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Agenda for this session

- Part 2: 1:30pm – 3:00pm
  - Introduction to the NWI and its resources
  - Building meaningful youth involvement into wraparound
  - Community and system supports for wraparound: An overview
  - System support for wraparound: How it is measured
  - Activity: Community Support Jeopardy!
  - Review of wraparound outcomes studies
The National Wraparound Initiative

- In 2004, stakeholders—including families, youth, providers, researchers, trainers, administrators and others—came together in a collaborative effort to better specify the wraparound practice model, compile specific strategies and tools, and disseminate information about how to implement wraparound in a way that can achieve positive outcomes for youth and families.

- [www.nwi.pdx.edu](http://www.nwi.pdx.edu)
the national wraparound initiative

In 2004, stakeholders—including families, youth, providers, researchers, trainers, administrators and others—came together in a collaborative effort to better specify the wraparound practice model, compile specific strategies and tools, and disseminate information about how to implement wraparound in a way that can achieve positive outcomes for youth and families. The NWI now supports youth, families, and communities through work that emphasizes four primary functions:

- Supporting community-level planning and implementation
- Promoting professional development of wraparound staff
- Ensuring accountability
- Sustaining a vibrant and interactive national community of practice

The NWI is membership supported. You can join the NWI to help continue this important work!
The National Wraparound Initiative (NWI) works to promote understanding about the components and benefits of wraparound, and to provide the field with resources to facilitate high quality and consistent wraparound implementation.

The NWI is membership supported. You can support this important work!!

### The National Wraparound Initiative

In 2004, state researchers, practitioners, and community leaders came together in a collaborative to compile and share information about how to implement the wraparound model at the community level. The National Wraparound Initiative (NWI) was formed.

The NWI is membership supported. You can support this important work!!

### Resources

- Supporting community-level plans
- Promoting professional development
- Ensuring accountability
- Sustaining a vibrant and interactive community

The NWI is membership supported. You can support this important work!!

### Upcoming Trainings & Events

- NWI presents at California Wraparound Institute – June 7, 2010
  Webinar: Accountability and Quality Assurance in Wraparound

### Theory of Change

- Ten principles
- Phases and activities
- Implementation guide
- User's guide
- Manual de usoario
- Family partner/principles
- Family partner/activities
- NWI impact

### Implementation Overview

- Evidence base
- Bibliography
- Wraparound research
- Implementation overview
- Webinars
- Johnny Chaos Comic

### Members & Affiliates Section

NWI members and affiliates can log in [here](#) to access job postings, bulletin boards, the NWI blog, members and providers directories, “beta” versions of new resources.
Introduction

Welcome to the Resource Guide to Wraparound—a collection of articles, tools, and resources that represent the expertise, experience, and shared work of the members of the National Wraparound Initiative. In the Resource Guide, you will find a variety of different types of contributions, including:

- Central products from the National Wraparound Initiative, including descriptions of the wraparound principles and practice model;
- Examples of how different communities and programs have implemented wraparound and supported its implementation;
- Stories from youth, families, and communities;
- Review articles about the theory and effectiveness of wraparound; and
- Appendices containing tools and resources that can be used in everyday practice.

This Guide is a work in progress, and our intention is to update and expand the contents to reflect the ongoing evolution of thinking about
Meaningful youth participation...

- What do we mean when we say youth are *meaningfully involved* in planning?
Aren’t We Doing That Already?

• What steps have we taken? What’s going right?
  –

• What are the challenges? What seems to go wrong?
  –
Aren't We Doing That Already? Research says....

- Research shows that few youth *meaningfully* participate in their education, care, and treatment team planning:
  - Schools/IEP
  - Systems of care
  - Wraparound

- Professionals are also dissatisfied with the level of youth participation
What's to be Gained?

- Why is it a good idea for young people to be involved in planning for their own treatment, education, and lives?
  - 
- What happens when young people are not meaningfully involved?
  - 

AMPlify!
What’s to be Gained?
Research says…

- Engagement increases when people feel they have a choice
  - Choice = more interest, excitement, and confidence
  - When adolescents choose activities, they have more positive mood and higher well-being AND they perform better

- Learning to make plans and achieve goals is an essential life skill. People with higher self-efficacy/self-determination tend to:
  - be more optimistic and hopeful, persist in face of obstacles
  - have better mental health, cope better and avoid depression
  - adopt healthy habits and maintain behavior change
  - do better after high school (youth with disabilities)
The Achieve My Plan! Project is...

- A research project to develop and test an intervention to increase youth participation in team planning
- Advisory Board creates materials/intervention, advises on research, makes presentations
- What would be the characteristics of an intervention with best chance of success?
  - Feasible within resources of agencies
  - Fit with what people are already doing—“module” for wraparound
  - Appealing
    - Address concerns of providers and caregivers
    - Be engaging for youth
  - Increases participation in ways that are obvious (and measurable) and positive

AMPLify!
AMP (Achieve My Plan)

Project Media

**Video - Youth Participation in Planning: Why It Matters**

In their own words and with stories from their own lives, youth describe what it feels like not to have any say in the plans that are made for their treatment, care, education and future. These young people, all of whom have been the focus of numerous multi-system plans, also describe the rare occasions when they were encouraged to participate meaningfully in the planning process, and how those experiences left them feeling hopeful and motivated.

Caregivers and providers contribute their perspectives as well, speaking about how positive experiences with youth participation in planning helped them overcome their prior fears and skepticism about including youth voice in the planning process. This video was conceived and created by AMP project advisors—youth, caregivers, and providers—in collaboration with RTC staff. Below you may choose either the file with or without closed-caption capability.

![Youth Participation Video](image)

![Youth Participation Video: Closed-Caption Version](image)

Leave feedback and discuss this video on our [Featured Discussions page](link)!
New Youth Participation Research Summary, Handbook, and Quiz

Human service and educational agencies and systems often convene teams to work collaboratively on plans for serving children or youth. Unfortunately, it is often true that these plans are created for youth, with little input or buy-in from the young people themselves. The latest publication in the "youth participation" series, Involving Youth in Planning for Their Education, Treatment, and Services: Research Tells Us We Should Be Doing Better, summarizes available research indicating that involving youth meaningfully and successfully in planning for their own future is possible and provides benefits for youth and their families. You may order 5 or more printed copies of the 8-page booklets for $0.75 each (includes shipping) via our Publications page, or you can download the PDF.

Another recent publication, Best Practices for Increasing Meaningful Youth Participation in Collaborative Team Planning, shares some information about how to create plans with youth, so that youth will see the plans as a means to help them move towards important life goals. You may order 5 or more printed copies of the 9-page booklets for $0.95 each (includes shipping) via our Publications page, or you can download the PDF.

Does your organization support meaningful youth participation in collaborative team planning? A recent 14-item Self-Assessment Quiz can help you identify your organization's strengths regarding youth participation, as well as areas in which you can do more. You may order 5 or more printed copies of the Quizzes for $0.95 each (includes shipping) via our Publications page, or you can download the PDF.

2007 Research and Training Center on Family Support and Children's Mental Health, Portland State University, Portland, Oregon.
Best Practices

- What are things that organizations, teams, individuals on teams can do to support youth participation?

- What are some things that should be avoided because they inhibit youth participation?
Best Practices

- Best practices for supporting meaningful participation, based on review of existing literature, input from advisors, and practice/testing of AMP

- Supporting participation requires:
  - Organizational commitment
  - Preparation for youth
  - During the meeting: meeting structures and interactions that promote youth participation
  - Accountability
Organizational Commitment

- Organizational culture that values youth participation
  - Build understanding of what it is; viewed as a priority, feasible
  - Practically supported
    - Time allotted
    - Training provided
    - Structures and expectations are changed
  - Values that promote youth participation become part of organizational beliefs and practices more broadly

- AMP requires commitment to certain structures/expectations, provides initial organizational training (half day) plus consultation and ongoing support
Preparation

- Youth knows what’s going to happen, how he/she will contribute in each part of the meeting
- AMP trains staff to act as AMP “coaches.” Provides coaching fidelity assessment (including video), certification and ongoing coaching
- Youth works with the “AMP coach” to:
  - Review and customize the ground rules
  - Decide “activities” to contribute to the agenda
  - Review the agenda
    - Option to handle uncomfortable topics outside the meeting
  - Plan what to say for each agenda item
  - Practice communication skills for the meeting
  - Plan what to do to stay calm and focused
  - Plan how the youth will get support—if needed—during the meeting
- More intensive preparation before the first AMP meeting. “Booster” sessions afterward
During the Meeting

- **No surprises!**
  - The meeting that the youth prepared for is the meeting that happens
  - Focus is on the plan, not on what happened last week or crisis of the moment. **No alterations to the agenda**

- **Active facilitation:** Facilitator/AMP coach work together
  - Keep the meeting moving forward
  - Ensure everyone is respectful and strengths based, stick to ground rules
  - Are on the lookout for common situations that derail meetings

- **AMP provides half-day training to facilitators and coaches,** video examples of common ways meetings get derailed, provides feedback based on AMP surveys and videotaped meetings
When Meetings are Derailed

• Crisis takes over, items not on the agenda
• “Runaway team member”
• Badgering the youth
• “Therapizing”
• People not following the ground rules
• People wanting to help too much
Accountability

- Accountability to the plan...
  - **Record decisions**. In subsequent meetings, follow up on who did what
  - Youth has a record of commitments/action steps and access to a copy of the plan

- Assess your efforts
  - “fidelity”—did the youth get preparation? Were meeting structures and procedures followed?
  - satisfaction
  - outcomes: youth participation and empowerment
Satisfaction Data

First meeting post-AMP (n=198)

- Much better than usual
- Better than usual
- Worse than usual
- Much worse than usual
• “[Youth’s] voice was heard.”- Parent
• “[Youth] much more attentive and involved”- Team member
• “[Youth] interacted and stayed connected much more than at other meetings. The adults were stopped from lecturing or ‘talking at’ [youth].” – Team member.
• “Things were being accomplished and we were less sidetracked.” Team member
• “Yes! It was led by me!”-Youth
• “I led it!” –Youth
Pre-Post-AMP Survey: Changes in Youth Empowerment and Participation
Supporting wraparound practice

- Wraparound practice is not easy! It requires support from the host organization or agency and from the system.

- Thus, in addition to the Principles and the Phases and Activities, we also need to ensure “Necessary Support Conditions”
  - Without this support, even well-meaning facilitators, team members, supervisors, and agencies will likely experience frustration and “burnout”
The implementation context

Hospitable System
* Funding, Policies

Supportive Organizations
* Training, supervision, interagency coordination and collaboration

Effective Team
* Process + Principles + Skills
Defining “necessary” elements of the implementation context

- Initial research using a “backward mapping” strategy, qualitative approach
- Stakeholder consensus building through the NWI to generate items, refine, group
- Pilot study in seven communities—279 participants—to assess reliability, validity
- Study with ten additional communities underway
- Designed as an efficient, low-cost way to provide useful information to communities while also yielding high quality data for research purposes.
Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory: What is it?

- Web-based stakeholder survey comprising ~40 items grouped within six implementation themes (factors)
- Each item has two descriptions that anchor each end of a Likert scale
  - One anchor describes “least development”—what conditions in a community look like in the absence of a collaborative effort to provide comprehensive care
  - The other anchor describes “fully developed”—what conditions look like when there is an effective, collaborative effort in place
- Locally-nominated stakeholders rate each item on a scale from “least developed” to “fully developed”
### Sample Items

#### Item 1A. Collaborative Oversight

**Fully developed**

There is a collaborative body ("collaborative oversight team") for joint planning and decision-making through which community partners oversee the development and implementation of the transition project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully Developed</th>
<th>Almost there</th>
<th>Midway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Least developed**

There is no collaborative group that brings together community partners to design or implement services, change policies, or create infrastructure so that they can better serve transition-aged young people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Least developed</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Item 1C. Influential Youth/Young Adult Voice

**Fully developed**

Youth and young adults with significant experience in systems and/or services are influential members of the collaborative oversight team, and they take active roles in decisions and discussions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully Developed</th>
<th>Almost there</th>
<th>Midway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Least developed**

Youth and young adults are not actively involved in decision-making, or are uninvolved or "token" members of community-level groups that plan or oversee efforts to serve transition-aged young people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Least developed</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Types of program and system support for Wraparound

1. **Community partnership:** Do we have collaboration across our key systems and stakeholders?

2. **Collaborative action:** Do the stakeholders take concrete steps to translate the wraparound philosophy into concrete policies, practices and achievements?

3. **Fiscal policies:** Do we have the funding and fiscal strategies to meet the needs of children participating in wraparound?

4. **Service array:** Do teams have access to the services and supports they need to meet families’ needs?

5. **Human resource development:** Do we have the right jobs, caseloads, and working conditions? Are people supported with coaching, training, and supervision?

6. **Accountability:** Do we use tools that help us make sure we’re doing a good job?


Overview of implementation support: www.nwi.pdx.edu/NWI-book/Chapters/Walker-5a.1-%28support-wrap-implement%29.pdf
"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."

—NWII Impact Survey Respondent

implementation

This section provides a basic overview of wraparound implementation, and to introduce you to the six implementation areas that are offered in this “Implementation Support” section of the NWII website.

1. What are the main things to plan in the development of implementation?

Every community implements wraparound in their own unique local conditions. However, each community also needs to complete key implementation tasks in various areas, such as setting goals, funding the wraparound process, developing a plan, training and tracking outcomes, and so on. There are no rules about where a community or initiative must start in terms of building wraparound infrastructure; however, research and experience tells us that it is critically important that a core set of supports gets put in place.

This “Implementation Support” resource is structured around six implementation areas or “themes” that have been identified in research...
human resource development and support

As conceived by the National Wraparound Initiative, implementation of wraparound requires attention to six types of community supports. One of these areas is Human Resource Development and Support.

According to the Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory, Human Resource Development and Support in wraparound is achieved when the policy and funding context supports wraparound staff and partner agency staff to work in a manner that allows full implementation of the wraparound model.

Wraparound projects require a thoughtful and deliberate approach to building staff and personnel capacity. Effective human resource development requires both organizational alignment and individual accountability to assure effective operations. The resources in this section provide information on how stakeholders involved in the wraparound effort can achieve such alignment and effective operations. Questions addressed include:

1. What represents adequate staffing in a wraparound project?
2. What are key areas to consider in building human resource development and support?
3. What are key human resource development cautions?
4. What is the “take-home” message?

1. What represents adequate staffing in a wraparound project?

The first concern that leadership in a wraparound project should consider is the allocation of staff resources. Certain functions must be carried out within wraparound, and it is important that the
CSWI Report to community includes:

- Highlights of findings
- Response rate
  - Employees (facilitators, parent partners, supervisors)
  - “Key” respondents
  - People with particular roles in the project
- Characteristics of respondents (race, sex, service experience)
- Total score (and how this compares to the mean of the comparison communities) and “grand mean”
- Theme means (and comparison)
- Individual item means (and comparison)
- Particular areas of strength and challenge
- Respondent comments
Sample report: Theme means

Overall and Theme Means: Site 8 and Comparison

Overall Mean

**Theme 1**: Community Partnerships
- Site 8: 1.94
- Comparison: 1.97

**Theme 2**: Collaborative Action
- Site 8: 1.42
- Comparison: 1.19

**Theme 3**: Fiscal Policies and Sustainability
- Site 8: 2.18
- Comparison: 2.83

**Theme 4**: Availability of Services and Supports
- Site 8: 2.07

**Theme 5**: Human Resource Development

**Theme 6**: Accountability

Least Developed | Midway | Fully Developed
Sample report: Theme means

Overall and Theme Means: Site 13 and Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Mean</th>
<th>Site 13</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme 1: Community Partnerships</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 2: Collaborative Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 3: Fiscal Policies and Sustainability</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 4: Availability of Services and Supports</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 5: Human Resource Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 6: Accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Least Developed | Midway | Fully Developed
Sample report: Item means

**Theme 5: Site 5 and Comparison Item Means**

5.1: Wraparound job expectations
5.2: Agency job expectations
5.3: Caseload sizes
5.4: Professional development
5.5: Supervision
5.6 Compensation for wraparound staff

- Site 5
- Comparison

Least Developed | Midway | Fully Developed
The How of Wraparound: Summary

- Implementing wraparound requires that practitioners and community members understand and embrace its principles.
- Full implementation, however, requires that teams undertake some basic activities.
- Implementing the phases and activities, and ensuring adherence to the principles, requires support from the host agency and the overall system.
Is there evidence for wraparound?

- Controlled studies
  - Nine controlled (experimental or quasi-experimental studies) have been published
  - First meta-analysis published (Suter & Bruns, 2009)
  - First NIMH-funded studies of wraparound underway

- Research summaries and updates available on the NWI website
Results from Nevada:
Impact on Child Functioning

![Graph showing impact on child functioning over time for Traditional Svcs and Wraparound services.]

Bruns et al. (2006)
Results from Clark County, WA
Impact on juvenile justice outcomes

• *Connections* (wraparound) group (N=110) 3 times less likely to commit felony offense than comparison group (N=98)

• *Connections* group took 3 times longer on average to commit first offense after baseline

• *Connections* youth showed “significant improvement in behavioral and emotional problems, increases in behavioral and emotional strengths, and improved functioning at home at school, and in the community”

Pullman et al. (2006)
Findings from our meta-analysis of seven controlled studies

- Strong results in favor of wraparound found for Living Situation outcomes (placement stability and restrictiveness)
- A small to medium sized effect found for:
  - Mental health (behaviors and functioning)
  - School (attendance/GPA), and
  - Community (e.g., JJ, re-offending) outcomes
- The overall effect size of all outcomes in the 7 studies is about the same (.35) as for “evidence-based” treatments, when compared to services as usual (Weisz et al., 2005)
Other unpublished outcomes of wraparound

- Greater/more rapid achievement of permanency when implemented in child welfare (Oklahoma)
- Reduced recidivism among adult prisoners
  - 95% survival at 27 mos post-release for “PrisonWrap” condition vs. 70% for TAU
- Reduction in costs associated with residential placements (Milwaukee, LA County, Washington State, Kansas, many other jurisdictions)
Examples of Community Outcomes

Wraparound Milwaukee

- Reduction in placement disruption rate from 65% to 30%
- School attendance for child welfare-involved children improved from 71% days attended to 86% days attended
- 60% reduction in arrest rates for delinquent youth from one year prior to enrollment to one year post enrollment
- Decrease in average daily RTC population from 375 to 50
- Reduction in psychiatric inpatient days from 5,000 days to less than 200 days per year
- Average monthly cost of $4,200 – all inclusive cost (compared to $7,200 for RTC, $6,000 for juvenile detention, $18,000 for psychiatric hospitalization)
The National Wraparound Initiative is based in Portland, Oregon. For more information, visit our website:

www.nwi.pdx.edu

The National Wraparound Initiative is funded by the Center for Mental Health Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, United States Department of Health and Human Services.