

## Steps to Community Readiness to Implement Wraparound in Oregon

The steps described below outline a general path to readiness for wraparound implementation. As is the case with many facets of wraparound, local context and local realities may dictate that the timing of specific activities varies from one community to the next, and there may even be certain activities that prove unnecessary in certain communities. In general, however, a community should be aware of what the typical expectations and timelines for wraparound readiness are, and have a clear understanding of (and be able to explain) why the community is moving ahead in the manner that it chooses. It is likely that a given community will not entirely complete all of the activities of one phase prior to beginning the next phase. Indeed, some of the activities are likely to continue without final completion for as long as the wraparound project is in place.

In short, the assessment of community readiness should be made based on an overall sense of community progress through the activities of the phases outlined below.

### How the information is organized

Implementation capacities and indicators are listed in the table beginning on page 3. The table has four sections, one for each implementation phase; and within each section are six “rows,” one for each of the six thematic areas. Each section is preceded by notes that respond to some issues that frequently come up within the phase.

### Some key definitions

**1) Implementation phases.** The **phases** described in the table below outline a general path to readiness for—and sustaining of—wraparound implementation. The phases are as follows:

**Phase 1: Funder, Community and Stakeholder Education and Engagement**

**Phase 2: Initial Planning**

**Phase 3: Getting to Implementation**

**Phase 4: Ongoing Implementation**

**2) Thematic areas.** Within each phase, key organizational and system capacities in **six thematic areas** are described. Indicators for the capacities are also provided. The six thematic areas correspond to the six themes of the *Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory* (Walker, Bruns, & Penn, 2008; Walker & Koroloff, 2007). The six themes represent different facets of wraparound implementation:

**Theme 1: Community Partnership.** Collective community ownership of and responsibility for wraparound is built through collaborations among key stakeholder groups.

**Theme 2: Collaborative Action.** Stakeholders involved in the wraparound effort take concrete steps to translate the wraparound philosophy into concrete policies, practices and achievements.

**Theme 3: Fiscal Policies and Sustainability.** The community has developed fiscal strategies to meet the needs of children participating in wraparound and methods to collect & use data on expenditures for wraparound-eligible children.

**Theme 4: Access to Needed Supports & Services.** The community has developed mechanisms for ensuring access to the wraparound process and the services and supports that teams need to fully implement their plans.

**Theme 5: Human Resource Development & Support.** The community supports wraparound and partner agency staff to work in a manner that allows full implementation of the wraparound model.

**Theme 6: Accountability.** The community has implemented mechanisms to monitor wraparound fidelity, service quality, and outcomes, and to assess the quality and development of the overall wraparound effort.

**3) “System level.”** This document assumes that wraparound is being provided through a formalized local collaboration of funders, together with other community stakeholders. The precise membership of the funder and stakeholder groups may vary considerably from community to community. Alternatively, there may be state-level guidance or requirements about specific stakeholders and/or funders—e.g., mental health, juvenile justice, education, child welfare, developmental disabilities, courts—that may or must participate in the collaboration. This formal collaborative structure undertakes activities and builds capacity at the “**system level.**”

**4) Wraparound.** This document assumes that high-quality wraparound will be provided. The clearest articulation of such a model has been made by the National Wraparound Initiative ([www.rtc.pdx.edu/nwi](http://www.rtc.pdx.edu/nwi)), in “Phases and Activities of the Wraparound Process” (Walker, Bruns, et al., 2004)

## Phase 1: Community and Stakeholder Engagement

Activities in the following six themes should be proceeding at the same time. By the end of this phase, the community should have learned enough about what wraparound implementation entails to make a well-informed decision about whether or not to proceed.

Theme	Activity	Possible Support from the State	Possible Indicators
<b>Community Partnerships</b>	<p>Formation of an initial collaborative structure (a precursor to the formal collaborative structure that will guide and oversee wraparound in the community) and initial commitments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants in the collaborative structure have some initial level of understanding of need, target population, etc.</li> <li>• Participants in the collaborative structure make commitment to wraparound/ SoC values and (at least eventually) providing coordinated services through a single plan of care for each child and his or her family</li> <li>• Non-token representation of families, youth, service recipients</li> <li>• Family and youth participants on the collaborative structure should be connected to and supported by the larger family and youth movements through advocacy groups such as OFSN, NAMI, Youth MOVE or others.</li> <li>• Participation of key provider groups</li> <li>• Participation of core state agencies</li> <li>• Participation of people with key expertise/functions: training, finance, evaluation, MIS, practice</li> <li>• Collaborative structure includes leaders and people who can make decisions and</li> </ul>	<p>State may develop clearer policies/guidelines regarding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Which stakeholder groups and/or funder groups must be represented in the collaborative structure.</li> <li>• Representation of families, youth, and/or service recipients on community team and function committees</li> <li>• Expectations for the community collaborative structure regarding representation of people with knowledge relevant to key functions: evaluation, training, MIS, practice</li> <li>• Nature of initial commitments</li> <li>• Relationship between the collaborative structure (or elements/subsets of it) and other governance/policy entities associated with other state initiatives: eg CSCI, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of initial commitment from the key funding agencies</li> <li>• Evidence that participants from key stakeholder groups—family/youth, providers, service recipients—are regular attendees on community level bodies/committees</li> <li>• Evidence that key stakeholders—importantly including key funders—are committed to moving forward together. This evidence might be some sort of formal initial commitments from community team/ governance structure members outlining expectations—expectations differ by role in implementation (Communities might create the content of their own commitments)</li> <li>• The initial commitments include a clear statement affirming the goals of a) family and youth involvement b) cultural competence, and c) the inclusion of community</li> </ul>

	<p>commit resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formation of “function” sub-committees to focus on thematic areas 4-6. Function committees include participation by families/youth and providers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Fiscal issues, compliance</li> <li>○ Access to needed services and supports (formal services, natural supports, peer support, etc.)</li> <li>○ Training and supervision</li> <li>○ Evaluation, accountability</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<p>and natural supports on wraparound plans. The commitment should also reflect the expectation that significant resources will be needed to support the achievement of each these three goals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The initial commitment should reflect reaching out to—and intentions to collaborate with—existing community collaborations serving the same population.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Collaborative Activity</b></p>	<p>Identified members of the community collaborative structure (including leaders and higher level decision makers) receive training so that they understand what they are getting into/aiming for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are realistic expectations for the collaborative effort (including need for resources and what sort of outcomes can be achieved), and how will implementing wraparound meet different stakeholder needs?</li> <li>• That participating in wraparound requires a commitment to share—resources, risk, responsibility—on a pretty deep level</li> <li>• Service level: information on principles, practice, expected outcomes</li> <li>• Implementation/System level: Covers expectations in each of theme areas—main considerations and cautions</li> <li>• “Function’ subcommittees receive intro training for their specific areas</li> </ul>	<p>Consistent training offered statewide to ensure that participants in the collaborative structure understand what they are striving for/what they are getting into, and state requirements/expectations around implementation. (NWI <i>Implementer’s Guide</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Separate trainings for different stakeholder groups</li> <li>• Matching experienced communities as “mentors” for new communities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attendance at trainings by appropriate representatives of different stakeholder groups</li> <li>• Planned meeting schedule and attendees for various “bodies” /committees that make up the community collaborative/governance structure</li> </ul>

	<p>As part of the decision making process, members of the community collaborative access and consider available data regarding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number of children that are likely to be eligible to receive wraparound</li> <li>• The current costs of serving these children</li> </ul> <p>Community collaborative considers options for a formalized, ongoing governance structure.</p>		
<b>Fiscal Policies/ Sustainability</b>	<p>Function subcommittee (or other task group) on fiscal issues receives intro training for its specific areas, such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the models and options for creating a funding stream, creating a fiscal entity (or other structure for managing the money), documenting flows of funds in and out of the project, billing, etc.?</li> <li>• What are the implications of the various models for who assumes risk and responsibility?</li> </ul>	<p>**Training in these function areas is made simpler and more consistent if the state has clearly defined expectations/ requirements in each area (see specifications laid out in phase 2); also if state is clear about where there is flexibility for individual communities. Where this is in place, the state can make things even easier and more consistent by providing access to trainings that cover these topics.</p>	
<b>Access to Needed Services and Supports</b>	<p>Function subcommittee on services/ supports receives intro training for its specific areas, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What populations does wraparound typically focus on, and what special considerations arise for different populations; what are services and supports that wraparound teams typically need, and how does this map onto what's typically available in the community; how do families access wraparound how can communities develop the essential (and usually underdeveloped) capacity to build natural supports and connect with</li> </ul>	<p>See note under Fiscal Policies.</p>	

	community services/supports, etc.		
<b>Human Resources</b>	<p>Function subcommittee on HR development receives intro training for its specific areas, such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the necessary vs. optional aspects of a practice model; what do family-driven, youtho-guided wraparound planning and treatment strategies really look like; what strategies can be used to build local capacity in key roles; what are typical staffing needs/patterns and case load sizes; what are the most important qualifications for key roles and in what ways should the hiring and training processes reflect this, etc.</li> </ul>	As above	
<b>Accountability</b>	<p>Function subcommittee on evaluation/ data/ accountability receives intro training for its specific areas, such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are typical/reliable means for evaluating the quality of wraparound; what other process indicators and outcomes are typically monitored, what are the options for assessing system development to support wraparound, and what are the sources of needed data; how will IT systems accommodate evaluation/QA/accountability data needs; what feedback loops can be used to make data useful to the wraparound effort in an ongoing manner, etc.</li> </ul>	As above	

## Phase 2: Initial Planning

Theme	Activity	Support from the State	Possible Indicators
<b>Community Partnerships</b>	<p>Ongoing commitment and attendance at meetings of bodies that comprise the community collaborative/governance structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participation by leaders who can make decisions and commit resources</li> <li>• Participation by key funders</li> <li>• Participation of families, youth, stakeholders strengthened—eg increased numbers, leadership training, connection to youth/family organizations</li> </ul>	<p>Participation of families and youth is supported when there is an existing state network of family/youth organizations</p> <p>Participation of leaders and funders from public agencies is supported when the state has clear expectations/policies that encourage this.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of continued participation and buy-in by key stakeholder groups.</li> <li>• Evidence of non-token representation of youth and families in the bodies that make up the collaborative structure—e.g., a minimum of three participating on each body/committee</li> <li>• Evidence of ongoing efforts to recruit, orient, and support family and youth</li> <li>• Evidence that family and youth who participate in the bodies/committees of the governance structure have connections to the wider family/youth movements</li> <li>• Evidence that stakeholders and the community at large have the opportunity to become involved in the collaborative, and that they have access to information about decisions and decision making processes</li> <li>• Evidence of collaboration with relevant community committees or policy boards that are focusing on the same population.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Collaborative Activity</b></p>	<p>Creation of initial versions of policies describing the following (and initial plans for the function areas as described below):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who will “staff” the collaborative-level efforts until a formal administrative structure is created and staffed. The early phases of implementation require people to coordinate logistical issues, maintain communication among participants, create and organize documentation, etc.</li> <li>• What the target population will be</li> <li>• What the key expected outcomes are</li> <li>• What the formal community collaborative/governance structure will be</li> <li>• How the collaborative will oversee implementation and monitor implementation quality</li> <li>• Nature of the entity/collaborative that will oversee wraparound practice and manage the money</li> <li>• Specification of who will be legally and financially at risk , and who has the authority to authorize services and expenditures</li> <li>• Hiring policies (e.g. participation of family/youth in hiring for key positions)</li> <li>• Administrative staff and supporting personnel required to staff the entity/ collaboration, job descriptions for key people, basic hiring policies (eg “donated” personnel versus people hired specifically into new jobs), job descriptions/ expectations</li> <li>• How administrative data will be gathered, stored, reported on; IT requirements for</li> </ul>	<p>Specification of target population and expected outcomes</p> <p>TA to assist communities through these aspects and ensure they understand what is required versus what is optional and can be individualized for the community.</p> <p>Training for similar stakeholder groups across communities, and/or other activities to develop ongoing cross-community “communities of practice”</p> <p>Local planning is made simpler and consistent across communities to the extent the state</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides guidelines or requirements for governance structure</li> <li>• Specifies the nature of the entity that oversees wraparound and manages money.</li> <li>• Provides access to IT system(s) that provide capacity for admin data and evaluation/QA</li> </ul> <p>State can develop templates that specify certain parameters and leave others open for communities to individualize,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administrative and supporting staffing requirements for the entity/ collaborative (director, evaluation, IT, etc.), hiring and job expectations/ policies</li> <li>• Template for wraparound planning documentation that supports wraparound philosophy and practice and AND supports mandates, provides data for required reporting, etc.</li> <li>• Required administrative data and</li> </ul>	<p>Initial iterations of key early planning products and documents individualized for each community, such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of the formal collaborative/governance structure and the function(s) of its constituent elements</li> <li>• Description of the entity/ collaboration to oversee wraparound and manage money</li> <li>• Description of staffing to administer the entity/ collaborative</li> <li>• Logic model- includes outcomes</li> <li>• Strategic plan to complete implementation through phase 3. Plan addresses key implementation tasks noted here</li> <li>• MOUs</li> <li>• Training plan for system-wide understanding of wraparound, SoC and practices consistent with these</li> </ul>
--------------------------------------	---	---	---

	<p>this</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training plan for administrative and support staff for the wraparound project/entity</li> <li>• Logic model spelling out connections between activities and outcomes</li> <li>• MOUs outlining formal commitments</li> <li>• Training plan to increase system-wide understanding of wraparound and the system of care philosophy and practices consistent with these</li> <li>• Strategies and priorities for ensuring family/youth participation and cultural competence at all levels of the wraparound effort</li> <li>• How wraparound planning will happen, what the single wraparound plan will look like and how the wraparound plan and associated documentation will meet stakeholders' needs regarding mandates, reporting requirements, evidence of outcomes/ effectiveness, etc.</li> <li>• How confidentiality issues will be handled so that needed information and data can be shared with relevant parties and so that privacy is respected</li> </ul>	<p>necessary IT capacity, systems, reporting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Logic model (includes required outcomes, room for optional outcomes.)</li> <li>• MOUs and guidance on confidentiality agreements and releases</li> <li>• Strategic plan template</li> </ul> <p>State makes available training to increase understanding of wraparound/ SoC systemwide</p>	
<p><b>Fiscal Policies/ Sustainability</b></p>	<p>Develop a plan/ proposal showing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What the funding stream(s)/ sources will be to support the wraparound effort in an ongoing way.</li> <li>• How funds for collaborative activity and wraparound will be managed and who will be accountable</li> <li>• How administrative, support and</li> </ul>	<p>Planning in this area made simpler and more consistent across communities to the extent that the State provides</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guidance or requirements regarding which funding model(s) can be used and what mechanisms for financial reporting and accountability will be needed.</li> <li>• Clarity about which funding streams</li> </ul>	<p>Production of a plan addressing the bullet points in column one of this thematic area</p>

	<p>wraparound key roles will be funded</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How IT/data systems will be acquired and paid for</li> <li>• How efforts to fill service/ support gaps identified in the community inventory (below) will be funded</li> <li>• Who will pay for or provide services/supports not provided directly by the wraparound entity</li> <li>• Who will authorize expenditures for services/supports on wraparound plans and how the necessary information will be documented</li> <li>• Who will authorize program-level expenditures and how that will be documented</li> <li>• How cost information will be collected</li> <li>• How compliance with state, local, federal reporting/billing requirements will be maintained</li> </ul>	<p>can be used for wraparound and how the needed braiding/blending can occur.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specifications for how the funds to support collaborative activity should be managed and who will be accountable</li> <li>• Parameters and specifications for how wraparound-specific roles will be funded (admin, key wrap roles, support functions); eg policies for how funds can or must be blended, braided, pooled, etc.</li> <li>• Access to an IT system that meets data and reporting requirements</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Access to Needed Services and Supports</b></p>	<p>Develop plans/proposals to accomplish the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inventory of existing service array and needs; current access policies, with particular attention to existing partner agency capacity (or lack thereof) to support access to community and natural support</li> <li>• Determination of who's eligible for wraparound</li> <li>• Plan for how children/families involved in wraparound will access services/supports</li> <li>• Plan for how resources will be made available to access individualized/non-</li> </ul>	<p>Work in this area is simplified for communities and made more consistent if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State has clear expectations regarding eligibility, required array, policies on access</li> <li>• Local communities can build on existing State level market assessment and template for local assessment</li> <li>• State can provide/access high quality training on non-traditional services/supports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Service/ support inventory comparing what exists to what is required for wraparound</li> <li>• Local assessment of current situation of eligible children and families</li> <li>• Description of intake procedures</li> <li>• Training plan for this area</li> </ul>

	<p>traditional services and supports or to purchase items needed for wraparound plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment of population of eligible children/families and their current situation vis a vis services and settings</li> <li>• Initial plan for access/intake</li> <li>• Training for function committee and key community team members on need for and development of community and natural supports, culturally responsive services/supports, peer support, choice</li> </ul>		
<b>Human Resources</b>	<p>Develop plans/proposals for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selection of a practice model and purveyor(s) for training</li> <li>• Staffing plan(including caseload sizes) for key wraparound roles: facilitation, peer support/family partner, supervisors for key roles</li> <li>• Job descriptions for key roles, pay scale/ salaries</li> <li>• Proposed hiring process (nature of family and youth involvement)</li> <li>• Training, coaching and supervision plan for key roles</li> <li>• Ensuring practice consistent with wraparound principles, particularly family/youth voice and cultural competence</li> </ul>	<p>State can provide templates/ expectations for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What the practice model will be</li> <li>• Staffing pattern/ plan and necessary roles/ ratios</li> <li>• Job descriptions/ expectations/ salaries</li> <li>• Hiring parameters</li> <li>• Training plan template</li> </ul> <p>State can provide access to training in these areas</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents for each item in this area</li> </ul>
<b>Accountability</b>	<p>Plan is created specifying</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What outcomes will be monitored and what data will be collected to assess outcomes, how it will be collected/ who will collect,</li> </ul>	<p>Planning in this area is simplified and made consistent across communities to the extent that the state provides expectations/ templates for</p>	<p>Evaluation/ accountability plan addressing the bullets in column one for this thematic area</p>

	<p>and how it will be used to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Monitor implementation quality and system development</li> <li>○ Monitor wraparound quality and other process outcomes</li> <li>○ Monitor and review administrative processes</li> <li>○ Monitor outcomes</li> <li>○ Monitor grievances and other system shortcomings</li> <li>○ Monitor the extent to which the wraparound effort is family driven, youth guided, and culturally competent</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● What data sharing agreements will be needed and how they will be implemented to ensure compliance with relevant regulations (HIPAA, FERPA)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● What outcomes will be collected</li> <li>● Who will be responsible for providing/ acquiring needed data, both that which exists in agency systems and that which needs to be acquired specifically for wraparound</li> <li>● How communities can comply with relevant privacy and related regulations</li> <li>● Access to an IT system that can accommodate evaluation and QA needs.</li> </ul> <p>State can also provide some evaluation services independently—eg WFI phone interviews, assessment of implementation quality and system development, audit of wraparound quality, etc.</p>	
--	--	--	--

### Phase 3: Getting to Implementation

Theme	Activity	Support from the State	Possible Indicators
<b>Community Partnerships</b>	<p>Ongoing commitment and attendance at meetings of bodies that comprise the community team/governance structure</p> <p>Outreach to the broader community—business, philanthropy, community organizations</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brief minutes/notes from meetings</li> <li>• Listings of who attends what meetings and their roles</li> <li>• Ongoing participation indicators as listed above for Phase 2</li> </ul>
<b>Collaborative Activity</b>	<p>Stakeholders—individually and as a collectivity—refine and implement plans/proposals and make formal commitments to structures and policies described in phase 2.</p> <p>Stakeholders implement plans to achieve necessary capacity for startup</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community collaborative/governance structure is formalized and policies documented</li> <li>• Entity to provide wraparound is formalized and policies documented</li> <li>• Capacity for gathering, reporting administrative data is achieved; IT needs are satisfied and IT system acquired if necessary</li> <li>• Administrative staff hired and given initial training</li> </ul>	<p>State can support/facilitate this phase of collaborative activity by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Having ongoing statewide social marketing efforts so that local plans can build off of/ mesh with these</li> <li>• Providing access to training for administrative staff</li> <li>• Providing a mechanism for ongoing monitoring of system development (eg CSWI)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of completion of action steps from overall plan and function committee plans</li> <li>• Documentation of training provided as planned in phase 2.</li> </ul>

	<p>Plans developed for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Processes for ongoing monitoring of implementation/system development as well as administrative effectiveness, wraparound quality, etc.</li> <li>Communication/ Social Marketing</li> </ul>		
<b>Fiscal Policies/ Sustainability</b>	<p>Capacity and policies in place as planned in phase 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Entity or collaborative is prepared to accept and dispense funds as necessary and document this as needed for compliance</li> <li>Entity/ collaborative is able to pay for services/supports where necessary</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fulfillment of plans— production of required documentation of policies</li> </ul>
<b>Services and Supports</b>	<p>Plans from phase 2 are implemented sufficiently for startup</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Basic array is in place and accessible for wraparound</li> <li>Resources have can be made flexible to fulfill individualized needs on wraparound plans</li> <li>Intake and access processes and policies are in place</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fulfillment of plans— production of required documentation of policies</li> </ul>
<b>Human Resources</b>	<p>Plans from phase 2 are fulfilled.</p> <p>Staff hired for key positions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Facilitators, parent partners, supervisors</li> <li>Supervisory processes described. Processes</li> </ul>	<p>State facilitates by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Providing access to training required for line staff and supervision</li> <li>Providing processes and support for ongoing supervision</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fulfillment of plans— production of required documentation of policies</li> </ul>

	<p>include direct observation, gathering and review of objective data on job performance (eg WFI, record review, TOM)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initial training provided, plan for ongoing coaching/local capacity development created</li> </ul>		
<b>Accountability</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data systems and IT systems as necessary are in place</li> <li>• Grievance procedure is designed</li> <li>• Procedure for community team oversight of accountability data is documented</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fulfillment of plans—production of required documentation of policies</li> </ul>

## Phase 4: Ongoing Implementation

After a community has moved through the first three phases, it can be considered fully “ready” for wraparound implementation. However, the community should be engaged in an ongoing way in monitoring the quality of implementation and the overall level of community/collaborative support for the wraparound effort. There are various ways to do this. For example, the *Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory* (Walker, Bruns & Penn, 2008), developed by the National Wraparound Initiative, provides a description of expectations for ongoing community/collaborative support for wraparound, as well as a reliable and valid mechanism for measuring the level of implementation support.

### References

- Walker, J. S., Bruns, E. J., & Penn, M. (2008). Individualized services in systems of care: The wraparound process. In B. A. Stroul & G. M. Blau (Eds.), *The system of care handbook: Transforming mental health services for children, youth, and families*. Baltimore, MD: Brookes Publishing.
- Walker, J. S., Bruns, E. J., Rast, J., VanDenBerg, J., D., Osher, T. W., Koroloff, N., et al. (2004). *Phases and activities of the wraparound process*. Portland, OR: National Wraparound Initiative, Research and Training Center on Family Support and Children's Mental Health, Portland State University.
- Walker, J. S., & Koroloff, N. (2007). Grounded theory and backward mapping: Exploring the implementation context for wraparound. *Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research*, 34, 443-458.

This document was prepared by Janet Walker based on the work of the National Wraparound Initiative combined with local input and experience.