



Impact of the National Wraparound Initiative: Results of a Survey of NWI Advisors



**Eric J. Bruns
April Sather
Janet S. Walker
Lisa Conlan
Carol LaForce**

January 2009

Acknowledgements:

This publication was produced by the National Wraparound Initiative at Portland State University and was developed with funding from the Center for Mental Health Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (contract number 280-03-4201). The content does not necessarily represent the views or policies of the funding agency. Thanks to the NWI advisors that gave their input.

Suggested Citation:

Bruns, E. J., Sather, A., Walker, J. S., Conlan, L., & LaForce, C. (2009). *Impact of the National Wraparound Initiative results of a survey of NWI advisors*. Portland, OR: National Wraparound Initiative, Portland State University.



Introduction

Participants in the National Wraparound Initiative (NWI) did not set out self-consciously to build a “community of practice.” Nevertheless, the NWI does indeed appear to function as one. While there are many definitions, most describe communities of practice as people coming together out of a shared passion for a topic and a desire to achieve change, improve existing practices, and/or identify and solve problems in a specific domain of knowledge. The community of practice provides members with opportunities for collaborative reflection, dialogue and inquiry, allowing them to share expertise and resources, learn from each other, and solve problems. The shared solutions and insights that emerge from community members’ interactions form a common store of knowledge that accumulates over time. Community members make use of this accumulated and co-created knowledge by applying it to their own practice which, in turn, deepens the expertise that they share with the community.

NWI Impact Survey

During the NWI’s brief existence, its members have shared countless anecdotal examples of how the Initiative has functioned as a community of practice in ways that align with the above description. Recently, the coordinators of the NWI used a more structured approach to attempt to assess the impact of the NWI. Using a web-based survey (a common method employed by the NWI), advisors were asked to present up to five specific examples of ways in which the NWI has influenced practice, policy, implementation, or some other aspect of service delivery. Advisors were then asked, for each example, to provide details on the community or jurisdiction that was impacted; the type of people or entities impacted by the NWI’s work; the type of policy, activity, or product that was impacted; the NWI products or resources that were used in producing the impact; and the size of the impact.

Seventy-two, or about one-third, of NWI advisors responded to the survey. Respondents represented the typical variety of roles served by NWI advisors, including supervisors and managers in provider organizations (28%), administrators and policy makers (26%), wraparound trainers and consultants (20%), wraparound provider staff (11%), and researchers (9%) (See **Table 1**). Across respondents and roles, 35% (n=25) of survey respondents said they had been a participant in the wraparound process for themselves or a child or family member at some point (See **Table 2**). Results of the survey showed that respondents were highly familiar with and

frequently used the NWI's core products in their own work (See **Table 3**). Among the nine products and resources presented, familiarity ranged from 78% for the NWI's on-line tool compendium to 97% for the practice model and 100% for the description of the 10 principles of wraparound. Ninety-three percent of all respondents were familiar with and used the *The Wraparound Process User's Guide: A Handbook for Families*.

TABLE 1

Current role related to wraparound	N	%
Supervisor, Manager, administrator within an agency or organization	20	27.8
Manager, administrator, policy maker for several programs etc.	19	26.4
Wraparound trainer	14	18.4
Wrap staff - - WF, Family Partner, Supervisor etc	7	9.7
Researcher/Evaluator	7	9.2
Participant in wrap planning for self/family	1	1.4
Other	4	5.2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board member of family organization • Director of Training Institute • Family advocate, family member • Wrap Consultant 		

TABLE 2

Have you and/or a family member ever received wraparound?

% Yes	% No
34.7	65.3

TABLE 3

NWI products/resources you are familiar with	N Yes	% Yes	N No	% No
Ten Principles of Wraparound	72	100	0	0
Phases and Activities (aka "practice model")	70	97.2	2	2.8
Theory of Change for Wraparound	65	90.3	7	9.7
Application of 10 Principles to Role of Family Partners on Wrap Teams	63	87.5	9	12.5
Tools to support wrap process (from online "tools compendium")	56	77.8	16	22.2
User's Guide to Wraparound (aka: Family Member's Guide)	67	93.1	5	6.9
Research/evidence reviews of wraparound	65	90.3	7	9.7
Resource Guide to Wraparound	60	83.3	12	16.7
Description of the Necessary Conditions or Systems Supports for Wrap	57	79.2	15	20.8
None of these	0	0	72	100
Other	4	5.6	68	94.4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to network of experts across roles and opportunities to develop relationships within rich network • CSWI • WFI (2) • Family engagement • Skill set for Family Partners, Skill set for WF's 				

Types of impacts. Overall, survey respondents presented 185 examples of the NWI's influence, from 32 U.S. states, as well as Canada and Norway (See **Table 4** for a summary of geographic areas impacted). Fourteen respondents presented examples of national impacts. A summary of a qualitative analysis of the types of impacts described by respondents is presented in **Table 5**. As shown, the most commonly presented example of NWI impact was on training and coaching of provider staff, which accounted for 25% of all examples provided (n=46). As described by one state official, "these standards help us to train staff on values and principles, help staff to understand the paradigm shift, and provide hope for families." Another advisor, a provider and trainer, said: "the NWI has helped us with consistently defining the wraparound process in our state. We use the [materials] almost daily in our coaching and training here and in other states." Another trainer put it this way: "NWI has given more consistency to the consultants and trainers who support the implementation of wraparound across the world."

TABLE 4	
Geographical area where NWI has had an impact	N
Arizona	1
Atlanta, GA	1
California (all counties)	13
Colorado	1
• Colorado Springs (JJ, MH, DHS)	3
• Grand Junction, Canon City, Aurora	2
• El Paso, Teller, Pueblo counties	1
Connecticut	2
Craighead, Lee, Mississippi, and Phillips Counties – Arkansas	1
Florida	
• Brevard County, FL	1
• Broward County	1
Florida	1
• Miami-Dade County	1
Illinois	2
• McHenry County	1
Indiana	1
• Indianapolis (Choices TA Center)	1
Iowa	1
Kentucky	1
Maine	3
• Northern York City	1
• Sagadahoc County	2
• Knox-Waldo Counties	3
• Cumberland County	2
• Penobscot County	1
• Aroostook County	1
• York	1

TABLE 4 (continued)

Geographical area where NWI has had an impact	N
Maryland	1
• Baltimore City, Montgomery County, St. Mary's County, Wicomico County, MD	1
• Baltimore City (Maryland Choices)	1
Massachusetts	2
• 10 cities: Worcester, Cambridge, Somerville, Malden, Medford, Everett, New Bedford, Springfield, Lawrence, Brockton	1
• Children's Friend & Family Services, Lynn & Lawrence, Mass	1
Michigan	2
Minnesota	
• St Cloud and surrounding counties	1
Missouri	1
• St. Louis Region and Central and Southwest Missouri	1
National Impact	11
• Including Canada	
New Hampshire	1
New Jersey	3
• Monmouth County (Monmouth Cares)	1
New York State	1
• Staten Island	1
Norway	1
Ohio	1
• Cincinnati, OH (Hamilton Choices)	1
• 33 Counties	1
Oklahoma	4
Oregon	2
• Linn, Marion, Polk, Tillamook, and Yamhill Counties	2
• Multnomah County	8
• Clackamas County	1
Pennsylvania	1
• Southern PA (4 counties)	1
Phoenix, Arizona	1
• Family Organization, service provider	
Rhode Island	2
Texas (statewide but limited practice)	1
Vermont	2
Virginia	1
Washington	1
• Benton and Franklin Counties, WA (3 Rivers Wraparound)	1
• King County	1
• Skagit, Snohomish, Whatcom, Island Counties, North Sound	1
• CCS's 5 Family Preservation sites (Pierce & Kitsap Counties, through Olympia, down to Vancouver, and the Tri-County area of Northwest Oregon)	1
Wyoming (CMHS sites)	1

TABLE 5

Type of policy, activity or product that was impacted.	N	%
Training, coaching, and/or credentialing staff	46	24.9%
Guiding development of policy (e.g., contracts, legislation, Medicaid waivers)	33	17.8%
Guiding development of services (wraparound implementation or practice)	15	8.1%
Education/training for families	13	7.0%
Evaluation/fidelity monitoring/quality assurance	11	5.9%
Integrating, training, and/or empowering Family Partners	10	5.2%
Validating/legitimizing participation in/implementation of wraparound	9	4.9%
Supervision/workforce management	7	3.8%
Facilitating local dialogue, planning, and problem-solving	6	1.6%
Systems re-organization/systems change	5	2.7%
Facilitating partnership with child-serving agencies (e.g., education, child welfare)	5	2.6%
Developing logic models or local theories of change	4	2.2%
Establishing benchmarks/standards	4	2.2%
Facilitating research	4	2.2%
Hiring (e.g., providing job descriptions)	4	2.2%
Obtaining funding	4	2.2%
Outreach/social marketing/community education	3	1.6%
Conferences/forums	2	1.1%

Note. Total respondents $N = 72$; total impacts $N = 185$. Percents are based on total N of impacts nominated by survey respondents.

The second most oft-presented example was the NWI's influence on policy, governance, or legislation, which accounted for 18% of all examples ($n=33$). According to respondents, the NWI's efforts have provided guidance to those overseeing implementation, and have helped legitimate the practice through production of standards, research, and fidelity tools. As one respondent described, "Changing large systems is difficult – the NWI is doing well with this task, especially by producing both research and concrete products to help change agents." Another respondent said, "NWI has been a forum that has generated a focal point beyond individual communities and contributors for the field. This has increased the perceived legitimacy in the field among those who previously knew little about what [wraparound] is."

Other relatively common types of impact included shaping the local practice model, or way services were delivered (9% of all impacts); education and training for family members (7%), and evaluation and fidelity monitoring (6%). Other interesting impacts described by advisors included methods for integrating family partners into wraparound implementation, establishment of provider

supervision and credentialing methods, and use in overall systems change initiatives and/or development of better interagency collaboration.

Populations impacted. Advisors were also asked what types of individuals were most directly impacted through the examples provided (See **Table 6**). Survey respondents provided 246 examples of types of individuals impacted by the NWI. Similar to types of impacts, the types of people impacted represented a broad range of influence, most commonly parents, caregivers, and family members, (24% of all impacted individuals), providers (17%), wraparound facilitators (13%), other wraparound staff (6%), parent or family partners (5%), and a number of other types of roles, including representatives of specific partner agencies.

TABLE 6

Type of people and/or entities impacted by NWI's work.	N	%
Families, parents, and caregivers	60	24.4%
Professionals (not specified further, e.g., providers, agency representatives)	43	17.5%
Wraparound facilitators (e.g., care managers)	32	13.0%
Other wraparound staff (e.g., supervisors & managers)	15	6.1%
Family/parent partners; family support organizations	12	4.9%
Child welfare staff	11	4.5%
Youth (including identified youth receiving wraparound)	11	4.5%
Mental health workers	10	4.1%
Policy makers (state/county department heads, legislators)	8	3.3%
Administrators	7	2.8%
Education/special education staff	7	2.8%
Juvenile justice workers	6	2.4%
Stakeholders and community members	7	2.8%
Judges/court officials	4	1.6%
"System" partners	5	2.0%
Funders	3	1.2%
Trainers/coaches	3	1.2%
Quality assurance and/or research	2	0.8%

Note. Total respondents $N = 72$; total impacts $N = 246$. Percents are based on total N of impacts nominated by survey respondents.

Success in meeting goals. Finally, advisors were asked directly via this survey to provide their opinion of the NWI's success in achieving the four primary goals that were identified at its first meeting in 2003. As shown in **Table 7**, advisors were most likely to perceive positive impact on the NWI goal to "provide tools, resources, and information," with 65% of respondents stating that the NWI had a "large positive" impact in this area. The majority of advisors (58%) also perceived that the NWI had a large positive impact with respect to providing the field with "a better understanding" of high-quality wraparound implementation. Half of all respondents (50%) observed a

large positive impact on a goal specific to developing a community of practice – bringing “family members, youth, providers, trainers, researchers and advocates together.” Least well achieved among the goal areas was to “build understanding about organizational and system factors” in implementing wraparound, where the majority of respondents (53%) believed the NWI had a moderate positive impact. This perception of relatively less impact in this area reinforces the NWI’s intent to focus on providing implementation support to communities and programs in the coming years.

Very few of the 72 respondents endorsed the option of “no real impact” for any of the above areas (1%-4% across the goal areas), and none of the respondents noted a negative impact in any of these four primary goal areas.

TABLE 7

Level of Perceived Impact of NWI on its Four Primary Goal Areas

GOAL: Provide field with better understanding of what high-quality wraparound is. How much of an impact does/did NWI’s work or products have?		
	N	%
Large Positive	42	58%
Moderate Positive	29	40%
No real impact	1	1%
Moderate Negative Impact	0	0
Large Negative Impact	0	0
GOAL: Build understanding about organizational and system factors for support. How much of an impact does/did NWI’s work or products have?		
	N	%
Large Positive	31	43%
Moderate Positive	38	53%
No real impact	3	4%
Moderate Negative Impact	0	0
Large Negative Impact	0	0
GOAL: Provide tools, resources, and information for implementation. How much of an impact does/did NWI’s work or products have?		
	N	%
Large Positive	47	65%
Moderate Positive	23	32%
No real impact	2	3%
Moderate Negative Impact	0	0
Large Negative Impact	0	0

TABLE 7 (continued)

Level of Perceived Impact of NWI on its Four Primary Goal Areas

GOAL: Bring family members, youth, providers, trainers, researchers and advocates together. How much of an impact does/did NWI's work or products have?		
	N	%
Large Positive	36	50%
Moderate Positive	33	46%
No real impact	3	4%
Moderate Negative Impact	0	0
Large Negative Impact	0	0

TABLE 8

How much of an impact does/did NWI's work or products have overall?	N	%
Large	54	61%
Moderate	33	38%
Small	1	1%

Opportunities for Collaboration and Reflection

Stories from family members. The results of survey presented above attest to the influence of the NWI on improving understanding, dissemination, and practice, which are certainly hallmarks of communities of practice. However, such quantitative results do not attest to the other major characteristic of communities of practice, which is the development of opportunities for shared inquiry, reflection, and effort. More detailed descriptions from advisors, however, begin to provide a sense of this function of the NWI. Consistent with the shifts in authority and expertise described in the introduction, some of the most compelling and impassioned stories of the NWI's impact on individual members of the community of practice come from family members who serve as NWI advisors and who have increasingly used the experience to develop expertise on implementation of the wraparound process. As one such NWI participant describes:

I have been an active member of the National Wraparound Initiative for the last two years. I have been able to meet colleagues across the country implementing wraparound in their own state or who are providing training and technical assistance to states implementing wraparound. Through participation in the NWI, I have been able to participate in workgroups (such as the family partner and standards workgroups) where I have been

able to provide input into documents, respond to surveys and questionnaires, and learn from others. At the same time, the opportunity to participate in the National Wraparound Initiative has definitely influenced my thinking about the implementation of wraparound in my own state, and as I provide technical assistance to other states and communities. As a parent who directly received wraparound in the early '90s, I learned a great deal about the implementation of wraparound firsthand, while participating now in the NWI has both reinforced and influenced my thinking in what the process should look like.

Thus, participation in the NWI is perceived as allowing for development of expertise among participants both through opportunities to learn from others, as well as through contributions to collective work. Other family member/advisors have also described the dual benefits of gaining in-depth understanding of wraparound through contributing to the work of the NWI and being able to then bring these to bear locally. Along the way, participation in such activities serves to develop a sense of legitimacy and authority among the participating advisors, as well as an enhanced ability to advocate for change among key stakeholders in the child serving system. A description from another advisor (a family member and local trainer) is presented here:

The personal impact of participating in the NWI has been tremendous. To be listened to and respected about my family, my experiences, my ideas, my suggestions, and my concerns has helped me to have more self esteem and feel that I am valued. In addition, my participation has influenced the way I think about wraparound by giving me a better understanding of "the big picture" – where wraparound came from and how it is continuing to develop. My participation and the understanding that comes from that helps me to more clearly define wraparound to others, including its similarities to and differences from other models and frameworks (such as systems of care), and how these different models impact the lives of participants. I am sure my passion for Systems of Care and Wraparound come through when I talk to people at conferences, at meetings, and when people call me for assistance.

In recent years, I have developed collaborations with the Oklahoma Family Support Partnership Council, Oklahoma Commission on Family and Youth's (OCCY's) Family Perspective Committee, the Oklahoma Child Abuse Prevention Interagency Task Force and their planning committee for Child Abuse

Prevention Day at the Capitol, the Interagency Coordinating Council for Sooner SUCCESS, the Oklahoma Federation of Families, Oklahoma Institute on Child Advocacy (OICA), Oklahoma Family Network (OFN), and many family members. Partially as a result of the expertise and connections I have developed through the NWI, when I work with these organizations and individuals, I am able to suggest ways to enhance activities to include and support children and youth with mental health issues and their families. This may be through adding a few words to a few items on a Needs Assessment Survey; finding ways that activities can be more accessible for family members and their natural supports; or informing family members, caregivers and natural supports about ongoing activities or and upcoming trainings.

Creating and sharing knowledge. From the above excerpt, one can get a sense of how the NWI actually functions as something of a “meta-community of practice,” bringing together people who represent their own, more localized communities of practice focused on children’s mental health and wraparound. These individuals contribute their own ideas to documents and resources developed by the NWI and then return to their local communities with a greater sense of commitment and empowerment, disseminating knowledge enhanced both through the documents that were developed as well as through the very process of sharing and developing these resources. Though the process can be unwieldy at times – and beg procedural questions about how best to blend the many perspectives – the potential benefits of this collective activity are equally clear. Members of the community of practice tend to not feel simply like passive “targets” of knowledge dissemination and utilization efforts, but are instead highly motivated to use the knowledge because they helped create it and have a thorough understanding of what it means. This method of developing critical implementation resources – where knowledge is simultaneously created and disseminated – may help to overcome critical characteristics of the “research-to-practice” problem, such as buy-in and acceptance on the part of those who implement and receive the intervention.

The potential for this expression of “practice-based evidence” to both advance knowledge as well as be receptive to innovations and expertise from the field is expressed in this quote from an administrator who completed the impact survey:

The NWI has compiled an enormous amount of information that will certainly have an impact on the field. In addition, by bringing

together those who are highly involved in wraparound, new practice and research ideas emerge that can be organized and pushed forward.

Of course, there can also be negative consequences of attempting to impose structures on a phenomenon such as wraparound implementation, which has, from its outset, strived to be a flexible and individualized process, both with respect to implementation for families as well as at the level of communities. Several advisors noted this tension (See **Table 10**), a representative description of which is provided here:

[One potential negative] impact is creating an environment that does not promote creativity and adaptability of implementation for Wraparound. Too often we seek answers from others rather than benefit from the lessons learned we have to offer. The NWI should continue to promote others to innovate as it relates to Wraparound implementation and quality improvement measures... because I believe we are clear that there is no prescription for Wraparound implementation, rather opportunities to create a team of committed, interested, and knowledgeable people to help a family develop a better quality of life, including a system that supports Wraparound.

Tables **9-11** present a broad range of perspectives of advisors' responses to requests for feedback about both the positive and negative impacts of the NWI's work. Reading through these responses to open-ended questions further illuminates areas in which the NWI has promoted positive change for children and families, and communities, as well as areas where tensions remain and significant work is still left to be done.

TABLE 9

Other comments re: POSITIVE IMPACTS

- Thank you for your many years of hard work and perseverance.
- It has been invaluable to have a resource treasure chest on the web that applies to policy purveyors, management, supervisors, facilitators, family partners and family and community members to go to have a guide to the process. Providing real tools has been extremely helpful in giving folks what they need to get along the way in achieving their dreams.
- State government officials and other bureaucrats are actively at work to promote the *replacement* of treatment programs with "high fidelity wraparound" programs, as if that is an ethical or appropriate practice. NWI should issue a specific statement against this practice.

TABLE 9 (continued)

Other comments re: POSITIVE IMPACTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It provides a central location to find the latest information and tools of wraparound. • Invaluable • I think that this was a big venture for anyone. I think there was a lot that was produced that can offer assistance to get it right. I do believe that this was much bigger than what anyone could have imagined and there were various opinions about wraparound that made coordination of the NWI efforts much more difficult and this should be commended. • The only reason I indicated "moderate" in some cases is that I think NWI needs more time and ways to spread the message. Impact is growing. • While I found this particular survey confusing, I enjoy being a part of this process. I think inviting seasoned practitioners to share decision-making is a good, good thing. • The funds used to support family and youth involvement is greatly appreciated. I doubt that the level of involvement would be as successful as it has because of the level of support from SAMHSA. • NWI has finally helped us with consistently defining the wraparound process in our state. We use the guide almost daily in our coaching and training here and in other states. • The information provided by NWI is wonderful. • NWI is providing consistency to the definition and implementation of wraparound. It is a credible place for individuals, agencies, and states to turn to as they work towards providing high fidelity wraparound. All the work of NWI will support the development of standardized training and will hopefully lead to the development of standardized credentialing. • Standards help train staff on values & principles. Helps staff to understand paradigm shift. Provides hope for families. Research valuable to win over state reps. • The work and influence of the NWI has been instrumental in establishing our [state's] initiative. The materials and resources, and the nationwide "community of practice" aspect of NWI has been invaluable in our efforts to help practitioners and stakeholders understand that Wraparound is not just an effective process for helping children and families, it is a unique catalyst for changing systems. We have a long way to go in the implementation, but we could not have come this far without the work and support of NWI & [our Statewide Coordinator]. • NWI has become a tremendous resource for across many different areas related to wraparound. From research to advocacy to leading the way on parent and youth leadership, it is an incredible example. • Just the existence of a "national" entity gives weight to the notion that there is a useful and definable practice model called "Wraparound." • Bringing all of the "experts" from across the nation together. Working to have a consensus among all stakeholders. • The impact could be greater with a full commitment to fund ongoing learning community activities and technical assistance. NWI is somewhat limited in its impact because its funding has been inadequate. • The positive has been in the practice model training and implementation. Unfortunately, I have observed in [our state] that funders and large policy and program administrators do not also incorporate the commitment to creating the community environment and using the community tools needed to support and sustain wraparound practice. The agencies and programs still, for the most part, deliver wraparound out of silos with little multi-level, multi-organization collaboration/integration of care. • The work done to promote wrap fidelity and the tools has been extremely useful in my work. • Changing large systems is very difficult. The NWI is doing very well with this task, especially by producing both research concrete help for change agents.

TABLE 9 (continued)

Other comments re: POSITIVE IMPACTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I don't think the materials are as widely disseminated as they need to be. You have not reached a significant portion of the target audience. • I feel privileged to have the opportunity to learn from the advisers of NWI. They have demonstrated the core value of benefice by sharing freely the insights that they have gained through participation in federally funded initiatives. NWI lives the principle of taking what they have been given and in turn freely giving it away. I honor their generosity and the benefits that it affords entities that are not fortunate enough to receive large federal grants to share in the knowledge and products developed on our tax dollars. • Created a collective synergy for participants to create a common platform for advancing wraparound. In a State so large, the reference to the NWI is emerging as a credible resource. • The framework provided by NWI has been invaluable. With well researched documents, clear and logical materials designed for multiple audiences, and sharing research finding, this community has been able to use the information effectively. The quality of the products is outstanding and creates credibility. Thank you. • I really think the necessary conditions needs more attention. I think the materials are excellent at highlighting this as an issue-Now we need some tools in this area. I think you have done a great job of bringing people together. • There's undoubtedly been positive impact, however, a survey isn't really going to tell us the specifics we need to move forward. We should be tracking downloads of the products and doing follow-up semi-structured interviews of the users, then use that info to pursue other questions about impact and next steps. • Having access to the website and resources through the links has been essential in being able to provide high fidelity wraparound in our community. • Incredible and valuable avenue for dissemination of w/a process • I believe the work done to create a national standard in the way wraparound services delivered is very important. [Our state] has struggled with making sure that the services provided are of the same quality in all communities. Through the credentialing process and the ongoing coaching and training this is becoming more of the norm than the exception. Billing/productivity continues to be a struggle with providing high fidelity wraparound services. • NWI has given more consistency to the consultants and trainers who support the implementation of wraparound across the world. • Recent activities have been a huge boon to our state by giving a consistent framework to measure against. • The NWI has had been a very positive and motivating force in creating and building support for the implementation of high quality Wraparound. The tools and resources developed by the NWI have helped our agency to enhance and expand our staff's understanding and practice of strengths-based, individualized, and culturally competent practice. • Serving as a centralized resource for information has made learning about wraparound easy. • I forgot to add this to the previous pages - the WFI has had a great impact in [our state]. To be able to measure our fidelity positively impacts families as well as programs. • NWI has been a forum that has generated a focal point beyond individual communities and contributors for the field. This has increased the perceived legitimacy of the field by those who know less about what it is. • Leadership. The leaders in NWI are people to admire, in terms of the work they do. They are mentors to the field. This is very important. Bringing together all the advanced leaders and practitioners every year at NWI workgroup has a positive impact on the historical movement.

TABLE 9 (continued)

Other comments re: POSITIVE IMPACTS

- WERT tools
 - NWI has the ability to pull together varying groups of people connected to High Fidelity Wraparound. I believe that in this regard the NWI has compiled an enormous amount of information that they are now making available to all those interested in this process. This certainly will have an impact on the field. In addition, by bringing together those that are highly involved in Wraparound, new ideas practice and research ideas emerge that can then be organized and pushed forward.
-

TABLE 10

Other comments re: NEGATIVE IMPACTS

- Does not apply
- The only thing that begins to come to mind here is the possibility that an organization can so define Wraparound service planning so that it takes away from the creativity of the process as well as detracting the individual intricacies that each community has in implementing Wraparound. NWI does a great job, though, at providing the "elemental" or necessary things for communities to grow their own wraparound community.
- People affiliated with NWI have been making presentations that "play into the hands" of the bureaucrats who are promoting the activity described in #37. You should stop being a party to that. I attended a meeting where this occurred, unfortunately. Maybe the NWI wasn't aware of the purposes to which its input was being applied.
- The NWI may have created a market for consultants with limited experience but I am not sure what could have been done to prevent this. I worry about sustainability long term and that the organization/person needs to be a neutral entity.
- I worry that the NWI is becoming too involved in defining practice. In order to serve the "top of the triangle" kids effectively, wraparound must continue to be an individualized intervention.
- Only potential impact is creating an environment that does not promote creativity and adaptability of implementation for Wraparound. Too often we seek answers from others rather than benefit from the lessons learned we have to offer. The NWI should continue to promote others to innovate as it relates to Wraparound implementation and quality improvement measures. Because I believe we are clear that there is no prescription for Wraparound implementation, rather opportunities to create a team of committed, interested, and knowledgeable people to help a family to develop a better quality of life, including a system that supports Wraparound.
- None....except I think the tools on the web site could be better vetted and described. I think it is important to make sure that we don't share (old) items that don't overtly share family driven practice and also vet the items we share on the web site for quality.
- The only one I can think of now is the user's guide for families. I think it is done ok but our families have a hard time understanding what wraparound is. Maybe it is all around of not understanding the process that just takes time and being part of before they see what it is we are trying to help them with.
- I would like to see us at the Initiative develop core trainings for Family Partners that go beyond theory-also for youth support partners which is dwindling off.
- None: The NWI makes every effort to have clear communication and to address issues that may arise.

TABLE 10 (continued)

Other comments re: NEGATIVE IMPACTS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about the potential to make wraparound so commercialized and package it up like other EBP's in such away that it becomes impossible to implement and sustain in community mental health settings - for example; developing strict standards and credentialing processes, etc. • I really can think of no negative impacts. • NWI should approach policy makers more directly as a resource that can improve system changes. The value of the think tank is not often felt within a State system. NWI should have a mechanism to share their message and material with State policy makers. • I don't think the "library" of tools available on the NWI site is well known. • There's been a quality of religion (as in passionate beliefs; sticking solely value definitions; not looking for assumptions that have been made; etc) in wraparound philosophy/practice for some time. The process of consensus in developing NWI products hasn't helped challenge this. Calling the 10 principles "the ten commandments" is an isomorph/example. Another was changing the name of one of the principles again. We haven't really succeeded in normalizing and learning from failures, nor have we challenged "group-think". • At times, members seem to be at odds or territorial about wraparound. • Not a single one • The only negative comment is that more families receiving or having received wraparound services find it difficult to be involved in the places where the decisions are made. This is a continuing struggle on all levels. • A decision that Wraparound is great had been made prior to the development of much of the work and I am concerned that some of the work is skewed by the closed mined opinions of a few that play a very critical role in the NWI. • NWI has been a forum for the further development of consensus about what this is, in a strength based vein we have tackled what we agree on while ignoring what we may differ on. This has limited the impact that the process has had. • At this time in our catchment area NWI appears to be influential in the upper levels of state government and in the contracting agencies but its influence hasn't spread to partners or families in terms of how the partner agencies integrate into the process based upon NWI research and materials. Instead there seems to be concern that contracting agencies are trying to determine how the partner does their work rather than recognizing the research and evidence requires integration beyond collaboration. • Does not apply. • The only thing that begins to come to mind here is the possibility that an organization can so define Wraparound service planning so that it takes away from the creativity of the process as well as detracting the individual intricacies that each community has in implementing Wraparound. NWI does a great job, though, at providing the "elemental" or necessary things for communities to grow their own wraparound community.

TABLE 11

Other comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Once again thanks. • I wish NWI would take a more assertive role in promoting the Wraparound Fidelity Index as a means of evaluating whether or not a given treatment delivery system actually is (or is not) implementing "high fidelity wraparound." • The fourth goal could be expanded greatly. Let's have some national NWI conferences. • Thanks for all the hard work. You did produce many useful tools, documents, and resource information that are being utilized in many places. • I think 36 would be greater if there was funding available to do conferences on a larger scale. • Thanks for inviting feedback. This format was confusing. Questions seemed backwards; tough to figure out exactly what type of info you were looking for. • Perhaps develop a hands on article to help Program Directors develop fidelity policies/hands on procedures. • This is an initiative that must continue. I believe that the impact of NWI has only just begun to spread, and stopping now would severely hamper the progress that has been made. • Keep up the good work! • I gain from every NWI meeting or project. Keep up your work. • I would like to see NWI develop a certification process that helps identify high quality wraparound and which provides a ladder for lower performing systems to get there. • NWI should be more like the National Resource Centers - and offer more consultant organizational work for States that want to advance hi fidelity wraparound. • NWI is a vital, necessary resource to the child-serving field and to the systems of care movement in particular. Now is not the time to reduce the capacity of NWI. We need to strongly focus on gathering rigorous data to prove the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of the wraparound approach, including on specific subpopulations of focus, especially to secure/protect public service system financial support for wraparound; and we need to continue to refine our teaching, QA and workforce development approaches based on ongoing analysis of above data. NWI is an absolutely vital pillar upon which these two efforts must be able to depend for at least the next 3-5 years. • How about international wraparound? • Please keep up the excellent work of NWI and keep the products coming. • I think NWI should develop the next step standards for HFW and work with [other organizations] to help develop an assessment instrument specific to wraparound.