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Team Observation Measure

• The Team Observation Measure (TOM) is employed by external evaluators to assess adherence to standards of high-quality wraparound during team meeting sessions.
• It consists of 20 items, with two items dedicated to each of the 10 principles of wraparound.
• Each item consists of 3-5 indicators of high-quality wraparound practice as expressed during a child and family team meeting.

DRM Indicators

• Yes should be scored if, per the scoring rules and notes, the described indicator was observed to have occurred during the meeting.
• No should be scored if, per the scoring rules and notes, the described indicator was not observed to have occurred during the meeting.
• N/A is an option for some items only, and is used if, for some reason, it is impossible to provide a score of Yes or No.

TOM Items

• After scoring all the relevant indicators within an item, the observer must assign a score to the item as a whole. Each item includes a response scale from 0 – 4, whereby:
  0 = None of the indicators for this item were evident during the team meeting (i.e., none were scored ‘Yes’)
  1 = Some, but fewer than half of the indicators for this item were scored ‘Yes’
  2 = About half of the indicators for this item were scored ‘Yes’
  3 = More than half, but not all, of the indicators for this item were scored ‘Yes’
  4 = All of the indicators for this item were evident during observation (i.e., all were scored ‘Yes’)

Pilot Test of the TOM

• Results from Clark County, Nevada
• N = 27 families observed
• 8 different program sites
• Meetings were observed in pairs, with individuals completing observations independently, comparing scores and coming to consensus on a final score
• Comparison of scores from individual observers of the same team was also used to assess inter-rater reliability
Results of pilot test

- Mean total score = 57.9%
- SD = 17.3
- Range = 22% - 86%
- Cronbach \( \alpha \) = .862 (Item scores)
- Inter-rater agreement = 79%
- Correlation with WFI:
  - WFI-WF \( r(24)=.41* \)
  - WFI-CG \( r(17)=.21 \)
  - WFI-Y \( r(15)=.11 \)
    - \( *p<.05 \)

Results: TOM Item Means (0-4 scale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team Membership &amp; Attendance</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Effective Team Process</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Facilitator Preparation</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Effective Decision Making</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Creative Brainstorming Options</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Individualized Process</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Natural and Community Supports</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Youth and Family Voice</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Youth and Family Choice</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Focus on Strengths</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results: Youth & Family Voice

- Mean = 3.27
- S.D. = 1.343
- Min = 0
- Max = 4

Results: Natural & Community Supports

- Mean = 1.04
- S.D. = 1.506
- Min = 0
- Max = 4

Results: Effective Decision Making

- Mean = 2.16
- S.D. = 1.179
- Min = 0
- Max = 4

Next steps for the TOM

- Development of more comprehensive training materials
- Creation of DVDs depicting team meeting processes for use in training and for use in training observers to criteria
- Inter-rater reliability studies
- Assessment of concurrent validity (e.g., WFI) with larger Ns
- Employment in controlled studies of wraparound effectiveness
**Documentation Measure**

- The Documentation Measure is employed by external evaluators to assess adherence to standards of high-quality wraparound in documentation of the process.
- It consists of 29 items, looking at:
  - Strengths, Needs and Culture Discovery
  - Wraparound and Crisis Plans
  - Progress Reporting
  - Transition Plans
- Each of the 29 DRM questions is scored on a four point scale with individual indicators for the four points for each question.

**Summary of Document Review by Phase and by Principle**

- Needs documented across domains: 66.6
- Needs are prioritized: 54.8
- Detailed examples of strengths: 52.0
- Detailed examples of culture: 48.5
- Identifies potential natural supports: 45.5
- There is a team: 88.6
- There is a team mission: 51.4
- Natural supports on the team: 34.8
- Goals and Objectives relate to vision: 56.8
- Least restrictive environment: 81.2
- Transition planning: 29.9
- Crisis plan based on functional assessment: 28.4
- Crisis plan has early intervention strategies: 29.9
- Crisis plan has specific steps to respond: 27.4

**Core Components in the Implementation of High Fidelity Wraparound**

- Community Context and Readiness
- Staff Selection
- Organizational Support
- Supervision
- Staff Evaluation
- Coaching
- Training

**Coaching and Credentialing Tools Support Development of Fidelity**

- WFAS
- Observation Tools
- Document Review Tools
Development of Skill Sets

- To supplement phases and activities developed by NWI to
  - Communicate detailed expectations
  - Guide training and coaching process
  - As the basis for staff credentialing

6. Explain confidentiality and information sharing with the family and youth and obtain needed releases.
7. Explain your responsibilities as a mandatory reporter.

1. Introduce yourself to the family and youth and explain your role.
2. Listen to the family and youth's needs to determine if wraparound is a good option.
3. Describe wraparound in a way the family understands.
4. Answer family and youth questions about wraparound.
5. Assist the family and youth to make an informed decision about participation in wraparound.

1.1 a. Orient the family.
GOAL: To orient the family to the wraparound process.
1. Orient the family and youth to wraparound.
2. Listen to the family and youth's needs to determine if wraparound is a good option.
3. Describe wraparound in a way the family understands.
4. Answer family and youth questions about wraparound.
5. Assist the family and youth to make an informed decision about participation in wraparound.

1.1 b. Address legal and ethical issues.
6. Explain confidentiality and information sharing with the family and youth and obtain needed releases.
7. Explain your responsibilities as a mandatory reporter.

Six Types of Credentialing

- Wraparound Novice
- Wraparound Practitioner
- Family Support Partner
- Coach for Wraparound Process
- Supervisor forWraparound Process
- Trainer for Wraparound Process

Credentialing - Wraparound Practitioner

Goal: to define the basic skill sets that must be demonstrated to be considered a competent entry level wraparound facilitator

Requirements include:
- Has met novice certification
- Has received 3 hours of supervision/coaching per week
- Has a professional development plan
- Has demonstrated competency on each of nine practitioner tools by completing two (for observation) or three (for documentation)