



Myers-JDC-Brookdale Institute
Engelberg Center for Children and Youth



Ministry of Social Affairs and Services
Research, Planning and Training Division
Juvenile Probation Service, Division for Adolescents,
Young Adults and Correctional Services



Wraparound Program for Youth in the Care of the Juvenile Probation Service Evaluation Study

Paula Kahan-Strawczynski ♦ Noa Sher ♦ Dganit Levi

The study was initiated by the Research, Planning and Training Division
and conducted in cooperation with the Juvenile Probation Service of
the Division for Adolescents, Young Adults and Correctional Services
at the Ministry of Social Affairs and Services

Wraparound Program for Youth in the Care of the Juvenile Probation Service Evaluation Study

Paula Kahan-Strawczynski

Noa Sher

Dganit Levi

The study was initiated by the Research, Planning and Training Division and conducted in cooperation with the Juvenile Probation Service of the Division for Adolescents, Young Adults and Correctional Services at the Ministry of Social Affairs and Services

Translation to English: Naomi Halstead

Layout and print production: Leslie Klineman

Myers-JDC-Brookdale Institute

Engelberg Center for Children and Youth

P.O.B. 3886

Jerusalem 91037, Israel

Tel: (02) 655-7400

Fax: (02) 561-2391

Website: www.jdc.org.il/brookdale



Related Myers-JDC-Brookdale Institute Publications

Rivkin, D and Somekh, S. 2010. *The Ma'atefet – Wraparound – Program: Evaluation Study*. RR-552-10 (Hebrew).

Rivkin, D and Shmaia-Yadgar, S. 2007. *Evaluation of the KEDEM Program: Family Group Conferences for Youth Offenders*. RR-491-07 (Hebrew).

Kahan-Strawczynski, P. and Levi, D. 2011. *Characteristics and Needs of Minors in the Care of the Juvenile Probation Service*. RR-585-11 (Hebrew).

Kahan-Strawczynski, P.; Yurovich, L.; Konstantinov, V. and Efrati, R. 2005. *Characteristics and Needs of Adolescent Girls in the Care of the Service for Women and Girls of the Ministry of Social Affairs*. RR-465-05 (Hebrew).

To order publications, please contact the Myers-JDC-Brookdale Institute, P.O.B. 3886, Jerusalem, 91037; Tel: (02) 655-7400; Fax: (02) 561-2391; E-mail: brook@jdc.org.il

Reports and English summaries are also available on the Institute website:

www.jdc.org.il/brookdale

Executive Summary

1. Introduction

1a. Background

Wraparound – Ma'atefet – is an intensive intervention program for high-risk adolescent offenders, which is meant to serve as an alternative for out-of-home placements. The goal is for the participants to remain with their families and in the community by "wrapping" them with services provided by a multidisciplinary range of professionals and by others in their natural environment (such as family members). The intervention components are tailored to meet each participant's needs and the goals of the intervention.

The Israeli version of the program is based on the Wraparound model developed in the United States in the 1980s, which resulted from a paradigm shift among professionals working with youth at risk. Conventional wisdom before this shift favored out-of-home frameworks, which were seen as best both to protect youth at risk and to provide them with suitable care for all their needs. The new approach, meanwhile, favors treatment in the family and within a community framework so as to strengthen the adolescents' natural environment and their connection with the community.

The Wraparound approach emphasizes the need for the adolescents and their families to actively participate in the interventions and stresses the importance of creating a collaborative work process that takes the attitudes and views of the adolescents and their families into consideration. Wraparound entails: recruiting a support team for the adolescents and their families that includes formal and informal supporters; providing services from within the community; making use of the adolescents' natural support systems; adapting the contents and inputs of the intervention to meet each individual's needs and make the intervention culturally sensitive; basing the intervention on the strengths of the adolescents and their families; perseverance; and aiming for outcome-based interventions.

The first program in Israel to be based on the Wraparound model – Ma'atefet (a pilot) – was implemented from 2001-2009 in Beersheva and Haifa in partnership with several agencies: JDC-Ashalim, the Division for Correctional Services and the Service for Children and Youth at the Ministry of Social Affairs and Services (MOSAS), the social service departments in Beersheva and Haifa and the International Initiative (Shvil ha-Kehila), a nonprofit organization. In 2008, the Myers-JDC-Brookdale Institute (MJB) conducted an evaluation study (initiated by JDC-Ashalim) of the pilot,¹ which included case studies and served as the basis for examination of the program prior to its renewed implementation by the Juvenile Probation Service (JPS).

¹ Rivkin, D and Somekh, S. 2010. The Ma'atefet – Wraparound – Program: Evaluation Study. RR-552-10 (Hebrew).

1b. The Wraparound Program Today

Since 2011, Wraparound has been implemented by the JPS. All the adolescents in the program are in the care of the Service by court order. Most are candidates for out-of-home placements and have particularly complex family and personal backgrounds.

The program is implemented in 5 localities: Tel Aviv, Haifa, Jerusalem, Hadera and Ashdod. Each locality can accommodate 5 adolescents (male or female) at any one time. Each has a coordinator who is a trained social worker and who is responsible for putting together the intervention team (known as the family support team – FST), facilitating their meetings, coordinating all the parties involved, and assisting in the provision of whatever inputs are decided upon.

The main goals of the Wraparound program, as defined by the JPS, are:

- ◆ To halt the illegal behaviors of the adolescents participating in the program and reduce the level of risk to themselves and to those around them (violence and aggression, recidivism, substance abuse)
- ◆ To create an alternative to the out-of-home frameworks
- ◆ To achieve normative integration in the community: regular attendance at school, work, or vocational training; appropriate, positive use of free time
- ◆ To strengthen the family – the parents, the adolescents themselves, and their siblings: to reinforce the parents' authority, provide the parents with tools to enhance their ability to cope with their children's difficulties, and improve the atmosphere at home
- ◆ To cooperate and pool resources with other agencies in the community.

The Research, Planning and Training Division at MOSAS and the JPS commissioned MJB to evaluate the implementation of Wraparound through the JPS.

2. The Study

2a. Goals and Topics Included in the Study

The overall goal of the study was to examine implementation of Wraparound by the JPS and its contribution to the adolescents and their families in order to help improve the program for broader implementation. The specific study goals were to examine:

- ◆ The principles of the program and the extent to which its implementation in practice follows the guidelines of the model
- ◆ The characteristics and needs of the adolescents participating in the program
- ◆ The work process of the program in general and the FST meetings in particular
- ◆ The contributions of the program to the adolescents participating, based on reports by the professionals as well as by the adolescents and their families
- ◆ Organizational aspects of implementation of the program.

2b. Study Design

The data were collected between August 2012 and April 2013. The study included qualitative and quantitative analyses:

- ◆ The qualitative analysis was conducted in 2 stages:
 - In the first stage, interviews were conducted with a number of individuals holding different positions in the program, from the administrative level in the JPS through the local/regional level, including members of the FSTs working in the field. This stage also included the first focus group with the coordinators and was conducted between August and November 2012.
 - The second stage included two elements:
 - A focus group with some of the juvenile probation officers participating in the program and a second focus group with the coordinators
 - Five case studies examining the interventions of one adolescent from each of the 5 localities in the program, in which the coordinator, a member of the family, and the adolescent him/herself were interviewed. The case studies sought to examine issues relating to the participation of the adolescents and their families in the program and to obtain their perspectives on the changes brought about through their participation. The coordinators were asked to base their choice of adolescents for the case studies on 2 criteria: participation in the program for at least 6 months and the feasibility of cooperation between the adolescents and their families and the research team. This stage lasted from February to April 2013.
- ◆ The *quantitative analysis* included a questionnaire about the adolescents participating in the program from its inauguration until March 2013, on condition that they had been in the program for at least 3 months. Thirty-three adolescents met this criterion and information was collected about each of them. The group included 22 adolescents who had completed their participation before the quantitative data collection began (November 2012) and another 11 who were still participating. The data collection was completed in March 2013. The questionnaire had 2 parts: The first was a self-report questionnaire for the coordinators and the second was completed by the juvenile probation officers. Note that the findings relate to the status of the participant either during participation in Wraparound or at the end of the intervention, depending on the individual adolescent's participation status at the time the questionnaire was completed.

Through the study, it was possible to examine the changes in the participants. However, it is difficult to assess the particular contribution to the participants without comparing them with a control group. The design of the current study did not allow for such a comparison.

2c. Data Analysis

The qualitative and quantitative data were analyzed in the most integrative way possible, so as to address the main issues arising from the study from different angles. The study compared the actual implementation of the program with the program model and its main goals as set out by the JPS

(planning vs. implementation). In addition, some of the data from this study were analyzed in comparison with the main conclusions from the 2008 evaluation study of the pilot, in order to examine the changes that had been made.

The study used the findings from the MJB study *Characteristics and Needs of Minors in the Care of the Juvenile Probation Service* (Kahan-Strawczynski, P. and Levi, D. 2011, Hebrew) as the basis on which to compare various characteristics of the program participants with those of all adolescents in the care of the JPS, particularly those in the Treatment and Rehabilitation Unit and the Detention Unit, who present the most severe cases among the adolescents in the care of the service. The purpose of the comparison was to see whether the program was indeed reaching youth with the most severe needs, as it is meant to do.

Note that the small number of participants in the program greatly limited the study's ability to conduct analyses based on either the personal characteristics of the adolescents or participation characteristics (such as the length of time participants remained in the program).

3. Main Findings

3a. Selection Criteria

The basic criteria for selecting adolescents to participate in the program were:

- ◆ A criminal record
- ◆ Candidate for out-of-home placement due to risk of self-harm or harm to others
- ◆ Agreement of the adolescents and their families.

The study found that 76% of the participants were candidates for out-of-home placements when they were accepted to the program. The program was also perceived to be an alternative for the older adolescents in the care of the JPS with multiple needs who could not be placed in out-of-home frameworks.

The interviews reveal that in addition to the three basic criteria listed above, in practice there are other considerations. The decision whether or not to include adolescents in the program is based on the overall characteristics of the potential participants and their families. The following are among the factors that are also taken into account:

- ◆ Motivation to participate
- ◆ Strengths of the adolescents and their families and their ability to meet the challenges of the program
- ◆ Agreement of the professionals working with the adolescents and their families to participate in the program
- ◆ Sufficient command of Hebrew.

Although the great majority of the program participants and adolescents in the care of the probation service are boys, one of the localities decided deliberately to include a higher percentage of girls in the program, relative to their percentage in the service, in order to make the program accessible to them as well.

According to the professionals, the main dilemma regarding participant selection is whether to focus on those with the greatest needs (to provide them with the most intensive care possible within the community) or to choose those with less complex needs but the greatest likelihood of success. In the end, it seems, there was a mix of adolescents from both groups selected.

The respondents noted that recruiting participants is a highly complex task. While the program seeks families and adolescents with multiple problems and needs, at the same time, they have to have the ability to cope with the challenge of participating in the program. For this reason, some of the localities found it difficult to meet the quota of 5 adolescents at any given time.

3b. Personal and Family Characteristics and Needs of the Participants

At the time of referral, the adolescents in the study were aged 14-18; around half of them were between 14 and 15. The percentage of girls in the program (12%) was similar to the percentage of girls in the care of the JPS, as was the percentage of participants from the Arab sector (19%). Several of the characteristics of the participants in Wraparound indicate complex life situations: according to a summary index that was built for the study, a high percentage of adolescents in the program had experienced multiple difficult events in the family in recent years (total 75%) and multiple areas of high risk (31% had 3 or more areas of increased risk).² Likewise they were found to have a background of offenses in multiple areas and a high rate of arrests: 51% of the Wraparound participants in the study had criminal records for at least 3 different types of offenses and 70% had been arrested at least once.

As noted above, the characteristics and needs of the participants and their families were compared with those of the adolescents in the care of the JPS Treatment and Rehabilitation Unit and its Detention Unit. The populations in these two units consist of the most severe cases in the care of the service. The comparison revealed that in all the above risk indices, the situation of the adolescents in Wraparound was even more severe than that of those in the said units.

Interestingly, compared with those in the two JPS units, a larger percentage of Wraparound families are Israeli-born (approximately 80%, vs. 60% of those in the JPS units), and a higher percentage of them have an adult family member who serves as a positive role model (70% vs. 40% or 50%

² The index included the following risk areas: 1. No working parent; 2. At least three difficult events in the family in past three years, e.g., divorce/separation of parents, death of a sibling, hospitalization or serious illness in the immediate family, arrest of parent or brother, etc.; 3. The adolescent does not have a normative occupation (not working or studying); 4. Difficult emotional status: receiving treatment for a psychiatric condition or suicide attempt; 5. Drug abuse; 6. Adolescents shows physical aggression towards their parents or the adults responsible for them; 7. Has been arrested at least once.

among those in the JPS units). The disparity in these characteristics may be due to the prerequisites for participation in the program, including: command of Hebrew (due to the program requirement for good communication ability) and the existence of a "meaningful" adult family member willing to meet the program requirements.

3c. Family Support Team Meetings

The vast majority of FST meetings take place in the families' homes. This location, which is considered a meaningful component of the program, has several clear advantages:

- ◆ The family is given the message that efforts are being made to accommodate their needs
- ◆ It is a suitable venue for families who have difficulty leaving home to receive services
- ◆ Home visits are an invaluable diagnostic tool that enables the staff to understand the conditions of the adolescents in their natural surroundings.

In most cases, the meetings are held once every two weeks and last about one hour. At the start of the intervention, they are more frequent, and over time they are held less often.

In general, the FST meetings are conducted in accordance with the program principles and the professional guidelines and are based on the Wraparound model. The coordinators reported that in every intervention the support team notes the strengths and the barriers or difficulties encountered by the adolescents as the basis for the intervention. At the start of the program, they draw up the work plan, which can be revised as and when needed. During the course of the intervention they monitor and check all progress made. In a high percentage of the interventions, measurable objectives are set, the adolescents and their families are given assignments, and the general atmosphere is positive. In keeping with the Wraparound model, in the great majority of cases, the adolescent and members of the family are included in designing the work plan.

However, despite the efforts to get the adolescents and their families actively involved, the findings show that this goal is often not fully achieved, particularly with some of the adolescents. Moreover, the coordinators reported that in about a quarter of the interventions, there was a lack of trust or lack of honesty on the part of the families, and in a similar proportion of cases, there had been multiple disagreements between the participants in the FSTs.

3d. Composition of the Teams

The program vision is to recruit the broadest possible FST, which includes professionals alongside natural supporters who encompass various areas of the adolescents' lives and "wrap" themselves around the at-risk youth. The pattern that seems to have evolved is that of two circles of participants:

- ◆ The **basic team**: The coordinator, probation officer and at least one family member (usually the mother)

- ◆ The **extended team**: Professionals working with the participant (e.g., from the *Kidum Noar* Youth-at-Risk Advancement Section, youth workers, or members of the school staff) and sometimes individuals from the adolescent's natural environment.

Importantly, the members of the basic team attend the meetings regularly (unless there are exceptional circumstances). In contrast, those in the extended team do not – some come to most of the meetings more or less consistently, while the attendance of others depends on circumstances. On average, the teams include two people from the natural environment and about 4 professionals (including those who do not attend regularly).

It was also reported in the interviews that there may be some additional professionals who do not attend the meetings, but receive updates about developments that are relevant to their areas of work. These professionals in fact constitute an additional, outer circle of intervention.

The degree of willingness of any service to participate in the FSTs was found to depend on how close the program's target population (i.e., adolescents on the risk spectrum) is to the target population of the service in question and the compatibility of the Wraparound work practices with their own (e.g., working in unconventional hours). Accordingly, particularly good cooperation has been established with employees of *Kidum Noar* (at the Ministry of Education) and with the Service for Adolescents and Young Adults at Risk (at MOSAS). In contrast, members of school staff and family social workers were found to be far less willing to attend meetings regularly. It seems that cooperation with services and other professionals in the locality also depends on the existence of inter-organizational mechanisms that are unrelated to the program and that serve as platforms for cooperation through the program.

Other difficulties in creating the support team were found to be: Lack of support in the adolescent's natural surroundings, or difficulty recruiting such supporters; difficulty integrating the adolescent into a normative occupation (mainly the older ones and those under house arrest), which makes recruiting professionals for the team more difficult; and lack of cooperation from the family or the adolescent in the course of the program (which was found in about half of the Wraparound cases).

3e. Program Inputs

Wraparound is dedicated to tailoring each intervention to suit each individual and to including a range of inputs chosen specifically to meet his or her needs and those of the family. The study found that these principles were indeed being followed and the adolescents and their families were receiving two types of inputs:

- ◆ Services and activities, some for payment and some free of charge: Treatments, diagnoses, and integration into recreational frameworks or a normative occupation
- ◆ Material assistance: Responses to basic needs such as clothing and food along with "gifts" such as bicycles or vouchers for cafes as a means of encouragement or assistance in reaching the intervention goals.

Most of the material assistance is for the adolescents themselves, but the referrals to external services are somewhat more for the families. The reason for this distribution may be that the adolescents have already been in contact with the various services while the program provides a new opportunity to broaden the circle of interventions and establish a connection between the families and the services.

It was also found that in most cases, there is agreement in the FSTs as to the treatments, diagnoses and referrals to services or frameworks needed for the adolescent or the family. Material assistance is a more complex issue and there are differences of opinion. While many believe that they are essential to the intervention, the professionals – including the coordinators – face professional dilemmas, such as concern that the adolescents and their families may exploit the program; that the material inputs may give the wrong message to the adolescents and those around them ("crime pays"); and that they may cause the adolescents and families to expect to receive material inputs in response to progress (the danger being that the intervention would revolve around external motivation only). There are also questions about the division of work with the social service departments.

With regard to the budget allocated for each participant (around NIS 3,500 per month), the coordinators agree that it is adequate and allows them to provide the required assistance. In practice, during the study period, when the program was in its early days, in most cases, the funding was only partially utilized, which resulted in calls to change the size of the allocation. Note that JPS executives reported that, later on, fuller use was made of the funding in most of the localities.

3f. Defining and Achieving Objectives

In the questionnaires about the participants, the coordinators were asked about the objectives that had been set for each adolescent and the extent to which they had been achieved. In addition, administrative data were obtained from the JPS about illegal behavior during the time the adolescents were in the program. These data refer only to those adolescents whose participation in the program had come to an end at the time of the study.

A range of objectives were set in the interventions, the most prominent being:

- ◆ Preventing recidivism
- ◆ Integration into a normative occupation (study or work), or improved functioning in the existing occupation
- ◆ Strengthening the participant's ability to accept authority and boundaries
- ◆ Improving the atmosphere at home and relationship with parents
- ◆ Preventing friendships with offenders
- ◆ Making contact with therapists and treatment providers
- ◆ Treating emotional problems.

Some of the objectives were found to have been achieved to a great extent, others to a lesser extent. The coordinators reported that all the adolescents had been integrated into a normative occupation or improved their performance. In most cases, there had been an improvement in the atmosphere at home and the relationship with the parents and most of the adolescents had been put in touch with treatment providers. Note that these outcomes were also achieved in some cases where the intervention had not yet been completed.

There was less success with the objectives of accepting authority and boundaries and refraining from friendships with offenders, which were achieved by about half of the adolescents whose participation had ended.

In contrast, improvement with emotional problems was only achieved in a small number of cases. The outcomes regarding the prevention of recidivism are still not satisfactory. About half of the adolescents whose participation had been either completed or discontinued, had engaged in illegal behaviors at some point during their participation. A third of them had engaged in illegal behaviors more than six months after joining the program.

As noted, these data relate to the adolescents during their period of participation in the program. The study did not continue to monitor what happened after they had left the program.

3g. Change as Perceived by the Adolescents and their Families

As noted above, for the case studies, 5 adolescents and their families were interviewed in order to obtain their perspectives on the contributions of the program. They reported change and progress in several areas, among them: integrating into work and study frameworks and setting an agenda; developing awareness and accepting responsibility; improved anger management; and acceptance of parental authority. In addition, the program impacted on the family circle in the following ways: better understanding of the adolescent, improved atmosphere within the family, and the creation of dialogue in the home. Apart from this, the families also reported that through the program they had found someone to listen to their problems and difficulties and, as a result of the program, some reported having changed their attitude towards the JPS, social services, and the establishment in general.

3h. Termination of the Intervention

The findings about the timing of termination of the intervention and the circumstances regarding each participant are unclear. The study found that for about half of the participants, the program was discontinued. In a few cases this was by court order. The most common reason for discontinuation was the adolescent's lack of motivation to continue with the program. As reflected both in the quantitative data and in the case studies, in some cases, the families and adolescents were not systematically prepared by the professionals for the end of the program and nothing was planned regarding what should be done next (see the following section).

3i. Contact with Professionals and Programs after the Intervention

Part of the Wraparound process includes connecting the participants with therapists and other professionals in the community. In most cases, the intervention is followed up by a professional of some kind: in around 60% of the cases, after the program ended, the participant remained in contact with the JPS and in 30% of them, there was contact with at least one other person in the program who was not part of the JPS. The study also found that at the time that the questionnaires were completed, altogether 18% of the adolescents who had reached the end of their participation in the program had been removed from the community (2 of the adolescents were in an out-of-home arrangement and another had been imprisoned).

3j. Key Players in Wraparound

The program is based mainly on the work of the coordinators and the probation officers. The coordinator's role is specific to the program and as they see it, it includes two main aspects: management and organization coupled with therapeutic aspects. The interviews with the coordinators reveal that their experience of the counseling and support that they received was positive. Evidently providing counseling from within the locality by someone whose field of work is related to Wraparound is preferable to seeking counseling from an outside source, largely because counselors within the system can support the program needs and help the coordinator to obtain the cooperation of various systems in the locality. The coordinators noted their need to acquire additional tools and skills, particularly for group facilitation, for working with parents and families, and for building up contacts and partnerships. They also expressed the need for increased counseling on clinical matters and for supervision with particularly difficult cases. The study also found that the coordinators who were allocated office space on the premises of one of the services working with the adolescents and their families were more satisfied than the others: apparently, having an office in one of these services increases the sense of belonging to the local community services, facilitates routine work with others, and provides a more convenient space for the demands of the job than is found working from home or in locations where there is no one else directly working with the program.

The probation officers working with adolescents in Wraparound are required to have different skills and work tools from those they use in their routine work in the JPS. However, they do not receive specific training for the job and some noted that such training was indeed lacking. The aspects that were reported to be deficient were group facilitation and family intervention skills; matters of confidentiality and ethics were also noted. The probation officers indicated a predicament that resulted from the tension between being legally responsible for the adolescents, while having to share decision-making jointly with others on the team. Although there are sometimes professional differences of opinion and disagreements over this tension, evidently in most cases, the professionals manage to establish a dialogue and work together according to the program principles.

4. Conclusion, Discussion and Programmatic Directions

4a. Characteristics of the Adolescents – Summary of Findings

- ◆ About half of the adolescents in the study were very young (14-15); 12% were girls; 19% were Arabs.
- ◆ The Wraparound participants are at the extreme end of the risk spectrum among the adolescents in the care of the JPS and are characterized by complex family and personal backgrounds that include multiple problems and risk situations, such as:
 - Multiple difficult family events
 - Multiple risk situations and risk behaviors
 - Background replete with illegal behaviors
- ◆ In contrast, many of the adolescents have at least one adult family member who could serve as a positive role model for them. Many families have strengths, since that is one of the considerations in admitting adolescents to the program.

4b. Program Strengths

Program Strengths at the Level of Work with the Adolescents

- ◆ Holistic view of the participants' needs, with inputs tailored to meet all these needs by building an individual work plan for each participant
- ◆ Visiting the adolescents in their homes, which has 3 main advantages:
 - Creates a comfortable framework that is appropriate for the families and enables continuous participation of the family members
 - Sends the message to the families that the system is "going out of its way" for them
 - Allows for better diagnosis and understanding of the adolescents' lives
- ◆ Intensive, long-term intervention not only for the adolescents but for their families too
- ◆ Intervention based on the principle of involving the family
- ◆ The work with a multidisciplinary team makes it possible to view the adolescent's needs from different angles and find a range of suitable inputs
- ◆ The program has rich resources that can be relatively freely allocated
- ◆ Creates the sense of achievement and success for the adolescents and their families by setting achievable objectives and tasks
- ◆ Offers a broader range of interventions than other programs
- ◆ Although the intervention focuses on the adolescent, it has considerable implications for the family as well.

Program Strengths at the Level of Services for at-Risk Adolescents

- ◆ Development of a response within the community for adolescents at the extreme end of the risk spectrum

- ◆ Creation of a joint discourse between the JPS and services in the locality, which extends beyond the limits of the program.

5c. Summary of the Difficulties with Implementation of the Program

- ◆ Difficulty recruiting people in the natural surroundings of the adolescents beyond a few members of the immediate family, especially in the case of single-parent families
- ◆ Occurrences of recidivism during the program, including adolescents who committed offenses after more than six months in the program. The study found that most of these adolescents were younger, with multiple risk factors. Apparently, the percentage of those committing offenses after a long time in the program is higher among those whose fathers were not in contact with them or did not participate in the program.
- ◆ Unplanned termination of participation in the program, or termination that was not compatible with the position taken by the professionals found in half of the cases. One of the main factors for unplanned discontinuation of the intervention was the loss of participant motivation during the program.
- ◆ Inadequate preparation for some of the adolescents and their families for the end of the intervention and the initial period after termination – even when all the professionals agreed about concluding the participation
- ◆ Difficulties involving people from the formal education system and social service departments as regular meaningful partners in the Wraparound team.

5d. Insights and Topics for Discussion

The following are some of the insights and topics for discussion arising from the findings:

- ◆ Importance of having someone to head the partnership: The study of the original Ma'atefet pilot in Israel found that there was no integrative leadership of the program at the national level. As noted, in the current format of the program, the administration of the JPS has accepted responsibility for managing the partnerships and the overall program management at the national level, and for providing guidance and assistance at the local level. The service has indeed headed the program and engaged in building the infrastructure and training the manpower and this has contributed greatly to the program's success.
- ◆ Wraparound as an alternative to out-of-home frameworks: One of the declared goals of the program is to serve as an alternative to removing the adolescents from home by providing an intensive and comprehensive solution in the community. As noted, most of the adolescents did not have to be removed from home.
- ◆ The question remains: Which adolescents are most suitable for the program and which are less so? The findings can contribute to this complex discussion.

5e. Programmatic Directions

The findings indicate several directions for the future:

- ◆ Write program guidelines for Wraparound, which will facilitate dissemination of the program and implementation in the field

- ◆ Continue to maintain the uniform format and the core principles, while enabling flexibility according to the circumstances in the locality and the individual cases
- ◆ Examine the feasibility of expanding the program in localities where it is already implemented, bearing in mind the burden on the services in the locality and the difficulty locating suitable participants
- ◆ Extending the program to additional localities requires groundwork at the locality level and examination as to whether the services are willing to collaborate with the program. It is also necessary to check the existence of the range of inputs required to implement the program
- ◆ Seek ways to improve cooperation with people in the education system and the social service departments
- ◆ Strengthen the training for the coordinators and probation officers in relevant areas – mainly group facilitation and work with the families
- ◆ Improve ways of coping with the loss of motivation among the adolescents during the program and discontinuation of the program earlier than planned, which is usually due to this loss of motivation. Strengthen ways of coping with recidivism during the program, which characterized a considerable number of the adolescents, while giving thought to the nature of the work required with adolescents and families who are at risk of recidivism
- ◆ Structure the process of concluding the intervention and obtaining further, less intensive, support if needed after it is over
- ◆ Fine-tune the criteria for selecting participants for the program based on learning from past experience and the accumulated knowledge about the characteristics that lead to success
- ◆ Further study of the program's contribution in the long-term to both the adolescents and their families
- ◆ Disseminate the principles of the program to other services and programs.

The findings have been discussed by the study steering committee, with the participation of representatives from the management of the JPS and the Research, Planning and Training Division at the Ministry of Social Affairs and Services. The JPS is continuing to study the findings in order to improve the program. The Division for Adolescents, Young Adults and Correctional Services is examining the dissemination of the model to additional target populations.

Acknowledgments

As usual, it is a pleasure to thank all who have helped with this study.

First of all, warm thanks to the adolescents and their parents who welcomed us into their homes, agreed to be interviewed for the study, and helped us to understand their perspective as participants in the program.

We are grateful to the coordinators and probation officers who were interviewed and who completed the comprehensive questionnaires about the adolescents in the program thoroughly and frankly. The information they provided gave us a deep understanding of the Wraparound process and its work. Thanks also to the team leaders at the JPS, who helped with the distribution and collection of the questionnaires.

We also thank all the professionals at the various services who participated in Wraparound, members of the steering committees at the locality level, and the staff at the JPS who were interviewed and provided us with a range of perspectives on the work done through the program.

Thanks to Tali Samuel, counselor and head of the JPS team in Jerusalem, and Merav Allon, former Wraparound coordinator in Jerusalem, who introduced us to the program in the early stages of the study and helped us to develop the study questionnaires.

Thanks to members of the steering committee: Dr. Yosef (Asi) Aharonov, director of research in the Research, Planning and Training Division at the Ministry of Social Affairs and Services; Efi Braver, director of the JPS (MOSAS), and Varda Rappaport, national supervisor at the JPS (MOSAS), for their important input throughout the study. We are also grateful to Ms. Rappaport for her commitment to the study, for the information and insights she contributed, and for introducing us to contacts in the field.

And, finally, thanks to our colleagues at the Myers-JDC-Brookdale Institute for their assistance in various stages of the study: Miriam Navot, director of the Engelberg Center for Children and Youth, for supporting the study and for her important comments; Revital Aviv-Matok, for her assistance with proofreading and typesetting; Anat Berberian, for editing this report; and Leslie Klineman for preparing it for publication.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 Background | 1 |
| 1.2 Wraparound in its Current Format | 2 |
| 2. Literature Review | 3 |
| 2.1 Community-Based Intervention Programs for Youth at Risk | 3 |
| 2.2 Background to the Development of Wraparound | 3 |
| 2.3 Wraparound in Other Countries | 4 |
| 2.4 Institutionalization of Wraparound Practices | 5 |
| 2.5 Impact of the Program | 6 |
| 3. Study Design | 8 |
| 3.1 Study Goals and Topics | 8 |
| 3.2 Study Population and Study Design | 9 |
| 3.3 Data Analysis and Presentation | 10 |
| 4. Selection of Adolescents for the Program | 11 |
| 4.1 Criteria for Selection of Adolescents and their Families | 11 |
| 4.2 Additional Considerations in the Selection | 12 |
| 4.3 Unsuitable Candidates | 13 |
| 4.4 Issues and Dilemmas in Selecting the Participants | 14 |
| 5. Individual and Family Characteristics of the Participants | 14 |
| 5.1 Socioeconomic Characteristics | 15 |
| 5.2 Illegal Behaviors | 16 |
| 5.3 Current Occupations | 17 |
| 5.4 Risk Factors | 18 |
| 5.5 Status of the Adolescents and Relationship with their Families at Time of Joining the Program | 20 |
| 6. Implementation of Wraparound in the Field | 23 |
| 6.1 Joining the Program | 23 |
| 6.2 Family Support Team Meetings | 25 |
| 6.3 Inputs for the Adolescents and Budget Allocations | 36 |
| 6.4 Setting and Achieving Objectives | 41 |
| 6.5 Contribution of the Program as Perceived by the Adolescents and their Families | 45 |
| 6.6 Completion of Intervention | 47 |
| 6.7 Evaluation of the Work Process by the Coordinators and Probation Officers | 51 |
| 7. Structuring the Key Positions in Wraparound | 52 |
| 7.1 Role of the Coordinator | 52 |
| 7.2 Probation Officers | 56 |
| 7.3 Division of Work between the Coordinators and Probation Officers in the Family Support Teams | 58 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 8. Conclusion, Insights and Programmatic Directions for Further Development of the Program | 58 |
| 8.1 Summary of Findings – Characteristics of the Adolescents | 58 |
| 8.2 Strengths and Challenges of the Program | 58 |
| 8.3 Additional Insights | 61 |
| 8.4 Programmatic Directions | 62 |
| Bibliography | 66 |
| Appendix I: Study Design | 69 |
| Appendix II: Procedures and Issues Regarding the Completion of Wraparound for Adolescents Returning from Out-of-Home Frameworks in Santa Clara County, California | 71 |

List of Tables

4. Selection of Adolescents for the Program

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 1: Integration in Wraparound, Probation Officers' Reports | 12 |
|---|----|

5. Individual and Family Characteristics of the Participants

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 2: Socioeconomic Characteristics according to Administrative Data from the JPS and Probation Officers' Reports – Comparison of Wraparound and the Treatment and Rehabilitation Unit (JPS) | 16 |
| Table 3: Characteristics of the Illegal Behaviors according to Administrative Data from the JPS and Probation Officers' Reports – Comparison of Wraparound and the Treatment and Rehabilitation Unit and the Detention Unit (JPS) | 17 |
| Table 4: Current Occupations of the Adolescents according to the Probation Officers' Reports – Comparison of Wraparound and the Treatment and Rehabilitation Unit and the Detention Unit (JPS) | 18 |
| Table 5: Risk Factors and Risk Characteristics according to the Probation Officers' Reports – Comparison of Wraparound and the Treatment and Rehabilitation Unit and the Detention Unit (JPS) | 19 |
| Table 6: Summary Index of Areas of Increased Risk – Comparison of Wraparound and the Treatment and Rehabilitation Unit and the Detention Unit (JPS) | 20 |
| Table 7: Relationship between the Adolescents and their Parents according to Coordinators' Reports | 21 |
| Table 8: Relationship between the Adolescents and their Parents according to Coordinators' Reports – Comparison of Wraparound and the Treatment and Rehabilitation Unit and the Detention Unit (JPS) | 21 |
| Table 9: Difficulties Characterizing the Adolescents upon Joining the Program according to the Coordinators' Reports | 22 |

| | | |
|-----------|--|----|
| Table 10: | Adolescents' Strengths upon Joining the Program according to the Coordinators' Reports | 23 |
|-----------|--|----|

6. Implementation of Wraparound in the Field

| | | |
|-----------|---|----|
| Table 11: | Responses of the Adolescents and their Families to Invitation to Join Wraparound according to Probation Officers' Reports | 24 |
| Table 12: | Considerations Affecting the Decision by the Adolescents and their Families to Join Wraparound according to Probation Officers' Reports | 25 |
| Table 13: | Format of the Family Support Team Meetings, according to Coordinators' Reports | 27 |
| Table 14: | Characteristics of the Meetings, according to Coordinators' Reports | 28 |
| Table 15: | Patterns of Participation of the Adolescents and their Families at Meetings, according to Coordinators' Reports | 28 |
| Table 16: | Participation of Various Individuals at Meetings, according to Coordinators' Reports | 35 |
| Table 17: | Inputs Provided to Adolescents and their Families, according to Coordinators' Reports | 37 |
| Table 18: | Utilization of Budgets Allocated to the Program for Inputs for the Adolescents, according to Coordinators' Reports | 41 |
| Table 19: | Setting and Achieving Objectives | 42 |
| Table 20: | Contact between Adolescents and the Community according to Probation Officers' Reports | 45 |
| Table 21: | Completion of the Intervention – Timing, Reasons and Parties involved in the Decision, according to the Coordinators' Reports | 48 |
| Table 22: | Steps Towards Completion of the Intervention, according to Coordinators' Reports | 50 |
| Table 23: | Current Intervention for Adolescents whose Participation in Wraparound has been Completed, according to Probation Officers' Reports | 51 |
| Table 24: | Work Processes, according to Reports by the Coordinators and Probation Officers | 52 |