

A Comparison of the Impact of Wraparound to Traditional Mental Health and Child Welfare Services


Christa Peterson, Ph.D.

Norma Abi-Karam,
Ph.D.


Jim Rast, Ph.D.



■ SED □ ED Not ED



MH Expenditures by Service Type



	TMH Group	Wraparound Group
Age	11.5 years	11.9 years
% Caucasian	54.5%	54.2%
CAFAS	99	101
CGAF	47	46
Residential Level	3.4	3.9
Moves Last 6 Months	1.9	2.4

Figure Two – Comparison of two groups at intake to the study. Figure Two shows a comparison of the two groups (e.g., wraparound and TMH at the time of intake to the study).




Figure Four– Wraparound Fidelity Score. Figure Four shows a comparison of the how well the two conditions match the principles of wraparound as measured by the wraparound fidelity index. The figure shows the overall average score for all measures for each condition at 6 and 12 months. The WFI eight point scale has been converted to a 100 point scale for each in comparison. A Student T Test analysis finds that the score at each interval are significant at the $P > .005$ level.

Figure Two Changes in Residential Living Level After 18 Months







Figure Two – Changes in Residential Living Level After 18 Months. Figure Two shows changes in the restrictiveness of residential living placement. A Student T Test analysis finds that the score at each interval are significant at the $P > .005$ level.

Impact on Academic Performance




Impact on Academic Performance

Changes in GPA after One Year



Impact on School Disciplinary Action



Impact on School Disciplinary Action

Change in School Disciplinary Actions

