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Six “Necessary conditions” for Wraparound success

- Human Resource Development
- Community Partnership
- Collaborative Action
- Access to Needed Supports and Services
- Fiscal Policies
- Accountability
Theme 6: Accountability

According to the Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory, when a wraparound initiative is fully supported in the area of accountability, the community has implemented mechanisms to monitor wraparound fidelity, service quality, and outcomes, and to assess the quality and development of the overall wraparound effort.

This section provides information regarding how stakeholders can monitor wraparound fidelity, quality, and outcomes in the wraparound effort.

1. What are the key topics to consider in the accountability for the wraparound process?

Communities implement wraparound for a variety of different reasons.
Why do we need implementation quality checks in Wraparound?

• Wraparound teams often fail to:
  – Incorporate full complement of key individuals
  – Engage youth in community activities, things they do well, or activities to develop friendships
  – Use family/community strengths
  – Engage natural supports
  – Use flexible funds to help implement strategies
  – Consistently assess outcomes and satisfaction

• Fidelity data allows you to connect the details of Wraparound practice to youth/family outcomes
Uses of Fidelity/Implementation Tools

• Formative Assessment
  – A starting point before launching or re-booting implementation

• Progress monitoring
  – To guide implementation efforts, and build action plans

• Annual Self-Assessment
  – To facilitate sustained implementation and inform partners

• Accountability
  – Hold sites, regions, providers accountable for quality
There are many ways to measure fidelity to the Wraparound model

- Have facilitators and team members fill out activity checklists
- Look at plans of care and meeting notes
- Sit in on and observe team meetings
- Interview the people who know—parents, youth, facilitators, program heads
A multi-method approach to assessing the quality and context of individualized care planning and management for children and youth with complex needs and their families.

- Interview: Wraparound Fidelity Index, v. 4
- Survey: short form, WFI-EZ
- Observation: Team Observation Measure, Version 2.0
- Chart Review: Document Assessment and Review Tool, v.2
- Program & System Assessments: Stakeholder Survey / Standards Assessment
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Wraparound Implementation and Practice Standards

• WHAT?
  – A self-assessment and QI Planning Guide.
  – Consensus building and planning process
  – Infuse evidence-based implementation strategies
  – Encourage healthy organizational functioning

• FOR WHO?
  – Wraparound provider organizations
  – The entity responsible for hiring and supervising Wrap Care Coordinators
  – States or systems with multiple providers/Care Management Entities (CMEs)
Standards Organized into Seven Areas

Five Wraparound Implementation Standards Areas

Hospitable System Conditions

1. Competent Staff
2. Effective Leadership
3. Facilitative Organizational Support
4. Utility-focused Accountability Mechanisms

Two Output-Related Standards Areas

- Fidelity: High Quality Wraparound Practice
- Outcomes: Improved Youth and Family Functioning
## Implementation Area 1: Competent Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competent Staff Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1A</strong> Stable Workforce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1B</strong> Qualified Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1C</strong> Rigorous Hiring Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1D</strong> Effective Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1E</strong> Initial Apprenticeship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1F</strong> Ongoing Skills-based Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1G</strong> Meaningful Performance Assessments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Implementation Area 3: Facilitative Organizational Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitative Organizational Support Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3A Manageable Workloads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B Adequate Compensation and Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C High Morale and Positive Climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D Fiscally Sustainable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3E Routine Oversight of Key Organizational Operations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Wraparround Implementation and Practice Standards (WIPS) Self-assessment and Quality Improvement Planning Guide will walk you and your colleagues through an easy-to-follow consensus building and planning process to help your Wraparround provider organization infuse and maintain evidence-based implementation strategies to ensure healthy organizational functioning, high-quality staff and services, and the best outcomes for youth and their families.

WHO IS THIS PROCESS FOR?
The self-assessment and quality improvement planning process described in this guide is geared toward Wraparround Provider Organizations (WPOs), not larger systems of care or government or oversight bodies. When we use the term “WPO,” we mean the entity responsible for hiring and supervising Wraparround care coordinators (sometimes called facilitators or care managers). A single organization is the focal point of the standards, as many pertain to an organization’s policies, practices, and climate and culture. These things can vary dramatically from office to office; if your WPO has multiple locations that operate in different contexts, consider having each of these units conduct this process separately.

WHERE DID THESE STANDARDS COME FROM?
The Wraparround Implementation and Practice Quality Standards (WIPS) are appended to this document, starting on page 20. Their development is described the 2016 publication by the same name. The document is available here: https://nwi.pdx.edu/pdf/Wraparround-implementation-and-practice-quality-standards.pdf

HOW CAN WE LEARN MORE?
As an addendum to this guide we have prepared a resource list to highlight websites and documents that can help WPOs learn more about high-quality human services implementation and Wraparround practice. This resource list can be found at: NWI LINK

WIPS builds a systematic process around the existing standards

PHASE 1: PLANNING

1A. Assemble a Wraparound Quality Team
1B. Identify a Wraparound Quality Champion
1C. Hold a Planning Meeting

PHASE 2: ASSESSING

2A. Complete Individual Self-assessments
2B. Generate a Variation Report
2C. Hold a Consensus-Building Meeting
2D. Generate a Final Team-based WIPS Assessment Report

PHASE 3: ACTING AND MONITORING

3A. Hold an Initial Quality Improvement Planning Meeting
3B. Finalize Quality Improvement Plan
3C. Implement the Plan and Hold Regular CQI Meetings
Understanding this Summary.

This report is generated based on the information from the Wraparound Quality Team members provided individually and then discussed to come to consensus. The average rating for each domain is the average of your ratings for every indicator within the domain.

Average scores of 0.00-1.33 are classified as “Emerging” areas, 1.34-2.66 are classified as “Progressing” areas, and 2.67-4.00 are classified as areas of “Sustaining.”

SUSTAINABILITY DOMAINS

SUSTAINING

Average Rating

4.00 — Implementation Area 1: Competent Staff

PROGRESSING

Average Rating

2.50 — Implementation Area 2: Effective Leadership

1.75 — Implementation Area 3: Facilitative Organizational Leadership

EMERGING

Average Rating

1.25 — Implementation Area 4: Utility-Focused Accountability Mechanisms

0.55 — Implementation Area 5: Hospitable System Conditions

SELF-ASSESSMENT OF FIDELITY AND OUTCOMES

Average Rating

1.75 — Wraparound Fidelity

0.66 — Youth and Family Outcomes (Scale: 0-2)
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We are happy to announce a brand new fidelity tool, the Wraparound Document Assessment and Review Tool (DART).
We have recently finished pilot testing the tool with four communities, and are in the process of revising and finalizing the tool based on that pilot.
The DART is a document review tool that measures fidelity to the model using Plans of Care and supporting documents.

The tool includes **52 items** across **seven major sections**:

- Timely Engagement
- Meeting Attendance
- Fidelity
  - Driven by Strengths and Families
  - Natural and Community Supports
  - Based on Underlying Needs
  - Outcomes Based
- Safety Planning
- Crisis Response
- Transition Planning
- Outcomes
The DART is a document review tool that measures fidelity to the model using Plans of Care and supporting documents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1 MA DSF</td>
<td>At least one caregiver or close family member attended every Child and Family Team Meeting.</td>
<td>2 1 0 N/A Miss</td>
<td>N/A if the youth is emancipated or the age of majority or older and has chosen not to have a caregiver involved in planning. Miss if no record of meeting attendance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E1. AT LEAST ONE CAREGIVER OR CLOSE FAMILY MEMBER ATTENDED EVERY CHILD AND FAMILY TEAM MEETING.**

**NOTES:** The term “caregiver” refers to the person or persons with primary day-to-day responsibilities of caring for the child or youth. This can be a biological, adoptive, or foster parent. In cases where the youth is in group care, the professional in the group home or residential center with primary oversight of the youth’s care should attend Child and Family Team Meetings.

**SCORING**

2 if at least one caregiver or close family member attended every Child and Family Team Meeting.
1 if at least one caregiver or close family member attended some (50-99%) Child and Family Team Meetings.
0 if there a caregiver or close family member attended fewer than half (<50%) of the Child and Family Team Meetings.
N/A if the youth is emancipated or the age of majority or older AND has chosen not to have a caregiver involved in planning.
MISS if there is no record of meeting attendance in the file, or you are not able to determine a score based on the information provided. Please note what is missing in the comments sections.
What makes the DART different than our other tools?

1. It relies on **documentation**
   a) Also provides an opportunity to evaluate the quality and organization of the documentation itself
   b) Documentation is important!

2. It **covers the entire Wraparound process** for each family, from engagement to transition.
   a) Special attention is paid to how (and whether) things change over time. Are strategies changing? Is progress monitored? Does the team react appropriately to crisis events?

3. It is be **completed by a reviewer alone**
   a) It can be difficult to contact families or attend meetings. The DART requires nothing but access to documents and time.
Generally, our pilot testers were pleased with the tool.

When using the DART, I thought of specific improvements that could be made to Wraparound practice.

When reviewing DART results, I thought of specific improvements that could be made to Wraparound practice.

The DART collects important information that we do not currently capture otherwise.

The DART is easy to use.
Generally, our pilot testers were pleased with the tool

Our site had the **necessary documentation** to complete the DART

Most of the **work done in Wraparound is NOT documented**

It is always **clear how to score items** on the DART

The DART is **similar to other document review tools** I have used

The DART is **too long**. Some items should be removed.
But our pilot testers also had crucial feedback that we need to address before rolling out the tool to the field.

So stay tuned!
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The **Wraparound Fidelity Index Short Form** (WFI-EZ) was designed to address multiple aspects of the Wraparound process:

- **Wraparound Involvement (4 Items)**
- **Satisfaction (4 Items)**
- **Outcomes (9 Items)**
- **Fidelity (25 Items)**
  - Community Supports
  - Needs-Based
  - Strengths & Family Involvement
  - Outcomes-Based
  - Effective Teamwork
Psychometric properties of the WFI-EZ have not yet been fully assessed

- Pilot testing of the WFI-EZ has not included assessment of reliability and validity using a large sample
- WERT has collected WFI-EZ data from over 50 programs using WrapTrack and data-sharing agreements since its release
- These data can be used to answer a series of questions about wraparound fidelity measurement in the real world
Three main research questions

• What are the basic characteristics of the WFI-EZ?
  – Variability & Factor Structure

• What is the reliability of the measure?
  – Internal consistency, test-retest reliability, inter-rater consistency

• What evidence exists for its validity?
  – Construct Validity & Concurrent Validity
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Our team collected **Caregiver & Facilitator** WFI-EZ data from wraparound-providing organizations across the country collected between January 1, 2015 and June 30, 2017.

- **n = 4,701**
  Caregiver WFI-EZ Forms in final dataset

- **n = 36**
  National Sites Providing Data

- **n = 2,399**
  Facilitator WFI-EZ Forms matched to Caregiver Forms
The sample consisted of caregivers whose youth had been in services for an average of 7.5 months before fidelity data collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sample (n = 4,701)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age, years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>11.30 (5.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>0-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing (%)</td>
<td>99 (2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Service at time of WFI-EZ, months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>7.51 (4.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>3-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing (%)</td>
<td>1292 (27.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sample (n = 4,701)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/Missing</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/Missing</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African-American</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-Racial</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/Missing</td>
<td>4180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor Structure of the WFI-EZ Fidelity Items

• WFI-EZ Fidelity items are organized into five key elements, based on the theoretical underpinnings of Wraparound

• We conducted an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) to determine if there are other methods of clustering the fidelity items, and how they compare to the key elements

• The EFA process also allows for the determination of any redundant items or items that do not cluster well together
The final factor structure contained 20 items “arranged” into **four factors**; three of which had acceptable reliability ratings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Uniqueness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B20</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B21</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B22</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B24</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B25</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B15</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EFA identified **five Items** for removal from factor structure

- B1. My family and I had a major role in choosing the people on our wraparound team.
- B2. There are people providing services to my child and family who are not involved in my wraparound team. (R)
- B4. My wraparound team came up with creative ideas for our plan that were different from anything that had been tried before.
- B18. Our wraparound plan includes strategies that do not involve professional services (things our family can do ourselves or with help from friends, family and community).
- B23. I worry that the wraparound process will end before our needs have been met. (R)
Factor 1 contains 10 items that incorporate youth and family agency and voice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Key Element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>Being involved in wraparound has increased the support my child and family get from friends and family.</td>
<td>Community/Natural Supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>The wraparound process has helped my child and family build strong relationships with people we can count on.</td>
<td>Community/Natural Supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13</td>
<td>My family was linked to community resources I found valuable.</td>
<td>Needs-Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14</td>
<td>My wraparound team came up with ideas and strategies that were tied to things that my family likes to do.</td>
<td>Strengths &amp; Family Driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>I am confident that our wraparound team can find services or strategies to keep my child in the community over the long term.</td>
<td>Outcomes-Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B20</td>
<td>Because of wraparound, when a crisis happens, my family and I know what to do.</td>
<td>Outcomes-Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B21</td>
<td>Our wraparound team has talked about how we will know it is time for me and my family to transition out of formal wraparound.</td>
<td>Outcomes-Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B22</td>
<td>At each team meeting, my family and I give feedback on how well the wraparound process is working for us.</td>
<td>Effective Teamwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B24</td>
<td>Participating in wraparound has given me confidence that I can manage future problems.</td>
<td>Outcomes-Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B25</td>
<td>With help from our wraparound team, we have been able to get community support and services that meet our needs.</td>
<td>Outcomes-Based</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor 2 contains **5 items** that focus on creating and maintaining the youth’s **plan of care**.

### Factor 2: Care Planning (alpha = 0.8001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Key Element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>At the beginning of the wraparound process, my family described our vision of a better future to our team.</td>
<td>Strengths &amp; Family Driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>With help from members of our wraparound team, my family and I chose a small number of the highest priority needs to focus on.</td>
<td>Needs-Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>Our wraparound plan includes strategies that address the needs of other family members, in addition to my child.</td>
<td>Needs-Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>At every team meeting, my wraparound team reviews progress that has been made toward meeting our needs.</td>
<td>Needs-Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td>At each team meeting, our wraparound team celebrates at least one success or positive event.</td>
<td>Strengths &amp; Family Driven</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor 3 contains **3 items** that assess the **quality** of the Wraparound team.

**Factor 3: Team Quality** (alpha = 0.7604)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Key Element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>I sometimes feel like our team does not include the right people to help my child and family. (R)</td>
<td>Effective Teamwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Members of our wraparound team sometimes do not do the tasks they are assigned. (R)</td>
<td>Effective Teamwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B17</td>
<td>I sometimes feel like members of my wraparound team do not understand me and my family. (R)</td>
<td>Strengths &amp; Family Driven</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor 3 contains 3 items that assess the quality of the Wraparound team. Factor 4 contains 2 items on the quality of natural supports.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Key Element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B12</td>
<td>Our wraparound team does not include any friends, neighbors, or extended family members. (R)</td>
<td>Community/Natural Supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16</td>
<td>Our wraparound team includes people who are not paid to be there (e.g., friends, family, faith).</td>
<td>Community/Natural Supports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The national means of these new factors are comparable to the key elements’.
Three main research questions

• What are the basic characteristics of the WFI-EZ?
  – Variability & Factor Structure

• What is the reliability of the measure?
  – Internal consistency, test-retest reliability, inter-rater consistency

• What evidence exists for its validity?
  – Construct Validity & Concurrent Validity
The new factors demonstrate good to excellent **internal consistency**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1: Family Involvement</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2: Care Planning</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3: Team Quality</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4: Natural Supports</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inter-rater consistency and test-retest reliability.

• We assessed the fidelity factors and total score on n = 2,399 matched pairs of caregiver and facilitator WFI-EZ forms completed on the same youth to assess inter-rater consistency using intraclass correlations (ICCs)

• In a separate sample taken from 11 caregivers in Washington state, we assessed test-retest reliability based on two measurements of the WFI-EZ taken approximately one week apart
Relatively low ICCs point to some concordance but **differences** in perception of Wraparound fidelity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(n = 2,399)</th>
<th>Average (SD)</th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caregiver Forms</td>
<td>Facilitator Forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1: Family Involvement</td>
<td>0.75 (0.13)</td>
<td>0.76 (0.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2: Care Planning</td>
<td>0.86 (0.12)</td>
<td>0.84 (0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3: Team Quality</td>
<td>0.68 (0.2)</td>
<td>0.72 (0.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4: Natural Supports</td>
<td>0.61 (0.28)</td>
<td>0.56 (0.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.75 (0.11)</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.76 (0.14)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This pattern is typical of multi-informant measures (e.g., the Child Behavior Checklist or CBCL)
WFI-EZ – CG showed **good to excellent test-retest reliability** across fidelity & satisfaction domains.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(n = 11)</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Significance (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1: Family Involvement</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2: Care Planning</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3: Team Quality</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4: Natural Supports</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Score</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.94</strong></td>
<td><strong>&lt; .001</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>&lt; .001</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Three main research questions

• What are the basic characteristics of the WFI-EZ?
  – Variability & Factor Structure

• What is the reliability of the measure?
  – Internal consistency, test-retest reliability, inter-rater consistency

• What evidence exists for its validity?
  – Construct Validity & Concurrent Validity
To assess validity of WFI-EZ, we examined fidelity scores for caregivers in wrap programs with:

• Lower versus higher scores on initial items about basic wraparound characteristics:
  – My family and I are part of a team
  – Together with my team, my family created a written plan
  – My team meets regularly (e.g., every 30-45 days)

• Lower versus higher facilitator caseloads
  – 1:10 and over
  – 1:9 and under
Median split among organizations on basic wrap questions

A1. My family and I are part of a team & this team includes more people than my family and at least one professional

"Non-wrap": n=12 sites, n=952 WFI-EZ forms

A2. Together with my team, my family created a written plan

"Standard wrap": N=24 sites, N=3749 WFI-EZ forms

A3. My team meets regularly (e.g., every 30-45 days)
“Standard Wraparound” had significantly higher ($p < .01$) fidelity scores (except for natural supports).

Non-Wraparound Group: 12 Sites, 952 forms
Wraparound Group: 24 Sites, 3,749 forms
Caregiver-reported **total fidelity** was **significantly higher** in organizations where the average Wraparound facilitator caseload size is **less than 10 youth**.

**Caseload < 10:** 7 Sites, 419 forms  
**Caseload 10+:** 19 Sites, 3,576 forms
Discussion: WFI-EZ

• EFA revealed latent dimensions of Wraparound fidelity that differ from the key elements
• Strong test-retest reliability and internal consistency
• Lower inter-rater consistency underscores the importance of multiple respondents for the tool
• Evidence for validity found, but not strong – more research needed
  – Association with alternate sources of data (e.g., expert ratings, coaching tools)?
  – Impact of training and coaching on fidelity?
  – Impact of organizing as a Care Management Entity?
Future Directions:

• Process will aid in item reduction
  – Remove confusing, redundant items and those that show little variability

• Consistently collect data on organizations, initiatives, characteristics of the workforce (supervision, turnover)

• Assess reliability and validity of facilitator, youth, and team member forms

• Examine fidelity’s association with youth outcomes
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The Wraparound Evaluation and Research Team seeks to improve the lives of children and their families through research on the implementation and outcomes of the Wraparound process.

Quality Assurance and Fidelity Monitoring

The Wraparound Fidelity Assessment System (WFAS) is a multi-method approach to assessing the quality of individualized care planning and management for children and youth with complex needs and their families.
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National Technical Assistance

WERT is a core partner of the National Training and Technical Assistance Center for Child, Youth and Family Mental Health, providing TA to states and communities to expand and sustain evidence-based systems of care.
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Research

Wraparound initiatives from around the country contract with WERT to conduct utilization-focused evaluations of their implementation and outcomes. WERT also advances Wraparound with rigorous research projects on topics of interest to the wider field.
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Evaluation of Training and Coaching

High-quality training is an essential component of successful Wraparound implementation. WERT and the NWI have developed tools to evaluate these services.
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Electronic Behavioral Health Information Systems

WERT has partnered with Fidelity-EHR to develop and test a web-based data collection, management, and feedback software package designed specifically for the Wraparound process.
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