

The WFI-EZ is a self-report measure that assesses the degree to which Wraparound care coordination is implemented with adherence to its principles and practice model. The measure also includes items related to satisfaction with Wraparound and basic youth outcomes. The WFI-EZ can be administered via interview or as self-report and can be completed in about 5 to 10 minutes. There are 4 versions of the measure, one for each of the following types of respondents: Caregiver, Youth, Care Coordinator, and Other Team Member.

### ASSESSING WRAPAROUND FIDELITY:

All versions of the WFI-EZ include 25 items designed to assess Wraparound fidelity. Participants are asked to indicate the extent to which they agree that each indicator of Wraparound fidelity has been achieved. Each item is rated on a 5-point index ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree.” Fidelity items are organized by the five core elements of Wraparound as promoted by the National Wraparound Implementation Center (NWIC): 1) Outcomes-Based; 2) Team-Based; 3) Natural Supports; 4) Needs-Based; and 5) Strengths- and Family-Driven. WrapStat provides scores for each of these core elements along with a Total WFI-EZ score that reflects overall fidelity. Scores are computed as percentages and can range from 0 to 100.

#### Establishing fidelity benchmarks:

To help WFI-EZ users interpret fidelity scores, the Wraparound Evaluation and Research Team (WERT) at the University of Washington has established benchmarks that can be used to assess the degree to which local implementation of Wraparound meets basic standards. To determine benchmarks, the WERT team used both **norm-referencing** and **criterion-referencing**.

**Norm-referencing** simply means calculating the measures of central tendency (e.g., mean scores) and variability (e.g., standard deviations) for all WFI-EZ user sites and examining the distribution of scores by user site. Sites using similar data collection approaches (i.e., those that achieve representative samples and survey completion rates) that score significantly higher than the average organization or initiative can be considered to be “higher” fidelity sites; and those that score lower can be considered “lower” fidelity sites.

**Criterion-referencing** is perhaps more important and refers to a process of determining what WFI-EZ scores are associated with youth outcomes or other factors shown by research to be associated with model-adherent Wraparound implementation. To do this, the team identified relevant factors related to high-quality Wraparound implementation, and then characterized WFI-EZ user sites and jurisdictions based on the presence or absence of those factors. The team then calculated site- or initiative-level WFI-EZ scores and statistically associated them with these factors. “Criteria” used in this process included:

- 1. Basic Wraparound elements.** Section A of the WFI-EZ includes three items that assess the degree to which the most basic and non-negotiable elements of Wraparound are present. These include: 1) The presence of a Wraparound Team; 2) Creation of a written plan; and 3) Regular team meetings. Past research using WFI-EZ data have demonstrated that presence of these three elements is associated with fidelity scores as well as youth outcomes.
- 2. Receipt of structured training, coaching, and workforce support.** Statistical analyses have indicated that organizations that receive technical support from organizations such as the National Wraparound Implementation Center (NWIC) and other entities that provide research-based training and coaching have higher WFI-EZ scores than those that do not receive such support.
- 3. Satisfaction with Wraparound processes.** Previous studies have found that caregiver and youth satisfaction are strongly correlated with WFI-EZ fidelity scores.
- 4. Youth and Family outcomes.** Given that past research has found associations between Wraparound fidelity and youth and family outcomes, we identified WFI-EZ user organizations and initiatives with data available (1) on percent of youth successfully discharged and (2) from standardized measures (e.g., the Child and Adolescent Functional Assessment Scale or CAFAS; the Ohio Scales) and constructed groups with higher and lower success rates and/or greater and lesser positive slopes of change.

To establish benchmark scores for the WFI-EZ, the WERT team calculated mean scores for groups that met various combinations of each of the above-mentioned predictors of Wraparound fidelity. These analyses were conducted separately for the Caregiver/Youth forms and the Care Coordinator/Other Team Member forms since the satisfaction items are not included on the surveys for the latter two respondent groups. Based on these analyses, four categories of fidelity emerged: 1) High Fidelity; 2) Adequate Fidelity; 3) Borderline Fidelity; and 4) Inadequate Fidelity (See Tables 1 and 2 for score ranges within each category).

Table 1. Fidelity Benchmarks for Caregiver and Youth Forms

CATEGORY	TOTAL WFI-EZ	OUTCOMES BASED	EFFECTIVE TEAMWORK	NATURAL SUPPORTS	NEEDS BASED	STRENGTH & FAMILY DRIVEN
<b>HIGH FIDELITY</b>	80+	90+	75+	75+	85+	90+
<b>ADEQUATE</b>	75-79	80-89	70-74	65-74	75-84	80-89
<b>BORDERLINE</b>	70-74	75-79	65-69	60-64	70-74	70-79
<b>INADEQUATE</b>	< 70	< 75	< 65	< 60	< 70	< 70

Table 2. Fidelity Benchmarks for Care Coordinator and Other Team Member Forms

CATEGORY	TOTAL WFI-EZ	OUTCOMES BASED	EFFECTIVE TEAMWORK	NATURAL SUPPORTS	NEEDS BASED	STRENGTH & FAMILY DRIVEN
<b>HIGH FIDELITY</b>	75+	75+	70+	70+	80+	85+
<b>ADEQUATE</b>	70-74	70-74	65-69	65-69	75-79	80-84
<b>BORDERLINE</b>	65-69	65-69	60-64	60-64	70-74	70-79
<b>INADEQUATE</b>	< 65	< 65	< 60	< 60	< 70	< 70

### Establishing satisfaction benchmarks:

Both the Caregiver and Youth WFI-EZ forms include four questions designed to assess satisfaction with Wraparound. Each question asks respondents to rate their experiences on a five-point index, and as with the fidelity questions, a composite score can be calculated with values ranging from 0 to 100. To establish benchmarks for the 4-item composite satisfaction index, the WERT team again used the norm- and criterion-referencing procedures outlined above. Benchmark categories are included in Table 3.

Table 3. Satisfaction Benchmarks for Caregiver and Youth Forms

CATEGORY	SATISFACTION
<b>HIGH SATISFACTION</b>	93.75+
<b>ADEQUATE SATISFACTION</b>	87.5-93.74
<b>BORDERLINE SATISFACTION</b>	75-87.49
<b>INADEQUATE SATISFACTION</b>	< 75