

WRAPAROUND FIDELITY ASSESSMENT SYSTEM (WFAS)

# **TEAM OBSERVATION MEASURE (TOM)**

---

## **Manual for Use & Scoring**

September 2013 version

Eric J. Bruns & April Sather  
University of Washington School of Medicine  
Division of Public Behavioral Health and Justice Policy

---

*Wraparound Evaluation and Research Team*

c/o Eric J. Bruns, Ph.D.

*Department of Psychiatry & Behavioral Sciences*

*Division of Behavioral Health & Justice Policy*

2815 Eastlake Ave E., Suite 200

Seattle, WA 98102

Phone 206.685.2310 • Fax 206.685.3430

<http://depts.washington.edu/wrapeval>

# Table of Contents

Preface: Introduction to the TOM and this Manual	1
Acknowledgments	3
Chapter 1: Introduction to Wraparound	4
Chapter 2: Introduction to the Team Observation Measure	20
Chapter 3: Qualifications for Use	24
Chapter 4: Preparing to collect TOM data	29
Chapter 5: Conducting TOM observations	31
Chapter 6: Scoring Rules for TOM indicators and items	39
Item 1. Team Membership & Attendance	39
Item 2. Effective Team Process	40
Item 3. Facilitator Preparation	41
Item 4. Effective Decision Making	43
Item 5. Creative Brainstorming and Options	44
Item 6. Individualized Process	45
Item 7. Natural & Community Supports	47
Item 8. Natural Support Plans	49
Item 9. Team Mission & Plans	50
Item 10. Shared Responsibility	52
Item 11. Facilitation Skills	53
Item 12. Cultural & Linguistic Competence	55
Item 13. Outcomes Based Process	56
Item 14. Evaluating Progress and Successes	58
Item 15. Youth & Family Voice	59
Item 16. Youth & Family Choice	60
Item 17. Focus on Strengths	62
Item 18. Positive Team Culture	63
Item 19. Community Focus	65
Item 20. Least Restrictive Environment	66
Chapter 7: Data Entry & Reporting	68

## Preface: Introduction to the TOM and this Manual

The Team Observation Measure is one component of the Wraparound Fidelity Assessment System (WFAS), a multi-method approach to assessing the quality of individualized care planning and management for children and youth with complex needs and their families. WFAS instruments include interviews with multiple stakeholders (the Wraparound Fidelity Index or WFI), a team observation measure, a document review form, and an instrument to assess the level of community and system support for wraparound (The Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory or CSWI). The instruments that comprise the WFAS can be used individually or in combination with one another, to provide a more comprehensive assessment.

**Uses of Fidelity Assessment Measures.** Fidelity measurement is a core implementation support to evidence-based practices. The WFAS provides a method for conducting fidelity measurement for the wraparound process, as specified by the National Wraparound Initiative.

As a fidelity measurement system, WFAS instruments were designed to support both program improvement as well as research. With respect to **program improvement**, sites or programs delivering services via the wraparound process can generate profiles, organized by the activities of the wraparound process or the 10 principles of wraparound, to illuminate areas of relative strength and weakness. This information can be used to guide program planning, training, and quality assurance.

With respect to **research**, data from WFAS instruments can help evaluate whether the wraparound process has been adequately implemented, and thus aid interpretation of outcomes. In addition, researchers on youth and family services may wish to use WFAS instruments to measure the relationship between adherence to the wraparound model and outcomes, as a way to explore which aspects of service delivery are most important to child and family well-being.

**Other uses.** Although the WFAS instruments were not intended originally for use on the individual family level, this type of analysis could provide useful guidance to wraparound teams around the quality of implementation for a specific family or the skills of individual wraparound staff (e.g., facilitators). However, great care needs to be undertaken in order to insure confidentiality and that team members understand the reasons for data collection. Finally, though WFAS instruments have not been used widely for standards conformance or staff certification, there has been some interest in adapting the WFAS tools for this purpose. Local communities and jurisdictions will need to carefully examine their own practice model, local standards, and/or requirements in order to determine whether WFAS tools are adequately in alignment to be used as a support to compliance or certification.

## The Team Observation Measure

The Team Observation Measure (TOM) is employed by external evaluators to assess adherence to standards of high-quality wraparound during team meeting sessions. It consists of 20 items, with two items dedicated to each of the 10 principles of wraparound. Each item consists of 3-5 indicators of high-quality wraparound practice as expressed during a child and family team meeting. Working alone or in pairs, trained raters indicate whether or not each indicator was in evidence during the wraparound team meeting session. These ratings are translated into a score for each item as well as a total fidelity score for the session overall.

This Manual is intended to assist you to use the TOM as a part of your wraparound quality assessment process. It is intended to provide our new collaborators with sufficient information to use the TOM, including a basis for training observers and a reference for TOM administration and scoring. The manual is divided into five chapters:

1. An introduction to wraparound,
2. An introduction to the TOM;
3. A discussion of User Qualifications and observer training;
4. Preparations to take before conducting observations;
5. Directions for administering the TOM; and
6. Notes and scoring rules for each TOM Item and indicator.



---

**Though we are pleased to provide measures of the WFAS, the TOM, and this manual for use to the field as a whole, use of the TOM and this manual continue to be restricted to collaborators who have an agreement with our research team. For more information about collaborating with our team as a pilot community or program, please visit our website at <http://depts.washington.edu/wrapeval>**

---

We highly value feedback at any phase of your collaboration. If you have questions, recommendations, or suggestions please contact us. In addition, we are interested in other uses for this measure that might better fit your needs. We appreciate your collaboration with us!

Thank you and best wishes,

## The Wraparound Evaluation and Research Team (WERT)

Eric Bruns, April Sather, Jesse Suter, Kristen Leverentz-Brady

## Acknowledgments

Development of the Team Observation Measure of the Wraparound Fidelity Assessment System was aided considerably by the pioneering work of several individuals. Most notably, we would like to recognize the efforts of Michael Epstein, Philip Nordness, and Melody Hertzog, of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Their Wraparound Observation Form (WOF) represented the first systematic attempt to use team observations to assess quality and fidelity of the wraparound process. In addition, we would like to thank Norin Dollard and other researchers at the Florida Mental Health Institute at the University of South Florida, whose Child and Family Team Observation evaluation project for the Tampa-Hillsborough Integrated Network for Kids (THINK) also provided many ideas about how best to design and support an observation measure to accompany our Wraparound Fidelity Index. Finally, we would like to recognize Janet Walker and Nancy Koroloff at the Research and Training Center on Family Support and Children's Mental Health. Their Checklist for Improving Planning and Practice (ChIPP) was also very helpful in generating potential content for the TOM.

We would also like to thank the small panel of wraparound experts who helped generate and then review potential items, including Patricia Miles, Janet Walker, Jim Rast, Trina Osher, and John VanDenBerg. Once an initial version of the TOM was created, the Nevada Department of Child and Family Services was willing to let us pilot this first version in Clark County, Nevada. We would like to thank Nevada DCFS (including Susan Mears, Norma Abi-Karam, Christa Peterson, Christine Moninghoff, and their colleagues), as well as researchers at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas (Stacey Shipe, Stacey Cramer, Michelle Ramey, Matt Gyger, and Ramona Brinson), for participating in the initial pilot test of the TOM. We would also like to thank the Maryland Governor's Office for Children for their willingness to allow the pilot TOM to be used to assess the quality and fidelity of their statewide wraparound initiative, and the Community Innovations Institute at the University of Maryland, Baltimore (including Michelle Clark, Michelle Zabel, and Pat Mosby), for their helpfulness in collecting TOM data in Maryland, and providing it to our team. We would also like to thank Kathy Cox from the Chico State University, for conducting her own inter-rater reliability pilot study. This study ultimately aided us in revising the tool and would not have been possible without the work of she and her colleagues.

Finally, we would like to thank the agencies and organizations who have funded this and other projects related to measuring and improving the quality and fidelity of wraparound implementation, including:

- The Child, Adolescent and Family Branch of the Center for Mental Health Services, U.S. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration;
- The National Institutes of Mental Health;
- The Child, Adolescent, and Family Unit of the Vermont Department of Developmental and Mental Health Services; the University of Vermont Department of Psychology;
- The Vermont Federation of Families for Children's Mental Health;
- The University of Maryland Division of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry;
- ORC Macro, Inc.; and
- The Maryland Offices of Children Youth and Families and Crime Control and Prevention.

# Chapter 1: Introduction to Wraparound

In order to appropriately administer the TOM, it is essential that the user have a good working knowledge about the wraparound process itself. Wraparound has been described in many ways, including (1) an overall philosophy on how to administer services and supports to youth and families, (2) a systems change approach aimed at integrating services and supports at an administrative level, and (3) a care management process that allows for integration of services and achievement of the wraparound principles at a child and family level. Though descriptions 1 and 2 above are important, the TOM primarily assesses adherence to the wraparound process as recently described in materials developed by the National Wraparound Initiative (NWI). In this conceptualization, wraparound is an intensive team-based process and not merely a philosophy or a service.

During the wraparound process, a team of individuals who are relevant to the well-being of the child or youth (e.g., family members, other natural supports, service providers, and agency representatives) collaboratively develop an individualized plan of care, implement this plan, and evaluate success over time. The wraparound plan typically includes formal services and interventions, together with community services and interpersonal support and assistance provided by friends, kin, and other people drawn from the family's social networks. The team convenes frequently to measure the plan's components against relevant indicators of success. Plan components and strategies are revised when outcomes are not being achieved.

The process of engaging the family, convening the team, developing the plan, implementing the plan, and transitioning the youth out of formal wraparound is typically facilitated by a trained care manager or "wraparound facilitator," sometimes with the assistance of a family support worker. The wraparound process, and the plan itself, is designed to be culturally competent, strengths based, and organized around family members' own perceptions of needs, goals, and likelihood of success of specific strategies.

Wraparound has been implemented nationally for over 20 years and presented as a promising practice in many publications. However, specification and consistent implementation of the model has occurred only in the past few years. As recently specified by the NWI, wraparound is conceived as four phase process:

- **Engagement and team preparation,**
- **Initial plan development,**
- **Plan implementation, and**
- **Transition.**

Since 2003, the NWI has undertaken a series of consensus-building and research projects to better define the principles, phases and activities, and necessary support conditions for the wraparound process. You can view the results of this initiative at the project's home page at [www.rtc.pdx.edu/nwi](http://www.rtc.pdx.edu/nwi). A summary of the principles of wraparound as defined by the members of the NWI, and a complete presentation of the phases and activities of the wraparound process as specified by the NWI, are presented below.

## The Ten Principles of the Wraparound process

*The National Wraparound initiative recently revisited previous descriptions of these basic principles and more fully described them, subjecting them to a consensus building process and an explication of some of the challenges in achieving them in “real world” practice. These principles are presented below.*

1. **Family voice and choice.** Family and youth/child perspectives are intentionally elicited and prioritized during all phases of the wraparound process. Planning is grounded in family members’ perspectives, and the team strives to provide options and choices such that the plan reflects family values and preferences.
2. **Team based.** The wraparound team consists of individuals agreed upon by the family and committed to them through informal, formal, and community support and service relationships.
3. **Natural supports.** The team actively seeks out and encourages the full participation of team members drawn from family members’ networks of interpersonal and community relationships. The wraparound plan reflects activities and interventions that draw on sources of natural support.
4. **Collaboration.** Team members work cooperatively and share responsibility for developing, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating a single wraparound plan. The plan reflects a blending of team members’ perspectives, mandates, and resources. The plan guides and coordinates each team member’s work towards meeting the team’s goals.
5. **Community-based.** The wraparound team implements service and support strategies that take place in the most inclusive, most responsive, most accessible, and least restrictive settings possible; and that safely promote child and family integration into home and community life.
6. **Culturally competent.** The wraparound process demonstrates respect for and builds on the values, preferences, beliefs, culture, and identity of the child/youth and family, and their community.
7. **Individualized.** To achieve the goals laid out in the wraparound plan, the team develops and implements a customized set of strategies, supports, and services.
8. **Strengths based.** The wraparound process and the wraparound plan identify, build on, and enhance the capabilities, knowledge, skills, and assets of the child and family, their community, and other team members.
9. **Unconditional Commitment and Persistence.** Despite challenges, the team persists in working toward the goals included in the wraparound plan until the team reaches agreement that a formal wraparound process is no longer required.
10. **Outcome based.** The team ties the goals and strategies of the wraparound plan to observable or measurable indicators of success, monitors progress in terms of these indicators, and revises the plan accordingly.

The principles listed above provide the value base for wraparound, and an essential framework for understanding the wraparound process as well as measuring fidelity. As such, the 20 items on the TOM are organized such that each of the 10 principles is assessed via two TOM items.

## Phases and Activities of the Wraparound Process<sup>1</sup>

In addition to following as closely as possible to the 10 principles of wraparound, full wraparound implementation requires conformance to specific activities that are hallmarks of the model. The following section presents a summary of the work of the National Wraparound Initiative in specifying the typical activities of a high-quality wraparound process. It is important for those who are administering the TOM to have a good understanding of these “phases and activities” of wraparound, because many of the indicators of good practice included on the TOM are based on the assumption that high quality wraparound consists of some expression of these activities.

Before presenting the phases and activities, a few clarifying comments are necessary. First, the activities below identify a *facilitator* as responsible for guiding, motivating, or undertaking the various activities. This is not meant to imply that a single person must facilitate all of the activities, and we have not tried to specify exactly who should be responsible for each activity. The various activities may be split up among a number of different people. For example, on many teams, a parent partner or advocate takes responsibility for some activities associated with family and youth engagement, while a care coordinator is responsible for other activities. On other teams, a care coordinator takes on most of the facilitation activities with specific tasks or responsibilities taken on by a parent, youth, and/or other team members. In addition, facilitation of wraparound team work may transition between individuals over time, such as from a care coordinator to a parent, family member, or other natural support person, during the course of a wraparound process.

Second, the *families* participating in wraparound, like American families more generally, are diverse in terms of their structure and composition. Families may be a single birth or adoptive parent and child or youth, or may include grandparents and other extended family members as part of the central family group. If the court has assigned custody of the child or youth to some public agency (e.g., child protective services or juvenile justice), the caregiver in the permanency setting and/or another person designated by that agency (e.g. foster parent, social worker, probation officer) takes on some or all of the roles and responsibilities of a parent for that child and shares in selecting the team and prioritizing objectives and options. As youth become more mature and independent, they begin to make more of their own decisions, including inviting members to join the team and guiding aspects of the wraparound process.

Third, The use of *numbering for the phases and activities* described below is not meant to imply that the activities must invariably be carried out in a specific order, or that one activity or phase must be finished before another can be started. Instead, the numbering and ordering is meant to convey an overall flow of activity and attention. For example, focus on transition activities is most apparent during the latter portions of the wraparound process; however, attention to transition issues begins with the earliest activities in a wraparound process.

---

<sup>1</sup>Taken directly from: Bruns, E.J., Walker, J.S., VanDenBerg, J.D., Rast, J., Osher, T.W., Miles, P., Adams, J., & National Wraparound Initiative Advisory Group (2004). *Phases and activities of the wraparound process*. Portland, OR: National Wraparound Initiative, Research and Training Center on Family Support and Children's Mental Health, Portland State University.



Finally, though the following description of the “Phases and Activities of the Wraparound Process” focuses on *what* needs to happen in wraparound; it is equally important to attend to *how* the work is accomplished. Merely accomplishing the tasks is insufficient unless this work is done in a manner consistent with the 10 principles of wraparound. As a research team member or evaluator charged with assessing the adherence to the wraparound process for individual families, it will be important for you to have a solid grounding in both the *principles* as well as *activities* of wraparound, because the items of the TOM require assessment of both, sometimes in the same item.

### Phase 1: Engagement and Team preparation

MAJOR TASKS/Goals	ACTIVITIES	NOTES
<b>PHASE 1: Engagement and team preparation</b> During this phase, the groundwork for trust and shared vision among the family and wraparound team members is established, so people are prepared to come to meetings and collaborate. During this phase, the tone is set for teamwork and team interactions that are consistent with the wraparound principles, particularly through the initial conversations about strengths, needs, and culture. In addition, this phase provides an opportunity to begin to shift the family's orientation to one in which they understand they are an integral part of the process and their preferences are prioritized. The activities of this phase should be completed relatively quickly (within 1-2 weeks if possible), so that the team can begin meeting and establish ownership of the process as quickly as possible.		
<b>1.1. Orient the family and youth</b> GOAL: To orient the family and youth to the wraparound process.	<b>1.1 a. Orient the family and youth to wraparound</b> In face-to-face conversations, the facilitator explains the wraparound philosophy and process to family members and describes who will be involved and the nature of family and youth/child participation. Facilitator answers questions and addresses concerns. Facilitator describes alternatives to wraparound and asks family and youth if they choose to participate in wraparound. Facilitator describes types of supports available to family and youth as they participate on teams (e.g., family/youth may want coaching so they can feel more comfortable and/or effective in partnering with other team members).	This orientation to wraparound should be brief and clear, and should avoid the use of jargon, so as not to overwhelm family members. At this stage, the focus is on providing enough information so that the family and youth can make an informed choice regarding participation in the wraparound process. For some families, alternatives to wraparound may be very limited and/or non-participation in wraparound may bring negative consequences (as when wraparound is court ordered); however, this does not prevent families/youth from making an informed choice to participate based on knowledge of the alternatives and/or the consequences of non-participation.
	<b>1.1 b. Address legal and ethical issues</b> Facilitator reviews all consent and release forms with the family and youth, answers questions, and explains options and their consequences. Facilitator discusses relevant legal and ethical issues (e.g., mandatory reporting), informs family of their rights, and obtains necessary consents and release forms before the first team meeting.	Ethical and legal considerations will also need to be reviewed with the entire team as described in phase 2.

MAJOR TASKS/Goals	ACTIVITIES	NOTES
<p><b>1.2. Stabilize crises</b> GOAL: To address pressing needs and concerns so that family and team can give their attention to the wraparound process.</p>	<p><b>1.2 a. Ask family and youth about immediate crisis concerns</b> Facilitator elicits information from the family and youth about immediate safety issues, current crises, or crises that they anticipate might happen in the very near future. These may include crises stemming from a lack of basic needs (e.g., food, shelter, utilities such as heat or electricity).</p>	<p>The goal of this activity is to quickly address the most pressing concerns. The whole team engages in proactive and future-oriented crisis/safety planning during phase 2. As with other activities in this phase, the goal is to do no more than necessary prior to convening the team, so that the facilitator does not come to be viewed as the primary service provider and so that team as a whole can feel ownership for the plan and the process.</p>
	<p><b>1.2 b. Elicit information from agency representatives and potential team members about immediate crises or potential crises</b> Facilitator elicits information from the referring source and other knowledgeable people about pressing crisis and safety concerns.</p>	<p>Information about previous crises and their resolution can be useful in planning a response in 1.2.c.</p>
	<p><b>1.2 c. If immediate response is necessary, formulate a response for immediate intervention and/or stabilization</b> Facilitator and family reach agreement about whether concerns require immediate attention and, if so, work to formulate a response that will provide immediate relief while also allowing the process of team building to move ahead.</p>	<p>This response should describe clear, specific steps to accomplish stabilization.</p>
<p><b>1.3. Facilitate conversations with family and youth/child</b> GOAL: To explore individual and family strengths, needs, culture, and vision and to use these to develop a document that will serve as the starting point for planning.</p>	<p><b>1.3 a. Explore strengths, needs, culture, and vision with child/youth and family.</b> Facilitator meets with the youth/child and family to hear about their experiences; gather their perspective on their individual and collective strengths, needs, elements of culture, and long-term goals or vision; and learn about natural and formal supports. Facilitator helps family identify potential team members and asks family to talk about needs and preferences for meeting arrangements (location, time, supports needed such as child care, translation).</p>	<p>This activity is used to develop information that will be presented to and augmented by the team in phase 2. Family members should be encouraged to consider these topics broadly.</p>

MAJOR TASKS/Goals	ACTIVITIES	NOTES
	<p><b>1.3 b. Facilitator prepares a summary document</b></p> <p>Using the information from the initial conversations with family members, the facilitator prepares a strengths-based document that summarizes key information about individual family member strengths and strengths of the family unit, as well as needs, culture, and vision. The family then reviews and approves the summary.</p>	
<p><b>1.4. Engage other team members</b></p> <p>GOAL: To gain the participation of team members who care about and can aid the youth/child and family, and to set the stage for their active and collaborative participation on the team in a manner consistent with the wraparound principles</p>	<p><b>1.4 a. Solicit participation/orient team members</b></p> <p>Facilitator, together with family members if they so choose, approaches potential team members identified by the youth and family. Facilitator describes the wraparound process and clarifies the potential role and responsibilities of this person on the team. Facilitator asks the potential team members if they will participate. If so, facilitator talks with them briefly to learn their perspectives on the family's strengths and needs, and to learn about their needs and preferences for meeting.</p>	<p>The youth and/or family may choose to invite potential team members themselves and/or to participate in this activity alongside the facilitator. It is important, however, not to burden family members by establishing (even inadvertently) the expectation that they will be primarily responsible for recruiting and orienting team members.</p>
<p><b>1.5. Make necessary meeting arrangements</b></p> <p>GOAL: To ensure that the necessary procedures are undertaken for the team is prepared to begin an effective wraparound process.</p>	<p><b>1.5 a. Arrange meeting logistics</b></p> <p>Facilitator integrates information gathered from all sources to arrange meeting time and location and to assure the availability of necessary supports or adaptations such as translators or child care. Meeting time and location should be accessible and comfortable, especially for the family but also for other team members. Facilitator prepares materials—including the document summarizing family members' individual and collective strengths, and their needs, culture, and vision—to be distributed to team members.</p>	

## Phase 2: Initial Plan Development

MAJOR TASKS/Goals	ACTIVITIES	NOTES
<b>PHASE 2: Initial plan development</b> During this phase, team trust and mutual respect are built while the team creates an initial plan of care using a high-quality planning process that reflects the wraparound principles. In particular, youth and family should feel, during this phase, that they are heard, that the needs chosen are ones they want to work on, and that the options chosen have a reasonable chance of helping them meet these needs. This phase should be completed during one or two meetings that take place within 1-2 weeks, a rapid time frame intended to promote team cohesion and shared responsibility toward achieving the team's mission or overarching goal.		
<b>2.1. Develop an initial plan of care</b> GOAL: To create an initial plan of care using a high-quality team process that elicits multiple perspectives and builds trust and shared vision among team members, while also being consistent with the wraparound principles	<b>2.1 a. Determine ground rules</b> Facilitator guides team in a discussion of basic ground rules, elicits additional ground rules important to team members, and facilitates discussion of how these will operate during team meetings. At a minimum, this discussion should address legal and ethical issues—including confidentiality, mandatory reporting, and other legal requirements—and how to create a safe and blame-free environment for youth/family and all team members. Ground rules are recorded in team documentation and distributed to members.	In this activity, the team members define their collective expectations for team interaction and collaboration. These expectations, as written into the ground rules, should reflect the principles of wraparound. For example, the principles stress that interactions should promote family and youth voice and choice and should reflect a strengths orientation. The principles also stress that important decisions are made within the team.
	<b>2.1 b. Describe and document strengths</b> Facilitator presents strengths from the summary document prepared during phase 1, and elicits feedback and additional strengths, including strengths of team members and community.	While strengths are highlighted during this activity, the wraparound process features a strengths orientation throughout.
	<b>2.1 c. Create team mission</b> Facilitator reviews youth and family's vision and leads team in setting a team mission, introducing idea that this is the overarching goal that will guide the team through phases and, ultimately, through transition from formal wraparound.	The team mission is the collaboratively set, long-term goal that provides a one or two sentence summary of what the team is working towards.

MAJOR TASKS/Goals	ACTIVITIES	NOTES
	<p><b>2.1 d. Describe and prioritize needs/goals</b> Facilitator guides the team in reviewing needs and adding to list. The facilitator then guides the team in prioritizing a small number of needs that the youth, family, and team want to work on first, and that they feel will help the team achieve the mission.</p>	<p>The elicitation and prioritization of needs is often viewed as one of the most crucial and difficult activities of the wraparound process. The team must ensure that needs are considered broadly, and that the prioritization of needs reflects youth and family views about what is most important. Needs are not services but rather broader statements related to the underlying conditions that, if addressed, will lead to the accomplishment of the mission.</p>
	<p><b>2.1 e. Determine goals and associated outcomes and indicators for each goal</b> Facilitator guides team in discussing a specific goal or outcome that will represent success in meeting each need that the team has chosen to work on. Facilitator guides the team in deciding how the outcome will be assessed, including specific indicators and how frequently they will be measured.</p>	<p>Depending on the need being considered, multiple goals or outcomes may be determined. Similarly, for each goal or outcome determined by the team for measurement, multiple indicators may be chosen to be tracked by the team. However, the plan should not include so many goals, outcomes, or indicators that team members become overwhelmed or tracking of progress becomes difficult.</p>
	<p><b>2.1 f. Select strategies</b> Facilitator guides the team in a process to think in a creative and open-ended manner about strategies for meeting needs and achieving outcomes. The facilitator uses techniques for generating multiple options, which are then evaluated by considering the extent to which they are likely to be effective in helping reach the goal, outcome, or indicator associated with the need; the extent to which they are community based, the extent to which they build on/incorporate strengths; and the extent to which they are consistent with family culture and values. When evaluating more formal service and support options, facilitator aids team in acquiring information about and /or considering the evidence base for relevant options.</p>	<p>This activity emphasizes creative problem solving, usually through brainstorming or other techniques, with the team considering the full range of available resources as they come up with strategies to meet needs and achieve outcomes. Importantly, this includes generating strategy options that extend beyond formal services and reach families through other avenues and time frames. These are frequently brainstormed by the team, with the youth and family and people representing their interpersonal and community connections being primary nominators of such supports. Finally, in order to best consider the evidence base for potential strategies or supports, it may be useful for a wraparound team or program to have access to and gain counsel from a point person who is well-informed on the evidence base.</p>

MAJOR TASKS/Goals	ACTIVITIES	NOTES
	<p><b>2.1 g. Assign action steps</b> Team assigns responsibility for undertaking action steps associated with each strategy to specific individuals and within a particular time frame.</p>	<p>Action steps are the separate small activities that are needed to put a strategy into place, for example, making a phone call, transporting a child, working with a family member, finding out more information, attending a support meeting, arranging an appointment. While all team members will not necessarily participate at the same level, all team members should be responsible for carrying out action steps. Care should be taken to ensure that individual team members, particularly the youth and family, are not overtaxed by the number of action steps they are assigned.</p>
<p><b>2.2. Develop crisis/safety plan</b> GOAL: To identify potential problems and crises, prioritize according to seriousness and likelihood of occurrence, and create an effective and well-specified crisis prevention and response plan that is consistent with the wraparound principles. A more proactive safety plan may also be created.</p>	<p><b>2.2 a. Determine potential serious risks</b> Facilitator guides the team in a discussion of how to maintain the safety of all family members and things that could potentially go wrong, followed by a process of prioritization based on seriousness and likelihood of occurrence.</p> <p><b>2.2 b. Create crisis/safety plan</b> In order of priority, the facilitator guides team in discussion of each serious risk identified. The discussion includes safety needs or concerns and potential crisis situations, including antecedents and associated strategies for preventing each potential type of crisis, as well as potential responses for each type of crisis. Specific roles and responsibilities are created for team members. This information is documented in a written crisis plan. Some teams may also undertake steps to create a separate safety plan, which specifies all the ways in which the wraparound plan addresses potential safety issues.</p>	<p>Past crises, and the outcomes of strategies used to manage them, are often an important source of information in current crisis/safety planning.</p> <p>One potential difficulty with this activity is the identification of a large number of crises or safety issues can mean that the crisis/safety plan “takes over” from the wraparound plan. The team thus needs to balance the need to address all risks that are deemed serious with the need to maintain focus on the larger wraparound plan as well as youth, family, and team strengths.</p>
<p><b>2.3. Complete necessary documentation and logistics</b></p>	<p><b>2.3 a. Complete documentation and logistics</b> Facilitator guides team in setting meeting schedule and determining means of contacting team members and distributing documentation to team members</p>	

### Phase 3: Plan Implementation

MAJOR TASKS/Goals	ACTIVITIES	NOTES
<b>PHASE 3: Implementation</b> During this phase, the initial wraparound plan is implemented, progress and successes are continually reviewed, and changes are made to the plan and then implemented, all while maintaining or building team cohesiveness and mutual respect. The activities of this phase are repeated until the team's mission is achieved and formal wraparound is no longer needed.		
<b>3.1. Implement the wraparound plan</b> GOAL: To implement the initial plan of care, monitoring completion of action steps and strategies and their success in meeting need and achieving outcomes in a manner consistent with the wraparound principles.	<b>3.1 a. Implement action steps for each strategy</b> For each strategy in the wraparound plan, team members undertake action steps for which they are responsible. Facilitator aids completion of action steps by checking in and following up with team members; educating providers and other system and community representatives about wraparound as needed; and identifying and obtaining necessary resources.	The level of need for educating providers and other system and community representatives about wraparound varies considerably from one community to another. Where communities are new to the type of collaboration required by wraparound, getting provider "buy in" can be very difficult and time consuming for facilitators. Agencies implementing wraparound should be aware of these demands and be prepared to devote sufficient time, resources, and support to this need.
	<b>3.1 b. Track progress on action steps</b> Team monitors progress on the action steps for each strategy in the plan, tracking information about the timeliness of completion of responsibilities assigned to each team member, fidelity to the plan, and the completion of the requirements of any particular intervention.	Using the timelines associated with the action steps, the team tracks progress. When steps do not occur, teams can profit from examining the reasons why not. For example, teams may find that the person responsible needs additional support or resources to carry out the action step, or, alternatively, that different actions are necessary.
	<b>3.1 c. Evaluate success of strategies</b> Using the outcomes/indicators associated with each need, the facilitator guides the team in evaluating whether selected strategies are helping team meet the youth and family's needs.	Evaluation should happen at regular intervals. Exactly how frequently may be determined by program policies and/or the nature of the needs/goals. The process of evaluation should also help the team maintain focus on the "big picture" defined by the team's mission: Are these strategies, by meeting needs, helping achieve the mission?
	<b>3.1. d. Celebrate successes</b> The facilitator encourages the team to acknowledge and celebrate successes, such as when progress has been made on action steps, when outcomes or indicators of success have been achieved, or when positive events or achievements occur.	Acknowledging success is one way of maintaining a focus on the strengths and capacity of the team and its members. Successes do not have to be "big", nor do they necessarily have to result directly from the team plan. Some teams make recognition of "what's gone right" a part of each meeting.

MAJOR TASKS/Goals	ACTIVITIES	NOTES
<p><b>3.2. Revisit and update the plan</b> GOAL: To use a high quality team process to ensure that the wraparound plan is continually revisited and updated to respond to the successes of initial strategies and the need for new strategies.</p>	<p>3.2. a. Consider new strategies as necessary When the team determines that strategies for meeting needs are not working, or when new needs are prioritized, the facilitator guides the team in a process of considering new strategies and action steps using the process described in activities 2.1.f and 2.1.g.</p>	<p>Revising of the plan takes place in the context of the needs identified in 2.1.d. Since the needs are in turn connected to the mission, the mission helps to guide evaluation and plan revisions.</p>
<p><b>3.3. Maintain/build team cohesiveness and trust</b> GOAL: To maintain awareness of team members' satisfaction with and "buy-in" to the process, and take steps to maintain or build team cohesiveness and trust.</p>	<p><b>3.3 a. Maintain awareness of team members' satisfaction and "buy-in"</b> Facilitator makes use of available information (e.g., informal chats, team feedback, surveys—if available) to assess team members' satisfaction with and commitment to the team process and plan, and shares this information with the team as appropriate. Facilitator welcomes and orients new team members who may be added to the team as the process unfolds.</p>	<p>Many teams maintain formal or informal processes for addressing team member engagement or "buy in", e.g. periodic surveys or an end-of-meeting wrap-up activity. In addition, youth and family members should be frequently consulted about their satisfaction with the team's work and whether they believe it is achieving progress toward their long-term vision, especially after major strategizing sessions. In general, however, this focus on assessing the process of teamwork should not eclipse the overall evaluation that is keyed to meeting identified needs and achieving the team mission.</p>
	<p><b>3.3 b. Address issues of team cohesiveness and trust</b> Making use of available information, facilitator helps team maintain cohesiveness and satisfaction (e.g., by continually educating team members—including new team members—about wraparound principles and activities, and/or by guiding team in procedures to understand and manage disagreement, conflict, or dissatisfaction).</p>	<p>Teams will vary in the extent to which issues of cohesiveness and trust arise. Often, difficulties in this area arise from one or more team members' perceptions that the team's work—and/or the overall mission or needs being currently addressed—is not addressing the youth and family's "real" needs. This points to the importance of careful work in deriving the needs and mission in the first place, since shared goals are essential to maintaining team cohesiveness over time.</p>



MAJOR TASKS/Goals	ACTIVITIES	NOTES
<b>3.4. Complete necessary documentation and logistics</b>	<b>3.4 a. Complete documentation and logistics</b> Facilitator maintains/updates the plan and maintains and distributes meeting minutes. Team documentation should record completion of action steps, team attendance, use of formal and informal services and supports, and expenditures. Facilitator documents results of reviews of progress, successes, and changes to the team and plan. Facilitator guides team in revising meeting logistics as necessary and distributes documentation to team members.	Team documentation should be kept current and updated, and should be distributed to and/or available to all team members in a timely fashion.

#### Phase 4: Transition

MAJOR TASKS/Goals	ACTIVITIES	NOTES
<b>PHASE 4: Transition</b> During this phase, plans are made for a purposeful transition out of formal wraparound to a mix of formal and natural supports in the community (and, if appropriate, to services and supports in the adult system). The focus on transition is continual during the wraparound process, and the preparation for transition is apparent even during the initial engagement activities.		
<b>4.1. Plan for cessation of formal wraparound</b> GOAL: To plan a purposeful transition out of formal wraparound in a way that is consistent with the wraparound principles, and that supports the youth and family in maintaining the positive outcomes achieved in the wraparound process.	<b>4.1 a. Create a transition plan</b> Facilitator guides the team in focusing on the transition from wraparound, reviewing strengths and needs and identifying services and supports to meet needs that will persist past formal wraparound.	Preparation for transition begins early in the wraparound process, but intensifies as team meets needs and moves towards achieving the mission. While formal supports and services may be needed post-transition, the team is attentive to the need for developing a sustainable system of supports that is not dependent on formal wraparound. Teams may decide to continue wraparound—or a variation of wraparound—even after it is no longer being provided as a formal service.

MAJOR TASKS/Goals	ACTIVITIES	NOTES
	<p><b>4.1 b. Create a post-transition crisis management plan</b> Facilitator guides the team in creating post-wraparound crisis management plan that includes action steps, specific responsibilities, and communication protocols. Planning may include rehearsing responses to crises and creating linkage to post-wraparound crisis resources.</p>	<p>At this point in transition, youth and family members, together with their continuing supports, should have acquired skills and knowledge in how to manage crises. Post-transition crisis management planning should acknowledge and capitalize on this increased knowledge and strengthened support system. This activity will likely include identification of access points and entitlements for formal services that may be used following formal wraparound.</p>
	<p><b>4.1 c. Modify wraparound process to reflect transition</b> New members may be added to the team to reflect identified post-transition strategies, services, and supports. The team discusses responses to potential future situations, including crises, and negotiates the nature of each team member's post-wraparound participation with the team/family. Formal wraparound team meetings reduce frequency and ultimately cease.</p>	<p>Teams may continue to meet using a wraparound process (or other process or format) even after formal wraparound has ended. Should teamwork continue, family members and youth, or other supports, will likely take on some or all of the facilitation and coordination activities.</p>
<p><b>4.2. Create a "commencement"</b> GOAL: To ensure that the cessation of formal wraparound is conducted in a way that celebrates successes and frames transition proactively and positively.</p>	<p><b>4.2 a. Document the team's work</b> Facilitator guides team in creating a document that describes the strengths of the youth/child, family, and team members, and lessons learned about strategies that worked well and those that did not work so well. Team participates in preparing/reviewing necessary final reports (e.g., to court or participating providers, where necessary)</p>	<p>This creates a package of information that can be useful in the future.</p>
	<p><b>4.2 b. Celebrate success</b> Facilitator encourages team to create and/or participate in a culturally appropriate "commencement" celebration that is meaningful to the youth/child, family, and team, and that recognizes their accomplishments.</p>	<p>This activity may be considered optional. Youth/child and family should feel that they are ready to transition from formal wraparound, and it is important that "graduation" is not constructed by systems primarily as a way to get families out of services.</p>

MAJOR TASKS/Goals	ACTIVITIES	NOTES
<b>4.3. Follow-up with the family</b> GOAL: To ensure that the family is continuing to experience success after wraparound and to provide support if necessary.	<b>4.3 a. Check in with family</b> Facilitator leads team in creating a procedure for checking in with the youth and family periodically after commencement. If new needs have emerged that require a formal response, facilitator and/or other team members may aid the family in accessing appropriate services, possibly including a reconvening of the wraparound team.	The check-in procedure can be done impersonally (e.g., through questionnaires) or through contact initiated at agreed-upon intervals either by the youth or family, or by another team member.

### Key Terms Used in Wraparound

Descriptions of wraparound in this manual and on the TOM forms may present terms that are unfamiliar. The following table is designed to give the reader exposure to some of the key terms used in wraparound as well as systems of care for children and families. If there are other terms that you would like to know that we have not defined here, please contact our research team.

Wraparound Term	Definition
<b>Action steps</b>	Statements in a wraparound plan that describe specific activities that will be undertaken, including who will do them and within what time frame.
<b>Community</b>	<i>Community</i> means the neighborhood, city, town, village, or rural area where the child/family chooses to live. We use the broader term <i>community</i> rather than city or town, because families have different perspectives of what their communities include. Community may also refer to the network of social supports upon which the family relies.
<b>Facilitator</b>	A person who is trained to coordinate the wraparound process for an individual family. This person may also be called care coordinator, navigator, wraparound specialist, wraparound facilitator or something else. The person in the facilitator role may change over time, depending on what the family thinks is working best. For example, a parent, caregiver, or other team member may take over facilitating team meetings after a period of time.
<b>Formal supports</b>	Services and supports provided by professionals (or other individuals who are “paid to care”) under a structure of requirements for which there is oversight by state or federal agencies, national professional associations, or the general public arena.
<b>Informal resources or supports</b>	These are resources that already exist in the family, their support network, or in their community. They often cost little or nothing and provide support to the family. This term can also be used to refer to friends or advocates of the family. For example, a caregiver may sometimes ask a neighbor to take her child out on an activity. Similarly, a community may have a strong community center or library that provides activities that the family likes to do.
<b>Life domains</b>	Areas of daily activity critical to healthy growth and development of a child or successful functioning of a family. Life domains include such areas as safety, school/work, health, social/fun, a place to live, legal issues, culture, emotions, transportation, and finances.

<b>Mission Statement</b>	A statement crafted by the wraparound team that provides a one or two sentence summary of what the team is working toward with the youth and family.
<b>Natural supports</b>	See also <i>informal resources or supports</i> . Individuals or organizations in the family's own community, kinship, social, or spiritual networks, such as friends, extended family members, ministers, neighbors, local businesspersons or shopkeepers, etc.
<b>Outcomes</b>	Child, family, or team goals stated in a way that can be observed and measured.
<b>Participant</b>	A person participating in the evaluation of quality or fidelity (e.g., being observed using the TOM) such as a caregiver, youth, wraparound facilitator, or other team member.
<b>Strengths</b>	Strengths are the assets, skills, capacities, actions, talents, potential and gifts in each family member, each team member, the family as a whole, and the community. In wraparound, strengths help family members and others to successfully navigate life situations; thus, a goal for the wraparound process is to promote these strengths and to use them to accomplish the goals in the team's plan of care.
<b>Supports and services</b>	This phrase refers to the full complement of formal services and informal supports received by the child or family.
<b>Vision</b>	A statement constructed by the youth and family (with help from their facilitator and possibly the wraparound team) that describes how they wish things to be in the future, individually and as a family.
<b>Wraparound Plan (Plan of Care)</b>	A dynamic document that describes the family, the team, and the work to be undertaken to meet the family's needs and achieve the family's long-term vision. Since families are constantly changing, the plan should always be updated to reflect changes in strengths, resources, needs, or goals. Also called <i>individualized plan, integrated plan, and Wraparound plan</i>
<b>Wraparound Team</b>	A group of people – chosen with the family and connected to them through natural, community, and formal support relationships – who develop and implement the family's plan, address unmet needs, and work toward the family's vision.

### Additional reading on Wraparound

The above orientation to the wraparound process is derived primarily from the basic materials developed by the National Wraparound Initiative. However, there is much more reading that can supplement understanding of the wraparound process, and fidelity assessment in general.

- ❑ **Resource Guide to Wraparound.** This online resource, developed by the National Wraparound Initiative, includes over 50 articles about wraparound. These articles contain central products from the NWI, including descriptions of the principles and practice model, examples of how different communities and programs have implemented and supported wraparound, stories from youth, families, and communities, and appendices containing tools and resources that can be used in everyday practice. The Resource guide can be found at [www.wrapinfo.org](http://www.wrapinfo.org).
- ❑ **A family member's guide to wraparound – based on the National Wraparound Initiative model:** Miles, P., Bruns, E.J., Osher, T.W., Walker, J.S., & the National Wraparound Initiative Advisory Group (2006). *The Wraparound Process User's Guide: A Handbook for Families*.

Portland, OR: National Wraparound Initiative, Research and Training Center on Family Support and Children's Mental Health, Portland State University. (Available at [www.rtc.pdx.edu/nwi](http://www.rtc.pdx.edu/nwi)).

- ❑ **An entire issue of *Focal Point***, published by the Research and Training Center on Family Support and Children's Mental Health, Portland State University, is available at [www.rtc.pdx.edu/pgFocalPoint.shtml](http://www.rtc.pdx.edu/pgFocalPoint.shtml)
- ❑ **Three chapters that present the basics of wraparound:**
  - Burchard, JD, Bruns, EJ, and Burchard, SN. (2002). The Wraparound Approach. In Burns & Hoagwood (Eds.) *Community-Based Interventions for Children and Families*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
  - Walker, J.S. & Bruns, E.J. (2006). The wraparound process: Individualized care planning and management for children and families. In S. Rosenberg & J. Rosenberg (Eds.) *Community Mental Health Reader: Current Perspectives* (pp. 44-54). New York: Routledge.
  - Bruns, EJ, Walker, JS, and Penn, M. (2008). Individualized services in systems of care: The wraparound process. In B. Stroul and G. Blau (Eds.). *The system of care Handbook: Transforming mental health services for children, youth and families*. Baltimore, MD: Brookes.
- ❑ **The original monograph that described the principles of wraparound and presented model programs for the field:** Burns, B.J., and Goldman, S.K. (Eds.) (1999). Promising practices in wraparound for children with serious emotional disturbance and their families. *Systems of Care: Promising Practices in Children's Mental Health, 1998 Series, Volume IV*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Effective Collaboration and Practice, American Institutes for Research. (You can download the entire monograph online at: <http://cecp.air.org/promisingpractices/1998monographs/vol4.pdf>)
- ❑ **Two compendiums of case studies of wraparound:** Kendziora, K. and Bruns, EJ (Eds.) (2001). Wraparound: Stories from the field. *Systems of Care: Promising Practices in Children's Mental Health, 2001 Series, Volume I*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Effective Collaboration and Practice, American Institutes for Research. (You can download the entire monograph online at: [http://cecp.air.org/Air\\_Monograph.pdf](http://cecp.air.org/Air_Monograph.pdf))
- ❑ **The first compendium of wraparound case studies:** Burchard, JD, Burchard, SN, Sewell, R., & VanDenBerg, J. (1993). *One Kid at a Time: Evaluative Case Studies and Description of the Alaska Youth Initiative Demonstration Project*. (This can be obtained by contacting the Georgetown Technical Assistance Center.)
- ❑ **An article about measuring treatment fidelity that references the Wraparound Fidelity Index as an example:** Bruns, E. J., Burchard, J. D., Suter, J.S., & Force, M.D. (2005). Measuring fidelity within community treatments for youth: Challenges and strategies. In Epstein, M. Kutash, K. & Duchnowski, A. (Eds.) *Outcomes for Children and Youth*. Austin, TX: Pro-ED.
- ❑ **A book by Karl Dennis and Ira Lourie, two of the original pioneers of the wraparound philosophy and advocates for using the wraparound process in service delivery:** Dennis, K. W., & Lourie, I.S. (2006). *Everything is normal until proven otherwise: A book about wraparound services*. Washington, DC: Child Welfare League of America.

## Chapter 2: Introduction to the Team Observation Measure

As described in the Preface, the Team Observation Measure (TOM) is designed to assess adherence to standards of high-quality wraparound during team meeting sessions. It consists of 20 items, with two items dedicated to each of the 10 principles of wraparound. Each item consists of 3-5 indicators of high-quality wraparound practice that should be observable during a child and family team meeting. Working alone or in pairs, trained raters indicate whether or not each indicator was in evidence during the wraparound team meeting session. These ratings are translated into a score for each item on a scale of 0 – 4. In addition, TOM ratings are translated into a total fidelity score for the session overall.

### Organization of the TOM

The TOM was designed to be relatively straightforward. Its cover page includes an area in which the observer records basic information about the meeting, and the number and types of team members in attendance. The remaining pages present the 20 TOM items, each of which includes between 3-5 indicators. Each indicator must be scored as ‘Yes’ (this was observed to occur during the meeting), ‘No’ (this was not observed to occur during the meeting), and, for some indicators ‘N/A.’ A summary of the items and indicators, by wraparound principle being assessed, is presented below.

Wraparound principle	TOM Item	Number of indicators
Team Based	1. Team Membership & Attendance	3
	2. Effective Team Process	4
Collaborative	3. Facilitator Preparation	4
	4. Effective Decision Making	4
Individualized	5. Creative Brainstorming and Options	3
	6. Individualized process	4
Natural Supports	7. Natural and Community Supports	4
	8. Natural Support Plans	3
Unconditional Commitment and Persistence	9. Team Mission and Plan	4
	10. Shared Responsibility	3
Cultural Competence	11. Facilitation Skills	4
	12. Cultural and Linguistic Competence	4
Outcomes Based	13. Outcomes Based Process	3
	14. Evaluating Progress and Success	3
Voice and Choice	15. Youth and Family Voice	4
	16. Youth and Family Choice	3
Strengths based	17. Focus on strengths	4
	18. Positive team culture	4
Community-based	19. Community focus	3
	20. Least Restrictive Environment	3
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF INDICATORS</b>		<b>71</b>

## TOM Items and Indicators

As presented above, each TOM item is numbered from 1-20. Indicators for each item are lettered from a through e. On the TOM form, in the TOM manual, and in entering data, the individual indicators are identified by the item number, followed by the letter for that indicator. For example, indicator 'c' ("Community team members and natural supports participate in decision making") for Item 7 ("Natural and community supports") is referred to as indicator 7c.

## Response Scale

There are two response scales that are relevant to TOM observers:

1. **Response scale for indicators:** Each of the 71 TOM indicators must be scored as either 'Yes,' or 'No.' For some indicators, 'N/A' is an appropriate response.
  - **Yes** should be scored if, per the scoring rules and notes (provided in chapter 6), the described indicator was observed to have occurred during the meeting.
  - **No** should be scored if, per the scoring rules and notes, the described indicator was not observed to have occurred during the meeting.
  - **N/A** is an option for some items only, and is used if, for some reason, it is impossible to provide a score of Yes or No.
2. **Response scale for items:** After scoring all the relevant indicators within an item, the observer must assign a score to the item as a whole. Each item includes a response scale from 0 – 4, whereby:
  - **0** = None of the indicators for this item were evident during the team meeting (i.e., none were scored 'Yes')
  - **1** = Some, but fewer than half of the indicators for this item were scored 'Yes'
  - **2** = About half of the indicators for this item were scored 'Yes'
  - **3** = More than half, but not all, of the indicators for this item were scored 'Yes'
  - **4** = All of the indicators for this item were evident during observation (i.e., all were scored 'Yes')

This response scale is used for each item for several reasons. First, since TOM items have different numbers of indicators (from 3 to 5), it is impossible to simply add up the number of 'Yes'-scored items to come up with a total score that will be consistent across all the items. Second, because one or more indicators per item may be scored 'N/A,' a method must be used that accounts for different numbers of scorable indicators per administration.

To assign a final score for a TOM item, the observer must consider the number of scorable indicators for the item (i.e., indicators for which a score of 'N/A' is not assigned); then, consider the number of "Yes" scores for those indicators; and assign the appropriate item score. The following table can assist in assigning the correct item score, based on the number of scorable (non-N/A) indicators for the item and the number of positively scored (i.e., 'Yes') indicators for the item (this Table is also provided on the last page of the TOM form, to help observers with scoring):

Number of scorable indicators	Number of indicators scored 'Yes'	Correct item score
5	5	4
	4	3
	3	2
	2	2
	1	1
	0	0
4	4	4
	3	3
	2	2
	1	1
	0	0
3	3	4
	2	3
	1	1
	0	0
2	2	4
	1	2
	0	0
1	1	4
	0	0
0	--	666*

\*Note that if all of the indicators for an item are N/A, and thus there are no scorable indicators, the best score for the item overall is “666” which is a missing data code for “Not applicable.” A key to item scores is provided at the bottom of the TOM data collection instrument to assist in assigning item scores.

### Role of the TOM observer

The TOM observer is intended to be just that – an inconspicuous observer of the wraparound team process that occurs for a child and family along with his or her team members. The observer should be well oriented to the TOM and the notes and scoring rules for each item and indicator that are presented in the chapter to follow. The TOM observer is expected to observe the entire team meeting, from start to finish, so that she or he can be certain whether the indicators on the TOM form did or did not occur during the meeting. The observer is also expected to take notes about what she or he observes during the team meeting. Such notes may be very useful in helping tell the story of this family's wraparound process, and will help facilitate the positive use of TOM data and improvements in practice for youth and families down the line.

### Use of video recorded team meetings

In order to reduce the logistical burden of attending team meetings in person, and/or disruption of team meetings, some collaborators choose to score TOMs by watching video



recorded team meetings. This is perfectly acceptable. Sites employing this approach should take steps to inform families and team members about the process and potentially obtain written consent to be video recorded.

## Chapter 3: Qualifications for Use

The TOM was designed to be a fairly straightforward measure that could be used by any community or site interested in collecting fidelity information on wraparound implementation, or overall quality of other child and family team processes. It was also designed so it could be administered by observers of many types of backgrounds, including researchers, evaluators, family members, and students. However, there are several criteria a community or program must meet before using the measure.

***1. An individual with some background and experience in evaluation research or quality assurance and data management should lead the local effort.***

Those responsible for training observers and managing observations, data entry, and data management should have training and/or experience in those particular areas. Our research team will provide a Manual and PowerPoint slide presentation, with notes, to be used in training observers. Videos of sample team meetings will also be available, along with fully scored TOMs for that team meeting, for use in training and ensuring observers have met criteria. It is expected that the materials provided, in the hands of an experienced evaluator or person with experience in quality assurance, should suffice.

***2. Observers should be selected who have experience and comfort with interacting with youth, family members and providers, or who can be trained and supervised closely until they do have such comfort.***

Observers will need to interact with individuals participating in the team process, in order to provide them with information statements, explain what they are doing at the meeting, and de-brief with the team leader or facilitator after the meeting is over. Therefore, observers should have training and/or experience interacting with children, youth, family members, and providers. If they have not received prior training or had prior experience, it is essential that they be sufficiently trained with the TOM, including practice administrations using videotaped team meetings. New observers may also need to be paired with a supervisor or experienced observer to get help and practice in observing a team meeting and scoring the TOM. Observers will also need to be experienced with the TOM form, this *User's Manual*, and have a good understanding of the wraparound process itself. The more they have mastered this information, the better able they will be to observe meetings and provide reliable scores on the indicators and items of the TOM.

The above is not to imply that only researchers must administer the TOM. Though sites often contract with universities or other traditional research partners to collect fidelity, outcome, and/or satisfaction data, many sites that employ wraparound have successfully employed teams of parents or other “non-traditional” evaluators to collect such data. Given adequate training and supervision, such observers may even be preferable to “formal” research team members. Their notes may be richer and better informed by their own experiences. Regardless of the observers’ backgrounds used it is crucial to ensure that those who administer the TOM are adequately trained on the TOM and this *User's Manual*. The statements in the box on the next page summarize our research team’s expectations on qualifications of individuals who use the TOM.

### **TOM: QUALIFICATIONS FOR USE**

The TOM was designed to be a straightforward instrument that could be used by any site interested in collecting information on wraparound implementation. Nonetheless, proper use requires competency in different areas depending on the individual's role in using the TOM.

#### **Administration**

The TOM was designed to be administered by a trained observer. Observers must be trained on administration and scoring of the TOM as well as have:

- Training and/or experience interacting with team members whose ages, languages, and backgrounds are similar to those being observed (i.e., youth receiving services; parents and caregivers of these youth, and service providers);
- Competence and familiarity with the TOM forms and the user's manual; and
- Experience with or a good working knowledge of the wraparound process.

#### **Scoring**

Individuals responsible for scoring must follow instructions on the TOM forms and in the *TOM User's Manual* to assure accurate scoring of TOM indicators and items. Scoring is fairly straightforward for most indicators. However, for some items observer judgment is necessary. All paper forms should be checked carefully before final scoring and submission for data entry.

Our research team can provide electronic files to simplify data entry and data management to all our collaborators. These files are available in Microsoft Excel<sup>®</sup> and SPSS<sup>®</sup> formats. However, the research team prefers that users access the online data entry and reporting system (WrapTrack). Using this online tool, collaborators will have the ability to enter data, run reports, and export data as well. To access WrapTrack, simply send an email to the system administrator at [wrapeval@uw.edu](mailto:wrapeval@uw.edu). Users will undergo a brief online tutorial that will allow them to access and utilize the system. Those responsible for managing observers, data entry, and data management should have training and experience in those areas.

#### **Management and Coordination**

It is essential that the person or persons responsible for coordinating the evaluation using the TOM have appropriate experience and/or training in such activities. At a minimum, they must have a thorough knowledge of the *TOM User's Manual* and form, uses for the data, and any limits to confidentiality. They must also ensure adequate training and supervision of observers. Ideally, these individuals should also be skilled in getting the key stakeholders from the community and/or program(s) invested in the assessment or evaluation (if they are not already), getting approval for the evaluation project, identifying observers and participants, and distributing information statements and/or obtaining consents from participants.

#### **Interpretation**

The proper clinical, quality assurance, program evaluation, and research use and interpretation of the TOM require knowledge of theory and methodology of assessment, as well as supervised training in working with the youths and families of interest. The training required may differ depending to the ways in which the data are to be used. However, no amount of prior training can substitute for professional maturity and a thorough familiarity with the procedures and cautions presented in the *TOM User's Manual*.

**3. A full training protocol should be implemented for observers.**

It is expected that a local community that employs multiple TOM observers will take the time to administer training for these individuals that includes:

1. An overview of the wraparound process, including its principles and four phases and activities;
2. An overview of the purpose and structure of the TOM;
3. A review of general TOM administration procedures;
4. A review of individual TOM indicators, items, and scoring rules;
5. Completion of the TOM Quiz (after initial training and review of TOM indicators, items, and scoring rules); results shared with supervisor;
6. Group practice administrations of the TOM using a videotaped team meeting or approved live team meeting;
7. Practice administrations done in a pair with an experienced observer, evaluation leader, or supervisor, with comparison and de-briefing of scores assigned; and
8. Periodic group and/or individual supervision for observers.

Though this recommended regimen may seem intensive, we believe it is critical to ensuring reliable and valid administration and TOM scores. The first four activities should be relatively straightforward: The Wraparound Evaluation and Research Team will provide a *User's Manual*, which can be used as an introduction for observers and a reference for administration and scoring. We also can provide a PowerPoint presentation to be used by local evaluation teams training multiple observers, especially if these observers are not trained as evaluators.

After the training on the TOM, the evaluation team should arrange to have group practice administrations of the TOM, using videotaped team meetings of various types (e.g., planning meeting, follow-up meeting). WERT is currently in the process of constructing such practice videos, but currently, provides one video that was done by Vroon VanDenBerg for observation practice. The full team will ideally observe a videotaped team meeting, score independently, and then debrief scores assigned. For more information, see the ***"TOM Interviewer Training Manual"***, included in this packet. This will help members of the team observe how observations should proceed and scores should be assigned. The supervisor or evaluation team leader may wish to have each team member score a TOM using a videotaped team meeting that has pre-assigned scores, to check the individual's accuracy. Because of the subjective nature of many of the indicators, it is our hope that an observer will (1) achieve correct scores on 80% of the indicators, and (2) correctly assign Item scores for all the items based on her or his indicator scores.

After initial group training and assessment of observer reliability and accuracy, it is recommended that initial observation sessions with "live" teams be supervised by an evaluation team leader or supervisor. Such initial observations may be conducted initially in pairs, as a training and quality assurance approach, OR team observations using the TOM may always be conducted in pairs, to ensure more reliable and accurate ratings. If being conducted in pairs, it is recommended that each observer complete the TOM individually, followed by comparison of scores by both reviewers and reconciliation of scores that are not the same.

Once the evaluation has begun, and observations are being conducted, team meetings or supervision sessions should also be held periodically so that members of the team can discuss administration issues they are encountering, scoring questions, and other issues as a group. The TOM Quiz can also be administered for refresher training at any time.

#### 4. Sampling Approaches for Measures of the Wraparound Fidelity Assessment System

1. The sample should be a random selection (or at least representative) of the families served by the wraparound effort.
2. If the evaluation wants to generate reports and information about different levels of wraparound implementation (e.g. multiple provider agencies, counties, supervisors), the sample must be stratified or representative of each of these levels. That is to say, you would want to draw a random sample of adequate size (e.g., no fewer than 10) at each level of evaluation.
3. Once the sample is chosen, adequate effort must be expended toward obtaining a high completion rate. Ideally, at least 80% of all proposed data collection (e.g. the total number of WFI surveys to be completed or teams to be observed) should be completed. Seventy percent is probably ok. Below 60%, we begin to doubt the representativeness of the sample (and thus the validity of the evaluation), because it may be biased toward team meetings or interview respondents who are easier to reach or complete.  
**Ultimately, the data collection completion rate is more important than the number of youth/families in the sample.**
4. If fidelity data collection is going to proceed over time, then once a sampling method is determined, the same method should be used consistently across data collection waves. A site or program could systematically draw samples and complete interviews/observations on a set schedule (e.g., every year, every 6 months, every 2 years).

In order to conduct a valid evaluation using the tools of the WFAS, it is necessary to administer the measures with a sample (of respondents, of team meetings) that is **representative** of the initiative or project overall. Put another way, if your administrations or interviews are completed with a “convenience sample” or if you only successfully complete interviews with respondents who are easy to reach, it is unlikely that the data will represent the reality of your project, and the perspectives of all your families and staff.

One way to do achieve representativeness is to administer the measure(s) to every caregiver/youth/staff person involved, and/or to observe every team meeting that occurs. However, this is obviously infeasible for most wraparound projects. The alternative is to **use a strategic sampling plan that achieves representativeness** and then **achieve a high (e.g., >80%) data collection completion success rate**, to minimize response bias and further ensure representativeness.

**Below are examples of how to use a strategic sampling approach to ensure representativeness. Sampling plans cannot be “one size fits all”: they must be based on local resources, information needs, and goals for the evaluation. Representativeness is of highest importance when creating your sampling frame. Achieving representativeness is far more important than the absolute number of families or team meetings included in your evaluation.**

**How Often?** Since the TOM can be used as a research and evaluation tool, but also as a supervision tool, this can vary. When used as strictly a research tool, we recommend the each youth/family get observed only once, unless they are randomly selected twice. If the TOM is being used in a supervisory capacity, it may be the case that certain families get chosen more than once, and this is okay. However, the burden on the youth and family should always be taken into consideration when multiple time point observations are considered.

Team observations are even more resource intensive, given the need to coordinate around time and date of team meetings, travel time by observers, and the length of team meetings, which can often take 1.5- 2 hours. Because of the effort involved in completing data collection for just one data point, sampling is a common approach to data collection using the WFAS tools.

**When?** Similar to the WFI-4, and depending on size of the wraparound initiative, and the goal of the evaluation, sites may choose to collect data 1x per year, 2x per year, etc. Or, they may choose to observe each youth/family at a certain time in their service (e.g., at 3 months or at 9 months etc.).

**How many?**

	TOM – N Served	Sample
<i>What is the sample size</i>	Up to 25 active families  26 – 50 active families  51 and greater = <i>(These are minimum standards!)</i>	Sample = 8 - 10  Sample = 12-15  Sample = minimum 16 maximum half of youth served
<i>How often data collected for every family</i>	Once per family unless selected twice as part of random sample. If TOM is used as more of a supervision tool, it may be appropriate to observe some families more than once, especially where there is a smaller N of families served.	
<i>Random sample method</i>	In this case, lets random sample by Wraparound Facilitator (WF). We will assume there are 5 facilitators, and each WF has a caseload of around 10 families. Each youth must be enrolled in Wraparound a minimum of 30 days (although there really are no constraints for doing TOM as far as time in enrollment goes), and a maximum of 12 months. This brings each eligible case load by WF to about 8. Given the low N, we would recommend that each youth/family get observed at least once. A 75-80% completion rate at this low N would be necessary to consider the findings valid.	

## Chapter 4: Preparing to collect TOM data

This chapter includes information on other types of preparation for observations as well as identifying and engaging participants in the TOM quality assessment. **It is important for those overseeing evaluation using the TOM to review this chapter before training observers or scheduling any observations.**

### Project Approval

Even before hiring or training begins, an Institutional Review Board (IRB) or Human Subjects Research Committee may need to approve your site's evaluation. If your site is at or affiliated with a college, university, or research center you should have a local IRB. If so, you should obtain approval (or an exemption) from them prior to beginning a formal evaluation.

### Selecting and preparing observers

Especially when using the TOM for evaluation or research purposes, it is important to use observers who are not directly involved with the services and supports that are being delivered to the families whose teams are being observed. Also, it is recommended that observers not personally know the participants in the team meeting. Personally knowing the family or team members can compromise both the confidential nature of the information and the participants' willingness to allow for an observation to occur. Anonymous observers who are not affiliated with members of families' wraparound teams are the best choice.

As mentioned in the section on User Qualifications (Chapter 3), observers should have adequate knowledge of the service delivery system (including the common terms for child-serving agencies and their representatives), the wraparound process model, and this Manual. Training should occur well in advance of administering observers and should cover this entire manual. Observers should have sufficient practice administering the TOM prior to starting.

### Approaching families and team members

Before a TOM is administered, information about the TOM process must be provided to the family and facilitator or team leader. Formal written or oral consent for their participation may also need to be obtained. Providing families with information about the evaluation process and TOM observations is crucial for ensuring they are fully willing and able to participate. The evaluation should be presented as an opportunity for families to have their experience reviewed as a way to facilitate positive change in their community. It is important to emphasize the confidential nature of the observations, as well as the extensiveness of the evaluation. In other words, one should emphasize that the TOM is being used to evaluate the team process for a large number of the families at the site and not just their family. Take the time to outline what your site's goals are for the evaluation (e.g., to improve services) and then respond to any questions or concerns they may have.

### Engaging wraparound facilitators and provider

As for caregivers and youths, wraparound facilitators (or care coordinators, or care managers, or team leaders) must be "on board" as stakeholders in the evaluation. Their investment and involvement is crucial to the process and it is recommended that ample time be taken to review the reasons for the evaluation and reasons their team process is being observed. This should be done in

advance of asking them to participate individually in a TOM observation. For example, care managers or facilitators on staff at a program may be informed about the evaluation during a staff meeting or supervision session. Later, the facilitator will need to be informed their team has been specifically selected for inclusion in the evaluation, and informed that an observer hopes to be allowed into a team meeting. (The facilitator or care manager may also be asked to provide information about the meeting time, date, and location.) Finally, at the time of the meeting itself, the observer may need to remind the facilitator – and explain to the rest of the team – about the purpose of the TOM and the goals of the evaluation.

Facilitators and other team members need to be reminded that TOM data will be used to provide comprehensive (and confidential, in most TOM uses) feedback on how wraparound is being implemented and that the data will be used to identify and support training needs. TOM data may be submitted to supervising agencies or policy makers to help attest to the program's meeting standards of accreditation. Data can also be used to make the case for additional funding and support (e.g., greater flex funds, lower caseloads).

Engaging wraparound facilitators is important not only to ensure their agreement and participation, but also because they are in the best position to identify and enlist youth and family participation. The better wraparound facilitators understand the process, the better they will be able to explain to families in advance of the observation, put them at ease, and encourage them to consent to participate.



---

**Under most conditions, an Information Statement about the TOM observation should be provided to the youth, family members, facilitator, and team members. In addition, consent (verbal or written) may need to be obtained from participants such as youth, caregivers, and wraparound facilitators before observations are conducted.**

---



# Chapter 5: Conducting TOM observations

## Setting up for the meeting

Before you go to the team meeting, be sure you have all the materials you need. These materials may include:

- Information on meeting location and time
- TOM form and manual
- An information sheet or evaluation project brochure to explain the TOM administration and evaluation to team members
- Consent form(s), if required
- Gift cards or other honoraria for participants, if being provided
- Gift card receipts

Once you arrive, you should:

- Introduce yourself and remind or explain to team members and other participants of the evaluation project's purpose, if facilitator/team leader has not done that
- Have family sign Informed Consent Form, if necessary
- Sit in corner or away from table, if possible
- Begin filling out cover sheet information

*As described in Section 3, remember that the TOM can be conducted using a video recording of the team meeting. This will reduce the burden of some of the logistical steps described here.*

## Filling out the Cover sheet

The TOM cover sheet consists of two sections. To the right of the sheet, you will find a box in which to enter ID numbers and basic information about the team meeting.

### **ID Numbers**

Someone at your site must be responsible for coordinating and monitoring the completion of all TOM observations. One of the responsibilities of this individual will be to keep track of families for whom wraparound fidelity is being assessed via the TOM. For consistency's sake, our research team has developed a tracking system that should be used by all collaborators in the pilot test of the TOM. Four separate identification numbers are used. These identification numbers and their descriptions are listed in the Table below:

<b>ID Number</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Project ID</b>	WERT will assign an identification number to your agency or site. This identification number is a three-digit number that is unique to your site (e.g., 401).
<b>Youth/Family</b>	This number is assigned by your agency for each family unit participating in the assessment. It must be unique to every family. The simplest method is to

<b>ID</b>	give the first family an ID number of 1, the next 2, and so on. If a family has multiple youth receiving services, these youths should have combined team meetings. Thus, we do not assign unique <i>Youth IDs</i> .
<b>Facilitator ID</b>	Because WERT will analyze how TOM data differs for different facilitators, a unique number should be assigned by your agency to each wraparound facilitator who is coordinating services in your program or site. Every time the same wrap facilitator has a team observed, their unique ID number should be recorded. If the facilitator for a family changes over time and a team meeting for the new facilitator is observed at a follow-up data collection point, the new facilitator's ID number should be used in data entry for the second TOM administration.
<b>Observer ID</b>	This ID number is assigned by your agency for each observer. Every time an observation is conducted, the observer's unique ID number should be recorded.
<b>Timeframe</b>	Use of this number is dependent on the site's evaluation plan. It is important for sites conducting multiple observations at designated time-points. For example, your site may be conducting observations every six months. In this case the first observation would be assigned a 1, the second a 2, and so forth. If a designated observation is skipped then the corresponding <i>Timeframe</i> number is also skipped. Thus if three observations were scheduled but only the first and third took place, then data for the first would be assigned a <i>Timeframe</i> of 1 and data for the second TOM observation conducted would be assigned a 3.



**Identification numbers should always be written on the TOM forms prior to conducting the observation and entered into your database during data entry.**

### **Meeting information**

Below the ID number fields, the observer should enter information about the team meeting. These fields include:

- Meeting date
- Meeting place
- Meeting start and end time

In addition, you will be asked to indicate which type of meeting you are observing. This may be something that you know before you arrive at the meeting, or you may have to ask the facilitator or team leader which type of meeting is being conducted. Options for types of meetings are described below:

1. An **initial team meeting** is intended to correspond to the Engagement phase of the wraparound process. Such meetings are held very early in the process, and are conducted before a wraparound plan is created. Typically, these meetings are intended to introduce team members to one another; explain the wraparound process; review the family's strengths, needs and goals; and develop a team mission statement or family vision statement. Initial team meetings are often followed by the beginning of a planning process for the youth and family. If planning occurs, then marking **'2'** for **Initial planning meeting** would be more appropriate.
2. An **initial planning meeting** takes place during the Planning phase of the wraparound process. During initial planning meetings, family needs and team goals are prioritized, strategies are brainstormed, and action steps are developed and assigned. Sometimes an initial planning process is preceded by an initial engagement session with the team members. If planning occurs during an initial team meeting, mark **'2'** for **initial planning meeting**.
3. **Follow-up meetings** (or maintenance, or implementation meetings) are the most frequent types of meetings, and correspond to the Implementation phase of wraparound. Follow-up meetings typically involve tracking progress on action steps, reviewing the status of the youth and family's goals, and revising strategies if necessary. Because planning and brainstorming of strategies and options may take place at follow up meetings, it is important for the observer to confirm whether a meeting is a follow-up meeting as opposed to an initial planning meeting (option '2'). If planning occurs, but the meeting is not an **initial planning meeting**, mark **'3'** for **follow-up meeting**.
4. **Transition meetings** (also known as discharge or graduation meetings) occur at the end of the wraparound process and consist of preparing the family to continue after the cessation of the formal wraparound process. Activities may include celebrating the transition, preparing a transition plan, or determining how the family can best access needed supports after formal wraparound is complete.
5. The observer may also specify **"Other"** as a meeting type. This would be appropriate if the meeting is clearly a special type of meeting that falls outside of the above options. Examples may include a crisis planning meeting or a celebration meeting (that is not a transition meeting). The observer should typically use this option rarely, and only if the meeting is very specialized and thus does not have any of the hallmarks of the other types of meetings described above.

### **Team members**

The observer should record the number of team members that participated in the meeting by type in the "Team members" section of the cover page. In the notes column, the observer may wish to record first names or initials to help him or her remember the participants later. If necessary, the observer may need to check with the team leader or facilitator about who specific individuals at the meeting were, and the role they play for the youth and family. **Note that there are different sections for recording "Parent" (birth or adoptive) vs. "Foster parent" vs. "Caregiver" present.** This is because wraparound teams may include one or more foster parents or other types of caregivers (e.g., group home staff) as well as birth parents present at a team meeting. If caregivers other than parents or foster parents are present, the observer may wish to record the specific type of caregiver present in the notes column of the team member section.

### **Completing the TOM**

As a trained TOM observer, you should be prepared to be looking for information relevant to the 71 indicators on the TOM. As the meeting progresses, take time to record your observations in the notes

## **CHAPTER 5: CONDUCTING TOM OBSERVATIONS**

area to the right of each item. You can also record your observations on a separate piece of paper or on the comments section on pages 7-8 of the TOM form. As things occur, you may also record your scores for relevant indicators by circling the appropriate response. Specific notes and scoring rules for each of the 71 indicators are provided in the next chapter.

**Recording observer notes and comments<sup>2</sup>**

The TOM form has small areas for “Notes” next to each item, as well as an area for “Observer comments” at the end of the form. Writing down your own observations and comments about the team process is a very important component of completing the TOM observation, for two reasons. First, these notes may be useful to you as you assign scores later on. Second, such information provides rich details that may be useful in constructing evaluation reports and guiding quality improvement efforts. Wherever possible, provide direct quotes and specific behaviors. Some examples of useful observer notes and comments include:

- **Examples of why you scored “yes” or “no” for certain indicators.** For example, if you score “yes” for indicator 8a (“Brainstorming of options and strategies include strategies to be implemented by natural and community supports”), in the “Notes” section, you might write: *“8a Father mentioned that a neighbor had offered to teach the youth to drive. Team thought it was a good idea, and set this as one of the goals in the plan.”*
- **Non-verbal communication that clarifies scoring.** For example, if you score ‘No’ for indicator 15a (“The team provides extra opportunity for the caregivers to speak and offer opinions, especially during decision making”) OR indicator 14b (“The facilitator checks in with the team members about their comfort and satisfaction with the team process”), you might note in the “Comments” section: *“During most of the meeting, youth sat at the table with arms folded and frowning. Appeared more and more upset as meeting progressed, but team did not check in with youth.”* OR this could be recorded in the “Notes” section for “Youth and family voice” (Item 15) or “Evaluating Progress and Success” (Item 14).
- **Non-verbal communication that adds details to the scoring.** For example, to add detail to a score of “No” for indicator 17a (“Team members acknowledge or list youth and family strengths”), you might write a note under Item 17: *“Team Leader tried to focus the team on strengths, but every time, P.O. (probation officer) rolled his eyes and made an exaggerated sigh, sometimes made negative comments.”*
- **General background comments that will help us understand the meeting.** For example, you might note on the last “comments” page: *“The meeting was held in a cramped room in the residential facility. The room temperature was very cold, and it was right next to the kitchen, so it was quite noisy and hard to hear.”*
- **Summary comments that will help provide additional information for the evaluation.** For example, you might note on the last “comments” page: *“WF (wraparound facilitator) did an artful job throughout the meeting of redirecting the team to strengths. Every time a team member tried to bring up a deficit, WF asked the team to state that same issue as a strength. By the end of the meeting, the team had quit discussing deficits and begun discussing strengths.”* -- OR -- *“By setting up the agenda at the very beginning of the meeting, the WF maintained control of the meeting at the outset and managed to keep the meeting very organized and productive.”*

**Types of comments and Notes NOT to include**

- DO NOT USE names. Use roles, job titles, or initials.
- Do not give ONLY your opinions. Present specific evidence. For example, rather than writing, “The youth seemed angry,” say instead, “The youth sat the entire meeting he sat

<sup>2</sup> Our thanks to the evaluation team at the Florida Mental health Institute who evaluated the Tampa-Hillsborough Integrated Network for Kids for these examples.

with a scowl on his face and his arms folded across his chest, and when he spoke his voice volume was loud and his voice tone was harsh.”

### ***Scoring the TOM***

After the meeting observation, plan on taking at least 30 to 60 minutes to sit down with your manual and TOM form to review your notes and complete your scoring while the meeting is still fresh in your mind. For some of the TOM indicators, you may not have assigned a score; for others, you may feel the need to review your scores against the criteria in the manual. Revising a score after reviewing the manual is acceptable as long as you are sure that the new score is the most appropriate one for the meeting.

### ***Scoring the TOM in pairs***

As notes in Chapter 3, TOM observations may be conducted in pairs at the beginning of an evaluation, as a way of assisting observers to master the TOM. Pairs may also be used consistently throughout an evaluation. For example, some communities have consistently employed observers of two different types (e.g., a parent advocate paired with a provider or university-based evaluator) to conduct observations together. If observations are conducted in pairs, the evaluation team must come to agreement about how to reconcile different scores across raters. A recommended approach would be to (1) have each observer assign their own scores, (2) review scores that differ and attempt to come to a consensus using the scoring rules in the TOM Manual, and (3) bringing indicators for which consensus could not be reached to the evaluation supervisor or evaluation team meeting for discussion and a final decision.

### ***Following up with the facilitator or team leader for certain indicators***

As will be noted in the scoring rules for each indicator in the next chapter, it may be difficult to assign scores for some of the TOM indicators without additional information. For these indicators, following up or debriefing with the team leader or facilitator may be necessary, either immediately after the team meeting, or on the phone at a later time, (if time does not permit an immediate de-brief). TOM indicators for which a follow-up with the facilitator or team leader is permissible are marked with an asterisk on the TOM form, and are briefly reviewed in the Table below:

<b>TOM Indicator</b>	<b>Reason for follow-up</b>
1c. Key school or other public stakeholder agency representatives are present.	If this is not clear from observing the team meeting, the observer may need to debrief with the facilitator or team leader to determine whether any team members (including school or agency representatives, providers, or other team members) who are important to the family and team were not in attendance,
2c. Tasks and strategies are explicitly linked to goals.	If not clear from observing the meeting, the observer may need to review the wraparound plan and/or ask the facilitator or team leader whether the tasks and strategies discussed during the meeting are actually linked to specific goals for the family.
6c. Team facilitates the creation of individualized supports or services to meet the unique needs of child and/or family.	If not clear from observing the meeting, the observer may wish to review the wraparound plan or ask the team leader or facilitator about the specific strategies in the wraparound plan, to assess whether they are individualized for that specific youth and family. With information about the nature of the services and supports in the plan, the observer should be able to use scoring rules to assign a score.
7c. Community team members and natural supports have a clear role on the team.	If a natural support attends the meeting but the observer is not sure whether she or he has a specific role on the team, a post-meeting query of the facilitator or review of the wraparound plan may be used to determine if the team member has a specific responsibility on the

	team, such as implementing a certain part of the wraparound plan.
8b. The plan of care represents a balance between formal services and informal supports.	Similar to indicator 6c above, the observer may wish to review the wraparound plan or ask the team leader or facilitator about the specific strategies in the wraparound plan, to assess whether they represent a balance of formal and informal services supports. With information about the nature of the services and supports in the plan, the observer should be able to use scoring rules to assign a score.
9c. The team has confirmed or is creating a crisis plan.	Many team meetings may occur after initial planning and crisis planning has occurred, and the crisis plan may not be mentioned during the meeting. To score this indicator, the observer may wish to follow-up with the facilitator or team leader to confirm whether there is a crisis plan in place that meets criteria described in the scoring rules.
9d. The wraparound team plan contains specific goals that are linked to strategies and action steps.	The observer should be able to ascertain if there are clear goals toward which the team is directing its efforts for the family, either because the plan of care is available or because the team members describe the family's goals. However, for certain meetings, the observer may need to follow up with the facilitator after the meeting to review the wraparound plan and confirm whether there are specific goals linked to strategies and action steps.
10a. The team explicitly assigns responsibility for action steps that define who will do what, when, and how often.	Similar to indicator 9d above, for certain meetings, the observer may need to follow up with the facilitator after the meeting to review the wraparound plan and confirm whether there are specific action steps for individual team members that define who will do what, when, and how often.
13a. The team uses objective measurement strategies.	Similar to indicator 9d above, for certain meetings, the observer may need to follow up with the facilitator after the meeting to review the wraparound plan and confirm whether the team has set goals linked to objective measurement strategies.
19a. The team is actively brainstorming and facilitating community activities for the youth and family.	The observer may not be able to observe whether community activities are a part of the youth and family's wraparound plan, and may need to review the wraparound plan and/or ask the facilitator or team leader if they are included.

Though following up with the facilitator or team leader may be inconvenient and even slightly awkward, it is a recommended way to make sure the TOM observation process yields the best information possible.

### Scoring rules

The next chapter includes detailed notes and scoring rules for each of the TOM indicators and items. The observer should be familiar with these rules before conducting an observation, in order to make it as efficient as possible to “score on the go.” At the same time, the observer will likely want the manual available when it comes time to review scores that were assigned.

The following issues should be considered in scoring all TOM indicators and items:

- Unless otherwise indicated, references to the “team” also include the youth, parent/caregiver, and family members.
- Per the wraparound principles, attendance and full involvement of the youth as a member of the team is expected wherever possible. However, if the youth is 9 or younger, or experiences significant developmental delays, his or her active involvement and attendance may not be expected.
- There are many references in the TOM manual to the “wraparound plan,” or “plan of care.” However, the plan of care may be different depending on the team, site, or

community. In scoring indicators, the observer should consider whatever the team is using as their plan. It may be a formal form with goals and action steps that everyone signs. Or, the plan might consist of a team mission or set of needs that is brought to every team meeting. Or it may be a set of objectives written on a flip chart. Toward the beginning of the meeting, decide what this team uses for the plan, then refer to that as you rate the questions asking about the “plan.” Needless to say, less formally documented plans may compromise the observer’s ability to give full credit for some of the indicators, because objective information will not be available to support assigning full credit.

- The observer must recognize that different types of meetings consist of different types of content. Follow-up meetings that are taking place many months after the initial wraparound plan of care was developed may present less information about the TOM indicators than an initial planning meeting. Nonetheless, **remember that objective information must be the basis for all scores assigned.** This primarily will consist of behaviors observed in front of the observer in a meeting. Though you may follow up with the facilitator or team leader or review the plan of care to score a few specific items, as an observer, you should **rely primarily on what you see in the meeting.**



## Chapter 6: Scoring Rules for TOM indicators and items

### Item 1. Team Membership & Attendance

*TOM Item 1 maps to the wraparound principle of “Team Based,” and assesses the extent to which the wraparound facilitator ensures that necessary participants (including formal and informal supports) attend and actively participate in wraparound team meetings.*

#### 1a. Parent/caregiver is a team member and present at the meeting.

**NOTES:** The term “parent/caregiver” refers to the person or persons with primary day-to-day responsibilities for 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 individual in the group home or residential center with primary oversight of the youth’s care should be present.

##### SCORING:

**Yes** if the primary caregiver or caregivers are in attendance.

**No** if one or more of the youth’s primary caregivers are not in attendance.

**N/A** may be appropriate for a youth in independent living situations; however, a score of “**No**” would be more appropriate if a youth in independent living has an aide, mentor, or life skills coach responsible for her or his residential situation and he or she is not in attendance.

#### 1b. Youth (over age 9) is a team member and present at the meeting.

**NOTES:** Youths 10 and older and involved in wraparound should be in attendance at their own team meetings. However, team members and facilitators often provide reasons for youth not to attend (e.g., he or she is in school at the time of the meeting, has a doctor’s appointment, or just doesn’t want to come). However, unless a youth experiences significant developmental or medical disability that makes their presence impossible, the team should ensure that a youth 10 or older is in attendance at their wraparound meetings. This should ideally be the case even if the youth is in an out-of-home placement, including hospital or detention settings.

##### SCORING:

**Yes** if the youth (10 or older) is in attendance

**No** if the youth (10 or older) is not in attendance.

**N/A** is an acceptable score if the youth is 9 or younger or experiences significant developmental or medical disability that makes their presence impossible.

#### 1c. Key school or other public stakeholder agency representatives are present.

**NOTES:** It can be a challenge to determine which school and agency representatives should be present at the meeting. “Key” representatives from school and relevant agencies (such as child welfare/social services or juvenile justice) are those who have a primary role in implementing strategies in a youth and family’s wraparound plan or who are implicated in important goals for the family (such as succeeding in school, transitioning home, or getting off probation). The observer may find it obvious that a “key” representative is absent, such as when a team member is referred to in reviewing a strategy or action step for the team but she or her not

present at the meeting. **In some cases, this is an item which may require a post-meeting query of the facilitator to determine if any key representatives were not present.**

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if key school and agency representatives are present.

**No** if one or more is not.

**N/A** is an acceptable score if there are no public agencies involved in the youth and family's plan, goals, or strategies.

## Item 2. Effective Team Process

*TOM Item 2 maps to the wraparound principle of "Team Based," and assesses the extent to which the team process is effective and aligned with the principles and expected activities of the wraparound process.*

### 2a. Team meeting attendees are oriented to the wraparound process and understand the purpose of the meeting.

**NOTES:** It is important for the wraparound facilitator or team leader to brief new team members on wraparound before inviting them to a team meeting. The facilitator should also orient all team members to the purpose of a specific meeting. Because wraparound team meetings take different forms depending on the phase of the process (e.g., initial planning meeting, crisis planning meeting, follow-up meeting, transition planning meeting), it can sometimes be difficult to determine whether meeting attendees are well-oriented and fully understand the purpose of the meeting. The observer should look for evidence that the facilitator or meeting leader is presenting the purpose of the meeting at the beginning, and for evidence that the meeting attendees understand why they are present and how they are expected to contribute.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if the facilitator explains the goals or purpose of the meeting AND meeting attendees seem to understand their role on the team.

**No** if goals of the meeting seem unclear OR if team members seem confused about the wraparound process or their role in the meeting.

**'N/A'** is not an option for this indicator.

### 2b. The facilitator assists the team to review and prioritize family and youth needs.

**NOTES:** Initial planning meetings and crisis or safety planning meeting are most likely to include a full review of family and youth needs, as well as prioritization of these needs. If you are observing a planning meeting, identification and prioritization of needs should occur. In addition, most types of follow-up wraparound meetings should include a review of goals or family needs, and possibly a prioritization of new needs or goals.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if youth or family needs and/or goals are identified or reviewed.

**No** if needs and/or goals are not reviewed OR, if multiple needs and/or goals are reviewed, if prioritization for action does not take place.

**N/A** is an acceptable score if the wraparound meeting is clearly not the type of meeting (e.g., a planning or follow-up meeting) that might require a review of youth or family needs or goals. However, most wraparound meetings should involve such a process.

### **2c. Tasks and strategies are explicitly linked to goals.**

**NOTES:** The tasks and strategies in a wraparound plan should be explicitly linked to goals for the youth and family. Identifying tasks and strategies in order to meet identified needs and goals should be a primary focus of planning meetings, while such links should be highlighted or at least implicit in a follow-up wraparound meeting. For example, provision of individual therapy for a youth should be determined as a strategy for meeting a priority need or achieving a clear goal for the youth or family (e.g., for the youth to feel less anxious in new situations so he can make friends). If, in a follow-up team meeting, an observer does not see clear evidence for how the tasks and strategies that were discussed link to youth or family goals, **he or she may wish to review the wraparound plan and/or debrief with the facilitator or team leader to assess whether there is clear linkage between strategies and needs/goals.**

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if tasks and strategies are linked to youth and/or family goals.

**No** if tasks or strategies that are discussed or reviewed do not have a connection to clear short-term or intermediate goals for the youth and/or family.

**N/A** is not an acceptable score for this item.

### **2d. Potential barriers to the nominated strategy or option are discussed and problem-solved.**

**NOTES:** If there are any clear, potential, or implicit challenges or barriers to implementing a service, strategy, or action step for a youth or family, the wraparound team meeting is a place where they should be raised and solutions brainstormed. Any strategy or action step is likely to have some potential barriers. Thus, if a new or revised strategy or action step is proposed, the team should, at the very least, discuss potential barriers to successful implementation. If any potential barriers are raised, there should be a process of brainstorming solutions or changing the strategy/action step.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if attention is given to potential barriers to parts of the wraparound plan AND time dedicated to brainstorming solutions.

**No** if an opportunity for team members to raise potential barriers is not given, OR if time is not dedicated to solving potential barriers or problems.

**N/A** may be used if there are no barriers AND if action steps and strategies are clearly not posing any problems to the youth, family or team members.

## **Item 3. Facilitator Preparation**

*TOM Item 3 maps to the wraparound principle of “Collaborative,” and assesses the extent to which the facilitator has prepared for the team meeting so that members can effectively collaborate on behalf of the youth and family.*

### **3a. There is a clear agenda or outline for the meeting, which provides an understanding of the overall purpose of the meeting and the major sections of the meeting.**

**NOTES:** The facilitator or team leader should present a clear agenda for the team meeting. This should ideally be a written agenda, but could also be presented verbally by the facilitator or written on a white board or bulletin board for team members to review in advance of the meeting.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if Team Leader verbalizes or hands out a printed agenda that provides an understanding of the overall purpose of the meeting AND major agenda items.

**No** if there is no clear agenda presented to team members before the team meeting begins, OR if the agenda is vague with respect to purpose and agenda items.

**N/A** is not an acceptable score for this item

**3b. The meeting follows an agenda or outline such that team members know the purpose of their activities at a given time.**

**NOTES:** In addition to orienting team members to the purpose and agenda for the meeting, the facilitator or team leader should follow the agenda or proposed timeline, and ensure that there is a clear understanding of the purpose of the team activities that take place during each section of the meeting. Note: If the facilitator does not present an agenda (and a score of “No” is assigned for indicator 3a above), it will be difficult to assign full credit for this indicator.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if the facilitator follows an agenda for the meeting AND effectively communicates the goal or purpose of each part of the meeting.

**No** if the facilitator does not follow an agenda OR if the goal for or purpose of parts of the team meeting are unclear.

**N/A** is not an appropriate score for this item.

**3c. The facilitator has prepared needed documents and materials prior to the meeting.**

**NOTES:** In addition to a meeting agenda, the facilitator or team leader should come to the meeting prepared with additional supporting documents and materials that are relevant to the goals of the meeting, such as the youth or family’s strengths and needs assessment, current wraparound plan, crisis plan, Individual Education Plan (IEP), releases for signature by team members, contact information for team members or providers, progress reports from school or job training program, and so forth.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if relevant documents and materials are prepared for the meeting.

**No** if needed documents and materials are not available.

**N/A** is an acceptable score if the goals or agenda for the meeting does not demand any supporting documents or materials.

**3d. A plan for the next meeting is presented, including time & date.**

**NOTES:** The team should set a time for the next meeting date/time and ask family members if the time and date are convenient. If there is a reason a time and date can not be set (e.g., there

is a team member absent who needs to be consulted about the next meeting), a clear plan for how the time and date will be set should be made.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if the facilitator works with the team to set the date/time for next meeting (or a plan to set the time/date) AND assesses that it is convenient for the youth (if 10 or older) and family.

**No** if one of above criteria is not satisfied

**N/A** is an acceptable score if the meeting is the last meeting for the team or if it is clearly not appropriate for a future meeting to be set at this time.

## Item 4. Effective Decision Making

*TOM Item 4 maps to the wraparound principle of “Collaborative,” and assesses the extent to which the team makes decisions effectively so that members can effectively collaborate on behalf of the youth and family.*

### 4a. Team members demonstrate consistent willingness to compromise or explore further options when there is disagreement.

**NOTES:** With help from the facilitator, a wraparound team should show the willingness to brainstorm different options or compromise when there is disagreement. This should be especially true when the youth or family disagrees with an opinion or proposed strategy. Sometimes, there will evidence of implicit disagreement on the part of a team member, such as negative body language or other signs or disapproval. A skilled facilitator should take note of and help the team problem solve around such “covert” disagreement or disapproval.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if the team shows willingness to compromise AND/OR explore further options.

**No** if disagreements are not successfully resolved OR if there is clear unspoken disagreement that is not raised and resolved.

**N/A** is an acceptable score if there is no clear or suggested disagreement among team members.

### 4b. Team members reach shared agreement after having solicited information from several members or having generated several ideas.

**NOTES:** This indicator assesses whether the team successfully takes advantage of the multiple perspectives that a wraparound team brings together. A skilled facilitator should solicit such multiple perspectives if team members do not volunteer them.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if decisions are reached after several team members have given their perspectives and ideas.

**No** if decisions are reached without input from multiple team members.

**N/A** is not an acceptable score for this indicator.

### 4c. The plan of care is agreed upon by all present at the meeting.

**NOTES:** The wraparound plan of care is a living document that should reflect changes in a youth and family’s needs and goals. Any new goals, strategies, and action steps agreed upon by the team during a wraparound meeting should be incorporated into revisions to the

wraparound plan of care after the end of the meeting. Team members should explicitly agree upon such changes after a follow-up wraparound meeting. If it is an initial planning meeting, all team members should agree to the plan that has been crafted for the youth and family.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if all present agree on the plan of care OR to the proposed changes to the plan of care.

**No** if all present do not agree OR if it is not clearly determined whether all team members agree to the plan or to changes to the plan.

**N/A** is an appropriate score if the plan of care has not yet been developed (e.g., at an initial engagement or orientation meeting) OR if it is a follow-up meeting but changes to the plan of care or new goals or strategies are not discussed.

**4d. The facilitator summarizes the content of the meeting at the end of the meeting, including next steps and responsibilities.**

**NOTES:** At the end of a wraparound team meeting, the facilitator or team leader should summarize progress made by the team, such as identifying strengths, prioritizing needs, or brainstorming options for strategies. In addition, next steps and team member responsibilities should be summarized, including ongoing responsibilities or tasks assigned at previous meetings that are still being accomplished. The facilitator should also summarize responsibilities and follow-up that she or he will take care of. This summary can be presented verbally by the facilitator or other team member, but should be clearly expressed for the full team.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if the facilitator summarizes the content of the meeting, major decisions, and next steps and responsibilities.

**No** if, at the end of the meeting, the facilitator does not summarize the content of the meeting or next steps.

**N/A** is not an acceptable score for this indicator.

## Item 5. Creative Brainstorming and Options

*TOM Item 5 maps to the wraparound principle of “Individualized,” and assesses how creatively and thoroughly the team brainstorms ideas for strategies that will meet the family’s needs, as well as options for how to implement the strategies.*

**5a. The team considers several different strategies for meeting each need and achieving each goal that is discussed.**

**NOTES:** At an initial planning meeting, wraparound team members should prioritize the family’s identify needs, set goals that will meet these needs, and then develop strategies that will achieve these goals. Multiple strategies should be identified and considered, in order to increase the likelihood the strategy will be successful and to make sure the strategy that best fits the family’s strengths and preferences will be chosen. At follow-up meetings, new strategies are often discussed, either because a current strategy is not working, or because a new goal has been set or need identified. In these meetings, too, multiple strategies should be proposed and considered.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if the team considers several strategies for meeting needs or achieving goals.

**No** if the team does not consider multiple strategies OR defers to a single team member to present strategies for consideration.

**N/A** may be scored if there is no discussion at the meeting of new strategies to achieve goals or meet needs

**5b. The team considers multiple options for tasks or action steps.**

NOTES: Once a strategy is determined (e.g., to find a mentor to meet a youth's need for productive after school activities), action steps must next be determined by the team (e.g., a team member will take the youth on a tour of nearby recreation centers). The team should brainstorm multiple options for such action steps in order to increase the chance for success, and the chances that connections to natural or community supports will be formed (e.g., the youth will go on a tour of the recreational facilities with his uncle or a college student who lives nearby).

SCORING:

**Yes** if multiple options are generated for tasks and action steps.

**No** if the team does not generate and consider multiple options.

**N/A** may be scored if there are no new tasks or action steps discussed at the meeting, though this should be a rare occurrence.

**5c. The facilitator leads a robust brainstorming process to develop multiple options to meet priority needs.**

NOTES: In a well-functioning wraparound team, methods for brainstorming strategies or action steps are robust. That is, team members think creatively, and the facilitator or team leader prompts team members who are not contributing to do so. The observer will ideally witness a dynamic team process that involves creativity on the part of all team members, not just one. Examples include taking time to write ideas on a flip chart or white board, or a team leader soliciting ideas from each team member. Such a process should occur for all needs or goals discussed, not just one.

SCORING:

**Yes** if the team takes on a robust brainstorming process that inspires creativity, multiple options, and contributions from all team members for all needs or goals that are discussed.

**No** if there is little brainstorming of options OR few contributions from one or more team members.

**N/A** may be scored if there are no new tasks or action steps discussed at the meeting, though this should be a rare occurrence.

## **Item 6. Individualized Process**

*TOM Item 6 maps to the wraparound principle of "Individualized," and assesses the extent to which the facilitator and team members undertake a process for creating a truly individualized plan, with services and supports that will meet the unique needs of the youth and his or her family, and that are based on their preferences and unique community supports.*

**6a. Planning includes action steps or goals for other family members, not just the identified youth.**

**NOTES:** Wraparound teams should be focused on meeting the needs of family members as well as the identified youth. In addition, the plan should include specific action steps for family members, both to meet their needs as well as implement the strategies identified for the youth. In general, the observer should see team members dedicating time and effort to planning and following up on the needs of other family members, in particular the youth's caregiver(s), whether they are birth parents, foster parents, or kinship caregivers such as grandparents.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if the team clearly plans or follows up on plans to meet the needs of family members other than the youth.

**No** if the youth is the sole focus of planning or follow-up and there is no attention paid to other family members.

**N/A** may be scored if the youth truly has no family members involved in her or his wraparound team and plan; however, if he or she has family members who are not present at the meeting, and there is no strategizing of action steps or strategies for them, the observer should score "No."

**6b. Facilitator and team members draw from knowledge about the community to generate strategies and action steps based on unique community supports.**

**NOTES:** Community supports refer to informal sources of potential support to the family that are in their local community, such as local businesses, churches, community service groups, and neighbors – resources that would be options regardless of a youth and family's involvement in formal services. The facilitator and wraparound team should demonstrate some knowledge of the community and its resources and take any opportunity possible to use community resources to meet youth and family needs and to implement service plans.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if the facilitator or team members demonstrate knowledge of community resources AND brainstorm ideas to access these supports to meet youth and family needs or implement strategies.

**No** if there is no discussion of possible community resources OR of using community resources.

**N/A** may be scored if there is no discussion of implementing strategies or action steps in the meeting.

**6c. Team facilitates the creation of individualized supports or services to meet the unique needs of child and/or family.**

**NOTES:** When wraparound is undertaken in a manner consistent with all of the principles, the resulting plan will be uniquely tailored to fit the family. Practical experience suggests that this typically requires going outside of existing formal services. Wraparound teams are thus challenged to create strategies for providing help and support that can be delivered outside the traditional service environment. Though it may be a challenge, the observer should attend to whether the mix of strategies and supports being discussed in a wraparound meeting are tailored to the family, different from services provided to other families, and based on the unique community and natural supports of that family. In meetings where there is little brainstorming of new strategies or action steps, **this is an item which may require a post-meeting query of**



**the facilitator to determine if the wraparound plan of care includes services and supports that are unique to the youth and family.**

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if services and supports discussed in the meeting or included in the plan are unique to the youth and family.

**No** if there is no evidence for individualization.

**N/A** is not an appropriate score for this indicator.

**6d. Youth, caregiver, & family members give their opinions about potential services, supports, or strategies, including describing what has or has not worked in the past.**

**NOTES:** The principle of family voice and choice lays the foundation for individualization. That principle requires that wraparound must be based in the family's perspective about how things are for them, how things should be, and what needs to happen. In the context of the wraparound team meeting, the facilitator and team should explicitly ask the parent/caregiver and youth what services (e.g., drug treatment, psychotherapy, medication, vocational training) and informal supports and strategies (e.g., caregiver routines, recreational options, use of kin and neighbors) have been attempted in the past as well as what worked or did not work.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if the team asks the youth (if 10 or older) and parent/caregiver their opinions about potential services, strategies and action steps, including what previous approaches have been tried and how well they worked

**No** if such opinions are not solicited or if the youth and caregiver are not present.

**N/A** is not an appropriate score for this item.

## **Item 7. Natural and Community Supports**

*TOM Item 7 maps to the wraparound principle of "Natural Supports," and assesses the extent to which the facilitator and team members fully involve individuals who are part of the youth and family's natural support system on the wraparound team and wraparound planning process.*

**IMPORTANT NOTES ON ITEM 7 INDICATORS:** (1) Natural supports include individuals such as friends, extended family members, neighbors, and co-workers, while members of a community support system may include ministers, local business persons, or individuals who run local recreational or community programs. (2) Paid parent partners or family partners are not considered natural supports. (3) Indicators 7b, 7c, and 7d may be scored "N/A" if there are no natural supports on the team.

**7a. Natural supports for the family are team members and present.**

**NOTES:** Natural supports are individuals such as friends, relatives, or neighbors; ministers or other faith representatives; community mentors or business owners; or others who come from the family's community or informal support network. A key principle of wraparound is that these individuals are critical to supporting youth and families over the long term and thus they will also be important to the ultimate success of the wraparound effort. One or more natural supports should be present at wraparound meetings. Paid providers (including therapists and one-on-one aides) and representatives of formal systems are not included in the definition of natural

supports. Paid family support workers employed by the system to support a youth or family on wraparound teams are also not truly natural supports. However, an unpaid representative of a family advocacy organization who is volunteering to help the youth and family may be counted as a natural support.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if at least one individual like those described above attends the meeting.

**No** if no individual like those described above do not attend the meeting.

**N/A** is not an option for this indicator.

**7b. Team provides multiple opportunities for natural supports to participate in significant areas of discussion.**

NOTES: It is not adequate to just be present at the meeting. Natural supports need to be active contributors and participate in significant areas of discussion.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if the team explicitly provides opportunities for the family's natural supports to participate in brainstorming and generation of ideas.

**No** if such opportunity is not presented OR if the opinions and contributions of natural and community supports are marginalized or afforded less weight than other team members.

**N/A** is an appropriate score if there are no natural or community supports on the team.

**7c. Community team members and natural supports participate in decision-making.**

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if the team explicitly provides opportunities for the family's natural supports to participate in decision making on prioritization of needs or determination of strategies and action steps.

**No** if such opportunity is not presented OR if, during the decision-making process, the opinions of natural and community supports are marginalized or afforded less weight than other team members.

**N/A** is an appropriate score if there are no natural or community supports on the team.

**7d. Community team members and natural supports have a clear role on the team.**

NOTES: The best example of a clear role for a community representative or natural support is that he or she has responsibility for a specific part of the family's wraparound plan. For example, an uncle may provide tutoring twice per week or a minister may supervise a youth during and after participation in a youth group. Community and natural supports may also have a role in supporting parents or family members, such as a neighbor who takes the parent to a support group meeting or is available to help a parent deal with stress. Other roles may include simply participating on the team for a specific purpose, such as a local Boys and Girls Club leader who participates in order to generate ideas about resources in the community. **NOTE that natural support person(s) need not be present in order to assign a score of "Yes."** If it is clear that there are natural supports involved in implementing wraparound and that they have a clear role on the team, a score of "Yes" can be assigned without their being present. **If a natural support attends the meeting but the observer is not sure whether she or he has a specific role on the team, this is an item which may require a post-meeting query of the facilitator to**

**determine if the team member has a specific role, such as responsibility for a certain part of the wraparound plan.**

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if there appears to be a clear role for natural or community support person(s) on the team (regardless of whether they are present at the meeting).

**No** if natural or community support(s) seem to have no clear role on the team (e.g., other than to attend the meeting).

**N/A** is an appropriate score if there are no natural or community supports on the team.

## **Item 8. Natural Support Plans**

*TOM Item 8 maps to the wraparound principle of “Natural Supports,” and assesses the extent to which the wraparound plan fully integrates and supports strategies to be implemented by natural and community supports.*

**8a. Brainstorming of options and strategies include strategies to be implemented by natural and community supports.**

**NOTES:** Different wraparound meetings will include different types of individuals and focus on different types of goals. For example, initial engagement meetings and planning meetings may not include many natural and community supports. However, even if natural and community supports are not present in large numbers at a meeting, an effective team will consider multiple strategies as well as multiple options for implementing strategies that would be implemented or assisted by the family’s natural and community supports.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if, during planning and discussions, team members consistently brainstorm options or strategies that would be implemented by natural or community supports.

**No** if the team members do not consider natural or community supports.

**N/A** may be scored if there is no discussion of implementing strategies or action steps in the meeting.

**8b. The plan of care represents a balance between formal services and informal supports.**

**NOTES:** To score this indicator, the observer will need to determine from the content of the planning meeting the approximate distribution of formal services vs. informal supports that are included in the youth and family’s wraparound plan. A formal service refers to those delivered by paid service delivery professionals (e.g., therapists, in-home aides, school personnel), while examples of informal supports include recreational activities with relatives, friends, or neighbors; camps with non-system involved peers; or volunteering at a church or community center.

Because wraparound is individualized, it is difficult to establish a hard and fast ratio of formal to informal services that should be in a plan. Thus for purposes of the TOM, we advise that observers should see evidence of (1) informal supports being planned or implemented, and (2) not more than twice as many strategies relying on formal services than informal services. In a planning meeting, this should be relatively straightforward to determine. In a formal follow-up meeting, in which the components of the plan of care are reviewed, this should also be relatively

straightforward. In other types of meetings (e.g., initial engagement meetings, crisis planning meetings, transition meetings), **this is an item which may require a post-meeting query of the facilitator to review the components of the plan of care to determine if there is a balance between formal services and informal supports.**

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if there is a relative balance between formal services and informal supports (e.g., no more than twice as many formal services identified as informal supports).

**No** if the vast majority of the strategies, services, and supports are services from formal providers or agencies.

**N/A** is not an appropriate score for this indicator.

**8c. There is flexible funding available to the team to allow for creative services, supports, and strategies.**

**NOTES:** In order to involve community and natural supports in the youth and family's wraparound effort, flexible resources are often required; for example, to allow a youth to enroll in a community basketball league, attend a music camp, purchase karate lessons, or pay an extended family member or neighbor to be a mentor or tutor. The observer should attend to whether such resources are available to support such options that are generated. This indicator should be scored "no" if a creative or informal way to meet a priority need is nominated for the plan that the team can not support due to lack of resources.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if there is indication that resources are available to support flexible and creative supports or strategies.

**No** if it is stated or implied that such resources are not available to support a strategy or support.

**N/A** may be scored if there is no discussion of implementing strategies or action steps in the meeting.

## **Item 9. Team Mission and Plans**

*TOM Item 9 assesses whether the team develops products to support effective wraparound planning and implementation, such as a team mission or family vision, a wraparound plan with specific action steps linked to strategies, and a crisis plan. These indicators map to the wraparound principle of "Unconditional Commitment and Persistence," in that such elements are critical to ensuring there is a clear road map to guide persistent effort by the team on behalf of meeting the needs of the youth and family.*

**9a. The team discusses or has produced a mission/vision statement.**

**NOTES:** A critical part of the early phases of the wraparound effort is that a family should present its vision for the future, and that the team should create a mission statement about the purpose of its work together. Such statements help guide the focus of the wraparound planning and implementation process. In an initial planning meeting, such statements should be created or referenced to support planning. During a follow-up meeting, mission and/or vision statements should be available to the team in some form (such as their copy of the wraparound plan or on a white board or bulletin board). Alternatively, the facilitator or other team members may reference the vision of the family or team mission verbally. One way or another, there should be a direct or

indirect sense that there is written documentation of the overarching purpose of the team's effort on behalf of the family.

**SCORING**

**Yes** if there is direct OR indirect evidence that the team's work is guided by a team mission AND/OR family vision.

**No** if there is no evidence of a written mission or vision AND the team does not reference or seem guided by a mission or vision.

**N/A** is not an appropriate score for this item.

**9b. The team creates or references a plan that guides its work.**

**NOTES:** The family's wraparound plan (which may also be referred to by some other term such as 'plan of care' or 'child and family plan') is an essential document that captures the mix of youth and family needs and goals and the specific strategies to meet these needs and achieve these goals. In initial planning meetings, this plan is being created, and in follow-up meetings, it should be available to team members or at least referenced. This plan should also be continually updated as a result of team meetings.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if an updated wraparound plan is available OR being created, OR referenced at the meeting

**No** if there is no evidence that a wraparound plan of care exists, is being created, OR if it is out of date.

**N/A** may be scored if the meeting being observed is very early in the process and planning has not yet begun.

**9c. The team has confirmed or is creating a crisis plan.**

**NOTES:** Crisis plans are another critical component of the wraparound process for most youths. A good crisis plan includes specific descriptions of likely crises (e.g., threats of harm to a sibling or parent, runaway behavior, school crises) and action steps on what specific individuals must do in the event of different possible crises. (A crisis plan that simply includes a crisis hotline or beeper number is not adequate.) A crisis plan should also be developed by the end of the Planning phase of wraparound and thus in place no later than the second or third full team meeting. However, unlike wraparound plans, crisis plans may not be discussed or referenced at many meetings. **Thus, this item may require a post-meeting query of the facilitator to determine if a crisis plan (with specific instructions on what all those involved must do) has been created for the youth and family.**

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if there is clear evidence that an adequate crisis plan has been developed or is being developed as part of the activities of the engagement or planning phase.

**No** if there is no crisis plan OR if a crisis plan is under development but team is beyond the planning phase and/or 3<sup>rd</sup> team meeting.

**N/A** is not an appropriate score for this item.

**9d. The team plan contains specific needs or goals that are linked to strategies and action steps.**

**NOTES:** A hallmark of a good wraparound plan is that it clearly presents the youth and family's needs and/or goals, and states the specific strategies and action steps that will help meet these needs and/or achieve these goals. The observer should be able to ascertain if there are clear goals toward which the team is directing its efforts for the family, either because the plan of care is available or because the team members describe the goals. **However, for certain meetings, the observer may need to follow up with the facilitator after the meeting to review the wraparound plan and see if there are specific goals linked to strategies and action steps.**

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if the youth and family have a wraparound plan with clear goals linked to strategies and action steps.

**No** if there is no plan, OR if the plan does not include goals, OR if there is no link between goals and strategies or actions steps.

**N/A** may be scored if the meeting being observed is very early in the wraparound process and planning has not yet begun.

## Item 10. Shared Responsibility

*TOM Item 10 maps to the principle of “Unconditional Commitment and Persistence” and assesses the extent to which team members are working on behalf of the family and share the responsibility of implementing the family’s wraparound plan.*

**10a. The team explicitly assigns responsibility for action steps that define who will do what, when, and how often.**

**NOTES:** The degree to which the wraparound team assigns action steps that specifies who is responsible for follow up tasks should be obvious to the observer from the discussions throughout the team meeting. The facilitator should reference decisions about which team members are responsible for specific action steps by, for example, summarizing such decisions at the end of the meeting. Additional evidence that the team assigns specific action steps with details on who will do what, when, and how often should be available in team meeting minutes or the wraparound plan itself.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if there is evidence the team assigns clear action steps with clear details about who, what, by when, and how often

**No** if there is no evidence such action steps have been or are typically assigned

**N/A** should not be used for this indicator, except under very rare occasions (e.g., the meeting is an ad hoc meeting around a specific issue that does not require any follow up).

**10b. There is a clear understanding of who is responsible for action steps and follow up on strategies in the plan.**

**NOTES:** In addition to assessing whether the team assigns action steps with clear details, the observer should assess whether, at the end of the meeting, team members have a clear understanding of their responsibilities for follow-up after the meeting.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if team members leave the team meeting with clear understanding of the action steps and follow-up for which they are responsible

**No** if team members do not seem to leave the meeting with clear assignments

**N/A** should not be used for this indicator, except under very rare occasions (e.g., the meeting is an ad hoc meeting around a specific issue that does not require any follow up).

**10c. Providers and agency representatives at the meeting demonstrate that they are working for the family and not there to represent a different agenda or set of interests.**

**NOTES:** Wraparound team members often bring agendas and interests specific to their agency to the table, such as behavior in school for school officials, permanency planning and visitation issues for child welfare workers, and issues specific to a probation plan for juvenile justice representatives. A skillful wraparound facilitator can use the wraparound process to ensure that the various players come to consensus about ways to meet needs and achieve goals identified by the youth and family, regardless of their own specific mandates. In scoring this indicator, the observer should be assessing whether team members seem to be representing the goals or interests of the youth and family's wraparound plan, as opposed to a narrower agenda. Ideally, all team members will participate in a way that blends with other team members toward meeting the goals of the wraparound plan and to achieve the vision of the youth and family.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if team members' opinions, ideas, and behavior supports the stated goals of the wraparound plan or needs of the family AND ARE NOT more in support of their own agenda.

**No** if the team is unable to facilitate agency representatives or others to blend their perspectives with others and brainstorm options that are specific to achieving family needs or team goals.

**N/A** may be an appropriate score if the meeting is very early in the planning process, during which time facilitators may allow for individual team members to state their personal or agency's interests rather than facilitate compromise and blending of perspectives.

## **Item 11. Facilitation Skills**

*TOM Item 11 assesses the facilitation skills of the team leader or facilitator. Though this item maps to the wraparound principle of "Cultural Competence," the indicators in this item actually assess a critical concept unto themselves, which is the ability of the wraparound team facilitator to skillfully direct the work of the team and its members, such as blend their perspectives, manage disagreement, and plan effectively.*

**11a. Facilitator is able to impart understanding about what the wraparound process is, how it will work for this family, and how individual team members will participate.**

**NOTES:** A wraparound facilitator or team leader should have detailed and ingrained understanding of what the important tasks and challenges are during each phase of the wraparound process, and the ability to prepare family and team members to undertake and address these tasks. She or he should demonstrate the ability to communicate clearly to others what wraparound is and how the principles apply to this individual family and the work that is being undertaken in the team meeting, including the roles, responsibilities and implications for team members. In later team meetings, this may be a subjective rating by the observer, based on how well this appears to be accomplished during the meeting.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if the facilitator appears to have a level of comfort about communicating about wraparound and its implications for the process taking place in the meeting, AND/OR if team members appear well-informed about the wraparound process and their role on the team.

**No** if the facilitator does not seem to be able to communicate this information, OR if team members seem confused about the purpose of wraparound, the team meeting, or their roles or responsibilities.

**N/A** is not an appropriate score for this indicator.

**11b. Facilitator reflects, summarizes, and makes process-oriented comments.**

**NOTES:** An effective facilitator should be able to run a team meeting in a way that helps plan effectively on behalf of the youth and family as well as achieve the wraparound principles. For example, the facilitator should be able to facilitate full expression of team members' (and others') perspectives; accurately summarize the most important parts; demonstrate active, empathic, non-judgmental listening that brings out and clarifies perspective of team members; and summarize content of the discussion and brainstorming in a way that is in tune with the intent of the team member who is speaking.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if the facilitator is observed to consistently and effectively actively reflect, summarize, and make process-oriented comments.

**No** if the facilitator does not consistently or effectively do this.

**N/A** is not an appropriate score for this indicator.

**11c. Facilitator is able to manage disagreement & conflict and elicit underlying interests, needs, and motivations of team members.**

**NOTES:** This indicator assesses a critical wraparound facilitation skill, which is the ability to “get to the interests” of team members. This means helping figure out underlying motivations and needs behind team members' positions and postures, as well as using techniques for managing disagreement and conflict. To do so, the facilitator should show ability to model interpersonal interaction that is respectful and strengths-oriented. He or she should also show an ability to interrupt talk and/or behavior that is not consistent with a family-driven, strengths-based approach and restate/redirect/coach people. Above all, he or she should demonstrate an ability to facilitate agreement among team members when differences arise.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if the facilitator demonstrates skills in managing disagreement and conflict, AND maintaining a strengths-based and productive team session even if there is disagreement.

**No** if the facilitator does not intervene to redirect conflict or disagreement so that it is productive, OR if he or she does not model interpersonal interaction that is respectful and strengths-oriented.

**N/A** may be an appropriate score for this indicator if there is no conflict or disagreement whatsoever during the meeting.

**11d. Talk is well distributed across team members and each team member makes an extended or important contribution.**



**NOTES:** In order to make a team meeting productive, a facilitator should be able to facilitate full expression of all team members' perspectives in a way that promotes trust, and also effectively uncovers "raw material" for the plan. Thorough understanding of and use of appropriate tools and processes, the facilitator should help people access and express their perspective on any relevant component of the wraparound process on which the team is working during the meeting, e.g., strengths, needs, vision and mission, service and support strategies

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if discussion is well-distributed across all team members, with each team member providing input on at least one high priority action item or encouraged to do so.

**No** if the facilitator dominates the discussion at the meeting OR if certain team members do not AND are not encouraged to contribute.

**N/A** is not an appropriate score for this indicator.

## Item 12. Cultural and Linguistic Competence

*TOM Item 12 directly maps to the wraparound principle of "Cultural Competence," with indicators of the facilitator and team's ability to implement activities related to cultural and linguistic competence.*

### 12a. The youth, caregiver, and family members are given time to talk about the family's values, beliefs, and traditions.

**NOTES:** The facilitator and team as a whole will express behaviors related to this indicator differently depending on the type of meeting and the phase of the wraparound process. During initial engagement and planning meetings, there should be systematic exploration of the family's values, beliefs, and traditions, and how these will impact strategies, services, and supports that are chosen. In follow-up meetings, the discussion may be less direct, but the observer should be paying attention to whether the team assesses the family's ideas about services and supports and whether they are in synch with the family's cultural beliefs. The team should also encourage the family and listen attentively when they discuss issues related to their beliefs and lifestyle.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if there is at least one instance of facilitator or non-family team members exploring and giving the family opportunities to discuss their culture, values, beliefs, attitudes, and life styles.

**No** if there is no instance observed of team members exploring and showing interest in learning about the family's culture, values, beliefs, attitudes, and life styles.

**N/A** may be scored or if the youth, caregiver, parent, and/or family members are not present.

### 12b. The team demonstrates a clear and strong sense of respect for the family's values, beliefs, and traditions.

**NOTES:** Examples of positive team behaviors include, but are not limited to, scheduling meetings around religious holidays, generating strategies and treatment options around a family's beliefs and traditions, and/or accommodating or modifying treatment plans around a family's values, beliefs, and traditions. Examples of negative behaviors in this area would include dismissing or ignoring family members' preferences that are based on their own values and beliefs. This item should be scorable even if the youth and/or family are not at the meeting.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if non-family team members are observed demonstrating specific ways in which they demonstrate clear and strong respect the family's culture, values, beliefs, attitudes, and life styles.

**No** if there is no instance observed of the team respecting the family's culture, values, beliefs, and attitudes, OR if team members demonstrate disrespect for the family's beliefs and traditions.

**N/A** is not an appropriate score for this indicator.

**12c. Meetings and meeting materials are provided in the language the family is most comfortable with.**

**NOTES:** Team meetings should either be conducted in, or translated into, the language that the family is most comfortable speaking. In addition, written forms and materials provided to the family should be provided in, or translated into, the language that the family is most comfortable reading. (Note that if the family's native language is English, and the meeting materials are provided in English, this would be scored as "Yes.").

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if ALL OF the meeting is conducted into the family's native language OR translated into the family's native language, AND the forms and written materials given to the family are provided in the family's native language, OR are translated into the family's native language.

**No** if one or more of above criteria is not satisfied.

**N/A** may be scored or if the youth, caregiver, parent, and/or family members are not present. (If the family's native language is English, and the meeting materials are provided in English, this would be scored as "yes").

**12d. Members of the team use language the family can understand (i.e. no professional jargon / acronyms).**

**NOTES:** In addition to meeting discussion and materials being conducted in the language with which the family has the most comfort, the observer should be taking note of whether the family has any difficulty understanding the discussion at the meeting, or materials presented due to the use of professional jargon or acronyms. If such language is used, but the family clearly is comfortable with it and understands the terms being used, this could be scored as "Yes."

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if team members do not use professional jargon or acronyms AND/OR the family clearly understands the language being used.

**No** if members of the team use language that is difficult for the family to understand (even if it is in the family's native language), OR is confusing to the family because it includes professional jargon or acronyms.

**N/A** may be scored or if the youth, caregiver, parent, and/or family members are not present.

## Item 13. Outcomes Based Process

*TOM Item 13 directly maps to the wraparound principle of "Outcomes Based," and assesses the extent to which the team sets and uses measurable goals and measurement strategies to help conduct its ongoing work on behalf of the family.*

**13a. The team uses objective measurement strategies.**

**NOTES:** “Objective measurement strategies” refers to methods included in the wraparound plan and/or discussed in the team meeting for assessing whether successful progress toward goals is occurring, such as number of days of school attended, number of friends a youth has, or number of work days a parent had to miss because of problems or crises. An objective measurement strategy could also be a team rating of progress toward meeting a need or achieving a goal. In initial planning meetings, the team should be setting goals with objective measurement strategies as a part of the planning process. In follow-up meetings, the team should be reviewing progress using such measures. In both of these types of meetings, the observer should have an opportunity to determine whether goals and measurement strategies have been set. However, **for certain meetings, the observer may need to follow up with the facilitator after the meeting to review the wraparound plan and see if the goals included have objective measurement strategies.**

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if the team develops OR refers to clear measurement strategies, OR other ways the team is measuring progress/success. The observer may also score “yes” if there is an up to date wraparound plan at the meeting with measurement strategies.

**No** if one of above criteria is not satisfied.

**N/A** may be scored if the meeting being observed is very early in the process and a plan of care has not yet been created.

**13b. The team assesses goals/strategies using measures of progress.**

**NOTES:** Unlike 13a, which focuses on objective measures of outcomes, this indicator focuses on the team setting or using measures of progress toward strategies in the plan. Strategies in a wraparound plan should be described clearly, such as “Chris will be enrolled in the job training program by April 15<sup>th</sup>, will attend 90% of all sessions, and will complete it by June 30<sup>th</sup>.” In follow-up meetings, goals and strategies should be reviewed and progress assessed based on objective measures (such as date of completion or days per week). This indicator should be scored as “no” if strategies or action steps do not include specific language about successful completion.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if the team sets OR reviews clear and measurable strategies AND assesses progress toward implementing the strategies.

**No** if specific strategies are not discussed OR if they are discussed only in general, non-specific terms.

**N/A** may be scored if the meeting being observed is very early in the process and a plan of care has not yet been created.

**13c. The team revises the plan if progress toward goals is not evident.**

**NOTES:** If progress toward meeting needs, achieving goals, or implementing strategies is not being achieved, there should be a clear effort to revise the strategies in the wraparound plan, or the goals themselves. This will be most evident in follow-up team meetings during the Implementation phase of wraparound.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if the team revises goals or strategies in response to a lack of progress.

**No** if the team notes a lack of progress but does not go through a process of revising goals or strategies.

**N/A** may be scored if the team is still in the Engagement or Planning phase of the wraparound process and progress toward goals is not yet expected.

## Item 14. Evaluating Progress and Success

*TOM Item 14 directly maps to the wraparound principle of “Outcomes Based,” and assesses the extent to which the team systematically evaluates follow-up on responsibilities and progress toward outcomes.*

### 14a. The team conducts a systematic review of members’ progress on assigned action steps.

**NOTES:** At each team meeting, review of team members’ follow-through on assigned tasks should be conducted. It should be fairly obvious when this is being done systematically by the team leader or facilitator. It is not necessary for each team member to have successfully completed his or her tasks, only that a review is conducted. The observer should score “No,” if information about team member follow-through is revealed throughout the meeting haphazardly and not systematically as part of the agenda for the meeting.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if the facilitator or other team member facilitates a systematic review of progress on responsibilities and action steps assigned.

**No** if progress in completing action steps is not reviewed OR progress is reviewed in an incomplete or haphazard fashion.

**N/A** may be scored if the meeting being observed is very early in the process and action steps have not yet been assigned.

### 14b. The facilitator checks in with the team members about their comfort and satisfaction with the team process.

**NOTES:** A skilled facilitator will spend a lot of time preparing and checking in with team members outside the context of a team meeting. However, this is also important for a facilitator to do within the meeting itself. The observer should look for the facilitator’s ability to recognize team member disagreement and dissatisfaction during the planning process, and whether she or he checks in with these team members about their concerns, perspectives, and satisfaction with the process that is occurring. Even when there appears to be no conflict or dissatisfaction, the facilitator should regularly check in with team members during the planning process.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if the facilitator checks in regularly and frequently with team members about their comfort and satisfaction with the team process.

**No** if the facilitator does not check in AND/OR there seems to be unchecked disagreement or dissatisfaction among team members.

**N/A** is not an appropriate score for this indicator.

**14c. Objective or verifiable data is used as evidence of success, progress, or lack thereof.**

NOTES: As for strategies (see Item 13), a team should establish intermediate and long-term outcomes that are expressed in clear objective terms. For example, “Chris will have a job that he works at least 20 hours per week and the he enjoys,” or “Chris will have a friend he gets to hang out with at least once per week.” Progress and success on these outcomes should be measured using objective data wherever possible, such as school or work attendance, or a verifiable event. An observer should score “No” for this indicator if progress is reviewed using information that is not verifiable or objective (e.g., only a verbal report of attendance when a report card or data from the school could be used).

SCORING:

**Yes** if there is evidence that the team is establishing or has established outcomes with objective measures and uses objective data to measure progress or success.

**No** if progress and outcomes are not measured using objective data and/or data used to evaluate progress or success is not objective or verifiable.

**N/A** may be scored if the meeting does not include an effort to track progress or success.

## **Item 15. Youth and Family Voice**

*TOM Item 15 directly maps to the wraparound principle of “Youth and Family Voice and Choice,” and assesses the extent to which the team provides opportunities to the youth and family members to present their opinions, hopes, and vision of the future.*

**15a. The team provides extra opportunity for caregivers to speak and offer opinions, especially during decision making.**

NOTES: There should be systematic effort on the part of the facilitator or other team members to give the caregiver or parent an opportunity to speak, as well as the caregiver or parent successfully presenting her or his opinions on things such as strategies and action steps.

SCORING:

**Yes** if the facilitator or team provides the parent/caregiver with opportunities to present his or her opinions AND she or he takes this opportunity.

**No** if such extra opportunity is not provided OR if the parent/caregiver is not able to speak up and/or offer his or her opinions

**N/A** may be scored if the caregiver is not in attendance.

**15b. The team provides extra opportunity for the youth to speak and offer opinions, especially during decision making.**

NOTES: There should be systematic effort on the part of the facilitator or other team members to give the youth an opportunity to speak, as well as the youth successfully presenting her or his opinions on things such as strategies and action steps.

SCORING:

**Yes** if the facilitator or team provides the youth with opportunities to present his or her opinions AND the youth takes this opportunity.

**No** if such extra opportunity is not provided OR if the youth does not actually speak up and/or offer his or her opinions.

**N/A** may be scored if youth is not in attendance, or if he or she is present but under 10 years old and/or unable to participate actively team meetings due to his or her developmental level.

**15c. Caregivers, parents, and family members are afforded opportunities to speak in an open-ended way about current and past experiences and/or about hopes for the future.**

NOTES: This indicator is similar to 15a; however, it specifically assesses whether, in addition to offering opinions about goals and strategies, the caregiver as well as other family members are encouraged and offered opportunities to give their perspectives on more open-ended issues, such as their hopes for the youth or family, feelings about what things work for the youth or family, concerns about services or the wraparound process, and so forth. Facilitator and team members should be receptive to such discussion and find ways to process the information provided by the family members in a strengths-based and productive way that is relevant to the youth's goals, strategies, and wraparound plan.

SCORING:

**Yes** if the team encourages and offers opportunities for the parent/caregiver and family members to speak in an open-ended way about their experiences, preferences, and hopes for the future.

**No** if the team does not encourage the family to discuss such issues, OR if the team cuts off or is not courteous to the family when they present such experiences.

**N/A** may be scored if no family members (including the parent/caregiver) are present.

**15d. The youth is invited to speak in an open-ended way about current and past experiences and/or about hopes for the future.**

NOTES: Similar to 15c, the youth should be encouraged and offered opportunities to give her or his perspectives on open-ended issues such as their hopes for the future, feelings about what things work for him or her, concerns about services and supports, and so forth.

SCORING:

**Yes** if the team encourages and offers opportunities for the youth to speak in an open-ended way about their experiences, preferences, and hopes for the future.

**No** if the team does not encourage the youth to discuss such issues, OR if the team cuts off or is not courteous to the youth when she or he present such experiences.

**N/A** may be scored if youth is not in attendance, or if he or she is present but under 10 years old and/or unable to participate actively team meetings due to his or her developmental level.

## **Item 16. Youth and Family Choice**

*TOM Item 16 directly maps to the wraparound principle of "Youth and Family Voice and Choice," and assesses the extent to which the team prioritizes the youth and family members' opinions about priorities to work on and specific strategies, services, and supports to be included in the wraparound plan.*

**16a. The youth prioritizes life domains, goals, or needs on which he or she would like the team to work.**

**NOTES:** Prioritization of life domains, goals, and needs to work on occurs in planning meetings as well as during follow-up meetings when needs or goals are reviewed and additional priorities are being identified for effort by the team. The indicator assesses whether the youth has a priority opinion in what will be worked on by the team. It may be a challenge for the observer to determine whether this is occurring in a follow-up meeting at which new priorities are not being set. The observer should look out for evidence that the youth is being consulted about his or her opinions about what is most important for the team to work on, and for signs that the youth is being excluded from such decision making.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if the youth is provided an opportunity to present her or his priorities.

**No** if the team does not give the youth an opportunity to present his or her priorities.

**N/A** may be scored if the youth is not present, if he or she is under 10 years old, or if there is no need to prioritize needs or goals in this team meeting.

**16b. The caregiver or parent prioritizes life domains, goals, or needs on which he or she would like the team to work.**

**NOTES:** Similar to 16a, the team should either explicitly ask the caregiver/parent and other family members what needs or goals they would like to work on, and to state which are most important to work on.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if the caregiver or parent is provided an opportunity to present her or his priorities for what the team will work on.

**No** if the team does not give the caregiver or parent an opportunity to present his or her priorities.

**N/A** may be scored if the caregiver is not present or if there is no need to prioritize needs or goals in this team meeting.

**16c. The family and youth have highest priority in decision making.**

**NOTES:** In addition to prioritizing needs and goals, the youth, caregiver, and family members should be afforded priority in determining strategies (including formal services) for meeting needs and achieving goals. The family's ideas about the components of the wraparound plan should be elicited by the team, and their ideas attended to by the team. If there are challenges to implementing the ideas the youth and family have, the team should prioritize their ideas and brainstorm multiple ways to make the idea work. In follow-up meetings, the parent and youth's opinions about how best to troubleshoot problems or how to make new strategies happen should be prioritized.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if the team prioritizes the parent/caregiver and youth's ideas to about strategies, services, and supports to be included in the plan.

**No** if the team does not ask for youth, caregiver, and family member contributions OR if these contributions are not prioritized or marginalized.

**N/A** may be scored if there is no caregiver, youth, or family members present.

## Item 17. Focus on Strengths

*TOM Item 17 directly maps to the wraparound principle of “Strengths-Based,” and assesses the extent to which the team reviews and reinforces the strengths and skills of the youth and family, and bases strategies and supports in the wraparound plan on these family strengths.*

### 17a. Team members acknowledge or list caregiver/youth strengths.

**NOTES:** A fundamental aspect of being “strengths based” in wraparound is to acknowledge, reinforce, and list the caregiver/parent, youth, and family’s strengths, skills, and assets. In initial engagement and planning sessions, the facilitator has open-ended conversations that help to surface these strengths and assets. During follow-up meetings, the facilitator and all team members should be referencing these strengths and acknowledging the family’s skills and assets at all times, even when discussing challenging situations. It is important to note that many team meetings begin with a review of success or progress since the last meeting. Though this may set a positive tone for the meeting, it does not substitute for a specific discussion or acknowledgement of youth/family strengths.

#### SCORING:

**Yes** if team members consistently acknowledge youth and parent/caregiver strengths.

**No** if the team does not acknowledge strengths OR if discussion is focused on deficits of the youth and family.

**N/A** is not an appropriate score for this indicator.

### 17b. Team builds an understanding of how youth strengths contribute to the success of team mission or goals.

**NOTES:** In addition to listing and acknowledging strengths, team members should also make explicit links between the family’s strengths and the ultimate success of achieving goals and meeting needs. In planning meetings, the facilitator and team should describe how the family’s stated strengths will be key to achieving the goals and implementing the strategies that have been established. In follow-up meetings, even small successes should be attributed to the skills and assets of the youth and family. In other words, “No” should be scored if success is attributed to other factors besides the youth and family’s strengths. When setbacks occur or challenges arise, the facilitator or team should “re-frame” the discussion to noting how the family’s skills, assets, persistence, and so forth, will allow new strategies to succeed. “No” should be scored if such reframes are not at least attempted by team members.

#### SCORING:

**Yes** if links are made between the youth and family’s strengths and assets and the success of team activities or goals.

**No** if the team does not take opportunities to build this understanding.

**N/A** is not an appropriate score for this indicator.

### 17c. In designing strategies, team members consider and build on strengths of the youth and family.

**NOTES:** The facilitator and, ideally, all team members, should have or develop an ability to consider family strengths, so they can work with the youth and family to brainstorm and select strategies that build on, complement, and enhance strengths and assets of the youth and family.



When ideas are being generated, the strengths of the family should be explicitly noted to both reinforce the strengths-based culture of the team as well as use strengths to design strategies that will succeed. For example, if a goal is to ensure that the youth has positive activities to participate in after school, the team should work diligently to consider strategies that ensure the youth will participate in activities that the youth enjoys and does well. Similarly, if a parent's strength is the ability to praise her son and make him feel proud of himself, the team should build in strategies to ensure that this occurs whenever he successfully takes part in that after-school activity.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if, during planning and strategizing, team members actively reference and attempt to link strengths to the strategies that are chosen.

**No** if the team does not take the opportunity to reference and consider strengths of the youth and family.

**N/A** may be scored if the meeting does not include any brainstorming or selecting of strategies.

**17d. Facilitator and team members analyze youth & family member perspectives and stories to identify functional strengths.**

**NOTES:** In addition to identifying relatively straightforward strengths or skills (e.g., likes music, is good at math), a facilitator and all team members should be capable of analyzing family stories, history & incidents to identify functional or applied strengths. Examples of identifying functional or applied strengths might be “Mrs. J. is effective at advocating for Chris’s academic needs at school, and when she does so she feels like an effective parent;” or, “Chris can be very responsible when he looks after his little brother. When he does so, Mrs. J. feels proud of him, and Chris feels like he has done a good job.” Note that this item should be scorable even if the youth and/or family are not present.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if, during planning and strategizing, team members take the time and make the effort to analyze and consider youth and family perspectives to identify functional and applied strengths.

**No** if the team does not take the time and make the effort to do so.

**N/A** is not an appropriate score for this indicator.

## Item 18. Positive Team Culture

*TOM Item 18 directly maps to the wraparound principle of “Strengths-Based,” and assesses the extent to which the facilitator and team maintain a positive team culture and strengths orientation to the work of the team.*

**18a. The team focuses on improvements or accomplishments throughout the meeting.**

**NOTES:** This would be evidenced by multiple references to the youth, family, and all team members’ progress, accomplishments, and/or evidence of positive effort, even if the meeting is also characterized by discussion of challenges or concerns.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if, during the team meeting, the facilitator and team members focus on and reinforce progress, improvements, and/or accomplishments.

**No** if the above criteria is not met.

**N/A** is not an appropriate score for this indicator.

**18b. The facilitator directs a process that prevents blame or excessive focus on or discussion of negative events.**

**NOTES:** A central tenet of the wraparound process is that challenges or negative events should be viewed as a need for a solution or better strategy, rather than a failing of the family or individual team members. The observer should be looking for the team reframing challenges in terms of finding solutions, and facilitator skills such as externalizing, reframing, and other narrative techniques. The team should also re-direct team members who enter into direct blaming of family or team members or excessive focus on negative events.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if, during the team meeting, the team focuses on solutions, prevents blame, AND prevents excessive focus on negative events.

**No** if the team directs blame at the youth, family, or team members, AND the facilitator does not skillfully redirect team members who blame or focus on negative events.

**N/A** is not an appropriate score for this indicator. If there is no discussion of negative events, the observer can assign a score of “Yes.”

**18c. The facilitator encourages team culture by celebrating successes since the last meeting**

**NOTES:** In addition to generally maintaining a strengths focus and attending to evidence of progress, the observer should take note of whether the facilitator actively celebrates successes that have occurred since the last team meeting. This could include an actual celebration, plans for celebrating and reinforcing the success (e.g., a reward or fun event for the youth or parent), or, at least, leading a vigorous recognition of the success during the team meeting.

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if, during the team meeting, the facilitator and team members celebrate OR make plans to celebrate any successes.

**No** if there have been successes but the facilitator and team do not make an effort to celebrate or make plans to celebrate.

**N/A** may be scored if there have been no apparent successes since the last meeting.

**18d. There is a sense of openness and trust among team members.**

**NOTES:** Openness and trust among wraparound team members may require some subjective judgment on the part of the observer. In general, it may be indicated by team members’ willingness to provide opinions, disagree with one another in a respectful way, refer to the team’s shared goals, express warmth toward other team members, and so forth. To score “Yes” on this indicator, the observer should see indication of such openness and trust among most team members, and a lack of overall distrust (e.g., negative posturing, a refusal to share opinions, or disapproval of the perspectives of others).

**SCORING:**

**Yes** if, during the team meeting, there is evidence of openness and trust among most team members AND a lack of clear distrust or disapproval.

**No** if there is little evidence of openness and trust, OR if one or more team members shows clear distrust and/or disapproval.

**N/A** may be scored if the meeting is early in the process and team members have not had a chance to interact and gain trust of one another.

## Item 19. Community Focus

*TOM Item 19 directly maps to the wraparound principle of “Community-Based,” and assesses the extent to which the facilitator and team brainstorm community activities and prioritize access to community-based services.*

### 19a. The team is actively brainstorming and facilitating community activities for the youth and family.

**NOTES:** The team should show evidence that it is working to ensure that the youth and family members are integrated into the community and that they have greatest possible access to the range of activities and environments that are available to other families and youth. With respect to the youth, “community activity” means an activity attended predominantly by peers who do not have complex needs. Examples include sports team, art class, work experiences, volunteering, church youth groups, martial arts, etc. It can be an activity that the team has helped identify for the youth or it can be an activity that the youth identified and already participates in. **Depending on the type of meeting, the observer may need to ask the facilitator or review the wraparound plan and see if community activities are part of the youth and family’s plan.**

#### **SCORING:**

**Yes** if, during the team meeting, the facilitator and team members brainstorm or strategize around involvement of the youth and family in community activities, OR reference community activities in which the team has previously facilitated participation.

**No** if the above criteria are not met.

**N/A** may be scored if the meeting is very early in the process and strategies to include in the wraparound plan have not yet been determined.

### 19b. The team prioritizes services that are community-based.

**NOTES:** The observer should be noting whether the facilitator and team help the family access services and supports that are located within the community where the family lives or provided within the home. The observer should be noting whether the family describes a lack of comfort because they are being required to leave their neighborhood or home community area. Ideally, any such concerns will lead to the team brainstorming and strategizing alternatives that are provided within the family’s home or in the family’s home community.

#### **SCORING:**

**Yes** if services, supports, and strategies being brainstormed or reviewed are located within the family’s home community AND efforts are made to prioritize services and supports that will meet the family’s needs within the family’s home community.

**No** if services are difficult to access because they are out of the family’s home community OR the team does not seem to prioritize services in the family’s home community.

**N/A** may be scored if the meeting is very early in the process and services and supports have not yet been determined.

**19c. The team prioritizes access to services that are easily accessible to the youth and family.**

NOTES: The observer should be looking to see if the facilitator and team help the family access services and supports that are easily accessible to the family. The observer should be noting whether there seem to be transportation problems because of long distances that need to be traveled or concerns by family or other team members that the options chosen take them out of their way or are inconvenient. The observer should score “No” if such accessibility or convenience concerns are raised by the family or other team members but not addressed by the team. This indicator is similar to 19b, but instead of focusing on whether services and supports are provided in the family’s home community, it focuses on the more practical issue of ease of access to services by the youth and family. In other words, a service or support could be located in the family’s community (and thus 19b scored ‘Yes’), but still be difficult or inconvenient to access (and thus 19c scored ‘No’).

SCORING:

**Yes** if services, supports, and strategies being brainstormed or reviewed are accessible AND there is no evidence they are inconvenient or require long commutes by the family.

**No** if services are difficult to access because of distances to be traveled or lack of accessibility.

**N/A** may be scored if the meeting is very early in the process and services and supports have not yet been determined.

**Item 20. Least Restrictive Environment**

*TOM Item 20 directly maps to the wraparound principle of “Community-Based,” and assesses the extent to which the facilitator and team exert all efforts necessary to maintain the youth’s integration in community residential and inclusive school environments.*

**20a. The team’s mission and/or identified needs support the youth’s integration into the least restrictive residential and educational environments possible.**

NOTES: During the team meeting, the observer should be looking for evidence that the team has a commitment to maintaining or re-integrating the youth into the least restrictive residential and educational placements possible. With respect to residential placement, this means maintenance or integration into the most home-like setting possible for the child or youth. With respect to educational placements, this means integrated and “mainstreamed” educational settings, such as in the youth’s home school with his or her community peers. Evidence should be noted from statement of the team’s mission, the purpose of strategies as stated in the team’s goals, or discussion among team members. **Because goals and team mission statements may not always be reviewed during team meetings, scoring this indicator can be a challenge to the observer and may require de-briefing with the facilitator after the meeting.** If the youth is already in normalized home and school settings, and there is little concern about maintaining the youth in these settings, the observer may score “Yes” for this indicator.

SCORING:

**Yes** if the team’s mission and the family’s goals state an emphasis on maintaining or re-integrating the youth in the most normalized and least restrictive residential AND educational placements possible.

**No** if the youth is not in a normalized educational setting or is in a restrictive residential setting (e.g., group home or residential treatment center) AND the team is not focused on re-integrating the youth in more normalized settings.

**N/A** may be scored if the meeting is very early in the process and services and the youth's goals or team mission supports have not yet been developed.

**20b. When residential placements are discussed, team chooses community placements for the child or youth rather than out-of-community placements, wherever possible.**

NOTES: During strategizing and brainstorming of options, the team may discuss immediate or future options for the youth's residential setting. In wraparound, the ideal is that resources are available to support placement in the least restrictive setting possible (e.g., at home, in independent living) for the youth, even if his or her behavior poses serious challenges. The observer should be noting whether the team prioritizes and chooses such educational options during planning and follow-up meetings.

SCORING:

**Yes** if the team prioritizes and/or chooses community placements for the child or youth rather than out-of-home or out-of-community placements.

**No** if the team rejects home or community options or does not discuss them.

**N/A** may be scored if there is no discussion of residential placement during the meeting.

**20c. Serious challenges are discussed in terms of finding solutions, not placement in more restrictive residential or educational environments.**

NOTES: As noted in Item 18, a principle of the wraparound process is that negative events or serious challenges should be reframed as an indicator of a need for a better plan or strategy, rather than a failing of the youth, family, or team members. Even serious challenges, such as threats of violence, arrest, or evidence of drug use by a young person or parent, should be discussed in terms of finding solutions. The facilitator should re-direct discussion of such negative events away from placement in out-of-home or out-of-community settings and toward the team finding solutions to the problem that maintain the youth in the home and/or community. For example, a negative event in the home of a foster or birth parent will ideally lead team members to focus on ways to prevent such events from occurring again, rather than options for residential care or psychiatric hospitalization. Sometimes in these instances, the parent or foster parent will insist that such behavior demands placement in a more restrictive setting for the youth. While the team should respect and listen to such opinions, the wraparound principle of "community based" demands that the team first and foremost consider all community-based options during its planning process.

SCORING:

**Yes** if serious behaviors or negative events have occurred and the team focuses on maintaining the youth in a home or community setting.

**No** if the team focuses on placement options out of the home or community due to serious behaviors or negative events.

**N/A** may be scored if there have been no recent serious behaviors or negative events.

## Chapter 7: Data Entry

This chapter includes information on using the online data entry and reporting system (WrapTrack).

### WrapTrack

Recently, we have developed a new web-based resource called WrapTrack that allows licensed users to enter their data using a web portal that will compile their TOM data into one exportable database. This system allows the user sites to enter data and create reports at their convenience.

In order to gain access to the web portal, contact the system administrator at [wrapeval@u.washington.edu](mailto:wrapeval@u.washington.edu). Users will complete a brief training before utilizing the web system. The system allows for multiple users at each site, as well as multiple levels of data access.

