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Wraparound Is . . .
- Individualized, Strength and Community-Based
- Family Centered, and Needs Driven
- An “Unconditional” Commitment for Empowerment
- Become Independent of “Systems Supports”
- Outcome Based
- Accessibility, “Unconditional Support”, Flexibility

Wraparound Sacramento
- Pilot study coordinated by the University of California at Berkeley
- Services Provided by four Sacramento agencies:
  - River Oak Center for Children*
  - Stanford Home for Children*
  - Eastfield Ming-Quong
  - Sacramento Children’s Home
- Collaboration with departments of Mental Health, Probation, and Social Services

Two Avenues for Admission
- **Title IV-E**
  - Primarily Child Protective Services and Juvenile Justice children
  - Federal funds
  - Pilot project that requires children referred to Wrap be randomized into the study project
    - If they don’t make the experimental group, they get “customary” services
- **SB 163**
  - Primarily Mental Health referrals
  - Non-federal funds
  - No requirement to be in the study project
  - Do not need to be MediCal-eligible

Unique Population: Program Evolution
- Initially served high risk youth in community
- Inclusion of CPS and Probation youth
- High percentage of youth in out-of-home placement
  - “Bring ‘em Home” Initiative
  - “Wrap for All” Initiative

Placement at Intake

*Source of data for current study*
**Success in Wraparound**
- Goals Are Met
- Transitioned to Community Resources
- Supports Available
- Outcomes Indicate Improvement
- Youth steps-down into or maintains a community placement

**Previous Study**
- Research questions:
  - Can Wraparound successfully serve this population of youth?
  - How do we measure “success”?
- Examined predictors of success at the annual assessment period and at discharge

**Predictors of Success**
- Most demographic factors were not related to success (child gender, ethnicity, age at admit)
- Diagnosis may be related to success
- Presence of certain risk factors is related to success
- Referral Source (CPS, Mental Health, Probation) may also be related to success

**Current Research Questions**
- **Question 1**: Are there differences in outcomes between the CPS, Probation and Mental Health referral groups?
- **Question 2**: Can children for whom Wraparound services were not originally designed (those in placement; often with no identified caregiver) achieve success in the program?

**Discharged Youth and Families**
- Analyses included families who had discharged from the services
- Data were available for 102 youth and families
  - Child Protective Services: 64
  - Children’s Mental Health: 19
  - Probation: 18
  - Other: 1

**Differences in Demographics**
- Probation had significantly more girls than CPS and Mental Health p < .05
- Mental Health had significantly more Caucasian clients than CPS and Probation p < .05
- Probation clients were significantly older than CPS and Mental Health p < .01
Differences in Demographics

- Probation had significantly more strengths than Mental Health. p<.05  CPS did not significantly differ from either group
- Mental Health had significantly fewer risk factors than CPS and Probation p<.05
- Mental Health had lower scores in most family functioning domains, particularly in the area of Parent and Family Conflict

Outcomes

- Community or facility placement at discharge
- Reason for Discharge
- Behavioral Changes
  - CAFAS pre-post
  - CBCL pre-post

Placement at Discharge

- Probation and CPS youth were significantly more likely to be in the community (p< .05)
- Mental Health Youth were significantly more likely to be in a facility placement (p<.05)

Changes in Community Placement

Reason for Discharge

- Child and Adolescent Functional Assessment Scale (CAFAS) K. Hodges 1995
  - Clinician/facilitator scored tool
  - Designed to assess problem behaviors in children ages 6 through 18
**CAFAS Pre-Post**

- Parent completed measure

**Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL)**

Achenbach & Edelbrock, 1983

- Designed to assess competencies and behavior problems in children ages 4-18

**Total CBCL Score Pre-Post**

- Higher scores indicate higher levels of model fidelity

**Wraparound Fidelity Index** Bachrach 2002

- Parent Voice and Choice - Youth and Family Team
- Community Based Services - Cultural Competence
- Individualized Services - Strength Based Services
- Natural Supports - Continuation of Care
- Collaboration - Flexible Resources
- Outcome Based Services

Each element score is between 0 and 8

Includes data from versions 2.1 and 3.0

**WFI by Referral Group**
WFI and Outcomes

- WFI scores were related to reason for discharge (Graduation vs. Drop-outs)
- Parent Total Fidelity scores were significantly lower for families who dropped out than for families who graduated ($p<.001$)
- Youth Total Fidelity scores were significantly lower for families who dropped out than for families who graduated ($p<.05$)
- There were no differences in Resource Facilitator Total Fidelity Scores

Summary and Future Research

- **Question 1**: Yes, there are differences between the referral groups in success rates
- **Question 2**: Can Wrap serve the unique population: Yes, in many cases we can achieve success with part of this population.