



WRAPAROUND FIDELITY ASSESSMENT SYSTEM (WFAS)

TEAM OBSERVATION MEASURE 2.0 (TOM)

Manual for Use & Scoring

September 2020 Version

University of Washington School of Medicine

Wraparound Evaluation and Research Team

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

University of Washington School of Medicine • Department of Psychiatry & Behavioral Sciences

Division of Public Behavioral Health & Justice Policy

6200 NE 74th Street, Building 29, Suite 110, Seattle, WA 98115

wrapeval@uw.edu

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

CONTENTS

Preface	3
The Wraparound Fidelity Assessment System (WFAS)	3
Uses of Fidelity Assessment Measures	3
The Team Observation Measure	4
Manual Structure.....	4
Acknowledgments	5
Chapter 1: Introduction to the Team Observation Measure 2.0	6
Organization of the TOM 2.0	6
Scoring the TOM 2.0	7
Role of the TOM observer	8
Use of video recorded team meetings	8
Chapter 2: Qualifications for Use	9
Chapter 3: Preparing to collect TOM data	14
Project approval	14
Selecting and preparing observers	14
Approaching families and team members	14
Engaging Wraparound facilitators and providers.....	14
Chapter 4: Conducting TOM observations	16
Setting up for the meeting	16
Completing the TOM 2.0	16
Recording observer notes and comments	17
When to score the TOM 2.0	18
Chapter 5: Scoring Rules for TOM 2.0 indicators and subscales	20
A note about Transition-Age Youth	20
Cover Sheet	20
Observed Meeting Information and ID Numbers.....	21
Team members	23

PREFACE

Subscale 1. Full Meeting Attendance	23
Subscale 2. Effective Teamwork	26
Subscale 3. Driven by Strengths and families	29
Subscale 4. Based on Priority Needs	33
Subscale 5. Use of natural and community supports	36
Subscale 6. Outcomes-based process	39
Subscale 7. Skilled facilitation	42
Total TOM 2.0 Score	45
Key Elements Score	45
Appendix A: Data Entry.....	46
Appendix B. Sample Team Meeting Observation Consent Form	47

PREFACE

THE WRAPAROUND FIDELITY ASSESSMENT SYSTEM (WFAS)

The Team Observation Measure (TOM), version 2 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.

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 ensure 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 2.0 is employed by external evaluators to assess adherence to standards of high-quality Wraparound during team meeting sessions. It consists of 7 subscales—five dedicated to the fidelity domains that align with the theory of change for Wraparound implementation (Walker & Matarese, 2011), one that evaluates meeting attendance, and one that assesses facilitation skills. Each subscale consists of 5 indicators, with the exception of Full Meeting Attendance, 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 subscale, as well as a total fidelity score for the session overall.

MANUAL STRUCTURE

This manual is intended to assist you to use the TOM 2.0 as a part of your Wraparound quality assessment process. It is intended to provide our new collaborators with sufficient information to use the TOM 2.0, 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 the TOM 2.0;
2. A discussion of user qualifications and observer training;
3. Preparations to take before conducting observations;
4. Directions for administering the TOM 2.0; and
5. Notes and scoring rules for each TOM 2.0 subscale and indicator.

An overview of the Wraparound model and terminology is provided in Appendix B.



Though we are pleased to provide measures of the WFAS, the TOM 2.0, and this manual for use to the field as a whole, use of the TOM 2.0 and its manual continue to be restricted to collaborators who have an agreement with our research team. For more information about collaborating with our team, please visit our website at <http://depts.washington.edu/wrapeval/content/becoming-wfas-collaborator>

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)

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 subscales, 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 her and her colleagues. Finally, we sincerely appreciate suggestions for edits to the TOM training materials that we received from Danielle Phillips, Mila Rodriguez-Adair, and Molly Kennedy from the Systems of Care Institute at Portland State University. These suggestions helped improve the accuracy of these materials.

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 THE TEAM OBSERVATION MEASURE 2.0

As described in the Preface, the Team Observation Measure, version 2 (TOM 2.0) is designed to assess adherence to standards of high-quality Wraparound during team meeting sessions. It consists of 7 subscales—five dedicated to the fidelity domains that align with the theory of change for Wraparound implementation (Walker & Matarese, 2011), one that evaluates meeting attendance, and one that assesses facilitation skills. Each subscale consists of 5 indicators, with the exception of Full Meeting Attendance, 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 subscale, as well as a total fidelity score for the session overall.

ORGANIZATION OF THE TOM 2.0

The TOM 2.0 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 7 TOM 2.0 subscales, each of which includes 5 indicators (and 6 for Full Meeting Attendance). 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 subscales and indicators, by Wraparound principle being assessed, is presented below.

The 36 indicators of the TOM 2.0 are organized into five theory- and research-based Key Element subscales, with additional subscales to assess meeting attendance and evaluate the Wraparound facilitator’s meeting facilitation skills. In order, the subscales are:

1. Full Meeting Attendance
2. Effective Teamwork
3. Driven by Strengths and Families
4. Based on Priority Needs
5. Use of Natural & Community Supports
6. Outcomes-Based Process
7. Skilled Facilitation

As presented above, each TOM 2.0 subscale is numbered from 1-7. Indicators for each subscale are lettered from ‘a’ through ‘e’. On the TOM 2.0 form, in the TOM 2.0 manual, and when entering data, the individual indicators are identified by the subscale number, followed by the letter for that indicator. For example, Subscale 4 (“Based on Priority Needs”) indicator ‘c’ (“Planning focused on the underlying needs of other family members, not just the identified youth.”) would be referred to as indicator 4c.

SCORING THE TOM 2.0

Each of the 36 TOM 2.0 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 5), 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 indicators only, and is used if, for some reason, it is impossible to provide a score of Yes or No.

Responses to the five indicators for each subscale are then used to derive subscale scores, which indicate the number of subscale-related indicators observed, taking into account the number of "N/A" responses. For example:

Subscale	Indicators	Indicator	Score Calculation
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	(A) #Y : <u>3</u> (B) 5 - #N/A : <u>4</u> (C) A / B : <u>.75</u> Score = 100 x C : <u>75%</u>
	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	
	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	

In the example above, three of the five indicators were observed (A), and one was not applicable (B). Therefore, three-fourths (or .75) of the applicable indicators received a "Yes" rating (C). To convert this fraction to a score that can be compared across subscales, the fraction of observed applicable indicators is multiplied by 100 in order to arrive at the subscale score of 75%.

A Total TOM 2.0 score is derived by averaging the seven subscale scores.

WRAPSTAT INTEGRATION

Our research team provides access to an online data entry and reporting system called WrapStat. WrapStat supports Wraparound initiatives enter and manage their TOM 2.0 data. To learn more about WrapStat, contact us at wrapeval@uw.edu.

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 subscale 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. The TOM observer must follow [the certification process outlined on the WERT website](#) in order to observe meetings and complete TOM 2.0s.

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 2: QUALIFICATIONS FOR USE

The TOM 2.0 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 2.0, 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 2.0. Observers will also need to be experienced with the TOM form, this *User 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 subscales of the TOM 2.0.

The above is not to imply that only researchers must administer the TOM 2.0. 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 Manual*. The statements in the box on the next page summarize our research team’s expectations on qualifications of individuals who use the TOM 2.0.

TOM 2.0: QUALIFICATIONS FOR USE

The TOM 2.0 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 2.0 was designed to be administered by a trained observer. Observers must be trained on administration and scoring of the TOM 2.0 and also 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 2.0 forms and the *User Manual*; and
- Experience with or a good working knowledge of the Wraparound process.
- Completed the [WERT observer certification process](#).

SCORING

Individuals responsible for scoring must follow instructions on the TOM 2.0 forms and in the User Manual to assure accurate scoring of TOM 2.0 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® and SPSS® formats. The research team is working to update WrapStat (the online Wraparound data entry and reporting system) to include the TOM 2.0, and hopes that this work is finished by the fall of 2016. Using this online tool, collaborators will have the ability to enter data, run reports, and export data as well.

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 2.0 have appropriate experience and/or training in such activities. At a minimum, they must have a thorough knowledge of the *TOM 2.0 User 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 consent from participants.

INTERPRETATION

The proper clinical, quality assurance, program evaluation, and research use and interpretation of the TOM 2.0 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 2.0 User 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 2.0;
3. A review of general TOM 2.0 administration procedures;
4. A review of individual TOM 2.0 indicators, subscales, and scoring rules;
5. Group practice administrations of the TOM 2.0 using a videotaped team meeting or approved live team meeting;
6. Practice administrations done in a pair with an experienced observer, evaluation leader, or supervisor, with comparison and de-briefing of scores assigned
7. Periodic group and/or individual supervision for observers
8. Review and score WERT Gold Standard Training Video of Brandon's team meeting; and
9. Completion and passing score on TOM 2.0 Observer Certification Quiz.

Though this recommended regimen may seem intensive, we believe it is critical to ensuring reliable and valid administration and TOM 2.0 scores. The first four activities should be relatively straightforward: The Wraparound Evaluation and Research Team has provided this *User Manual*, which can be used as an introduction for observers and a reference for administration and scoring. We also provide a PowerPoint presentation to be used by local evaluation teams training multiple observers, especially if these observers are not trained as evaluators.

We strongly encourage supervisors of staff who are working toward or have TOM 2.0 certification to also become certified users themselves. Ideally, a supervisor would become certified prior to their staff going through the process so they can answer questions and provide necessary guidance on key elements of Wraparound and the Team Observation Measure. Furthermore, skills-based supervision and ongoing conversations about tool administration and Wraparound fidelity are essential to preventing drift and erosion of data reliability over time.

After the training on the TOM 2.0, the evaluation team should arrange to have group practice administrations of the TOM 2.0, using videotaped team meetings of various types (e.g., planning meeting, follow-up meeting). The full team will ideally observe a videotaped team meeting, score independently, and then debrief scores 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 subscale scores for all of the subscales 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 2.0 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 2.0 individually, followed by comparison of scores by both reviewers and reconciliation of scores that are not the same.

CHAPTER 2: QUALIFICATIONS FOR USE

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.

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 acceptable. 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 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.

EXAMPLES OF SAMPLING APPROACH

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 the 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 2.0 can be used not only as a research and evaluation tool, but also as a supervision tool, this can vary. When used strictly as a research tool, we recommend that each youth/family get observed only once, unless they are randomly selected twice. If the TOM 2.0 is being used in a supervisory capacity, it may be

CHAPTER 2: QUALIFICATIONS FOR USE

the case that certain families get chosen more than once, and this is acceptable. 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, 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, 9 months, etc.).

How many?

	TOM 2.0 – N Served	Sample
What is the sample size?	Up to 25 active families	Sample = 8 - 10
	26 – 50 active families	Sample = 12-15
	51 and greater <i>(These are minimum standards!)</i>	Sample = minimum 16, maximum half of youth served
How often data is collected for every family?	Once per family unless selected twice as part of random sample. If the TOM 2.0 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.	
Random sample method	In this case, let's randomly sample by Wraparound facilitator (WF). We will assume there are 5 facilitators, and each WF has a caseload of around 10 families. You decide that, in order to be eligible for an observation, a youth/family must be enrolled in Wraparound a minimum of 30 days and a maximum of 12 months (although there really are no constraints for doing the TOM 2.0 as far as time in enrollment goes). This brings each eligible caseload by WF to about 8, or about 40 for the program. Thus, ideally 12-15 observations would be conducted. These observations should be stratified (or split) by WF, proportional to their caseload size. Since they all have roughly equal caseloads, they should each have three team observations completed on three randomly chosen eligible youth/families on their caseloads (15 observations, divided by five WFs). A 75-80% completion rate at this low N would be necessary to consider the findings valid.	

CHAPTER 3: 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 2.0 quality assessment. **It is important for those overseeing evaluation using the TOM 2.0 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 2.0 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 2), 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 *User Manual*. Training should occur well in advance of observations and should cover this entire manual. Observers should have sufficient practice administering the TOM 2.0 prior to starting.

APPROACHING FAMILIES AND TEAM MEMBERS

Before a TOM 2.0 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 2.0 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 PROVIDERS

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

CHAPTER 3: PREPARING TO COLLECT TOM DATA

process is being observed. This should be done in advance of asking them to participate individually in a TOM 2.0 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 2.0 and the goals of the evaluation.

Facilitators and other team members need to be reminded that TOM 2.0 data will be used to provide comprehensive (and confidential, in most TOM 2.0 uses) feedback on how Wraparound is being implemented and to identify and support training needs. TOM 2.0 data may be submitted to supervising agencies or policy makers to help attest to the program 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 2.0 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. See Appendix B for a sample consent form.

CHAPTER 4: 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 2.0 form and *User Manual*
- An information sheet or evaluation project brochure to explain the TOM 2.0 administration and evaluation to team members
- Consent form(s), if required
- Gift cards or other incentives for participants, if being provided
- Gift card receipts, if necessary

Once you arrive, you should:

- Introduce yourself and remind or explain to team members and other participants of the evaluation project's purpose, if the facilitator/team leader has not yet 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 2.0 can be conducted using a video recording of the team meeting. This will reduce the burden of some of the logistical steps described here.

COMPLETING THE TOM 2.0

As a trained TOM 2.0 observer, you should be prepared to look for information relevant to the 36 indicators on the measure. As the meeting progresses, take time to record your observations in the notes area to the right of each subscale. You may also record your observations on a separate piece of paper and later transfer to the TOM 2.0 form. As things occur, you may also record your scores for relevant indicators by circling the appropriate response. Specific scoring rules for each of the 36 indicators are provided in the next chapter.

RECORDING OBSERVER NOTES AND COMMENTS ¹

The TOM 2.0 form has small areas for “Notes” next to each subscale, as well as an area for “Overall Reflections” 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 2.0 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 2d (“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.”), in the “Notes” section, you might write: *“2d: Everyone wrote down the explicit tasks each team member would be accountable for.”*
- **Non-verbal communication that clarifies scoring.** For example, if you score “No” for indicator 2b (“Talk was well-distributed across team members, and *each* team member made a meaningful contribution. No one or two people dominated the conversation or remained virtually silent during the meeting.”), 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.”*
- **Non-verbal communication that adds details to the scoring.** For example, to add detail to a score of “No” for indicator 3d (“When designing strategies to meet needs, the team explicitly discussed how the youth’s and parent/caregiver(s)’ strengths could be utilized.”), you might write a note under Subscale 3: *“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 “Overall Reflections” page: *“The meeting was held in a cramped room in the residential facility. The room temperature was 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 “Overall Reflections” 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 or other private identifiable information. 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 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.”

¹ Our thanks to the evaluation team at the Florida Mental Health Institute who evaluated the Tampa-Hillsborough Integrated Network for Kids for these examples.

WHEN TO SCORE THE TOM 2.0

After the meeting observation, plan on taking 30 to 60 minutes to sit down with your *User Manual* and TOM 2.0 form to review your notes and complete scoring while the meeting is still fresh in your mind. For some of the TOM 2.0 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 2.0 IN PAIRS

As noted in Chapter 2, TOM 2.0 observations may be conducted in pairs at the beginning of an evaluation, as a way of assisting observers to master the measure. 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 2.0 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.

USING WRAPSTAT TO TRACK TOM 2.0 SCORES

To learn more about WrapStat, [please visit our website](#). Individuals at your site who are responsible for managing data, running reports, or entering data from hard copy forms should reach out to us to learn more about how the system can best support your Wraparound fidelity efforts. Please contact us at wrapeval@uw.edu.

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 2.0 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 debrief). 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 2.0 observation process yields the best information possible.

TOM 2.0 indicators for which a follow-up with the facilitator or team leader is permissible are marked with an asterisk on the TOM 2.0 form, and are briefly reviewed in the following Table:

TOM 2.0 Indicator	Reason for Follow-Up
Cover Sheet. Team Membership and Meeting Attendance Grid.	Prior to or following the meeting, the observer should ask the facilitator to list who is formally on the team (i.e., who is expected/invited to attend the meeting).
1c. 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.	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 state agency representatives, juvenile justice affiliates, or other team members) who are important to the family and team were not in attendance.
1d. All other service providers who are not on the team OR seem integral to the youth and family's plan were present at the meeting.	If not clear from observing the meeting, the observer may need to debrief with the facilitator or team leader to determine which members of the team are important to the family and may fall into this classification (including therapists, medical doctors, etc.) and whether or not they were in attendance.
1e. All peer partners (e.g., family advocates, family support partners, youth supports partners, etc.) who are on the team were present at the meeting.	If not clear from observing the meeting, the observer may need to debrief with the facilitator or team leader to determine if there are any peer partners on the team, and whether or not they were in attendance.

CHAPTER 5: SCORING RULES FOR TOM 2.0 INDICATORS AND SUBSCALES

This chapter includes detailed notes and scoring rules for each of the TOM 2.0 indicators and subscales. 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 *User Manual* available when it comes time to review scores that were assigned.

The following issues should be considered in scoring all TOM 2.0 indicators and subscales:

- 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 11 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 2.0 manual to the “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, and 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 plan of care was developed may present less information about the TOM 2.0 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 subscales, as an observer, you should **rely primarily on what you see in the meeting.**

A NOTE ABOUT TRANSITION-AGE YOUTH

If the team meeting being observed is for a transition-age youth (i.e., a youth over the age of majority or emancipated), items referring to a parent/caregiver could be scored N/A if no parent/caregiver is on the team. Furthermore, items that refer to the “youth and family” should be scored as they refer to only the youth. *However*, if a parent/caregiver is engaged in the Wraparound process and is a team member, the items referring to a parent/caregiver and “youth and family” should be scored Yes or No.

COVER SHEET

The first page of the TOM 2.0 form collects information about the youth, their team, and the meeting being observed. The top section asks for three pieces of demographic information about the youth. *If the form needs to be kept de-identified or anonymous*, note the youth’s age, not date of birth.

CHAPTER 5: SCORING RULES

On the left-hand side of the cover sheet, enter information about the meeting being observed. Project/Agency, Youth/Family, Facilitator, and Observer IDs may be names, initials, or study ID numbers depending on the circumstances under which the TOM is being administered.

The Team Membership and Meeting Attendance Grid on the right provides information that can be helpful to analyze in aggregate and can assist with scoring items on the first subscale. Prior to or following the meeting, the observer should ask the facilitator to list who is formally on the team (i.e., who is expected/invited to attend the meeting) to get the necessary information to complete the grid.

OBSERVED MEETING INFORMATION AND ID NUMBERS

Information about the meeting and team being observed is essential to interpreting results and exploring trends. Thus, completing this section is very important. Furthermore, someone at your site must be responsible for coordinating and monitoring the completion of all TOM observations. For the sake of consistency, our research team has developed a tracking system that should be used by all collaborators. Five separate identification numbers are used (in addition to some basic information about the meeting and the youth's Wraparound enrollment date). These identification numbers and their descriptions are listed in the table below:

ID Number	Description
Youth/Family ID	This number is assigned by your agency for <i>each family</i> unit participating in the assessment. It must be unique to every family. The simplest method is to 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> . If your site is administering other WFAS tools, please ensure the Youth/Family ID is consistent across all tools to allow for comparisons and combining of the data. This would necessitate someone being responsible for maintaining a "key" that links the Youth/Family ID with their identifying information to assist with sampling, etc.
Project/Agency Name/ID	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). If you don't know your site's ID, please at least list the agency or Wraparound initiative's name.
Facilitator Name/ID	A unique number or name should be assigned to each Wraparound facilitator who is coordinating services in your program or site. Every time the same facilitator has a team observed, their unique ID number or name 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 2.0 administration.
Supervisor Name/ID	A unique number or name should be assigned to each Wraparound supervisor. The ID number or name of the current <i>supervisor of the facilitator</i> should be indicated on the TOM 2.0 form to allow for easy analysis by supervisor. This information can also be compared to the Observer Name/ID to determine the relationship of the observer to the facilitator.
Observer Name/ID	This ID number or name is assigned by your agency for each observer. Every time an observation is conducted, the observer's unique ID number or name should be recorded. This allows statistics based on observer to be calculated.

TYPE OF MEETING

In addition to when and where the meeting is taking place and who is facilitating and observing it, you will be asked to indicate which type of meeting you are observing. This may be something 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:

INITIAL TEAM/PLANNING MEETING

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 plan of care 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 and/or a family vision statement. Initial team meetings are often followed by the beginning of a planning process for the youth and family.

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.

FOLLOW-UP MEETING

Follow-up meetings (also known as 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.

TRANSITION/DISCHARGE MEETING

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 on 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.

OTHER

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 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 Membership and Meeting Attendance” 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.

SUBSCALE 1. FULL MEETING ATTENDANCE

1A. AT LEAST ONE PARENT/CAREGIVER WAS PRESENT AT THE MEETING.

NOTES: The term “parent/caregiver” refers to the person or persons with primary day-to-day responsibilities of 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 at least one parent/caregiver was in attendance.

NO if none of the youth’s parents/caregivers are in attendance, but should be.

N/A is an acceptable score if the youth is over the age of majority or is emancipated AND there are no caregivers or family members on the youth’s team.

1B. THE YOUTH WAS PRESENT AT THE MEETING.

NOTES: Youths age 11 and older and involved in Wraparound should be in attendance at their own team meetings. While 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), unless a youth experiences a significant developmental or medical disability that makes their presence impossible, the team should ensure that a youth 11 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 is in attendance, regardless of age.

NO if the youth (11 or older) is not in attendance.

N/A is an acceptable score if the youth is 10 years of age or younger or experiences significant developmental or medical disability that makes their presence extremely difficult, or impossible.

1C. 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.*

** Before or after the meeting, the observer should ask the facilitator for a list of team members and their roles.*

NOTES: Key representatives from school, child welfare/social services, or juvenile justice (i.e., public agencies) are those who have a primary role in implementing strategies in a youth and family’s plan of care or who are implicated in important goals for the family (such as succeeding in school, transitioning home, or getting off probation). Ideally all of the key representatives should be formal team members and present at the meeting being observed; however, the observer may find it obvious that a relevant representative or agency is not active on the team or in the meeting, such as when they or their agency is referred to in reviewing or developing a strategy or action step but no representative from that agency is present and/or a team member.

SCORING:

YES if all team members affiliated with education, child welfare, or juvenile justice are present AND all relevant partner agencies are represented at the meeting.

NO if one or more team member affiliated with education, child welfare, or juvenile justice is not present AND/OR a relevant partner agency is not represented at the meeting.

N/A is an acceptable score if there are no public agencies relevant to the youth and family’s plan, goals, or strategies.

1D. ALL OTHER SERVICE PROVIDERS WHO ARE ON THE TEAM OR SEEM INTEGRAL TO THE YOUTH AND FAMILY’S PLAN WERE PRESENT AT THE MEETING.*

** Before or after the meeting, the observer should ask the facilitator for a list of team members and their roles.*

NOTES: Other service providers may include a mental health counselor, medical doctor, tutor, one-on-one aides, etc., essentially any paid professional the youth and/or family is not mandated to interface with but is receiving services from. Ideally, all of the relevant providers should be formal team members and present at the meeting being observed; however, the observer may find it obvious that a provider integral in implementing strategies in a youth and family’s plan of care or who are implicated in important outcomes/goals for the family is not active on the team or in the meeting, such as when they are referred to in reviewing or developing a strategy or action step but they are not present and/or a team member.

SCORING:

YES if all other relevant service providers, whether a formal team member or not, are present.

NO if one or more relevant provider is not present.

N/A is an acceptable score if there are no other service providers relevant to the youth and family’s plan, goals, or strategies.

1E. ALL PEER PARTNERS (E.G., FAMILY ADVOCATES, FAMILY SUPPORT PARTNERS, YOUTH SUPPORT PARTNERS, ETC.) WHO ARE ON THE TEAM WERE PRESENT AT THE MEETING.*

** Before or after the meeting, the observer should ask the facilitator for a list of team members and their roles.*

NOTES: Peer partners serve a unique role on a Wraparound team. They directly support a caregiver or youth by increasing their coping skills and understanding of the system in order to help them engage and actively participate on the team and make informed decisions that drive the process. If they are on the team, they should be present at every meeting.

SCORING:

YES if all peer partners on the team are present.

NO if one or more peer partner(s) on the team is not present.

N/A is an acceptable score if no peer partners are on the team.

1F. AT LEAST ONE NATURAL OR COMMUNITY SUPPORT FOR THE YOUTH AND FAMILY WAS PRESENT AT THE MEETING.

NOTES: Natural supports are individuals such as extended family (grandparents, aunts/uncles, cousins, etc.; note: younger siblings *do not* count), friends, 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. Younger siblings who are part of the family unit *do not* count as natural supports on the team. Older siblings that are actively participating as a unique member of the team and have specific roles and contributions to plan development may count. 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 or community supports should be present at the 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 or community support.

SCORING:

YES if at least one individual like those described above attended the meeting.

NO if no individual like those described above attended the meeting.

SUBSCALE 2. EFFECTIVE TEAMWORK

2A. 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.

NOTES: The team should display an in-depth understanding of what Wraparound is and how the principles apply to this individual family, as well as the work that is being undertaken in the team meeting. This includes an understanding of roles, responsibilities and implications for team members, and preparation to undertake and address these tasks. 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 meeting attendees seem to understand the Wraparound process as well as their role on the team and seem to be invested in creating a single coordinated plan of care above and beyond achieving their specific agency's service plan or advancing their personal interests.

NO if team members seem confused about the Wraparound process or their role on the team or if they seem to be focused on or advancing their personal interests or achieving their specific agency's service plan more than creating a single, coordinated plan of care.

2B. TALK WAS WELL-DISTRIBUTED ACROSS TEAM MEMBERS, AND *EACH* TEAM MEMBER MADE A MEANINGFUL CONTRIBUTION. NO ONE OR TWO PEOPLE DOMINATED THE CONVERSATION OR REMAINED VIRTUALLY SILENT DURING THE MEETING.

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. This includes ensuring that *each* team member, including the youth (age 11 or older), is actively involved in the meeting. Each team member should talk on multiple occasions, especially during any strengths discovery or brainstorming phases. Special attention should be paid to whether or not any team members remain silent for most of the meeting.

SCORING:

YES if talk was well-distributed across team members and each team member made a meaningful contribution.

NO if there were one or more team members who did not talk or contribute meaningfully to the meeting.

2C. SINCE THE LAST TEAM MEETING, ALL TEAM MEMBERS HAVE FOLLOWED THROUGH WITH THEIR PREVIOUSLY ASSIGNED TASKS/ACTION STEPS OR AT LEAST DEMONSTRATED DILIGENT EFFORTS TO DO SO.

NOTES: For the youth and family to accomplish their goals while in Wraparound, team members must accomplish the tasks/action items assigned to them in the plan of care, otherwise needs can go unmet, the process could lose momentum and the youth and family could lose faith in the process. Effective team members should work independently and support each other to diligently work toward task completion. Each team member has their own role and should be working in between meetings to make a valuable contribution to the shared goals of the team.

SCORING:

YES if all team members have followed through with or made diligent attempts to make progress toward tasks/action steps that have been assigned to them.

NO if one or more of the team members have not followed through with or made progress on tasks/action steps that have been assigned to them. If the team did not explicitly review progress but it is evident one or more team members did not follow through with their task(s), the item should be scored “No”.

N/A is an acceptable score if you are observing an initial team meeting OR the team did not review progress on tasks/action steps in a way that makes it possible to score this item.

2D. 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.

NOTES: In addition to assessing whether the team assigns tasks/action steps with clear details, the observer should assess whether team members have a clear understanding of their responsibilities for follow-up after the meeting. This can be accomplished by restating responsibilities at the end, or recording the decisions along the way in a way that everyone is able to clearly understand what is expected of them.

SCORING:

YES if team members leave the team meeting with a clear understanding of the tasks/action steps and follow-up for which they may be responsible.

NO if team members do not seem to leave the meeting with clear assignments.

2E. TEAM MEMBERS DEMONSTRATED A CONSISTENT WILLINGNESS TO COMPROMISE OR EXPLORE FURTHER OPTIONS WHEN THERE WAS 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 be evidence of implicit disagreement on the part of a team member, such as negative body language or other signs of disapproval. A skilled facilitator should take note and help the team problem solve around such “covert” disagreement or disapproval.

SCORING:

YES if team members were open to exploring different options when the youth or family disagreed with an opinion or proposed strategy.

NO if team members were not open or willing to explore different options or compromise when there was disagreement.

N/A is an acceptable score if there is no disagreement apparent throughout the course of the meeting.

SUBSCALE 3. DRIVEN BY STRENGTHS AND FAMILIES

3A. 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).

NOTES: The principle of family voice and choice makes it clear that Wraparound must be based on the family's perspective about how things are for them, how things should be, and what needs to happen. Parent/caregiver(s) and other family members should be active participants in planning. Some may naturally step up in this role, while others may need more solicitation and encouragement from the facilitator and other team members. Regardless of how participation is elicited, the parent/caregiver and/or other family members should be expected to actively do at least some of the following in each meeting. This goes beyond simply providing a check-in about recent events or concerns, but should be in the service of developing, monitoring, and/or revising the Plan of Care.

- Articulate their needs (either underlying or concrete)
- Share their perspectives, values, beliefs, and traditions, and how these will impact strategies, services, and supports that are chosen
- Participate in monitoring progress toward meeting needs and goals on the Plan of Care
- Share their opinions or experiences with proposed or previously tried services, supports, and strategies
 - E.g., 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
- Suggest services, supports, and strategies that they feel will meet their needs

SCORING:

YES if the caregiver(s) or other family members actively participated in planning by articulating a need, explaining their perspective about those needs or proposed services/supports/strategies and/or made their own suggestions about services/supports/strategies. *Simply indicating agreement with needs and/or services/supports/strategies articulated by others is NOT sufficient. There need to be multiple instances in which the parent/caregiver is actively involved in planning.*

NO if the criteria for YES, above, were not met OR if no parent/caregiver or other family members are present, but should be.

N/A is an acceptable score if the youth is over the age of majority or is emancipated AND there are no caregivers or family members on the youth's team.

3B. 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).

NOTES: See notes for 3a, above.

SCORING:

YES if the youth actively participated in planning by articulating a need, explaining their perspective about those needs or proposed services/supports/strategies and made their own suggestions about services/supports/strategies. *Simply indicating agreement with needs and/or services/supports/strategies articulated by others is NOT sufficient. There need to be multiple instances in which the youth is actively involved in planning.*

NO if the criteria for YES, above, were not met OR if the youth (11 or older) is not present.

N/A is an acceptable score if the youth is 10 or younger or experiences significant developmental or medical disability that makes their active engagement impossible.

For the Observer to judge the identification and utilization of a functional strength within a single team meeting, they need to observe a strength being used concretely in planning and/or strategy development. If an identified strength has been used to develop a strategy or task, then it has become functional.

3C. 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.

NOTES: The highest-quality Wraparound teams are able to elicit functional strengths from the family's stories and positive attributes. Once these functional strengths have been identified, they can be utilized in planning to increase the likelihood that the plan will be accomplished, and the youth and family can succeed on its own once Wraparound has concluded.

For the Observer to judge the identification and utilization of a functional strength within a single team meeting, they need to observe a strength being used concretely in planning and/or strategy development. If an identified strength has been used to develop a strategy or task, then it has become functional. A simple list of characteristics, such as "youth is nice" or "youth is funny", does not qualify.

Has the team taken an identified strength such as, "Tasha is a good cook" and turned it into strategies to meet a need for Tasha and/or her family? Perhaps, a strategy to meet Tasha's "need to feel more respected by her siblings" could be for Tasha to teach her mom and sister how to cook one dish a week. Or, if her need is "to feel like she has the potential for self-sufficiency", perhaps a strategy is for her to seek out a part-time job in food service, or enroll in a cooking class to explore career options.

SCORING:

YES if the team identified at least one strength (talent, skill, and/or positive coping mechanism) of the youth that was then used to develop a strategy during the planning process OR if, in reviewing strategies currently being implemented, it is clear how the youth's strengths have been used to inform the plan.

CHAPTER 5: SCORING RULES

NO if the criteria for YES, above, were not met OR if the team did not identify or review strengths at all.

3D. 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.

NOTES: See notes for 3c, above.

SCORING:

YES if the team identified at least one strength (talent, skill, and/or positive coping mechanism) of the PARENT/CAREGIVER or FAMILY AS A WHOLE that was then used to develop a strategy during the planning process OR if, in reviewing strategies currently being implemented, it is clear how the caregiver's/parent's or family's strengths have been used to inform the plan.

NO if the criteria for YES, above, were not met OR if the team did not identify or review strengths at all.

N/A is an acceptable score if the youth is over the age of majority or is emancipated AND there are no caregivers or family members on the youth's team.

3E. TEAM MEMBERS AVOIDED BLAMING AND REMAINED FOCUSED ON SOLUTIONS, RATHER THAN DWELLING ON 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 failure of the family or individual team members. The observer should be looking for the team reframing challenges in terms of finding solutions and also instances of re-directing team members who enter into direct blaming of family or team members or excessive focus on negative events. For example, if the youth failed to improve their school attendance, the conversation should not be about the youth's poor attitude or behavior, but rather about why the previous strategies did not work and what revised or new strategies might be more successful. The team should always be searching for the underlying reasons why progress is not being made rather than blaming the individual not making progress, and should balance the conversation of negative events with constructive suggestions about how to move forward.

SCORING:

YES if 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 if those who blame or focus on negative events are not re-directed.

SUBSCALE 4. BASED ON PRIORITY NEEDS

4A. BEFORE BEGINNING TO BRAINSTORM STRATEGIES, THE TEAM *EXPLICITLY* ARTICULATED, PRIORITIZED, AND/OR REVIEWED AND CONFIRMED THE YOUTH’S AND FAMILY’S NEEDS TO PLAN FOR/ADDRESS DURING THE MEETING.

NOTES: Initial planning meetings and crisis or safety planning meetings are most likely to include a full review of family and youth needs, as well as prioritization of these needs to focus planning. If you are observing a planning meeting, identification and prioritization of needs should be a focal point of the meeting. In addition, follow-up Wraparound meetings should always include a review and confirmation of the youth’s and family’s needs to ensure that everyone agrees that the focal need is still the most important thing to work on during the meeting. This should take place before identifying outcomes/goals, brainstorming and selecting strategies, or assigning tasks/action steps.

SCORING:

YES if the youth’s and family’s needs are identified, prioritized, and/or reviewed and confirmed before the team moved on to brainstorming and selecting strategies.

NO if needs are not reviewed and confirmed before brainstorming strategies began OR if multiple needs are reviewed, but prioritization for tasks/action steps does not take place.

4B. 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.

NOTES: The definition of needs is wide-ranging within the human services community. A key element of Wraparound is the concept of *underlying needs* rather than superficial or simply spoken needs. The notion of underlying need means the process will be organized to create agreement about the *root cause* of situations. What is the problematic behavior trying to achieve? Or, what is the underlying barrier to achieving the desired outcome? Rather than focusing on surface needs, the effective Wraparound practitioner will lead a team, inclusive of and centered on the youth and family, in developing a common understanding of underlying need. The concept of need is used because it avoids judging people or families for current conditions, and then all Wraparound activity is focused on meeting needs rather than containing problems.

The notion of underlying need means the process will be organized to create agreement about the root cause of situations. Rather than focusing on surface needs, the effective Wraparound practitioner will lead a team in developing a common understanding of underlying need.

An example of a superficially-stated need may be: “Anya needs friends,” or “Anya needs to fight less.” In contrast, the deep need(s) this statement may be getting at is: “Anya needs to have successful experiences with peers

CHAPTER 5: SCORING RULES

outside of the home.” Or, “Anya needs to feel accepted for who she is.” These deeper needs open up a broader range of possible strategies to meet Anya’s needs, potentially leading to more enduring success. Ideally, a needs statement uses the words “know,” “feel,” or “understand.”

This step of reaching agreement will be followed by an organized approach to constructing strength-based responses to address those underlying causes.

SCORING:

YES if the needs planned for/addressed during the meeting were appropriately articulated as underlying reasons why problematic situations or behaviors are/were occurring.

NO if needs planned for/addressed during the meeting were only stated as deficits or problems of the youth and/or family.

N/A is an acceptable score if the team did not identify or discuss needs at all.

4C. PLANNING FOCUSED ON THE UNDERLYING NEEDS OF 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 tasks/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 the needs of other family members.

N/A is an acceptable score if the youth is over the age of majority or is emancipated AND there are no caregivers or family members on the youth’s team.

4D. 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.

NOTES: Once a need is identified and prioritized, and related outcomes/goals are articulated, the team should go through a robust brainstorming process to generate multiple potential strategies to meet the need and achieve the outcome/goal. This brainstorming process is a key to individualization and ensuring each team member makes a meaningful contribution. Once a diverse list of strategies is generated, the team should help the family choose a feasible number of desired strategies and then assigns tasks/action steps.

SCORING:

YES if FOR EVERY need that was planned for/addressed, the team brainstormed MORE THAN ONE strategy before choosing strategies and assigning tasks/action steps and moving on.

NO if FOR ANY ONE NEED that was planned for/addressed, the team did not brainstorm MORE THAN ONE strategy before choosing strategies and assigning tasks/action steps and moving on.

N/A is an acceptable score if brainstorming strategies was not a relevant activity of the meeting being observed. For example, if adequate progress is being made and new or revised strategies are not called for. Brainstorming is a relevant activity *any time* a new or revised service, strategy, or action step is being considered.

4E. 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.

NOTES: Engaging in Wraparound should bolster the family’s self-sufficiency, while reassuring them that support will be available until their priority needs are met (i.e., there is not an artificial time limit imposed upon services). The team should engage in conversations that assist in monitoring this balance. Metrics (whether objective or subjective) should be set to help them assess when the family may be ready for transition, such as “when the youth has consistently gone to school for three months”, or “when the caregiver feels confident in her ability to navigate the system to get her son’s educational needs met.” This conversation is most likely to occur early in the **Planning** phase, or later in the **Transition** phase.

SCORING:

YES if there is a conversation about how the team will know it is appropriate to transition the family out of services or a review of how the family is doing on the metrics for transition previously set.

NO if there is no conversation about how the team will know it is appropriate to transition the family out of services and no review of how the family is doing on the metrics for transition previously set.

N/A is an acceptable score if you are not observing a meeting during the Planning or Transition phase.

SUBSCALE 5. USE OF NATURAL AND COMMUNITY SUPPORTS

5A. 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.

NOTES: Natural supports are individuals such as extended family (grandparents, aunts/uncles, cousins, etc.), friends, 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. The observer should be noting whether the facilitator and team ensure that ongoing connection to natural supports is encouraged whenever possible, either instead of or in addition to more formal supports.

SCORING:

YES if connection to natural supports is explicitly explored and encouraged and prioritized over relying on formal supports like paid helpers.

NO if connection to natural supports is not explored and/or not prioritized over relying on formal supports like paid helpers.

N/A is an acceptable score if the meeting is very early in the process and services and supports have not yet been determined.

5B. 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.

NOTES: The observer should be noting whether the facilitator and team ensure that participation in community organizations and activities is included in the Plan of Care and that ongoing connection to these supports is encouraged whenever possible, either instead of or in addition to more formal supports. These are the types of opportunities for positive social interaction/engagement that could continue to offer support and recreation to the family even after formal services have ended. Examples include parks and recreation programs, mentoring, scouting, church services, sports teams, volunteering, etc.

Examples of community activities include parks and recreation programs, mentoring, scouting, church services, sports teams, volunteering, voluntary participation with a local non-profit, etc.

CHAPTER 5: SCORING RULES

These activities should represent the youth/family joining groups of people in a social way that is NOT related to formal service provision (i.e., group therapy, classes, etc.). Very rarely, these types of services are not relevant to the priority need(s) being reviewed or planned for, and therefore this indicator may be scored as N/A.

SCORING:

YES if participation in community organizations and activities are included in the Plan of Care and ongoing connection to these supports is explicitly encouraged.

NO if participation in community organizations and activities are not included in the Plan of Care or ongoing connection to these supports is discouraged or not prioritized over formal supports.

N/A is an acceptable score if the meeting is very early in the process and services and supports have not yet been determined OR these types of services are not relevant to the priority need(s) being reviewed or planned for.

5C. 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.

NOTES: Actively involving natural supports in helping the youth and family achieve the goals is an essential element to sustaining progress once the family has transitioned out of formal Wraparound services. Thus, natural supports on the team should be responsible for implementing elements of the Plan of Care and/or Crisis Plan.

Natural supports are individuals such as extended family (grandparents, aunts/uncles, cousins, etc.), friends, 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.

SCORING:

YES if each natural support present at the meeting has at least one task/action step that they are working on accomplishing or that is newly assigned to them by the end of the meeting.

NO if at least one natural support present at the meeting DOES NOT have at a task/action step that they are working on accomplishing or that is newly assigned to them by the end of the meeting.

N/A is an acceptable score if there are no natural supports present at the meeting OR if the meeting is very early in the process and a Plan of Care or Crisis Plan has not yet been developed.

5D. 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.

NOTES: 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 school with his or her community peers. Evidence should be noted from the team’s mission, the purpose of strategies as stated in the team’s goals or Crisis Plan, or discussion among team members. 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 and re-integrating the youth in the most normalized and least restrictive residential and/or educational environments 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 normalized settings.

N/A is an acceptable score if the meeting is early in the process and a Plan or Care or Crisis Plan has not been developed.

5E. 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.

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 Plan of Care. 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 behavioral modification efforts implemented by the caregiver(s); 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 2.0, 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.

SCORING:

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

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

N/A is an acceptable score if the meeting is early in the process and a Plan or Care or Crisis Plan has not yet been developed.

SUBSCALE 6. OUTCOMES-BASED PROCESS

6A. 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).

NOTES: Within the first few engagement and planning meetings, a team should have helped the family articulate their overarching vision and/or mission and possibly made their goal as a team explicit. At each subsequent meeting, the team should check in on the family and/or team's progress toward this vision/mission/goal. This could be done on a 0-10 rating scale or more subjectively, but should be done explicitly, often toward the beginning of the meeting. What matters is that the overarching purpose of Wraparound involvement is reviewed and progress toward living up to that purpose (and possibly ending services) is evaluated.

SCORING:

YES if the team explicitly reviewed how close the family is to achieving their vision, mission, or Wraparound team goal.

NO if the team did not explicitly review how close the family is to achieving their vision, mission, or Wraparound team goal.

N/A is an acceptable score if the meeting being observed is very early in the process and a family vision or mission or Wraparound team goal has not yet been articulated.

6B. THE TEAM REVIEWED THE STATUS OF TASK/ACTION STEP COMPLETION SINCE THE LAST MEETING.

NOTES: Once tasks/action steps related to meeting a specific need have been developed, progress toward completing them should be routinely monitored to provide accountability and continuity between meetings.

SCORING:

YES if the team reviewed which tasks/action steps were completed since the last meeting.

NO if completion of tasks/action steps was not reviewed.

N/A is an acceptable score if the team is still in the Engagement or Planning phase and there were not tasks/action steps assigned in the previous meeting.

6C. THE TEAM MONITORED PROGRESS TOWARD MEETING NEEDS AND ACHIEVING OUTCOMES/GOALS SINCE THE LAST MEETING.

NOTES: Beyond simply monitoring whether certain tasks/action steps were completed within a certain timeframe, the team should be routinely evaluating progress toward meeting the family's priority needs through achieving specific outcomes or goals. This activity provides accountability and continuity between meetings and the ability to assess the impact and effectiveness of the assigned tasks/action steps. This may look like an objective measurement of an outcome or goal, or team members reporting their subjective assessment of progress of what, if anything, is different.

SCORING:

YES if the team monitored progress toward meeting needs and/or achieving outcomes/goals since the last meeting.

NO if the team did not assess progress toward meeting needs and/or achieving outcomes/goals since the last meeting.

N/A is an acceptable score if the team is still in the Engagement or Planning phase and progress toward goals is not yet expected and/or tasks have not yet been assigned; therefore not reviewed.

An outcome or goal is a description of what would be different if an underlying need was met. Strategies and related tasks/action steps are designed to achieve the outcome or goal.

6D. 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.

NOTES: This evaluation of progress toward meeting needs and achieving outcomes/goals should be as objective as possible. "Objective and verifiable measures" refers to tracking observable things such as **number of days** of school attended, **number of arguments** a family has during a week, **number of friends** a youth has, **number of work days** a parent had to miss because of problems or crises. This requires outcomes or goals to be described clearly, such as "Chris will attend 90% of his job training sessions," "Brianna will receive a time-out one or fewer times a day," "Jacob will maintain a GPA of 3.0 this semester," etc. If there really is no objective way to evaluate progress for a particular outcome/goal, a numeric team rating of progress could suffice, but most outcomes/goals, when closely examined, could be operationalized in such a way so as to lend itself to more objective evaluation.

SCORING:

YES if the team evaluates progress toward meeting needs or achieving outcomes/goals using objective and verifiable measures, whenever possible.

NO if the team uses subjective measures to review progress when objective measures were possible OR does not monitor progress (i.e., 6c is a "No").

N/A is an acceptable score if the team is still in the Engagement or Planning phase and progress toward goals is not yet expected and/or tasks have not yet been assigned; therefore not reviewed OR objective and verifiable measures were truly not possible to attach to ALL outcomes/goals discussed.

CHAPTER 5: SCORING RULES

6E. FOR ANY NEW 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.

NOTES: In the event that the team identifies a new need to be met and/or develops a goal or outcome related to that need, the team should be creating objective measurement strategies as a part of the planning/development process. The outcome or goal should be clearly described, such as “Chris will attend 90% of his job training sessions,” “Brianna will receive a time-out one or fewer times a day,” “Jacob will maintain a GPA of 3.0 this semester,” etc. The way of objectively tracking progress should also be explicitly outlined, such as the ***number of days*** of school attended, ***number of arguments*** a family has during a week, ***number of friends*** a youth has, ***number of work days*** a parent had to miss because of problems or crises. If there really is no objective way to evaluate progress for a particular outcome/goal, a numeric team rating of progress could suffice, but most outcomes/goals, when closely examined, could be operationalized in such a way so as to lend itself to objective evaluation.

SCORING:

YES if the team develops outcomes/goals with a specific and measurable way to evaluate progress AND/OR discusses whether or not the goal lends itself to this kind of measurement.

NO if the team develops outcomes/goals with no explicit way to evaluate progress or with solely subjective measures when objective measures were possible to develop.

N/A is an acceptable score if no new needs were discussed AND/OR no new outcomes or goals were developed during the meeting.

SUBSCALE 7. SKILLED FACILITATION

7A. 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.

NOTES: In addition to a meeting agenda, the facilitator 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 Plan of Care, 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 and team members were able to access the information and follow along during the meeting.

NO if needed documents and materials are not prepared and/or reasonably available for team members.

7B. THE MEETING FOLLOWED A CLEAR AGENDA THAT PROVIDED AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE OVERALL PURPOSE OF THE MEETING AND THE PRIORITY AGENDA ITEMS.

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 or written on a white board or for team members to review in advance of the meeting. 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 there is a clear understanding of the purpose of the team activities that take place during each section of the meeting. This indicator should be scored as a "No" if there is no agenda or timeline presented in any capacity.

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.

7C. THE FACILITATOR REFLECTED AND SUMMARIZED TEAM MEMBERS' CONTRIBUTIONS, PROBED FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, AND GENERALLY STIMULATED PRODUCTIVE BRAINSTORMING AND DISCUSSION.

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 the perspectives 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 while moving the planning process forward. When this is not happening team members may be reticent to share their ideas, brainstorming may appear to be unfocused or too short or too lengthy, disagreements may remain unresolved, etc.

SCORING:

YES if the facilitator is observed to consistently and effectively reflect, summarize, and stimulate productive brainstorming and discussion.

NO if the facilitator does not consistently or effectively do this.

7D. THE FACILITATOR WAS DYNAMICALLY ENGAGED IN THE PROCESS, AND WAS ABLE TO MAINTAIN AN APPROPRIATE MOMENTUM AND MEMBERS' FOCUS THROUGHOUT THE MEETING.

NOTES: A skilled facilitator will be able to keep the meeting from feeling stilted or having low energy. They keep the conversation moving—paying attention to time—while hitting all the necessary agenda items. They artfully guide the conversation of multiple team members to stay on topic, while still making everyone feel heard.

SCORING:

YES if the meeting felt upbeat and had forward momentum AND was on task for the majority of the time.

NO if the meeting had low energy, felt plodding, AND/OR there were many off-topic or long-winded side conversations that were not pertinent to the agenda.

7E. THE FACILITATOR WAS ABLE TO MANAGE DISAGREEMENT AND CONFLICT AND MAKE SURE ALL TEAM MEMBERS' OPINIONS AND IDEAS WERE HEARD.

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 the 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 is an acceptable score if there is no conflict or disagreement demonstrated during the meeting.

TOTAL TOM 2.0 SCORE

Once each subscale has received a score from 0 to 100%, you will then transfer the final scores to the TOM 2.0 Subscale grid on page 5. You will then calculate the average of the seven subscales (sum the seven scores, and then divide by 7) and will obtain the final fidelity score for that team meeting observation. If one of the subscales is scored as “N/A”, you will instead sum the number of applicable subscales, and divide by that number as well. For example, if Subscale 6 (Outcomes-Based Process) was scored as “N/A”, you will add the scores from Subscales 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7, and then divide by 6.

KEY ELEMENTS SCORE

While calculating your final TOM 2.0 score, you may also score this team meeting on the five theory- and research-based Key Elements, which only includes scores from Subscales 2 through 6. Once subscale scores are transferred appropriately, you will take the average of these five subscales (or less, if a category is scored as “N/A”) and divide by the total number of applicable subscales. Below are two examples: (1) all subscales having an applicable score, and (2) one subscale having a subscale that was scored as “N/A”.

Example 1: All subscales have a score between 0 and 5.

TOM 2.0 Subscale	Overall Score	Key Elements Score
1. Full Meeting Attendance	100%	N/A
2. Effective Teamwork	80%	80%
3. Driven by Strengths and Families	100%	100%
4. Based on Priority Needs	60%	60%
5. Use of Natural and Community Supports	40%	40%
6. Outcomes-Based Process	40%	40%
7. Skilled Facilitation	80%	N/A
TOTAL TOM 2.0 SCORE (average of subscale scores)	71.4%	64%

Example 2: One subscale was scored as “N/A”.

TOM 2.0 Subscale	Overall Score	Key Elements Score
1. Full Meeting Attendance	100%	N/A
2. Effective Teamwork	80%	80%
3. Driven by Strengths and Families	100%	100%
4. Based on Priority Needs	60%	60%
5. Use of Natural and Community Supports	40%	40%
6. Outcomes-Based Process	N/A	N/A
7. Skilled Facilitation	80%	N/A
TOTAL TOM 2.0 SCORE (average of subscale scores)	76.7%	70%

APPENDIX A: DATA ENTRY

This chapter includes information on using WrapStat, our online data management system.

WRAPSTAT

Our data management system, WrapStat, allows licensed users to enter their data using a HIPAA- and FERPA-compliant web portal that will compile 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@uw.edu. The system allows for multiple users at each site, as well as multiple levels of data access, to allow for your unique Wraparound configuration



Welcome to WrapStat!

WrapStat is an implementation support system designed to help Wraparound personnel:

- Conduct high-quality evaluations of Wraparound fidelity
- Track program performance
- Assess youth outcomes
- Collect implementation data

Sign in to get started! If you need technical assistance, please contact 3C Institute at support@wrapstat.org. For all other inquiries, please contact the Wraparound Evaluation and Research Team at wrapeval@uw.edu.

APPENDIX B. SAMPLE TEAM MEETING OBSERVATION CONSENT FORM

[SITE NAME] Wraparound Program is committed to providing high-quality Wraparound care to the children and families that it serves. We evaluate the quality of our program's services in a variety of ways, including using the Team Observation Measure (TOM 2.0).

The Team Observation Measure (TOM 2.0), assesses the adherence to high-quality Wraparound during team meeting sessions. The TOM 2.0 requires that reviewers observe a team meeting and indicate how a team worked together to help meet the needs of the youth and their family. The tool does not focus on the specific content of the meeting or the specific circumstances of a family, but rather it focuses on how the team communicates, makes decisions, puts together a plan, and tracks progress.

Today's team meeting has been randomly selected for observation. [NAME AND POSITION OF PERSON DOING THE OBSERVATION] has agreed to observe your meeting and score it using the TOM 2.0. **By signing this consent form, you are agreeing to allow [NAME OF PERSON DOING THE OBSERVATION] to observe today's team meeting and to share their scoring of the TOM 2.0 with the [NAME OF ENTITY RECEIVING AND STORING THE DATA].**

Specifically, you are stating that:

- I understand that [NAME OF PERSON DOING THE OBSERVATION] will not participate in the meeting in any way and that I should conduct the meeting as if [S/HE] were not there.
- I understand that the Team Observation Measure will not record any identifying information (name, contact information, etc.), and everything I say will be kept confidential to the maximum extent allowable by law. No one will see my name when looking at the results.
- I also understand that the TOM 2.0 form will be sent to [NAME OF ENTITY RECEIVING AND STORING THE DATA] for data entry and analysis. Only [NAME OF PERSON DOING THE OBSERVATION] and members of [NAME OF ENTITY] will have access to the paper form and its data.
- I understand that the TOM 2.0 data will mainly be used to help improve [SITE NAME] Wraparound program.
- I understand that my participation is voluntary, and I will not receive any monetary payment or form of incentive for participating. I may refuse to participate or withdraw at any time for any reason without it affecting my services or status on the Wraparound team.

Your Name (Please Print)

Today's Date

Your Signature

If you have any questions or concerns, please speak with the Wraparound Facilitator or contact [NAME, POSITION, AND CONTACT INFORMATION FOR QA STAFF OR OTHER LEADER IN CHARGE OF DATA COLLECTION AND USAGE].