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The Issues To Be Addressed By Wraparound in California

1. Population of maltreated children with emotional/behavioral difficulties:
   a. Dissatisfaction with group care and its effectiveness for a certain population of maltreated children
   b. Group care living environment is too restrictive for some children

2. Cost of high-level group care
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Wraparound in California

Wraparound is a two-pronged approach (planning process and service allocation) to accomplishing a change in management of behavior to allow children to live in the most family-like setting possible.

Specific interventions borne out of the planning process are designed to alleviate stressors that may factor in triggering the child’s problematic behavior, or limit the family’s capacity to manage the behavior.

Practice Model:
Professional team approach
Working as a team with key people identified by the child/family

An Analysis of Wraparound

The Goal of Wraparound in California

To change or manage a child’s behavior in order to improve foster care placement outcomes, specifically,

1. Target Population One: to allow a child to move from a more restrictive placement setting to a less restrictive placement setting, or
2. Target Population Two: to stabilize a current foster care placement, thereby preventing a placement into a more restrictive type of out-of-home placement, while keeping the child safe.

Program and Evaluation Logic Model

Environment
Child/Family
Child Behavior

Wraparound

In-Depth Interview
Evaluation
Process Fidelity
Outcome

Child Welfare Outcomes
Safety, Stability, Permanence
**Study Methods**

Data Collection Design:
- Post-activity Comparison Group Design
- R x G (Wraparound)
- R x G (Bi-Traditional Child Welfare Services)

County Included in Analysis:
- Alameda County (Oakland, CA)
- Los Angeles County
- Sacramento County (Central Valley)

**Study Population**
1. Eligible for WV-1 Foster Care funds
2. Dependent of county child welfare and eligible between 06/1/98 – 12/31/02
3. Nontreatment (non-treated population)

**Sampling**
1. Behavioral criteria for enrollment
2. Index children and sibling children process by counties

**Random Assignment Process**
- 8:1 treatment/comparison group
- families not randomly selected as study child

**An Analysis of Wraparound Fidelity in Alameda County**

**WFI—Results**

Table: WFI Overall Score (%; N = 79)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Std</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>78.08</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>62.00</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>11.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>66.53</td>
<td>71.56</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>92.00</td>
<td>67.00</td>
<td>18.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Substantiated Malnutrition**

**Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Tx %</th>
<th>Comp %</th>
<th>ONR</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>17 of 212</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>15 of 192</td>
<td>18.46</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>16 of 188</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Child Welfare Outcomes—Results**

**Outcomes**
- Child Well-Being
  - Behavioral Measures
  - Child Safety
  - Substantiated Malnutrition
- Placement Stability
  - Number of Placement Moves
  - Types of Placement Moves
- Permanence
  - Types of Placement
  - Exit from Care

**Data Source**
- In-Depth Interviews
- California's Case Management Data System (CWS/CMS)
- Additional sources as needed

**Child Well-Being in Alameda County—Results**

The children receiving Wraparound in Alameda County improved over a period of 12 – 18 months, in relation to the comparison group.

**Variable (Instrument)**  **Result**
- Respondent (Result):
  - Caregiver (+Hend)
  - Youth (p < .05)
- Emotional Well-Being (SSP):
  - Caregiver (p < .05)
- Emotional Adjustment (SSP):
  - Youth (p < .05)
- Emotional/Behavioral (Ohio Scaler):
  - Caregiver (+Hend)
- Emotional/Behavioral Strengths (BERS):
  - Caregiver (+Hend)
- School Trouble Avoidance (SSP):
  - Youth (+Hend)
- Satisfaction (CSQ-18):
  - Caregiver (p < .05)

(all other comparisons neutral)
### Number of Placement Moves—Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Tx %</th>
<th>Comp %</th>
<th>OR 95% CI</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>1.167</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1.428</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Types of Placement Moves: Step Down—Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Tx %</th>
<th>Comp %</th>
<th>OR 95% CI</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>26 of 42</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>64.29</td>
<td>1.096</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>12 of 17</td>
<td>88.67</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>41 of 70</td>
<td>54.17</td>
<td>53.57</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Types of Placement Moves: Step Up—Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Tx %</th>
<th>Comp %</th>
<th>OR 95% CI</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>48 of 169</td>
<td>26.87</td>
<td>28.13</td>
<td>1.445</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>10 of 70</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>15.36</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>16 of 49</td>
<td>24.57</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>1.796</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Types of Placements—Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Tx %</th>
<th>Comp %</th>
<th>OR 95% CI</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>566 of 212</td>
<td>26.10</td>
<td>39.34</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>43 of 70</td>
<td>60.84</td>
<td>59.77</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>2051 of 146</td>
<td>30.02</td>
<td>41.38</td>
<td>1.796</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Exits from Care—Results

#### Exit from Care Due to Incarceration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Tx %</th>
<th>Comp %</th>
<th>OR 95% CI</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>7 of 312</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>2 of 102</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>4 of 181</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Exit from Care Due to Permanency (reunification, adoption, guardianship)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Tx %</th>
<th>Comp %</th>
<th>OR 95% CI</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>7 of 312</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>2 of 102</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>3 of 181</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

Overall, children receiving Wraparound, as compared to children receiving traditional child welfare services:

1. Do not have higher levels of child safety.
2. Do not have higher levels of placement stability.
3. Do not have higher levels of permanence.

Trends of findings do not show improved child welfare outcomes for children receiving Wraparound.

However, there were two significant findings in specific counties:

1. Alameda County: a larger proportion of children receiving Wraparound were living in family-based environments at the end of the study.
2. Sacramento County: a smaller proportion of children receiving Wraparound exited care due to incarceration.

Discussion

Possible explanations for the neutral findings:

1. The various programs may have been evaluated prior to program maturity—implementation, enrollment, data issues.
2. The range of child characteristics and target populations, given the sample size, may have reduced the ability to measure Wraparound’s impact.
3. The possibility exists that the comparison group received services similar in nature to Wraparound, reducing the potential differences in outcomes.
4. The distal nature of the outcomes: child behavior outcomes vs. child welfare outcomes. A possible missing programmatic element that more adequately addresses family functioning and stability.
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