference family-run organizations
- Shouldn't it say 'formal collaborative structure' in BOTH statements?
- Addition of partnership
- Add natural non agency resources
- There are different levels of 'structure'- clarify which level is of interest.
- Examples of 'community' should be included.
- Add to the positive anchor the notion of joint resource allocation.
- Indicate this is an on-going, long term team and not just for start-up
- e.g., workgroup

### Item 1.2 Empowered Team Members

- Essential = 91.9
- Optional = 8.1
- Inadvisable = 0
- Wording Fine = 78.4
- Wording O.K. = 21.6
- Wording Unacceptable = 0

The community team includes leaders who are empowered to make decisions and commit resources on behalf of their organization

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

#### I. Comments

- Some rural and frontier communities they have to grow their own, and sometimes there aren't enough people, money, or other resources available to support their community development

#### II. Suggested wording changes

- Insert 'will' before and 'sufficient' after 'commit.'
- delete 'development and implementation'

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

## *Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)*

- Change the word 'organization' to 'organizations'
- III. Suggested general changes or additions
  - Define the level of 'Community Team Leaders- County? State?
  - Active team members?
  - Delete 'reluctant' (first two negative anchors read as biased and may skew survey responses)
  - see above comment
  - Is 'community team' common language?

### Item 1.3 High Level Leadership

- Essential = 81.1
- Optional = 18.9
- Inadvisable = 0
- Wording Fine = 73.5
- Wording O.K. = 26.5
- Wording Unacceptable = 0

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

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

#### I. Comment

- I would rate this item 'advisable,' rather than 'optional,' if that was a choice.
- Not everybody embraces the wraparound values, especially in a culture way.
- All agreements are documented
- System level leadership
- I would say it's most preferable, knowing that communities without this support can (and do) manage to offer a Wraparound approach.

#### II. Suggested wording changes

- Add 'families' after 'who support systems of care development'
- Delete 'and' in the parentheses for positive anchor.
- Negative anchor 'leaders in the system do not support system of care development, or are unable to forge partnerships, integrate systems, and blend funding through new fiscal strategies

#### III. Suggested general changes or additions

- Add statement about changing policies as needed
- At the end of the positive add 'and supporting their staff members'

### Item 1.4 Organized Family Leadership

- Essential = 83.3
- Optional = 13.9
- Inadvisable = 2.8
- Wording Fine = 66.7
- Wording O.K. = 22.2
- Wording Unacceptable = 11.1

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

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

#### I. Comment

- I think that the issue is not how families are organized, implying they must be so to earn a voice but rather what the leadership group does to prepare itself to recruit, train, and support family voi
- Essential part of the collaborative, equal member of the voting structure, members of boards, staff, etc.
- Some families have skilled natural supports and prefer not to involve a parent partner. Are you saying that it has to be a parent partner, or must be from an organization?
- See comment box - not enough space here for wording change suggested.
- Not sure about the 'formal organization' part...

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

## Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)

- Substantial family influence is essential, but I cannot conclude that 'organization' is essential to support such influence.
- Any family member, youth are recruited to be part of the infrastructure even if they are not affiliated with a family organization
- II. Suggested wording changes
  - 'they' should be 'families'
  - After Family representatives suggest 'of family organizations'
- III. Suggested general changes or additions
  - This item should indicate participation of parents with a range of system experiences, from kids in restrictive care, to removal for neglect and abuse, to kids with SED. Also racial and ethnic diver

### Theme 1 Overall

- Essential = 87.05
- Optional = 12.25
- Inadvisable = 0.7
- Wording Fine = 70.15
- Wording O.K. = 26.35
- Wording Unacceptable = 3.45

Now, thinking about this theme as a whole, do you have any feedback about items that are needed, redundancy between items, etc.?

#### I. General Comments

- I think this section is good. Go with it.
- These all appear to be fine.
- No redundancy. All items are at a system infrastructure level
- Empowered team members imply they never had power. I would like to say they are now supported/resourced.
- Please, think of original culture of all communities and if the community is monolingual, have resources available for all to read, write, and listen to get the information to all of the families. Also, person centered Family Teams are a must in the continuum of care.

#### II. Suggested Improvements

- Change item 1.4 positive to read 'Families are organized . . . active and influential voice on the community team. Family representatives reflect the diversity of the community and the perspectives of their respective organizations. Change item 1.4 negative by deleting 'in the community' and 'implementation.' Add 'there is no family-run organization in the community.'
- Stronger language is needed in Item 1.4. When compared to the wording used to describe strong leadership within 'professional' organizations (empowered, forging, inspiring) the question appears to minimize the value of the family organization and the influence they can have on system change.
- Need more clarity on the difference between 1.1 and 1.3. In terms of order of questions, I recommend making 1.3 1.1.
- I would like to see the issue of supporting front-line staff and mid-level managers from high level leaders worked into this item.
- I think 1.2 and 1.3 are similar and the wording could be combined to make one question that would get at the answer that the community team has members that are stakeholders that are empowered and able to make decisions on behalf of their agencies
- Item 1.4 - families and/or family leaders may participate on community teams without being part of a formal organization, especially in smaller communities. Sometimes family support and/or advocacy groups grow out of this involvement rather than the reverse. After participating on community teams, family members may feel more confident and supported in starting such a group.

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

## Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)

- Language in first two negative anchors seems biased and may skew responses. use specific language for Leadership section 'system leaders are engaged in revising policies to allow blended funding and collaboration across agencies and systems'
  - Maybe define 'community team' since it is frequently used. We currently do not use that term in Broward.
  - It might be useful to ask whether there exist in the key agencies Wraparound 'champions'-- individuals who go out of their way to encourage others to support high-fidelity wraparound implementation.
  - The work that is being done is difficult. What I'd suggest is a glossary of terms to make the definitions most clear. What is written is being filtered through colored lenses, especially from those who actually believe they are doing Wraparound and haven't been. Community and family representation are essential. My experience has been that Wraparound becomes more professionally driven because the skill set and patience to work with the community and families in a meaningful and developmental way is truly lacking.
  - The addition of clarity about the role of the community team in resource allocation, assuring that teams have access to appropriate levels of flexible and fixed dollars for the things teams plan, rather than the system holds will be an important distinction.
- III. Concerns
- Families and youth do not seem to be infused in the process which I believe is essential
  - I find the survey a bit confusing. Are you asking about the item only, or the positive and negative factors within the item? I rated the item working at its best.
  - Mostly a word of caution that this not become a crusade to create change. A well-defined model, supervised for fidelity, can address a number of these concerns. By that I do not mean that individual teams negotiate system change. Many of the reasons we need collaborative administrative multi-system structure go well beyond implementation of wraparound.
  - Family Leadership is very important. Although there are still communities without an active Family Network/Organization, this I feel is a needed item but may require more support especially at the Federal Level to make sure that all communities have Family Organizations/Networks. This is especially true for Native American Communities.

## THEME 2: COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP

### Item 2.1 Full Agency Support

- Essential = 81.8
- Optional = 15.2
- Inadvisable = 3.0
- Wording Fine = 67.6
- Wording O.K. = 29.4
- Wording Unacceptable = 2.9

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

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

- I. Comments
- Don't give up if it doesn't happen
  - I'm not sure how this question is different from items in Theme 1. In terms of the negative anchor,
  - Again, it's most preferable, but you may have
  - The Wraparound effort significantly benefits from...
- II. Suggested wording change
- 'all'...this is too broad...again my concern is that we don't try to mount a crusade
  - at end of positive, add 'and other community organizations'
  - 'The wraparound effort does not include active participation.....' (omit parenthetical reference)  
(wraparound teams conduct their work without financial or systems support')
- III. Suggested general change or addition

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

## *Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)*

- make sure the community has opportunity to become educated in wraparound
- The standard of all versus most may be worth examining
- Specify child serving agencies includes schools and courts

### Item 2.2 Full Family Partnership

- Essential = 87.9
- Optional = 9.1
- Inadvisable = 3.0
- Wording Fine = 90.6
- Wording O.K. = 9.4
- Wording Unacceptable = 0

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

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

- I. Comments
  - And staff
- II. Suggested wording change
  - In positive after implementation add 'management'
  - substitute ....., or are 'not included in decision-making'
- III. Suggested general change or addition
  - I find myself checking optional because I want there to be the choice 'helpful'
  - This seems repetitive
  - Cuts to participation, may be preferable to 2.1

### Item 2.3 Full Youth Partnership

- Essential = 73.5
- Optional = 23.5
- Inadvisable = 2.9
- Wording Fine = 80.6
- Wording O.K. = 19.4
- Wording Unacceptable = 0

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

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

- I. Comments
  - Same wording as adults
  - Looking at the whole age continuum is essential
- II. Suggested wording change
  - In positive after implementation add 'oversight'
  - Omit 'influential, or 'token' replace with 'are not actively engaged in decision-making'
- III. Suggested general change or addition
  - Might include individual youth advocates as well as state or regional networks
  - Perhaps a young adult is better... Youth require training and adult support that may not be readily available to lend to meaning involvement at this level.
  - Same comment, 'influential members'...they should influence and contribute, but the degree in program planning, etc depends on who/where they are
  - Include .....participate in and are supported in leadership roles....

### Item 2.4 Natural Supports

- Essential = 67.7
- Optional = 29.4

The community team includes leaders from faith-based, business, and service orgs., who partner in system design, implementation and evaluation and provide tangible resources

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

## Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)

- Inadvisable = 2.9
- Wording Fine = 84.8
- Wording O.K. = 12.1
- Wording Unacceptable = 3.0

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

### I. Comments

- Optional only in that this is a dimension that's lagging somewhat
- Natural supports are friends etc. of specific families. Stakeholders are 'friends' of the system of care.
- A system of sharing information easily
- Don't mix apples and oranges...faith-based runs a gamut
- This again, is highly preferable.
- This is def, preferred but maybe not essential

### II. Suggested wording change

- I'd used the word stakeholders to describe folks at this level on community teams.
- In positive after implementation add 'oversight'

### Item 2.5 Community Representativeness

- Essential = 72.7
- Optional = 27.3
- Inadvisable = 0
- Wording Fine = 91.2
- Wording O.K. = 5.9
- Wording Unacceptable = 2.9

The membership of the community team fully reflects the social, cultural, and economic diversity of the community and the families

### I. Comments

- To the best of it's ability - when including agencies you take who they send
- It is helpful..the survey is forcing 'essential'
- again, highly preferable

### II. Suggested general change or addition

- The word fully bothers me. No selected group can fully represent the diversity of a modern community.

### Theme 2 Overall

- Essential = 76.7
- Optional = 20.9
- Inadvisable = 2.36
- Wording Fine = 82.96
- Wording O.K. = 15.24
- Wording Unacceptable = 1.76

Now, thinking about this theme as a whole, do you have any feedback about items that are needed, redundancy between items, etc.?

### I. General Comments

- Great that you are including the faith-based perspective. I just asked to add a member of the clergy to our Maricopa Collaborative in Phoenix.
- There is a point where you move beyond slot filling to bringing together a group of people who have a job to do, know how to do, and are engaged in getting it done. I've seen so many community teams wilt because all the folks did was get a bunch of different people together. They enjoyed meeting each other but after a while got bored because they didn't have any real job to do.
- None

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

## Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)

- This is a nice section as it provides concrete requirements of participation at the high level- not just at the Child and Family Team level.
  - I think it is key to include all of these areas in serving the basic element of wraparound as reaching all areas of families and children's lives
  - Great work.
- II. Suggested Improvements
- Due to limited space in 2.1, I did not complete my feedback. The item should differentiate between desire and behavior- threes a difference between 'not benefiting' and 'not doing things' (regardless of whether or not they would benefit.
  - item 2.4 and 2.5 could be combined
- III. Concerns
- 2.3 - While youth involvement is highly desirable, there are existing examples of successful wraparound that pre-dated focus on youth involvement. 2.4 - Same comment as above re natural supports. 2.5 - Essentially same comment re community representation. All three of these items seem very important to me, yet not necessarily, literally essential.
  - The tone is very black and white. Depending upon the developmental stage of the wraparound initiative, the responses may fall somewhere in the middle.
  - Same comments...survey is forcing 'essential' as an answer...Yes community support at an administrative level across multiple systems (and not just service systems) is very helpful if it is well structured, cohesive, well focused and composed. The broad statements can fuel the same sort of crusade at this level that wraparound value-based philosophy did at a direct practice level, and with similar results.
  - The above items are all essential as I've noted. BUT...they are currently not happening. We need to make sure this begins to happen in order for true wraparound to occur.
  - Items are again at the systems level not at the service delivery level. The optional items would probably best be thought of as optimal items in a developing system of care.
  - While items 2.3 and 2.4 are ideal, the lack of them should not be a barrier to providing high quality wraparound. The importance of having the youth voice is well documented, but without a federal grant to hire a person to identify and train youth to participate in governance, it is difficult to find funding for this. While it is often common to find faith based leaders, business and community service group leaders on community teams in smaller communities, it can be difficult to recruit them in larger cities where so many other 'worthy causes' compete for their time and energy.
  - The items seem discrete. I harbor a lonely worry that renewed emphasis on youth voice and partnership could turn back the clock on work about family and parent voice. I see youth voice and participation as an important element but perhaps not on the same priority level because progress and accomplishment around parent voice is still so new in so many communities
  - Under many privatized systems, CMO's and HMO's have tremendous influence and must be knowledgeable and committed. Sometimes these are national or multi-state entities and top level individuals, who may be out of state, most be committed. This comment may be more appropriate on theme 1 depending on the structure of the system.

### THEME 3: PHILOSOPHY, VALUES & STRATEGIC PLAN

#### Item 3.1 Community Values & Principles

- Essential = 84.8
- Optional = 12.1
- Inadvisable = 3.0
- Wording Fine = 75.8
- Wording O.K. = 24.2
- Wording Unacceptable = 0

Participants in the wraparound effort have collectively developed statements of mission, principles, and outcomes that serve as

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

#### I. Comments

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

## Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)

- Outcomes and evaluation need to be stressed
- Know what they're doing and why they are doing it, and why they think it will work. People mostly think of mission statements as dry overwrought and effusive proclamations that once uttered are buried
- This applies to more than wraparound
- Participants???
- See general comment
- I like 'cohesive collaborating body'...
- The issue is joint action and planning lock step articulation of values may not be a necessary ingredient. In other words the positive anchor may be too pie in the sky

### II. Suggested general change or addition

- I would use the phrase wraparound philosophy since so many do not understand
- Add: Participants on all levels and their actions, policy, procedure reflect the mission, principles and outcomes
- In positive after statements of add vision and values. After development add 'implementation'.

### Item 3.2 Proactive Planning

- Essential = 78.7
- Optional = 18.2
- Inadvisable = 3.0
- Wording Fine = 75.8
- Wording O.K. = 21.2
- Wording Unacceptable = 3.0

Community stakeholders have engaged in a process to develop a strategic plan that describes the population of concern, goals of the wraparound effort and related projects,

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

### I. Comments

- I'd place it as less than essential if there were that option
- Which includes actual family and youth consumers of service
- Family friendly language?
- Optional is helpful
- See general comment
- Stakeholder roles in the strategic plan are described and relevant individuals have clearly committed to and prioritized these roles.

### II. Suggested wording change

- Community stakeholders on all levels...Change population of concern to target population...
- Object to the words 'strategic plan' - implies a complicated time consuming process that involves consultants, etc. Just call it a 'plan'.
- At end of positive, add that fits with the individual or organizational goals.

### Item 3.3 Commitment to Principles

- Essential = 84.8
- Optional = 9.1
- Inadvisable = 6.1
- Wording Fine = 69.7
- Wording O.K. = 27.3
- Wording Unacceptable = 3.0

The community's mission, and strategic plan demonstrate specific and tangible steps (e.g., signing MOUs, contributing resources

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

### I. Comments

- Principles are in the first section, this is about action steps
- You don't achieve principles, you help children and families have better lives and the community be a better place to live.
- Absolutely essential

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

## Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)

- This will fuel a crusade
- See general comment
- Some of these steps come as a result of involvement in the wrap effort, not as a prerequisite.
- Reword 'Key Stakeholders have not developed Memorandum of Understanding or revised policies and regulations to support the development of wraparound'
- This one is a bit unclear to me.
- It has been my experience that the Community Team is an administrative element of the Wraparound effort. The actually governing body will be Social Services, Mental Health, or an interagency referral

### II. Suggested general change or addition

- Consider adding 'joint training' as one more example of activities in positive anchor statement.
- Add policy or procedure
- In positive after planning activities add adapting agency mission, vision and goals.

### Item 3.4 Stakeholder Education

- Essential = 75.8
- Optional = 21.2
- Inadvisable = 3.0
- Wording Fine = 60.6
- Wording O.K. = 39.4
- Wording Unacceptable = 0

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

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

### I. Comments

- It makes it sound like a debating club. Examining the philosophy. Look at what's working and what isn't and how to make it better from a macro-level system perspective.
- It is very difficult to measure a philosophy but you can measure practice
- Tone it down.
- See general comment
- Continued education will keep those involved in turn over to a minimum
- Wrap philosophy doesn't change so learning it is not ongoing-learning about current status of application is

### II. Suggested wording change

- At end of positive, add that supports wraparound.
- I would remove the word 'continually' - it implies a commitment some would not be able to make even though they support the process.
- Omit 'continually'
- Rather than 'learning and examining' the wording could be identifying and adopting policy and practice changes based on the implications.....

### III. Suggested general change or addition

- Include family members/organizations
- High-level stakeholders gain personal experience with wraparound(CFT team member, mentor, etc.).

### Item 3.5 Provider and Agency Staff Education

- Essential = 87.5
- Optional = 6.2
- Inadvisable = 6.2
- Wording Fine = 75
- Wording O.K. = 21.9
- Wording Unacceptable = 3.1

The wraparound effort continually educates providers and agency personnel about the wraparound philosophy and its implications

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

### I. Comments

- You need to educate the community as well if you want to be truly held accountable

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

## Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)

- Training should occur regularly. They should learn what to expect and how to do it. Supervision should re-enforce KISS principle
  - See general comment
  - Same-about their efforts instead
  - This could be a real help in implementation but could be more specific about roles for agency staff in the delivery and planning of WA supports
- II. Suggested general change or addition
- Might want to mention who does the education (cross systems teams with family/youth co-trainers)
  - Clarify the nature of such training - something more than simply repeating the same training, suggesting gradual deepening, broadening of application etc.

### Item 3.6 Social Marketing and Public Engagement

- Essential = 65.6
- Optional = 31.2
- Inadvisable = 3.1
- Wording Fine = 81.2
- Wording O.K. = 15.6
- Wording Unacceptable = 3.1

Social marketing activities are conducted that result in improved public engagement and political support for the wraparound effort,
--

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

#### I. Comments

- Political/leadership is more critical if there is such a thing
- System must be able to handle increase in demands before it markets
- Helpful not essential
- See general comment
- Families are the key here the public and government respond to the consumer

#### II. Suggested general change or addition

- Define or describe 'social marketing.' People do not always clearly understand this concept.
- Could be added to last item 3.5
- In positive after 'engagement and', add 'private and'.

### Theme 3 Overall

- Essential = 79.53
- Optional = 16.3
- Inadvisable = 4.06
- Wording Fine = 73.01
- Wording O.K. = 24.93
- Wording Unacceptable = 2.03

Now, thinking about this theme as a whole, do you have any feedback about items that are needed, redundancy between items, etc.?

#### I. General comments

- Marketing is so important, but often overlooked.
- The issue of high level buy-in is critical, but hard to put into words. Because high level folks know how to say all the right things and still freeze projects they don't like. Another issue is how they deal with successions in leadership, which are happening at an ever faster rate. Does the whole thing fall apart when a new child welfare director is hired?
- No
- This is an important area--training, lessons learned etc. If the community does not have favorable experience in this area, they may not fully comprehend the significance of the statements.

#### II. Suggested improvements

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

## Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)

- I do see overlap across the items. Would consider collapsing into vision/principles, leadership support and activities, and education.
  - I am not sure how this would be worded, but I think it's important to address whether or not high-level agency stakeholders are communicating their 'buy-in' to their people in the trenches working directly with families. If this buy-in is not communicated then the value of wraparound is lost to the people responsible for creating the individual plan for a family.
  - Again, optional items should be optimal items in a developing system of care. Item 3.5 is a service delivery item the others are higher level infrastructure.
  - Combine 3.5 and 3.6 - both describe social marketing.
- III. Concerns
- I don't like the term 'population of concern'...
  - Survey forces 'essential' response. We need to cut the rhetoric, keep it simple and to the point about what is helpful and what is not. Each community will have different issues and parameters.
  - I understand the rationale to have 'the negative anchor' read 'no....', but in the absence of the wording of the anchors in between the extreme, it is difficult to determine if the working is appropriate.
  - The items seem to be discrete from one another. The emphasis on education rather than adapting staff activities and job roles to fit is troubling. I am not certain that telling more people about the philosophy results in anything other than people saying they 'know' WA when they have not adapted any of their activities to fit the implications of the framework and approach

## **THEME 4: FISCAL TRACKING & POLICIES**

### Item 4.1 Fiscal Understanding

- Essential = 72.7
- Optional = 24.2
- Inadvisable = 3.0
- Wording Fine = 75
- Wording O.K. = 18.8
- Wording Unacceptable = 6.2

Expenditures for behavioral health services and supports have been analyzed across funding streams and agencies and decision-makers understand what is being spent on the

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

#### I. Comments

- Wraparound is not a behavioral health intervention....that term is very mental health driven and discount other services and community support that agencies are spending money on
- Helpful not essential
- This is the ideal, though sometimes almost impossible to achieve.
- Using the term 'behavioral health' makes this item focused on mental health to the exclusion of juvenile justice, child welfare, developmental disabilities, etc.
- look at rural frontier communities

#### II. Suggested wording change

- Transparent is a good descriptive word that could be used
- At end of positive, add 'both from their agency and in total.'
- Substitute 'methods for' instead of 'ways that'

#### III. Suggested general change or addition

- Add the needs that are not being met
- Need to make mention of collaboration here so the reader doesn't interpret as 'bird dogging', not sharing, extensive justification etc.
- The phrase 'behavioral health services and supports seems limiting to me, not all wrap programs are housed in or led by the behavioral health system, some are based in child welfare, and some in juv j

### Item 4.2 Fiscal Analysis

- Essential = 56.2
- Optional = 37.5

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

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

## *Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)*

- Inadvisable = 6.2
- Wording Fine = 71.9
- Wording O.K. = 21.9
- Wording Unacceptable = 6.2

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

### I. Comments

- Policy has an off sound. Financing structure?
- This is not often enough to evaluation and now there is a new term 'population of interest' last section it was population of concern? Don't like either one
- same as item 4.1

### II. Suggested wording change

- If 'community team' is defined in the beginning, this will help any future reference to this team
- Change 'at least annually to 'regularly'.
- Substitute quarterly for annually as the period of review

### III. Suggested general change or addition

- You want something that says this sort of review is helpful but each community decides parameters and timeframes
- It could be another entity within the public/community system

## Item 4.3 Risk & Cost Management

- Essential = 66.7
- Optional = 27.3
- Inadvisable = 6.1
- Wording Fine = 71.9
- Wording O.K. = 21.9
- Wording Unacceptable = 6.2

Key decision-makers and the community team monitor overall expenditures for the population of concern and work together to

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

### I. Comments

- Bit hesitant on the cost containment and risk issues as these tend to be expensive target populations that are risky from a fiscal perspective
- I dunno about this one. Would need to think it through more. Have some concerns about melding a gate-keeping function with a service procurement function with a service delivery function....
- Okay, here's where you get into cost effectiveness, which is a big issue. This doesn't really nail that topic.
- Family input is essential as well as key decision makers
- Helpful, not essential
- This function may be hired out to others (i.e. care management organization) who report to the team.
- As it relates to maintaining fidelity to Wraparound. (something like that)

### II. Suggested wording change

- Change....'had their own management and cost controls'
- Move some of the specific language from the negative anchor in to the positive anchor... like.... 'cost shifting, expenditures by population and domain'

### III. Suggested general change or addition

- This needs to indicate costs are contained but adequate funding is available

## Item 4.4 Flexible Funds

- Essential = 90.9
- Optional = 9.1
- Inadvisable = 0
- Wording Fine = 87.5
- Wording O.K. = 9.4

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

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

## Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)

- Wording Unacceptable = 3.1

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

### I. Comments

- A huge priority - I'd trade this for most other items in this section
- An interesting thing about this = how much 'flexibility' is in the mind of the person administering the funds. I've seen people do creative things to flex funds that were highly categorical.
- Nontraditional
- Helpful not essential
- Financing for services continue to be categorical. There is little latitude for flexibility, blended or braided funding or collaborative services....to support individualized care....
- Frequently a developmental process rather than a fixed condition

### II. Suggested general change or addition

- Something added around cultural practices should be added.

### Item 4.5 Fiscal Support for Community-Based Care

- Essential = 78.8
- Optional = 18.2
- Inadvisable = 3.0
- Wording Fine = 65.6
- Wording O.K. = 25
- Wording Unacceptable = 9.4

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

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

### I. Comments

- Reinvest savings language?
- The negative anchor is too one-dimensional. Incentives for residential are only ONE EXAMPLE of non-supportive financing.
- I still don't like saying something has to be consistent with my philosophy. Sounds like the Council of Trent.
- This item is somewhat ambiguous. A local wrap effort may not have the power to do this. Who is responsible?

### II. Suggested wording change

- I suggest 'do not provide financial incentives to keep children and youth in the community' (restatement of create disincentives)
- 'Incentives to foster the creation of individualized supports and responses crafted for one family as well as supports and services that are based in the community.....'

### III. Suggested general change or addition

- Don't like the term wraparound philosophy...it sounds too soft...wraparound is a planning process
- In the negative anchor: ...encourage traditional community services and/or encourage placing...

### Item 4.6 Integrated Financing

- Essential = 68.8
- Optional = 28.1
- Inadvisable = 3.1
- Wording Fine = 81.2
- Wording O.K. = 15.6
- Wording Unacceptable = 3.1

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

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

### I. Comments

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

## Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)

- My experience is that braiding is more likely than blending, particularly at the state level
  - The negative anchor seems to one-dimensional. At minimum there should be a level of leadership attention to cross-system financial perspective.
  - You can't mandate change with this. you can say it would be helpful
  - I think this is essential, but creatively can be worked around
- II. Suggested wording change
- At end of positive, add 'with accountability'.

### Item 4.7 Maximizing Federal Entitlement

- Essential = 62.5
- Optional = 25
- Inadvisable = 12.5
- Wording Fine = 60
- Wording O.K. = 20
- Wording Unacceptable = 20

Efforts are undertaken to ensure that federal funding is maximized and directed towards providing flexible and individualized care

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

#### I. Comments

- One concern is that in our state MA funds have a local match and is a hot issue
- It is not necessary for all SOC sites to use Federal Dollars for service delivery
- Why?
- While unlikely, I can imagine a situation where (e.g. Calif's MHSA) non-federal funding sources might be the ones it makes sense to optimize.
- Can be done without federal funds
- The positive & negative anchor say the same thing
- That is just good fiscal planning to use entitlements which I think is addressed elsewhere
- There is no difference between the positive and negative anchor
- Positive and Negative Anchor are the same????
- This is very important but may be totally out of the hands of the 'community'.
- maximizing federal funding often means categorical funding, so this question should be restated or omitted
- I worry that we are not acknowledging the Medicaid changes/impacts. Federal Medicaid \$\$ don't allow for as much flexibility anymore (we use state \$\$ for that).
- I am not sure that federal entitlements, particularly Medicaid are sustainable strategies over time given the cost explosion in that portion of federal and state budgets
- Efforts are NOT undertaken

#### II. Suggested wording change

- Negative needs reworded, can't think of how to do it that would convey the same meaning

### Item 4.8 Sustained Funding

- Essential = 90.9
- Optional = 6.1
- Inadvisable = 3.0
- Wording Fine = 90.9
- Wording O.K. = 6.1
- Wording Unacceptable = 3.0

There is a clear plan for sustaining fiscal support for programs that serve the population of concern and the wraparound

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

## Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)

### I. Comments

- Doesn't make sense if we are doing individualized planning...reword maybe to ensure families have access to the necessary supports, services and interventions for their individualized plan
- ...sustaining the wraparound effort through blended or braided funding or re allocation of funding from categorical to flexible

### Theme 4 Overall

- Essential = 73.44
- Optional = 21.93
- Inadvisable = 4.61
- Wording Fine = 75.5
- Wording O.K. = 17.34
- Wording Unacceptable = 7.15

Now, thinking about this theme as a whole, do you have any feedback about items that are needed, redundancy between items, etc.?

### I. General Comments

- Not clearly redundant, but integrated and flexible funding could overlap.
- Really want to think through any bleed through in roles among persons convening the teams, persons serving on the teams, & persons administering the funding.
- Public funds need to be integrated more
- There are many projects around the country where proponents are attempting to incorporate wraparound in environments where they may not have control over resources and consequently they do the best they can given the political climate
- Helpful or advisable, not essential...each community must determine parameters, means, timeframes, concerns
- No
- 4.4, 4.5 and 4.8 are service delivery and the other items are higher level infrastructure. No redundancy.

### II. Suggested improvements

- Cost effectiveness. Got to talk about whether there is an ongoing evaluation to see if using the approaches as is are producing a reasonable benefit for the expenditure. I know this is a complex issue and there are erudite and nearly unreadable articles on it, but you have to face it.
- It is confusing why the positive and negative anchors in the area of maximizing federal entitlement are exactly the same. Is this a typo??
- I suggest reworking 4.7 and 4.8 into one question that has clear anchors for best practices in sustaining wraparound financing (blended or braided funds, shared management and risk, and incentives for community-based care)
- Within this theme, there should be reference to funds being available for supporting parent's needs, I'm thinking of child welfare where it is typically a behavior or activity of the parent that resulted in the child being removed from the home. Judges focus on parent behavior changing before reunification.
- As noted, the phrase 'behavioral health services' seems to identify wraparound as a behavioral health service rather than a planning and support process for youth and families involved in a variety of systems: child welfare, juvenile justice, education, as well as behavioral health.

### III. Concerns

- I caution against creating an inadvertent impression (items 4.1, 4.2) that either: a. we do wraparound to try to save money, or b. if wraparound costs more than traditional approaches, then that is a legitimate reason not to proceed. Serving people more effectively might be worth higher costs; and avoiding long-term future costs through effective wraparound support is certainly defensible.
- I don't like the term philosophy because it is hard to measure...This is too service driven and not enough on planning
- People want to know where the money is spent and proof of not only the best service available but that it is cost effective I think 4.5 and 4.6 are too similar

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

## Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)

- If 'communities' are to be measured against these standards, it is important that these items are under their control. It is not clear to me that items 4.5 and 4.7 are controlled by local 'communities'. Also, unclear what the word 'incentive' means in 4.5
- Item 4.5 may leave others out who are not quite up to speed with WA. I can't see having others suffer simply because the community and professionals are not together.

### THEME 5: COORDINATED AND ACCESSIBLE RESOURCES

#### Item 5.1 Integrated Data Systems

- Essential = 78.8
- Optional = 15.2
- Inadvisable = 6.1
- Wording Fine = 78.8
- Wording O.K. = 15.2
- Wording Unacceptable = 6.1

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

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

#### I. Comments

- Hippa rules should guide this and there are many restrictions that exist that are state specific too
- Include sharing information among natural supports

#### II. Suggested wording change

- Define 'data system'- does this mean an electronic process or manual process of sharing information?
- Sharing information does not mean there are 'integrated data systems' as the name of this section suggests.

#### III. Suggested general change or addition

- Negative anchors should not be used
- Need to say more than sharing information. The IM system should provide structured support for the wrap process and monitoring outcomes and procedures and accomplish the one family, one team, one place

#### Item 5.2 Pathways to Care

- Essential = 78.1
- Optional = 15.6
- Inadvisable = 6.2
- Wording Fine = 80.6
- Wording O.K. = 16.1
- Wording Unacceptable = 3.2

Children and families who are eligible for wraparound are aware that it is available,

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

#### I. Comments

- Negative anchor should not be used
- As worded it seems to imply there are at least two ways to serve families. If wraparound is the ONLY approach used, then family awareness is not important, but their ability to participate well IS.
- You shouldn't have to fail into wrap any more than failing into high level residential care.
- Rural and frontier families
- This sounds like the family has to initiate a request
- This would be wonderful! But not available to all families in California yet.

#### II. Suggested wording change

- The sentence addresses 2 different issues-- eligibility and acceptance. I recommend splitting the two issues

#### III. Suggested general change or addition

- Language around more specifics of what wraparound can do for a family
- This is the ideal, but funding streams need to be found for all families - especially those who are not eligible for Medicaid.

#### Item 5.3 Comprehensive Service Array

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

## *Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)*

- Essential = 84.8
- Optional = 6.1
- Inadvisable = 9.1
- Wording Fine = 75.8
- Wording O.K. = 21.2
- Wording Unacceptable = 3.0

There is a broad and comprehensive array of community-based services and supports (including non-traditional services such as respite and family support) capable of

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

### I. Comments

- Same
- Tall order!
- Respite is not necessarily a non-traditional service, sometimes respite is billed as a formal support through a contract
- Respite and family support are traditional services.
- Definitely essential!
- Once again this is the idea, but may be impossible in small and rural communities. The key then is to develop natural supports.
- Unlimited service array

### II. Suggested general change or addition

- Respite is considered a categorical service in many situations...I would cite other non-traditionals that are not service based at all
- The anchors in previous sections tend to reflect an all or nothing situation. If that is intentional, the negative anchor here should be consistent (...'not available in sufficient...')

### Item 5.4 Choice

- Essential = 84.8
- Optional = 9.1
- Inadvisable = 6.1
- Wording Fine = 78.8
- Wording O.K. = 18.2
- Wording Unacceptable = 3.0

Children and families have the opportunity to select among options to meet their needs, and to choose an alternate service/support provider if they are dissatisfied with a

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

### I. Comments

- Same
- Don't know if it's 'essential', but definitely would be 'optimal'.
- Look at rural and frontier areas
- Very service driven
- Families rarely know they have other options

### II. Suggested wording change

- The sentence reflects 2 issues- opportunity and satisfaction. I recommend separating them
- ...and limited by categorical funding...

### III. Suggested general change or addition

- Positive anchor too one-dimensional: can also modify service approaches without changing providers to better meet individualized needs.

### Item 5.5 Skilled Provider Network

- Essential = 69.7
- Optional = 27.3
- Inadvisable = 3.0
- Wording Fine = 75.8
- Wording O.K. = 12.1

Providers are knowledgeable of and provide services and supports that are "research based" in that they a) conform to current information about best practices, b) are based in rationale derived from research

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

## Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)

- Wording Unacceptable = 12.1

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

### I. Comments

- It's important to use services & supports that we know have worked based on research, but let's not minimize the value of creativity & flexibility
- Maybe I miss the intent, but I have concerns that all 'research based' removed the ability to be flexible
- Excellent! Is this on the WFI 4.0?
- Who's completing the survey? How would they know if services and supports are research based?
- What about 'practice-based' evidence???
- without data we are just another opinion
- We are so far from this that I think it is an unrealistic expectation. It is a very important goal to work toward.
- Reword neg anchor.... Most behavioral health services reflect categorical services (i.e. office-based or institutional care' vs. evidence based practices
- However, this has been used as an argument against wraparound.

### II. Suggested general change or addition

- Eliminate negative anchors, how do you assess accurately positive anchor?
- Add that interventions are individualized based on learning styles, brain development and enhance resiliency factors

### Item 5.6 Integrated Planning Process

- Essential = 84.8
- Optional = 9.1
- Inadvisable = 6.1
- Wording Fine = 87.9
- Wording O.K. = 6.1
- Wording Unacceptable = 6.1

Partner orgs that serve the same child and family work with the child and family to
---

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

### I. Comments

- Why is this in this section...it's about the wraparound team process not community teams

### II. Suggested wording change

- Should refer to Wraparound philosophy within this statement

### III. Suggested general change or addition

- do not use negative anchors
- Should clarify that it does not necessarily need to be one plan but can be separate plans as long as they reflect similar goals (most systems need to maintain their own plans)

### Theme 5 Overall

- Essential = 80.16
- Optional = 13.73
- Inadvisable = 6.1
- Wording Fine = 79.62
- Wording O.K. = 14.82
- Wording Unacceptable = 5.58

Now, thinking about this theme as a whole, do you have any feedback about items that are needed, redundancy between items, etc.?

### I. General Comments

- Single plan of care. High bandwidth IM system. Ability to coordinate many streams of care through a single entry system. Intelligent feedback in the system that guides the development of a full-featured plan.

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

## Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)

- same comments
  - These items with the exemption of 5.1 are relevant to service delivery and the wraparound model rather than systems level items. Although the system level is essential there may not be a direct route to having an impact on the wraparound service delivery model.
  - See comments under individual items.
- II. Suggested improvements
- In addition to 5.4, perhaps asking whether a grievance procedure is readily accessible to families...
  - The whole format of this is wrong. This need to be totally redone on with a strength base philosophy.
  - This section really needs some work. It is very heavy on service coordination versus on individualized planning based on the steps of the wraparound process. You should be doing whatever you need to meet outcomes and needs while utilizing strengths. It is missing cultural relevancy and the overall team process. it is the team that develops a plan and that is not mentioned...that is who should coordinate with the community team the resources
  - I think there should be more emphasis on the use of technology for communication and transmission of data and timeliness of data being collected and used to inform decision making at all levels (policy to treatment).
  - Item 5.1, how are confidentiality concerns going to be addressed. Item 5.3, need to address shortage of workforce. Item 5.4, need to address transportation issues, especially in rural areas where choices in providers would include those that are farther away.
  - Wording needs to be added to account for the little evidence-based practices especially when it comes to working with families of color (Native American, Latino, etc.)
  - Question 5.5 needs some work on the negative anchor, also 'research based' practices also include categorical clinic-based services such as medication and cognitive therapy. Because this survey is focused on wraparound, perhaps the survey should focus on 'studies on practices that support the efficacy of community-based care' vs. all 'research based'
- III. Concerns
- Does comprehensive services array fit into financing section? The research/evidenced based caveat is troubling to some family members, as some kids and families with complex needs (we've seen) can be excluded from the research/participation as they can skew the results. Just an observation, I'd say keep it in as a goal.

## **THEME 6: HUMAN RESOURECS DEVELOPMENT & SUPPORT**

### Item 6.1 Support to Wraparound Staff

- Essential = 90.9
- Optional = 6.1
- Inadvisable = 3.0
- Wording Fine = 84.8
- Wording O.K. = 12.1
- Wording Unacceptable = 3.0

The job expectations (duties and requirements from supervisors) of people with primary roles for carrying out wraparound (e.g., wraparound facilitators) encourage and allow

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

#### I. Comments

- Same
- Not a model, but the model chosen and implemented by the community team - we want some consistency here.
- KISS...'fully implement high fidelity' is rhetorical and redundant
- See general comments
- People might have different understanding about what those expectations actually are
- I would change it to

### Item 6.2 Support to Partner Agency Staff

- Essential = 90.3

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

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

## Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)

- Optional = 3.2
- Inadvisable = 6.5
- Wording Fine = 75
- Wording O.K. = 18.8
- Wording Unacceptable = 6.2

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

### I. Comments

- This survey is really bad
- Like that will ever happen, but it is nice to think so.
- What about non-paid members of wraparound teams such as parent advocates/partners. Compensation and flexibility is important for these members.
- Same issue as above
- I worry that we will create Wraparound as a program, rather than an individualized approach by using

### II. Suggested wording change

- Define high-fidelity

### III. Suggested general change or addition

- Neg anchor add something about creativity options
- This invites a crusade to make the world wraparound

## Item 6.3 Caseload Sizes

- Essential = 93.8
- Optional = 0
- Inadvisable = 6.2
- Wording Fine = 84.4
- Wording O.K. = 9.4
- Wording Unacceptable = 6.2

Caseloads sizes for people with primary roles for carrying out wraparound (e.g. wraparound facilitators) allow them to consistently complete the phases and activities of the

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

### I. Comments

- Would be nice
- looks good on paper but too tough to achieve
- what is acceptable number of cases
- Instead of

### II. Suggested wording change

- Specify recommended # as anchor?

### III. Suggested general change or addition

- This must change.
- This needs to indicate the process is carried out on timeline that is very responsive to family needs and legal requirements

## Item 6.4 Human Resources Development

- Essential = 87.5
- Optional = 3.1
- Inadvisable = 9.4
- Wording Fine = 81.2
- Wording O.K. = 12.5
- Wording Unacceptable = 6.2

Wraparound facilitators receive comprehensive training, shadow experienced workers prior to working independently, and receive ongoing coaching, including live observation and feedback from an experienced coach, that

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

## Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

### I. Comments

- Would make a world of difference
- They should also be provided feedback/training from family members in or experienced in wraparound services
- Each community will have different capabilities, but ideally...
- This again is the ideal, but without a great deal more money available, it is not always possible.

### II. Suggested general change or addition

- Be sure wording makes clear the 'coach' can (should ultimately) be an experienced/qualified supervisor.
- This is too prescriptive. You should put something in about the supervisors role to coach and shadow to ensure accountability but that should be individualized to the site.

### Item 6.5 Compensation for Wraparound Staff

- Essential = 71.9
- Optional = 18.8
- Inadvisable = 9.4
- Wording Fine = 77.4
- Wording O.K. = 16.1
- Wording Unacceptable = 6.7

Compensation for people with primary roles for carrying out wraparound (e.g., wraparound facilitators) reflects their value and encourages staff retention and commitment. There is a career ladder such that highly

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

### I. Comments

- We are a small community where this is a big problem. We are not resolving this and will pay for it with staff turnover, but I think it should be essential for high fidelity.
- Assuming a massive change in our political structure, but its great to dream.
- also look at available and potential staff retention or recruitment
- I agree with this but I think this in too based on agencies, funding and they don't have control over this
- Here is another one that I believe, but have concerns that to concentrate of 'financial' aspect is not all of the compensation
- In a perfect world, this would be great, but much workforce development needs to be done before it would be possible.
- Programs may not start here, but can develop this capacity

### II. Suggested wording change

- The sentence addresses 2 issues which I would recommend separating
- ...'limited access'

### III. Suggested general change or addition

- Not sure 'positive' is exactly the antidote to 'negative' on this one. Not sure about the relevance of 'career ladder'.
- De-emphasize the 'career ladder' as, in many initiatives, the good ones 'move up' quickly, leaving ranks of qualified facilitators depleted.

### Item 6.6 Supervision

- Essential = 83.9
- Optional = 9.7
- Inadvisable = 6.5
- Wording Fine = 66.7
- Wording O.K. = 26.7
- Wording Unacceptable = 6.7

Wraparound facilitators receive regular (weekly) individual and group supervision, and periodic "in-vivo" (observation) supervision (several times a month to start

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

### I. Comments

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

## Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)

- Not sure. What's 'weekly' based on?
  - Some facilitators have no supervision at all
  - Does this sort of repeat that earlier one?
  - Prescriptive based on one model of coaching ...supervisors should hold this responsibility with the community team
  - Supervision is individualized, yes a structure and frequency but this is too restrictive
  - Prescribing weekly may be to far
  - Hopefully the supervision and feedback given to facilitators is also strength based.
  - Great idea
  - I coach group supervision but I am not aware of a research base for this activity
- II. Suggested wording change
- 'Quarterly' is too specific. Make that an example instead of a minimum requirement.
  - Negative anchor to reflect 'nothing' to make it consistent with other negative anchors.
  - Also, do we want all supervision forum ('and') or one or the other ('or')?
  - Change quarterly to monthly.
- III. Suggested general change or addition
- Reword neg anchor ...(and/or observational supervision???)

### **Theme 6 Overall**

- Essential = 86.38
- Optional = 6.81
- Inadvisable = 6.8
- Wording Fine = 78.25
- Wording O.K. = 15.9
- Wording Unacceptable = 5.8

Now, thinking about this theme as a whole, do you have any feedback about items that are needed, redundancy between items, etc.?

- I. General Comments
- Remember the out back rural and frontier staf and population growth potentials
  - Item 6.1 is important but may not be necessary to have as part of fidelity or QA/QI. These are all service delivery items.
  - Would it be helpful to indicate level of education needed? Also, would experiential expertise (family members) be included in what qualifications a wraparound facilitator should have?
  - Have supervisors been facilitators; area they well trained in supervising wrap; cross agency supervision groups; team supervision to supporting learning a team based model; supervisors teaming across agency etc
- II. Suggested improvements
- Redo this whole survey using a strength based philosophy. Have your goal and this have teams rate the stage they are in reaching that goal such as just beginning, initial components in place, reaching attainment, fully attained. Something like that not Negative anchors. What were you guys thinking?
  - Reliable, consistent and well trained facilitators and providers. We didn't mention parent partners. Maybe that should get an entry.
  - Supervisors are key to ensure high fidelity wraparound. You could add items based on this and allow some individualization and not just one model of coaching. Supervisors impact practice the most so they need to be the area of focus. There should be an item added about Staff to supervisor ratio...many supervisors have many staff under many different programs which impacts fidelity the most
  - Could add something like: Wraparound providers recognize the need for proactive support for job burn-out and compassion fatigue in order to maintain high staff morale and minimize 'preventable turn-over.'
- III. Concerns
- Only in that section 6.5 shows up twice!
  - 6.4 and 6.6 were very similar. This entire section is only helpful if some standards are set. For example to say that caseloads are low enough...does not say caseloads should not exceed 12 in order to be successful.

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

## Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)

Same thing with compensation, the question says people are compensated so they feel valued, what is the standard and how do we exceed it?

- 6.5 was repeated twice.
- 6.5 is repeated
- Again the tone implies a crusade to make the world wraparound. which seems to belie some of the principles around individualization, no? These are guidelines not commandments.
- Overall, this section is important and relevant, however, I found it very confusing since I didn't understand the 'level' of the system of interest. For example, the questions seem more relevant to an agency-level vs. a county or state level (e.g., state vs. county vs. agency vs. individual level). I would recommend having a different measure for agencies,
- 6.5 is asked twice on this survey
- I believe that Item 6.4 is crucial to developing quality wraparound, but who is funding this nationally? Very few states.... I also feel item 6.5 is very important, but we have to have trained and competent facilitators who are well supported with coaching, etc. before we can raise compensation and ensure a 'career ladder'.

### **THEME 7: ACCOUNTABILITY**

#### Item 7.1 Community Population Assessment

- Essential = 50
- Optional = 37.5
- Inadvisable = 12.5
- Wording Fine = 74.2
- Wording O.K. = 16.1
- Wording Unacceptable = 9.7

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

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

#### I. Comments

- If you can get around cross-systems info sharing hurdles
- Feels a little too 'Big Brother/NSA' to me. I question the need to conduct such surveillance on persons BEFORE they request our help.
- Huh? Is this from the Dept. of Homeland Security? I'm not sure you're saying what you're thinking.
- This is not very individualized. It have been very hard to predict success and this information can be used to not serve certain populations so I think I would use this item with caution
- This is the ideal, but is simply not possible given current soiled funding, different systems and even vocabulary for data collection, and unwillingness to share information at the system level.

#### II. Suggested wording change

- ((change 'contained piecemeal' to are not aggregated or cross coded....to allow cross systems evaluation of outcomes))
- population should be plural

#### Item 7.2 Outcomes Monitoring

- Essential = 78.1
- Optional = 15.6
- Inadvisable = 6.2
- Wording Fine = 93.8
- Wording O.K. = 3.1
- Wording Unacceptable = 3.1

There is centralized monitoring of relevant outcomes for the population of concern that is used as the basis for funding, policy

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

#### I. Comments

- Centralized monitoring is not always possible

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

## Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)

- It would be nice to cover both output and outcomes: are we doing what we said we would do, and is it helping?
- OK for those who are served in the wrap effort, but very difficult to get comparable data from individual systems.

### II. Suggested general change or addition

- Combine this with the next one

#### Item 7.3 Wraparound Quality

- Essential = 90.3
- Optional = 0
- Inadvisable = 9.7
- Wording Fine = 77.4
- Wording O.K. = 16.1
- Wording Unacceptable = 6.5

There is ongoing monitoring of the quality of wraparound provided, including live observation, plan review, and feedback from children and families. The methods used to assess quality are grounded in the principles

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

### I. Comments

- Observation is desirable, but not essential if family/youth feedback and plan review are effective.
- I guess this is the output section.
- All levels should be monitored...we need to move from measuring philosophy and measure more outcomes. What are team members doing outside of meetings? That impacts outcomes just as much if not more
- See general comment
- Feedback from consumers of services is very important
- Feedback should come from other team members too

### II. Suggested wording change

- Add 'among others'

### III. Suggested general change or addition

- Combine with 7.4

#### Item 7.4 Plan Fulfillment

- Essential = 81.2
- Optional = 6.2
- Inadvisable = 12.5
- Wording Fine = 78.1
- Wording O.K. = 12.5
- Wording Unacceptable = 9.4

There is centralized monitoring and analysis of the types of services and supports included in wraparound plans, whether or not planned services and supports are provided, and whether or not the goals/needs that

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

### I. Comments

- Same as above
- Does this tie to the IM system?
- Silo thinking and latitudinal approaches need to be considered
- This one doesn't make much sense to me because there are several items in one statement...interventions should be outcome based
- See general comments
- This is the ideal, but many communities do not have the resources to collect and monitor data like this.
- I believe this would encourage micro-management, drive the providers crazy, and drive up the cost of Wraparound. Much better to look at outcomes and child/family satisfaction
- Services and supports need to be related to the family vision and the needs from the SNCD should reflected on the plan. Family voice should be effident when looking at the plan

#### Item 7.5 Services Quality

- Essential = 75

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

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

## Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)

- Optional = 18.8
- Inadvisable = 6.2
- Wording Fine = 81.2
- Wording O.K. = 12..5
- Wording Unacceptable = 6.2

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

### I. Comments

- 'LData'? The measure of quality has to be based on some sort of consistent set of standards.
- Families great!
- No rhetoric
- LData? typo??
- This would be great, but who pays for it?

### II. Suggested wording change

- Remove 'L'

### Item 7.6 Principles Monitoring

- Essential = 65.5
- Optional = 21.9
- Inadvisable = 12.5
- Wording Fine = 73.1
- Wording O.K. = 15.4
- Wording Unacceptable = 11.5

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

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

### I. Comments

- I'd say optional only in the sense that it's a bit hard to implement/design a way to do this
- More of the Council of Trent stuff. The point is to be effective, not orthodox.
- Why two of the same questions
- See general comments
- Same as 7.3

- It should be a generally accepted process

### II. Suggested general change or addition

- 7.6 is redundant. I think 7.3 would provide this same information
- this is fine as written
- Too soft...philosophy...we have lots of data that family likes WA but how much data is out there about outcomes...we need to move our focus from philosophy and measure both

### Item 7.7 Satisfaction Monitoring

- Essential = 77.4
- Optional = 12.9
- Inadvisable = 9.7
- Wording Fine = 81.2
- Wording O.K. = 12.5
- Wording Unacceptable = 6.2

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

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

### I. Comments

- Satisfaction is not a great measure
- See general comments
- I just worry about the administrative costs of doing some of this.

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

## Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)

### II. Suggested wording change

- Don't like the word 'buy-in'

### Item 7.8 Gaps Analysis

- Essential = 87.5
- Optional = 6.2
- Inadvisable = 6.2
- Wording Fine = 87.5
- Wording O.K. = 9.4
- Wording Unacceptable = 3.1

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

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

### I. Comments

- Glad you thought of this one.
- And regional/local
- See general comments
- I would think gaps are identified family to family
- Great!

### II. Suggested wording change

- Change the word 'acting' to 'there are attempts'

### III. Suggested general change or addition

- Need to include outcomes are reported on the actions taken to address the shortcomings.

### Item 7.9 Barrier Busting

- Essential = 90.6
- Optional = 3.1
- Inadvisable = 6.2
- Wording Fine = 81.2
- Wording O.K. = 15.6
- Wording Unacceptable = 3.1

There is an ongoing, systematic process for identifying and addressing barriers that prevent wraparound teams from implementing effective plans. Several central barriers

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

### I. Suggested wording change

- Delete 'several'
- Cut the rhetoric 'barrier busting'
- Define some barriers in the anchor (example shared funding, conflicting policies, duplicative staff functions)
- 'busting' should be replaced with removal

### II. Suggested general change or addition

- Two issues are addressed. The second part has to do with the effective of the first part. Separate?
- Combine this one with the previous one

### Theme 7 Overall

- Essential = 77.28
- Optional = 14.46
- Inadvisable = 9.07
- Wording Fine = 80.85
- Wording O.K. = 12.57
- Wording Unacceptable = 6.53

Now, thinking about this theme as a whole, do you have any feedback about items that are needed, redundancy between items, etc.?

### I. General Comments

- Please use our wraparound philosophy of strength based!!!!!!!!!!!!

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

## Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)

- 7.1 is advisable, not essential. 7.6 error - failed to elicit any changes in wording. Also, I'd combine this with 7.3 as measurement of the quality of wraparound should directly reflect the principles. 7.7 this can be combined with 7.3 as the process for measuring wraparound quality should necessarily interview families and youth.
  - Somehow we need to reflect that the community team decides on how it wants to implement wraparound, and then checks to see if the model it has selected is actually happening, not just that it complies with the high church of wraparound's catechism. Beyond that, we also have to ask, are they finding ways of improving the model?
  - The items identified represent the ideal in providing wraparound services. However, as a provider who is painfully aware of the resources, I wonder how the ideal can be achieved.
- II. Suggested improvements
- Similar issue here- the context (level that is being addressed) will help clarify the questions. For example, what is there is ongoing monitoring at the agency level, but not system (county or state) level? Centralized monitoring can refer to an agency level, but is that what is being asked?
  - Items 7.3, 7.4 and 7.6 could be integrated in to an overall QA/QI items.
  - There are other barriers to completing 7.1 beyond those mentioned - different service areas of child serving systems - one may keep records by county or city, another by school district, another by catchment area - all with different boundaries that overlap! When collecting this type of data, you wind up collecting data on different populations.
  - Combine 7.3 and 7.4 omit 7.6
- III. Concerns
- This section seems to weigh heavy on service coordination and there is no mention of safety or risk. The team planning process is not evident but instead the use of the term philosophy. It is most important how people practice outside of team meetings and how they support youth and family. Also, supervisors should be included more. What about the steps of the process? The structure of the planning process helps us offer some choices of supports, services and interventions. Too program focused which misses why WA works which tends to be the team planning process
  - Pretty much the same comments. except this survey is way way way too long
  - I'm personally not sure what the difference is between gaps and barriers and the difference between quality monitoring and principles monitoring. To me it seems somewhat redundant.
  - Service quality and satisfaction monitoring seem redundant.

### THEME 8: STATE SUPPORT FOR WRAPAROUND

#### Item 8.1 State Interface

- Essential = 76.7
- Optional = 16.7
- Inadvisable = 6.7
- Wording Fine = 80.6
- Wording O.K. = 9.7
- Wording Unacceptable = 9.7

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

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

#### I. Comments

- It can be done without the state
- All levels
- Not a crusade...it all depends
- See general comments
- As wraparound efforts mature, not every community team will need to be responsible for altering state policies, etc.
- It's certainly preferable, but state policies are tough for community teams to impact.
- Not in an Abramoff sort of productive partnership one would presume.
- This may be the place CMOs should be mentioned

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

## Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)

- II. Suggested wording change
  - ....and state agencies responsible for children's mental health issues.....
- III. Suggested general change or addition
  - There should be no usurping the existing child-serving system. This statement should come from the governing body...child-serving agency collaborative
  - ...state and/or county...

### Item 8.2 Collaboration

- Essential = 71
- Optional = 16.1
- Inadvisable = 12.9
- Wording Fine = 74.2
- Wording O.K. = 12.9
- Wording Unacceptable = 12.9

State organizations practice collaboration and partnership by working together to provide cross-organization wraparound

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

- I. Comments
  - Not a crusade...each state is different
  - See general comments
  - Integration
- II. Suggested wording change
  - Reword.....'fragmented and contradictory' to ' State support for Wraparound Training and support for local communities to blend funds and revise policies to support local efforts is lacking'
  - State and/or county organizations...
- III. Suggested general change or addition
  - Add outcome monitoring
  - Clarify what is meant by 'state organizations'

### Item 8.3 Outcomes & Improvement

- Essential = 67.7
- Optional = 25.8
- Inadvisable = 6.5
- Wording Fine = 77.4
- Wording O.K. = 12.9
- Wording Unacceptable = 9.7

There is a state entity that supports cross agency outcome and process measurement around behavioral health issues at the state and local level

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

- I. Comments
  - Might not be one entity in a large state
  - See general comments
  - The state entity should not be the host agency for SOC.
  - This would be ideal (support is one thing and making it happen another)
  - See comments for 8.2
  - As long as measuring process doesn't encourage micro-managing, I would support this.
- II. Suggested wording change
  - Take out behavioral health...add families and youth
  - The term 'behavioral health' is not generally used by some systems, include a few additional descriptors
  - ...process measurement around behavioral health, child welfare, juvenile justice, and educational issues...
- III. Suggested general change or addition

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

## Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)

- Do we ever want to talk about closing the gap between substance abuse agencies and mental health agencies?

### Item 8.4 State Structure

- Essential = 67.7
- Optional = 25.8
- Inadvisable = 6.5
- Wording Fine = 77.4
- Wording O.K. = 9.7
- Wording Unacceptable = 12.9

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

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

#### I. Comments

- And how do they fit with the community team? see what happens when you go on a crusade
- See general comments
- Again the ideal, but difficult to hold communities accountable for what the state does or doesn't do.
- It's not the way our state is structured. This wouldn't work in Washington at this time.

#### II. Suggested wording change

- Add to positive child-serving agencies, community agencies and gay stakeholders.

### Item 8.5 Barrier Busting

- Essential = 67.7
- Optional = 22.6
- Inadvisable = 9.7
- Wording Fine = 77.4
- Wording O.K. = 9.7
- Wording Unacceptable = 12.9

State orgs. implement specific methods to gather information from families, youth and local community teams on barriers to effective wraparound and they help to remove

Please provide any comments or suggested wording changes for this item, particularly if you rated it 'inadvisable' and/or 'unacceptable.'

#### I. Comments

- See general comments
- I believe this should be provider organizations or child-serving systems instead of state organizations (see above).
- This makes for a very good check and balance approach

#### II. Suggested wording change

- In positive, add 'providers, host agency and other key stakeholders.
- Define 'organizations'. This would be nice, but not essential as a separate activity. If all other items in this inventory are OK, this will be done.
- Replace busting with removal

#### III. Suggested general change or addition

- I would change the language from gathering information to partnering with youth and families
- Keep it at the community level..address state level state by state

### Theme 8 Overall

- Essential = 70.16
- Optional = 21.4
- Inadvisable = 8.46
- Wording Fine = 77.4
- Wording O.K. = 10.98
- Wording Unacceptable = 11.62

Now, thinking about this theme as a whole, do you have any feedback about items that are needed, redundancy between items, etc.?

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

## Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)

- I. General Comments
  - Redo whole thing.
  - The state needs to be involved and seem accountable also
  - I think it is difficult to generalize about what responsibilities belong to states, counties, cities, towns, etc. who is responsible for most of the items in this section may depend on who is funding the wraparound effort, though no matter who it is, it should be supported by the state.
- II. Suggested improvements
  - 8.5 consider language that information on barriers (and successes) flow from community teams to state-level structures/oversight body.
  - As a state-level wraparound guy I absolutely agree with this series of items - but I would respect the perspective of successful local wraparound leaders who find the described state-level support to be sufficient even if it falls a bit short of the positive anchor statements in the series of items.
  - Tough to make the state/local distinction in a single document when there are some state operated systems, and some county and some mixed. Maybe we should look into that a bit and figure out how to make it easier to address it - maybe in the instructions.
  - I think some of this is right on target but some needs to be revised to truly reflect wraparound. This seems to be more focused on mental health service coordination than on the wraparound team planning process. It may meet some Medicaid standards but if I was a collaborative partner I may not recognize the terminology. I think it should also incorporate more of a focus on outcomes and less on the philosophy. I can be contacted if you need to clarify something. This was a very time consuming process so I may have said several things twice so I apologize for that. Connie Conklin
  - Items 8.5 and 7.9 could be merged into one item.
  - Although I've indicated that the wording for each item is fine. Should there be a distinction between state and tribal governments? Will this be used for Native American Tribes also??
- III. Concerns
  - State level is really inviting trouble.
  - This section was difficult to evaluate. While I think the state level collaboration is essential and could really help with ensuring fidelity to Wraparound (so agencies like EMQ can provide services in multiple counties without dealing with the logistics of each individual County) for a state like California (versus a smaller state), how realistic is this?
  - I believe that State organizations need to support local planning. The statements above sound as if the process is state-driven.
  - As noted, some states administer human services via the counties rather than at the state level. So collaboration, planning, policies, funding issues exist at both levels in those states.

## OVERALL RESPONSE TO SURVEY

- I was shocked by this survey that used negative anchors especially calling it a Wraparound Inventory. What were you all thinking. This was so disappointing to be that it is not strength based, and needs driven.
- There seems to be a couple of duplicated items in here. Also might be helpful to clarify more explicitly the distinction between 'the community team' and 'the wraparound team'. Are they the same people? Is there overlapping membership? etc. Only other thoughts are that I'm not sure how much centralization and state-level involvement is needed or wanted? Are these standards based on any particular studies that I'm just not recalling at the moment?
- Already indicated in prior comments (e.g. collapse three items on wraparound quality into 7.3).
- I think its pretty close, but would like to have less philosophy and more reality. But you probably noticed that. Excellent job, hard work. Onward!
- Thanks for the effort. Sue
- I think there should be some directed questions about parent partners on the team and how they play an essential part in forming community support.
- I do like the simplicity of the questions.
- please remember there are families all over and in rural/frontier areas there's more collaboration recruitment and retention of staff needed along with educating the public, current staff about the

# CSWI "Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory"

9/21/06

## Themes, comments, recommendations from advisors' reviews (N=41)

philosophical changes being made. I have been frustrated that the colleges and universities have little or no changes in curriculum to support the wraparound process. thank you for this opportunity to participate as a parent and spouse of consumers, and an consumer myself! B

- Already provided...it is too long...tendency to force answers...tendency toward rhetoric, tendency to ignore individualization necessary for implementation
- Overall, I think there needs to be more clarity so the person using the rating scale have a clear context on which to evaluate 'systems.' I think this is a very important tool. Much needed in the field, particularly for policy makers.
- Need items to address: 1) supporting front-line staff and mid-level managers 2) need participation from other community organizations, law enforcement and community members. 3) specifically addresses confidentiality concerns 4) address workforce shortage 5) address transportation issues especially in rural areas where there is a higher level of poverty and lack of access to transportation 6) address education of community on research-based practices
- A few items could be combined. Some items were local system and service delivery while others were higher level infrastructure items. These items would be better for measuring a system of care rather than a wraparound service delivery model.
- Would like to see a little more discussion about family empowerment, independence, family/youth able to facilitate team toward transition period etc.
- I think this is an incredibly important tool. So much effort is put into the practice of wraparound and not nearly enough on the conditions that support wraparound. I would like to work in the state that scores well on this tool!
- refine negative anchors, which in some cases seem to convey a judgment or bias. provide more specific anchors from best administrative practices to better cue respondents (i.e. blended funding, categorical funding, redirect funds from high end care to community-based options, flexible arrays of services and support funded from blended or braided funding pools)
- Thanks for sending this out! I do have a concern that if we truly expect providers/communities to be able to do all this, Wraparound will be far too expensive administratively and we will encourage micro-management. I loved the inclusion of youth voice! Thank you.
- not at this time. The survey was long.
- Inclusion of a way to indicate how decision making and the role of parents is handled when state custody is ordered or there is drug court involvement. This looks great, good job!
- Great job! We will start using this across California as soon as it is available.
- Great Tool! Could be very useful to those considering becoming involved in wraparound as well as those who have attempted to implement and have run into obstacles.