

National Wraparound Initiative  
Research & Evaluation Work Group Plan  
June 26<sup>th</sup>, 2009

Okay NWI research & evaluation group, here is a rough sketch of the study we discussed in Portland that would provide a foundation for the current efforts of the workforce development group and of course, would also support beginning to address the gaps in the literature identified in the study completed this year that will be a centerpiece to the edition of Journal of Child & Family studies devoted to wraparound implementation: To support staff selection as well as training and supervision/coaching we wanted to identify competencies that support effective, efficient and high fidelity wraparound facilitation.

We also discussed identifying competencies in supervision/coaching, and perhaps also in the efforts of family partners.

We described competencies in reference to knowledge, skills, and aptitude. Hence we would be seeking data regarding what knowledge, what skills, what aptitude. Chuni has put further thought to this in discussions with myself and Janet Walker regarding the workforce development group.

We discussed deriving data from select sites using the wraparound model. We discussed how data could/should define selection of participants for focus groups. Thus, effective facilitation could be determined by improved child and family outcomes (the question remains what measures of those outcomes). Fidelity could be derived from WFI or Team Observation Form data. Efficiency probably would be determined somewhat by questioning supervisors/coaches or administrators. For example, we might ask for effective high fidelity facilitators whose teams move to transition within a specified time period (within a year? within 18 months? etc). I realize those time frames are somewhat arbitrary, but I suspect Jesse or Eric have some data on length of cases prior to transition that we could use as a basis for selecting focus group participants.

We discussed how we could pursue further data via semi-structured interviews with select participants from the focus groups. This might be an addition to the study as focus group data are analyzed.

We briefly considered developing a focus group in the east, north, south, west, and central sections of the country. I think it is important to select urban, suburban, exurban/rural sites. Jon thought he could help develop a group in central/southern California. Chuni and/or Jesse might help us develop a group in the east. I might be able to develop a group from the south or central USA and I am sure Eric has logical selections for any of these areas.

We discussed how this site selection might of necessity be a convenience sampling. However, even if sites were selected by convenience (one of us has knowledge about a particular site), the power of the study would increase if we used data to select participants for the groups (child and family outcome data, WFI or TOF data, etc). We need to determine the structure for the data search (questions for the

focus groups). I briefly suggested we develop sets of questions to identify what knowledge, what skills, what aptitude for phases of wraparound. For example: Family Engagement and Team Engagement/ team Development/ Discovery or Assessment/Plan Development & Design of Interventions/ Evaluation & Adjustment of Plans/Interventions/ and Transition.

Focus groups would probably last 60-90 minutes. They could be recorded or we could have a group facilitator and one or two aides recording the questions and responses...or we could use both methods of data collection.

The questions can be very straightforward but we might also derive useful data by asking about constraints, not simply what made each phase work (knowledge, skills, aptitude). Such questions might open pathways to information about organizational culture and climate, facilitative administrative structures and practices, etc. that contribute to or constrain effective, efficient, high fidelity wraparound.

Questions to a group of supervisors/coaches would be interesting to compare with responses from groups of facilitators and groups of family partners. We should look for between group similarities and differences, as well as between group similarities and differences of urban, suburban, exurban/rural groups.

We also discussed the necessity for running the study through an SSIRB. I am a member of the UMKC SSIRB, so that might simplify things, although anyone engaged in the collection or analysis of the data would have to take an online CITI course (this would be true for most, if not all, SSIRBs).

We discussed a timeline...to flesh out the outline of the study, including questions for the focus groups by the end of July, to identify focus group sites & write the study for an SSIRB and take the online CITI course (it is not at all difficult) by September. To conduct the focus groups in September & October. To begin data analysis as each focus group is completed and to cross-site and between group comparisons of data in November. Then we could present initial results at the Tampa systems of care research conference in February/March and use this as a platform for writing, submitting, and publishing an article by the end of spring 2010.

Obviously this needs work. Consider this our initial suggestions. We may choose to simplify the study by only focusing on facilitators and supervisors/coaches. The case can be made that the family partner is another study, and that we might discover pathways to that study by first focusing on facilitators and supervisors/coaches.

Okay, that should get our dialogue rolling. Let's try to bring this into a plan or reject it by the end of July.