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Assessing Wraparound Fidelity

Common methods:
- Surveys re: service delivery/planning
  - e.g., Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI) (Suter et al.)
- Observation of team meetings
  - e.g., Wraparound Observation Form (Nordress & Epstein)
- Surveys of team participants
  - e.g., Participant Rating Form (Cook et al.)

Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI)
- Interview with Caregiver/Care Coordinator/Youth
- 11 dimensions
- 6-month time intervals
- Reports on 30 days of services/planning efforts

Wraparound Observation Form
- Trained observers attend team meetings
- Rate on multiple dimensions
- Training needed and time intensive
- “Real time” reporting
- Primarily based on what happens at team meeting

Participant Rating Form (PRF)
- All team members rate CFT functioning and practices
- Short and simple
- “Near time” rating
- Focuses on what happens at team meeting
- Multiple dimensions
- Different forms for different types of participants:
  - Caregiver/Parent
  - Youth
  - Facilitator
  - Informal Support
  - Service Provider

Using the PRF

Initial Plan:
- Collect PRF data at end of each CFT meeting
- After sufficient data collected:
  - Report ratings of system, agencies
  - Use data to improve
    - Community training efforts
    - Agency supervision
    - Team functioning
Data Provided

- Graphs show
  - 19 ‘common’ items, i.e., those rated by all team members
  - Changes over time
  - Comparisons across groups

Items include:

- Convenient time: “The meeting was at a convenient time for me.”
- Convenient location: “The meeting was at a convenient location for me.”
- People present: “Everyone who needed to be at the meeting was present.”
- Team understands: “Everyone at the meeting seemed to understand the child and family.”
- Agencies helped: “People from agencies were able to make decisions and help.”
- Sensitive to culture: “Participants were sensitive to the family’s faith, culture and background.”

Items include:

- Listened to family: “Everyone at the meeting listened to the family’s concerns and ideas.”
- Worked as team: “Participants worked together as a team.”
- Strengths focused: “The team focused on the child’s strengths.”
- Reviewed plan: “We reviewed and followed up on the past plan.”
- Family needs discussed: “We talked about the needs of everyone in the family.”
- Child stay home: “The team is working to help the child stay (return to) home.”
- Barriers to plan: “We discussed things that may make it hard to follow the plan, and how to deal with them.”

Items include:

- Plan implemented: “All parts of the plan created at the last meeting were carried out.”
- Address child’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of the child.”
- Address family’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of other family members.”
- Clear what need to do: “It is clear what each person is to do to carry out the current plan.”
- Family issues addressed: “The issues most important to the family were addressed.”
- Crisis plan: “We have a good plan for what to do if a crisis occurs.”

Changes in Plan

- Provide individual team data
  - Balance between stability and timeliness
  - Compare last team meeting with prior 3
  - Compare past 3 with system-level averages
- Provide copies to Care Coordinator to bring back to team
  - To help team improve, gain greater ownership of team process
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistency of data collection</td>
<td>Provide more consistent feedback to supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of timely submission of data</td>
<td>Encouragement/report of submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generating graphs</td>
<td>Need greater automation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use by care coordinators</td>
<td>Modeling, training, “instruction sheet”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use by teams</td>
<td>Train parents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signs of Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team members asking for graphs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors discussing usefulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation of measure used by agencies for non-SOC youth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compare ratings with observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine degree to which team ratings predict child and family outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine ratings as a function of team participants/team stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine impact of team use of data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact us</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James R. Cook, Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor of Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC Charlotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9201 University City Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte, NC 28223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: 704-687-3096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704-687-4758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jcook@email.uncc.edu">jcook@email.uncc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Libby Cable, Community Systems Consultant
Project Director, MeckCARES
The Lee Institute
400 Hermitage Road
Charlotte, NC 28207
704-714-4451 (phone)
704-375-4441 (fax)
lcable@leeinstitute.org
www.leeinstitute.org

Kimm Campbell
Clinical Director
MeckCARES SOC
3430 Wheatley Ave.
Charlotte, NC 28205
704-432-0695 (phone)
704-432-4591 (fax)
kimm.campbell@mecklenburgcountync.gov
www.Meckcares.charmeck.gov
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**Data Provided**

- Graphs show
  - 19 ‘common’ items, i.e., those rated by all team members
  - Changes over time
  - Comparisons across groups

**Items include:**

- Convenient time: “The meeting was at a convenient time for me.”
- Convenient location: “The meeting was at a convenient location for me.”
- People present: “Everyone who needed to be at the meeting was present.”
- Team understands: “Everyone at the meeting seemed to understand the child and family.”
- Agencies helped: “People from agencies were able to make decisions and help.”
- Sensitive to culture: “Participants were sensitive to the family’s faith, culture and background.”

**Items include:**

- Listened to family: “Everyone at the meeting listened to the family’s concerns and ideas.”
- Worked as team: “Participants worked together as a team.”
- Strengths focused: “The team focused on the child’s strengths.”
- Reviewed plan: “We reviewed and followed up on the past plan.”
- Family needs discussed: “We talked about the needs of everyone in the family.”
- Child stay home: “The team is working to help the child stay (return to) home.”
- Barriers to plan: “We discussed things that may make it hard to follow the plan, and how to deal with them.”

**Items include:**

- Plan implemented: “All parts of the plan created at the last meeting were carried out.”
- Address child’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of the child.”
- Address family’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of other family members.”
- Clear what need to do: “It is clear what each person is to do to carry out the current plan.”
- Family issues addressed: “The issues most important to the family were addressed.”
- Crisis plan: “We have a good plan for what to do if a crisis occurs.”

**Changes in Plan**

- Provide individual team data
  - Balance between stability and timeliness
  - Compare last team meeting with prior 3
  - Compare past 3 with system-level averages
- Provide copies to Care Coordinator to bring back to team
  - To help team improve, gain greater ownership of team process
Challenges | Responses
---|---
• Consistency of data collection | • Provide more consistent feedback to supervisors
• Lack of timely submission of data | • Encouragement/report of submissions
• Generating graphs | • Need greater automation
• Use by care coordinators | • Modeling, training, “instruction sheet”
• Use by teams | • Train parents

Signs of Progress

• Team members asking for graphs
• Supervisors discussing usefulness
• Variation of measure used by agencies for non-SOC youth

Next Steps

• Compare ratings with observations
• Examine degree to which team ratings predict child and family outcomes
• Examine ratings as a function of team participants/team stability
• Examine impact of team use of data

Contact us

James R. Cook, Ph.D.  Ryan P. Kilmer, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Psychology
Psychology Department
UNC Charlotte
9201 University City Blvd
Charlotte, NC 28223
Fax: 704-687-3096
704-687-4758  704-687-3689
jcook@email.uncc.edu  rpkilmer@email.uncc.edu
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Libby Cable, Community Systems Consultant
Project Director, MeckCARES
The Lee Institute
400 Hermitage Road
Charlotte, NC 28207
704-714-4451 (phone)
704-375-4441 (fax)
lcable@leeinstitute.org
www.leeinstitute.org

Kimm Campbell
Clinical Director
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Charlotte, NC 28205
704-432-0695 (phone)
704-432-4591 (fax)
kimm.campbell@mecklenburgcountync.gov
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## Participant Rating Form (PRF)

- All team members rate CFT functioning and practices
- Short and simple
- “Near time” rating
- Focuses on what happens at team meeting
- Multiple dimensions
- Different forms for different types of participants:
  - Caregiver/Parent
  - Youth
  - Facilitator
  - Informal Support
  - Service Provider

## Using the PRF

Initial Plan:

- Collect PRF data at end of each CFT meeting
- After sufficient data collected:
  - Report ratings of system, agencies
  - Use data to improve
  - Community training efforts
  - Agency supervision
  - Team functioning
Data Provided

- Graphs show
  - 19 ‘common’ items, i.e., those rated by all team members
  - Changes over time
  - Comparisons across groups

Items include:

- Convenient time: “The meeting was at a convenient time for me.”
- Convenient location: “The meeting was at a convenient location for me.”
- People present: “Everyone who needed to be at the meeting was present.”
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- Agencies helped: “People from agencies were able to make decisions and help.”
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- Plan implemented: “All parts of the plan created at the last meeting were carried out.”
- Address child’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of the child.”
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  - To help team improve, gain greater ownership of team process
Challenges | Responses
--- | ---
• Consistency of data collection | • Provide more consistent feedback to supervisors
• Lack of timely submission of data | • Encouragement/report of submissions
• Generating graphs | • Need greater automation
• Use by care coordinators | • Modeling, training, “instruction sheet”
• Use by teams | • Train parents

Signs of Progress
• Team members asking for graphs
• Supervisors discussing usefulness
• Variation of measure used by agencies for non-SOC youth

Next Steps
• Compare ratings with observations
• Examine degree to which team ratings predict child and family outcomes
• Examine ratings as a function of team participants/team stability
• Examine impact of team use of data

Contact us
James R. Cook, Ph.D.  Ryan P. Kilmer, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Psychology
Psychology Department
UNC Charlotte
9201 University City Blvd
Charlotte, NC 28223
Fax: 704-687-3096
704-687-4758  704-687-3689
jcook@email.uncc.edu  rpkilmer@email.uncc.edu
Contact us

Libby Cable, Community Systems Consultant
Project Director, MeckCARES
The Lee Institute
400 Hermitage Road
Charlotte, NC 28207
704-714-4451 (phone)
704-375-4441 (fax)
lcable@leeinstitute.org
www.leeinstitute.org

Kimm Campbell
Clinical Director
MeckCARES SOC
3430 Wheatley Ave.
Charlotte, NC 28205
704-432-0695 (phone)
704-432-4591 (fax)
kcampbell@mecklenburgcountync.gov
www.Meckcares.charmeck.gov
Using the Participant Rating Form to Assess Team Functioning and Enhance Wraparound Fidelity

James R. Cook, Ryan P. Kilmer, Libby Cable, Kimm Campbell, Alicia DeRusso, and Tanya Vishnevsky
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Assessing Wraparound Fidelity

Common methods:
- Surveys re: service delivery/planning
  - e.g., Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI) (Suter et al.)
- Observation of team meetings
  - e.g., Wraparound Observation Form (Nordress & Epstein)
- Surveys of team participants
  - e.g., Participant Rating Form (Cook et al.)

Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI)

- Interview with Caregiver/Care Coordinator/Youth
- 11 dimensions
- 6-month time intervals
- Reports on 30 days of services/planning efforts

Wraparound Observation Form

- Trained observers attend team meetings
- Rate on multiple dimensions
- Training needed and time intensive
- “Real time” reporting
- Primarily based on what happens at team meeting

Participant Rating Form (PRF)

- All team members rate CFT functioning and practices
- Short and simple
- “Near time” rating
- Focuses on what happens at team meeting
- Multiple dimensions
- Different forms for different types of participants:
  - Caregiver/Parent
  - Youth
  - Facilitator
  - Informal Support
  - Service Provider

Using the PRF

Initial Plan:
- Collect PRF data at end of each CFT meeting
- After sufficient data collected:
  - Report ratings of system, agencies
  - Use data to improve
    - Community training efforts
    - Agency supervision
    - Team functioning
Data Provided

- Graphs show
  - 19 ‘common’ items, i.e., those rated by all team members
  - Changes over time
  - Comparisons across groups

Items include:

- Convenient time: “The meeting was at a convenient time for me.”
- Convenient location: “The meeting was at a convenient location for me.”
- People present: “Everyone who needed to be at the meeting was present.”
- Team understands: “Everyone at the meeting seemed to understand the child and family.”
- Agencies helped: “People from agencies were able to make decisions and help.”
- Sensitive to culture: “Participants were sensitive to the family’s faith, culture and background.”

Items include:

- Listened to family: “Everyone at the meeting listened to the family’s concerns and ideas.”
- Worked as team: “Participants worked together as a team.”
- Strengths focused: “The team focused on the child’s strengths.”
- Reviewed plan: “We reviewed and followed up on the past plan.”
- Family needs discussed: “We talked about the needs of everyone in the family.”
- Child stay home: “The team is working to help the child stay (return to) home.”
- Barriers to plan: “We discussed things that may make it hard to follow the plan, and how to deal with them.”

Items include:

- Plan implemented: “All parts of the plan created at the last meeting were carried out.”
- Address child’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of the child.”
- Address family’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of other family members.”
- Clear what need to do: “It is clear what each person is to do to carry out the current plan.”
- Family issues addressed: “The issues most important to the family were addressed.”
- Crisis plan: “We have a good plan for what to do if a crisis occurs.”

Changes in Plan

- Provide individual team data
  - Balance between stability and timeliness
  - Compare last team meeting with prior 3
  - Compare past 3 with system-level averages
- Provide copies to Care Coordinator to bring back to team
  - To help team improve, gain greater ownership of team process
Challenges | Responses
--- | ---
Consistency of data collection | Provide more consistent feedback to supervisors
Lack of timely submission of data | Encouragement/report of submissions
Generating graphs | Need greater automation
Use by care coordinators | Modeling, training, “instruction sheet”
Use by teams | Train parents

Signs of Progress

- Team members asking for graphs
- Supervisors discussing usefulness
- Variation of measure used by agencies for non-SOC youth

Next Steps

- Compare ratings with observations
- Examine degree to which team ratings predict child and family outcomes
- Examine ratings as a function of team participants/team stability
- Examine impact of team use of data

Contact us

James R. Cook, Ph.D.  Ryan P. Kilmer, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Psychology
Psychology Department
UNC Charlotte
9201 University City Blvd
Charlotte, NC 28223
Fax: 704-687-3096
704-687-4758  704-687-3689
jcook@email.uncc.edu  rpkilmer@email.uncc.edu
Contact us

Libby Cable, Community Systems Consultant
Project Director, MeckCARES
The Lee Institute
400 Hermitage Road
Charlotte, NC 28207
704-714-4451 (phone)
704-375-4441 (fax)
lcable@leeinstitute.org
www.leeinstitute.org

Kimm Campbell
Clinical Director
MeckCARES SOC
3430 Wheatley Ave.
Charlotte, NC 28205
704-432-0695 (phone)
704-432-4591 (fax)
kimm.campbell@mecklenburgcountync.gov
www.Meckcares.charmeck.gov
Using the Participant Rating Form to Assess Team Functioning and Enhance Wraparound Fidelity

James R. Cook, Ryan P. Kilmer, Libby Cable, Kimm Campbell, Alicia DeRusso, and Tanya Vishnevsky
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Assessing Wraparound Fidelity

Common methods:
- Surveys re: service delivery/planning
  - e.g., Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI) (Suter et al.)
- Observation of team meetings
  - e.g., Wraparound Observation Form (Nordress & Epstein)
- Surveys of team participants
  - e.g., Participant Rating Form (Cook et al.)

Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI)
- Interview with Caregiver/Care Coordinator/Youth
- 11 dimensions
- 6-month time intervals
- Reports on 30 days of services/planning efforts

Wraparound Observation Form
- Trained observers attend team meetings
- Rate on multiple dimensions
- Training needed and time intensive
- “Real time” reporting
- Primarily based on what happens at team meeting

Participant Rating Form (PRF)
- All team members rate CFT functioning and practices
- Short and simple
- “Near time” rating
- Focuses on what happens at team meeting
- Multiple dimensions
- Different forms for different types of participants:
  - Caregiver/Parent
  - Youth
  - Facilitator
  - Informal Support
  - Service Provider

Using the PRF

Initial Plan:
- Collect PRF data at end of each CFT meeting
- After sufficient data collected:
  - Report ratings of system, agencies
  - Use data to improve
    - Community training efforts
    - Agency supervision
    - Team functioning
Data Provided

- Graphs show
  - 19 ‘common’ items, i.e., those rated by all team members
  - Changes over time
  - Comparisons across groups

Items include:

- Convenient time: “The meeting was at a convenient time for me.”
- Convenient location: “The meeting was at a convenient location for me.”
- People present: “Everyone who needed to be at the meeting was present.”
- Team understands: “Everyone at the meeting seemed to understand the child and family.”
- Agencies helped: “People from agencies were able to make decisions and help.”
- Sensitive to culture: “Participants were sensitive to the family’s faith, culture and background.”

Items include:

- Listened to family: “Everyone at the meeting listened to the family’s concerns and ideas.”
- Worked as team: “Participants worked together as a team.”
- Strengths focused: “The team focused on the child’s strengths.”
- Reviewed plan: “We reviewed and followed up on the past plan.”
- Family needs discussed: “We talked about the needs of everyone in the family.”
- Child stay home: “The team is working to help the child stay (return to) home.”
- Barriers to plan: “We discussed things that may make it hard to follow the plan, and how to deal with them.”

Items include:

- Plan implemented: “All parts of the plan created at the last meeting were carried out.”
- Address child’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of the child.”
- Address family’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of other family members.”
- Clear what need to do: “It is clear what each person is to do to carry out the current plan.”
- Family issues addressed: “The issues most important to the family were addressed.”
- Crisis plan: “We have a good plan for what to do if a crisis occurs.”

Changes in Plan

- Provide individual team data
  - Balance between stability and timeliness
  - Compare last team meeting with prior 3
  - Compare past 3 with system-level averages
- Provide copies to Care Coordinator to bring back to team
  - To help team improve, gain greater ownership of team process
Challenges

- Consistency of data collection
- Lack of timely submission of data
- Generating graphs
- Use by care coordinators
- Use by teams

Responses

- Provide more consistent feedback to supervisors
- Encouragement/report of submissions
- Need greater automation
- Modeling, training, "instruction sheet"
- Train parents

Signs of Progress

- Team members asking for graphs
- Supervisors discussing usefulness
- Variation of measure used by agencies for non-SOC youth

Next Steps

- Compare ratings with observations
- Examine degree to which team ratings predict child and family outcomes
- Examine ratings as a function of team participants/team stability
- Examine impact of team use of data

Contact us

James R. Cook, Ph.D.        Ryan P. Kilmer, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Psychology
Psychology Department
UNC Charlotte
9201 University City Blvd
Charlotte, NC 28223
Fax: 704-687-3096
704-687-4758    704-687-3689
jcook@email.uncc.edu  rpkilmer@email.uncc.edu
Contact us

Libby Cable, Community Systems Consultant
Project Director, MeckCARES
The Lee Institute
400 Hermitage Road
Charlotte, NC 28207
704-714-4451 (phone)
704-375-4441 (fax)
lcable@leeinstitute.org
www.leeinstitute.org

Kimm Campbell
Clinical Director
MeckCARES SOC
3430 Wheatley Ave.
Charlotte, NC 28205
704-432-0695 (phone)
704-432-4591 (fax)
kimm.campbell@mecklenburgcountync.gov
www.Meckcares.charmeck.gov
# Using the Participant Rating Form to Assess Team Functioning and Enhance Wraparound Fidelity

**James R. Cook, Ryan P. Kilmer, Libby Cable, Kimm Campbell, Alicia DeRusso, and Tanya Vishnevsky**  
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte

## Assessing Wraparound Fidelity

Common methods:
- Surveys re: service delivery/planning  
  - e.g., Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI) (Suter et al.)
- Observation of team meetings  
  - e.g., Wraparound Observation Form (Nordress & Epstein)
- Surveys of team participants  
  - e.g., Participant Rating Form (Cook et al.)

## Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI)

- Interview with Caregiver/Care Coordinator/Youth
- 11 dimensions
- 6-month time intervals
- Reports on 30 days of services/planning efforts

## Wraparound Observation Form

- Trained observers attend team meetings
- Rate on multiple dimensions
- Training needed and time intensive
- “Real time” reporting
- Primarily based on what happens at team meeting

## Participant Rating Form (PRF)

- All team members rate CFT functioning and practices
- Short and simple
- “Near time” rating
- Focuses on what happens at team meeting
- Multiple dimensions
- Different forms for different types of participants:
  - Caregiver/Parent
  - Youth
  - Facilitator
  - Informal Support
  - Service Provider

## Using the PRF

Initial Plan:
- Collect PRF data at end of each CFT meeting
- After sufficient data collected:
  - Report ratings of system, agencies
  - Use data to improve
    - Community training efforts
    - Agency supervision
    - Team functioning
Data Provided

- Graphs show
  - 19 ‘common’ items, i.e., those rated by all team members
  - Changes over time
  - Comparisons across groups

Items include:

- Convenient time: "The meeting was at a convenient time for me."
- Convenient location: "The meeting was at a convenient location for me."
- People present: "Everyone who needed to be at the meeting was present."
- Team understands: "Everyone at the meeting seemed to understand the child and family."
- Agencies helped: "People from agencies were able to make decisions and help."
- Sensitive to culture: "Participants were sensitive to the family’s faith, culture and background."

Items include:

- Listened to family: "Everyone at the meeting listened to the family’s concerns and ideas."
- Worked as team: "Participants worked together as a team."
- Strengths focused: "The team focused on the child’s strengths."
- Reviewed plan: "We reviewed and followed up on the past plan."
- Family needs discussed: "We talked about the needs of everyone in the family."
- Child stay home: "The team is working to help the child stay (return to) home."
- Barriers to plan: "We discussed things that may make it hard to follow the plan, and how to deal with them."

Items include:

- Plan implemented: "All parts of the plan created at the last meeting were carried out."
- Address child’s needs: "The current plan addresses the needs of the child."
- Address family’s needs: "The current plan addresses the needs of other family members."
- Clear what need to do: "It is clear what each person is to do to carry out the current plan."
- Family issues addressed: "The issues most important to the family were addressed."
- Crisis plan: "We have a good plan for what to do if a crisis occurs."

Changes in Plan

- Provide individual team data
  - Balance between stability and timeliness
  - Compare last team meeting with prior 3
  - Compare past 3 with system-level averages
- Provide copies to Care Coordinator to bring back to team
  - To help team improve, gain greater ownership of team process
Challenges | Responses
--- | ---
- Consistency of data collection | - Provide more consistent feedback to supervisors
- Lack of timely submission of data | - Encouragement/report of submissions
- Generating graphs | - Need greater automation
- Use by care coordinators | - Modeling, training, “instruction sheet”
- Use by teams | - Train parents

Signs of Progress
- Team members asking for graphs
- Supervisors discussing usefulness
- Variation of measure used by agencies for non-SOC youth

Next Steps
- Compare ratings with observations
- Examine degree to which team ratings predict child and family outcomes
- Examine ratings as a function of team participants/team stability
- Examine impact of team use of data
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Assessing Wraparound Fidelity

Common methods:
- Surveys re: service delivery/planning
  * e.g., Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI) (Suter et al.)
- Observation of team meetings
  * e.g., Wraparound Observation Form (Nordress & Epstein)
- Surveys of team participants
  * e.g., Participant Rating Form (Cook et al.)

Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI)
- Interview with Caregiver/Care Coordinator/Youth
- 11 dimensions
- 6-month time intervals
- Reports on 30 days of services/planning efforts

Wraparound Observation Form
- Trained observers attend team meetings
- Rate on multiple dimensions
- Training needed and time intensive
- “Real time” reporting
- Primarily based on what happens at team meeting

Participant Rating Form (PRF)
- All team members rate CFT functioning and practices
- Short and simple
- “Near time” rating
- Focusses on what happens at team meeting
- Multiple dimensions
- Different forms for different types of participants:
  - Caregiver/Parent
  - Youth
  - Facilitator
  - Informal Support
  - Service Provider

Using the PRF

Initial Plan:
- Collect PRF data at end of each CFT meeting
- After sufficient data collected:
  * Report ratings of system, agencies
  * Use data to improve
    * Community training efforts
    * Agency supervision
    * Team functioning
Data Provided

- Graphs show
  - 19 ‘common’ items, i.e., those rated by all team members
  - Changes over time
  - Comparisons across groups

Items include:

- Convenient time: "The meeting was at a convenient time for me."
- Convenient location: "The meeting was at a convenient location for me."
- People present: “Everyone who needed to be at the meeting was present.”
- Team understands: “Everyone at the meeting seemed to understand the child and family.”
- Agencies helped: “People from agencies were able to make decisions and help.”
- Sensitive to culture: “Participants were sensitive to the family’s faith, culture and background.”

Items include:

- Listened to family: “Everyone at the meeting listened to the family’s concerns and ideas.”
- Worked as team: “Participants worked together as a team.”
- Strengths focused: “The team focused on the child’s strengths.”
- Reviewed plan: “We reviewed and followed up on the past plan.”
- Family needs discussed: “We talked about the needs of everyone in the family.”
- Child stay home: “The team is working to help the child stay (return to) home.”
- Barriers to plan: “We discussed things that may make it hard to follow the plan, and how to deal with them.”

Items include:

- Plan implemented: "All parts of the plan created at the last meeting were carried out.”
- Address child’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of the child.”
- Address family’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of other family members.”
- Clear what need to do: "It is clear what each person is to do to carry out the current plan.”
- Family issues addressed: “The issues most important to the family were addressed.”
- Crisis plan: “We have a good plan for what to do if a crisis occurs.”

Changes in Plan

- Provide individual team data
  - Balance between stability and timeliness
  - Compare last team meeting with prior 3
  - Compare past 3 with system-level averages
- Provide copies to Care Coordinator to bring back to team
  - To help team improve, gain greater ownership of team process
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### Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistency of data collection</td>
<td>Provide more consistent feedback to supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of timely submission of data</td>
<td>Encouragement/report of submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generating graphs</td>
<td>Need greater automation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use by care coordinators</td>
<td>Modeling, training, “instruction sheet”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use by teams</td>
<td>Train parents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Signs of Progress

- Team members asking for graphs
- Supervisors discussing usefulness
- Variation of measure used by agencies for non-SOC youth

### Next Steps

- Compare ratings with observations
- Examine degree to which team ratings predict child and family outcomes
- Examine ratings as a function of team participants/team stability
- Examine impact of team use of data

### Contact us

James R. Cook, Ph.D.  Ryan P. Kilmer, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Psychology  
Psychology Department  
UNC Charlotte  
9201 University City Blvd  
Charlotte, NC 28223  
Fax: 704-687-3096

704-687-4758  jcook@email.uncc.edu  704-687-3689  rpkilmer@email.uncc.edu
Contact us

Libby Cable, Community Systems Consultant
Project Director, MeckCARES
The Lee Institute
400 Hermitage Road
Charlotte, NC 28207
704-714-4451 (phone)
704-375-4441 (fax)
lcable@leeinstitute.org
www.leeinstitute.org

Kimm Campbell
Clinical Director
MeckCARES SOC
3430 Wheatley Ave.
Charlotte, NC 28205
704-432-0695 (phone)
704-432-4591 (fax)
kimm.campbell@mecklenburgcountync.gov
www.Meckcares.charmeck.gov
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Assessing Wraparound Fidelity

Common methods:
- Surveys re: service delivery/planning
  - e.g., Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI) (Suter et al.)
- Observation of team meetings
  - e.g., Wraparound Observation Form (Nordress & Epstein)
- Surveys of team participants
  - e.g., Participant Rating Form (Cook et al.)

Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI)

- Interview with Caregiver/Care Coordinator/Youth
- 11 dimensions
- 6-month time intervals
- Reports on 30 days of services/planning efforts

Wraparound Observation Form

- Trained observers attend team meetings
- Rate on multiple dimensions
- Training needed and time intensive
- “Real time” reporting
- Primarily based on what happens at team meeting

Participant Rating Form (PRF)

- All team members rate CFT functioning and practices
- Short and simple
- “Near time” rating
- Focuses on what happens at team meeting
- Multiple dimensions
- Different forms for different types of participants:
  - Caregiver/Parent
  - Youth
  - Facilitator
  - Informal Support
  - Service Provider

Using the PRF

Initial Plan:
- Collect PRF data at end of each CFT meeting
- After sufficient data collected:
  - Report ratings of system, agencies
  - Use data to improve
    - Community training efforts
    - Agency supervision
    - Team functioning
Data Provided

- Graphs show
  - 19 'common' items, i.e., those rated by all team members
  - Changes over time
  - Comparisons across groups

Items include:

- Convenient time: “The meeting was at a convenient time for me.”
- Convenient location: “The meeting was at a convenient location for me.”
- People present: “Everyone who needed to be at the meeting was present.”
- Team understands: “Everyone at the meeting seemed to understand the child and family.”
- Agencies helped: “People from agencies were able to make decisions and help.”
- Sensitive to culture: “Participants were sensitive to the family’s faith, culture and background.”

Items include:

- Listened to family: “Everyone at the meeting listened to the family’s concerns and ideas.”
- Worked as team: “Participants worked together as a team.”
- Strengths focused: “The team focused on the child’s strengths.”
- Reviewed plan: “We reviewed and followed up on the past plan.”
- Family needs discussed: “We talked about the needs of everyone in the family.”
- Child stay home: “The team is working to help the child stay (return to) home.”
- Barriers to plan: “We discussed things that may make it hard to follow the plan, and how to deal with them.”

Items include:

- Plan implemented: “All parts of the plan created at the last meeting were carried out.”
- Address child’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of the child.”
- Address family’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of other family members.”
- Clear what need to do: “It is clear what each person is to do to carry out the current plan.”
- Family issues addressed: “The issues most important to the family were addressed.”
- Crisis plan: “We have a good plan for what to do if a crisis occurs.”

Changes in Plan

- Provide individual team data
  - Balance between stability and timeliness
  - Compare last team meeting with prior 3
  - Compare past 3 with system-level averages
- Provide copies to Care Coordinator to bring back to team
  - To help team improve, gain greater ownership of team process
Challenges | Responses
---|---
• Consistency of data collection | • Provide more consistent feedback to supervisors
• Lack of timely submission of data | • Encouragement/report of submissions
• Generating graphs | • Need greater automation
• Use by care coordinators | • Modeling, training, “instruction sheet”
• Use by teams | • Train parents

Signs of Progress
• Team members asking for graphs
• Supervisors discussing usefulness
• Variation of measure used by agencies for non-SOC youth

Next Steps
• Compare ratings with observations
• Examine degree to which team ratings predict child and family outcomes
• Examine ratings as a function of team participants/team stability
• Examine impact of team use of data
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James R. Cook, Ph.D.  Ryan P. Kilmer, Ph.D.
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Psychology Department
UNC Charlotte
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<td>Project Director, MeckCARES</td>
<td>The Lee Institute</td>
<td>400 Hermitage Road</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC 28207</td>
<td>704-714-4451 (phone)</td>
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</tbody>
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Assessing Wraparound Fidelity

Common methods:
- Surveys re: service delivery/planning
  - e.g., Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI) (Suter et al.)
- Observation of team meetings
  - e.g., Wraparound Observation Form (Nordress & Epstein)
- Surveys of team participants
  - e.g., Participant Rating Form (Cook et al.)

Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI)

- Interview with Caregiver/Care Coordinator/Youth
- 11 dimensions
- 6-month time intervals
- Reports on 30 days of services/planning efforts

Wraparound Observation Form

- Trained observers attend team meetings
- Rate on multiple dimensions
- Training needed and time intensive
- “Real time” reporting
- Primarily based on what happens at team meeting

Participant Rating Form (PRF)

- All team members rate CFT functioning and practices
- Short and simple
- “Near time” rating
- Focuses on what happens at team meeting
- Multiple dimensions
- Different forms for different types of participants:
  - Caregiver/Parent
  - Youth
  - Facilitator
  - Informal Support
  - Service Provider

Using the PRF

Initial Plan:
- Collect PRF data at end of each CFT meeting
- After sufficient data collected:
  - Report ratings of system, agencies
  - Use data to improve
    - Community training efforts
    - Agency supervision
    - Team functioning
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Data Provided

• Graphs show
  • 19 ‘common’ items, i.e., those rated by all team members
  • Changes over time
  • Comparisons across groups

Items include:

• Convenient time: "The meeting was at a convenient time for me."
• Convenient location: "The meeting was at a convenient location for me."
• People present: “Everyone who needed to be at the meeting was present.”
• Team understands: “Everyone at the meeting seemed to understand the child and family.”
• Agencies helped: “People from agencies were able to make decisions and help.”
• Sensitive to culture: “Participants were sensitive to the family’s faith, culture and background.”

Items include:

• Listened to family: “Everyone at the meeting listened to the family’s concerns and ideas.”
• Worked as team: “Participants worked together as a team.”
• Strengths focused: “The team focused on the child’s strengths.”
• Reviewed plan: “We reviewed and followed up on the past plan.”
• Family needs discussed: “We talked about the needs of everyone in the family.”
• Child stay home: “The team is working to help the child stay (return to) home.”
• Barriers to plan: “We discussed things that may make it hard to follow the plan, and how to deal with them.”

Items include:

• Plan implemented: “All parts of the plan created at the last meeting were carried out.”
• Address child’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of the child.”
• Address family’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of other family members.”
• Clear what need to do: “It is clear what each person is to do to carry out the current plan.”
• Family issues addressed: “The issues most important to the family were addressed.”
• Crisis plan: “We have a good plan for what to do if a crisis occurs.”

Changes in Plan

• Provide individual team data
  • Balance between stability and timeliness
  • Compare last team meeting with prior 3
  • Compare past 3 with system-level averages
• Provide copies to Care Coordinator to bring back to team
  • To help team improve, gain greater ownership of team process
Challenges   Responses

- Consistency of data collection
- Lack of timely submission of data
- Generating graphs
- Use by care coordinators
- Use by teams
- Provide more consistent feedback to supervisors
- Encouragement/report of submissions
- Need greater automation
- Modeling, training, “instruction sheet”
- Train parents

Signs of Progress

- Team members asking for graphs
- Supervisors discussing usefulness
- Variation of measure used by agencies for non-SOC youth

Next Steps

- Compare ratings with observations
- Examine degree to which team ratings predict child and family outcomes
- Examine ratings as a function of team participants/team stability
- Examine impact of team use of data

Contact us

James R. Cook, Ph.D.  Ryan P. Kilmer, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Psychology
Psychology Department
UNC Charlotte
9201 University City Blvd
Charlotte, NC 28223
Fax: 704-687-3096
704-687-4758  704-687-3689
jcook@email.uncc.edu  rpkilmer@email.uncc.edu
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  - e.g., Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI) (Suter et al.)
- Observation of team meetings
  - e.g., Wraparound Observation Form (Nordress & Epstein)
- Surveys of team participants
  - e.g., Participant Rating Form (Cook et al.)

Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI)

- Interview with Caregiver/Care Coordinator/Youth
- 11 dimensions
- 6-month time intervals
- Reports on 30 days of services/planning efforts

Wraparound Observation Form

- Trained observers attend team meetings
- Rate on multiple dimensions
- Training needed and time intensive
- “Real time” reporting
- Primarily based on what happens at team meeting

Participant Rating Form (PRF)

- All team members rate CFT functioning and practices
- Short and simple
- “Near time” rating
- Focuses on what happens at team meeting
- Multiple dimensions
- Different forms for different types of participants:
  - Caregiver/Parent
  - Youth
  - Facilitator
  - Informal Support
  - Service Provider

Using the PRF

Initial Plan:

- Collect PRF data at end of each CFT meeting
- After sufficient data collected:
  - Report ratings of system, agencies
  - Use data to improve
    - Community training efforts
    - Agency supervision
    - Team functioning
Data Provided

- Graphs show
  - 19 'common' items, i.e., those rated by all team members
  - Changes over time
  - Comparisons across groups

Items include:

- Convenient time: "The meeting was at a convenient time for me."
- Convenient location: "The meeting was at a convenient location for me."
- People present: "Everyone who needed to be at the meeting was present."
- Team understands: "Everyone at the meeting seemed to understand the child and family."
- Agencies helped: "People from agencies were able to make decisions and help."
- Sensitive to culture: "Participants were sensitive to the family’s faith, culture and background."

Items include:

- Listened to family: "Everyone at the meeting listened to the family’s concerns and ideas."
- Worked as team: "Participants worked together as a team."
- Strengths focused: "The team focused on the child’s strengths."
- Reviewed plan: "We reviewed and followed up on the past plan."
- Family needs discussed: "We talked about the needs of everyone in the family."
- Child stay home: "The team is working to help the child stay (return to) home."
- Barriers to plan: "We discussed things that may make it hard to follow the plan, and how to deal with them."

Items include:

- Plan implemented: "All parts of the plan created at the last meeting were carried out."
- Address child’s needs: "The current plan addresses the needs of the child."
- Address family’s needs: "The current plan addresses the needs of other family members."
- Clear what need to do: "It is clear what each person is to do to carry out the current plan."
- Family issues addressed: "The issues most important to the family were addressed."
- Crisis plan: "We have a good plan for what to do if a crisis occurs."

Changes in Plan

- Provide individual team data
  - Balance between stability and timeliness
  - Compare last team meeting with prior 3
  - Compare past 3 with system-level averages
- Provide copies to Care Coordinator to bring back to team
  - To help team improve, gain greater ownership of team process
Challenges | Responses
--- | ---
- Consistency of data collection  | - Provide more consistent feedback to supervisors
- Lack of timely submission of data  | - Encouragement/report of submissions
- Generating graphs  | - Need greater automation
- Use by care coordinators  | - Modeling, training, “instruction sheet”
- Use by teams  | - Train parents

Signs of Progress

- Team members asking for graphs
- Supervisors discussing usefulness
- Variation of measure used by agencies for non-SOC youth

Next Steps

- Compare ratings with observations
- Examine degree to which team ratings predict child and family outcomes
- Examine ratings as a function of team participants/team stability
- Examine impact of team use of data
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- Convenient time: "The meeting was at a convenient time for me."
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- People present: “Everyone who needed to be at the meeting was present.”
- Team understands: “Everyone at the meeting seemed to understand the child and family.”
- Agencies helped: “People from agencies were able to make decisions and help.”
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Items include:

- Listened to family: “Everyone at the meeting listened to the family’s concerns and ideas.”
- Worked as team: “Participants worked together as a team.”
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- Family needs discussed: “We talked about the needs of everyone in the family.”
- Child stay home: “The team is working to help the child stay (return to) home.”
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Items include:

- Plan implemented: “All parts of the plan created at the last meeting were carried out.”
- Address child’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of the child.”
- Address family’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of other family members.”
- Clear what need to do: “It is clear what each person is to do to carry out the current plan.”
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Changes in Plan

- Provide individual team data
  - Balance between stability and timeliness
  - Compare last team meeting with prior 3
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- Agencies helped: “People from agencies were able to make decisions and help.”
- Sensitive to culture: “Participants were sensitive to the family’s faith, culture and background.”

Items include:

- Listened to family: “Everyone at the meeting listened to the family’s concerns and ideas.”
- Worked as team: “Participants worked together as a team.”
- Strengths focused: “The team focused on the child’s strengths.”
- Reviewed plan: “We reviewed and followed up on the past plan.”
- Family needs discussed: “We talked about the needs of everyone in the family.”
- Child stay home: “The team is working to help the child stay (return to) home.”
- Barriers to plan: “We discussed things that may make it hard to follow the plan, and how to deal with them.”

Items include:

- Plan implemented: “All parts of the plan created at the last meeting were carried out.”
- Address child’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of the child.”
- Address family’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of other family members.”
- Clear what need to do: “It is clear what each person is to do to carry out the current plan.”
- Family issues addressed: “The issues most important to the family were addressed.”
- Crisis plan: “We have a good plan for what to do if a crisis occurs.”

Changes in Plan

- Provide individual team data
  - Balance between stability and timeliness
  - Compare last team meeting with prior 3
  - Compare past 3 with system-level averages
- Provide copies to Care Coordinator to bring back to team
  - To help team improve, gain greater ownership of team process
Challenges | Responses
--- | ---
- Consistency of data collection | - Provide more consistent feedback to supervisors
- Lack of timely submission of data | - Encouragement/report of submissions
- Generating graphs | - Need greater automation
- Use by care coordinators | - Modeling, training, "instruction sheet"
- Use by teams | - Train parents

Signs of Progress

- Team members asking for graphs
- Supervisors discussing usefulness
- Variation of measure used by agencies for non-SOC youth

Next Steps

- Compare ratings with observations
- Examine degree to which team ratings predict child and family outcomes
- Examine ratings as a function of team participants/team stability
- Examine impact of team use of data
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James R. Cook, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor of Psychology  
UNC Charlotte  
9201 University City Blvd  
Charlotte, NC 28223  
Fax: 704-687-3096  
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Kimm Campbell
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Assessing Wraparound Fidelity

Common methods:
- Surveys re: service delivery/planning
  - e.g., Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI) (Suter et al.)
- Observation of team meetings
  - e.g., Wraparound Observation Form (Nordress & Epstein)
- Surveys of team participants
  - e.g., Participant Rating Form (Cook et al.)

Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI)

- Interview with Caregiver/Care Coordinator/Youth
- 11 dimensions
- 6-month time intervals
- Reports on 30 days of services/planning efforts

Wraparound Observation Form

- Trained observers attend team meetings
- Rate on multiple dimensions
- Training needed and time intensive
- “Real time” reporting
- Primarily based on what happens at team meeting

Participant Rating Form (PRF)

- All team members rate CFT functioning and practices
- Short and simple
- “Near time” rating
- Focuses on what happens at team meeting
- Multiple dimensions
- Different forms for different types of participants:
  - Caregiver/Parent
  - Youth
  - Facilitator
  - Informal Support
  - Service Provider

Using the PRF

Initial Plan:
- Collect PRF data at end of each CFT meeting
- After sufficient data collected:
  - Report ratings of system, agencies
  - Use data to improve
    - Community training efforts
    - Agency supervision
    - Team functioning
Data Provided

- Graphs show
  - 19 ‘common’ items, i.e., those rated by all team members
  - Changes over time
  - Comparisons across groups

Items include:

- Convenient time: “The meeting was at a convenient time for me.”
- Convenient location: “The meeting was at a convenient location for me.”
- People present: “Everyone who needed to be at the meeting was present.”
- Team understands: “Everyone at the meeting seemed to understand the child and family.”
- Agencies helped: “People from agencies were able to make decisions and help.”
- Sensitive to culture: “Participants were sensitive to the family’s faith, culture and background.”

Items include:

- Listened to family: “Everyone at the meeting listened to the family’s concerns and ideas.”
- Worked as team: “Participants worked together as a team.”
- Strengths focused: “The team focused on the child’s strengths.”
- Reviewed plan: “We reviewed and followed up on the past plan.”
- Family needs discussed: “We talked about the needs of everyone in the family.”
- Child stay home: “The team is working to help the child stay (return to) home.”
- Barriers to plan: “We discussed things that may make it hard to follow the plan, and how to deal with them.”

Items include:

- Plan implemented: “All parts of the plan created at the last meeting were carried out.”
- Address child’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of the child.”
- Address family’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of other family members.”
- Clear what need to do: “It is clear what each person is to do to carry out the current plan.”
- Family issues addressed: “The issues most important to the family were addressed.”
- Crisis plan: “We have a good plan for what to do if a crisis occurs.”

Changes in Plan

- Provide individual team data
  - Balance between stability and timeliness
  - Compare last team meeting with prior 3
  - Compare past 3 with system-level averages
- Provide copies to Care Coordinator to bring back to team
  - To help team improve, gain greater ownership of team process
20th Annual RTC Conference  
Presented in Tampa, March 2007

**Challenges**  
- Consistency of data collection  
- Lack of timely submission of data  
- Generating graphs  
- Use by care coordinators  
- Use by teams

**Responses**  
- Provide more consistent feedback to supervisors  
- Encouragement/report of submissions  
- Need greater automation  
- Modeling, training, “instruction sheet”  
- Train parents

**Signs of Progress**  
- Team members asking for graphs  
- Supervisors discussing usefulness  
- Variation of measure used by agencies for non-SOC youth

**Next Steps**  
- Compare ratings with observations  
- Examine degree to which team ratings predict child and family outcomes  
- Examine ratings as a function of team participants/team stability  
- Examine impact of team use of data

**Contact us**  
James R. Cook, Ph.D.  
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Assessing Wraparound Fidelity

Common methods:
- Surveys re: service delivery/planning
  - e.g., Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI) (Suter et al.)
- Observation of team meetings
  - e.g., Wraparound Observation Form (Nordress & Epstein)
- Surveys of team participants
  - e.g., Participant Rating Form (Cook et al.)

Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI)
- Interview with Caregiver/Care Coordinator/Youth
- 11 dimensions
- 6-month time intervals
- Reports on 30 days of services/planning efforts

Wraparound Observation Form
- Trained observers attend team meetings
- Rate on multiple dimensions
- Training needed and time intensive
- “Real time” reporting
- Primarily based on what happens at team meeting

Participant Rating Form (PRF)
- All team members rate CFT functioning and practices
- Short and simple
- “Near time” rating
- Focuses on what happens at team meeting
- Multiple dimensions
- Different forms for different types of participants:
  - Caregiver/Parent
  - Youth
  - Facilitator
  - Informal Support
  - Service Provider

Using the PRF

Initial Plan:
- Collect PRF data at end of each CFT meeting
- After sufficient data collected:
  - Report ratings of system, agencies
  - Use data to improve
    - Community training efforts
    - Agency supervision
    - Team functioning
Data Provided

- Graphs show
  - 19 'common' items, i.e., those rated by all team members
  - Changes over time
  - Comparisons across groups

Items include:

- Convenient time: "The meeting was at a convenient time for me."
- Convenient location: "The meeting was at a convenient location for me."
- People present: "Everyone who needed to be at the meeting was present."
- Team understands: "Everyone at the meeting seemed to understand the child and family."
- Agencies helped: "People from agencies were able to make decisions and help."
- Sensitive to culture: "Participants were sensitive to the family’s faith, culture and background."

Items include:

- Listened to family: "Everyone at the meeting listened to the family’s concerns and ideas."
- Worked as team: "Participants worked together as a team."
- Strengths focused: "The team focused on the child’s strengths."
- Reviewed plan: "We reviewed and followed up on the past plan."
- Family needs discussed: "We talked about the needs of everyone in the family."
- Child stay home: "The team is working to help the child stay (return to) home."
- Barriers to plan: "We discussed things that may make it hard to follow the plan, and how to deal with them."

Items include:

- Plan implemented: "All parts of the plan created at the last meeting were carried out."
- Address child’s needs: "The current plan addresses the needs of the child."
- Address family’s needs: "The current plan addresses the needs of other family members."
- Clear what need to do: "It is clear what each person is to do to carry out the current plan."
- Family issues addressed: "The issues most important to the family were addressed."
- Crisis plan: "We have a good plan for what to do if a crisis occurs."

Changes in Plan

- Provide individual team data
  - Balance between stability and timeliness
  - Compare last team meeting with prior 3
  - Compare past 3 with system-level averages
- Provide copies to Care Coordinator to bring back to team
  - To help team improve, gain greater ownership of team process
Challenges | Responses
---|---
Consistency of data collection | Provide more consistent feedback to supervisors
Lack of timely submission of data | Encouragement/report of submissions
Generating graphs | Need greater automation
Use by care coordinators | Modeling, training, “instruction sheet”
Use by teams | Train parents

Signs of Progress

- Team members asking for graphs
- Supervisors discussing usefulness
- Variation of measure used by agencies for non-SOC youth

Next Steps

- Compare ratings with observations
- Examine degree to which team ratings predict child and family outcomes
- Examine ratings as a function of team participants/team stability
- Examine impact of team use of data
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- **Assessing Wraparound Fidelity**
  - Common methods:
    - Surveys re: service delivery/planning  
      - e.g., Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI) (Suter et al.)
    - Observation of team meetings  
      - e.g., Wraparound Observation Form (Nordress & Epstein)
    - Surveys of team participants  
      - e.g., Participant Rating Form (Cook et al.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Interview with Caregiver/Care Coordinator/Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 11 dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 6-month time intervals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reports on 30 days of services/planning efforts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Wraparound Observation Form</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Trained observers attend team meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rate on multiple dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Training needed and time intensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Real time” reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Primarily based on what happens at team meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Participant Rating Form (PRF)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• All team members rate CFT functioning and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Short and simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “Near time” rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focuses on what happens at team meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multiple dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Different forms for different types of participants:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  - Caregiver/Parent  
  - Youth  
  - Facilitator  
  - Informal Support  
  - Service Provider |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Using the PRF</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial Plan:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collect PRF data at end of each CFT meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• After sufficient data collected:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  - Report ratings of system, agencies |
  - Use data to improve |
  - Community training efforts |
  - Agency supervision |
  - Team functioning |
Data Provided

- Graphs show
  - 19 ‘common’ items, i.e., those rated by all team members
  - Changes over time
  - Comparisons across groups

Items include:

- Convenient time: “The meeting was at a convenient time for me.”
- Convenient location: “The meeting was at a convenient location for me.”
- People present: “Everyone who needed to be at the meeting was present.”
- Team understands: “Everyone at the meeting seemed to understand the child and family.”
- Agencies helped: “People from agencies were able to make decisions and help.”
- Sensitive to culture: “Participants were sensitive to the family’s faith, culture and background.”

Items include:

- Listened to family: “Everyone at the meeting listened to the family’s concerns and ideas.”
- Worked as team: “Participants worked together as a team.”
- Strengths focused: “The team focused on the child’s strengths.”
- Reviewed plan: “We reviewed and followed up on the past plan.”
- Family needs discussed: “We talked about the needs of everyone in the family.”
- Child stay home: “The team is working to help the child stay (return to) home.”
- Barriers to plan: “We discussed things that may make it hard to follow the plan, and how to deal with them.”

Items include:

- Plan implemented: “All parts of the plan created at the last meeting were carried out.”
- Address child’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of the child.”
- Address family’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of other family members.”
- Clear what need to do: “It is clear what each person is to do to carry out the current plan.”
- Family issues addressed: “The issues most important to the family were addressed.”
- Crisis plan: “We have a good plan for what to do if a crisis occurs.”

Changes in Plan

- Provide individual team data
  - Balance between stability and timeliness
  - Compare last team meeting with prior 3
  - Compare past 3 with system-level averages
- Provide copies to Care Coordinator to bring back to team
  - To help team improve, gain greater ownership of team process
Challenges | Responses | Signs of Progress
---|---|---
- Consistency of data collection | - Provide more consistent feedback to supervisors | - Team members asking for graphs
- Lack of timely submission of data | - Encouragement/ report of submissions | - Supervisors discussing usefulness
- Generating graphs | - Need greater automation | - Variation of measure used by agencies for non-SOC youth
- Use by care coordinators | - Modeling, training, “instruction sheet” | -
- Use by teams | - Train parents | -

Next Steps
- Compare ratings with observations
- Examine degree to which team ratings predict child and family outcomes
- Examine ratings as a function of team participants/team stability
- Examine impact of team use of data
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Assessing Wraparound Fidelity

Common methods:
- Surveys re: service delivery/planning
  - e.g., Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI) (Suter et al.)
- Observation of team meetings
  - e.g., Wraparound Observation Form (Nordress & Epstein)
- Surveys of team participants
  - e.g., Participant Rating Form (Cook et al.)

Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI)

- Interview with Caregiver/Care Coordinator/Youth
- 11 dimensions
- 6-month time intervals
- Reports on 30 days of services/planning efforts

Wraparound Observation Form

- Trained observers attend team meetings
- Rate on multiple dimensions
- Training needed and time intensive
- “Real time” reporting
- Primarily based on what happens at team meeting

Participant Rating Form (PRF)

- All team members rate CFT functioning and practices
- Short and simple
- “Near time” rating
- Focuses on what happens at team meeting
- Multiple dimensions
- Different forms for different types of participants:
  - Caregiver/Parent
  - Youth
  - Facilitator
  - Informal Support
  - Service Provider

Using the PRF

Initial Plan:
- Collect PRF data at end of each CFT meeting
- After sufficient data collected:
  - Report ratings of system, agencies
  - Use data to improve
    - Community training efforts
    - Agency supervision
    - Team functioning
### Data Provided

- Graphs show
  - 19 'common' items, i.e., those rated by all team members
  - Changes over time
  - Comparisons across groups

### Items include:

- **Convenient time**: "The meeting was at a convenient time for me."
- **Convenient location**: "The meeting was at a convenient location for me."
- **People present**: "Everyone who needed to be at the meeting was present."
- **Team understands**: "Everyone at the meeting seemed to understand the child and family."
- **Agencies helped**: "People from agencies were able to make decisions and help."
- **Sensitive to culture**: "Participants were sensitive to the family’s faith, culture and background."

### Items include:

- **Listened to family**: "Everyone at the meeting listened to the family’s concerns and ideas."
- **Worked as team**: "Participants worked together as a team."
- **Strengths focused**: "The team focused on the child’s strengths."
- **Reviewed plan**: "We reviewed and followed up on the past plan."
- **Family needs discussed**: "We talked about the needs of everyone in the family."
- **Child stay home**: "The team is working to help the child stay (return to) home."
- **Barriers to plan**: "We discussed things that may make it hard to follow the plan, and how to deal with them."

### Items include:

- **Plan implemented**: "All parts of the plan created at the last meeting were carried out."
- **Address child’s needs**: "The current plan addresses the needs of the child."
- **Address family’s needs**: "The current plan addresses the needs of other family members."
- **Clear what need to do**: "It is clear what each person is to do to carry out the current plan."
- **Family issues addressed**: "The issues most important to the family were addressed."
- **Crisis plan**: "We have a good plan for what to do if a crisis occurs."

### Changes in Plan

- **Provide individual team data**
  - Balance between stability and timeliness
  - Compare last team meeting with prior 3
  - Compare past 3 with system-level averages
- **Provide copies to Care Coordinator to bring back to team**
  - To help team improve, gain greater ownership of team process
Challenges  Responses

• Consistency of data collection  • Provide more consistent feedback to supervisors
• Lack of timely submission of data  • Encouragement/report of submissions
• Generating graphs  • Need greater automation
• Use by care coordinators  • Modeling, training, “instruction sheet”
• Use by teams  • Train parents

Signs of Progress

• Team members asking for graphs
• Supervisors discussing usefulness
• Variation of measure used by agencies for non-SOC youth

Next Steps

• Compare ratings with observations
• Examine degree to which team ratings predict child and family outcomes
• Examine ratings as a function of team participants/team stability
• Examine impact of team use of data
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Assessing Wraparound Fidelity

Common methods:
- Surveys re: service delivery/planning
  * e.g., Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI) (Suter et al.)
- Observation of team meetings
  * e.g., Wraparound Observation Form (Nordress & Epstein)
- Surveys of team participants
  * e.g., Participant Rating Form (Cook et al.)

Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI)

- Interview with Caregiver/Care Coordinator/Youth
- 11 dimensions
- 6-month time intervals
- Reports on 30 days of services/planning efforts

Wraparound Observation Form

- Trained observers attend team meetings
- Rate on multiple dimensions
- Training needed and time intensive
- “Real time” reporting
- Primarily based on what happens at team meeting

Participant Rating Form (PRF)

- All team members rate CFT functioning and practices
- Short and simple
- “Near time” rating
- Focuses on what happens at team meeting
- Multiple dimensions
- Different forms for different types of participants:
  * Caregiver/Parent
  * Youth
  * Facilitator
  * Informal Support
  * Service Provider

Using the PRF

Initial Plan:
- Collect PRF data at end of each CFT meeting
- After sufficient data collected:
  * Report ratings of system, agencies
  * Use data to improve
    * Community training efforts
    * Agency supervision
    * Team functioning
Data Provided

- Graphs show
  - 19 ‘common’ items, i.e., those rated by all team members
  - Changes over time
  - Comparisons across groups

Items include:

- Convenient time: “The meeting was at a convenient time for me.”
- Convenient location: “The meeting was at a convenient location for me.”
- People present: “Everyone who needed to be at the meeting was present.”
- Team understands: “Everyone at the meeting seemed to understand the child and family.”
- Agencies helped: “People from agencies were able to make decisions and help.”
- Sensitive to culture: “Participants were sensitive to the family’s faith, culture and background.”

Items include:

- Listened to family: “Everyone at the meeting listened to the family’s concerns and ideas.”
- Worked as team: “Participants worked together as a team.”
- Strengths focused: “The team focused on the child’s strengths.”
- Reviewed plan: “We reviewed and followed up on the past plan.”
- Family needs discussed: “We talked about the needs of everyone in the family.”
- Child stay home: “The team is working to help the child stay (return to) home.”
- Barriers to plan: “We discussed things that may make it hard to follow the plan, and how to deal with them.”

Items include:

- Plan implemented: “All parts of the plan created at the last meeting were carried out.”
- Address child’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of the child.”
- Address family’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of other family members.”
- Clear what need to do: “It is clear what each person is to do to carry out the current plan.”
- Family issues addressed: “The issues most important to the family were addressed.”
- Crisis plan: “We have a good plan for what to do if a crisis occurs.”

Changes in Plan

- Provide individual team data
  - Balance between stability and timeliness
  - Compare last team meeting with prior 3
  - Compare past 3 with system-level averages
- Provide copies to Care Coordinator to bring back to team
  - To help team improve, gain greater ownership of team process
Challenges | Responses
---|---
• Consistency of data collection | • Provide more consistent feedback to supervisors
• Lack of timely submission of data | • Encouragement/report of submissions
• Generating graphs | • Need greater automation
• Use by care coordinators | • Modeling, training, “instruction sheet”
• Use by teams | • Train parents

Signs of Progress

• Team members asking for graphs
• Supervisors discussing usefulness
• Variation of measure used by agencies for non-SOC youth

Next Steps

• Compare ratings with observations
• Examine degree to which team ratings predict child and family outcomes
• Examine ratings as a function of team participants/team stability
• Examine impact of team use of data
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Assessing Wraparound Fidelity

Common methods:
- Surveys re: service delivery/planning
  - e.g., Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI) (Suter et al.)
- Observation of team meetings
  - e.g., Wraparound Observation Form (Nordress & Epstein)
- Surveys of team participants
  - e.g., Participant Rating Form (Cook et al.)

Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI)
- Interview with Caregiver/Care Coordinator/Youth
- 11 dimensions
- 6-month time intervals
- Reports on 30 days of services/planning efforts

Wraparound Observation Form
- Trained observers attend team meetings
- Rate on multiple dimensions
- Training needed and time intensive
- “Real time” reporting
- Primarily based on what happens at team meeting

Participant Rating Form (PRF)
- All team members rate CFT functioning and practices
- Short and simple
- “Near time” rating
- Focuses on what happens at team meeting
- Multiple dimensions
- Different forms for different types of participants:
  - Caregiver/Parent
  - Youth
  - Facilitator
  - Informal Support
  - Service Provider

Using the PRF

Initial Plan:
- Collect PRF data at end of each CFT meeting
- After sufficient data collected:
  - Report ratings of system, agencies
  - Use data to improve
    - Community training efforts
    - Agency supervision
    - Team functioning
Data Provided

- Graphs show
  - 19 ‘common’ items, i.e., those rated by all team members
  - Changes over time
  - Comparisons across groups

Items include:

- Convenient time: “The meeting was at a convenient time for me.”
- Convenient location: “The meeting was at a convenient location for me.”
- People present: “Everyone who needed to be at the meeting was present.”
- Team understands: “Everyone at the meeting seemed to understand the child and family.”
- Agencies helped: “People from agencies were able to make decisions and help.”
- Sensitive to culture: “Participants were sensitive to the family’s faith, culture and background.”

Items include:

- Listened to family: “Everyone at the meeting listened to the family’s concerns and ideas.”
- Worked as team: “Participants worked together as a team.”
- Strengths focused: “The team focused on the child’s strengths.”
- Reviewed plan: “We reviewed and followed up on the past plan.”
- Family needs discussed: “We talked about the needs of everyone in the family.”
- Child stay home: “The team is working to help the child stay (return to) home.”
- Barriers to plan: “We discussed things that may make it hard to follow the plan, and how to deal with them.”

Items include:

- Plan implemented: “All parts of the plan created at the last meeting were carried out.”
- Address child’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of the child.”
- Address family’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of other family members.”
- Clear what need to do: “It is clear what each person is to do to carry out the current plan.”
- Family issues addressed: “The issues most important to the family were addressed.”
- Crisis plan: “We have a good plan for what to do if a crisis occurs.”

Changes in Plan

- Provide individual team data
  - Balance between stability and timeliness
  - Compare last team meeting with prior 3
  - Compare past 3 with system-level averages
- Provide copies to Care Coordinator to bring back to team
  - To help team improve, gain greater ownership of team process
20th Annual RTC Conference  
Presented in Tampa, March 2007

**Challenges**  
- Consistency of data collection  
- Lack of timely submission of data  
- Generating graphs  
- Use by care coordinators  
- Use by teams

**Responses**  
- Provide more consistent feedback to supervisors  
- Encouragement/report of submissions  
- Need greater automation  
- Modeling, training, “instruction sheet”  
- Train parents

**Signs of Progress**  
- Team members asking for graphs  
- Supervisors discussing usefulness  
- Variation of measure used by agencies for non-SOC youth

**Next Steps**  
- Compare ratings with observations  
- Examine degree to which team ratings predict child and family outcomes  
- Examine ratings as a function of team participants/team stability  
- Examine impact of team use of data

**Contact us**  
James R. Cook, Ph.D.  
Ryan P. Kilmer, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor of Psychology  
Psychology Department  
UNC Charlotte  
9201 University City Blvd  
Charlotte, NC 28223  
Fax: 704-687-3096  
704-687-4758  
jcook@email.uncc.edu  
rpkilmer@email.uncc.edu
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Libby Cable, Community Systems Consultant
Project Director, MeckCARES
The Lee Institute
400 Hermitage Road
Charlotte, NC 28207
704-714-4451 (phone)
704-375-4441 (fax)
lcable@leeinstitute.org
www.leeinstitute.org

Kimm Campbell
Clinical Director
MeckCARES SOC
3430 Wheatley Ave.
Charlotte, NC 28205
704-432-0695 (phone)
704-432-4591 (fax)
kcampbell@leeinstitute.org
www.Meckcares.charmeck.gov
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Assessing Wraparound Fidelity

Common methods:
- Surveys re: service delivery/planning
  - e.g., Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI) (Suter et al.)
- Observation of team meetings
  - e.g., Wraparound Observation Form (Nordress & Epstein)
- Surveys of team participants
  - e.g., Participant Rating Form (Cook et al.)

Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI)
- Interview with Caregiver/Care Coordinator/Youth
- 11 dimensions
- 6-month time intervals
- Reports on 30 days of services/planning efforts

Wraparound Observation Form
- Trained observers attend team meetings
- Rate on multiple dimensions
- Training needed and time intensive
- “Real time” reporting
- Primarily based on what happens at team meeting

Participant Rating Form (PRF)
- All team members rate CFT functioning and practices
- Short and simple
- “Near time” rating
- Focuses on what happens at team meeting
- Multiple dimensions
- Different forms for different types of participants:
  - Caregiver/Parent
  - Youth
  - Facilitator
  - Informal Support
  - Service Provider

Using the PRF

Initial Plan:
- Collect PRF data at end of each CFT meeting
- After sufficient data collected:
  - Report ratings of system, agencies
  - Use data to improve
  - Community training efforts
  - Agency supervision
  - Team functioning
### Data Provided

- Graphs show
  - 19 ‘common’ items, i.e., those rated by all team members
  - Changes over time
  - Comparisons across groups

### Items include:

- **Convenient time:** "The meeting was at a convenient time for me."
- **Convenient location:** "The meeting was at a convenient location for me."
- **People present:** “Everyone who needed to be at the meeting was present.”
- **Team understands:** “Everyone at the meeting seemed to understand the child and family.”
- **Agencies helped:** “People from agencies were able to make decisions and help.”
- **Sensitive to culture:** “Participants were sensitive to the family’s faith, culture and background.”

### Items include:

- **Listened to family:** “Everyone at the meeting listened to the family’s concerns and ideas.”
- **Worked as team:** “Participants worked together as a team.”
- **Strengths focused:** “The team focused on the child’s strengths.”
- **Reviewed plan:** “We reviewed and followed up on the past plan.”
- **Family needs discussed:** “We talked about the needs of everyone in the family.”
- **Child stay home:** “The team is working to help the child stay (return to) home.”
- **Barriers to plan:** “We discussed things that may make it hard to follow the plan, and how to deal with them.”

### Items include:

- **Plan implemented:** “All parts of the plan created at the last meeting were carried out.”
- **Address child’s needs:** “The current plan addresses the needs of the child.”
- **Address family’s needs:** “The current plan addresses the needs of other family members.”
- **Clear what need to do:** “It is clear what each person is to do to carry out the current plan.”
- **Family issues addressed:** “The issues most important to the family were addressed.”
- **Crisis plan:** “We have a good plan for what to do if a crisis occurs.”

### Changes in Plan

- **Provide individual team data**
  - Balance between stability and timeliness
  - Compare last team meeting with prior 3
  - Compare past 3 with system-level averages
- **Provide copies to Care Coordinator to bring back to team**
  - To help team improve, gain greater ownership of team process
Challenges | Responses
--- | ---
• Consistency of data collection | • Provide more consistent feedback to supervisors
• Lack of timely submission of data | • Encouragement/report of submissions
• Generating graphs | • Need greater automation
• Use by care coordinators | • Modeling, training, “instruction sheet”
• Use by teams | • Train parents

Signs of Progress

• Team members asking for graphs
• Supervisors discussing usefulness
• Variation of measure used by agencies for non-SOC youth

Next Steps

• Compare ratings with observations
• Examine degree to which team ratings predict child and family outcomes
• Examine ratings as a function of team participants/team stability
• Examine impact of team use of data
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Assessing Wraparound Fidelity

Common methods:
- Surveys re: service delivery/planning
  - e.g., Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI) (Suter et al.)
- Observation of team meetings
  - e.g., Wraparound Observation Form (Nordress & Epstein)
- Surveys of team participants
  - e.g., Participant Rating Form (Cook et al.)

Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI)
- Interview with Caregiver/Care Coordinator/Youth
- 11 dimensions
- 6-month time intervals
- Reports on 30 days of services/planning efforts

Wraparound Observation Form
- Trained observers attend team meetings
- Rate on multiple dimensions
- Training needed and time intensive
- “Real time” reporting
- Primarily based on what happens at team meeting

Participant Rating Form (PRF)
- All team members rate CFT functioning and practices
- Short and simple
- “Near time” rating
- Focuses on what happens at team meeting
- Multiple dimensions
- Different forms for different types of participants:
  - Caregiver/Parent
  - Youth
  - Facilitator
  - Informal Support
  - Service Provider

Using the PRF

Initial Plan:
- Collect PRF data at end of each CFT meeting
- After sufficient data collected:
  - Report ratings of system, agencies
  - Use data to improve
    - Community training efforts
    - Agency supervision
    - Team functioning
Data Provided

• Graphs show
  • 19 'common' items, i.e., those rated by all team members
  • Changes over time
  • Comparisons across groups

Items include:

• Convenient time: "The meeting was at a convenient time for me."
• Convenient location: "The meeting was at a convenient location for me."
• People present: "Everyone who needed to be at the meeting was present."
• Team understands: "Everyone at the meeting seemed to understand the child and family."
• Agencies helped: "People from agencies were able to make decisions and help."
• Sensitive to culture: "Participants were sensitive to the family’s faith, culture and background."

Items include:

• Listened to family: "Everyone at the meeting listened to the family’s concerns and ideas."
• Worked as team: "Participants worked together as a team."
• Strengths focused: "The team focused on the child’s strengths."
• Reviewed plan: "We reviewed and followed up on the past plan."
• Family needs discussed: "We talked about the needs of everyone in the family."
• Child stay home: "The team is working to help the child stay (return to) home."
• Barriers to plan: "We discussed things that may make it hard to follow the plan, and how to deal with them."

Items include:

• Plan implemented: "All parts of the plan created at the last meeting were carried out."
• Address child’s needs: "The current plan addresses the needs of the child."
• Address family’s needs: "The current plan addresses the needs of other family members."
• Clear what need to do: "It is clear what each person is to do to carry out the current plan."
• Family issues addressed: "The issues most important to the family were addressed."
• Crisis plan: "We have a good plan for what to do if a crisis occurs."

Changes in Plan

• Provide individual team data
  • Balance between stability and timeliness
  • Compare last team meeting with prior 3
  • Compare past 3 with system-level averages
• Provide copies to Care Coordinator to bring back to team
  • To help team improve, gain greater ownership of team process
### Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistency of data collection</td>
<td>Provide more consistent feedback to supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of timely submission of data</td>
<td>Encouragement/report of submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generating graphs</td>
<td>Need greater automation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use by care coordinators</td>
<td>Modeling, training, “instruction sheet”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use by teams</td>
<td>Train parents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Signs of Progress

- Team members asking for graphs
- Supervisors discussing usefulness
- Variation of measure used by agencies for non-SOC youth

### Next Steps

- Compare ratings with observations
- Examine degree to which team ratings predict child and family outcomes
- Examine ratings as a function of team participants/team stability
- Examine impact of team use of data
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Assessing Wraparound Fidelity

Common methods:
- Surveys re: service delivery/planning
  - e.g., Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI) (Suter et al.)
- Observation of team meetings
  - e.g., Wraparound Observation Form (Nordress & Epstein)
- Surveys of team participants
  - e.g., Participant Rating Form (Cook et al.)

Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI)
- Interview with Caregiver/Care Coordinator/Youth
- 11 dimensions
- 6-month time intervals
- Reports on 30 days of services/planning efforts

Wraparound Observation Form
- Trained observers attend team meetings
- Rate on multiple dimensions
- Training needed and time intensive
- “Real time” reporting
- Primarily based on what happens at team meeting

Participant Rating Form (PRF)
- All team members rate CFT functioning and practices
- Short and simple
- “Near time” rating
- Focuses on what happens at team meeting
- Multiple dimensions
- Different forms for different types of participants:
  - Caregiver/Parent
  - Youth
  - Facilitator
  - Informal Support
  - Service Provider

Using the PRF

Initial Plan:
- Collect PRF data at end of each CFT meeting
- After sufficient data collected:
  - Report ratings of system, agencies
  - Use data to improve
  - Community training efforts
  - Agency supervision
  - Team functioning
Data Provided

- Graphs show
  - 19 'common' items, i.e., those rated by all team members
  - Changes over time
  - Comparisons across groups

Items include:

- Convenient time: "The meeting was at a convenient time for me."
- Convenient location: "The meeting was at a convenient location for me."
- People present: “Everyone who needed to be at the meeting was present.”
- Team understands: “Everyone at the meeting seemed to understand the child and family.”
- Agencies helped: “People from agencies were able to make decisions and help.”
- Sensitive to culture: “Participants were sensitive to the family’s faith, culture and background.”

Items include:

- Listened to family: “Everyone at the meeting listened to the family’s concerns and ideas.”
- Worked as team: “Participants worked together as a team.”
- Strengths focused: “The team focused on the child’s strengths.”
- Reviewed plan: “We reviewed and followed up on the past plan.”
- Family needs discussed: “We talked about the needs of everyone in the family.”
- Child stay home: “The team is working to help the child stay (return to) home.”
- Barriers to plan: “We discussed things that may make it hard to follow the plan, and how to deal with them.”

Items include:

- Plan implemented: “All parts of the plan created at the last meeting were carried out.”
- Address child’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of the child.”
- Address family’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of other family members.”
- Clear what need to do: “It is clear what each person is to do to carry out the current plan.”
- Family issues addressed: “The issues most important to the family were addressed.”
- Crisis plan: “We have a good plan for what to do if a crisis occurs.”

Changes in Plan

- Provide individual team data
  - Balance between stability and timeliness
  - Compare last team meeting with prior 3
  - Compare past 3 with system-level averages
- Provide copies to Care Coordinator to bring back to team
  - To help team improve, gain greater ownership of team process
Challenges | Responses
--- | ---
Consistency of data collection | Provide more consistent feedback to supervisors
Lack of timely submission of data | Encouragement/ report of submissions
Generating graphs | Need greater automation
Use by care coordinators | Modeling, training, “instruction sheet”
Use by teams | Train parents

Signs of Progress

- Team members asking for graphs
- Supervisors discussing usefulness
- Variation of measure used by agencies for non-SOC youth

Next Steps

- Compare ratings with observations
- Examine degree to which team ratings predict child and family outcomes
- Examine ratings as a function of team participants/team stability
- Examine impact of team use of data
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Assessing Wraparound Fidelity

Common methods:
- Surveys re: service delivery/planning
  * e.g., Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI) (Suter et al.)
- Observation of team meetings
  * e.g., Wraparound Observation Form (Nordress & Epstein)
- Surveys of team participants
  * e.g., Participant Rating Form (Cook et al.)

Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI)

- Interview with Caregiver/Care Coordinator/Youth
- 11 dimensions
- 6-month time intervals
- Reports on 30 days of services/planning efforts

Wraparound Observation Form

- Trained observers attend team meetings
- Rate on multiple dimensions
- Training needed and time intensive
- “Real time” reporting
- Primarily based on what happens at team meeting

Participant Rating Form (PRF)

- All team members rate CFT functioning and practices
- Short and simple
- “Near time” rating
- Focuses on what happens at team meeting
- Multiple dimensions
- Different forms for different types of participants:
  * Caregiver/Parent
  * Youth
  * Facilitator
  * Informal Support
  * Service Provider

Using the PRF

Initial Plan:
- Collect PRF data at end of each CFT meeting
- After sufficient data collected:
  * Report ratings of system, agencies
  * Use data to improve
    * Community training efforts
    * Agency supervision
    * Team functioning
## Data Provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Graphs show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 19 ‘common’ items, i.e., those rated by all team members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Changes over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Comparisons across groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Items include:

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Convenient time: &quot;The meeting was at a convenient time for me.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Convenient location: &quot;The meeting was at a convenient location for me.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- People present: “Everyone who needed to be at the meeting was present.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Team understands: “Everyone at the meeting seemed to understand the child and family.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Agencies helped: “People from agencies were able to make decisions and help.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sensitive to culture: “Participants were sensitive to the family’s faith, culture and background.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Items include:

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Listened to family: “Everyone at the meeting listened to the family’s concerns and ideas.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Worked as team: “Participants worked together as a team.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strengths focused: “The team focused on the child’s strengths.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reviewed plan: “We reviewed and followed up on the past plan.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Family needs discussed: “We talked about the needs of everyone in the family.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Child stay home: “The team is working to help the child stay (return to) home.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Barriers to plan: “We discussed things that may make it hard to follow the plan, and how to deal with them.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Items include:

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Plan implemented: “All parts of the plan created at the last meeting were carried out.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Address child’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of the child.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Address family’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of other family members.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clear what need to do: “It is clear what each person is to do to carry out the current plan.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Family issues addressed: “The issues most important to the family were addressed.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Crisis plan: “We have a good plan for what to do if a crisis occurs.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Changes in Plan

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Provide individual team data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Balance between stability and timeliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Compare last team meeting with prior 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Compare past 3 with system-level averages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provide copies to Care Coordinator to bring back to team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To help team improve, gain greater ownership of team process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges  Responses

- Consistency of data collection  - Provide more consistent feedback to supervisors
- Lack of timely submission of data  - Encouragement/report of submissions
- Generating graphs  - Need greater automation
- Use by care coordinators  - Modeling, training, “instruction sheet”
- Use by teams  - Train parents

Signs of Progress

- Team members asking for graphs
- Supervisors discussing usefulness
- Variation of measure used by agencies for non-SOC youth

Next Steps

- Compare ratings with observations
- Examine degree to which team ratings predict child and family outcomes
- Examine ratings as a function of team participants/team stability
- Examine impact of team use of data

Contact us

James R. Cook, Ph.D.  Ryan P. Kilmer, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Psychology  Psychology Department
UNC Charlotte  UNC Charlotte
9201 University City Blvd  9201 University City Blvd
Charlotte, NC 28223  Charlotte, NC 28223
Fax: 704-687-3096  Fax: 704-687-3096
704-687-4758  704-687-3689
jcook@email.uncc.edu  rpkilmer@email.uncc.edu
### Contact us

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Position</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libby Cable</td>
<td>Community Systems Consultant Project Director, MeckCARES</td>
<td>The Lee Institute</td>
<td>704-714-4451</td>
<td>704-575-4441</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lcable@leeinstitute.org">lcable@leeinstitute.org</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.leeinstitute.org">www.leeinstitute.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimm Campbell</td>
<td>Clinical Director MeckCARES SOC</td>
<td>3430 Wheatley Ave.</td>
<td>704-432-0695</td>
<td>704-432-4591</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kimm.campbell@mecklenburgcountync.gov">kimm.campbell@mecklenburgcountync.gov</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.Meckcares.charmeck.gov">www.Meckcares.charmeck.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Assessing Wraparound Fidelity

Common methods:
- Surveys re: service delivery/planning
  - e.g., Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI) (Suter et al.)
- Observation of team meetings
  - e.g., Wraparound Observation Form (Nordress & Epstein)
- Surveys of team participants
  - e.g., Participant Rating Form (Cook et al.)

Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI)
- Interview with Caregiver/Care Coordinator/Youth
- 11 dimensions
- 6-month time intervals
- Reports on 30 days of services/planning efforts

Wraparound Observation Form
- Trained observers attend team meetings
- Rate on multiple dimensions
- Training needed and time intensive
- “Real time” reporting
- Primarily based on what happens at team meeting

Participant Rating Form (PRF)
- All team members rate CFT functioning and practices
- Short and simple
- “Near time” rating
- Focuses on what happens at team meeting
- Multiple dimensions
- Different forms for different types of participants:
  - Caregiver/Parent
  - Youth
  - Facilitator
  - Informal Support
  - Service Provider

Using the PRF

Initial Plan:
- Collect PRF data at end of each CFT meeting
- After sufficient data collected:
  - Report ratings of system, agencies
  - Use data to improve
  - Community training efforts
  - Agency supervision
  - Team functioning
**Data Provided**

- Graphs show
  - 19 ‘common’ items, i.e., those rated by all team members
  - Changes over time
  - Comparisons across groups

**Items include:**

- Convenient time: “The meeting was at a convenient time for me.”
- Convenient location: “The meeting was at a convenient location for me.”
- People present: “Everyone who needed to be at the meeting was present.”
- Team understands: “Everyone at the meeting seemed to understand the child and family.”
- Agencies helped: “People from agencies were able to make decisions and help.”
- Sensitive to culture: “Participants were sensitive to the family’s faith, culture and background.”

### Items include:

- Listened to family: “Everyone at the meeting listened to the family’s concerns and ideas.”
- Worked as team: “Participants worked together as a team.”
- Strengths focused: “The team focused on the child’s strengths.”
- Reviewed plan: “We reviewed and followed up on the past plan.”
- Family needs discussed: “We talked about the needs of everyone in the family.”
- Child stay home: “The team is working to help the child stay (return to) home.”
- Barriers to plan: “We discussed things that may make it hard to follow the plan, and how to deal with them.”

**Items include:**

- Plan implemented: “All parts of the plan created at the last meeting were carried out.”
- Address child’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of the child.”
- Address family’s needs: “The current plan addresses the needs of other family members.”
- Clear what need to do: “It is clear what each person is to do to carry out the current plan.”
- Family issues addressed: “The issues most important to the family were addressed.”
- Crisis plan: “We have a good plan for what to do if a crisis occurs.”

**Changes in Plan**

- Provide individual team data
  - Balance between stability and timeliness
  - Compare last team meeting with prior 3
  - Compare past 3 with system-level averages
- Provide copies to Care Coordinator to bring back to team
  - To help team improve, gain greater ownership of team process
Challenges  Responses

- Consistency of data collection
- Lack of timely submission of data
- Generating graphs
- Use by care coordinators
- Use by teams
- Provide more consistent feedback to supervisors
- Encouragement/report of submissions
- Need greater automation
- Modeling, training, “instruction sheet”
- Train parents

Signs of Progress

- Team members asking for graphs
- Supervisors discussing usefulness
- Variation of measure used by agencies for non-SOC youth

Next Steps

- Compare ratings with observations
- Examine degree to which team ratings predict child and family outcomes
- Examine ratings as a function of team participants/team stability
- Examine impact of team use of data

Contact us

James R. Cook, Ph.D.  Ryan P. Kilmer, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Psychology  Psychology Department
UNC Charlotte  UNC Charlotte
9201 University City Blvd  9201 University City Blvd
Charlotte, NC 28223  Charlotte, NC 28223
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Kimm Campbell  
Clinical Director  
MeckCARES SOC  
3430 Wheatley Ave.  
Charlotte, NC 28205  
704-432-0695 (phone)  
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Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI)
- Interview with Caregiver/Care Coordinator/Youth
- 11 dimensions
- 6-month time intervals
- Reports on 30 days of services/planning efforts

Wraparound Observation Form
- Trained observers attend team meetings
- Rate on multiple dimensions
- Training needed and time intensive
- “Real time” reporting
- Primarily based on what happens at team meeting

Participant Rating Form (PRF)
- All team members rate CFT functioning and practices
- Short and simple
- “Near time” rating
- Focuses on what happens at team meeting
- Multiple dimensions
- Different forms for different types of participants:
  - Caregiver/Parent
  - Youth
  - Facilitator
  - Informal Support
  - Service Provider

Using the PRF

Initial Plan:
- Collect PRF data at end of each CFT meeting
- After sufficient data collected:
  - Report ratings of system, agencies
  - Use data to improve
    - Community training efforts
    - Agency supervision
    - Team functioning
Data Provided

- Graphs show
  - 19 'common' items, i.e., those rated by all team members
  - Changes over time
  - Comparisons across groups

Items include:

- Convenient time: "The meeting was at a convenient time for me."
- Convenient location: "The meeting was at a convenient location for me."
- People present: "Everyone who needed to be at the meeting was present."
- Team understands: "Everyone at the meeting seemed to understand the child and family."
- Agencies helped: "People from agencies were able to make decisions and help.
- Sensitive to culture: "Participants were sensitive to the family’s faith, culture and background."

Items include:

- Listened to family: "Everyone at the meeting listened to the family’s concerns and ideas."
- Worked as team: "Participants worked together as a team."
- Strengths focused: "The team focused on the child’s strengths."
- Reviewed plan: "We reviewed and followed up on the past plan."
- Family needs discussed: "We talked about the needs of everyone in the family."
- Child stay home: "The team is working to help the child stay (return to) home."
- Barriers to plan: "We discussed things that may make it hard to follow the plan, and how to deal with them."

Items include:

- Plan implemented: "All parts of the plan created at the last meeting were carried out."
- Address child’s needs: "The current plan addresses the needs of the child."
- Address family’s needs: "The current plan addresses the needs of other family members."
- Clear what need to do: "It is clear what each person is to do to carry out the current plan."
- Family issues addressed: "The issues most important to the family were addressed."
- Crisis plan: "We have a good plan for what to do if a crisis occurs."

Changes in Plan

- Provide individual team data
  - Balance between stability and timeliness
  - Compare last team meeting with prior 3
  - Compare past 3 with system-level averages
- Provide copies to Care Coordinator to bring back to team
  - To help team improve, gain greater ownership of team process
Challenges | Responses
---|---
Consistency of data collection | Provide more consistent feedback to supervisors
Lack of timely submission of data | Encouragement/report of submissions
Generating graphs | Need greater automation
Use by care coordinators | Modeling, training, "instruction sheet"
Use by teams | Train parents

Signs of Progress

• Team members asking for graphs
• Supervisors discussing usefulness
• Variation of measure used by agencies for non-SOC youth

Next Steps

• Compare ratings with observations
• Examine degree to which team ratings predict child and family outcomes
• Examine ratings as a function of team participants/team stability
• Examine impact of team use of data
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