Overview

The Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory (CSWI) is a research and quality improvement tool that assesses how well a local community or system supports the implementation of high quality wraparound. The CSWI can be used in several ways:

· To help communities evaluate to what extent the supports that are needed for wraparound are (or are not) in place in their community. Using this information, the community partners can make changes and track improvements in community supports over time.

· To help researchers determine how much these community support conditions affect fidelity and outcomes of wraparound.

· To help evaluators understand the system context for wraparound as part of their local evaluation projects.

In general, the information that you and others in your community provide on the CSWI will be used to improve implementation of community based services for children, youth, and families.

The CSWI typically takes up to 45 minutes to complete.

CSWI responses will be kept confidential

Thank you for agreeing to complete the CSWI.

Instructions

Please check off each of the boxes below to confirm that you have covered that part of the instructions.

The CSWI is organized into six themes, with six to eight items per theme. Each item has one "anchor" statement that describes what a fully developed system would look like relevant to that item, and another anchor statement that describes what the least developed system, or a system at the beginning of its development might look like related to that item.

For *each* item, you should consider the conditions in your community or system relevant to that item. Next, you should select a rating on the five-point scale that is provided.

On this scale, a score of 4 is the highest and indicates that your community resembles the description of the fully developed system for that item. In other words, your community shows the greatest level of system support.

On the other end of the scale, a score of 0 is the lowest and would indicate that your community resembles the description of the least developed system for that item.

Often, your community will not resemble either extreme of the scale. In this case, you should choose a score elsewhere on the 4-to-0 scale that best approximates where you feel your community lies on the continuum from the description of the fully developed system to the least developed.

Check each of the boxes below:

- ∈ A 4 rating means you believe your community fits the description of fully developed system for this item.

- ∈ A 3 means your community is fairly close to achieving the fully developed system. It has made substantial progress, but is not all the way there yet.

- ∈ A 2 means midway between the two end points, indicating that you believe your community or system is about midway between "fully" and "least" developed system support.

- ∈ A 1 means that a small amount of progress has been made, but that your system still resembles the least developed description.

- ∈ A 0 means that the description for least developed system support is accurate for your community.

If you do not feel adequately informed or knowledgeable about your community's system choose "DK" for "Don't Know".

- ʲⁿ I should choose "Don't know" for any item that I don't know enough about to rate

How to stop the survey and finish it later

If you don't have enough time to complete the survey in one sitting, you may leave the survey and then resume it later. In order to do this, SurveyMonkey needs to place a cookie on your web browser. You will need to use the same original computer to resume the survey. For this feature to work, you will also need to have your browser settings configured so as to allow cookies.

When you want to leave the survey, click on the white "exit this survey" link in the upper right-hand corner of the page. When you are ready to access the survey again, just click on the link you received in the original invitation e-mail. The link remembers where respondents left off based on the last completed page. As you click on the "next" button in the survey, the survey page saves.

jn If I want to stop the survey and finish later, I just have to click on the "exit this survey" link to leave, and then using the *same original computer* click on the link in the invitation e-mail I received to resume from the point where I left off.

Click "Next" to proceed to the CSWI Survey.

Respondent Information

Please enter the identification number from your email invitation. If you do not have the email invitation, please contact April Sather at sathea@u.washington.edu.

How many TOTAL years have you been involved in wraparound in ANY role?

How many years have you participated in the following roles? (Please provide an answer in each row. Choose 0 if you have never had this role.)

	0 or N/A	less than 1 year	between 1 and 2 years	between 2 and 4 years	between 4 and 7 years	between 7 and 10 years	10 years or more
Family member/youth on a wrap team or involved in wrap implementation	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Natural support on teams other than your family's own	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Family partner/other wraparound family support role	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Wraparound facilitator or care coordinator	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Wraparound team member who is a professional	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Wraparound supervisor or coach	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Program manager/agency administrator involved with wraparound	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Higher-level (e.g., county or state) administrator or policy maker involved with wrap	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Evaluator or researcher on wraparound	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Primary Role

Describe your primary role within the wraparound project that you will be referencing as you fill out this form. (Choose one answer.)

- ○ Facilitator/care coordinator in this wraparound project
- ○ Parent/family partner or other formal parent support role in this wraparound project
- ○ Other provider or supervisor of direct wraparound practice employed in this wraparound project
- ○ Family member or natural support on teams
- ○ Youth
- ○ Service provider not primarily employed in wraparound (therapist, parole officer, teacher, respite provider)
- ○ Administrator of wraparound program
- ○ Administrator of some other service program
- ○ Other (please specify)

How long have you been involved with this wraparound program?

In terms of your ethnic or racial background, which of these best describes you?

- ○ African American
- ○ Latino/Hispanic
- ○ Native American/American Indian
- ○ Asian American
- ○ Pacific Islander
- ○ Caucasian/European American
- ○ Other (please specify)

If you are unable to make a rating, please click "Don't know." There is space for comments at the end of this survey.

THEME 1-- Community Partnership: Collective community ownership of and responsibility for wraparound is built through collaborations among key stakeholder groups.

**In this theme, "community team" means a group of people who have formally organized themselves into a collaborative structure to take collective responsibility for the wraparound effort. Your community may have a different name for this group of people. Also, the "team" can take many forms, and may be composed of several smaller committees or forums that work together in a coordinated manner to set policies and make decisions, etc.

Item 1.1 Community Team

Fully developed system	Least developed system
There is a formal collaborative structure (e.g., a "community team" or other body) for joint planning and decision making through which community partners take collective responsibility for development and implementation of wraparound.	The wraparound effort is not supported by any collaborative system-level decision-making entity to oversee wraparound implementation, bust barriers and solve system-level problems.

◌ 4 - Fully developed   ◌ 3 - Almost there   ◌ 2 - Midway   ◌ 1 - Beginning   ◌ 0 - Least developed   ◌ Don't know

Item 1.2 Empowered Community Team

Fully developed system

The community team includes leaders who are empowered to make decisions and commit resources on behalf of their organizations to support the development and implementation of wraparound.

Least developed system

People who represent their agencies and organizations in planning and overseeing the wraparound effort do not have the power to make decisions or commit resources for wraparound on behalf of their organizations.

◌ 4 - Fully developed ◌ 3 - Almost there ◌ 2 - Midway ◌ 1 - Beginning ◌ 0 - Least developed ◌ Don't know

Item 1.3 Influential Family Voice

Fully developed system

Families are influential members of the community team and other community level decision-making entities, and they take active roles in wraparound program planning, implementation oversight, and evaluation. Families are provided with support and training so that they can participate fully and comfortably in these roles.

Least developed system

Family members are not actively involved in decision-making, or are uninfluential or "token" components of the community team, boards, and other collaborative bodies that plan programs and guide implementation and evaluation.

◌ 4 - Fully developed ◌ 3 - Almost there ◌ 2 - Midway ◌ 1 - Beginning ◌ 0 - Least developed ◌ Don't know

Item 1.4 Influential Youth Voice

Fully developed system

Youth and young adults are influential members of the community team and other community level decision-making entities, and they take active roles in wraparound program planning, implementation oversight, and evaluation. Young people are provided with support and training so that they can participate fully and comfortably in these roles.

Least developed system

Young people are not actively involved in decision-making, or are uninfluential or "token" components of the community team, boards, and other collaborative bodies that plan programs, oversee implementation, and conduct evaluation.

ⓙ 4 - Fully developed   ⓙ 3 - Almost there   ⓙ 2 - Midway   ⓙ 1 - Beginning   ⓙ 0 - Least developed   ⓙ Don't know

Item 1.5 Full Agency Support

Fully developed system

Relevant public agencies (e.g., mental health, child welfare, schools, courts) and major provider organizations all collaborate with and participate actively and productively on the community team. These agencies and organizations fully "buy in" to the wraparound effort.

Least developed system

Relevant child-serving agencies and major provider organizations do not participate actively and constructively on the community team. The organizations or agencies that provide wraparound do so in the absence of "buy-in" from these other agencies and their staff.

ⓙ 4 - Fully developed   ⓙ 3 - Almost there   ⓙ 2 - Midway   ⓙ 1 - Beginning   ⓙ 0 - Least developed   ⓙ Don't know

Item 1.6 Community Stakeholders

Fully developed system

The community team includes leaders from the business, service, faith and other sectors, who partner in system design, implementation oversight, and evaluation, and provide tangible resources (including human resources such as volunteers).

Least developed system

Few if any representatives of the business, service, faith or other sectors participate actively in the wraparound effort or provide tangible resources.

jn 4 - Fully developed   jn 3 - Almost there   jn 2 - Midway   jn 1 - Beginning   jn 0 - Least developed   jn Don't know

Item 1.7 Community Representativeness

Fully developed system

The membership of the community team reflects the social, cultural, and economic diversity of the community and the families served by wraparound.

Least developed system

Members on the community team and/or other collaborative bodies do not reflect the social, cultural, and economic diversity of the community and the families served by wraparound.

jn 4 - Fully developed   jn 3 - Almost there   jn 2 - Midway   jn 1 - Beginning   jn 0 - Least developed   jn Don't know

Theme 2: Collaborative Action.

If you are unable to make a rating, please click "Don't know." There is space for comments at the end of this survey.

THEME 2 Collaborative Action: Stakeholders involved in the wraparound effort take specific steps to translate the wraparound philosophy into concrete policies, practices and achievements.

Item 2.1 Community Principles & Values

Fully developed system	Least developed system
Key stakeholders in the wraparound effort have collectively developed and formally ratified statements of mission, principles, and desired outcomes that provide a clear direction for planning, implementation, and joint action.	Statements of mission, principles, and/or outcomes have not been developed. Each agency and organization has its own mission and values and there is no common vision or set of values or desired outcomes shared across agencies.

⊙ 4 - Fully developed   ⊙ 3 - Almost there   ⊙ 2 - Midway   ⊙ 1 - Beginning   ⊙ 0 - Least developed   ⊙ Don't know

Item 2.2 High-Level Leadership

Fully developed system

The system has multiple high level leaders (e.g., senior agency administrators, elected officials, and other influential stakeholders) who understand wraparound and who actively support wraparound development by forging partnerships among agencies and organizations, changing policies, inspiring individual stakeholders, and creating effective fiscal strategies.

Least developed system

There are few if any high-level leaders in the system who truly understand or actively support wraparound development. Leaders are unable or unwilling to forge partnerships, integrate systems, or create effective fiscal strategies to support the wraparound effort.

꙼ 4 - Fully developed   ꙼ 3 - Almost there   ꙼ 2 - Midway   ꙼ 1 - Beginning   ꙼ 0 - Least developed   ꙼ Don't know

Item 2.3 Proactive Planning

Fully developed system

The wraparound effort is guided by a plan for joint action that describes the goals of the wraparound effort, the strategies that will be used to achieve the goals, and the roles of specific stakeholders in carrying out the strategies.

Least developed system

There is no plan for joint action that describes goals of the wraparound effort, strategies for achieving the goals, or roles of specific stakeholders.

꙼ 4 - Fully developed   ꙼ 3 - Almost there   ꙼ 2 - Midway   ꙼ 1 - Beginning   ꙼ 0 - Least developed   ꙼ Don't know

Item 2.4 Joint Action Steps

Fully developed system

Collaborative and individual agency plans demonstrate specific and tangible collaborative steps (e.g., developing MOUs, contributing resources, revising agency regulations, participating in planning activities) toward achieving joint goals that are central to the wraparound effort.

Least developed system

Though there may be a stated commitment to the wraparound effort, agencies and other key stakeholders have NOT taken specific and tangible steps toward achieving central goals of the wraparound effort (such as developing MOUs, revising policies and regulations, etc).

j℩ 4 - Fully developed   j℩ 3 - Almost there   j℩ 2 - Midway   j℩ 1 - Beginning   j℩ 0 - Least developed   j℩ Don't know

Item 2.5 Partner Agency Staff Preparation

Fully developed system

The collaborating agencies take concrete steps to ensure that their staff members are informed about wraparound values and practice. All staff who participate directly in the wraparound effort do so in a manner that is in keeping with wraparound principles, such as collaborative, strengths-based, and respectful of families and youth.

Least developed system

Providers and agency personnel are not informed about the wraparound philosophy, and staff who participate in the wraparound effort are unable or unwilling to do so in a manner that is in keeping with wraparound principles.

j℩ 4 - Fully developed   j℩ 3 - Almost there   j℩ 2 - Midway   j℩ 1 - Beginning   j℩ 0 - Least developed   j℩ Don't know

Item 2.6 Information Sharing

Fully developed system

Information is shared efficiently across systems (or is maintained centrally for the wraparound program) so as to provide the data needed to monitor wraparound quality, plan implementation, costs, and outcomes.

Least developed system

Agencies have not resolved legal issues and/or developed mechanisms for efficiently sharing the information that is required to monitor wraparound quality, plan implementation, costs, and outcomes.

jn 4 - Fully developed   jn 3 - Almost there   jn 2 - Midway   jn 1 - Beginning   jn 0 - Least developed   jn Don't know

Item 2.7 Single Plan

Fully developed system

The wraparound plan is the plan of care that structures and coordinates all partner agencies' work with a given child and family. The format and structure for documenting the plan reinforces relevant wraparound principles such as strengths-based, family-driven, and individualized.

Least developed system

Different agencies and systems that serve a child and family develop and maintain separate, uncoordinated plans of care; and/or the wraparound plan or other agency plans are recorded in ways that are not in keeping with wraparound principles (e.g., plans reflect deficit-based, family-blaming, or expert-driven perspectives).

jn 4 - Fully developed   jn 3 - Almost there   jn 2 - Midway   jn 1 - Beginning   jn 0 - Least developed   jn Don't know

Item 2.8 State Interface

Fully developed system

The wraparound effort has an active and productive partnership with state agencies. This partnership has been successful in motivating policy and funding changes that support wraparound programs and practice.

Least developed system

There is no organized interface between the community and state agencies around children's services and supports. State level policies, regulations, and funding are in conflict with the community's wraparound effort and different stakeholder groups are competing for different types of changes to rules, regulations, and laws.

jn 4 - Fully developed   jn 3 - Almost there   jn 2 - Midway   jn 1 - Beginning   jn 0 - Least developed   jn Don't know

If you are unable to make a rating, please click "Don't know." There is space for comments at the end of this survey.

THEME 3 Fiscal Policies and Sustainability: The community has developed fiscal strategies to meet the needs of children participating in wraparound and methods to collect and use data on expenditures for wraparound-eligible children.

Item 3.1 Fiscal Understanding

Fully developed system	Least developed system
Agencies and decision makers have access to accurate information about the types and magnitudes of expenditures from all funding streams (e.g., mental health, special education, juvenile justice, developmental disabilities) for services and supports for all children with serious and complex needs (regardless of whether or not they are actually enrolled in wraparound).	Information about expenditures for services and supports is fragmented across different information systems/sources such that decision makers cannot determine the use and costs of services and supports for children with serious and complex needs (regardless of whether or not they are actually enrolled in wraparound).

jn 4 - Fully developed   jn 3 - Almost there   jn 2 - Midway   jn 1 - Beginning   jn 0 - Least developed   jn Don't know

Item 3.2 Removing Fiscal Barriers

Fully developed system

The community collaborative has a formalized process for identifying and acting to remedy fiscal policies that impede the implementation of the wraparound program or the fulfillment of wraparound plans. Important changes to fiscal policies have been made.

Least developed system

The community collaborative lacks formal understanding of the ways in which fiscal policies act as barriers to the implementation of the wraparound program or the fulfillment of wraparound plans; and/or, where awareness exists, no action is taken to change policy.

◯ 4 - Fully developed   ◯ 3 - Almost there   ◯ 2 - Midway   ◯ 1 - Beginning   ◯ 0 - Least developed   ◯ Don't know

Item 3.3 Collective Fiscal Responsibility

Fully developed system

Key decision-makers and relevant agencies assume collective fiscal responsibility for children and families participating in wraparound and do not attempt to shift costs to each other or to entities outside of the wraparound effort.

Least developed system

Each agency has its own cost controls and agencies do not collaborate to reduce cost shifting, either to each other or to entities outside of the wraparound effort.

◯ 4 - Fully developed   ◯ 3 - Almost there   ◯ 2 - Midway   ◯ 1 - Beginning   ◯ 0 - Least developed   ◯ Don't know

Item 3.4 Fiscal Monitoring

Fully developed system

There is a formalized mechanism for reviewing the costs of implementing the wraparound program and wraparound plans. This information is used to clarify/streamline spending policies and to seek ways to become more efficient at providing high-quality wraparound.

Least developed system

There is little or no information available about the costs of implementing the wraparound program or wraparound plans and/or what information is available is not used to streamline spending policies or improve efficiency.

4 - Fully developed   *3 - Almost there*   *2 - Midway*   *1 - Beginning*   *0 - Least developed*   *Don't know*

Item 3.5 Fiscal Flexibility

Fully developed system

Funds are available to pay for services and supports, and funds are flexible, so that teams can fully implement the strategies included in individual wraparound plans and safety/crisis plans.

Least developed system

Financing policies are rigid and are largely or entirely designed to facilitate payment for categorical services. There is little latitude for flexibility to provide creative, individualized care for children, youth, and families.

4 - Fully developed   *3 - Almost there*   *2 - Midway*   *1 - Beginning*   *0 - Least developed*   *Don't know*

Item 3.6 Sustained Funding

Fully developed system

There is a clear and feasible plan for sustaining fiscal support for the wraparound effort over the long term, and this plan is being fully implemented.

Least developed system

There is no clear and feasible plan for sustaining fiscal support for the wraparound effort.

4 - Fully developed   *3 - Almost there*   *2 - Midway*   *1 - Beginning*   *0 - Least developed*   *Don't know*