



Wraparound Oregon

September 2007



Evaluation Results from the Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI) interviews of youth and caregivers.

Reported by Janet Walker, Ph.D., Portland State University's Regional Research Institute for the Wraparound Oregon evaluation.



Wraparound Oregon

Wraparound Fidelity Index Results

September 2007

Caregiver Wraparound Fidelity Instrument (WFI) is a bit below national mean but about at the median which is really not bad for a site early in implementation. This also may reflect the fact that caregivers in WO may not be brought into the picture at the very beginning of the wraparound process because they haven't yet been identified, for example when youth is returning to community foster placement.



Wraparound Oregon

Wraparound Fidelity Index Results

September 2007

The box plots show medians (the heavy black line inside the "box" part of the box plot) and the upward tilting line shows change in the mean. The box plots are useful because they show how change is meaningful, particularly for kids on the lower end, while kids who start out higher on various measures seem to bump into a ceiling in many cases (this is a problem with measure design though these are established measures).



Wraparound Oregon

Wraparound Fidelity Index Results

September 2007



Also all of the measures have been re-scaled (where necessary) into percentage of the total possible on the scale. (i.e., if someone answered all questions giving best possible ratings they'd get 1.0.) This makes it easier to interpret/compare.



Wraparound Oregon


Wraparound Fidelity Index Results

September 2007



Youth WFI is quite a bit above national comparison. And if you look at all the remaining youth data you will see a good pattern of positive results – particularly nice given these are "toughest" kids. Plus you see results in all the places you'd want to for real wraparound: increased youth participation in planning, increased perceptions of service coordination, empowerment (two subscales), social support, quality of life, etc. As well as reduced moves.

Wraparound Oregon: System Development Feedback November 2006




■ Successes
■ Priorities

1	Community Partnership
1A	Formalized decision making structure
1B	Appropriate participation in the partnership
2	Collaborative Activity
2A	Plan to turn vision into reality
2B	Joint action steps taken
3	Fiscal Tracking and Policies
3A	Access to information about costs
3B	Shared fiscal responsibility
3C	Sufficient, flexible funding
4	Access to Supports and Services
4A	Ready access to supports and services
4B	Developing new supports and services
4C	Adequate crisis response
5	Human Resource Development and Support
5A	Appropriate case loads
5B	Adequate training, coaching, and supervision
6	Accountability
6A	Outcome data
6B	Wraparound quality data
6C	Identifying and addressing grievances and barriers


WFI: Caregiver

Wraparound OR/National Comparison



WFI: Youth

Wraparound OR/National Comparison




	Total	Eng.	Plan.	Impl.	Trans.
WO	77.69	78.33	75.45	84.48	62.75
National	72.11	62.94	72.77	79.86	65.94



Youth Self-Report Data


- ◆ Compares same youth at intake and after 1 year in Wraparound Oregon (or at exit if youth leaves before 1 year)
- ◆ Not a full sample– several youth declined and others don't return calls
- ◆ Difficult to resolve questions about the status of different youth (hiatus/discharged/never engaged)

Youth Participation in Planning: Intake to Year 1




From the YPP: Intake mean: .76 Year 1 mean: .85

Youth Satisfaction w/Services: Intake to Year 1




From the YSS: Intake mean: .82 Year 1 mean: .90

Service Coordination Scale (youth): Intake to Year 1




Intake mean: .78 Year 1 mean: .89

Youth Empowerment- Managing My Condition



Youth Empowerment, Self Subscale:
Intake mean: .67 Year 1 mean: .76


Youth Empowerment- Managing Services



Youth Empowerment, Services Subscale:
Intake mean: .62 Year 1 mean: .74


Youth Life Satisfaction

Intake to Year 1




From the YSS: Intake mean: .73 Year 1 mean: .83

Youth Social Support: Subscales




Adapted from Zimet's Social Support Scale

Youth Social Support




Intake mean: .74 Year 1 mean: .85

Youth Assets: Intake to Year 1 Comparison



Intake mean = .76 Year 1 mean = .89

Youth Strengths: Activities




1 = Never 4 = 3 or more hours/week



Youth: Drug and Alcohol Self Report


- ◆ Only one youth reported alcohol use at intake, by 1 year, this was up to three, but all reported use in the least frequent category (once per week or less) and said they'd never had more than 4 drinks at once
- ◆ Three youth reported drug use at intake, by 1 year this had decreased to two. All reported infrequent use

Youth Global Quality of Life



Intake mean: .64 Year 1 mean: .81

Youth Moves in Last Year (youth report)



Intake mean: 3.75 Year 1 mean: 1.44