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The Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory (CSWI)

• The Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory (CSWI) is intended for use as both a research and quality improvement tool to measure how well a local system supports the implementation of high quality wraparound.
• The CSWI is based on the Necessary Conditions for Wraparound described by Walker & Koroloff (2007)*
• Further refined through collaborative work undertaken by the National Wraparound Initiative
• Includes 40 community or system variables that support wraparound implementation.


The Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory

• The 40 items are grouped within 6 themes:
  1. Community partnership
  2. Collaborative action
  3. Fiscal policies and sustainability
  4. Service array
  5. Human resource development, and
  6. Accountability
• Respondents complete the 40 items by rating the development of supports in their community or program on a 5 point scale
  – 0 = "least developed" and 4 = "fully developed"

Pilot Study

• 7 communities in different states, rural, urban and small city with environs
• Stakeholders are identified by a local coordinator and invited by email to complete the CSWI via a link to a web survey version
• Local coordinator builds support for participation
• Emails that bounce are removed from the sample
• Reminders sent until research team and local coordinators decide to close the survey
• Communities provide narrative histories of their wraparound projects

Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Key Informant Response</th>
<th>Employee Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents’ Experience with Wraparound

Employee Response Key Informant Response
**Inter-rater reliability:**
Average measure intraclass correlation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>ICC</th>
<th>n*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*limited to respondents with no missing data

**Measure structure and reliability**

- **Factor analysis:** Principle Axis Factoring, oblique rotation (Promax) yielded 5-factor solution that essentially followed the themes
  - First factor accounted for 56% of variance, then 5%, 4%, 3% and 3%
  - Community mean .692, only item 1.4 (youth voice) < .600
  - Themes 1 and 2 on one factor
  - Themes 3 and 4 on one factor
  - Items 1.4 (youth voice) and 1.3 (family voice) did not hang with theme 1

**Themes are interrelated**

- **Factors intercorrelated**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Correlation Matrix</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One-factor solution with loadings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 11</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CSWI Total Scores
(Maximum possible = 160)

Mean Item Score by Theme:
Seven Sites and All Sites

Internal Reliability:
Themes and Overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire CSWI</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Validity

- Face validity
- Content validity
  - Initial research to tap the domain
  - NWI member input and consensus
- Matching site narratives to level of development
- Matching findings from the CSWI with respondents’ answers to open-ended questions
- Future study in combination with fidelity measures and other data
Piloting the CSWI: A Local Evaluator Perspective
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Objectives
- Project background
- Site’s role in CSWI

Field/ Local Evaluator Perspective on:
- How CSWI data informed System of Care planning and implementation.
- An approach to dissemination.

Project Background
- SAMHSA System of Care (SOC) site: “...a coordinated network of community-based services and supports that are organized to meet the challenges of children and youth with serious mental health needs and their families.”
- Columbia River Wraparound: Oregon, 4 counties- rural and frontier, 5500 square miles.

Site Role in CSWI
- Wanting to strengthen Wraparound component as part of our strategic plan.
- Pilot participation in CSWI study
- 50 personal invites to participate
- Potential respondents were mostly “heavy hitters”
  - Influential, knowledgeable, held key roles in SOC implementation

How CSWI Informed SOC Planning and Implementation

Process of completing CSWI survey
- Educational
- Framework for Self-Assessment
- Catalyst for system change

Many of the useful conversations occurred long before data was released...

How CSWI Informed SOC Planning and Implementation

Data also informative
- Project sustainability- what to do about it?
- Catalyst to launch community wide strategic planning forum
- Data helped buy-in/ increased validity of discussion topics
Local Evaluator Approach to Dissemination: The Details

**Electronic:**
- Disseminated 40 item by item scores to all respondents (long ppt)
- Filtered 2 page written report to community members
  - Summary of results broken by theme
  - 3 lowest and highest rated items

http://www.rri.pdx.edu/columbia_river_wa.php
Monthly Evaluation Reports link in top right corner

**Local Evaluator Approach to Dissemination: The Details**

**Electronic:**
- Filtered out "what matters" within 2 page written report: "The Traffic Light"
  - Traffic Light: The Summary Evaluation Matrix
    - Red: Lack of local sustainability for project
    - Yellow: Partial adherence to philosophy of system of care
    - Green: Being accountable, helping community translate, perceived quality, participation, feedback, empowerment

**Why is she telling me all this?**

**Local Evaluator perspective on utility of data:**
- Boulder uphill
- Resource consuming
- Relationship building is key
- Short, varied formats
- Repeated hits with same data

**One-on-One:**
- Thank you for participation (X 45)
- Follow up - personalized offer to answer questions

**In-Person meeting(s):**
- Service leads/ implementation staff
- Administrative leads
- Family leads