

Journal of Systemic Therapies, Vol. 23, No. 2, 2004

NARRATIVE WORK IN PUBLIC SOCIAL SERVICES THROUGH WRAPAROUND PLANNING

RONNIE SWARTZ, MSW, LCSW
Humboldt State University

Narrative ways of working are often associated with traditional therapy contexts, such as counseling with individuals, couples, families, and groups in an office or therapeutic facility. Recent developments in the realm of social services, however, are consistent with narrative ideas and practices. Wraparound planning, which is committed to individualized services, collaborative planning, community-based contexts, and unconditional care, is a burgeoning movement in public social services that intersects with narrative ways of working.

Interest in understanding therapeutic work through a narrative metaphor has increased significantly since Michael White and David Epston began publicly exploring these ideas (Epston, 1989; White, 1989; White & Epston, 1990). As this interest has grown, so too have the ways in which narrative ideas are being used in various practice settings. Many articles, books, videos, workshops, and conferences on narrative work focus on traditional therapy contexts, such as counseling with individuals, couples, families, and groups in an office or therapeutic facility. The vast majority of therapeutic services in the United States, however, take place within publicly financed social service settings (Lynn, 2002).

In areas such as child welfare, mental health, special education, developmental disabilities, and juvenile justice, momentum is building to partner with individuals, families, and communities through individualized, collaborative, "strength-based" planning. Models and philosophies such as wraparound, restorative justice (Bazemore & Terry, 1997), family unity meetings (Graber & Nice, 1998), family group conferencing (Hardin, Cole, Mickens, & Lancour, 1996), student success teams (California Dropout Prevention Network, 2000), and the recovery model

Address correspondence to: Ronnie Swartz, Department of Social Work, Humboldt State University, Arcata, CA 95521. E-mail: swartz@humboldt.edu.

(Copeland, 2003) offer people interested in the purposes and commitments of a narrative approach the opportunity to bring their ways of working into more general social service settings. I am interested in the intersection between one of these programmatic approaches, wraparound planning, and narrative work.

A DEFINITION OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Narrative work has been successfully implemented in programs that provide non-therapy services to people. For example, the work of the Dulwich Centre Community Mental Health Project (Dulwich Centre, 1997) for people affected by HIV (Dulwich Centre, 2000b), and Latino Health Access (Dulwich Centre, 2000a), exemplify narrative work with people involved in social services. While in no way do I wish to diminish the work of the people associated with these programs, I do want to distinguish private social service settings from public social services, and I would like to emphasize that neither of these are therapy services.

What I am referring to as *social* service settings can be distinguished from what might be called *therapy* service settings. In therapy service settings, persons struggling with a problem meet with a professional helper (e.g., counselor, therapist, psychologist, psychiatrist, social worker) alone, with family members, or as part of a group, to talk about the effects a problem is having in their lives, and perhaps talk about ways to change this relationship. A social service setting assists people in addressing a variety of concerns that get in the way of their preferences for living. Typically, these services relate to medical care, dental care, referrals for counseling, assistance with finding housing, transportation, mentoring, financial support, nutrition, food, training for and/or finding work, education, activities, and respite care. *While social services may very well be therapeutic, they are not therapy.* As I intend to mean it, social services are those services that assist individuals in connecting with various social communities.

The second distinction I am making is between those services that take place within private organizations and those that take place within public organizations. Private social service organizations are independent businesses that commonly report to a board of directors and are typically funded through fees collected for the provision of services, donations, grants from private institutions, and contracts with public entities. Public organizations are governmental bodies operating through local, regional, state, and/or federal appropriations. They are responsible to elected officials and the citizens of the communities they represent. Employees who engage in direct practice within these organizations often work for city, county, state, or federal government and tend to get paid more, have more extensive benefits, and belong to labor unions (National Association of Social Workers, 2000).

COMPATIBILITY OF WRAPAROUND AND NARRATIVE IDEAS

While many communities may find local programs claiming to provide wraparound services, it is important to clarify what kind of wraparound planning I am referring to in the context of narrative practice. *Wraparound* refers to the practice of developing service plans with people that *wrap services around* a family through the consideration of individual and family needs across life domains. These life domains represent an inclusive construction of areas important to a person and/or family's living. This planning happens within a strength-based and collaborative context in relation to social service workers' interactions with individuals and families, workers' interactions with other workers, and interactions between community agencies and organizations. The kind of wraparound planning I am referring to, then, occurs at individual, family, agency, and community levels. This conception of wraparound planning is consistent with the work of Miles and Franz (1994, 2001; see www.paperboat.com), VanDenBerg (2003a, 2003b; see www.vroonvdb.com), and Grealish (VanDenBerg & Grealish, 1996; see www.wraparoundsolutions.com) and can be found in practice, for example, in The Stark Family Council of Stark County, Ohio (www.starkfamilycouncil.org), Wraparound Milwaukee, in Milwaukee, Wisconsin (www.milwaukeecounty.org), and the Youth Services Bureau of Ottawa, Canada (www.ysb.on.ca).

While some social service programs have incorporated elements of a wraparound approach, such as family team meetings, multidisciplinary teams, or shared agency funding of services, these alone do not fully describe a wraparound process. A complete wraparound approach is informed by a set of values, from which specific planning practices are constructed. VanDenBerg (2003a) notes these values as: persistent commitment; child centered; family-focused; child, family, and community safety; individualized and culturally competent; strength-based; family, youth, and professional partnership; collaboration and community support; social networks and informal supports; outcome-based and cost responsible. Miles and Franz (1994) suggest: access; voice; ownership; effective parent support; flexible access; outcome-focused planning; strength-based, need-driven services; flexible, integrated service delivery; community-based care; consistent interagency coordination. I find the following to be helpful guidelines: 1) individualized care that is, 2) based on needs, 3) using a child and family-driven process that, 4) takes place within a "strengths perspective," 5) with a commitment to unconditional care that, 6) builds on cultural contexts, 7) using community-based services.

Specific planning processes and practices that result from these values include: strengths-discoveries, family teams, strength/need-based planning, flexible funding, and systems change. These will be explored below within the context of narrative ways of working as described by White and Epston (Epston, 1989, 1998; Epston & White, 1992; White, 1989, 1995, 1997, 2000; White & Epston, 1990).

Strengths-Discoveries and Excavation of Preferred Stories

The wraparound process begins before a social service planning team ever meets, when an agency worker first meets with a family who will be involved in services. In this first meeting workers spend time inviting family members into conversation about their own knowledgeable and they build the groundwork for a strength/need-based family team meeting. Questions such as the following are addressed: What have your previous experiences with social service agencies been like? What did you find most helpful? What did you find least helpful? Which family events are considered important to your family? What cultural influences are important to you? What are some individual and family strengths? What needs can be identified? The worker can get a sense before a family team convenes what the salient issues are from the family's perspective. Any concerns that have already been identified by systems the family is involved with are shared as well so that the family knows what may be requested of them.

Since the wraparound approach is new for many families, workers who facilitate the process should explain how it works so families know what to expect along the way. The strength/need-based format of wraparound planning contradicts many people's experiences of deficit- and expert-based planning. In initial getting-to-know-you meetings, workers can begin excavating for stories of liberation within problem-stories that resulted in the original program referral.

A vast, open construction of strengths results in a list that is meaningful to family members. Strengths can include qualities, interests, commitments, preferences, and anything else that might be considered a strength. The list that is generated serves as the basis of an alternate plot to a problem-dominated story and is useful for subsequent service planning.

By the time they get referred to a public social service program, individuals and families are likely to have had many encounters with problems and with people that contribute to a deficit-based totalization of their identities. As more and more of their time is spent trying to manage the effects of a problem, and as more and more people with whom they interact describe them in relation to a problem, individuals and families begin to understand and experience their lives as problem-saturated; that is, mostly filled with problems. Interactions with social service workers often reinforce this "problem-description" in two ways. First, if a social service professional makes recommendations that the family finds useful, it reinforces the notion that it takes outside experts for people to bring forth their preferred ways of living. Thus, the family was flawed to begin with. Second, if a social service professional makes recommendations that do not turn out to be helpful, it reinforces the notion that the family is beyond help. Thus, the family is utterly flawed because even the wisdom of a professionally trained worker doesn't work for them. The process of a strengths-discovery opens up an entirely new experience with a social service professional defined by the family's abilities, qualities, and preferences for living. It is in "space" that is "opened" through which the

ensuing wraparound process invites family members to step, generating an alternative story.

When constructing an inventory of strengths workers might miss opportunities to unpack what appears to be a singular, or *thinly described* strength. From a position of wanting to know more about the strength, wraparound facilitators can ask questions that offer what Geertz (1973, 1986) refers to as a *thick description* of the strength, such as the role of the strength in a person's life, who has contributed to this development, and how someone else might know that the strength is present. Questions that generate a rich context for the strength generate more meaningful experiences for those who participate in wraparound planning processes. Simple lists of what somebody is good at, which often top weak strengths-discoveries, are unlikely to invite participants to step into preferred identities. Instead, family members may experience the process as invalidating of the very real pain and suffering they have encountered. From a narrative perspective, lists of strengths that do not explore the context of those strengths in a person or family's life thinly describe experiences and identities—that is, they lack depth, richness, and vividness—and offer little hope of generating preferred stories.

When the initial strengths-discovery is complete, it can be typed up as a document for family members to review and share. This document also can be transferred onto large, easel size paper for posting around the room when the first wraparound family team meeting takes place, thereby inviting further consideration of family members' preferred identities. Documenting alternatives to problem-based descriptions of a family like this is consistent with narrative practice (White & Epston, 1990).

Family Teams and Remembering Processes

In addition to conversations about family strengths (individual family members and the family as a whole), initial meetings between wraparound facilitators and family members include explorations into possible composition of the family team. It is this team of people that develops a comprehensive service plan constructed around family strengths and preferences (or needs). The team meets on a regular basis to develop, monitor, and update the family plan, typically meeting weekly until team members feel ready to decrease the meetings. Meetings then take place biweekly or monthly. Finally, they meet quarterly or as needed, with a clear goal of eliminating professional involvement from the meeting context, leaving family teams composed solely of those people who are considered part of a natural community of support (VanDenBerg, 2003).

The process for generating a list of members for the family team, inviting those people to participate, and maintaining their presence in the family's life might be considered, in a narrative context, as a *re-membering* practice. The cultural anthropologist Barbara Myerhoff, in her work with older people (1982), offered a "club" metaphor for the constitution of individual lives and identities. That is, we

may consider each personal identity as being like a club to which significant people belong. In bringing forth the contributions, both helpful and not-so-helpful, that members make to an individual or family's identity, Myerhoff says, "the term 'Remembering' may be used, calling attention to the reaggregation of members, the figures who belong to one's life story, one's own prior selves, as well as significant others who are part of the story" (p. 111).

The family team, then, certainly participates in the development of a service plan, but it also serves to offer a renewed membership to the club that constitutes each person's life and the identity of the family as a whole. In order to do this effectively, it is preferable that less than half of the team members are professional workers paid to engage in service planning with families. The rest of the team may be made up of any people the family considers a resource and an important part of their life.

As family team members are identified, wraparound facilitators talk with workers from other agencies involved in the family's life and who are invited to participate in service planning. It is important to find out their concerns, their experience with a strength/need-based planning process, and their sense for family strengths. This invites other workers to step into a competency-based perspective in their work with families, and decreases the chances that the family team will unexpectedly shift to a problem-oriented conversation.

Strength/Need-Based Planning and Real Time Outsider Witness Groups

The team of people who regularly gather to engage in wraparound planning come together to craft individualized services that build on the strengths and respond to the needs of the identified family. In fulfilling this charge, the team participates in the telling and re-telling of individual and family stories. They also serve as an audience for the circulation of preferred stories which result from the strength/need-based planning process. So, while the team *is* a planning team, they are also a group of people that bears witness to the generation of new and preferred identities. In describing Myerhoff's (1986) term, White (1995) claims that *outsider witness groups* are "essential to the processes of the acknowledgement and the authentication of people's claims about their histories and about their identities, and to the performance of these claims" (p. 178).

Following a strength/need-based planning process, family team meetings begin with a reading of previously identified strengths identified for individual family members and the family as a whole. Time is then spent asking about and adding to the discovery of strengths. Next, needs are explored through a range of life domains, often noted as: family, residence/a place to live, social/fun, emotional/behavioral, school/work, financial, legal, medical, crisis/safety, cultural/spiritual (VanDenBerg & Grealish, 1996). After identifying priority needs, strengths are matched to needs and a plan is developed for responding to those needs.

The members of the family team serve as an outsider witness group by offering unconditional support to families in their efforts to develop a comprehensive, individualized plan that responds to the unique needs and utilizes the unique strengths of the family. They can be considered real-time outsider witness groups in that their acknowledgement and authentication occurs while family members themselves reclaim preferred histories and construct preferred futures. Though this process is similar to “reflecting teams” (Friedman, 1995) that engage in conversation after a family has talked with a therapist, wraparound family teams offer reflections *in the process of developing a service plan*.

Re-Storying Social Services

Wraparound planning challenges the discourse of an essential self with a fixed identity that is separate and distinct from its context. In addition to facilitating change in the lives of the individuals and families who participate, wraparound work supports social justice in communities and social service systems. Significant limitations are imposed on public social services by tying funding for services to a specific funding stream. Known as “categorical funding,”¹ people can only access services if the problems they are dealing with or their identities as a whole can be categorized—furthering the notion that people are problems and reducing the number of people who can access services. One way wraparound work addresses this issue is through the use of flexible funding (often called “Flex Funds”) for the purchase of an item or service that cannot be accessed through traditional funding.

Wraparound processes assist people with a re-connection to their communities by making use of natural resources and supports found in a family’s community. Parks, neighborhood elders, after-school programs, skilled tradespeople, and cultural traditions are just as important in social service planning as those resources and supports that are provided through agencies, departments, and programs.

Commitments to strength-based and collaborative ways of working also feature in the practices and policies of organizations responsible for service plan development and delivery. Collaboration and decisionmaking extends along horizontal and vertical lines, and makes use of worker strengths (Miles & Franz, 2001). Traditional problem-focused meeting structures transform into ceremonies of recognition and can become outsider witness groups. This changes how workers see individuals and families, how they see themselves in relation to individuals and families, and how they see themselves as workers. Conversations between agency/program workers lose their opaque, privileged, global status, and become re-creations of case file identity.

1. Opposition to categorical social welfare programs has a long history in the United States. When the Committee on Economic Security proposed the Social Security Act in January 1935, the American Association of Social Workers expressed strong concern that a system of categorical programs would be ineffective in meeting the unique and local needs of people and their communities. They advocated, instead, for a flexible, comprehensive, and unified system of care (Tice & Perkins, 2002).

Previous experiences with case planning often have left families feeling excluded, under the surveillance of authorities, and without agency in their own lives. Wraparound family teams offer an alternative to expert-based planning. Facilitators get family member's permission before writing things down in the meeting notes. They make sure that the language used on the notes matches what people actually said and meant. The list of strengths can be left with the family and family members can be enlisted to support in facilitating the family team meeting. Decisions that impact family members are not made without their consultation. Meetings are held wherever and whenever family members feel most comfortable. In traditional social services, as well as therapy services, meetings would take place in a worker's office. In a wraparound process, workers might meet on evenings or weekends; they might gather together at a restaurant, talk in the park, or hold a meeting in people's homes. Ultimately, wraparound planning resurrects contradictions to dominant discourses about publicly funded social services as being ineffective, expensive, and instruments of social control (Rector & Fagan, 1996).

THE FORBES FAMILY TEAM²

The Forbes family was referred to a publicly funded collaboration between the county probation department, mental health department, child welfare services, and office of education. The purpose of the program was to develop a comprehensive, individualized, strength/need-based service plan with families whose children were not regularly attending school. Young people referred to the program tended to have missed a high percentage of school days (over 10%), been involved in the juvenile justice system for offenses other than truancy, and had family involvement with the child welfare system (Evaluation and Training Institute, 2001).

I introduced myself to the Forbes family by sending them a letter letting them know a little about the program and that I would be giving them a call to set up a time for us to meet. Our first conversation took place in their home, with Ryan, the young person who hadn't been going to school; his mother, Marcia; his sister, Sharyn; and Marcia's partner, Mike, present for part of the time. The initial meeting centered around a strengths-discovery, explaining strength/need-based planning, and membering a family team. I followed up this conversation with a letter:

Dear Members of the Forbes Family,

It was great meeting you today. I wanted to send you a quick note to share some of what I learned after talking with you. I also wanted you to know some of the things I'm wondering about.

2. Not real names.

Ryan, thanks for letting me know some of your interests. You said you think you are struggling with school and some stuff in your home, but you also told me what you're feeling really good about. This helps me get a better picture of who you are. Now I know that you are an intelligent person who likes to play basketball but doesn't get told he's good at basketball enough and gets told he's intelligent too much! I'm hopeful that you'll be doing well enough by the end of the quarter to add Science to your course load. You said that's something you really enjoy. I wonder if the tutoring that's available to you at Franklin is enough or if you think some tutoring outside of school would be helpful? The extra credits you'll earn for the work you're doing at Uncle Steve's restaurant should allow you to get on the Basketball team . . . if you pass try-outs.

You said you'd be interested in doing some counseling with someone. When the phone gets turned back on we'll work on getting you an appointment. You said you thought Ritalin might be something that could be helpful to you. I wonder if you'll let the counselor know about that? Would people who know you be surprised to hear about your desire to talk with a counselor and your curiosity about other ways to help you focus your life? Or do you think they'd expect as much from you? Do you think it makes it more likely or less likely that you'll work things out at home and in school?

Marcia, you talked about how hard you think it must be for Ryan to study at home. You said, "There's some privacy and quiet at Uncle Steve's, but it doesn't seem like there's much of that in our home." Ryan, you agreed with your Mom. How does distraction get in the way of successful studying? Do any of you have some ideas on how to remove the distractions so there can be a focus on work? Sharyn, do you have any suggestions for your big brother? Can we talk more about this at the family team meeting?

As for our next meeting, Ryan, this is who I have listed as being invited to the Family Team: you, your Mom, Sharyn (your sister), Mike (your Mom's partner), Uncle Steve, Beth (your Mom's friend), Damon (your friend), Hector (Damon's Dad), Lucy Preton (your teacher), Barry Erthyme (the school psychologist at Franklin), Jerry Ross (your probation officer), and me, who will facilitate the meeting. As a group, we'll get together at 3:00pm, on Monday, October 12, at your house. Thank you for allowing me into your home and for inviting the family team to meet here too. We'll bring the food!

Warmly, Ronnie

I then contacted each of the people invited to the meeting to let them know what to expect and to find out if there were any issues they needed to make sure we addressed.

A Family Plan was developed at the first Family Team meeting using a strength/need-based planning process as follows:

- 1) Team members introduced themselves, stated their purpose for being at the meeting, and noted how long they've known the family. This last step is important for establishing that the family knows itself better than anyone else at the meeting.

- 2) A common purpose for gathering together was developed. I find that questions along the lines of the “miracle question” (de Shazer, 1991), “how will we know that getting together like this has been helpful?” and “how will things look in this family when the court no longer sees a reason for involvement?” are useful.
- 3) The initial discovery of strengths, which was written on large newsprint and taped to the wall of the room, was read off and people were invited to add to it. Each strength was then transferred to a 5 × 7 notecard and taped to an open area on the wall.
- 4) The “life domains” were written on notecards and taped to the wall as headings to a table. The family was then asked to note what percentage of their needs they saw as being met in each of the life domains. These percentages were written on notecards and taped below the corresponding life domain card.
- 5) The team was asked if they’d like to begin addressing needs according to those life domains that had the lowest percentage noted. Needs were written on notecards, placed under the appropriate life domain, and prioritized.
- 6) Previously recorded strengths were matched to needs by placing the strength notecard adjacent to the need notecard and a plan for meeting the need was developed and written on a notecard. Plans are framed in terms of *who* will do *what* by *when*. Team members responsible for doing something can then take the notecards with them as reminders of their task.
- 7) Notecard contents were recorded and subsequently typed up into a more formal document (see end of this article) that was mailed to all team members, including those who were unable to attend the meeting so as to keep them engaged. Family plans meet many social service workers’ paperwork requirements.

There are incredible opportunities within this process for excavating alternatives to problem-dominated stories, circulating preferred stories among an audience, and inviting a collaborative experience with social service providers.

DILEMMAS IN PROVIDING A NARRATIVE-BASED WRAPAROUND PROCESS

Significant dilemmas arise for those interested in providing non-coercive, collaborative, respectful, and socially just experiences as a result of the mandated nature of many people’s involvement with social service agencies. Wraparound offers workers an opportunity to privilege people’s lived experience, wisdom, and preferences, but an element of non-voluntariness will continue to be present in many programs.

Wraparound, and other approaches to social service planning noted in the beginning of this article, are often referred to as strength-based services. While narrative work might be considered strength-based, there are good reasons for holding back such a description. From a narrative perspective the essentialist nature of the word *strength* is problematic (White, 1999). Strengths might be considered as *belonging to* individual people, as being *inside* them, as being *lacking* in some people, or as being amenable to *growth, harvesting, mining, or extracting*. Offering an inclusive and open-ended understanding of “strength” has allowed me to be involved in strength-based wraparound planning without compromising my personal commitments to nonstructuralist practice.³ By offering multiple ways to think about strengths, such as achievements, qualities, skills of living, values, hopes, dreams, beliefs, and activities, I can keep my distance from essentialist notions of self and continue working within a larger social service system that might not yet be ready to embrace nonstructuralist language.

Another dilemma follows from the need-based nature of wraparound planning. The thinking behind this language is that need-based is a much more helpful way to look at things than problem-based, deficit-based, pathology-based, or diagnosis-based (Franz, 1994). Unfortunately, in doing so the idea of a need is elevated to a status that doesn't quite fit with narrative ways of working. In my work with individuals and families, and in agency/program training, I offer that we can understand the construct of needs in this strength/need-based planning to be *preferences for ways of living and being in the world*. It is important to make clear that needs are not services, they are not *things*. A car can meet the need of reliable transportation, but it is not the need itself. Just as well, a bicycle, bus tickets, matching someone up with a ride, and fixing part of a car can meet the need of reliable transportation—this would be considered a *plan*. A car is not a need; reliable transportation is a need.

How effective can a worker be who works in a system that has historically supported problems instead of people? This is a timeless dilemma in public social services: Do we change the system from the inside or is it the case, in the words of Lorde (1984), that “the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house”? While I cannot offer a general solution to this dilemma, I can say that I have seen historically marginalizing systems make significant changes in terms of accountability to people referred for services. Wraparound values and practices require such a transformation.

In writing this article, I struggled with whether or not to quote and/or capitalize the word *wraparound*. As I understand it, wraparound is an approach to service delivery informed by a set of values and practices. It is not a program, a technique, a methodology, or a therapy (VanDenBerg & Grealish, 1996). As such, I decided not to “thingify” it by capitalizing the word or quoting it.

3. For a concise description of *nonstructuralism*, see Thomas (2002).

A last dilemma I would like to highlight involves the “pilot,” “waiver,” or “demonstration” project nature of many wraparound programs. Rather than being the default way in which social service agencies operate, the vast majority of programs using wraparound processes do so in limited venues (Kendziora, Bruns, Osher, Pacchiano, & Mejia, 2001; Koyanagi & Feres-Merchant, 2000). Ostensibly, this is because of the aforementioned restrictions imposed on programs through categorical funding. My suggestion to those interested in exploring wraparound work is to try it out within existing constraints and see what happens. As wraparound is a philosophy for providing services rather than a specific set of services, there is no strong reason for its exclusion. On the other hand, many agencies *say* they are engaging in wraparound planning, while their programs bear little resemblance to what I’ve described. This is often because funding is available for a limited pilot program dictating a specific population to be served and/or criteria for referral. In this case, wraparound is happening because of the funds tied to it, not because of a commitment to its philosophy. Multidisciplinary meetings in which professionals from several agencies get together with a family to tell them what they need to do to comply with system mandates is not wraparound. Even multidisciplinary meetings that are strength/need-based aren’t consistent with a wraparound philosophy unless membership includes non-professionals invited by the family.

While many communities embrace the concept of an approach to social service delivery because of their strong commitment to a competency-based perspective, there are surely others that prefer the economic benefits that come along with comprehensive and individualized planning. Experience has shown, however, that wraparound planning is seriously undermined without agency commitment to the values upon which a wraparound approach is based (Franz, 1999).

CONCLUSION: MAKING PROGRESS

Therapists, counselors, social workers, psychologists, and other people working the in so-called helping professions who are interested in broader applications of narrative ideas—and want to address the very real effects of injustice and marginalization but see public social services as instruments of social control rather than instruments of social change—might consider the possibilities opened up by wraparound planning processes. Comprehensive, individualized, and competency-based approaches to social service planning and delivery allow for a resurrection of responsive, effective, efficient, and socially just work within public social services. Workers can effectively bring about a shift to wraparound planning by changing the way they interact with individuals and families, away from expert-based services and toward collaborative, individualized, unconditional services. This is a place to begin.

APPENDIX: FAMILY PLAN FOR THE FORBES

September 21, 2000

Present: Marcia Forbes, Ryan Forbes, Sharyn Forbes, Mike Ortega, Steve Forbes, Beth Crow (Marcia’s best friend), Damon Schultz (Ryan’s friend), Hector Schultz (Ryan’s friends’ Dad), Lucy Preton (Ryan’s teacher), Jerry Ross (Ryan’s probation officer), June Robes (mental health case manager), Ronnie Swartz (Office of Education Wraparound facilitator)

Not Present: Barry Erthyme (Franklin School Psychologist)

Strengths:

- Ryan genuinely likes his teacher, Mrs. Preton.
- Franklin is a good school for Ryan and he likes it there.
- Marcia finds working with June a good thing.
- Marcia completed the Parenting Skills Course.
- Mike has started to see a counselor about anger.
- Ryan managed fine in the kids’ part of the Parenting Skills Course.
- Ryan successfully went through the shelter’s kids’ group.
- “It was wonderful to watch [Ryan] spread his wings and fly,” Marcia.
- “[Ryan] can now swim,” Marcia.
- Ryan successfully completed four group swim lessons.
- Marcia is a good listener.
- Ryan has a lot of academic potential (e.g., writing, reading, math).
- Despite having a hard day at school, Ryan continues to maintain a positive attitude.
- Marcia is working really hard to get her car running.
- Marcia and Ryan regularly attend their counseling meetings.
- Marcia is seeing her own counselor and she likes it.
- Marcia is proactive—she is willing and able to participate in her son’s life and school.
- Ryan has a lot of support.
- The family stands up for one another.

Needs:

Marcia felt that the following percentages represent the degree to which her family’s needs were being met:

Family	A Place To Live	Social/ Fun	Emotional/ Behavioral	School/ Work	Legal	Medical	Crisis/ Safety	Cultural/ Spiritual
75%	100%	20%	35–40%	50%	100%	25%	50%	45%

Social/Fun

The family needs reliable transportation.

Plan:

- Strength: Marcia is working really hard to get her car running.
- Marcia's mechanic is coming over next week to find out what parts her van needs. He will then get the parts and install them.
- June provides transportation for Marcia and Ryan's counseling appointments.

Social/Fun

Marcia needs time for herself.

Plan:

- Strength: Marcia is seeing her own counselor and she likes it; Marcia completed the Parenting Skills Course.
- Ronnie will get the phone number at Sunshine Child Care for Marcia to call to arrange up to 7 hours a week of respite care.
- Marcia will call Sunshine Child Care to set up the respite care.

Medical

Marcia needs to be in good health.

Plan:

- Strength: Marcia completed the Parenting Skills Course; Marcia is proactive—she is willing and able to participate in her son's life and school; Marcia is working really hard to get her car running.
- Marcia will call her doctor today to tell her how she is feeling and to schedule an appointment.
- Ronnie will get Marcia bus tickets so she can get to her appointments.
- Marcia can take the bus to get to the doctor's appointment.

Emotional/Behavioral

Marcia and Ryan need to treat each other respectfully.

Plan:

- Strength: Marcia completed the Parenting Skills Course; Ryan managed fine in the kids' part of the Parenting Skills Course; Ryan successfully went through the shelter's kids' group; "It was wonderful to watch [Ryan] spread his wings and fly," Marcia; Ryan has a lot of support.
- Marcia and Ryan will continue to meet with June two times a week.
- Marcia will continue with her Wednesday support group (night or day).
- Beth will give Marcia a ride to the shelter support groups.
- Ryan can go to the Wednesday meetings too.

- June will continue to take Marcia to her individual counseling appointments.
- Lucy will make sure Marcia has enough bus tickets to get to the shelter groups.

School/Work

Ryan needs a quality education.

Plan:

- Strength: Ryan genuinely likes his teacher, Mrs. Preton; Franklin is a good school for Ryan and he likes it there; Ryan has a lot of academic potential (e.g., writing, reading, math).
- Ryan will continue to attend Mrs. Preton's classroom for two hours a day, where he receives considerable one-on-one support from Mrs. Preton and the classroom aide.
- A meeting will be held on October 21, at 2:30pm to review Ryan's individualized goals and objectives.
- Mrs. Preton or her aide will complete the documents that Ryan's doctor needs.
- Hector will help Ryan with his homework when he helps Damon until a tutor is secured.
- Uncle Steve will make space available in his restaurant (before customers arrive) for Ryan to study.
- Everyone will think about someone who could be a tutor for Ryan.
- Ronnie will facilitate the search and hiring of a tutor for Ryan.

We'll continue the family team planning on October 21, at 2:30pm, at Mrs. Preton's classroom, at Franklin. Jerry will bring the food.

REFERENCES

- Bazemore, G., & Terry, W. (1997). Developing delinquent youths: A reintegrative model for rehabilitation and a new role for the juvenile justice system. *Child Welfare, 76*, 665-717.
- California Dropout Prevention Network. (2000). *SST: Student success teams*. Santa Cruz, CA: Education Alliance.
- Copeland, M. (2003). On line at www.mentalhealthrecovery.com
- de Shazer, S. (1991). *Putting difference to work*. New York: Norton.
- Dulwich Centre. (1997). Companions on a Journey: An exploration of an alternative community mental health project. *Dulwich Centre Journal, 1*, 1-26.
- Dulwich Centre. (2000a). Towards a healthy community . . . even if we have to sell tamales: The work of Latino Health Access. *Dulwich Centre Journal, 3*, 1-59.
- Dulwich Centre. (2000b). Living positive lives: A gathering for people with an HIV positive diagnosis and workers within the HIV sector. *Dulwich Centre Journal, 4*, 1-48.
- Epston, D. (1989). *Collected papers*. Adelaide, Australia: Dulwich Centre Publications.

- Epston, D. (1998). *'Catching up' with David Epston: A collection of narrative practice-based papers*. Adelaide, Australia: Dulwich Centre Publications.
- Epston, D., & White, M. (1992). *Experience contradiction narrative & imagination*. Adelaide, Australia: Dulwich Centre Publications.
- Evaluation and Training Institute. (2001). *Evaluation of the targeted truancy and public safety program*. Los Angeles: Applied Management & Planning Group.
- Franz, J. (1993). The creative battlefield. *Paper Boat*. Retrieved July 1, 2002. On-line at www.paperboat.com/calliope/teams.html.
- Franz, J. (1994). Some notes on wraparound and paradigm shifts. *Paper Boat*. Retrieved July 1, 2002. On-line at www.paperboat.com/calliope/paranote.html.
- Franz, J. (1999). *The secret of the card shop caper*. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Council on Children and Families.
- Friedman, S. (Ed.). (1995). *The reflecting team in action: Collaborative practice in family therapy*. New York: Guilford.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Geertz, C. (1986). Making experiences, authoring selves. In V. Turner & E. Bruner (Eds.), *The anthropology of experience*. Chicago: The University of Illinois Press.
- Graber, L., & Nice, J. (1998). *Family unity model*. Sheridan, OR: Family Unity Project.
- Hardin, M., Cole, E., Mickens, J., & Lancour, R. (1996). *Family group conferences in child abuse and neglect cases*. Washington, DC: ABA Center on Children and the Law.
- Kendziora, K., Bruns, E., Osher, D., Pacchiano, D., & Mejia, B. (2001). Wraparound: Stories from the field. In *Systems of care: Promising practices in children's mental health, 2001 Series, Volume 1*. Washington, DC: Center for Effective Collaboration and Practice, American Institutes for Research.
- Koyanagi, C., & Feres-Merchant, D. (2000). For the long haul: Maintaining systems of care beyond the federal investment. In *Systems of care: Promising practices in children's mental health, 2000 Series, Volume 3*. Washington, DC: Center for Effective Collaboration and Practice, American Institutes for Research.
- Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister outsider: Essays and speeches*. Trumansburg, NY: Crossing Press.
- Lynn Jr., L. (2002). Social services and the state: The public appropriation of private charity. *Social Service Review*, 76, 58–82.
- Miles, P., & Franz, J. (1994). Access, voice, and ownership. *Paper Boat*. Retrieved July 1, 2002. On-line at www.paperboat.com/calliope/access.html.
- Miles, P., & Franz, J. (2001). Foundations of wraparound: Values, practice patterns and essential ingredients. *Paper Boat*. Retrieved July 1, 2002. On-line at www.paperboat.com/calliope/Foundations.html.
- Myerhoff, B. (1982). Life history among the elderly: Performance, visibility and remembering. In J. Ruby (Ed.), *A crack in the mirror: Reflexive perspectives in anthropology* (pp. 261–286). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Myerhoff, B. (1986). Life not death in Venice: Its second life. In V. Turner & E. Bruner (Eds.), *The anthropology of experience* (pp. 99–117). Chicago: The University of Illinois Press.
- National Association of Social Workers. (2000). *Practice research network*. Retrieved December 1, 2003. On-line at www.naswdc.org/naswprn.
- Rector, R., & Fagan, P. (1996). *How welfare harms kids*. Washington, DC: The Heritage Foundation.

- Tice, C., & Perkins, K. (2002). *The faces of social policy*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Thomas, L. (2002). *Poststructuralism and therapy—what's it all about?*. Dulwich Centre Publications. Retrieved December 1, 2003. On-line at www.dulwichcentre.com.au/leoniearticle.htm.
- VanDenBerg, J. (2003a). Community values: Wraparound/system of care. Retrieved December 1, 2003. On-line at www.vroonvdb.com/about_communityvalues.html.
- VanDenBerg, J. (2003b). What is the wraparound process?. Retrieved December 1, 2003. On-line at cecp.air.org/wraparound/intro.html.
- VanDenBerg, J., & Grealish, M. (1996). Individualized services and supports through the wraparound process: Philosophy and procedures. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 5, 7–21.
- White, M. (1989). *Selected papers*. Adelaide, Australia: Dulwich Centre Publications.
- White, M. (1991). Deconstruction and therapy. *Dulwich Centre Newsletter*, 1991(3), 21–40.
- White, M. (1995). *Re-authoring lives: Interviews & essays*. Adelaide, Australia: Dulwich Centre Publications.
- White, M. (1997). *Narratives of therapists' lives*. Adelaide, Australia: Dulwich Centre Publications.
- White, M. (1999). *Re-authoring conversations map*. Workshop handout, September 9–10, 1999, San Francisco, CA.
- White, M. (2000). *Reflections on narrative practice: Essays & interviews*. Adelaide, Australia: Dulwich Centre Publications.
- White, M., & Epston, D. (1990). *Narrative means to therapeutic ends*. New York: Norton.