Wraparound Fidelity Assessment System **Team Observation Measure 2.0**

June 2020 Version



This form was completed by:
Internal Staff
External Evaluator

3) Non-Binary

2) Female

Age:

4) Prefer not to say

Transgender? (Circle one) Yes No

5) Other:

Youth's DOB: /

Youth Gender Identity: 1) Male

Observed Meeting Information

Team Membership and Meeting Attendance Grid (Before or after the meeting, the observer should check with the Facilitator about who is on the team.)

Meeting Date:	To an Advertised	1	How many	How many	Neter
Meeting Length:	Team Members	Indicator	on Team?	present?	Notes
Meeting Place:	Facilitator	n/a			
	Youth	1b			
Vouth /Formily ID:	Parent (birth or adoptive)	1a			
Youth/Family ID:	Foster parent	1a			
Youth Wrap	Caregiver (if different from parent or foster parent)	1a			
Enrollment Date:	Sibling of the Youth (17 or younger)	n/a			
Project/Agency	School representative	1c			
Name/ID:	Juvenile justice representative/probation officer	1c			
Facilitator	Social services representative/social worker	1c			
Name/ID:	Court appointed special advocate (CASA)	1c			
Supervisor	Attorney	1c			
Name/ID:	Mental health provider	1d			
Observer	Mental health agency representative	1d			
Name/ID:	Medical provider	1d			
Type of meeting (circle one):	Family support partner or advocate (peer)	1e			
1 Initial team/planning meeting	Youth support partner or advocate (peer)	1e			
	Older sibling of the Youth (18 or older)	1f			
2 Follow-up meeting	Extended family member	1f			
3 Transition/discharge meeting	Friend of parent/caregiver	1f			
4 Other (please specify)	Friend of youth	1f			
	Other natural or community support	1f			
	Other (please specify)				

FOR AUTHORIZED USE ONLY - DO NOT DISTRIBUTE OR ALTER IN ANY WAY

Copyright 2016 | Wraparound Evaluation and Research Team / Eric J. Bruns, Ph.D. | University of Washington | (206) 685-2477 | www.depts.washington.edu/wrapeval

June 2020 Version

Subscale	Indicators	Score	Score Calculation	Notes
1. Full Meeting Attendance*	a. At least one parent/caregiver was present at the meeting.	Y N N/A		
	b. The youth was present at the meeting. (N/A for youth age 10 or younger.)	Y N N/A	(A) #Y :	
	c. All key representatives from school, child welfare, and juvenile justice agencies who are on the team OR seem integral to the youth and family's plan were present at the meeting.*	Y N N/A	(B) 6 - #N/A :** (C) A / B : Score = 100 x C : %**	
	d. All other service providers who are on the team OR seem integral to the youth and family's plan were present at the meeting.*	Y N N/A		
	e. All peer partners (e.g., family advocates, family support partners, youth support partners, etc.) who are on the team were present at the meeting.*	Y N N/A		
	f. At least one natural or community support for the youth and family was present at the meeting.	Y N		
2. Effective Teamwork	a. All team members demonstrated a full understanding about what the Wraparound process is, the need for a single plan, and what they will contribute to the process to help the youth and family.	Y N		
	b. Talk was well-distributed across team members, and <i>each</i> team member made a meaningful contribution. No one or two people dominated the conversation or remained virtually silent during the meeting.	Y N	<pre>(A) #Y : (B) 5 - #N/A : (C) A / B : Score = 100 x C :</pre>	
	c. Since the last team meeting, <i>all</i> team members have followed through with their previously assigned tasks/action steps or at least demonstrated diligent efforts to do so.	Y N N/A		
	d. There was a clear understanding of who would be responsible for following through on the tasks and strategies necessary to help the youth and family meet their needs.	Y N	%	
	e. Team members demonstrated a consistent willingness to compromise or explore further options when there was disagreement.	Y N N/A		

Notes:

*Before or after the meeting, the observer should check with the facilitator about who is on the team. **If four or more items are "N/A", score subscale as "N/A".

Wraparound Fidelity Assessment System: Team Observation Measure 2.0

June 2020 Version

Page 3 of 5

Subscale	Indicators	Score	Score Calculation	Notes
3. Driven by Strengths and Families	 a. The parent/caregiver(s) and/or other family members constructively contributed to the care planning process (e.g., by articulating their needs, explaining their perspectives, and/or suggesting a potential service, support, or strategy). 	Y N N/A	(A) #Y : (B) 5 - #N/A : (C) A / B : Score = 100 x C : %	
	b. The youth constructively contributed to the care planning process (e.g., by articulating their needs, explaining their perspectives, and/or suggesting a potential service, support, or strategy). (N/A for youth age 10 or younger.)	Y N N/A		
	c. The team identified or reviewed at least one functional strength of the youth that was used in planning to develop a strategy to meet their needs.	Y N		
	d. The team identified or reviewed at least one functional strength of the parent/caregiver or family as a whole that was used in planning to develop a strategy to meet their or the youth's needs.	Y N N/A		
	e. Team members avoided blaming and remained focused on solutions, rather than dwelling on negative events.	Y N		
4. Based on Priority Needs**	 a. Before beginning to brainstorm strategies, the team <i>explicitly</i> articulated, prioritized, and/or reviewed and confirmed the youth's and family's needs to plan for/address during the meeting. 	Y N		
	b. Every need that was planned for/addressed during the meeting was articulated as the underlying reason(s) why a problematic situation or behavior was occurring, and was not simply stated as a deficit, problematic behavior, or service need.	Y N N/A	<pre>(A) #Y : (B) 5 - #N/A :** (C) A / B : Score = 100 x C :%**</pre>	
	c. Planning focused on the underlying needs of other family members, not just the identified youth.	Y N N/A		
	d. For every need that was planned for/addressed during the meeting, the team brainstormed more than one strategy to meet the need before deciding on next steps.	Y N N/A		
	e. The team discussed how they will know the youth and family's needs have been sufficiently met to warrant a transition out of formal Wraparound services.	Y N N/A		

List the strengths identified and needs that were planned for/addressed during the meeting to assist in scoring (optional):

June 2020 Version

Subscale	Indicators	Score	Score Calculation	Notes
5. Use of Natural and Community Supports**	a. The team encouraged the youth's and family's positive connection to their natural supports (extended relatives, friends, neighbors, clergy, business owners, etc.) by exploring their current level of connection and integrating activities to foster connections into the Plan of Care.	Y N N/A		
	b. The team encouraged the youth's and family's positive connection to their community through participation in community activities, clubs, and/or other informal organizations by exploring their current level of connection and integrating activities to foster connections into the Plan of Care.	Y N N/A	(A) #Y : (B) 5 - #N/A :	
	c. Natural supports (e.g., extended relatives, friends, neighbors, clergy, business owners, etc.) are actively involved in implementing strategies in the Plan of Care or Crisis Plan developed and/or discussed at the meeting.	Y N N/A	(C) A / B : Score = 100 x C :	
	d. The Plan of Care or Crisis Plan developed and/or discussed at the meeting supports the youth's integration into the least restrictive residential and/or educational environment possible.	Y N N/A	%**	
	e. The Plan of Care or Crisis Plan developed and/or discussed at the meeting represents a balance between informal (natural and community) and formal strategies, services, and supports.	Y N N/A		
6. Outcomes- Based Process**	a. The team reviewed how close the youth and family are to achieving their vision, mission, or Wraparound team goal (i.e., the overarching purpose of Wraparound involvement).	Y N N/A	(A) #Y :	
	b. The team reviewed the status of task/action step completion since the last meeting.	Y N N/A	(B) 5 - #N/A :**	
	c. The team monitored progress toward meeting needs and achieving outcomes/goals since the last meeting.	Y N N/A	(C) A / B :	
	d. Progress toward meeting needs and achieving outcomes/goals since the last meeting was evaluated using objective and verifiable measures, not just general or subjective feedback.	Y N N/A	Score = 100 x C : %**	
	e. For any <u>new</u> outcome or goal (i.e., what it would look like if a need was met) developed during the meeting, the team discussed and agreed upon a specific and measurable way to evaluate progress.	Y N N/A	7o ***	

Wraparound Fidelity Assessment System: Team Observation Measure 2.0

June 2020 Version

Subscale	Indicators	Score	Score Calculation	Notes
	a. The facilitator prepared the needed documents and materials prior to the meeting, such as the Plan of Care, Crisis Plan, data on progress, etc., and had enough copies to share with each team member.	Y N	(A) #Y :	
	b. The meeting followed a clear agenda that provided an understanding of the overall purpose of the meeting and the priority agenda items.	Y N	(B) 5 - #N/A :	
7. Skilled Facilitation	c. The facilitator reflected and summarized team members' contributions, probed for further information, and generally stimulated productive brainstorming and discussion.	Y N	(C) A / B : Score = 100 x C :	
	d. The facilitator was dynamically engaged in the process, and was able to maintain an appropriate momentum and members' focus throughout the meeting.	Y N	%	
	e. The facilitator was able to manage disagreement and conflict and make sure all team members' opinions and ideas were heard.	Y N N/A		

Overall reflections of the meeting, the Wraparound team process, areas of strength and needing improvement (optional):

TOM 2.0 Subscale	Overall Score	Key Elements Score
1. Full Meeting Attendance		N/A
2. Effective Teamwork		
3. Driven by Strengths and Families		
4. Based on Priority Needs		
5. Use of Natural and Community Supports		
6. Outcomes-Based Process		
7. Skilled Facilitation		N/A
TOTAL TOM 2.0 SCORE (average of subscale scores)		