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Assessing Support for Wraparound Implementation: Results of the Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory for FAST Forward

In May and June of 2016, FAST Forward used the Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory (CSWI) to assess the extent to which the local service system had developed the capacity to support Wraparound implementation.

This report provides background information on the CSWI, findings from FAST Forward, and a comparison of FAST Forward’s scores on the CSWI to those of a set of comparison communities from across the nation.

Highlights from the findings include the following:

- The final list of potential respondents from FAST Forward included 29 people. Of those, 23 responded, and 6 either declined or did not respond. This represents an overall response rate of 79.3%, which is almost exactly equal to the 80% target for response to the CSWI.

- FAST Forward scored a total of 103.7 on the CSWI. FAST Forward’s total score was significantly above the average total score from the comparison communities.

- It is easier to interpret CSWI scores when thought of as mean scores on items or groups of items. The 103.7 score translates to a grand item mean of 2.48, which is between “midway” and “almost there” on the five-point developmental scale. Thus, FAST Forward can be described as having made substantial overall progress in implementing Wraparound, achieving an overall level of development that is significantly above the average of the comparison communities that used the CSWI.

- The means from the comparison communities show that development in some areas is typically more difficult than in other areas. For example, communities tend to score lower on theme 3, fiscal policies and sustainability, than on the other themes. The pattern of theme scores for FAST Forward mostly followed the pattern for the comparison communities. Like those communities, FAST Forward had its highest score on theme 5, human resource development and support; however, in contrast to the comparison communities, FAST Forward had its lowest score on theme 4, access to needed services and supports. For four of the six themes, FAST Forward’s scores were significantly higher than the scores in the comparison communities.

- Three of the five specific items showing areas of greatest strength for FAST Forward come from theme 6, accountability. These items are
Wraparound quality monitoring (item 6.3, the single area of greatest specific strength), satisfaction monitoring (item 6.6), and addressing barriers (item 6.7). The other two items showing greatest relative strength are caseload sizes (item 5.3) and youth voice (item 1.4).

- All of the top areas of specific relative challenge come from theme 4, access to needed services and supports. The specific area of top challenge was crisis response (item 4.8), followed by program access (item 4.1), service/support availability (item 4.2), and service/support quality (item 4.7). FAST Forward may want to prioritize the general area of access to services and supports, as well as these specific areas, for future attention.
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Background on the CSWI

What is Wraparound and why is it important to measure its implementation context? The Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory (CSWI) is a survey tool that assesses the level of development of a particular community’s system-level support for Wraparound. Wraparound is a team-based planning process intended to provide individualized, coordinated, family-driven care to meet the complex needs of children with severe emotional and behavioral difficulties. The Wraparound team typically includes the child (if he or she is old enough) and family members, people who provide services and supports for the family, and people from the family’s social support network. Team members work together to create, implement, and monitor an individualized plan to meet child and family needs.

The children, youth and families who receive Wraparound are typically involved with two or more child- and family-serving systems, such as mental health, special education, developmental disabilities, child welfare, and juvenile justice. Other organizations and agencies—including provider agencies and community organizations—may also be involved. Both research and experience has shown that successfully implementing the Wraparound process at the team level requires extensive support from and collaboration among these various agencies and organizations. For example, the agencies and organizations need to collaborate to provide access to the services and supports that are included in Wraparound plans, to ensure that personnel are trained for their roles on teams, to allow staff the time and flexibility that is required to carry out team-assigned tasks, and to monitor the quality of Wraparound provided and the outcomes for children and families. Typically, fulfilling these and other necessary functions requires that collaborating agencies and organizations make many changes that involve the reallocation of resources and the creation of new policies. Further, because Wraparound is a collaborative effort that is not “owned” by a single agency, communities usually find it necessary to create some kind of collaborative-level body or governance structure through which stakeholders act collectively to carry out key operations, such as strategic planning, risk management, and oversight.

Building this system-level capacity can be a difficult and confusing process, and the CSWI was designed to help communities. In essence, the CSWI is designed to serve as a kind of map or guide for the process. The CSWI helps communities understand the destination (fully developed system support for Wraparound) and provides data that tells communities how far they are along the path to that destination. Communities can then use this information as an input for strategic planning for sustainable Wraparound implementation. Repeated use of the CSWI—at intervals of 18 months or so—allows communities to objectively assess what they have accomplished, and what yet needs to be done. Data from the
CSWI also allows communities to see how their system-level support for Wraparound compares to that of other communities around the nation.

**How was the CSWI developed?** The CSWI is based on the “Necessary Conditions” for Wraparound that emerged from research by Walker & Koroloff.* The CSWI was further refined through feedback collected from the advisors of the National Wraparound Initiative.†

Research using the CSWI has provided evidence of the measure’s reliability and validity. Within communities, there is typically a fairly high level of agreement about where greatest progress has been made, and where most work remains to be done. Different communities show variation both in the overall level of implementation support (recognized by item means that are high relative to averages in other communities) and in areas of strength and challenge. Moreover, previous studies of system and organizational support for Wraparound implementation have shown that greater levels of such supports are associated with higher Wraparound fidelity scores.‡

**What is the format for the CSWI?** The CSWI survey instrument includes 42 items grouped into six themes:

---

**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.

The CSWI provides an overall score—for all themes combined—as well as a score for each theme and each item. Scores are computed by averaging respondents’ ratings for the appropriate item(s) on the CSWI. Respondents are asked to provide ratings for each item on the assessment; however, if they do not have information to rate a particular item, they are encouraged to provide a “don’t know” response. For each item, respondents are provided with two “anchor” descriptions. One anchor represents the “least developed” system support, and describes what a system looks like when there is no collaborative system support for Wraparound. The other anchor represents “fully developed” system support.

**How is data for the CSWI gathered?** In the first step for the CSWI, a community selects a local coordinator to work with staff from the Wraparound Research and Evaluation Team (WERT). The local coordinator has two main responsibilities for the CSWI. First, he or she works with WERT staff to compile a list of potential respondents for the CSWI. Second, the local coordinator is responsible for working within the community to ensure that respondents do indeed complete the CSWI. The goal is to ensure a good response rate, so that the community can have confidence that the findings from the CSWI are indeed an accurate representation of community perceptions. Communities responding to the CSWI have compiled lists of anywhere between about 25 and 130 respondents. Exactly how many respondents are nominated depends on the size of the community and, to some extent, on how much system-level development has already taken place. Often, as the Wraparound effort matures within a community, the number of people engaged increases initially, and then levels off.

The local coordinator provides the list of potential respondents to WERT staff. WERT staff then create an online version of the CSWI for the community and send an email invitation to each potential respondent on the list. Potential respondents are given about three weeks to complete the CSWI, and they are sent weekly email reminders. People can take the survey, or they can choose to “decline” the survey. People who decline the survey and people who complete the survey do not receive further reminders. Other people from the list are considered “nonresponders” and receive emails and, perhaps, followup calls asking them to respond or decline.
After three weeks, WERT staff and the local coordinator check the response rate. If the response rate is not high enough—75% is considered the minimum acceptable rate—WERT staff and the local coordinator work together to encourage further responses. Usually, this involves making reminder phone calls to nonresponders. Communities are usually able to get response rates near 80%.
Response rate. The final list of potential respondents from FAST Forward included 29 people. Of those, 23 responded, and 6 either declined or did not respond. This represents an overall response rate of 79.3%, which is almost exactly equal to the 80% target for response to the CSWI.

As is typical for communities using the CSWI, the response rate among those employed by the project (85.0%) was higher than the response rate for people who were identified by the local coordinator as not being employed by the project (55.6%); however, this difference was not statistically significant.

Response rates by role in the project were also calculated. Response rates varied dramatically across the categories of respondents, from 0% for family members to 100% for most other roles, except for community partners (33.3%) and higher level administrators (60.0%). The complete lack of response from family members is somewhat troubling, given that family voice and choice at all levels of service provision is the first principle of Wraparound. However, all four of the family partners who were invited to respond to the CSWI did so, so family voice was not entirely missing.

Respondent characteristics. Response rates are calculated from information provided by the local coordinator. Further information about the respondents is gathered during the survey. One question, “How long have you been involved in Wraparound in any role and any project?” is intended to provide information about the overall level of experience with Wraparound that is available to the project. Respondents reported a mean of 4.1 years of experience with Wraparound, which is slightly below the average number of years of experience reported in the comparison communities. Only four respondents reported having four or more years of experience. (See chart on next page.)
In response to the question “Have you or your child ever received intensive services from child- and family-serving agencies? (This is not limited to Wraparound, and includes agencies such as mental health, child welfare, special education, juvenile justice, etc.),” six people (26%) indicated that they had.
When asked about their racial or ethnic background, most of the respondents (n=21) identified themselves as Caucasian, with the remaining two people identifying as Latino/Hispanic.

Respondents were also asked to describe their primary role in FAST Forward. The largest number of respondents described themselves as being administrators from outside of the Wraparound project, or as having “other” roles (five respondents in each of these two categories).
Overall Score and Theme Scores

FAST Forward scored a total of 103.7 on the CSWI. The maximum total score on the CSWI is 168; however, no community has ever achieved anything near this perfect score. FAST Forward’s score on the CSWI can be compared to scores of communities that have used the CSWI in the past seven years. In some of these communities, Wraparound development had just gotten underway, while other communities were well established. Scores in these comparison communities ranged from a low of 62.3 to a high of 116.5. FAST Forward’s total score was significantly above the average total score from the comparison communities.

It is easier to interpret CSWI scores when thought of as mean scores on items or groups of items. The 103.7 score translates to a grand item mean of 2.48, which is between “midway” and “almost there” on the five-point developmental scale. Thus, FAST Forward can be described as having made substantial overall progress in implementing Wraparound, achieving an overall level of development that is significantly above the average of the comparison communities that used the CSWI. (In the following graphs, the bars to the left and right of the points indicating FAST Forward’s scores represent a statistical confidence interval for the score. When the score for FAST Forward lies outside these bars, the difference between that score and the comparison is statistically significant. The length of the bars is influenced by the number of respondents, the response rate, and the extent to which respondents agree in rating the items. In communities with a smaller pool of respondents, a lower response rate, and/or less agreement amongst respondents, the bars will be longer and statistical uncertainty is increased. Statistical confidence is generally higher for groups of items—such as the entire CSWI scale or the six themes—than individual items. Thus the confidence intervals for individual items are larger.)

The means from the comparison communities show that development in some areas is typically more difficult than in other areas. For example, communities tend to score lower on theme 3, fiscal policies and sustainability, than on the other themes. The pattern of theme scores for FAST Forward mostly followed the pattern for the comparison communities. Like those communities, FAST Forward had its highest score on theme 5, human resource development and support; however, in contrast to the comparison communities, FAST Forward had its lowest score on theme 4, access to needed services and supports. (See graph on next page.) For four of the six themes, FAST Forward’s scores were significantly higher than the scores in the comparison communities.

* In 2012, the comparison community scores on the CSWI were updated to include communities that had taken the assessment during the previous four years. Because there has been an upward trend in the CSWI scores over time—presumably reflecting greater understanding about implementation—the comparison scores are a bit higher than previously. For example, the mean total for the CSWI has risen from 79.4 to 86.8.
The next sections of this report discuss the themes one by one. This discussion provides more detail on exactly where FAST Forward’s strengths and challenges lie. Even within themes where FAST Forward has a relative strength, there may be items that point to specific challenges, and the opposite may be true even where a theme score represents an area of relative challenge.
Theme 1: Community Partnership

Collective community ownership of and responsibility for Wraparound is built through collaborations among key stakeholder groups.

For this theme as a whole, FAST Forward’s score was not significantly higher than the comparison communities’ average score. Closer inspection reveals some variation among the seven individual items within the theme. Two of FAST Forward’s scores for individual items were significantly higher than the comparison scores: family voice (item 1.3) and youth voice (item 1.4). For the remaining five items, FAST Forward’s scores were roughly on par with (i.e., not significantly different from) the comparison scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FAST Forward</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1: Community Team</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2: Empowered Community Team</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3: Family Voice</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4: Youth Voice</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5: Agency Support</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6: Community Stakeholders</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7: Community Representativeness</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Theme 1 Item Means Detail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FAST Forward</th>
<th>Comparison Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1 Community team</strong></td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a formal collaborative structure (e.g., a “community team”) for joint planning and decision-making through which community partners take collective responsibility for development and implementation of Wraparound.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2 Empowered community team</strong></td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community team includes leaders who are empowered to make decisions and commit resources on behalf of their organization to support the development and implementation of Wraparound.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.3 Family voice</strong></td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families are influential members of the community team and other decision-making entities, and they take active roles in Wraparound program planning, implementation oversight, and evaluation. Families are provided with support and training so that they can participate fully and comfortably in these roles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.4 Youth voice</strong></td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth and young adults are influential members of the community team and other decision-making entities, and they take active roles in Wraparound program planning, implementation oversight, and evaluation. Young people are provided with support and training so that they can participate fully and comfortably in these roles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.5 Agency support</strong></td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community team benefits from active collaboration across child-serving agencies. Relevant public agencies (e.g., mental health, child welfare, schools, and courts) and major private provider organizations all participate actively and “buy in” to the Wraparound effort.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.6 Community stakeholders</strong></td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community team includes leaders from the business, service, faith and other sectors, who partner in system design, implementation oversight, and evaluation and provide tangible resources (including human resources such as volunteers).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.7 Community representativeness</strong></td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The membership of the community team reflects the social, cultural, and economic diversity of the community and the families served by Wraparound.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theme 2: Collaborative Action

Stakeholders involved in the Wraparound effort take concrete steps to translate the Wraparound philosophy into concrete policies, practices and achievements.

For this theme as a whole, FAST Forward’s mean score was significantly above the comparison communities’ average score. This was also true for seven of the eight individual items within the theme. The exception was item 2.5, partner agency staff preparation. The score for this item was not significantly different from the mean item score in the comparison communities.
## Theme 2 Item Means Detail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FAST Forward</th>
<th>Comparison Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1 Community principles and values</strong></td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key stakeholders in the Wraparound effort have collectively developed and formally ratified statements of mission, principles, and desired outcomes that provide a clear direction for planning, implementation, and joint action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.2 High-level leadership</strong></td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The system has multiple high level leaders (e.g., senior agency administrators, elected officials, and other influential stakeholders) who understand Wraparound and who actively support Wraparound development by forging partnerships among agencies and organizations, changing policies, inspiring individual stakeholders, and creating effective fiscal strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.3 Proactive planning</strong></td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Wraparound effort is guided by a plan for joint action that describes the goals of the Wraparound effort, the strategies that will be used to achieve the goals, and the roles of specific stakeholders in carrying out the strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.4 Joint action steps</strong></td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative and individual agency plans demonstrate specific and tangible collaborative steps (e.g., developing MOUs, contributing resources, revising agency regulations, participating in planning activities) toward achieving joint goals that are central to the Wraparound effort.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.5 Partner agency staff preparation</strong></td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The collaborating agencies take concrete steps to ensure that their staff members are informed about Wraparound values and practice. All staff who participate directly in the Wraparound effort do so in a manner that is in keeping with Wraparound principles, such as collaborative, strengths-based, and respectful of families and youth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.6 Information sharing</strong></td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information is shared efficiently across systems (or is maintained centrally for the Wraparound program) so as to provide the data needed to monitor Wraparound quality, plan implementation, costs, and outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.7 Single plan</strong></td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Wraparound plan is the plan of care that structures and coordinates all partner agencies' work with a given child and family. The format and structure for documenting the plan reinforces relevant Wraparound principles such as strengths-based, family-driven, and individualized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.8 State interface</strong></td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Wraparound effort has an active and productive partnership with state agencies. This partnership has been successful in motivating policy and funding changes that support Wraparound programs and practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

Fiscal policies and sustainability is an area of challenge for most Wraparound projects, and this appeared to be somewhat true for FAST Forward as well. FAST Forward’s score on this theme was lower than its scores on all but one of the other themes; however, the score was still significantly higher than the comparison score. For all but one of the individual items on this theme, FAST Forward’s scores were above the comparison. The exception was item 3.4, fiscal monitoring. For this item, FAST Forward’s score was not significantly different from the comparison score. (The larger confidence intervals for the items on this theme were due to more people responding “don’t know.”)

### Theme 3: Item Means and Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FAST Forward</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1: Fiscal Understanding</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2: Removing Fiscal Barriers</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3: Collective Fiscal Responsibility</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4: Fiscal Monitoring</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5: Fiscal Flexibility</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6: Sustained Funding</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theme 3 Item Means Detail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FAST Forward</th>
<th>Comparison Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.1 Fiscal understanding</strong>&lt;br&gt;Agencies and decision makers have access to accurate information about the types and magnitudes of expenditures from all funding streams (e.g., mental health, special education, juvenile justice, developmental disabilities) for services and supports for <em>all</em> children with serious and complex needs (regardless of whether or not they are actually enrolled in Wraparound)</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.2 Removing fiscal barriers</strong>&lt;br&gt;The community collaborative has a formalized process for identifying and acting to remedy fiscal policies that impede the implementation of the Wraparound program or the fulfillment of Wraparound plans. Important changes to fiscal policies have been made</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.3 Collective fiscal responsibility</strong>&lt;br&gt;Key decision-makers and relevant agencies assume collective fiscal responsibility for children and families participating in Wraparound and do not attempt to shift costs to each other or to entities outside of the Wraparound effort.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4 Fiscal monitoring</strong>&lt;br&gt;There is a formalized mechanism for reviewing the costs of implementing the Wraparound program and Wraparound plans. This information is used to clarify/streamline spending policies and to seek ways to become more efficient at providing high-quality Wraparound.</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.5 Fiscal flexibility</strong>&lt;br&gt;Funds are available to pay for services and supports, and to fully implement strategies included in individual Wraparound plans and safety/crisis plans.</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.6 Sustained funding</strong>&lt;br&gt;There is a clear and feasible plan for sustaining fiscal support for the Wraparound effort over the long term, and this plan is being fully implemented.</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

FAST Forward’s theme score on this theme was its lowest. This score was almost exactly the same as (and not significantly different from) the mean theme score from the comparison communities. There was quite a bit of variation across the scores for the individual items, with two items (item 4.1, program access and item 4.8, crisis response) having scores significantly below the comparisons; and two items (item 4.4, building cultural and linguistic competence and item 4.5, access to peer support) having scores significantly above the comparison. The differences between FAST Forward’s scores and the comparison scores were not significant for the remaining items.
### Theme 4 Item Means Detail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FAST Forward</th>
<th>Comparison Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1 Program access</strong></td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wraparound is adequately available and accessible so that families who can benefit from it are able to participate if they wish.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.2 Service/support availability</strong></td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wraparound teams can readily access (or receive necessary support to create) the services and supports required to fully implement their plans (including services such as respite, in home services, family support, mentoring, etc., that are commonly requested by Wraparound teams).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.3 Building natural and community supports</strong></td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Wraparound effort devotes resources to and is able to develop connections with organizations in the community and individuals in families’ social support networks. Teams, family members, and youths regularly and effectively access these resources to implement individualized strategies contained in Wraparound plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.4 Building cultural and linguistic responsiveness</strong></td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Wraparound effort devotes resources to developing – and is able to develop – services and supports that are culturally and linguistically responsive to the needs and preferences of the families and youth who participate in Wraparound.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.5 Access to peer support</strong></td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All caregivers who participate in Wraparound have access to support offered by peers whose children have had significant involvement with child- and family-serving systems. Peer supporters have clearly defined roles, and the activities of peer supporters are coordinated by and fully integrated within the Wraparound process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.6 Choice</strong></td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children and families have the opportunity to select among service and support options when developing strategies for their Wraparound plans (including options that rely on natural or informal supports rather than formal supports). They are able to choose different providers or strategies if they become dissatisfied.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.7 Service/support quality</strong></td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providers offer high-quality services and supports (e.g., therapies, treatments, in-home services, mentoring) that are &quot;research based&quot; in that they conform to current information about best practices and/or have research or evaluation data demonstrating their effectiveness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.8 Crisis response</strong></td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary support for managing crises and fully implementing teams’ safety/crisis plans is available around the clock. The community’s crisis response is integrated with and supportive of Wraparound crisis and safety plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

FAST Forward’s mean score for this theme was significantly higher than the mean from the comparison communities. This was also true for five of the six individual item scores. The difference between FAST Forward’s score and the comparison score was not significant for agency job expectations, item 5.2.

### Theme 5: Item Means and Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FAST Forward</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1: Wraparound Job Expectations</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2: Agency job Expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3: Caseload Sizes</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4: Professional Development</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5: Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6: Compensation for Wraparound Staff</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Least Developed | Midway | Fully Developed
### Theme 5 Item Means Detail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FAST Forward</th>
<th>Comparison Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.1 Wraparound job expectations</strong></td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The job expectations (duties and requirements from supervisors) of people with primary roles for carrying out Wraparound (e.g., Wraparound facilitators, parent partners) affords them adequate time, flexibility, and resources and encourages them to implement high-fidelity Wraparound.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.2 Agency job expectations</strong></td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The job expectations of people who participate on Wraparound teams (e.g., providers and partner agency staff) affords them adequate time, flexibility, and resources to participate fully in team meetings and to carry out their assigned tasks for implementing Wraparound plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.3 Caseload sizes</strong></td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseload sizes for people with primary roles for carrying out Wraparound (e.g., Wraparound facilitators, parent partners) allow them to consistently and thoroughly complete the activities of the Wraparound process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.4 Professional development</strong></td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with primary roles for carrying out Wraparound (e.g., Wraparound facilitators, parent partners) receive comprehensive training, shadow experienced workers prior to working independently, and receive ongoing coaching that focuses on systematically developing needed skills.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.5 Supervision</strong></td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with primary roles for carrying out Wraparound (e.g., Wraparound facilitators, parent partners) receive regular individual and group supervision, and periodic &quot;in-vivo&quot; (observation) supervision from supervisors who are knowledgeable about Wraparound and proficient in the skills needed to carry out the Wraparound process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.6 Compensation for Wraparound staff</strong></td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation for people with primary roles for carrying out Wraparound (e.g., Wraparound facilitators, parent partners) reflects their value and encourages staff retention and commitment. These people have opportunities for career advancement based on the skills they acquire with Wraparound.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

For the accountability theme, FAST Forward’s overall score was once again significantly above the average theme score from the national comparison. This was also true for all but one of the individual items within the theme. The score for item 6.5, grievance procedure was not significantly different from the comparison score.
# Theme 6 Item Means Detail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FAST Forward</th>
<th>Comparison Sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.1 Outcomes monitoring</strong>&lt;br&gt;There is centralized monitoring of relevant outcomes for children, youth, and families in Wraparound. This information is used as the basis for funding, policy discussions and strategic planning.</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.2 Range of outcomes</strong>&lt;br&gt;The outcomes that are measured include outcomes that are typically important to families and that reflect the values of Wraparound (e.g. child and family assets and strengths, caregiver well-being, family/youth empowerment).</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.3 Wraparound quality</strong>&lt;br&gt;There is ongoing collection and review of data on the quality of Wraparound provided, including live observation, plan review, and feedback from children and families. The methods used to assess quality are grounded in the principles of Wraparound. Data is used as the basis for ongoing quality assurance/improvement.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.4 Plan fulfillment</strong>&lt;br&gt;There is centralized monitoring and analysis of the types of services and supports included in Wraparound plans, whether or not planned services and supports are provided, and whether or not the goals and needs that appear on Wraparound plans are met.</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.5 Grievance procedure</strong>&lt;br&gt;There is a grievance procedure that is easily accessible to families when they believe that they are not receiving appropriate supports and services or are not being treated in a manner consistent with the Wraparound philosophy. Grievances are resolved in a timely manner, and families are in no way penalized for accessing the procedure.</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.6 Satisfaction monitoring</strong>&lt;br&gt;There is an ongoing process to track satisfaction and buy-in among stakeholder groups, including youth and families and representatives of partner agencies and organizations.</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.7 Addressing barriers</strong>&lt;br&gt;There is an ongoing, systematic process for identifying and addressing barriers that prevent Wraparound teams from doing their work and/or fully implementing their plans. Central barriers have been successfully addressed through this process.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Specific Areas of Strength and Challenge**

Comparing FAST Forward’s mean item scores to those of the comparison communities provides an indication of the project’s greatest relative strengths and challenges.

Three of the five specific items showing areas of greatest strength for FAST Forward come from theme 6, *accountability*. These items are *Wraparound quality monitoring* (item 6.3, the single area of greatest specific strength), *satisfaction monitoring* (item 6.6), and *addressing barriers* (item 6.7). The other two items showing greatest relative strength are *caseload sizes* (item 5.3) and *youth voice* (item 1.4).

All of the top areas of specific relative challenge come from theme 4, *access to needed services and supports*. The specific area of top challenge was *crisis response* (item 4.8), followed by *program access* (item 4.1), *service/support availability* (item 4.2), and *service/support quality* (item 4.7). FAST Forward may want to prioritize the general area of access to services and supports, as well as these specific areas, for future attention.
Appendix A: Text of CSWI Items

Item 1.1 - Community Team
There is a formal collaborative structure (e.g., a “community team” or other body) for joint planning and decision making through which community partners take collective responsibility for development and implementation of Wraparound.

Item 1.2 - Empowered Community Team
The community team includes leaders who are empowered to make decisions and commit resources on behalf of their organizations to support the development and implementation of Wraparound.

Item 1.3 - Influential Family Voice
Families are influential members of the community team and other community level decision-making entities, and they take active roles in Wraparound program planning, implementation oversight, and evaluation. Families are provided with support and training so that they can participate fully and comfortably in these roles.

Item 1.4 - Influential Youth Voice
Youth and young adults are influential members of the community team and other community level decision-making entities, and they take active roles in Wraparound program planning, implementation oversight, and evaluation. Young people are provided with support and training so that they can participate fully and comfortably in these roles.

Item 1.5 - Full Agency Support
Relevant public agencies (e.g., mental health, child welfare, schools, courts) and major provider organizations all collaborate with and participate actively and productively on the community team. These agencies and organizations fully "buy in" to the Wraparound effort.

Item 1.6 - Community Stakeholders
The community team includes leaders from the business, service, faith and other sectors, who partner in system design, implementation oversight, and evaluation, and provide tangible resources (including human resources such as volunteers).

Item 1.7 - Community Representativeness
The membership of the community team reflects the social, cultural, and economic diversity of the community and the families served by Wraparound.

Item 2.1 - Community Principles & Values
Key stakeholders in the Wraparound effort have collectively developed and formally ratified statements of mission, principles, and desired outcomes that provide a clear direction for planning, implementation, and joint action.

Item 2.2 - High-Level Leadership
The system has multiple high level leaders (e.g., senior agency administrators, elected officials, and other influential stakeholders) who understand Wraparound and who actively support Wraparound development by forging partnerships among agencies and organizations, changing policies, inspiring individual stakeholders, and creating effective fiscal strategies.

Item 2.3 - Proactive Planning
The Wraparound effort is guided by a plan for joint action that describes the goals of the Wraparound effort, the strategies that will be used to achieve the goals, and the roles of specific stakeholders in carrying out the strategies.
Item 2.4 - Joint Action Steps
Collaborative and individual agency plans demonstrate specific and tangible collaborative steps (e.g., developing MOUs, contributing resources, revising agency regulations, participating in planning activities) toward achieving joint goals that are central to the Wraparound effort.

Item 2.5 - Partner Agency Staff Preparation
The collaborating agencies take concrete steps to ensure that their staff members are informed about Wraparound values and practice. All staff who participate directly in the Wraparound effort do so in a manner that is in keeping with Wraparound principles, such as collaborative, strengths-based, and respectful of families and youth.

Item 2.6 - Information Sharing
Information is shared efficiently across systems (or is maintained centrally for the Wraparound program) so as to provide the data needed to monitor Wraparound quality, plan implementation, costs, and outcomes.

Item 2.7 - Single Plan
The Wraparound plan is the plan of care that structures and coordinates all partner agencies' work with a given child and family. The format and structure for documenting the plan reinforces relevant Wraparound principles such as strengths-based, family-driven, and individualized.

Item 2.8 - State Interface
The Wraparound effort has an active and productive partnership with state agencies. This partnership has been successful in motivating policy and funding changes that support Wraparound programs and practice.

Item 3.1 - Fiscal Understanding
Agencies and decision makers have access to accurate information about the types and magnitudes of expenditures from all funding streams (e.g., mental health, special education, juvenile justice, developmental disabilities) for services and supports for all children with serious and complex needs (regardless of whether or not they are actually enrolled in Wraparound).

Item 3.2 - Removing Fiscal Barriers
The community collaborative has a formalized process for identifying and acting to remedy fiscal policies that impede the implementation of the Wraparound program or the fulfillment of Wraparound plans. Important changes to fiscal policies have been made.

Item 3.3 - Collective Fiscal Responsibility
Key decision-makers and relevant agencies assume collective fiscal responsibility for children and families participating in Wraparound and do not attempt to shift costs to each other or to entities outside of the Wraparound effort.

Item 3.4 - Fiscal Monitoring
There is a formalized mechanism for reviewing the costs of implementing the Wraparound program and Wraparound plans. This information is used to clarify/streamline spending policies and to seek ways to become more efficient at providing high-quality Wraparound.

Item 3.5 - Fiscal Flexibility
Funds are available to pay for services and supports, and funds are flexible, so that teams can fully implement the strategies included in individual Wraparound plans and safety/crisis plans.

Item 3.6 - Sustained Funding
There is a clear and feasible plan for sustaining fiscal support for the Wraparound effort over the long term, and this plan is being fully implemented.
Item 4.1 - Program Access
Wraparound is adequately available and accessible so that all families who can benefit from it are able to participate if they wish.

Item 4.2 - Service/Support Availability
Wraparound teams can readily access (or receive necessary support to create) the services and supports required to fully implement their plans (including services such as respite, in-home services, family support, mentoring, individualized behavior support, etc., that are commonly requested by Wraparound teams).

Item 4.3 - Building Natural & Community Supports
The Wraparound effort devotes resources to developing—and is able to develop—connections with organizations in the community and individuals in families' social support networks. Teams, family members, and youths regularly and effectively access these resources to implement individualized strategies contained in Wraparound plans.

Item 4.4 - Building Cultural and Linguistic Responsiveness
The Wraparound effort devotes resources to developing—and is able to develop—services and supports that are culturally and linguistically responsive to the needs and preferences of the families and youth who participate in Wraparound.

Item 4.5 - Access to Peer Support
All caregivers who participate in Wraparound have access to support offered by peers whose children have had significant involvement with child- and family-serving systems. Peer supporters have clearly defined roles, and the activities of peer supporters are coordinated by and fully integrated within the Wraparound process.

Item 4.6 - Choice
Children and families have the opportunity to select among service and support options when developing strategies for their Wraparound plans (including options that rely on natural or informal supports rather than formal supports). They are able to choose different providers or strategies if they become dissatisfied.

Item 4.7 - Service/Support Quality
Providers offer high-quality services and supports (e.g., therapies, treatments, in-home services, mentoring) that are "research based" in that they conform to current information about best practices and/or have research or evaluation data demonstrating their effectiveness.

Item 4.8 - Crisis Response
Necessary support for managing crises and fully implementing teams' safety/crisis plans is available around the clock. The community's crisis response is integrated with and supportive of Wraparound crisis and safety plans.

Item 5.1 - Wraparound Job Expectations
The job expectations (duties and requirements from supervisors) of people with primary roles for carrying out Wraparound (e.g., Wraparound facilitators, family partners) allow them adequate time, flexibility, and resources to implement high-quality Wraparound.

Item 5.2 - Partner Agency Job Expectations
The job expectations of people who participate on Wraparound teams (e.g., providers and agency staff who are NOT primarily working for agency) allow them adequate time, flexibility, and resources to participate fully in team meetings and to carry out their assigned tasks for implementing Wraparound plans.
Item 5.3 - Caseload Sizes
Caseload sizes for people with primary roles for carrying out Wraparound (e.g., Wraparound facilitators, family partners) allow them to consistently and thoroughly complete the activities of the Wraparound process.

Item 5.4 - Professional Development
People with primary roles for carrying out Wraparound (e.g., Wraparound facilitators, family partners) receive comprehensive training, shadow experienced workers prior to working independently, and receive ongoing coaching that focuses on systematically developing needed skills.

Item 5.5 - Supervision
People with primary roles for carrying out Wraparound (e.g., Wraparound facilitators, parent partners) receive regular individual and group supervision, and periodic live observation from supervisors who are knowledgeable about Wraparound and proficient in the skills needed to carry out the Wraparound process. The supervision process regularly and systematically incorporates objective data about a supervisee’s performance (e.g. data gathered from a review of the supervisee’s plans, satisfaction or fidelity data gathered from families and youth, etc).

Item 5.6 - Compensation for Wraparound Staff
Compensation for people with primary roles for carrying out Wraparound (e.g., Wraparound facilitators, parent partners) reflects their value and encourages staff retention and commitment. These people have opportunities for career advancement based on the skills they acquire with Wraparound.

Item 6.1 - Outcomes
There is centralized monitoring of relevant outcomes for children, youth, and families in Wraparound. This information is regularly reported to all stakeholders in the Wraparound effort, and is used as the basis for funding, policy discussions and strategic planning.

Item 6.2 - Full Range of Outcomes
The outcomes that are measured include outcomes that are typically important to families and that reflect the values of Wraparound (e.g. child and family assets and strengths, caregiver well-being, family/youth empowerment).

Item 6.3 - Wraparound Quality
There is ongoing collection and review of data on the quality of Wraparound provided, including live observation, plan review, and feedback from children and families. The methods used to assess quality are grounded in the principles of Wraparound. Data is used as the basis for ongoing quality assurance/improvement.

Item 6.4 - Plan Fulfillment
There is centralized monitoring and analysis of the types of services and supports included in Wraparound plans, whether or not planned services and supports are provided, and whether or not the goals and needs that appear on Wraparound plans are met.

Item 6.5 - Grievance Procedure
There is a grievance procedure that is easily accessible to families when they believe that they are not receiving appropriate supports and services or are not being treated in a manner consistent with the Wraparound philosophy. Grievances are resolved in a timely manner, and families are in no way penalized for accessing the procedure.

Item 6.6 - Satisfaction Monitoring
There is an ongoing process to track satisfaction and buy-in among stakeholder groups, including youth and families and representatives of partner agencies and organizations.
Item 6.7 - Addressing Barriers

There is an ongoing, systematic process for identifying and addressing barriers that prevent Wraparound teams from doing their work and/or fully implementing their plans. Central barriers have been successfully addressed through this process.
Appendix B: Responses from the Open-Ended Questions

Things that are going best:

- enhanced community agency involvement, higher percentage of being "on the same page", better communication between team members, families feel group support,

- intense focus on developing high quality wraparound training and practice / policy work toward sustainability

- Collaboration among agencies

- The collaboration is strong between state directors, policy makers, family and youth advocates, CLAC trainers and advocates, providers, and trainers.

- There is a growing number of people and providers who are accepting wraparound as the most effective way to serve youth.

- Has been successful with those youth and families that have been able to participate.

- State leadership has been awesome. Shared leadership around planning has been a model for the field. Facilitators are tremendous, we've been lucky. Youth Peer is nascent but working well so far. Wrap curriculum development team has been awesome.

- Partnerships between the administrators, wraparound facilitators and family support partners is immensely strong, and the degree to which they get along and work together both increases immensely the effectiveness of the program as well as provides an excellent example of partnership to the families, youth and other team members on productive and positive partnership.

- Systems supports show an interests in learning more about the WRAP NH process. They want their staff to support families in the process and the family's values. Management and coordinators have dedicated efforts to ongoing education and communication with NH communities to ensure appropriate understanding of the WRAP process, principles/values, and the importance of positive collaboration with these communities.

- I have seen families have hope that never saw a better way for their youth in the community. That team members now see the value of wraparound

- The compassion that supports are showing to families, and the overall wanting to help in the most family driven way possible.

- Having it as an option for families.

- The starting of the process; that is, of actually having a wrap around system.

- the collaboration amongst the community

- the different views they bring to the table and then form ideas with other experienced outlooks

- Youth Peer support being piloted. Commitment from state.
The most positive development of system supports for the wraparound in my community is that my child was able to stay in school where he was told he could not.

**Biggest challenges:**

- scheduling, more families need wraparound than can access, the ban on having families who are involved with an open court case being involved - they do NOT get any level of wraparound from DJJS or DCYF
- scale / accessibility of services/supports / communication with providers / dispersal of practice across the whole state—hard to create local/regional systems with such dispersed practice
- The workforce isn't available and/or trained to provide different types of supports and services to meet the variety of needs with which youth and families present
- Reaching under-represented populations, funding for our treatment providers (mental health and SUD services), and a centralized data collection system
- Limited resources restricts the number of youth served and the services they receive.
- lack of providers, lack of awareness in local community, lack of funds to pay for services, workforce development needs not yet addressed but in process - need better pay for staff as well as funding and understanding of EBP in the field for those making referrals.
- Gossipy nature of a family support person- little to no boundary about what is discussed where and with whom, wonder where the supervision is in this. / / Would like to get to serving more families.
- Funding for further expansion, particularly making wraparound and related services billable under medicaid and private insurance. There are programs/strategies in the works for addressing these needs and to allow for expansion that would serve a far greater portion of the population who could benefit from services, but it still carries the greatest degree of uncertainty in the program currently.
- Some barriers include capacity of available supports within the State of NH (respite, in-home supports, etc) that support more intensive service provided in wraparound and staff turn-around rates at community agencies.
- Interim list, referrals not getting calls in timely matter, not a good choice of purchase services usually only one option, no good respite options still
- The lack of crisis response, respite availability, and time from referral to start time
- It has not been utilized in the community. Many families are unaware of the supports. Criteria that eliminates families from qualifying for supports.
- Switching the thought process/ paradigm to that of wrap. Staffing appropriately for staff with qualifications best matched to wrapo families needs--- when not knowing when or where (location) of the next wrap around referral.
- I cannot say for sure, but in my experience it would be getting supports to buy in and show up
- Too little access
- The most problematic issues facing my community regarding system supports for wraparound is getting the school system to cooperate.
Additional feedback:

- fabulous beginnings to a GREAT program- it's very exciting to have this more formalized in the area...I'm anxious to see how it grows and expands...

- need more flexible funding to pay for EBP and such.

- I was somewhat surprised to see that there is no mention of youth peer support specialists or any type of youth peer in this survey, as I believed it was a critical component of gold-standard, best-practice wraparound to at least have it available as a service. But anyways, in our program it is finally being offered on a pilot basis, and has already seen incredible success and positive impacts. The ability to expand it by hiring and training more youth peer support specialists would be an incredibly valuable next step.

- Management is very supportive to this work being completed effectively. Dedication to sustainability shows that Wraparound is here to stay!

- Thank you looking forward to the future and what we can offer these families in NH!

- There seems to be a lot of money invested in the program with very few youth and families served during a four year period. It was projected to serve 400 youth and has only served about 37. There seems to be a lot of funding dedicated to the program that is not a clinical service that could have been used to look at the absence of psychiatric beds at NHH for youth. Within the past month, 25 youth were waiting in ER's for a bed at NHH.

- excited to be a part of Fast Forwards development! / / Pricing of HBT and ISO level services needs to be reviewed.

- I wish I had access to this when I was younger!

- I love this program and wish it was around years ago.