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Objective:
Use NIRN framework to examine the relationships between SOC, wraparound and outcomes for youth and families

3 papers:
1. Essential Implementation Components
2. Strengths-Based Site Assessment
3. Level of Development, Fidelity and Outcomes

Indiana’s Essential Implementation Components
Betty Walton, Ph.D.

Overview

Source

Defines Practice
Original Standards
Best Features of Local Implementation

Wraparound Values and Principles

In mid 1990’s wraparound started in a few Indiana communities

2 federally funded SOCs

Destination

FSSA, DMHA
• Leadership
• Support
• Funding
• Technical assistance
• Infrastructure
• Sought federal funding
• Learned from experience
• Persistent
Communication Link (Purveyor)

Assures “that the practitioner has knowledge, skills, ability and continuing resources to provide the core intervention components competently”

Technical Assistance Center

- Training
- Consultation and Coaching
- Peer Support Groups
- Community Assessment

Sphere of Influence

Implementation occurs within a sphere of influence: factors that affect people, organizations and systems.

- Changes in way mental health services were funded
- Medicaid Rehabilitation Option
- Recent reforms in child welfare system
- Current transformation of behavioral health system

Feedback

“a regular flow of reliable information about performance of individuals, teams and organizations acted upon by relevant practitioners, managers and purveyors”

- Critical to success
- Community Alternatives to Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facilities (CA-PRTF)
- Statewide evaluation of wraparound
- Information shared with stakeholders

Strengths-Based Site Assessment

Vicki Effland, Ph.D.
Janet McIntyre, MPA

Strengths-Based Site Assessment

- Pires (2002) Building Systems of Care: A Primer

Organizational and System-Level Conditions

- Collaboration and partnerships
- Capacity building and staffing
- Acquiring services and supports
- Accountability
- Family support
Stages of Implementation

- Stage 1: Exploration and Adoption
- Stage 2: Program Installation
- Stage 3: Initial Implementation
- Stage 4: Full Operation
- Stage 5: Innovation
- Stage 6: Sustainability

Exploration and Adoption Stage

Consensus Building

- Forming an implementation team (Oversight Team)
- Assessing community needs and desired outcomes related to needs
- Studying and assessing “fit”
- Assessing potential barriers

Installation Stage

- Setting the stage for infrastructure
- Creating structural and instrumental changes necessary to initiate the innovation
- Active participation by key stakeholders

Initial Implementation Stage

- Survive the awkward!!!!!
- Learn from mistakes
- Continue “buy-in” efforts
- Manage expectations

Full Operation Stage

- Innovation is operational with full staffing
- Appropriate referrals flowing through
- Funding is stable
- New practice operates with skill and fidelity
- Strong support of administrators and supervisors
- Community adapted to the innovation
Assigning Stage Ratings

• Completed by TA Center Coaches

• Rating guide
  – Characteristics of communities at each stage
  – Within 5 organizational and system-level conditions

Organizational and System-Level Conditions

• Collaboration and partnerships
• Capacity building and staffing
• Acquiring services and supports
• Accountability
• Family support

Collaboration and Partnerships

• Coordinating committee meets
• Identified tasks completed
• Representatives from child-serving
  – actively involved
  – demonstrate support
• Family members involved

Capacity Building and Staffing

• SOC Coordinator
  – No caseload
  – Dedicated to SOC
• Care coordinators
  – Desired youth to coordinator ratio
  – Turnover
  – Understand and implement wraparound
• Organizational support for staff

Acquiring Services and Supports

• Medicaid
• Funding provided by child-serving agencies
• Plan for blended funding
• Sustainability of funding

Accountability

• Outcomes identified
• Data collection
• Reporting
• Results used for decision making
Family Involvement

- Family to family support
  - Family mentors
  - Support groups
  - Advocacy

- Multiple opportunities to receive support

Wraparound Implementation in Indiana: Level of Development, Fidelity and Outcomes
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Betty Walton, Ph.D.

Purpose

- Provide feedback

- Examine relationships between
  - Stage of implementation and wraparound fidelity
  - Wraparound fidelity and youth and family outcomes

Overall Stage of Implementation

- Mean of ratings across the 5 organizational and system-level conditions

Stages of Implementation

- Stage 1: Exploration and Adoption
- Stage 2: Program Installation
- Stage 3: Initial Implementation
- Stage 4: Full Operation

Stage of Implementation Results

- Stage 1 – 20%
- Stage 2 – 34.5%
- Stage 3 – 32.7%
- Stage 4 – 12.7%
Wraparound Fidelity Index, 4.0


- 4 Phases of Wraparound

- 10 Wraparound Principles

WFI Administration

- Trained Interviewers

- Respondents
  – Wraparound facilitators
  – Caregivers
  – Youth

- Several times during wraparound

WFI Results

- 276 youth with at least one interview

- Average overall WFI score = 80.2%

Levels of Wraparound Fidelity

- > 84% High Fidelity
- 75 to 85% Adequate Fidelity
- 65 to 74% Borderline Fidelity
- < 65% No Wraparound

(Bruns, Leverentz-Brady & Suter, 2005)

WFI Results

- High Fidelity Wraparound = 39.9%
- Adequate Fidelity Wraparound = 36.2%
- Borderline Wraparound = 15.5%
- No Wraparound = 8.3%

Wraparound Fidelity by Stage of Implementation

- WFI interviews for at least one youth in 33 of 51 communities

- 263 interviews in the 33 communities

- Average of 8 interviews per community
Wraparound Fidelity by Stage of Implementation

Child and Adolescent Needs and Strengths (CANS)
Dimensions:
- Functioning
- Strengths
- Acculturation
- Behavioral Health Needs
- Risk Behaviors
- Caretaker Needs & Strengths

Copyright: Praed Foundation, 1999

Measuring Improvement

Improvement in any CANS Domain

Reliable Change Index Calculated for Each Domain, $p < .05$.

CANS Results

- 115 youth had CANS available at baseline and at least one follow-up point
- 67% had improvement in at least one CANS dimension

Youth Outcomes by Wraparound Fidelity

Conclusions

- Outcomes for “No Wraparound” similar to usual public services
- Preliminary evidence of association between wraparound fidelity and outcomes
- Consistent with implementation studies for other practices
- Further research indicated
**Implementation Drivers**

- Supervision & Coaching
- Staff Performance Evaluation
- Decision Support Data Systems
- Preservice & Inservice Training
- Recruitment and Selection
- Systems Interventions
- Facilitative Administrative Supports
- Integrated & Compensatory
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