



*National Wraparound
Initiative*



Federation of Families for
Children's Mental Health

Development of the Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory


Presented at:

**The 20th Annual
Conference:**

**A System of Care for
Children's Mental
Health: Expanding the
Research Base**

**March 6, 2007
Tampa, Florida**





Hospitable
System (Policy and Funding Context)



Supportive
Organization
(lead and partner agencies)

Effective
Team



Organizational and System Levels...

- What does it take to be a supportive organization?
- What does it take to have a hospitable policy and funding context?



First stages of research...




Development of the framework of “necessary conditions”* to support wraparound at the organizational and system levels

- **Interviews with people highly experienced in implementation in sites around the country**
- **Expert review, development and pilot testing of organizational and system assessments**

***Walker, Koroloff, & Schutte (2003). Implementing High-quality Individualized Service/Support Planning: Necessary Conditions. Portland OR: RTC on Family Support and Children’s Mental Health**


Walker & Koroloff (in press). Grounded theory and backward mapping: Exploring the implementation context for wraparound. *Journal of Behavioral Health Services and Research.*

Program/system supports predict higher-quality wraparound



WFI-PA domains

	Site 1 (N=43)	Site 2 (N=24)	Site 4 (N=46)	Site 3 (N=320)	Site 5 (N=20)	Site 7 (N=40)	Site 6 (N=20)	Site 8 (N=24)
Program Longevity	Y				Y	Y	Y	Y
Low Caseload Size		Y	Y	Y	Y			Y
Low Staff turnover			Y	Y		Y		
Interagency collab.	Y		Y	Y			Y	Y
Pooled funding					Y		Y	
Natural supports	Y			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Family centeredness		Y		Y		Y	Y	Y
Fund/Serv.Flexibility					Y	Y	Y	Y
Outcomes assessed					Y	Y	Y	Y
TOTAL WFI-PA	3	2	3	5	6	6	7	7



Building on this work...

Members of the National Wraparound Initiative* began efforts to further specify the community- or collaborative-level factors that need to be in place to support wraparound.

- **Small group work/ feedback**
- **Submitted to NWI advisors for rating and review**

***Walker, J. S., & Bruns, E. J. (2006). Building on practice-based evidence: Using expert perspectives to define the wraparound process. *Psychiatric Services*.**

Respondents' Ratings of the Importance and Wording of Items on the Draft CSWI

Theme	Importance (%)			Wording (%)		
	Essential	Optional	Inadvisable	Fine	Minor Changes	Unacceptable
Leadership	86.3	13	0.7	68.4	27.9	3.7
Community Partnerships	75.8	21.2	3.2	81.8	16.2	1.9
Philosophy, Values & Strategic Plan	78.2	17.4	4.4	71.3	22.7	2.1
Fiscal Tracking & Policies	71.7	23.4	3	75.1	17.2	7.2
Coordinated & Accessible Resources	79	14.5	6.5	78.4	15.7	5.9
Human Resources	85.5	7.3	7.3	76.8	17	6.2
Accountability	75.8	14.5	9.7	79.5	13.4	7
State Support for Wraparound	68.1	23	9	78	10.3	11.7
Not all respondents rated every item.						

Revision...



Revised CSWI

- Six themes (“state support” dropped)
 - Community partnership
 - Collaborative action
 - Fiscal Policies and Sustainability
 - Access to Needed Supports and Services
 - Human Resource Development and Support
 - Accountability
- Nine items dropped, average 63.3% “essential”; 80.3% “essential” for remaining options
- New items created to fill “gaps” identified by respondents

Pilot test...



Six sites (four with data so far...)

Primarily web-based data collection

- “Paper” version for people who prefer that option
- People reminded until they decline participation or complete the measure
- Each item rated on 0-4 scale
- Participants encouraged to feel comfortable marking “don’t know”

Pilot test of revised CSWI: Early findings



	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3
Number of respondents	34	14	19
Mean/longest wrap experience	2.5 4	2.9 8	1.8 5
Mean/longest years in current wrap program	2.2 4	1.7 2.5	1.6 5

Your primary role withing the wraparound project that you are referencing

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Facilitator/Care coordinator	3	8.8	9.7	9.7
	Parent partner in this project	1	2.9	3.2	12.9
	Other provider or supervisor of direct wraparound practice e	2	5.9	6.5	19.4
	Family Member	2	5.9	6.5	25.8
	Service provider not primarily employed in wraparound	5	14.7	16.1	41.9
	Administrator of wraparound program	1	2.9	3.2	45.2
	Administrator of some other service program	14	41.2	45.2	90.3
	Other	3	8.8	9.7	100.0
	Total	31	91.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	8.8		
Total		34	100.0		

Percentage of variance accounted for by "agreement" factor...

	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3
Theme 1	45.2% $\alpha=.827$	51.3 % $\alpha=.854$	66.4% $\alpha= .905$
Theme 2	56.0 % $\alpha=.908$	42.0 % $\alpha=.768$	57.4% $\alpha=.931$
Theme 3	54.5 % $\alpha=.863$	56.13 % $\alpha=.785$	73.8 $\alpha=.950$
Theme 4	64.6 % $\alpha=.902$	70.53 % $\alpha=.890$	55.4% $\alpha=.852$
Theme 5	62.9 % $\alpha=.941$	64.24 % $\alpha=.950$	64.8% $\alpha=.935$
Theme 6	48.1 % $\alpha=.768$	59.05 % $\alpha=.833$	56.1% $\alpha=.799$

Five highest rated items... (item means)

Site 1	Site 2	Site 3
Sustained funding 3.95	Grievance procedure** 4.56	Community Stakeholders 3.69*
Collective fiscal responsibility 3.77	Crisis response 4.54	Compensation for wraparound staff 3.56
Fiscal monitoring 3.67	Collective fiscal responsibility* 4.50	Choice 3.50*
Removing fiscal barriers 3.56	Fiscal monitoring 4.45	Addressing barriers 3.47
Community stakeholders 3.34	Satisfaction monitoring 4.45	State Interface 3.33**

*identified by more than one person in comments


**item with lower agreement loading

Five lowest rated items... (item means)

Site 1	Site 2	Site 3
Grievance procedure 1.87**	Youth voice 3.15	Service/Support availability 2.40*
Family voice* 2.00	Community team 3.17	Community principles and values 2.47*
Range of outcomes 2.03	Agency support 3.23	Empowered community team 2.56
Wraparound quality 2.06	Empowered community team 3.23	Community team 2.61
Outcomes monitoring 2.07	Partner agency staff preparation 3.25	Crisis response 2.69

*identified by more than one person in comments

**item with lower agreement loading



Next steps...

Track “problematic” items

- **Possibly youth voice, grievance procedure, state interface, but...**

Monitor change over time

Examine sampling issues

Strategies for examining properties of the measure



Portland, Oregon

Funds to support this activity come from The Child, Adolescent and Family Branch, Center for Mental Health Services, Substance Abuse Mental Health Services Administration, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services;

The National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research, U.S. Department of Education;

ORC Macro, Inc.;

The Center for Medical and Medicaid Services;

The Maryland Department of Juvenile Services and Governor's Office of Crime Control and Prevention; and

The National Technical Assistance Partnership for Child and Family Mental Health.



Center for Mental Health Services,
Substance Abuse and Mental Health
Services Administration, U.S. Department
of Health and Human Services



National Institute on Disability
and Rehabilitation Research,
U.S. Department of Education