



UNSW
SYDNEY

Australia's
Global
University



Gonski Institute for Education

Education-Centred Formal Wraparound Services in Support of School-Aged Students with Complex Needs

Grey Literature Review
Project Report



UNSW
SYDNEY



Gonski Institute
for Education



Report prepared by:

Professor Iva Strnadová, Project Investigator
Associate Professor Therese M. Cumming, Lead Project Investigator
Dr Hee Min Lee, Research Assistant
School of Education, Arts and Social Sciences, UNSW Sydney

Suggested Citation

Strnadová, I., Cumming, T. M., & Lee, H. M. (2019). *Education-Centred Formal Wraparound Services in Support of School-Aged Students with Complex Needs. Policy and Grey Literature Review*. Project Report. UNSW Sydney.

Contact: Professor Iva Strnadová
School of Education
UNSW Sydney
i.strnadova@unsw.edu.au

This project is funded by the UNSW Gonski Institute for Education.



UNSW
SYDNEY



Table of Contents

Executive summary	4
Overview of the study	4
Key research findings	4
Recommendations	5
Introduction	6
Methodology	7
Review aims and design	7
Identification and selection of documents	8
Approach to analysis	9
Results	10
Results of domain level analysis	10
Youth justice	10
Out of home	13
Disability	19
Mental health	20
Drug and alcohol.....	20
Homelessness	21
Education.....	25
Methods of Implementation	27
Australia.....	27
New Zealand	33
Conclusion	37
How are wraparound services presented/advocated for in state or national policy?	38
According to grey literature, to what extent are schools in NSW or nationally using the wraparound model?	39
What does the grey literature say about best practices in wraparound?	39
Strengths and Limitations	40
References	41
Appendix 1. List of Included Polices: Domain and Jurisdiction	46
Appendix 2. Wraparound Policy Analysis: Domain level	49

Executive summary

Overview of the study

This review is part of a research project commissioned by the UNSW Gonski Institute for Education. The study aimed to examine how wraparound supports are represented in the Australian national and NSW state policies and schools and to identify best practices and models of wraparound support.

This review addressed three overarching questions:

- (1) How are wraparound services presented/advocated for in state or national policy?
- (2) To what extent are schools using the wraparound model in NSW and nationally, according to the grey literature?
- (3) What does the grey literature say about best practices in wraparound model?

A search was conducted to identify grey literature relevant to wraparound practices. This was achieved through a comprehensive review of Australian national and NSW legislation and policies in relation to the following sectors: (a) youth justice, (b) out of home care, (c) disability, (d) mental health, (e) drug and alcohol, (f) homelessness, and (g) education.

Key research findings

The term “wraparound” was found to have diverse meanings. The wraparound-related terms were used in both Australian national and NSW state legislation and policy documents, across all seven sectors, i.e., youth justice, out of home care, disability, mental health, drug and alcohol, homelessness and education. Across the sectors, different wraparound-related terms, such as case management, integrated services and support coordinated, were used.

This indicated the sectors did not have a consistent understanding of wraparound model and methods to support youths with complex needs.

Methods to measure how effective the wraparound service were rarely discussed in the documents. This was due to the nature of the wraparound service, as each wraparound service aims to cater to the individual. What was consistently acknowledged in the documents was the importance of multiple agencies working in collaboration with each other to support the youth. However, most sectors did not include education institutions as one part of the support team when implementing the wraparound service.

Recommendations

- Understanding that wraparound models are team based and the team is made up of a combination of formal and informal supports.
- Education institutions are an integral part of the support team and therefore must be included in planning and implementing the wraparound service.
- It is essential to recognise the young person and the family are central to deciding who is part of the team.
- Team meetings need to be regular, so the young person and the family are provided with a routine.
- The young person and the family should not be forced to give more information than what they are comfortable with. To prepare for these meetings, the facilitator helps to prepare the young person and the family before the meetings to ensure their voices are heard.

- Wraparound support plans are individualised and focused on the young person’s and their family’s strengths. Regular monitoring and evaluation of the plan is needed to make sure the plan is working.
- Due to the wraparound being team based, working in collaboration with other agencies is crucial. As wraparound supports are usually long-term, building rapport is crucial.
- Cultural competence of all team members is critical.

Introduction

Young people with complex needs are “people who have a combination of co-occurring cognitive disability, mental health problems, other impairments, drugs or alcohol misuse, and social or educational disadvantage” (Dowse, Cumming, Strnadová, Lee, & Trofimovs, 2014, p. 174). Research has indicated that when the needs of these young people are not met, they experience poor outcomes in the areas of education, housing, substance use, and involvement with the juvenile justice system. Often, this population of young people has negative experiences and outcomes, despite receiving a variety of services in and outside of school. A possible reason for this may be a lack of central coordination amongst the services, resulting in overlaps and gaps in support (Ungar, Liebenberg, & Ikeda, 2012).

The term wraparound is often used in the grey literature of Canada and the United States of America to describe the provision of support to young people with complex needs. Wraparound service is a “structured, team-based planning process that is used to provide comprehensive, community-based care for children and youth with complex mental health



and related challenges” (Walker & Sanders, 2011, p. 2). Education systems in the United States and United Kingdom have used wraparound models to address the complex needs of youths (Bruns, Rast, Peterson, Walker, & Bosworth, 2006). A large body of research (see Bruns et al., 2006; Carney & Buttell, 2003; Clark, Prange, Lee, Stewart, McDonald, & Boyd, 1998) provides evidence of positive outcomes for young people with complex needs when the wraparound is well implemented.

The current review was designed to answer three overarching questions: (1) How are wraparound services presented/advocated for in state or national policy? (2)

To what extent are schools using the wraparound model in NSW and nationally, according to the grey literature?

(3) What does the grey literature say about best practices in wraparound? A search was conducted to identify grey literature relevant to wraparound practices. This was achieved through a comprehensive review of Australian national and NSW state legislation and policies in the following sectors: (a) youth justice, (b) out of home care, (c) disability, (d) mental health, (e) drug and alcohol, (f) homelessness, and (g) education.

Methodology

Review aims and design

This review aimed to identify the policy and practices of wraparound models of support in Australia at a national and NSW state level. To examine the current policy and legislation for wraparound service, seven relevant domains were identified:

- Youth justice
- Out of home care
- Disability

- Mental health
- Drug and alcohol
- Homelessness
- Education.

Identification and selection of documents

The researchers began with a list of already identified Australian and New South Wales legislation and policy documents in a previous study (Strnadová, Cumming, Boaden, Dew, Athanassiou, & Dowse, 2017). The researchers then searched and collected additional legislation and policy documents that were publicly available. In addition, the researchers also conducted searches for implementation guides within Australia and New Zealand. The inclusion criteria that were used for the search were:

- Available online.
- Contained at least one of the following wraparound-related terms: (a) support coordination; (b) integrated services; (c) service evaluations; (d) case management; (e) wrap around, wraparound, wrap-around; (f) multisystemic system of support;
- Contained at least one term relevant to complex support needs: (a) disabilit*; (b) autism; (c) emotional behavioural disorder; (d) mental illness; (e) acquired brain injury; (f) foetal alcohol spectrum disorder; (g) challenging behaviour; (h) complex health conditions.
- Contained at least one term relevant to education: (a) schools; (b) special education; (c) support services; (d) individualised education plans.
- Policy, legislation, or implementation guides regarding wraparound support implementation.

Once all the documents were found (the search was conducted between May and July 2019), two researchers independently examined the documents and identified the documents that met the inclusion criteria for the study. The documents were organised by national or state and then further organised into the domains listed above. This allowed for a thorough investigation of the documents. Two researchers individually read each document to confirm inclusion and then results were compared. There were only minor differences found and differences were resolved.

Approach to analysis

Qualitative content analysis was used to investigate the three overarching research questions for its highly systematic, yet flexible approach to data analysis (Schreier, 2013, p. 170). After deciding on the three research questions and selecting relevant grey literature (see the above sections *Review aims and design*, and *Identification and selection of documents*), the researchers used Excel spreadsheet to detail essential information about each identified document, including the wraparound-related terms used, and the way wraparound model is identified for the purposes of each policy document (for the list of all policy documents included in the content analysis, please see Appendix 1).

In the next phase, the researchers adapted a domain analysis coding frame used in their previous study (Strnadová, Cumming, Boaden, Dew, Athanassiou, & Dowse, 2017) to fit the purpose of this review. Thus, a pilot phase to trial the coding frame was not needed. The adapted coding frame (see Appendix 2) let the analysis of the documents, which included attention to (a) alignment between national and NSW policies; (b) wraparound as a term used in policies, including its use and measure; (c) complex needs as a term used in

policies; (d) interagency collaboration; (e) evidence-base in policy documents; and (f) person-centeredness.

The implementation guidelines were summarised in order to gain an understanding into best practices in applying the wraparound model to Australian context. The findings relevant to the implementation guides are presented separately (see the section *Methods of implementation*). The decision to include also New Zealand implementation guidelines was driven by: (a) a dearth of implementation guidelines related to Australia, both on national and state level, and (b) New Zealand's similar political, socio-economic and cultural context relevant to Australia.

Results

The results of the data analysis are presented below in two sections: results of the domain level analysis of Australian national and NSW policy documents, and implementation of wraparound.

Results of domain level analysis

The findings from the content analysis of Australian national and NSW policy documents are presented in seven domains. In each domain, the documents referred to wraparound, describing or applying wraparound, or making strong reference to wraparound as a school based or school linked process.

Youth justice

National

Out of seven youth justice policy documents, only one policy, *Protecting Children is Everyone's Business: National Framework for Protecting Australia's Children 2009-2020* included wraparound-related terms, integrated services and case management. This policy

discussed the national framework for protecting Australia’s children and discussed the strategy to “implement an integrated approach to service design, planning and delivery for children and families across the life cycle and spectrum of need” (p.18), including the establishment of new demonstration sites of models of integrated service delivery to provide more coordinated and intensive supports to children at risk. The policy recognised the importance of providing the right support and services for the vulnerable but did not go further to discuss what integrated service is.

There were two reports from the youth justice sector that qualified for inclusion in the review and only one, *Good Practice, Strengthening Services of Youth in Juvenile Justice*, consisted of wraparound terms (case management and collaborative practice). This report focuses on 11 case studies that demonstrated, despite the difficult circumstances faced by juvenile justice, collaboration of stakeholders can make a positive difference. In particular, one case study was set in the remote part of Western Australia (WA) and focused on the importance of a community equipped with a range of services and is committed to helping. This case study discussed a program called the SHINE program, that aimed to assist women and girls in personal development. When asked the question “what’s working?”, the report answered this question in four components – the right people, engaging with the community, adaptation and flexibility and harnessing community resources. Interestingly, workers in the program were either trained teachers with a passion for working with the youth or people who have extensive experience working with the youth.

New South Wales

Out of eight government policies only one policy, *A Strategic Review of the NSW Juvenile Justice System*, contained the wraparound-related terms multi-agency, integrated



services, and case management. This document comprised a comprehensive review of the Juvenile Justice system in NSW, conducted due to a rise to level of detention, despite the level of crime being static. A multi-agency approach was designed to address the causes of anti-social behaviour and providing directions to reduce risk of re-offending.

The multi-agencies included, Inner City Supportive Housing and Support for Young People, Joint Tenancy Assistance Program, Youth Drug and Alcohol Court, and the Effective Practice Working Group. The plan entailed the Inner City Supportive Housing and Support for Young people providing coordinated case management and supportive housing for young people who were homeless or at risk of homelessness. Joint Tenancy Assistance Program (JTAP) is a program through a partnership between Juvenile Justice, Housing NSW, Community Housing providers BridgeHousing and Catholic Care that offers housing support for young offenders (16-18 years old) for over 12 months or more. Youth Drug and Alcohol Court provides young offenders an opportunity to participate in an intensive period of rehabilitation before they are being sentenced. Continuous case management was provided, in which treatment schedules, appointments with court, health, housing and educational needs were included. Effective Practice Working Group, a group set up by Juvenile Justice that examine case management practices. A framework was developed that involves significant collaboration with other agencies and departments to keep others accountable to a case plan and its outcomes. This report demonstrated that a clear understanding of the importance of integrated practice when supporting young offenders exists. It should be noted that although much of the framework and practice incorporated the education system, it was as a participant only, not the central coordinator or hub.



Out of home

National

Of the six Out-of-Home Care (OOHC) policies, only one, *Supporting Young People Transitioning from Out-of-Home-Care to Independence in Australia: Good Practice in 2011/2012*, contained wraparound-related content. There were two reports on OOHC, but only one, *National Standards for Out of Home Care Final Report*, contained wraparound-related terms.

Wraparound-related terms that were used were case management and wraparound. In this policy there were two practices that used wraparound models. First, the school retention team in South Australia provided supports during Individualised Education Program (IEP) meetings for children and young people (12-17 years of age) with complex needs and difficult behaviour. The wraparound supports included the school retention team coordinating key stakeholders to focus on providing individualised tailored assistance for the students. This wraparound model focused on the students' social and educational needs. Secondly, in the Lead Tenant model (VIC), wraparound services were provided to young people to learn and apply independent life skills in a safe environment. Though wraparound supports were used, school was not the central coordinator or hub. In the *National Standards for Out of Home Care Final Report*, one of the standards of the OOHC system, provision of quality care to children and young people, recognises the importance of case management for the children or young person. The provision of wraparound supports was very vague in the report.

New South Wales

Out of 36 included NSW OOHC policies, 10 contained wraparound-related terms. The common theme found throughout the 10 documents was that though wraparound was

discussed or referred to, the actual provision of wraparound supports was only vaguely discussed, and school was very loosely linked or not linked at all.

The *Advocate for Children and Young People Act 2014* used wraparound-related terms such as “co-operation with other agencies.” When defining the functions of the Advocate, one of the defining points was, “co-operation with other agencies”, meaning that the Advocate and government or non-government agencies that work with services or issues affecting young people need to work in collaboration. The actual provision of wraparound supports was vague, and school was not the central coordinator or hub. Similarly, the *Out of Homecare Transition Implementation Framework Stage 2, 2013-2014* also contained wraparound-related terms, such as case management and collaborative practice. The *Framework* described one of the functions of Regional Implementation Groups as establishing localised collaborative practices and joint decision-making processes. It stated that case management responsibility belongs to the agency accepting placement as the child enters care, and responsibility for case management transfers with children and young people as they move from community placement to non-government placements.

The document *Keep Them Safe-A Shared Approach to Child Wellbeing 2009-2014* used wraparound-related terms, such as support coordination and case management, and examined methods of improving coordination across agencies. One example was having a common case management framework, where schools in disadvantaged areas act as community centres to connect families with young children (aged 0-8 years old) to their local service network, community, and school.

The *Joint Operational Practice Guidelines to Accompany the Memorandum of Understanding between the Department of Family and Community Services, Community*



Services and Department of Justice, Juvenile Justice About Children or Young People who are Shared Clients of Community Services and Juvenile Justice 2014, contained the wraparound-related terms case management and collaborative cross agency work. The document discussed wraparound-like supports through collaborative case management of a shared client. The responsibility of case management and coordination is either CSC/other family and Community Services or designated OOHC agency (who is under the parental responsibility of the Minister for Family and Community services). School and education were mentioned in the guidelines, but they were not the coordinator or central hub for the support services. This was also seen in *NSW Interagency Guidelines for Child Protection Intervention*, which used the wraparound-related terms coordinated service delivery, integrated service, and case management. The importance of building interagency collaboration was emphasised and wraparound supports were provided, although school was a service provider, it was not central. There were three levels of interagency practice in child protection: policy level, program level, and direct service level. School was also not a central hub in the *Transition Program Office Policy Paper 3: Caring for Children and Young People in NSW*, where the only wraparound term used was co-ordinate services. For children and young people who need support and services, Out of Home Care Transition facilitate closer collaboration between agencies to provide more effective coordinated services to address the needs of children and their family.

Although the terms collaborative practice was used, schools or education were not mentioned in *Memorandum of Understanding between Community Services and Ageing, Disability and Home Care (ADHC) on Children and Young People with a Disability*. However,

the collaboration between service providers was recognised as being crucial for achieving good outcomes for children and young people under the Memorandum of Understanding.

Joint Practice Guidelines - For Joint Work with Children and Young People with a Disability used wraparound-related terms, integrated case management and collaborative environment. This policy provides joint practice guidelines that were designed to provide practical resources for staff, specifically to support collaborative work.

The terms case management and coordinated service delivery were used in the *Memorandum of Understanding Between the Department of Family and Community Services, Community Services and NSW Health on Health Screening, Assessment, Intervention and Review for Children and Young People in Statutory Out-of-Home Care*. Case management in this policy was defined as the process of assessing, planning, implementation, and monitoring that aims to strengthen families and decrease risks to children and young people through integrated and coordinated service delivery. When case management has been transferred to an NGO, the NGO has responsibility for assessment, case planning, implementation, monitoring, review, placement transition, and case closure.

Senate inquiry (national)

Out of Home Care (wraparound-related terms: support coordination, integrated service, case management, wrap-around) secondary interventions were discussed, and in particular in [Western Australia, the Department for Child Protection and Family Support provided the committee with details of its Family Support Network \(FSN\) program that provide secondary intervention services to vulnerable families. A review of the model by one of the Big Four accounting organisations, KPMG \(Klynveld Peat Marwick Goerdeler\), found that it significantly improved wrap-around services for families and calculated a cost](#)

benefit ratio of \$3.65 for each dollar invested in the FSN program. Finding Solutions Plus is funded by the Victorian Government and delivered by Melbourne City Mission. This provides young people ages 10-15 years old and/or family with timely and intensive support to contain the family conflict issues being experienced and reduce the likelihood of placement in out of home care. Also, Mr Rob Ryan, State Director for Key Assets in Queensland, stated anyone who is managing and supporting children in care requires wraparound support. He went on to continue to express when wraparound support model is taken on board will increase the chance of success.

The Adequacy of Existing Residential Care Arrangements Available for Young People with Severe Physical, Mental or Intellectual Disabilities in Australia 2015 consisted of wraparound-related terms, integrated services, case management and wrap the service around the child. The document noted the lack of advocacy and support to assist young people and their families to make decisions. The Chief Executive Officer, Ms Stephanie Gotlib outlined the principles behind successful transition from hospital to home: "... then they had ongoing case management and looked at what the family's needs were, what the children's needs were, or vice versa, and looked at how they could wrap the services around the child, their developing needs and their life. It was an expensive, Rolls Royce kind of program at the time when I was there, but it worked and worked well" (p. 34).

A National Approach to Mental Health - From Crisis to Community First Report (wraparound-related terms: case management, integrated services) discussed support services for people facing mental health problems. It was stated in this document, that for inter-agency integration to work there needed to be a culture change. Opportunities for coordination of services would be greatly facilitated by better communication, sharing of



information and breaking down of interagency “territorialism”. The documents also identified significant barriers to the coordination of clinical and so called non-clinical or rehabilitation services that seem to be borne out of professional jealousy, ignorance or disrespect. This resulted in gaps in services to clients due to one service provider either not knowing what other services were available and/or a service provider believing (wrongly) that a service was being provided by another agency.

Towards Recovery: Mental Health Services in Australia (wraparound-related terms: integrate service, case management, collaborative service delivery) included different perspectives on the strengths of care coordination. At a systemic level there was a consensus that a service connection and integration was essential. In terms of how care for an individual was coordinated, there were different responses. For example, Mr Cheverton, of the Queensland Alliance Mental Illness and Psychiatric Disability Groups Inc, advocated the consumer role, “What people with mental illness are finding is that they have three other people who think it is their job to coordinate their care. Their case manager thinks he or she is doing it; their NGO think they are doing it; maybe their parent or husband thinks they are doing it. There is no space left for the person in that. It is very complex. There is not going to be one model. It has to be individualised” (p. 36).

There were different views about whether a new way of providing services could be achieved without designated funding. The Western Australian Association for Mental Health (WAAMH) considered that in the long term, care coordination would become a central part of everyday work and be cost neutral, but that there were additional costs in the initial phases. Representatives from Ruah Community Services, an NGO in Western Australia (WA), commented that lack of funding for care coordination meant that progress in WA had been

stripped down to a small pilot test. There was further concern that there was an expectation that care coordination would improve with no additional resources, this was suggesting that the mental health system may not have a good case management and care coordination.

Housing the Homeless. Report on the Inquiry into Homelessness Legislation

(wraparound-related terms: integrated service, case management) proposed integrated and coordinated responses to homelessness. The whole government response to Homelessness NSW was consistent with one of the key principles of the Government's Social Inclusion Agenda, in particular the principle of "building joined-up services and whole of government(s) solutions" aims to involve integrated and collaborative responses by getting different parts and different levels of government to work together in new and flexible ways. In this document, school was mentioned as one of the possible transition point or area for reengagement.

Disability

There were no wraparound-related terms found in the national grey literature on Disability.

New South Wales

There were 20 NSW policies on disability, from which only two contained wraparound-related terms. First, the *Memorandum of Understanding Between Community Services and ADHC on Children and Young People with a Disability* used the wraparound-related terms case management and collaborative practice. This document highlighted the collaboration between service providers as being fundamental to achieving good outcomes for children and young people covered under the Memorandum of Understanding. However, there was no mention of education or the school system. Similarly, although the term case management was used, there was also no mention of education or schooling

system in the *Joint Practice Guidelines – for Joint Work with Children and Young People with a Disability*.

Mental health

National

There were seven national documents that met the inclusion criteria, but only one, the *Australian Government Response to Contributing Lives, Thriving Communities - Review of Mental Health Programmes and Services* included wraparound-related terms (i.e., support coordinated, integrated service and wraparound). This document discussed the current delivery of child mental health programmes, i.e., duplication of services and siloed implementation and the need for better targeting and integration of services. Wraparound coordinated care was suggested for people with complex needs.

New South Wales

There were 11 NSW policies, and only the *NSW Living Well, A strategic Plan for Mental Health in NSW 2014-2024* included the wraparound-related terms integrated care and case manager. In addition to including these terms, the document stated the need for greater integration among school-based programs and community-based services and recognised the need for coordinated specialist child and adolescent mental health services.

Drug and alcohol

National

Only one of the five included national documents, the *National Alcohol and Other Drug Workforce Development Strategy 2015-2018*, recognised wraparound as an important part of service delivery for people with complex needs and used the terms case management and wraparound. Tiers of activity involving different services/workers were

described and depending on the tiers, the contributions from different occupational groups can be identified. There are 4 tiers:

- Tier 1 - whole populations focus, prevention, social determinants, education, law enforcement, community services;
- Tier 2 – primary healthcare, community services, information services, NSP’s peer support, self-help groups;
- Tier 3 – specialist assessment and referral, corrections, case management, relapse prevention, community pharmacotherapy, counselling;
- Tier 4 – services for people with complex needs, specialist withdrawal management, residential rehabilitation.

New South Wales

The New South Wales policy documents on Drugs and alcohol did not contain any wraparound-related terms.

Homelessness

National

The national policy documents on homelessness did not contain any wraparound-related terms.

New South Wales

Only seven of the 18 NSW policy documents contained wraparound-related terms. In the *Framework for Multi-Agency Client Transition Planning to Reduce Homelessness* the wraparound-related terms support co-ordination, co-ordinated support, integrated and responsive services, and multi-agency were used, with multi-agency understood as crucial. One of the aims and objectives was to improve interagency collaboration and multi-agency transition planning to address all of a person’s needs and risk factors. Education/school was

recognised as one of the participating agencies, as was the Department of Family and Community Services (encompassing Housing NSW, Community Services, Ageing Disability and Home Care, Aboriginal Housing Office), NSW Ministry of Health, Department of Attorney General and Justice (Corrective Services NSW, Juvenile Justice), and the Department of Education and Communities (Aboriginal Affairs NSW).

In the *National Partnership on Homelessness NSW Implementation Plan 2009-2013*, interagency collaborations were recognised and implemented to reduce homelessness and support was provided for children who were homeless or at risk of being homeless to maintain contact with school. School or education was mentioned only briefly in the *Housing and Mental Health Agreement*, although the terms coordinated, client-focused, integrated service, and joint client-focused were present. This policy includes an action plan that commits to strengthening integrated service planning across government agencies and across the government and non-government service sectors. To achieve this, four actions were proposed:

- 1) When reviewing or commencing funding contracts with NGO's, agencies will assist service providers in aligning their service model with the principles and commitments of the Agreement where relevant.
- 2) Engage in joint planning with partner agencies and relevant NGOs for developing, improving and/or expanding services in response to identified need and service gaps.
- 3) Build an evidence base through existing data collection mechanisms and share best practice to inform the planning and delivery of services for the target group on an on-going basis.

- 4) Promote and communicate the implementation of the Agreement through mechanisms such as the launch of the updated HASI manual across NSW.

The *Homeless Youth Assistance Programme - Service Delivery Framework 2015* (Revised version: 23 February 2016), uses the term wraparound as well as case management and provides a framework service design and delivery that recognises that all unaccompanied young people (12-15 years of age) have a unique set of experiences, strengths, and needs that require tailored, holistic, and outcomes-focused service responses. One of the service components discussed was the provision of wraparound supports. Wraparound was defined here as comprehensive and coordinated community-based service delivery programs that address the individual needs of a child or young person, as identified through an assessment and case planning process. Targeted needs include social, emotional, educational, cultural, and physical needs of children and young people. A strengths-based case management was also discussed, focusing on a collaborative, person-focused approach that was aimed at empowering clients to meet individual needs and to achieve their goals and objectives. The focus was on potential strengths, abilities, knowledge, interests, and capacity rather than their limitations. Interventions were based on client self-determination and aimed to assist individuals to identify and achieve their own goals instead of minimising risk factors and addressing immediate needs.

The *Homeless Youth Assistance Programme – Evaluation Strategy Workshop Consultation Report Aug 2015* mentioned the importance of collaborative services to meet the client’s individual needs. The *Homeless Youth Assistance Programme – Summary Report of Statewide consultation April – May 2015* used the terms collaborative planning, case



management, and wrap-around. It targeted children aged 12 to 15 years who are homeless or at risk of homelessness. The *Homeless Youth Assistance Programme (HYAP)* aims for a child's immediate safety, restoration to family, engagement with school and services, when restoration was not available and/or alternative options for long term wellbeing. School-based identification and intervention for children were discussed in the policy.

The HYAP suggests family case management and Milwaukee Wrap-around were possible methods of service delivery that offered child-centred and family-focused models. This meant the child's strengths, needs, aspirations and choices were central to planning. Additionally, the family was also engaged in case planning and service as much as possible. HYAP services needed a high level of cultural competence when working with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders children and also children from different cultural backgrounds and their families.

Specialist Homelessness Services Practice Guidelines contained the terms wraparound, integrated service, and case management. The *Guidelines* recommended intensive responses for clients with complex needs, including wraparound supports. The wraparound support model was found in the Geelong project, The Sydney District West Family Homelessness Support Service, Inner City of Sydney Assertive Outreach and Case Coordination Service, and the Canterbury Bankstown Multicultural Family Homelessness Support service. In these projects, schools were consistently collaborated with when working with children with complex needs.

Education

National

There were four National policies in Education out of 12 that contained wraparound-related terms. The *Disability Standards for Education 2005* used the term collaborative arrangement to describe wraparound support and discussed measures that the education provider could implement so that students with a disability were able to access educational support services and be provided education on the same basis as a student without a disability. The *Standards* also aimed to ensure the provision of specialised services for the student, where necessary, was facilitated through collaborative arrangements with specialised service providers and that the school provided appropriately trained support staff, such as specialist teachers, interpreters, note takers and teachers' aides for students with disabilities.

Career and Transition Services Framework: An Effective National Approach to Youth Transition used the term wraparound and proposed a framework for careers and transition services in which education and training authorities, schools, community service providers, government agencies, and industry bodies could implement in ways appropriate to their circumstances. The framework consisted of (a) a learning pathways plan; (b) a transition plan and portfolio; (c) an exit plan; (d) follow-up support; (e) career education; (f) brokerage where young people will have opportunities to receive a range of vocational educational programs (e.g., vocational educational training); (g) career information, guidance and counselling; (h) brokerage: placement or referral; (i) individual support approaches; and (j) monitoring and tracking. The individual support approaches and monitoring and tracking elements contained wraparound-like features. These elements ensured that approaches such as mentoring or case management were available for young people who would benefit

from intensive one-on-one intervention. A monitoring and tracking element ensured appropriate arrangements across service and institution boundaries so young people could be followed up as they move through school into post-school destinations. The monitoring and tracking element aimed to ensure practises are in place so young people could be followed up through school and post-school destinations. This tracking system was a mechanism for identifying young people who were potentially at risk of not making successful transitions.

Positive Pathways for Young People in Remote Communities: What works? 2012 used the term wraparound and described a research report project that explored the meaning and characteristics of positive pathways for young people aged 12-19 years. The focus of the research was on experiences of those who work in remote communities with young people. The section that focused on wraparound contained the suggestion that relationships should be cultivated with young people. These relationships can provide wraparound structures to support young people at school and outside school in the broader community.

The Final Report on the Evaluation of the Youth Connections Specialised Services Program referred to wraparound using the terms support coordinated and case management. The design of Youth Connections services emphasised a holistic and personalised case management approach for each client, with a focus on identifying and addressing the barriers to their learning or employment. The document suggested strategies and approaches that contribute to capacity building across education providers and other relevant programs. Thus, across the State there was a maximisation of available resources to support young people who were at imminent risk of entering, were in, or were exiting the juvenile justice system.



New South Wales

There were no wraparound-related terms found in the New South Wales grey literature on education.

Methods of Implementation

As discussed in the beginning of this report, there is a dearth of implementation guidelines in the Australian context; therefore, the researchers searched not only for the Australian national and NSW guidelines, but also focused on other Australian states and New Zealand. The identified wraparound implementation guidelines are briefly described below, including the key learnings.

Australia

Creating Engaging Schools for All Children and Young People: What Works

This document aimed to improve school and student engagement in Victoria. Case studies were examined, and seven principles were proposed for establishing engaging schools:

1. Embrace diversity through creating an inclusive school culture.
2. Provide vulnerable children and young people with additional, tailored assistance when required.
3. Manage successful transitions from early childhood to primary school and from primary school to secondary school.
4. Actively collaborate with families.
5. Address the learning needs, strengths and interests of every child in every classroom.
6. Focus on the whole child and young person to promote their wellbeing and social-emotional development.

7. Work with the local community, including the community sector, other education providers and businesses.

Wraparound supports were discussed as part Principles 2 and 5. In principle 2, wrap-around was presented as one of the initiatives for additional support for children with disabilities. “Coordinated, holistic wrap-around service” (p. 18) was suggested as a strategy for vulnerable students to remain engaged in school. In Principle 5, wraparound was suggested as a flexible learning option to improve student well-being. Despite discussing wraparound service, wraparound needed more clear information about the service.

Principles for Successful Programs

This document focused on the important elements for the delivery of programs. Wraparound was one of the two provisions that was identified as being as a key element of successful welfare programs. Several case studies that demonstrated the benefits of wraparound were discussed. However, these wraparound services were delivered by not-for-profit organisations (e.g., UnitingCare West, Save the Children, The Smith Family) for disadvantaged Australians. Recommendations to continue to fund wraparound services were made to the Australian Government.

An interesting aspect of this document was the section on “place based services”. This service appears to be similar to wraparound, but used school as the place based centre as the community hub. One of the reasons for using school as the community hub was due to its accessibility.

Stepping Forward. Sharing What Works

This document provides a national picture of current activity across all governments. Wraparound was implemented in South Australia and Tasmania. In South Australia, collaborative planning was not new but two new processes were recognised in the

wraparound process. Firstly, the focus was placed on the student and their families; they were at centre of the planning process and decision making of who will make up the support team. Secondly, there was an emphasis of decreasing formal supports by the support team being largely made up of non-professionals.

In Tasmania, young people with challenging behaviours were supported by wraparound services. The agencies that work in collaboration for these people can range from Department of Education, Youth Justice, Project Hahn, Anglicare and the Salvation Army.

The Models of Service Delivery and Interventions for Children and Young People with High Needs

This document highlights the need for effective approaches to service coordination. Wraparound was defined as a “planning process involving the child or young person and family that results in a unique set of community services and natural support individualised to the child and family, to achieve a positive set of outcomes” (Burn & Goldman, 1999, p. 23). Wraparound was for children and young people with serious or complex emotional and behavioural needs, identified by child welfare or juvenile justice for being at immediate risk of out of home placement or being removed from the community.

According to the *Models of Service Delivery and Intervention for Children and Young People with High Needs*, three points influence the effectiveness of wraparound supports: (1) adherence to elements and principles, (2) involvement of family members and community supports, and (3) organisation, policy and funding constraints. Wraparound assumed a child or a young person will benefit best when they are supported by services that have been coordinated by their family and services are tailored to the specific individual needs of the child or young person and their family.

The document provided four principle characteristics of wraparound programs according to Lyons and Rawal (2005):

1. A strengths-based approach
2. Life domain planning
3. Case management
4. Development of natural supports (e.g., extended family, friends and neighbours).

There were 2 primary goals of wraparound: to reduce the possibility of Out of Home Care and unnecessarily restrictive placements and to improve behavioural and emotional functioning.

Wraparound was recognised as a long-term intervention because developing connections between services and the young person and their families takes time and there were barriers when implementing wraparound. The identified barriers to implementation were organisational, policy and funding constraints (e.g., excessive documentation requirements, rigidity around access to payment for services and supports), and inconsistent team support.

Challenges to implementing and evaluating wraparound, according to the *Models of Service Delivery and Intervention for Children and Young People with High Needs*, are listed below:

- Inconsistent adherence to wraparound elements and principles (e.g., not including important individuals on the child and family team, especially school staff, friends and family advocates).
- Limited involvement of the young person in community activities and activities the young person does well.

- Limited use of family and community strengths to plan services.
- Limited flexible funds to implement innovative ideas generated from team planning, and inconsistent measurement of consumer satisfaction.
- Flexible funding – programs remain hampered by traditional reimbursement methods and agencies that continue to operate in isolation.
- A clear understanding of family-centred, community-based principles and strategies.
- Intensive and ongoing training, supervision and administrative support.
- Wraparound strongly involves family centred and community competent individualised plan and process but some of the families receiving wraparound service have few, if any social supports. This is common in disadvantaged neighbourhood communities. Some families opt to not involve friends, relatives or neighbours in team meetings due to feelings of shame and also privacy reasons. As a result, working with professionals may be preferred over an informal support system made up of friends or family.
- Some people from poor and disadvantage homes have difficulty committing time and energy to neighbours and do not follow through with agreements. This is particularly true for young people returning home to an overwhelmed single parent and many siblings.
- A persistent challenge is encouraging the young people and families to actively participate and accept joint responsibility.
- Some of the lifestyles of the young people and/or family members may include substance abuse.

The NSW Ombudsman Inquiry into Behaviour Management in Schools

This inquiry recognised wraparound support as a collaboration and team approach within the school with professionals external to the schools for students with complex needs. Wraparound support was one of the services provided by transitional centres starting in the second half of 2016.

This inquiry and their continuing work demonstrated government and non-government schools were invested in collaboration with government and non-government agencies. The aims of these collaborations were to help students attend school, school engagement, assist students to gain health and other supports, and provide support for families to improve circumstances for students. For these aims to be achieved, a “well-calibrated interagency response” (p. 57) such as wraparound is needed for students with complex needs.

One example of wraparound supports that have been initiated is School-Link, which has been designed to provide access to specialist mental health services to children and young people in school and in TAFE. The program was being delivered to approximately 3,000 schools in NSW. Schools have expressed that their involvement with child and adolescent mental health services (CAMHS) through school-link has been positive. CAMHS staff meetings with students at their schools have created avenues for support.

Green Square School - Ngaramadhi Space

Green Square School (GSS) was a school that caters for students with complex needs from 10 to 16 years of age. This school implemented the wraparound service model in 2016 by establishing a school-based multidisciplinary team called the Ngaramadhi Space meaning “active listening” (Rangan & Eastwood, 2019), that worked in collaboration with one another to provide specialised services for students with complex needs. The Ngaramadhi



Space included: a psychiatrist, senior psychologist, psychologist, paediatrician, occupational therapist, speech pathologist, social worker, art therapist, nurse and specialist teachers. In this space issues ranging from “physical health, learning, psychological and social” (Santuri & Eastwood, 2019, p. 88) were addressed by using a student-centred multidisciplinary approach.

The wraparound service model could be seen in the Ngaramadhi Space through education and health services working in collaboration with each other. Santuri and Eastwood (2019) stated there were five aims of the Ngaramadhi Space: “(a) supplement the educational opportunities by providing access to health and social support services, (b) undertake interagency multidisciplinary planning, review and implementation of personalised learning and development plans, (c) connect the teachers with the health practitioners to build their health literacy and universal therapeutic techniques, (d) enabling teachers to transfer skills to mainstream classroom, (e) provide an educational opportunity for families” (p. 88).

One of the key results from the Ngaramadhi Space has been the improvement of access to health care for students at GSS and their families. As a result, this has assisted creating a more effective partnership between education and the health services and in turn providing the students’ a more coordinated approach to support their needs long term.

New Zealand

Wellbeing for Success: Effective Practice

Schools in New Zealand with “Wellbeing for Success: Effective Practice” all have common themes to support wellbeing for all students. The themes included: (a) we can do better, (b) focus on improvement, (c) recognising the need for a balanced focus on

wellbeing and achievement, (d) providing layers of support, (e) systems, people, and initiatives “wrap around” students, (f) making implicit school values explicit, (g) schools using restorative practices, and (h) wanting the best for all students. These schools have developed a culture of wellbeing and understand that there is a need for wellbeing in the curriculum.

The culture of wellbeing in the school was developed by each school through working together with the community to create an underlying set of values for the school. By working with the community to create the school’s values, though it took time, the process allowed the community to understand the school’s values and take on board the culture of the school. Therefore, it was important to focus on creating better pathways for collaborating with the community.

Planning for a wellbeing culture was done consciously and intentionally. The culture and values were ingrained into everything done by school leaders and teachers: strategic planning, development of policies, school systems, relationships throughout the community, and the classroom.

Continuous efforts were made by boards of trustees and principals to strengthen the culture of wellbeing. The board of trustees provided regular reports on the progress of working towards wellbeing goals, and the principals worked with staff, both existing and new, to ensure the culture of wellbeing was being practised and understood.

One principal noted that before the promotion of a culture of wellbeing in 2010, there were high levels of stand downs and suspensions, attendance was poor, and the student roll was decreasing. The school environment was poorly maintained, systems were

focused on adult wellbeing rather than student wellbeing, and for some students and the wider community, deficit views were practised.

In response to the points listed above, the principal and deputy principal investigated possible underlying causes. Firstly, the view of students, parents, teachers, school trustees, and contributing schools were examined. Secondly what other local students were actively doing to build a positive school culture was examined. Thirdly, the methods of support other schools provided their school leaders to improve school's culture was examined. And finally, they investigated what research reported to be effective.

The culture of wellbeing was embedded into the curriculum and the focus was placed on social, emotional, and physical aspects of wellbeing in the curriculum to encourage wellbeing. For example, teachers aimed to nurture student dispositions that support their learning (e.g., persistence identity as learners). Students were taught methods to support one another's learning, and teachers aimed to have their students see them as caring about their learning, compared to caring about them or being simply liked.

Additionally, the environment was organised to develop inclusive learning communities.

Wraparound support for students was discussed. In this secondary school, there were five houses. Each house had a dean that was responsible for the support and guidance of students. The houses consisted of 15 students from years 9 to 13. Each house was assigned a staff member who was a teacher, guidance counsellor, or principal who stayed with the group as they moved through the school.

The school's wraparound hub was designed to be a "one-stop-shop". The hub consisted of guidance counsellors, a career advisor/gateway coordinator, a nurse, a Resource Teacher: Learning and Behaviour (RTL), and a physiotherapist. The focus was to

make seeking help “normal”. Text messaging was used by counsellors and health professionals to keep in contact with students, making bookings, and confirm appointments. Text messaging was also used when counsellors or health professionals were concerned about the students’ wellbeing. A range of learning support programs were available to cater for all students:

- Specialist help to address literacy and numeracy needs;
- Peer reading and mentoring;
- Individual and group interventions focused on learning how to learn; and
- Programmes for gifted and talented students.

Te Kahu Toi, Intensive Wraparound Service (IWS)

Te Kahu Toi, Intensive wraparound service (IWS) was a service provided by the NZ Ministry of Education for young people aged 5-14 years with complex needs and required support at school, at home and in the community. Students were referred to the IWS by teachers or schools because they were experiencing significant challenges in their lives and were really struggling to stay at school and learn. IWS puts the student and family in the centre with classroom, school, community and society as supports.

The characteristics of IWS were: (a) it consists of evidence-based practices, (b) team-based, (c) culturally competent, (d) community-based, (e) persistent to meet goals and needs, (f) collaborative, (g) consists of natural supports, (h) strength-based, (i) individualised, and (j) gives the family a voice and a choice.

There several elements that were crucial to make IWS work. The team meetings were held regularly in order to provide consistency to the student and the family. The families were never asked to give more information than they wanted to give; they had the option to “pass” on any question. Each individualised plan was evaluated regularly to ensure

that it was working and to allow for any necessary changes. Funding for the student's plan went straight to the school. A facilitator helped the student and family prepare for meetings and make sure their voices were heard. The plan included actions or steps to provide support for the wider family if needed. The facilitator worked with the child and family to decide who would be part of the team. Team members could consist of close friends, neighbours, or professionals that the student and family had good relations with. More information about this program, including case studies can be found at:

<https://www.education.govt.nz/school/student-support/special-education/intensive-wraparound-service-iws/>

Conclusion

This review of grey literature revealed details on how wraparound supports are represented in the Australian national and NSW state policies and schools. In addition to this, the best practises and models of wraparound support are currently being implemented in Australia and New Zealand were identified. Firstly, discussion of the importance of interagency collaboration was found in most of the national and NSW state policies, but whether there was any collaboration with education institutions, was concerning. While there were several policies that recognised education institutions as key stakeholders for the support team, many discussed interagency collaboration without involving education institutions.

The authors of this review found that wraparound relevant terms were loosely used in most of Australian national and NSW state policies. This suggested there was a need for a clear understanding of what the wraparound service model is and how wraparound can be

implemented to support children and youth with complex needs in Australia. Firstly, this meant understanding the ten principles of the wraparound process developed by Bruns, Leverentz-Brady, and Suter (2008). The ten principles of the wraparound process are: (1) family voice and choice, (2) team based, (3) natural supports, (4) collaboration, (5) community based, (6) culturally competent, (7) individualised, (8) strengths based, (9) unconditional, and (10) outcome based. Though there is a level of flexibility involved with each wraparound service, it is crucial the ten principles are followed to provide adequate support for youth and children with complex needs. Secondly, for each wraparound process Bruns and Walker (2008) stated there are four phases of the wraparound model: (1) engagement phase, (2) initial plan development, (3) plan implementation, and (4) transitioning. Bruns and Walker (2008) emphasised, with the development of each phase the focus on culture should be enhanced. Therefore, future research may examine how successful culturally based wraparound models could be implemented in the Australian culture.

There were three overarching research questions in this study. The answers to the three research questions will be addressed below.

[How are wraparound services presented/advocated for in state or national policy?](#)

Descriptions of wraparound services were found to be generally very vague in most documents. Wraparound-related terms were common throughout national and New South Wales (NSW) grey literature. Wraparound related terms were mentioned in national policy regarding the following domains: Youth Justice, Out of home, Mental health, Drug and Alcohol and Education. In NSW state grey literature wraparound terms were found in the following domains: Youth Justice, Out of home, Disability, Mental health and Homelessness.

Across the domains, different wraparound terms were used, for example, support coordination, integrated services, service evaluations, case management, wraparound and multisystemic system of support. The documents discussed the need for collaboration of multiple agencies to meet the needs of children or young people with complex needs. However, the need for collaboration was consistently discussed separate from the other domains and so were each siloed. This obvious disconnect amongst the multiple domains indicated a lack of collaborative support required for children or young people with complex needs.

According to grey literature, to what extent are schools in NSW or nationally using the wraparound model?

The documents reviewed suggested that some kind of wraparound model was being used in schools in Victoria and in NSW, but it was more commonly used by not-for-profit organisations, with the department of education acting as one of the agencies that worked in collaboration with other agencies. In NSW, Green Square School was one school that has implemented a wraparound model. This school was structured to support students with complex needs through their Ngarmadhi Space, which was made up of a team of specialised service providers who were available for students on the school grounds.

What does the grey literature say about best practices in wraparound?

The national grey literature recognised that collaborative practise is not new, but the current review found two practises of the wraparound model that are new. The first is that wraparound is student and family focused, with students and their families at the centre of the planning process and are central in deciding who will be part of the support team. Secondly, there has been a shift to some members of the support team being made up of non-professionals providing informal supports in addition to the formal supports provided

by professionals. The NSW grey literature revealed that three conditions influence the effectiveness of wraparound supports: (1) adherence to elements and principles, (2) involvement of family members, community supports, and organisations, and (3) policy and funding constraints. In addition to this, numerous challenges to implementing wraparound were discussed.

The provision of wraparound supports in New Zealand was also examined and examples of wraparound supports implemented in schools were revealed. One school created a hub that was a “one-stop-shop” where the student had access to guidance counsellors, career advisor/Gateway coordinator, a nurse, Resource teacher: Learning and Behaviour (RTLB), and a physiotherapist.

Strengths and Limitations

The analysis conducted for this study examined documents from Australian national and NSW state legislation and policies to identify grey literature relevant to wraparound services. This allowed for unique insights into the direction Australia national and NSW state legislation and policies were taking to aim for more effective interagency collaboration for youths with complex needs. Despite the interesting findings of wraparound relevant content, this study had few limitations. Firstly, the legislations and policy documents of only Australian national and NSW state were investigated. Future studies should examine all of Australia’s states and territories legislations and policy documents.

Secondly, implementation practice guides only from Australia national, NSW state and New Zealand were examined. Future studies may want to include practice guides from United States of America and Canada to consider how wraparound service model is implemented in different cultures.

References

- Australian Government. Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations. (2012). *The Final Report on the Evaluation of the Youth Connections Specialised Services Program*. Retrieved from https://docs.education.gov.au/system/files/doc/other/youth_connections_specialised_services_report.pdf
- Australian Government Department of Health. (2015). *Australian Government Response to Contributing Lives, Thriving Communities - Review of Mental Health Programmes and Services*. Retrieved from [https://www1.health.gov.au/internet/main/publishing.nsf/Content/0DBEF2D78F7CB9E7CA257F07001ACC6D/\\$File/response.pdf](https://www1.health.gov.au/internet/main/publishing.nsf/Content/0DBEF2D78F7CB9E7CA257F07001ACC6D/$File/response.pdf)
- Bruns, E. J., Rast, J., Peterson, C., Walker, J., & Bosworth, J. (2006). Spreadsheets, service providers, and the statehouse: Using data and the process to reform systems for children and families. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 38*, 201-212. doi: [10.1007/s10464-006-9074-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-006-9074-z)
- Bruns, E. J., Leverentz-Brady, K. M., & Suter, J. C. (2008). Is it wraparound yet? Setting quality standards for implementation of the wraparound process. *Journal of Behavioral Health and Services & Research, 35*, 240-252. doi: [10.1007/s11414-008-9109-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11414-008-9109-3)
- Bruns, E. J., & Walker, J. S. (2008). *The resource guide to wraparound*. Portland, OR: National Wraparound Initiative, Research and Training Center for Family Support and Children's Mental Health.
- Carney, M. M., & Buttell, F. (2003). Reducing juvenile recidivism: Evaluating the wraparound services model. *Research on Social Work Practice, 13*, 551-568. doi: [10.1177/1049731503253364](https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731503253364)
- Anonymous. (n.d.). *Career and Transition Services Framework: An Effective National Approach to Youth Transition*. Retrieved from <http://www.educationcouncil.edu.au/site/DefaultSite/filesystem/documents/Reports%20and%20publications/Archive%20Publications/Youth%20Affair/Career%20and%20Transition%20Services%20Framework-Youth%20Transitions.pdf>
- Clark, H. B., Prange, M. E., Lee, B., Stewart, E. S., McDonald, B. B., & Boyd, L. A. (1998). An individualized wraparound process for children in foster care with emotional/behavioral disturbances: Follow-up findings and implications from a controlled study. In M. H. Epstein K. Kutash, & A. Duchnowski (Eds.), *Outcomes for children and youth with emotional and behavioral disorders and their families: Programs and evaluation best practices* (pp. 513-542). Austin, TX: Pro-ED, Inc.
- Commonwealth of Australia. (2009). *Protecting Children is Everyone's Business: National Framework for Protecting Australia's Children 2009-2020*. Retrieved from https://www.dss.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/child_protection_framework.pdf
- Commonwealth Attorney-General. (2006). *Disability Standards for Education 2005 plus Guidance Notes*. Retrieved from https://docs.education.gov.au/system/files/doc/other/disability_standards_for_education_2005_plus_guidance_notes.pdf
- Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs. (2012). *Supporting Young People Transitioning from Out-of-Home-Care to Independence in Australia: Good Practice in 2011/2012*. Retrieved from

https://www.dss.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/supporting_young_people_2012_1.pdf

- Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs. (2010). *National Standards for Out of Home Care Final Report*. Retrieved from https://www.dss.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/final_report_nsfohc_kpmg.pdf
- Dowse, L., Cumming, T. M., Strnadová, I., Lee, J-S., & Trofimovs, J. (2014). Young people with Complex Needs in the Criminal System. *Research and Practice in Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, 1*, 174–185. doi:[10.1080/23297018.2014.953671](https://doi.org/10.1080/23297018.2014.953671)
- Education Review Office. Te Tari Arotake Mātauranga. (n.d.). *Schools with Good Wellbeing Practises*. Retrieved from <https://www.ero.govt.nz/publications/wellbeing-for-success-effective-practice/schools-with-good-wellbeing-practices/>
- Education Review Office. Te Tari Arotake Mātauranga. (2016). *Wellbeing for Success: Effective Practice*. Retrieved from <https://www.ero.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/Wellbeing-effective-practice-2-pager.pdf>
- Family & Community Services. (2014). *Specialist Homelessness Services. Practice Guidelines*. Retrieved from http://www.housing.nsw.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0009/327996/GHSHPracticeGuidelines.pdf
- Family & Community Services, NSW Health. (2011). *Memorandum of Understanding Between the Department of Family and Community Services, Community Services and NSW Health on Health Screening, Assessment, Intervention and Review for Children and Young People in Statutory Out-of-Home Care*. Retrieved from http://www.community.nsw.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0011/319916/mou_cs_nsw_health.pdf
- Family & Community Services Housing NSW, NSW Health. (2011). *Housing and Mental Health Agreement*. Retrieved from http://www.housing.nsw.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0006/326166/HousingandMentalHealthAgreement.pdf
- Family and Community Services. (2015). *Homeless Youth Assistance Programme – Evaluation Strategy Workshop: Consultation Report*. Retrieved from http://www.housing.nsw.gov.au/_data/assets/file/0008/346274/HYAP-Evaluation-Strategy-Workshop-Outcomes-Report.pdf
- Goodrick, D. (2012). *Positive Pathways for Young People in Remote Communities: What works?* Retrieved from https://docs.education.gov.au/system/files/doc/other/report_positive_pathways_for_young_people_in_remote_communities_what_works_july_2012.pdf
- House of Representatives. Standing Committee on Family, Community, Housing and Youth. (2009). *Housing the Homeless. Report on the Inquiry into Homelessness Legislation*. Retrieved from https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/House_of_Representatives_committees?url=fchy/homelessness/report.htm
- Housing NSW. (2015). *Homeless Youth Assistance Programme (HYAP) - Service Delivery Framework 2015*. Retrieved from http://www.housing.nsw.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0009/325188/HYAP-Service-Delivery-Framework.pdf

- Human Services. (2010). *Memorandum of Understanding Between Community Services and ADHC on Children and Young People with a Disability*. Retrieved from http://www.community.nsw.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0003/319917/mou_cs_adhc.pdf
- Human Serviced Community Services, Human Services Ageing, Disability & Home Care. (2010). *Joint Practice Guidelines – for Joint Work with Children and Young People with a Disability*. Retrieved from http://www.community.nsw.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0004/319918/joint_practice_guidelines_cs_adhc.pdf
- Intergovernmental Committee on Drugs. (2014). *National Alcohol and Other Drug Workforce Development Strategy 2015-2018*. Retrieved from <https://www.health.gov.au/sites/default/files/national-alcohol-and-other-drug-workforce-development-strategy-2015-2018.pdf>
- MCEETYA. (2001). *Stepping Forward. Sharing What Works*. Retrieved from <http://www.educationcouncil.edu.au/site/DefaultSite/filesystem/documents/Reports%20and%20publications/Archive%20Publications/Youth%20Affair/Stepping%20Forward%20-%20Sharing%20What%20Works%20Case%20Studies%202002.pdf>
- McGinness, A. (2010). *A Strategic Review of the NSW Juvenile Justice System*. Retrieved from <http://www.juvenile.justice.nsw.gov.au/Documents/Juvenile%20Justice%20Review%20Report%20FINAL.pdf>
- Ministry of Education. Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga. (n.d.). Te Kāhu Tōi, Intensive Wraparound Service (IWS). Retrieved from <https://www.education.govt.nz/assets/Documents/School/Supporting-students/Flyer-IWS-Service-providers-FINAL.pdf>
- NSW Department of Community Services. (2006). *Models of Service Delivery and Interventions for Children and Your People with High Needs*. Retrieved from http://www.community.nsw.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0020/321716/research_service_delivery_models.pdf
- NSW Department of Education. (n.d.). *Green Square School - Ngaramadhi Space*. Retrieved from <https://greensq-s.schools.nsw.gov.au/ngaramadhi-space---deep-listening.html>
- NSW Government. (2006). *NSW Interagency Guidelines for Child Protection Intervention*. Retrieved from <https://www.victimsservices.justice.nsw.gov.au/sexualassault/Documents/Child-Protection-Interagency-Guidelines.pdf>
- NSW Government. (2007). *Transition Program Office Policy Paper 3: Caring for Children and Young People in NSW*. Retrieved from http://www.community.nsw.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0017/320039/tpo_policy_paper_3_caring_for_children_and_young_people_in-nsw_final_october-2012.pdf
- NSW Government. (2009). *Keep Them Safe-A Shared Approach to Child Wellbeing 2009-2014*. Retrieved from http://www.keepthemsafe.nsw.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0004/57145/Keep_Them_Safe.pdf
- NSW Government. (2014). *Joint Operational Practice Guidelines to Accompany the Memorandum of Understanding between the Department of Family and Community Services, Community Services and Department of Justice, Juvenile Justice About Children or Young People who are Shared Clients of Community Services and Juvenile Justice*. Retrieved from

http://www.community.nsw.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0007/319921/endorsed_practice_guidelines.pdf

NSW Government. (2014). *Advocate for Children and Young People Act 2014 (No 29)*. Retrieved from <https://www.legislation.nsw.gov.au/#/view/act/2014/29/full>

NSW Government. (2010). *Memorandum of Understanding between Community Services and Ageing, Disability and Home Care (ADHC) on Children and Young People with a Disability*. Retrieved from

http://www.community.nsw.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0003/319917/mou_cs_adhc.pdf

NSW Government. (2010). *Joint Practice Guidelines - For Joint Work with Children and Young People with a Disability*. Retrieved from

http://www.community.nsw.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0004/319918/joint_practice_guidelines_cs_adhc.pdf

NSW Government. (2012). *Framework for Multi-Agency Client Transition Planning to Reduce Homelessness*. Retrieved from

http://www.housing.nsw.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0003/326055/Framework_for_MultiAgency_Client_Transition_Planning.pdf

NSW Government. (2009). *National Partnership on Homelessness NSW Implementation Plan 2009-2013*. Retrieved from

http://www.housing.nsw.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0018/326061/Nationalagreementhomelessness.pdf

NSW Mental Health Commission. (2014). *NSW Living Well, A strategic Plan for Mental Health in NSW 2014-2024*. Retrieved from

[https://nswmentalhealthcommission.com.au/sites/default/files/141002%20Living%20Well%20-%20A%20Strategic%20Plan%20\(1\).pdf](https://nswmentalhealthcommission.com.au/sites/default/files/141002%20Living%20Well%20-%20A%20Strategic%20Plan%20(1).pdf)

Ombudsman NSW. (2017). *NSW Ombudsman Inquiry into Behaviour Management in Schools*.

Retrieved from <https://rypple.org.au/wp-content/uploads/sites/54/2017/08/NSW-Ombudsman-Inquiry-into-behaviour-management-in-schools.pdf>

Rangan, S. & Eastwood, J. (2019). Ngaramadhi. *International Journal of Integrated care*. 19, 88. doi: [10.5334/ijic.s3088](https://doi.org/10.5334/ijic.s3088)

Ross Beaton Consulting. (2015). *Homeless Youth Assistance Programme – Summary Report of State-Wide Consultation Homeless Youth Assistance Programme (HYAP)*. Retrieved from

http://www.housing.nsw.gov.au/_data/assets/file/0007/346273/Summary-Report-of-Statewide-Consultations.pdf

Schreier, M. (2013). Qualitative data analysis. In Flick, U. (Ed.). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative data analysis* (pp. 170-183). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Senate Community Affairs Committee Secretariat. (2015). *Out of Home Care*. Retrieved from

https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Senate/Community_Affairs/Out_of_home_care/Report

Senate Community Affairs Committee Secretariat. (2015). *Adequacy of Existing Residential Care Arrangements Available for Young People with Severe Physical, Mental or Intellectual Disabilities in Australia*. Retrieved from

https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Senate/Community_Affairs/Young_people_in_aged_care/Report

- Select Committee on Intergenerational Welfare Dependence. (2018). *Principles for Successful Programs*. Retrieved from https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/House/Intergenerational_Welfare_Dependence/IGWD/Final_Report/section?id=committees%2Freportrep%2F024242%2F26848#footnote34target
- Select Committee on Mental Health. (2006). *A National Approach to Mental Health - From Crisis to Community First Report*. Retrieved from https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Senate/Former_Committees/mentalhealth/report/index
- Senate Community Affairs Committee Secretariat. (2008). *Towards Recovery: Mental Health Services in Australia*. Retrieved from https://www.aph.gov.au/Parliamentary_Business/Committees/Senate/Community_Affairs/Completed_inquiries/2008-10/mental_health/report/index
- Strnadová, I., Cumming, T. M., Boaden, N., Dew, A., Athanassiou, U., & Dowse, L. (2017). *Frameworks for transition: Representation of issues for young people with complex support needs in Australian policy*. Sydney: UNSW Sydney.
- Tricia Rushton Consulting. (2015). *Good Practice, Strengthening Services of Youth in Juvenile Justice*. Members of the Youth Justice Working Party (Eds.). Retrieved from https://docs.education.gov.au/system/files/doc/other/good_practice_strengthening_services_for_youth_in_juvenile_justice_1.pdf
- Transition Program Office. (2013). *Out of Homecare Transition Implementation Framework Stage 2, 2013-2014*. Retrieved from https://www.facs.nsw.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0014/320081/tpo_oohc_framework_stage2.pdf
- Ungar, M., Liebenberg, L., & Ikeda, J. (2012). Young people with complex needs: Designing coordinated interventions to promote resilience across child welfare, juvenile corrections, mental health and education services. *British Journal of Social Work*, 44(3), 675-693.
- Victorian Council of Social Service (VCOSS), Centre for Excellence in Child and Family Welfare (CFECFW), Youth Affairs Council of Victoria (YACVic), Early Learning Association Australia (ELAA) and Hume Whittlesea Local Learning and Employment Network (HWLLEN). (2016). *Creating Engaging Schools for All Children and Young People: What Works*. Retrieved from https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=14&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwis7bqvXuXIAhVWWX0KHTkmBb8QFjANegQIBxAC&url=https%3A%2F%2Fela.org.au%2Fsites%2Fdefault%2Ffiles%2FREP_161213_Engaging-schools-report_Final.pdf&usq=AOvVaw2X3h3BVPoTP4mA3bYIp4kH
- Walker, J. S., & Sanders, B. (2011). The Community Supports for Wraparound Inventory: An Assessment of the Implementation Context for Wraparound. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 20, 747-757. doi: [10.1007/s10826-010-9432-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-010-9432-1)

Appendix 1. List of Included Polices: Domain and Jurisdiction

Domain	National	NSW
Out of Home Care	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supporting young people transitioning from out of home care to independence in Australia: good practice in 2011/2012 2. Senate Inquiry – Out of Home Care 3. Senate Inquiry- Adequacy of Existing Residential Care Arrangements Available for Young People with Severe Physical, Mental or Intellectual Disabilities in Australia 2015 4. Senate Inquiry - A national Approach to Mental Health - From Crisis to Community 2006 5. Senate Inquiry – Towards Recovery: Mental Health Services in Australia 2008 6. Senate Inquiry – Inquiry into Homelessness Legislation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Advocate for Children and Young People Act 2014 2. Keep Them Safe – A Shared Approach to Child Wellbeing 2009-2014 3. Out of Homecare Transition Implementation Framework Stage 2, 2013-2014 4. Transition Program Office Policy Paper 3: Caring for Children and Young People In NSW 2007 5. MoU between Community Services and ADHC on Children and Young People with a Disability 2010 6. Joint Practice Guidelines – for Joint Work with Children and Young People with a Disability. (Practice Guidelines for Joint Work by Community Service and ADHC for Children and Young People with a Disability) 2010 7. MoU between the Department of Family and Community Services and NSW Health on Health Screening, Assessment, Intervention and Review for Children and Young People in Statutory Out of Home Care 2011 8. Joint Operational Practice Guidelines to accompany the MoU between the Department of Family and Community Services, Community Services and Department of Justice, Juvenile Justice about children or young people who are shared clients of Community Services and Juvenile Justice 2014 9. Office of the Children’s Guardian: NSW Standards for Statutory Out- Of –Home –Care. 2015 10. NSW Interagency Guidelines for Child Protection Intervention 2006

Disability		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Transition care network for young people with chronic illness/disabilities 2013 (AIC) 2. MoU between Community Services and ADHC on children and young people with a disability 2010 3. Joint Practice Guidelines – For Joint Work with Children and Young People with a Disability. (Practice Guidelines for Joining Work by Community Services and ADHC for Children and Young People with a Disability) 2010
Youth Justice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Protecting Children is Everyone's Business: National Framework for protecting Australia's children 2009-2020 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A Strategic Review of the NSW Juvenile Justice System 2010
Mental Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Response to Review: Australian Government Response to Contributing Lives, Thriving Communities – Review of Mental Health Programmes and Services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NSW Living Well, A Strategic Plan for Mental Health 2014-2024
Alcohol and Other Drugs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. National Alcohol and other Drug Workforce Development Strategy 2015-2018 	
Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Disability Standards for Education 2005 2. Career and Transition Services Framework: An effective national approach to youth transition 2003 3. Positive Pathways for Young People in Remote Communities: What Works? 2012 4. Final Report on the Evaluation of the Youth Connections Specialised Services Program 2012 	

<p>Homelessness</p>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Framework for Multi-Agency Client Transition Planning to Reduce Homelessness 2012 2. National Partnership on Homelessness NSW Implementation Plan 2009-2013 3. Housing and mental health agreement 2011 4. Homeless Youth Assistance Programme - Service Delivery Framework 2015 5. Homeless Youth Assistance Programme Evaluation Strategy Workshop Consultation Report Aug 2015 6. Homeless Youth Assistance Programme – Summary Report of State wide Consultation April-May 2015 7. Specialist homelessness services practice guidelines 2014
----------------------------	--	---



Appendix 2. Wraparound Policy Analysis: Domain level

Question	Response
<p>What is the alignment between national and NSW state policies?</p>	<p>FED:</p> <p>NSW:</p>
<p>Holistic Young Person’s Care</p> <p>Is the term ‘wraparound’ or ‘multisystemic’ present? How is it used? How is it measured? What is the outcome? Is it evidence-based?</p> <p>Other terms used instead of ‘wraparound’ – how defined?</p>	<p>FED:</p> <p>NSW:</p>
<p>Evidence-based</p> <p>Do documents say what the evidence is? How is it established?</p>	<p>FED:</p> <p>NSW:</p>
<p>Complex needs</p> <p>How are complex needs conceptualised?</p>	<p>FED:</p> <p>NSW:</p>
<p>Interagency collaboration and integration</p> <p>Is it recommended? If yes, what model/s is recommended, and what are the outcome measures? How is this multiagency collaboration understood and operationalised? What do documents refer to as cross-sector collaboration/community of service/etc.?</p>	<p>FED:</p> <p>NSW:</p>
<p>Person-centeredness</p> <p>Is the sector/domain moving towards person-centeredness? Is there evidence of need to foster a young person's self-determination? How is the person constructed in the policy? Only as a target group? Or in alignment with person-centeredness?</p>	<p>FED:</p> <p>NSW:</p>

