

# Wrap County (Example Report)

University of Washington School of Medicine Division of Public Behavioral Health & Justice Policy 2815 Eastlake Ave E. Suite 200 Seattle, WA 98102 www.wrapinfo.org

Prepared by: The Wraparound Evaluation & Research Team April 16, 2014

### Contents

#### Introduction

Purpose	2
Procedure	2
Interpreting WFI-EZ Results	3
1. Summary of Respondents	4
2. Youth Information & Demographics	5
3. Basic Information	7
4. Item Means	
5. Fidelity Scores	9
6. Satisfaction	10
7. Outcomes	11
8. Strengths & Areas for Improvement	

## Introduction

### Purpose

The Wraparound Fidelity Index, Short Form (WFI-EZ) is designed to assess the extent to which the core activities of wraparound are being implemented in service delivery, according to the model defined by the National Wraparound Initiative. The purpose of this evaluation is to determine the extent to which the services and supports that are being received by children, youth, and families enrolled in services in adhere to those primary activities of the wraparound process on an individual youth or family basis.

### Procedure

The WFI-EZ is completed through brief, self-report surveys with four types of respondents: parents or caregivers, youths 11 years of age or older, wraparound facilitators, and team members. It is important to gain the unique perspectives of these four informants to understand fully how wraparound is being implemented. The survey can be self-administered or administered by a program staff member. It can be completed online or by hand on a piece of paper.

The survey is separated into four sections.

<u>Section A, Basic Information</u>: This section asks four Yes or No questions about the basic foundations of wraparound (e.g. is there a team in place, does it meet regularly, and does it have a written plan?).

Section B, Your Experiences in Wraparound: This section includes 25 items about the detailed activities of the wraparound process, the make-up of the wraparound team, and the strategies of the wraparound plan. For example, the first item for a caregiver reads, "My family and I had a major role in choosing the people on our wraparound team." Respondents rate the degree to which they agree with each item (Strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree, or don't know). These items receive scores from -2 to 2. Some items are reverse-scored so that "Strongly disagree" receives a score of 2 and "Strongly agree" a score of -2. These scores produce a Total Fidelity score as well as five Key Element scores.

The Key Elements scores are each calculated from five items and sorted into the following:

- 1. Outcomes-based,
- 2. Effective teamwork,
- 3. Natural/Community Supports, and
- 4. Strength-and-family-driven.

The Total Fidelity and Key Element scores are calculated as percentages of the total possible score. For example, if each of the items in the "Outcomes-based" Key Element was marked "Strongly Agree" by a caregiver, that Key Element would receive a score of 100%.

<u>Section C, Satisfaction</u>: This section asks four items about the respondent's satisfaction with his or her experiences in wraparound, on the same scale as is used in Section B. Only caregivers and youth are asked these questions. A total satisfaction score is calculated from the average of these items.

<u>Section D, Outcomes</u>: This section consists of two sets of items. The first are Yes or No questions about specific outcomes, such as the youth being suspended or expelled from school. These questions are asked of caregivers, youth, and facilitators. The second set of items is only completed by caregivers and facilitators, and asks them to rate how much the youth has experienced problems in the previous month in several domains (e.g., problems that interfere with school, problems that make it difficult to develop friendships) on the following scale: Very much, a good deal, a little bit, not at all, or don't know. An average is calculated from this scale between 0 and 3.

### **Interpreting WFI-EZ Results**

WFI-EZ data can be used for quality assurance, program evaluation, or research purposes. When respondents are informed that their facilitator/staff person may see results, it could also be used for data-informed directive supervision.

The following report includes National Means to help with interpretation. The WFI-EZ is a relatively young tool. As such, collection of national data is still ongoing, and this benchmark will change over time, possibly even dramatically. In the meantime, the number should provide your site with a comparison sample.

## 1. Summary of Respondents

	Region 1	Region 2	Tot
Number of children/youth assessed	9	10	1
nterviews Completed:	9	10	-
WFI-EZ Caregiver	7	10	
WFI-EZ Facilitator	9	10	
WFI-EZ Youth	8	5	
WFI-EZ Team Member	9	9	
Missing/Not Given			
Birth/Adoptive Parent			
Stepparent			
Foster parent			
Live-in partner of parent			
Sibling			
Aunt or Uncle			
Grandparent		1	
Cousin			
Other family relative			
Adult friend			
Youth friend			
Parent support partner/peer		_	
professional	2	5	
Mentor			
Therapist/Clinician	3		
Case Worker	2	1	
Respite Worker			
Residential/Group home staff			
Probation Officer			
Teacher/school staff			
Minister/faith-based			
Youth support partner	2		
Community Member		2	
Other			
Total Interviews Completed	33	34	
Table 1.3 Team Member Roles			

	Ν
Grandparent	1
Parent support partner/peer professional	7
Therapist/Clinician	3
Case Worker	3
Youth support partner	2
Community Member	2

## 2. Youth Information & Demographics

Youth Demographics			
	Region 1	Region 2	Total
Number of children/youth assessed	9	10	19
Months in Wraparound	12	11	11
Age of youth			
Mean (SD)	19(10.0)	12(2.8)	15(7.7)
Range	9 - 44	7 - 16	7 - 44
Age (frequencies)			
<1	0	0	0
1-4	0	0	0
5-9	1	2	3
10-14	2	7	9
15-18	4	1	5
19 and older	2	0	2
Missing	0	0	0
Gender			
Male	6(66.67%)	8(80.00%)	14(73.68%)
Female	3(33.33%)	2(20.00%)	5(26.32%)
Transgender			
Race of youth			
African-American	2(22.22%)	2(20.00%)	4(21.05%)
Native-American			
Asian Pacific			
Caucasian	5(55.56%)	7(70.00%)	12(63.16%)
Mixed Race	1(11.11%)	1(10.00%)	2(10.53%)
Hispanic/Latino			
Other	1(11.11%)	0(0.00%)	1(5.26%)

School Information			
Enrolled in school			-
Not enrolled in school			-
Missing	9(100.00%)	10(100.00%)	19(100.00%
Grade Level			
Pre-School			-
Kindergarten			-
Grade 1-3			-
Grade 4-6			-
Grade 7-9			-
Grade 10-12			-
Post-Secondary			-
N/A			-
Other			-
Missing	9(100.00%)	10(100.00%)	19(100.00%
Legal Custody			
Two birth parents OR one birth parent and one step	2(28.57%)	1(10.00%)	3(17.65%
Birth mother only	1(14.29%)	4(40.00%)	5(29.41%
Birth father only		3(30.00%)	3(17.65%
Adoptive parent(s)	3(42.86%)	0(0.00%)	3(17.65%
Foster parent(s)			
Sibling(s)			
Aunt and/or uncle			
Grandparent(s)		2(20.00%)	2(11.76%
Friend(s)			
Ward of the state	1(14.29%)		1(5.88%
Other			
Missing			
Caregiver relationship to youth			
Birth parent	3(42.86%)	7(70.00%)	10(58.82%
Adoptive parent	2(28.57%)		2(11.76%
Foster parent	1(14.29%)		1(5.88%
Live-in partner of parent			
Sibling			
Aunt or uncle			
Grandparent		2(20.00%)	2(11.76%
Cousin			
Other family relative			
Step parent		1(10.00%)	1(5.88%
Friend (adult friend)			
Other	1(14.29%)		1(5.88%

### **3.** Basic Information



## 4. Item Means

lt <u>em</u>	Means		
		Mean	Standard Deviation
B1.	My family and I had a major role in choosing the people on our wraparound team.	1.6	0.6
B2.	There are people providing services to my child and family.	-0.2	1.4
B3.	At the beginning of the wraparound process, my family described our vision of a better future to our team.	1.6	0.6
B4.	My wraparound team came up with creative ideas for our plan that were different from anything that had been tried before.	1.3	0.7
B5.	With help from members of our wraparound team, my family and I chose a small number of the highest priority needs to focus on.	1.5	0.6
B6.	Our wraparound plan includes strategies that address the needs of other family members, in addition to my child.	1.4	0.7
B7.	I sometimes feel like our team does not include the right people to help my child and family.	1.3	1.0
B8.	At every team meeting, my wraparound team reviews progress that has been made toward meeting our needs.	1.6	0.6
B9.	Being involved in wraparound has increased the support my child and family get from friends and family.	0.9	1.0
B10.	The wraparound process has helped my child and family build strong relationships with people we can count on.	1.2	0.8
B11.	At each team meeting, our wraparound team celebrates at least one success or positive event.	1.5	0.6
B12.	Our wraparound team does not include any friends, neighbors, or extended family members.	0.6	1.4
B13.	My family was linked to community resources I found valuable.	1.3	0.7
	My wraparound team came up with ideas and strategies that were tied to things that my family likes to do.	1.3	0.7
B15.	Members of our wraparound team sometimes do not do the tasks they are assigned.	0.8	1.3
	Our wraparound team includes people who are not paid to be there (e.g. friends, family, faith).	0.8	1.1
B17.	I sometimes feel like members of my wraparound team do not understand me and my family.	1.4	0.9
B18.	Our wraparound plan includes strategies that do not involve professional services (things our family can do ourselves or with help from friends, family and	1.0	1.0
B19.	community). I am confident that our wraparound team can find services or strategies to keep my child in the community over the long term.	1.0	1.0 0.7
B20	Because of wraparound, when a crisis happens, my family and I know what to do.	1.1	1.0
	Our wraparound team has talked about how we will know it is time for me and my family to transition out of formal wraparound.	1.1	0.9
B22.	At each team meeting, my family and I give feedback on how well the wraparound process is working for us.	1.3	0.7
B23.	I worry that the wraparound process will end before our needs have been met.	0.0	1.3
	Participating in wraparound has given me confidence that I can manage future problems.	1.3	0.7
B25.	With help from our wraparound team, we have been able to get community support and services that meet our needs.	1.1	0.9

## 5. Fidelity Scores – Total & Key Elements



#### **Total Fidelity Scores**

#### **Key Element Scores**





### 6. Satisfaction

Table 6.1 Satisfaction: Item Level Means						
	All		Region 1		Region 2	
	Caregiver	Youth	Caregiver	Youth	Caregiver	Youth
Satisfied with the wraparound process	1.77	1.50	1.45	1.22	1.97	1.78
Satisfied with my (or my child's) progress	0.89	0.71	0.78	1.42	1.00	-0.12
Family has made progress toward meeting our goals	1.02	1.20	0.99	1.80	1.05	0.60
More confident about ability to care for youth at home (or I feel like things have improved at home)	1.12	1.11	1.05	1.04	1.19	1.18

### 7. Outcomes

Table 7.1 Selected Respondents: Caregiver & Facilitator			
	WF	CG	Total Forms
N Forms Included:	18	23	41

#### **School and Community Outcomes**



### Functioning Outcomes



## 8. Relative Strengths & Needs for Improvement

#### Strengths

Relative Strengths by WFI-EZ Item: WFI-EZ **Facilitator** Form Number of children/youth assessed: 19

Item	Description	National Mean	Your Score
2.1	The family had a major role in choosing the people on their wraparound team	1.38	1.90
2.3	At the beginning of the wraparound process, the family described their vision of a better future, and this statement was shared with the team.	1.44	1.85
2.4	The family's wraparound team came up with creative ideas for its plan that were different from anything that had been tried before.	1.21	1.50
2.5	With help from its wraparound team, the family chose a small number of the highest priority needs to focus on.	1.55	1.75
2.6	The wraparound plan includes strategies that address the needs of other family members, in addition to the identified child or youth.	1.46	1.60

#### Relative Strengths by WFI-EZ Item: WFI-EZ **Caregiver** Form Number of children/youth assessed: 17

Item	Description	National Mean	Your Score
2.1	My family and I had a major role in choosing the people on our wraparound team.	1.38	1.61
2.3	At the beginning of the wraparound process, my family described our vision of a better future to our team.	1.44	1.68
2.4	My wraparound team came up with creative ideas for our plan that were different from anything that had been tried before.	1.21	1.64

#### **Needs for Improvement**

Needs for Improvement by WFI-EZ Item: WFI-EZ Facilitator Form Number of children/youth assessed: 19

ltem	Description	National Mean	Your Score
2.2	There are people providing services to this child and family who are not involved in their wraparound team.	1.19	0.63
2.7	I am concerned that this family's team does not include the right people to help the child and family.	1.59	1.11
2.9	Through wraparound, the family has increased the support it gets from friends and family.	1.16	1.00
2.12	The wraparound team does not include any natural supports such as friends, neighbors, or family members.	0.87	0.45
2.15	Members of the wraparound team sometimes do not do the tasks they are assigned.	1.57	0.70
2.17	I sometimes feel like members of this wraparound team do not understand or respect the family.	1.7	1.60
2.20	An effective crisis plan is in place that ensures this family knows what to do in a crisis.	1.35	0.80
2.23	It is possible that the wraparound process could end before the family's needs have been met.	1.61	-0.35

#### Needs for Improvement by WFI-EZ Item: WFI-EZ **Caregiver** Form Number of children/youth assessed: 17

ltem	Description	National Mean	Your Score
2.2	There are people providing services to my child and family who are not involved in my wraparound team.	1.19	0.05
2.7	I sometimes feel like our team does not include the right people to help my child and family.	1.59	1.39
2.9	Being involved in wraparound has increased the support my child and family get from friends and family.	1.16	1.00
2.11	At each team meeting, our wraparound team celebrates at least one success or positive event.	1.7	1.43
2.12	Our wraparound team does not include any friends, neighbors, or extended family members.	0.87	0.48
2.15	Members of our wraparound team sometimes do not do the tasks they are assigned.	1.57	0.96
2.17	I sometimes feel like members of my wraparound team do not understand me and my family.	1.7	1.30