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Agenda

• Introduction to Fidelity Measurement:
  – Why fidelity? Why measurement?
• Overview of the measures of the Wraparound Fidelity Assessment System
• What predicts fidelity? Connections to system supports
• What does fidelity get you? Connections to outcomes
• Q&A and implications for Michigan
The three big ideas

• We need to move from principles to practice in doing wraparound
  – i.e., people who have the skills to accomplish the necessary tasks

• The better we implement the practice, the better the outcomes will be for youth and families

• Measuring the quality of practice can help us accomplish both these goals:
  – Better fidelity
  – Better outcomes!
Quote of the day

• “In theory, there is no difference between theory and practice. In practice, there is.”
  • Dean Fixsen, National Implementation Research Network

STRING THEORY SUMMARIZED:

I JUST HAD AN AWESOME IDEA.
SUPPOSE ALL MATTER AND ENERGY
IS MADE OF TINY, VIBRATING "STRINGS."

OKAY, WHAT WOULD
THAT IMPLY?

I DUNNO.
What is Wraparound?

- Wraparound is a family-driven, team-based process for planning and implementing services and supports.
- Through the wraparound process, teams create plans that are geared toward meeting the unique and holistic needs of children and youth with complex needs and their families.
- The wraparound team members (e.g., the identified youth, his or her parents/caregivers, other family members and community members, mental health professionals, educators, and others) meet regularly to implement and monitor the plan to ensure its success.
Ten principles of the wraparound process

Model adherent wraparound
• Youth/Family drives goal setting
• Single, collaboratively designed service plan
• Active integration of natural supports and peer support
• Respect for family’s culture/expertise
• Opportunities for choice
• Active evaluation of strategies/outcomes
• Celebration of success

Phases and Activities of the Wraparound Process

Short term outcomes:
• Better engagement in service delivery
• Creative plans that fit the needs of youth/family
• Improved service coordination
• Follow-through on team decisions
• Family regularly experiences success/support

Intermediate outcomes:
• Participation in services
• Services that “work” for family

Intermediate outcomes:
• Achievement of team goals
• Increased social support and community integration
• Improved coping and problem solving
• Enhanced empowerment
• Enhanced optimism/self-esteem

Long term outcomes:
• Stable, home-like placements
• Improved mental health outcomes (youth and caregiver)
• Improved functioning in school/vocation and community
• Improved resilience and quality of life

From Walker (2008)
*In theory* (i.e., when wraparound is implemented as intended), good things happen

- High-quality teamwork and flexible funds leads to better plans, and better fit between needs and services/supports
  - This leads to greater relevance for families, less dropout
- Strengths, needs, and culture discovery leads to more complete partnership with families
- As family works with a team to solve its own problems, develops family members’ self-efficacy
  - i.e., skills to get things they need
- Focus on setting goals and measuring outcomes leads to more frequent problem-solving and better plans
In practice, however…

- Until recently, there was no consensus on what wraparound consisted of
- Growing evidence that much “wraparound” was not living up to its promise
- This made it difficult to:
  - Coach, train, or supervise people with responsibility to carry out the wraparound process
  - Do quality assurance or develop evidence of wraparound’s effectiveness
Wraparound Process
The Principles

1. Family voice and choice
2. Team-based
3. Natural supports
4. Collaboration
5. Community-based
6. Culturally competent
7. Individualized
8. Strengths based
9. Persistence
10. Outcome-based

Walker, Bruns, Adams, Miles, Osher et al., 2004
A practice model:
The Four Phases of Wraparound

Phase 1A  Engagement and Support
Phase 1B  Team Preparation
Phase 2  Initial Plan Development
Phase 3  Implementation
Phase 4  Transition

Time
Phase 1: Engagement and Team Preparation

- Care Coordinator & Family Support Partner meets with the family to discuss the wraparound process and listen to the family’s story.
- Discuss concerns, needs, hopes, dreams, and strengths.
- Listen to the family’s vision for the future.
- Assess for safety and make a provisional crisis plan if needed.
- Identify people who care about the family as well as people the family have found helpful for each family member.
- Reach agreement about who will come to a meeting to develop a plan and where we should have that meeting.
Phase 2: Initial Plan Development

- Conduct first Child & Family Team (CFT) meeting with people who are providing services to the family as well as people who are connected to the family in a supportive role.
- The team will:
  - Review the family vision
  - Develop a Mission Statement about what the team will be working on together
  - Review the family’s needs
  - Come up with several different ways to meet those needs that match up with the family’s strengths
- Different team members will take on different tasks that have been agreed to.
Phase 3: Plan Implementation

• Based on the CFT meetings, the team has created a written plan of care.
• Action steps have been created, team members are committed to do the work, and our team comes together regularly.
• When the team meets, it:
  − Reviews Accomplishments (what has been done and what’s been going well);
  − Assesses whether the plan has been working to achieve the family’s goals;
  − Adjusts things that aren’t working within the plan;
  − Assigns new tasks to team members.
Phase 4: Transition

- There is a point when the team will no longer need to meet regularly.
- Transition out of Wraparound may involve a final meeting of the whole team, a small celebration, or simply the family deciding they are ready to move on.
- The family will get a record of what work was completed as well as a list of what was accomplished.
- The team will also make a plan for the future, including who the family can call on if they need help or if they need to re-convene their team.
- Sometimes transition steps include the family and their supports practicing responses to crises or problems that may arise.
Outcomes of Wraparound

Does wraparound work?
For whom?
What leads to positive outcomes?
Outcomes from Wraparound Milwaukee

- After Wraparound Milwaukee assumed responsibility for youth at residential level of care (approx. 700-1000 per year)...
  - Average daily Residential Treatment population reduced from 375 placements to 70 placements
  - Psychiatric Inpatient Utilization reduced from 5000 days per year to under 200 days (average LOS of 2.1 days)
  - Reduction in Juvenile Correctional Commitments from 325 per year to 150 (over last 3 years)

(Kamradt et al., 2008)
Results from Clark County, WA
Impact on juvenile justice outcomes

- *Connections* (wraparound) group (N=110) 3 times less likely to commit felony offense than comparison group (N=98)
- *Connections* group took 3 times longer on average to commit first offense after baseline
- *Connections* youth showed “significant improvement in behavioral and emotional problems, increases in behavioral and emotional strengths, and improved functioning at home at school, and in the community”

Pullman et al. (2006)
Other outcomes of wraparound

• Greater/more rapid achievement of permanency when implemented in child welfare (Oklahoma)

• More successful integration of adult prisoners into the community (Oklahoma)

• Reduction in costs associated with residential placements (LA County, Washington State, Kansas, many other jurisdictions)
There have been Seven Published Controlled Studies of Wraparound

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Control Group Design</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bickman et al. (2003)</td>
<td>Mental health</td>
<td>Non-equivalent comparison</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Carney et al. (2003)</td>
<td>Juvenile justice</td>
<td>Randomized control</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Evans et al. (1998)</td>
<td>Mental health</td>
<td>Randomized control</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Hyde et al. (1996)</td>
<td>Mental health</td>
<td>Non-equivalent comparison</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pullman et al. (2006)</td>
<td>Juvenile justice</td>
<td>Historical comparison</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings from our meta-analysis of seven controlled studies

• Strong results in favor of wraparound found for Living Situation outcomes (placement stability and restrictiveness)

• A small to medium sized effect found for:
  – Mental health (behaviors and functioning)
  – School (attendance/GPA), and
  – Community (e.g., JJ, re-offending) outcomes

• The overall effect size of all outcomes in the 7 studies is about the same (.35) as for “evidence-based” treatments, when compared to services as usual (Weisz et al., 2005)

Suter & Bruns (2008)
Positive Outcomes are **Not** Guaranteed!

Studies indicate that Wraparound teams often fail to:

- Incorporate full complement of key individuals on the Wraparound team;
- Engage youth in community activities, things they do well, or activities to help develop friendships;
- Use family/community strengths to plan/implement services;
- Engage natural supports, such as extended family members and community members;
- Use flexible funds to help implement strategies
- Consistently assess outcomes and satisfaction.
Fidelity is critical to outcomes

F  Higher levels of fidelity to organizational level assessment for ACT was associated with greater reductions in days spent in psychiatric hospitals (McGrew, Bond, Dietzen & Salyers, 1994)
F  Improved youth delinquency outcomes for higher fidelity Teaching Family model (Kirigin et. al. 1982)
F  Improved youth delinquency outcomes for higher fidelity MST (Henggler, Melton, Browndino, Scherer & Hanley, 1997)
F  Better overall outcomes for youth receiving model adherent FFT (Alexander, Pugh, Parsons and Sexton, 2000)
F  Better outcomes for school-wide behavioral management when implemented with fidelity (Felner et. al. 2001)
What is the connection between fidelity and outcomes with wraparound?

• Families who experience better outcomes have staff who score higher on fidelity tools (Bruns, Rast et al., 2006)

• Wraparound initiatives with positive fidelity assessments demonstrate more positive outcomes (Bruns, Leverentz-Brady, & Suter, 2008)
What does it take to get high fidelity scores?

• Training and coaching found to be associated with gains in fidelity and higher fidelity

• Communities with better developed supports for wraparound show higher fidelity scores
  - Measuring fidelity is a major part of the community’s effort to maintain high fidelity
    • “What gets measured gets done”
    • Who should be involved?
      - Trainers and coaches, supervisors, evaluators and community teams
Implementation with High Fidelity Requires...

State Support → County Context and Readiness → Program Evaluation → Performance Management

Organizational Supports → Supervision and Coaching → Staff Selection → Training
What are some ways to monitor the quality of implementation of child and family teams???

• Have facilitators and team members fill out activity checklists
• Look at plans of care and meeting notes
• Sit in on and observe team meetings
• Interview the people who know—parents, youth, facilitators, program heads
Wraparound Fidelity Assessment System

www.wrapinfo.org or http://depts.washington.edu/wrapeval

TOM – Team Observation Measure

CSWI – Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory

WFI-4 – Wraparound Fidelity Index

DRM - Document Review Measure
The Wraparound Fidelity Index, version 4

- Assesses implementation of the wraparound process through brief interviews with multiple respondents
  - Caregivers
  - Youths
  - Wraparound Facilitators
  - Team Members
- Found to possess good psychometric characteristics
  - Test-retest reliability
  - Inter-rater agreement
  - Internal consistency
- Used in research on wraparound
- Even more widely as a quality assurance mechanism by wrap programs
Wraparound Fidelity Index, v.4

- Items on the principles and core activities, organized by the 4 phases of wraparound
  - Engagement: Did you select the people who would be on your youth and family team?
    - Principle = Team based
  - Planning: Does the plan include strategies for helping your child get involved with activities in the community?
    - Principle = Community based
  - Implementation: Does the team evaluate progress toward the goals of the plan at every team meeting?
    - Principle = Outcome based
  - Transition: Will some members of your team be there to support you when formal wraparound is complete?
    - Principle = Persistence
### WFI Items: Engagement and Team Preparation Phase

#### Phase 1: Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>SometimesSo</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>When you first met your wraparound facilitator, were you given time to talk about your family's strengths, beliefs, and traditions?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Circle one:</em> YES NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did this process help you appreciate what is special about your family?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Circle one:</em> YES NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Before your first team meeting, did your wraparound facilitator fully explain the wraparound process and the choices you could make?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>At the beginning of the wraparound process, did you have a chance to tell your wraparound facilitator what things have worked in the past for your child and family?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Did you select the people who would be on your wraparound team?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Is it difficult to get agency representatives and other team members to attend team meetings when they are needed?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Before your first wraparound team meeting, did you go through a process of identifying what leads to crises or dangerous situations for your child and your family?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reports from the WFI: Individual items (Engagement phase)

Q1. Were you given time to talk about your family's strengths, beliefs, and traditions?
True - 10  Partly True - 3  Not True - 2

Q2. Did your facilitator fully explain wraparound & the choices you could make?
True - 9  Partly True - 4  Not True - 2

Q3. Did you have a chance to tell your wraparound facilitator what has worked in the past for your child and family?
True - 7  Partly True - 4  Not True - 4

Q4. Did you select the people who would be on your wraparound team?
True - 7  Partly True - 4  Not True - 4

Q5. Is it difficult to get team members to meetings when they are needed?
True – 9  Partly True – 3  Not True - 3

Q6. Did you go through a process of identifying what leads to crises for your family?
True – 8  Partly True – 3  Not True - 4
WFI-4: Discriminant Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wrap sites (n=12)</th>
<th>Non-wrap sites (n=4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Member</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Team Observation Measure
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.

• Internal consistency very good

• Inter-rater reliability found to be adequate (Average 79% agreement for all indicators)
Sample TOM report:
Most frequently observed TOM indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Pct.</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20a</td>
<td>The team's mission and/or needs support the youth's integration into the least restrictive residential and educational environments possible</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Parent/caregiver is a team member and present at meeting</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12e</td>
<td>Members of the team use language the family can understand</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18d</td>
<td>Serious challenges are discussed in terms of finding solutions, not termination of services or sanctions.</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>There is a written agenda or outline for the meeting, which provides an understanding of the overall purpose of meeting</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11e</td>
<td>Talk is well distributed across team members and each team member makes an extended or important contribution</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18e</td>
<td>There is a sense of openness and trust among team members</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20d</td>
<td>Serious behavioral challenges are discussed in terms of finding solutions, not placement in more restrictive residential or educational environments</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>.332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample TOM report:
Least frequently observed TOM indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Pct</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8a</td>
<td>In designing strategies, team members consider and build on strengths of the youth and family</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13b</td>
<td>The team assesses goals/strategies using measures of progress</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5d</td>
<td>The facilitator leads a robust brainstorming process to develop multiple options to meet priority needs.</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c</td>
<td>Community team members and natural supports have a clear role on the team</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14a</td>
<td>The team conducts a systematic review of members' progress on assigned action steps</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19a</td>
<td>The team is actively brainstorming and facilitating community activities for the youth and family</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b</td>
<td>The plan of care represents a balance between formal services and informal supports</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>Key natural supports for the family are team members and present</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>.362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wraparound Fidelity Assessment System

Document Review Measure
Document Review Measure

- Consists of 30 items
- Each wraparound principle linked to 3 items
- Scale = 0-4, with criteria for each point on the scale
- Source material = documentation (electronic or paper) related to youth’s wraparound process
  - Strengths, needs, culture discovery documentation
  - Wraparound plan of care
  - Crisis plan
  - Transition plan
  - Progress notes
- Currently being thoroughly revised
Wraparound Fidelity Assessment System

Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory
Hospitable System  *Funding, Policies

Supportive Organizations  * Training, supervision, interagency coordination and collaboration

Effective Team  * Process + Principles
The Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory (CSWI)

- The Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory (CSWI) is intended for use as both a research and quality improvement tool to measure how well a local system supports the implementation of high quality wraparound.
- The CSWI is based on the Necessary Conditions for Wraparound described by Walker & Koroloff (2007)*
- Further refined through collaborative work undertaken by the National Wraparound Initiative
- Includes 42 community or system variables that support wraparound implementation.
- Requires ~45 minutes to complete

CSWI

- The 42 items are grouped within 6 themes:
  1. Community partnership
  2. Collaborative action
  3. Fiscal policies and sustainability
  4. Service array
  5. Human resource development, and
  6. Accountability

- Respondents complete the 42 items by rating the development of supports in their community or program on a 5 point scale
  - 0 = “least developed” and 4 = “fully developed”
Community Procedures

• Stakeholders are identified by a local coordinator and invited by email to complete the CSWI via a link to a web survey version
  - Stakeholder groups—family, youth, admin, providers, etc.
  - “key respondents”
  - Project employees
• Local coordinator builds support for participation
• Emails that bounce are removed from the sample
• Reminders sent until research team and local coordinators decide to close the survey
CSWI Total Scores
(Maximum possible = 160)
Sample Site Feedback: Themes

Theme Means: Site and National Comparison

**Theme 1:** Community Partnerships

**Theme 2:** Collaborative Action

**Theme 3:** Fiscal Policies and Sustainability

**Theme 4:** Availability of Services and Supports

**Theme 5:** Human Resource Development

**Theme 6:** Accountability

---

Least Developed | Midway | Fully Developed

- NWI Mean
- Site 2 Mean
Sample Site Feedback: Theme 1

Theme 1: Site and National Item Means

1.1: Community Team
1.2: Empowered Community Team
1.3: Family Voice
1.4: Youth Voice
1.5: Agency Support
1.6: Community Stakeholders
1.7: Community Representativeness

NWI Mean
Site 2 Mean

Least Developed
Midway
Fully Developed
Sample Site Feedback: Theme 1

Theme 1: Site and National Item Means

1.1: Community Team
1.2: Empowered Community Team
1.3: Family Voice
1.4: Youth Voice
1.5: Agency Support
1.6: Community Stakeholders
1.7: Community Representativeness

Least Developed | Midway | Fully Developed

NWI Mean
Site 7 Mean

0 1 2 3 4
What is the evidence on connections between systems, wrap fidelity and outcomes?

1. Youth/families with higher WFI scores show more positive outcomes (but evidence inconsistent across studies)
2. Individual provider staff whose families experience better outcomes have higher WFI scores (Emerging evidence)
3. Wraparound sites/initiatives with higher WFI scores achieve better outcomes (Emerging but consistent)
4. Training and coaching is associated with gains in fidelity and higher fidelity (Consistent evidence)
5. Communities with better developed supports for wraparound show higher WFI scores (Strong and consistent evidence)
6. We are beginning to be able to described what “high fidelity” wraparound is
Study 1

- N=176, one provider organization
  - Outcomes included goal attainment, CAFAS, and residential restrictiveness
  - Results found positive but weak association between WFI total scores and outcomes
  - Association found between several WFI principles (Community based, strengths based) and outcomes
  - Presence of Natural supports on team predicted residential and goal attainment outcomes

Study 2: Relationship between fidelity and outcomes

• Caregiver reported fidelity was found to be related to several 6-month outcomes:
  - Restrictiveness of living ($p<.1$)
  - Family resources
  - Caregiver satisfaction

• CG-reported fidelity was associated in the hypothesized direction with all 6-months outcomes
  - Overall, however, few significant relationships were found

• Stronger findings at the site level
Study Findings: Outcomes differences between sites with high vs low WFI scores

- Significant between-group differences found for:
  - Total services received
  - Caregiver satisfaction
  - Restrictiveness of living environment
  - Placement changes
  - Family functioning
    - All differences in hypothesized direction

- No differences found for:
  - Child functioning
  - Child behavior (CBCL or YSR)
  - Behavioral strengths
  - Caregiver strain
  - Family resources
  - Youth satisfaction

Fidelity and outcomes at the staff level

- Studies have been primarily restricted to program evaluations; however one published study:

- Analyses have been completed in NV, AZ implementation efforts

- Currently possible in MD, CA, WA, NV
Low vs. high-fidelity wraparound in NV: Family resources

FRS measures a caregiver’s report on the adequacy of a variety of resources (time, money, energy, etc.) needed to meet the needs of the family as a whole, as well as the needs of individual family members. Group average on the scale of 1 – 5 1 = Not at all adequate 5 = Almost always adequate.
Low- vs. high-fidelity wraparound in AZ: Child Behavior

Intake 6 Months 12 Months

Time Frame

Low Fidelity Staff — High Fidelity Staff
Ongoing training and professional development support leads to higher fidelity

Phase in Wraparound Fidelity Process

Wraparound Projects (N=6) with coaching to staff certification: Mean WFI scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th>Caregiver</th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Team Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fidelity projects</strong></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nati Mean</strong></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organizational and system-level supports predict fidelity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WFI-PA domains</th>
<th>Site 1</th>
<th>Site 2</th>
<th>Site 3</th>
<th>Site 4</th>
<th>Site 5</th>
<th>Site 6</th>
<th>Site 7</th>
<th>Site 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Longevity</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Caseload Size</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Staff turnover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interagency collab.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pooled funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural supports</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family centeredness</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund/Serv. Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes assessed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL WFI-PA: 3 2 3 5 6 6 7 7
WFI Scores at a State Level
Benchmarks and real-world reality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total WFI scores</th>
<th>Percent of total fidelity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-wraparound comparisons</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State No.1</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State No.2</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Average</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State No.3</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State No.4</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Getting to “high fidelity”
The story of “state number 3”

- Statewide training and TA center
- Consistent availability of family partners (+ youth advocates)
- Certification program for facilitators/FPs
- Referrals from and fiscal responsibility shared by multiple agencies
- Care management entity (CME) that maintains MIS, develops service array, holds some risk for overall costs
  - Allows for flexible funding of team strategies
- 1915c Waiver
- Professional development at SSW and in provider agencies
Fidelity’s Impact on Outcomes at a state level?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Functional Impairment on the CAFAS</th>
<th>Intake</th>
<th>6 months</th>
<th>12 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State 1 (WFI=68)</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State 2 (WFI=69)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State 4 (WFI=81)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is the evidence on connections between fidelity and outcomes?

1. Do youth/families with higher WFI scores show more positive outcomes? (Inconsistent)
2. Do individual provider staff whose families experience better outcomes have higher WFI scores? (Stronger)
3. Do wraparound sites/initiatives with higher WFI scores achieve better outcomes? (Emerging)
4. Is training and coaching associated with gains in fidelity and higher fidelity? (Growing)
5. Do communities with better developed supports for wraparound show higher WFI scores (Strong)
6. Can we say what “high fidelity” wraparound is yet?
What is High-Fidelity???

Association between WFI and TOM scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>WFI Combined</th>
<th>Team Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site 1 WFI n=19 / TOM n=4  
Site 3 WFI n=19 / TOM n=14  
Site 5 WFI n=17 / TOM n=10  
Site 9 WFI n=110 / TOM n=39  
Site 6 WFI n = 22 / TOM n=13  
Site 7 WFI n = 3 / TOM n=3  
Site 8 WFI n = 50 / TOM n=24  
Site 10 WFI n = 207 / TOM n=16
Findings

• Fidelity-outcomes associations are tenuous and inconsistent at the family/youth level
• At the site/program level, there is a discernable pattern of WFI Fidelity scores across studies
  - Wraparound vs. non-wraparound programs
  - Wraparound programs with different levels of system support and that achieve different degrees of impact
  - Site-level scores from the national WFI dataset show significant variability, but fall logically within the pattern
• Beginning to be able to interpret the “level of fidelity” WFI scores
• Team Observations correlate with WFI scores and may be even more sensitive to quality
Conclusions/Implications

• Factors at the youth/family level make WFI scores difficult to interpret reliably at that level
  – This is the nature of interviews
• WFI scores may be most reliable, valid, and useful at a staff and program level
• WFI scores should be helpful in interpreting research results
• The TOM is emerging as a reliable and valid instrument
Mean WFI scores by Principle and Respondent (N=2200)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>WF</th>
<th>CG</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>TM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Voice &amp; Choice</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Team Based</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Natural Supports</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Collaborative</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Community Based</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Culturally Competent</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Individualized</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Strengths Based</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Persistent/Unconditional</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Outcomes Based</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean WFI scores by Principle and Respondent (N=2200)
Is Fidelity Happening Nationally?
## WFI Items with 5 Highest Scores (From National WFI-4 dataset)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item means (CG form; range = 0-2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.11 Does your team create a positive atmosphere around successes and accomplishments at each team meeting?</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Are there supports and services in your plan connected to the strengths and abilities of your child and family?</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 At the beginning of the wraparound process, did you have a chance to tell the WF what things have worked for you in the past?</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15 Does your child have the opportunity to communicate their own ideas when it comes to decisions?</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12 Does your team go out of its way to make sure all members present ideas and participate in decisions?</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11 During the planning process, did the team make enough time to understand your values, and is the plan in tune with those values?</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## WFI Items with Lowest Scores (From National WFI-4 dataset)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item means (CG form; range = 0-2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Does your plan include mostly professional services?</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Is there a friend or advocate of your child or family who actively participates on the team?</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Has your team discussed a plan for how wraparound will end, and when?</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Does your team get your child involved with activities they like and do well?</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8 Are the services and supports in your plan difficult for you to access?</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9 Does the team assign specific tasks to all members at the end of the meeting, and does the team review follow-through at the next meeting?</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 Does your team come up with new ideas when something isn’t working?</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Does the team find ways to increase the support you get from friends &amp; family?</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>