

WHO, WHAT, AND WHEN OF WRAPAROUND

Kathy Cox, Ph.D., L.C.S.W.
Dawniel Baker, M.F.T.
EMQ Children and Family Services

Retrospective Study

- ▣ Analyzes data obtained on youth who received wraparound (2004-2007) from EMQ Children & Family Services
- ▣ Focus: Identifying client and service variables associated with positive outcomes

EMQ Children & Family Services

- ▣ Private non-profit organization
- ▣ Provides community based mental health services to youth
- ▣ Serves Santa Clara, San Bernadino, Los Angeles, and Sacramento regions
- ▣ Sacramento County: Wraparound used as a strategy for hastening the transition of youth from residential to home care

Study Sample

- ▣ 176 youth provided wraparound, ranging in age from 7-18 years (mean = 14.6 years)
- ▣ Majority were male (56.7%)
- ▣ Majority were Caucasian (55.6%); sizable proportion African-American (32.6%)
- ▣ Primary diagnosis: Anxiety Disorder (39%); Mood Disorder (29%); Attention Deficit or Disruptive Behavior Disorder (20%); Psychotic Disorder (8%)

Study Sample Continued

- ▣ Majority referred by CPS (67.4%); fewer by Mental Health (27%), Probation (5.6%)
- ▣ High percentage (89%) lived in residential care at program entry
- ▣ Mean number of days youth had been in placement prior to referral = 721

Outcome Measures

- ▣ Goal attainment (had youth met service goals by discharge)
- ▣ Transition to home setting (had youth transitioned from residential program to family living situation by discharge)
- ▣ Improvements in functioning (pre-post CAFAS* scores)

* Child and Adolescent Functional Assessment Scale (Hodges, 1990)

Independent Variables

- **Client Variables:** Age, gender, ethnicity, level of functioning, diagnosis, # of collateral helpers
- **Service Variables:** Days in residential care prior to referral; adherence to elements of wraparound

Wraparound Fidelity Index (3.0)

Sitter, Force, Bruns, Leverentz-Brady & Burchard, 2002

Assesses adherence to elements of:

- Caregiver Voice and Choice
- Youth and Family Team
- Community-Based Services and Supports
- Cultural Competence
- Individualized Services and Supports
- Strengths-Based Services and Supports
- Natural Supports
- Continuation of Services and Supports
- Collaboration
- Flexible Resources and Funding
- Outcome-Based Services

* Administered to Facilitators and Caregivers every 6 months. Most recent scores entered into analysis.

Results: Factors NOT Associated with Outcomes

- Client age
- Gender
- Ethnicity
- Diagnosis
- Length of time in residential care prior to referral

Factors Associated with Positive Outcomes

- 1) **Lower Level of Functional Impairment at Entry**
 - Mean CAFAS score was significantly lower for youth who transitioned to home setting ($t = 2.0$; $df = 134$; $p = .048$)
- 2) **Number of collateral helpers**
 - Youth who met service goals had significantly higher # than those who did not ($t = -3.41$; $df = 108.06$; $p = .001$)
 - Youth who transitioned to home setting had significantly higher # than those who remained in residential care ($t = -2.625$; $df = 116$; $p = .01$)
- 3) **Adherence to elements of wraparound.....**

Relationship Between WFI Scores and Outcomes

- **Caregiver As Respondent:**

Total Fidelity was significantly higher for youth who **met service goals** ($p = .045$) and for those who **transitioned** to home setting ($p = .008$)

Adherence to emphasis on **Strength-Based services** was significantly higher for youth who **transitioned** to home setting ($p = .012$)

WFI & Outcomes Continued

- **Facilitator As Respondent:**

Adherence to element of **Strength-Based services** and **Child/Family Teamwork** was significantly and positively associated with improved **child functioning** ($r = .243$, $p = .046$; $r = .274$, $p = .024$)

Adherence to emphasis on **Community-Based services** was significantly higher for youth who **met service goals** ($p = .001$) and for those who **transitioned** to home setting ($p = .000$)

Relationships Between Outcome Measures and WFI Scores
Adjusted for Tests of Association by Respondent

Adherence Element	Transition to Home			Caregiver		
	Pre-Post CAFAS (N=92)	Goal Attainment (N=111)	Transition Home (N=111)	Pre-Post CAFAS (N=22)	Goal Attainment (N=29)	Transition Home (N=29)
Voice and Choice	r = -.102	r = -.620	r = -.346	r = -.189	r = -1.151	r = .954
Child and Family Team	r = .274*	r = -1.880	r = -.943	r = -.020	r = -.783	r = -1.582
Community Based Services	r = .174	r = -3.470 **	r = -3.708 ***	r = -.287	r = -1.402	r = -1.712
Cultural Competence	r = .047	r = -.393	r = -.613	r = -.147	r = -.263	r = -.445
Individualized Services	r = .056	r = -.147	r = -.832	r = -.087	r = -.897	r = -1.402
Strengths-Based Services	r = -.243*	r = -.702	r = -.845	r = -.267	r = -1.321	r = -2.514*
Natural Supports	r = .019	r = -.094	r = -.192	r = -.056	r = -.774	r = -1.695
Continuation of Care	r = .109	r = -.105	r = -.990	r = -.222	r = -1.198	r = -.458
Collaboration	r = -.085	r = -.568	r = -1.204	r = -.411	r = -1.019	r = -1.345
Flexible Resources	r = .017	r = -.991	r = -1.332	r = -.081	r = -.572	r = -1.141
Outcome Based Services	r = .196	r = -1.390	r = -1.115	r = -.016	r = -.821	r = -.777
Total WFI	r = .162	r = -1.642	r = -1.282	r = -.239	r = -2.802*	r = -2.631**

*p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

Community-Based Services Element of WFI-3

- ☐ Hours spent by youth at community school; working at paying job; in job training
- ☐ To what extent services/supports for family are accessible
- ☐ To what extent team helps youth get involved in community activities
- ☐ Amount of time youth lived in community-based setting

* When last item eliminated from this element score: significantly higher for youth who met goals (p = .015) and youth who transitioned (p = .008).

Binary Logistic Regression

Predictor	% When High	% When Low	Outcome
Community Involvement	73.5	45.8	Transition to Home Setting
Community Involvement	75.6	45.8	Goal Attainment
Collateral Helpers	73.7	44.8	Transition to Home Setting
Collateral Helpers	79.8	38.8	Goal Attainment

Conclusions

- ☐ WFI is a valuable tool for assessing wraparound fidelity
- ☐ Caregiver reports of adherence are important to obtain- appear to have a strong relationship to outcomes
- ☐ Cultivation of collateral helpers may be key in obtaining ultimate outcome
- ☐ Community involvement of youth and families in wraparound is tied to positive outcomes

Implications for Practice

- ☐ Building a system of collateral supports for youth is important in achieving outcomes. Even when not present at team meetings, these helpers should be included in plan.
- ☐ Involving youth in community activities is key in promoting and sustaining transition to home setting.
- ☐ Feedback regarding caregivers view of adherence to wrap process should be given to providers.