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Today’s Agenda

• WrapSTAR Process Overview
• Ratings and Feedback Overview
• Lessons Learned and Next Steps
• Questions and Answers
Wraparound needs a comprehensive program assessment tool

• Many sites don’t have the time or expertise to design and implement a comprehensive fidelity and outcomes evaluation plan
  – They may occasionally use one WFAS tool, but they want more information
• Sites struggle to make sense of the data they do have and use it for program improvement
• Implementation and system support are complex factors that are difficult to assess from “the inside”
• State-wide implementation efforts are difficult to assess since individual sites rarely evaluate their services using the same tools and approach
What is WrapSTAR?

- A systematic process for collecting and synthesizing a wide variety of information to create a comprehensive snapshot of how Wraparound is working within a community or agency.
- Provides an external, objective assessment above and beyond routine quality assurance.
- Goal is to inform quality improvement and sustainability efforts.
WrapSTAR’s framework is unique and very comprehensive.
WFAS tools and WrapSTAR-specific measures are used

- **WFAS tools**
  - Measuring Fidelity and Outcomes
    - Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI-EZ)
    - Team Observation Measure (TOM 2.0)
    - Wraparound Document Review Measure (DRM 2.0)
  - Measuring System Support
    - Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory (CSWI)

- **WrapSTAR-specific tools**
  - Caseload survey to gather information about youth’s situations
  - Administrator survey asks about staffing, supervision, use of data, etc.
  - TCU’s Survey of Organizational Functioning
  - Staff Interviews during site visit
  - Organizational document assessment tool reviews strategic plans, job descriptions, training logs, etc.
WrapSTAR is broken up into five phases over five months

| WEEK | Phase and Task | -4 | -3 | -2 | -1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
|------|----------------|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Preparation | Introductory Planning Meeting | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Consent & Client Privacy Logistics | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Staff Orientation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Consent Gathering | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | CSWI & WFI-EZ Administration Planning | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Kick Off Meeting | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Preliminary Data Collection | Administrator Survey | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Caseload Survey | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Survey of Organizational Functioning | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | CSWI respondent list | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Wraparound Fidelity Assessment System Tool Administration | Choose WFAS Sample and Approach | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Comm. Supports for Wrap Inventory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI-EZ) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Team meeting recordings for observ. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Site Visit (Two Days) | Staff Interviews | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Family Record Review | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Organizational Document Assessment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Data Synthesis | Data Analysis and Report Writing | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Draft Report Available | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Debriefing Meeting | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Final Report Available | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
Eight sites have participated in WrapSTAR, with more on the way

• One intensive pilot site
  – Worked out the logistics, feasibility, and developed needed supporting documents
  – Refined most of the measures and several indicators as a result of the process

• Six sites as part of a state initiative currently participating simultaneously
  – Will subsequently receive targeted QI and evaluation TA
  – Six more sites slated for FY16

• One state “apprenticeship” model being tested
  – UW WERT is training a state Institute for Excellence on using the WrapSTAR protocol to build local capacity

• Other fee-for-service evaluation contracts in the works
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Final ratings are the average of 45 indicators of high-quality practice

Example: Fidelity Rating Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| F1                | Timely Engagement and Planning  
Families are engaged Wraparound in services within 10 days of a referral and develop their initial Wraparound plan within 30 days of being engaged. Then, teams meet regularly (at least every 30-45 days) to review and modify the Plan of Care as needed.  
Then, teams meet regularly (at least every 30-45 days) to review and modify the Plan of Care as needed. |
| F2                | Outcomes-based Process  
Success of the Wraparound plan—including progress toward meeting needs—is measured objectively, reviewed routinely, and used to inform changes to the plan as needed.                                                                                                                                                                       |
| F3                | Effective Teamwork  
Diverse teams consisting of formal and natural supports work together to develop, implement, and monitor creative service plans that meet the unique needs of the family. All team members take ownership over their assigned tasks and work together to meet the family’s needs.                                                                 |
| F4                | Use of Natural/Community Supports  
Natural supports are integral team members. Involvement in Wraparound strengthens the support received by families from natural and community supports. When possible, strategies in the plan are undertaken by natural supports within the family’s community.                                                                                             |
| F5                | Based on Needs  
Services and supports are focused on addressing the high-priority needs of the youth as well as family members. If the services are not useful, the Wraparound plan is changed or barriers are addressed. The Wraparound process continues until needs are sufficiently met.                                                                 |
| F6                | Driven by Strengths  
Strengths of the family, all team members, and the family’s community are collectively reviewed and matched to chosen strategies.                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| F7                | Determined by Families  
The family’s culture, capabilities, interests, and skills are elicited, fully understood, and celebrated. They are viewed as critical to a successful Wraparound process and are the basis for decision making and creative problem solving. The family’s perspective is prioritized in developing and modifying the mix of strategies and supports to assure the best fit with the family’s preferences. |
| F8                | Planned for Transitions and Follow-Up  
Transitions are planned for in advance and celebrated with full family participation. In addition, the Wraparound provider organization follows up with families several months after transition to ensure improvements have been maintained and that the youth is stable and the family is adequately supported. |
Each indicator has a scoring rubric to synthesize the data from many sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXAMPLE: F3. Effective Teamwork</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition</strong>: Diverse teams consisting of formal and natural supports work together to develop, implement, and monitor creative service plans that meet the unique needs of the family. All team members take ownership over their assigned tasks and work together to meet the family’s needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DATA SOURCES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Source</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wraparound Document Review Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFI-EZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUANTITATIVE DATA WORKSHEET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Data Source</strong></th>
<th><strong>Needed Statistic</strong></th>
<th><strong>Data (write in)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOM 2.0</td>
<td>Full Meeting Attendance subscale score:</td>
<td>2.76 (out of 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective Teamwork subscale score:</td>
<td>4.34 (out of 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wraparound Document Review Measure</td>
<td>Average score on items E9-E14:</td>
<td>1.67 (out of 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFI-EZ</td>
<td># of WFI-EZ respondents that responded “Yes” to item A1:</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of WFI-EZ respondents who answered question A1:</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of WFI-EZ respondents that responded “Yes” to item A1:</td>
<td>94.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFI-EZ</td>
<td>Average score on Effective Teamwork subscale:</td>
<td>0.66 (out of 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Make sure to reverse code the (R) items before averaging.

The items relevant to the indicator from each data collection instrument.

The site’s performance on each criteria (sometimes with some math).
The data is translated into scores on each indicator criteria.

### DATA SOURCE/ITEM SCORING GUIDE
(circle the appropriate score description for each data source/item based on the data above)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source/Item</th>
<th>To Earn a Score of 0</th>
<th>To Earn a Score of 1</th>
<th>To Earn a Score of 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOM 2.0: Full Meeting Attendance subscale</td>
<td>Score of less than 2.5.</td>
<td>Score of less than 3.5, but 2.5 or higher.</td>
<td>Score of 3.5 or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM 2.0: Effective Teamwork subscale</td>
<td>Score of less than 2.5.</td>
<td>Score of less than 3.5, but 2.5 or higher.</td>
<td>Score of 3.5 or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRM</td>
<td>An average score of less than 1.5.</td>
<td>An average score of less than 2.5, but 1.5 or higher.</td>
<td>An average score of 2.5 or higher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFI-EZ: Item A1</td>
<td>Less than 75% of respondents answered “Yes.”</td>
<td>75-89% of respondents answered “Yes.”</td>
<td>90% or more of respondents answered “Yes.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFI-EZ: Effective Teamwork Subscale</td>
<td>An average score of less than 0.5.</td>
<td>An average score of less than 1.5, but 0.5 or higher.</td>
<td>An average score of 1.5 or higher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FINAL INDICATOR SCORING GUIDE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F3. Effective Teamwork</th>
<th>Sum of Criteria Scores</th>
<th>Total Possible Sum Score</th>
<th>Final Indicator Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Boxes shaded dark blue indicate the site’s score from each data source.

The green-shaded box provides the site’s final score on the indicator: the % of earned vs. total possible score.
Sites receive several reports with increasing level of detail

- **Final Report**
  - Synthesized and digestible results, along with detailed areas of strength and constructive suggestions for where and how to improve

- **Ratings guide**
  - Detailed information on performance for each of the criteria for all 45 indicators of high-quality practice within the 4 domains

- **Tool subreports**
  - Tool-specific reports on the results of each survey administered, including comparisons to national means, when possible
Final ratings example—what are the takeaways?

Final WrapSTAR Ratings

- System Support: 70%
- Implementation: 68%
- Fidelity: 55%
- Outcomes: 55%

Implementation Subratings

- Leadership Driver: 72%
- Organizational Driver: 71%
- Competency Driver: 60%
Examples of narrative feedback provided to sites

• Implementation: Competency
  – Strength: The organization provides a thorough and innovative training program, with many required trainings upon hiring to ensure staff have the knowledge and skills necessary to perform their job duties, and ongoing in-service trainings that respond to need in real time. Often these trainings are created by and for the staff, creating ownership and a culture of learning.
  – Potential Need for Improvement: Integrate behavioral question or practice, writing exercises, and/or contact with relevant stakeholders into the interview process for every type of staff in order to more thorough assess aptitude prior to hiring.

• Fidelity
  – Strength: Team members take ownership over their assigned tasks and work together to meet the family’s needs. There seems to be good working relationships between team members, and team members are well-oriented to the Wraparound process.
  – Potential Need for Improvement: Focus on eliciting, documenting, and utilizing functional strengths, rather than just successes or accomplishments over time.
    • Explore techniques to uncover functional strengths of each family and team member during the initial Strength Needs and Culture Discovery.
    • During a CFT and in the POC separate the listing of successes and accomplishments from the articulation of newly developed or strengthened functional strengths that may be useful in planning or celebrated.
Staff are engaged in QI brainstorming via a “Debriefing Meeting”

• The debriefing meeting orients staff to the ratings process and provides them with data on specific indicators

• Staff celebrate successes and begin to translate WrapSTAR findings into quality improvement plans
  – A structured interactive process is used to begin to identify needs related to low-scoring indicators and brainstorm strategies to meet those needs
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Lessons learned

• It is possible to collect a large amount of data efficiently, with little burden on front-line staff
  – Local administration of caregiver and youth WFI-EZs is doable and preferable
  – Team meeting video recording reduces burden, but increases anxiety

• WFAS tools can work together seamlessly, allowing for each to shore up the weaknesses of the others while providing nuanced and integrated feedback on multiple practice elements

• Stakeholders at different levels found the final results to be immediately understandable and actionable

• Messaging and engaging stakeholders in the beginning is critical—tone and expectations filter down from the top

• Client information privacy and confidentiality must be addressed at a local level
Next Steps

• Continue doing more WrapSTARs!
• Possibly add measures or indicators to better assess service array and availability and use of evidence based practices
• Further test the apprenticeship model of building local capacity to use the protocol
• Eventually use data to explore connections between the domains
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