

**BLOOM WRAPAROUND COMPARISON STUDY
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**Prepared By
Denise Wintenberger McHugh, JD
Center for Systems Integration**

**For
Colorado Division of Mental Health
JFK Partners
Project BLOOM**

INTRODUCTION

The wraparound process is structured to operationalize the core values and guiding principles of a system of care. The purpose of this study was to determine how closely other mandated planning processes also operationalize system of care values and principles across the four Project BLOOM communities. The results from this study will be used to inform Project BLOOM's strategic planning efforts to reduce and/or coordinate the different planning processes when appropriate.

A. Wraparound Process

Wraparound is a comprehensive child-centered/family-focused way of assessing and planning services. It involves a shift away from the traditional service delivery model where service providers are viewed as experts, to seeing families and service providers as partners (Malysiak, 1997). In wraparound, children and families are viewed as the key to solving problems, rather than being viewed as the problem itself (VanDenBerg & Grealish, 1996). The term "wraparound" came from the idea that youth could be best served by "wrapping" individualized services and supports around them in their homes and communities.

In wraparound, families identify the areas of their life that they would like to address, such as school, recreation, home, health, employment or other life domains. Families also choose the members of their wraparound team. These teams generally consist of the four to eight people who know the child and family best. They include both informal supports, such as neighbors, friends or relatives, and professionals from agencies involved with the family, such as schools, mental health or child welfare. Ideally, wraparound teams have less than fifty percent professionals on them. The reason for this is that professionals will come and go in a family's life whereas informal supports will generally stay with the family.

Together with their team, families develop their wraparound plans. These plans set forth a unique set of community services and natural supports that are individualized for each child and family based on their culture, strengths and needs (Burns & Goldman, 1999). The wraparound team meets periodically to develop, review and adjust the plan as needed.

B. Study Methodology

The Project BLOOM communities utilize several different planning processes to provide services and supports to young children and their families. The planning processes that were studied are as follows:

- Part C Individualized Family Services Plan (IFSP)
- Family Support Planning Process
- Part B Individualized Education Plan (IEP)
- Head Start/Early Head Start
- Family Group Conferencing (FGC)
- Team Decision Making (TDM)

Generally, two people were interviewed per plan per community. In some cases, however, only one person could be interviewed. Also, the Head Start planning process was not studied or included in the final report in Aurora and Mesa County. In Fremont County, neither the TDM nor the FGC were studied.

In order to compare these different planning processes to the wraparound process, the following eleven different elements were analyzed.

- Element 1: Caregiver Voice and Choice
- Element 2: Child and Family Team
- Element 3: Community-Based Services and Supports
- Element 6: Strengths-Based Services and Supports
- Element 7: Natural Supports
- Element 8: Continuation of Services and Supports
- Element 9: Collaboration
- Element 10: Flexible Resources and Funding
- Element 11: Outcome-Based Services and Supports

Within each element, several different questions were asked and scored based on the interviewee’s response. The higher the score a planning process received, the more comparable it was found to the high fidelity wraparound process. The scored questions were adapted from the interview guides used by the Wraparound Fidelity Index, commonly known as the “WFI”. Project BLOOM uses the WFI to assess its fidelity to the wraparound model. Following the scored questions, the interviewer asked several open ended questions to learn more about the particular planning process.

C. Aurora

Overall, the IFSP received the highest score of all of the planning processes studied. Therefore, it was found to be the most comparable to wraparound as implemented in Aurora. The planning processes studied are ranked in order from most similar to least similar to wraparound.

- Part C Individualized Family Services Plan
- Family Group Conferencing (FGC)
- Part B Individualized Education Plan (IEP)
- Part B Family Support Plan

The chart below summarizes the scores that each planning process received.

Wraparound Element	IFSP	FSP	IEP	FGC
Family Voice & Choice	14 points (out of 15)	13 points (out of 15)	7.5 points (out of 15)	8.5 points (out of 15)
Child & Family Team	24 points (out of 27)	9.5 points (out of 27)	19.5 points (out of 27)	23 points (out of 27)
Community-Based Services & Supports	8 points (out of 9)	6.5 points (out of 9)	5.5 points (out of 9)	7 points (out of 9)
Cultural Competency	4 points (out of 6)	4.5 points (out of 6)	3 points (out of 6)	5.5 points (out of 6)

Individualized Services & Supports	10 points (out of 12)	9 points (out of 12)	7 points (out of 12)	6.5 points (out of 12)
Strengths-Based Services & Supports	9 points (out of 9)	6.5 points (out of 9)	4 points (out of 9)	8 points (out of 9)
Natural Supports	7 points (out of 9)	5 points (out of 9)	3 points (out of 9)	8 points (out of 9)
Continuation of Services & Supports	11 points (out of 12)	8 points (out of 12)	9.5 points (out of 12)	9.5 points (out of 12)
Collaboration	8 points (out of 12)	4 points (out of 12)	5.5 points (out of 12)	6 points (out of 12)
Flexible Resources & Funding	7 points (out of 9)	3 points (out of 9)	4.5 points (out of 9)	8.5 points (out of 9)
Outcome Based Services & Supports	9 points (out of 9)	3 points (out of 9)	6.5 points (out of 9)	4.5 points (out of 9)
Total Number of Points Awarded:	111 points (out of 129)	72 points (out of 129)	75.5 points (out of 129)	95 points (out of 129)

D. El Paso

Unlike the other BLOOM communities, two planning processes received the highest score in El Paso County. These were the IFSP and Head Start/Early Start planning processes. In the other communities, only the IFSP received the highest score. Therefore, these two planning processes were found to be the most comparable to wraparound. The planning processes studied are ranked in order from most similar to least similar to wraparound.

- Part C Individualized Family Services Plan and Head Start/Early Head Start
- Team Decision-Making (TDM)
- Part B Individualized Education Plan (IEP)
- Part B Family Support Plan

The chart below summarizes the scores that each planning process received.

Wraparound Element	IFSP	FSP	IEP	Head Start/Early Head Start	TDM
Family Voice & Choice	14 points (out of 15)	9 points (out of 15)	9.5 points (out of 15)	13 points (out of 15)	10 points (out of 15)
Child & Family Team	21 points (out of 27)	9 points (out of 27)	19 points (out of 27)	23 points (out of 27)	20.5 points (out of 27)
Community-Based Services & Supports	9 points (out of 9)	6 points (out of 9)	5 points (out of 9)	9 points (out of 9)	6 points (out of 9)
Cultural Competency	5 points (out of 6)	3 points (out of 6)	4 points (out of 6)	6 points (out of 6)	5 points (out of 6)
Individualized Services & Supports	10.5 points (out of 12)	7 points (out of 12)	8.5 points (out of 12)	9 points (out of 12)	9 points (out of 12)

Strengths-Based Services & Supports	7 points (out of 9)	7.5 points (out of 9)	7.5 points (out of 9)	7 points (out of 9)	5.5 points (out of 9)
Natural Supports	6.5 points (out of 9)	6 points (out of 9)	3 points (out of 9)	6 points (out of 9)	6.5 points (out of 9)
Continuation of Services & Supports	10.5 points (out of 12)	6.5 points (out of 12)	8.5 points (out of 12)	11 points (out of 12)	9.5 points (out of 12)
Collaboration	7 points (out of 12)	4 points (out of 12)	4.5 points (out of 12)	8 points (out of 12)	7.5 points (out of 12)
Flexible Resources & Funding	8.5 points (out of 9)	3 points (out of 9)	3.5 points (out of 9)	8 points (out of 9)	7 points (out of 9)
Outcome Based Services & Supports	9 points (out of 9)	3 points (out of 9)	6.5 points (out of 9)	8 points (out of 9)	5 points (out of 9)
Total Number of Points Awarded:	108 points (out of 129)	64 points (out of 129)	79.5 points (out of 129)	108 points (out of 129)	91.5 points (out of 129)

E. Fremont County

Overall, the IFSP received the highest score of all of the planning processes studied. Therefore, it was found to be the most comparable to wraparound as implemented in Fremont County. The planning processes studied are ranked in order from most similar to least similar to wraparound.

- Part C Individualized Family Services Plan
- Head Start
- Early Head Start
- Part B Individualized Education Plan (IEP)
- Part B Family Support Plan

The chart below summarizes the scores that each planning process received.

Wraparound Element	IFSP	FSP	IEP	Early Head Start	Head Start
Family Voice & Choice	15 points (out of 15)	12 (out of 15)	13.5 (out of 15)	14 (out of 15)	13.5 (out of 15)
Child & Family Team	24 points (out of 27)	9 (out of 27)	22 (out of 27)	16 (out of 27)	21 (out of 27)
Community-Based Services & Supports	9 points (out of 9)	7 (out of 9)	6 (out of 9)	7.5 (out of 9)	9 (out of 9)
Cultural Competency	6 points (out of 6)	6 (out of 6)	5.5 (out of 6)	5 (out of 6)	6 (out of 6)
Individualized Services & Supports	10.5 points (out of 12)	9 (out of 12)	8.5 (out of 12)	10 (out of 12)	10 (out of 12)
Strengths-Based Services & Supports	9 points (out of 9)	5 (out of 9)	7.5 (out of 9)	7 (out of 9)	8 (out of 9)
Natural Supports	7.5 points (out of 9)	5 (out of 9)	4 (out of 9)	7 (out of 9)	6.5 (out of 9)
Continuation of Services & Supports	10 points (out of 12)	7 (out of 12)	8.5 (out of 12)	9 (out of 12)	10.5 (out of 12)

Collaboration	8.5 points (out of 12)	4 (out of 12)	5.5 (out of 12)	11 (out of 12)	8 (out of 12)
Flexible Resources & Funding	9 points (out of 9)	3 (out of 9)	8 (out of 9)	6 (out of 9)	7 (out of 9)
Outcome Based Services & Supports	9 points (out of 9)	3 (out of 9)	8.5 (out of 9)	5.5 (out of 9)	8 (out of 9)
Total	117.5 points (out of 129)	70 (out of 129)	97.5 (out of 129)	98 (out of 129)	107.5 (out of 129)

F. Mesa County

Overall, the IFSP received the highest score of all of the planning processes studied. Therefore, it was found to be the most comparable to wraparound as implemented in Mesa County. The planning processes studied are ranked in order from most similar to least similar to wraparound.

- Part C Individualized Family Services Plan
- Team Decision-Making (TDM)
- Part B Individualized Education Plan (IEP)
- Part B Family Support Plan

The chart below summarizes the scores that each planning process received.

Wraparound Element	IFSP	FSP	IEP	TDM
Family Voice & Choice	15 points (out of 15)	13 points (out of 15)	12 points (out of 15)	15 points (out of 15)
Child & Family Team	21.5 points (out of 27)	15 points (out of 27)	21 points (out of 27)	21 points (out of 27)
Community-Based Services & Supports	9 points (out of 9)	7.5 points (out of 9)	7 points (out of 9)	8.5 points (out of 9)
Cultural Competency	5.5 points (out of 6)	6 points (out of 6)	5.5 points (out of 6)	5.5 points (out of 6)
Individualized Services & Supports	10 points (out of 12)	7 points (out of 12)	8.5 points (out of 12)	11 points (out of 12)
Strengths-Based Services & Supports	6.5 points (out of 9)	8 points (out of 9)	7 points (out of 9)	6.5 points (out of 9)
Natural Supports	7 points (out of 9)	7 points (out of 9)	4 points (out of 9)	6 points (out of 9)
Continuation of Services & Supports	11 points (out of 12)	8 points (out of 12)	10.5 points (out of 12)	7 points (out of 12)
Collaboration	4 points (out of 12)	4.5 points (out of 12)	5.5 points (out of 12)	9 points (out of 12)
Flexible Resources & Funding	8.5 points (out of 9)	6 points (out of 9)	6 points (out of 9)	7.5 points (out of 9)
Outcome Based Services & Supports	8 points (out of 9)	5 points (out of 9)	5.5 points (out of 9)	6 points (out of 9)
Total Number of Points Awarded:	106 points (out of 129)	87 points (out of 129)	92.5 points (out of 129)	103 points (out of 129)

CONCLUSION

Overall, the IFSP was found to be the most comparable across all four communities to the wraparound process than the other planning processes studied with one exception. In El Paso County, the Head Start/Early Head Start Planning process was found to be equally comparable to wraparound as the IFSP.

Further, it should be noted that if a child and family have both a Part B Individualized Educational Plan (IEP) and a Family Support Plan, the combined planning process might be more comparable to wraparound than children who have only an IEP, provided that the planning processes are integrated. There are certain areas, however, that would not be improved by the integrated process. Additionally, opportunities should be explored as to how the TDM and FGC planning processes could be coordinated with the wraparound process given their shared values and principles.

Regardless of whether a plan can stand on its own or in combination with another planning process, further modification is needed in some key areas in order for these plans to meet high-fidelity wraparound standards. Areas in particular that require modification across most planning process are:

- Frequency of team meetings
- Natural supports on teams
- Crisis or safety plans
- Strengths and culture discovery
- Termination of services and supports
- Caseload standards and typical caseloads