

**EVALUATION OF THE STONEY CREEK
UNITED CHURCH
WRAPAROUND PROJECT**

October 2008

Prepared for:
The Stoney Creek United Church Wraparound

Prepared by:
Don Jaffray, M.A.



Celebrating more than 40 Years
of social development in Hamilton

162 King William Street, Suite 103, Hamilton, ON L8R 3N9
Phone: 905.522.1148 Fax: 905.522.9124 E-mail: sprc@sprc.hamilton.on.ca
Website: sprc.hamilton.on.ca



A United Way Agency

© The Social Planning and Research Council of Hamilton
162 King William Street, Suite 103
Hamilton, ON L8R 3N9

and

The Stoney Creek United Church Wraparound
1 King Street West
Stoney Creek, ON L8G 1G7

All rights reserved including the right to reproduce in whole or in part any form.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to acknowledge the support and cooperation of the many members and clients of The Stoney Creek United Church Wraparound Project in completing this evaluation. Their work and reflections on it have been vital to documenting the achievements of this project.

We would also like to acknowledge the Hamilton Community Foundation for their funding support of The Stoney Creek United Church Wraparound project and particularly their ongoing commitment to evaluating this and other pilot projects that address poverty in the community. We are pleased to work along with these organizations in the effort to reflect on learning and contribute to knowledge transfer about the impacts and benefits of these program innovations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION..... 1

2.0 EVALUATION METHODOLOY 2

3.0 GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE SCUC WRAPAROUND PROJECT 4

4.0 ANALYSIS OF EVALUATION FINDINGS 9

5.0 EXTENDED LEARNING FOR WRAPAROUND IN STONEY CREEK 10

6.0 CONCLUSION 11

APPENDIX A: Stoney Creek Wraparound Informant Questionnaire

**APPENDIX B: Stoney Creek United Church Wraparound Client Survey
Questionnaire**

**APPENDIX C: Stoney Creek United Church Wraparound Facilitator Survey
Questionnaire**

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Wraparound Process was first developed in the 1980's as a means for maintaining youth with the most serious emotional and behavioural problems in their home and community. More recently it has evolved into a model for providing supports to adults and children as a way to improve life outcomes for those individuals in a community. In essence, the wraparound process assembles a team of individuals that may have some relevance to the well being of an identified adult or child. These individuals then work collaboratively to develop an individualized plan of care and support implementation of this plan.

The Stoney Creek United Church Wraparound project is a program specifically designed to assist unemployed or underemployed individuals in Stoney Creek to break the cycle of poverty and become productive and independent citizens of their community. In a proposal for funding to the Hamilton Community Foundation, the project sponsors articulated these clear goals:

1. To increase, coordinate and provide services and supports that help people reach their goals and alleviate the distress of living in poverty,
2. To assist people to develop life and job skills that would improve their financial position.

The project was then funded by the Hamilton Community Foundation to meet these goals over a period extending from early in 2006 to 2008.

The proposal for funding provided a description of indicators that would be used to measure the projects success in meeting their desired outcomes. These indicators were:

- Measurement of the forty developmental assets in children identified by the Search Institute
- Mapping of life domains and identification of corresponding needs
- Success with increasing the developmental assets of children affected by the program and a decrease in the number of needs in life domains of families affected by the program.

The Stoney Creek United Church Wraparound project engaged the services of the Social Planning and Research Council in June 2008 to conduct an evaluation of the project in accordance with the terms noted in the proposal.

This report has been organized into sections on methodology, evaluation outcomes based on the objectives, overall evaluation findings and lessons learned. The report closes with a summary of lessons learned and conclusions.

2.0 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluation plan and methods were defined with reference to performance indicators and project outcomes articulated in a funding proposal submitted to the Hamilton Community Foundation in 2006.

The SPRC employed both qualitative and quantitative methods in evaluating the Stoney Creek United Church Wraparound project. These methods included the following:

- *Review and analysis of project records noting developmental assets data, referral forms and life domain data, and caseload summaries*
- *Conduct key informant interviews (4) with Project Coordinator, Steering Committee Chair, a Wraparound facilitator and one other project participant*
- *Conduct a mail out survey of individuals (clients) identified and assisted by the SCUC Wraparound Project.*
- *Conduct a mail out survey of facilitators for SCUC Wraparound teams.*
- *Summarize and analyze data in relation to project goals and objectives*
- *Discussion of preliminary findings between evaluator and project leaders*
- *Preparation of a written report summarizing findings making recommendations*

Records on case study activity were kept in a mix of both electronic and hard copy format. These files were made available to the evaluator by the Stoney Creek Wraparound Project for the purposes of analysis. A summary table of case activity and status of fifty-one (51) cases was reviewed and analyzed.

Key informant interviews were conducted with several participants central to the operation of the project. Each provided an comments from their perspective on the program's operation. Each key informant also provided suggestions on lesson's learned from their experience. The most significant recurring themes are reported later in this evaluation report. A guide to key informant interviews including questions is appended to this report.

A mail out survey was constructed in accordance with project goals and sent to twenty-two (22) project clients in August 2008 along with a postage paid business reply envelope that would return the survey responses to the Social Planning and Research Council of Hamilton office. This was the size of the client population served over the period of the operation of the project funded by the Hamilton Community Foundation for which current contact information was available. The survey was constructed to deliberately examine client condition in relation to outcomes for success defined by the project sponsors. A follow up letter was sent to this same group three weeks later to encourage additional response. Three (3) survey responses were received for a response rate of thirteen (13.6%) percent. A copy of the survey is appended to this report for information.

A mail out survey was also constructed and sent to eighteen (18) project facilitators in August 2008 along with a postage paid business reply envelope that would return the survey responses to the Social Planning and Research Council of Hamilton office. This was the size of the facilitator population that volunteered with the project over the period of time being evaluated. A follow up letter was sent to this same group three weeks later

to encourage additional response. Five (5) responses to the survey were returned for a response rate of twenty-seven (27.7%) percent. A copy of the survey is appended to this report for information.

3.0 GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE SCUC WRAPAROUND PROJECT

The results of the interviews, evaluative surveys and review of case files are organized by the goals of the project. The various methods outlined above all contributed to the following analysis.

Goal #1: To increase, coordinate and provide services and supports that help people reach their goals and alleviate the distress of living in poverty.

Goal Achievement:

The Wraparound process by its very design brings together services and supports to help people reach their goals. There is clear evidence that this happened for many of the clients of the Stoney Creek Wraparound Project. Small teams of people were formed to support a number of clients. These teams included people with a range of skills and abilities that enabled them to identify and engage a wider range of other supports from the community. These supports provided access to basic necessities including food, clothing, household items and transportation support. They also went beyond this to facilitate appropriate support of social service agencies and other continuing education supports that for some, led in turn to gainful employment.

Positive Outcomes:

Responses to surveys and interviews indicated that the role of a facilitator was key to providing successful support. Facilitators were identified as a helpful support on their own but also as a bridge to other supports including new friends, volunteer opportunities, job search programs and other community service programs including recreation centers, summer camps, housing services, schools, food banks and special Christmas assistance programs. Clients responding to the mail out survey indicated a very high degree of satisfaction with the support provided by the program and facilitator support was particularly helpful. Survey responses from facilitators indicated that the program was able to provide support that made a positive difference “you can see”. Their responses noted that the support given to coaches was “great” and Colleen Cavanaugh, the project coordinator, had been particularly supportive and helpful.

Challenges:

There are two clear areas in the program’s operation that provided significant challenge. The first was record keeping on the progress and outcomes for client cases. When interviewed key informants conceded that “...forms weren’t regularly done.” As a result, most of the case records were incomplete in terms of outcomes recorded. This limitation in record keeping appears to be the result of several contributing factors. Record keeping on a case file could call for the completion of many forms. These would include: case note forms, permission forms, team outlines, medical forms and more. In fact a substantial binder of forms and instructions has been created to assist facilitators in understanding and managing forms on case activity. In addition to that facilitators were provided an extensive training program over several days to become familiar with the functions of a facilitator including how to complete the forms and the protocol for managing them. In addition to requiring rigorous and disciplined attention to detail, the record keeping system required a considerable amount of volunteer time to remain current.

Facilitators struggled with the record keeping requirements of the Wraparound model of service. There were indications that their 'non-professional social service worker background' left them feeling "overwhelmed" by the record keeping requirements. There was also some indication that facilitators as volunteers are also not highly motivated to complete seemingly unrewarding tasks such as filling out forms and keeping up to date records. It was often enough for them to know they had helped and to see the benefits of the intervention on a clients' life without going on to complete and submit written reports on that result.

The second challenge that had an impact on the program's operation appears to be related to clear communication and governance of the project's operation. The Wraparound model calls for the collective effort of a variety of organizational, institutional and individual members to work in a well coordinated cooperative fashion to make the service a success. This is a complex undertaking and can be an inherently difficult process to manage. The complexity is compounded when it requires paid professionals and volunteers to work together on an equal basis to commit time, skill and resources to make a project work. Familiar stresses in a program's operation such as staffing issues, funder accountability requirements, ideological differences, and many other financial, resource and personnel issues combine to made this project complex, stressful and a challenge to manage. There was some suggestion that participation of both service providers and directors of the project together on the governing body complicated governance process. The Stoney Creek Wraparound project struggled with many of these project management issues over the course of its operation and this diverted resources and energy to some extent away from the focus on client support.

Goal #2: To assist people to develop life and job skills that would improve their financial position.

The project's original evaluation plan indicated that measurements to gauge success with achieving this goal would be drawn from records that would map the life domains of clients and identify their corresponding needs and then increase the developmental assets of children and families being assisted.

Goal Achievement:

To achieve success with this goal the project coordinator implemented a formal model for operation that was designed to create positive results. Wraparound facilitators were provided with formal orientation, training, coaching and supervision. The project coordinator also established an intake process for families being assisted by the program. Facilitators did receive support from Wraparound teams in assessing families and in identifying strengths and resources that would be helpful. In many cases individualized plans were articulated to enhance a family's support system and address their needs.

As was noted in the project plan, facilitators did work with families to address issues in their life domains and augment the developmental assets of the children in the family. As noted earlier, case file records did not always quantify this activity. However the summary of cases indicates that fifty-two (52) cases were assessed and thirty-eight of those were provided support and assistance in some form. Program records indicate that in at least five (5) cases the client 'graduated', indicating client success in achieving their goals and having a markedly improved life condition. Records show that

graduating families included a total of nine (9) children that benefitted from supports provided by Stoney Creek United Church Wraparound. Seven (7) other cases were at the time of the evaluation, considered 'open' or at the 'intake' stage and so actively engaged in the program and making progress. No outcome measures on these cases were available for analysis. Twenty-four (24) cases were recorded as 'closed'. Most of these were closed as a result of loss of contact during the course of engagement in the program. There were thirteen (13) additional cases that were initially assessed but not 'opened' or engaged in the Wraparound program, generally for reasons of safety, unsuitability or geographic barriers. Two cases (2) remain on a waiting list for program services.

Table 1: Disposition of Client Cases in August 2008

Did Not Open	Open	Intake	Closing or Closed	Taking a Break	Waiting	Graduated	Total
13	4	3	25	1	1	5	52

Key informant interviews and survey responses clearly indicate a number of instances that demonstrate elements of successful outcomes. They often reported examples of clients that were assisted in returning to school to advance their educational achievement, enrolled in employment support programs, had children engaged in local recreation programs and friends or neighbours identified who could lend support that increased self esteem or sense of client well being.

The underlying assumption in the goal statement is that individuals and families with enhanced life and job skills will improve their financial position as a result. The information recorded in case records does not specifically gather data on changes in income or financial position over the term of the project's operation. There were however, several cases that were well known by all key informants as successful 'graduates' of the program. Those families had a marked improvement in life and job skills and which resulted in improved financial /employment status. The fact that successful clients and their stories were so familiar to all key informants indicates that in those cases teams were likely functioning and communicating effectively about progress.

Positive Outcomes:

Anecdotal information gathered in key informant interviews indicates that several components of the program worked well for facilitators and clients. Strong community networks and links to other community groups and programs were formed by program staff. This activity was productive in terms of identifying people who could benefit from life skills and job skills development. The Wraparound model of creating and using multidisciplinary teams to assist facilitators and clients in developing skills and capacities that would improve client outcomes was seen as an effective model. This team approach was credited with achieving progress faster and sustaining progress over a long term in several cases in particular. The process of recording and tracking life

domains and client assets appeared to be useful in the initial stages of an intervention but of declining value as experience with the client increased over time.

Survey response data indicates that clients and facilitators both had favourable experiences with the Stoney Creek United Church Wraparound Program and that it produced positive benefits for client families. Clients indicated that the program had been effective in linking them to supports in the form of volunteers, social programs and facilitator support that was very helpful. All clients responding to the survey indicated that their situation had improved as a result of help provided by the Wraparound project and that their financial position had improved over the past year. In fact clients indicated that they were not only very satisfied with the service received from the Stoney Creek United Church Wraparound project but that they also felt it had been helpful in enabling them to develop goal setting skills and in connecting them to "...supportive, caring people who go out of their way to help families."

Facilitators responding to the survey had a similarly positive view of the program but did not report uniformly successful results for all clients assisted. For example facilitators noted that clients' situations "sometimes" improved as a result of help from the Wraparound project. This suggests something other than a straight linear progression of achievement with support to clients. In the reported experience of facilitators, the majority of clients improved their financial position over the past year, but there were exceptions. Key pathways to success that facilitators noted were assisting clients to upgrade their education, accessing child care services as a support to returning to work and accessing other material household supports such as appliances, furniture and bedding that their budgets could not otherwise provide.

There was one other program innovation that warrants mentioning and will be discussed later in this report; that is the development of a process referred to as the 'mini-wrap' or 'quick-wrap'. This is essentially a modification to the formal Wraparound model that would allow more people with identified but short term or modest needs to access support of those in the Wraparound program. These clients were assisted by the program over shorter periods of time, maybe only one month or two and could still access to some extent material supports available through the Wraparound program. The record keeping requirements for a 'mini-wrap' response were not as extensive or rigorous as those required for a full Wraparound program response. As a result it is difficult at this time to provide any data and analysis as to the comparative value of this service response.

Challenges:

Key informants noted a number of challenges in achieving the success with clients that was anticipated. In their view only about half of the clients assisted seemed to make identifiable progress financially or in their lives generally. To some this seemed a low and even disappointing success rate. The effort to gauge this result was also more difficult than expected. For example, in one case the client was able to find low wage manual labour (cleaning job) as a source of income rather than continue to be reliant on social assistance income support benefits. The difficulty is that it became apparent that this low wage work, although an improvement, still left the family with many financial challenges and other life management struggles that continued to be stressful and problematic for the client. This made it difficult then to see the intervention as fully successful.

Again it was challenging to develop and maintain a record keeping system that would easily provide clear measures of success for a program that was called upon to respond to a wide diversity of family, financial and life problems. Increasing financial stability was not always possible or even the first priority. In some cases providing support to make small steps forward in improving relationships between family members, developing a simple plan for getting a household in order or aiding a family in connecting with other community service supports was a significant achievement for the family members. The process of recording and measuring progress with clients was often time consuming and not always relevant to capturing real successes.

Partnerships and teamwork are essential elements of the Wraparound model of service. There were indications from key informant interviews that the partnerships did not always function smoothly and that clearer definition of the roles and responsibilities of each partner in the project would have been helpful to the process. Management of funding resources also appears to have created challenges for the program. At times limitations on the way in which financial resources could be used to support the operation of the program and delivery of services created operational stresses. There was also an indication that some unresolved differences in values for delivering this support service hampered the program's operation. This was once described as "a tension between franchisee and franchisor", a reference to the difference between those delivering the program at this local level and the individuals schooled in the generic model of Wraparound service that has developed over time and in other places.

Evaluative comment indicated that the priorities of a team of volunteers focused on helping individuals were at times inconsistent with the priorities for engaging volunteers and providing service that underlie other publicly funded and formalized social services. One manifestation of this difference in values appears to be reflected in the investment of resources in record keeping process. The higher priority in the operation of this program was clearly on forming supportive Wraparound teams and providing timely and useful support to clients in need. Key informants and survey respondents uniformly noted evidence of success from the process and often cited specific case examples to support this view.

4.0 ANALYSIS OF EVALUATION FINDINGS

The project had a measure of success in meeting its stated goals. Over the course of the project the sponsors and participants were able to provide service and support to more than thirty-nine (39) individuals and families. In five of those cases there were clear indications that supports were provided in a helpful way and the adults and children in those families gained life and job skills that improved their situation. Four additional families are currently receiving similar support and may be expected to achieve similar gains. These cases combined have six children. It is reasonable to expect their prospects for improved development will be another beneficial impact of this program.

Although this is a positive result, well articulated targets for the number of cases to be engaged by the program or measures defined for a success rate with clients served were not put on the record and progress towards them periodically reviewed. Without that frame of reference it is difficult to provide a precise rating for success of the program.

Partnership difficulties emerged during the course of the project and these led to a fracturing of the original partnership. Stoney Creek United Church is committed to continuing on with a program that is a variation on the original Wraparound model. They have modified the service model in a way that better meets the capacity of the Church and its volunteers to support clients. These changes are described in a recently developed business plan

A feature of the challenge in managing this project was the management of scarce financial resources for it. Although the parameters of this project evaluation do not extend to examination of project finances, it is useful to note that choices related to use of funding resources did emerge and the process of deciding financial matters in a partnership type of project added stress and tension to operational relationships. One choice with respect to use of resources that was contentious had to do with deciding the appropriate honorarium to be paid to project facilitators. Elements of that debate remain.

The demands of the record keeping system were onerous. Intake information on cases was extensively recorded but progress on cases was not uniformly recorded and tracked. Still, some cases were very well documented and extensive notes were kept on the life domain conditions. The quality of record keeping was not consistent across all cases. There is evidence that a routine systematic process of case reviews through team conferences was undertaken in the early stages of the project but that other project issues interrupted this process and may have hampered follow-up activity in some cases. The challenge was in documenting and recording case progress, not an inability of the project to deliver helpful service.

5.0 EXTENDED LEARNING FOR WRAPAROUND IN STONEY CREEK

The Wraparound model of supporting clients has developed as a clinical approach to providing support and as such is a well developed model for service. Its function is grounded in practice models developed in the United States over many years and now used in a number of communities in Canada. This model of service is so well developed that it is supported by a detailed written model for record-keeping and case development assessment forms. This material was made available to the Stoney Creek Wraparound Project and instituted as a framework within which the project operated. The evaluation of the project indicates that the level of record keeping required by the formal model of service is not practical or sustainable for a community based project in the order of the Stoney Creek United Church Wraparound project. Similarly, project management elements of the Wraparound model need to be further examined to determine if changes are required or some other action taken to clarify roles and responsibilities of the governing body members.

It is an awareness of this service model limitation that led to the innovation of the “mini wrap”. This variation on the Wraparound model provides an alternative solution by reducing intake and assessment requirements, expediting the intervention or provision of support and reducing the amount of record keeping required. The irony of this however, is that it will be more difficult to assess over the long term the comparative impact and value of a mini-wrap process as fewer records or case tracking information will be gathered for analysis.

One clear challenge in achieving the stated goal of “assisting people to develop life and job skills to improve their financial position” is in knowing just how much success to expect over the course of one or two years in people’s lives. In the early stages of the project, sponsors thought that they would have the capacity to enable twenty families to significantly improve their situation. In retrospect, key informants indicated some level of disappointment in the results. Yet, by many standards the results of this program have been a success. For the next phase of the Stoney Creek United Church Wraparound Project, it is recommended that project leaders discuss and explore more thoroughly what measureable results for improvement can reasonably be expected and to then to again test those revised targets for measures of success.

The lives of client families assisted by Wraparound are prone to instability and transition. This makes it difficult to maintain contact and communication with them over long periods of time. Still, to establish a stronger assessment of impacts and benefits, it may be useful to invest more resources in maintaining contact with clients and former clients over a longer term.

The allocation of honorarium payments for facilitators and coaches remains a question. These program participants must begin with a commitment of their time and interest in helping others. At the same time they need to be motivated by the work and feel rewarded by the interaction with clients. Few volunteers of this kind seem to feel rewarded by the obligation to keep up with record keeping and evaluation requirements. It may be useful to consider linking payment of an honorarium to the submission of completed case file records to improve compliance on that feature of the program.

6.0 CONCLUSION

The Stoney Creek United Church Wraparound project set out “to serve families and individuals in need...to truly make a difference for those with poverty and/or social issues.” This evaluation has gathered evidence which clearly indicates that they have had success with this effort. Many individuals and families with children have been assisted. There is evidence that the lives of some have been significantly improved and in ways that can be sustained.

In the course of delivering this service the Project has engaged other social service providers, volunteers and family members in a supportive role with families in need. Facilitators that have been involved in the project have been gratified and rewarded by the experience and believe the program is ‘fantastic’, ‘amazing’ and should certainly continue.

Lead partners in the program have struggled with the stresses of managing such a complex partnership model of service for some of the most challenging families and family situations needing help. Ultimately they achieved good results and also developed new strategies for continuing the work more effectively.

Although many contributors to this evaluation had suggestions as to how, in retrospect, the program could have been improved, they also offered many reasons and recommendations for continuation of the Stoney Creek United Church Wraparound Project, and in the end, those sentiments as much as any other data collected, point way to the future for this program.

**APPENDIX A:
STONEY CREEK WRAPAROUND KEY INFORMANT QUESTIONS**

Stoney Creek Wraparound Key Informant Questions
June 2008

Name of Key Informant:

Date of interview:

Introduction:

This interview is being conducted as a component of the evaluation of the Stoney Creek Wraparound Project over the past year ending in June 2008. Results of the evaluation process will be summarized in a report for the project sponsors and funders to aid in understanding of the project's successes, learnings and accomplishments.

Your individual identity will not be identified in relation to the answers and information you provide, although you and other key informants contributing to this evaluation process will be acknowledged in the evaluation report.

Preamble to Evaluation Questions:

The Stoney Creek Wraparound Project was designed to assist unemployed (or underemployed) individuals in Stoney Creek to break the cycle of poverty and become productive and independent citizens of their community. It was designed to increase, coordinate and provide services and supports that help people reach their goals and alleviate the distress of living in poverty. It also was to assist people to develop life and job skills that will improve their financial position. The project was funded by the Hamilton Community Foundation.

Questions:

1. Please describe your role or relationship to the project.
2. How would you describe the accomplishments and successes of the project?
3. What have you learned from the Stoney Creek Wraparound Project that could be used to make it stronger or more successful in future?
4. Was the project successful in helping people become productive and independent members of the community? Can you describe a good example?
5. Did the project coordinate and provide helpful services to people? Please describe the best example of this.
6. Have any of those assisted by the project been successful in improving their financial position? Examples?
7. Are there other benefits, lessons or comments that you would like to note for the evaluation of the project?

Thanks for your time in reflecting on your experiences with the Stoney Creek Wraparound project.

**APPENDIX B:
STONEY CREEK UNITED CHURCH WRAPAROUND
CLIENT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE**

Stoney Creek United Church Wraparound Survey Questionnaire July 2008

Please take a few minutes to answer a several questions to help evaluating the Stoney Creek United Church Wraparound Project and its work over the past year.

The Wraparound Project was designed to assist individuals in Stoney Creek to break the cycle of poverty and become productive and independent citizens of their community. It was designed to increase, coordinate and provide services and supports that help people reach their goals and alleviate the distress of living in poverty. It also was to assist people to develop life and job skills that will improve their financial position.

Please tell us a little about yourself and your experience with the program by answering the following questions:

Your Name (optional): _____

How did you find out about the Stoney Creek United Church Wraparound Project?

- Church Social Service Agency Family Member Friend
- Other, please note: _____

What services did the Wraparound Project connect you to that were helpful?

- Facilitator/ support New Friend Social Service Provider Neighbour
- Other, please note: _____

Has your situation improved as a result of help from the Wraparound Project?

Check one box: Yes No

If yes, how has it improved?

- Feel better about self More success with work Improved friendships
- Improved relationship with my children More success with school
- Other, please note: _____

In your opinion, could the program be improved or be more helpful to families?

Check one box: Yes No

If yes, how?

(Please turn over and continue)

Has your financial position improved over the past year?

Check one box: Yes No

If yes, please describe:

Are you satisfied with the service you received from the Stoney Creek United Church Wraparound Project?

Check one box:

Very Satisfied Satisfied Acceptable Unsatisfied Very Unsatisfied

Would you like to provide more comment about this rating? If so, please add your comments below:

Are there other benefits, lessons or comments that you would like to note for the evaluation of the project?

If you have any questions about this survey or would like to speak to the evaluator directly, please contact:

SPRC Hamilton at (905) 522-1148

or

Colleen Cavanaugh at Stoney Creek United Church at (905) 662-4963 Ext. 224

Please return this survey by mail in the postage paid return envelope provided.

Thank you for taking time to tell us about your experiences with the Stoney Creek United Church Wraparound Project!

**APPENDIX C:
STONEY CREEK UNITED CHURCH WRAPAROUND
FACILITATOR SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE**

**Stoney Creek United Church Wraparound Survey Questionnaire
July 2008**

Please take a few minutes to answer a several questions to help evaluating the Stoney Creek United Church Wraparound Project and its work over the past year.

The Wraparound Project was designed to assist individuals in Stoney Creek to break the cycle of poverty and become productive and independent citizens of their community. It was designed to increase, coordinate and provide services and supports that help people reach their goals and alleviate the distress of living in poverty. It also was to assist people to develop life and job skills that will improve their financial position.

Please tell us a little about yourself and your experience with the program by answering the following questions:

Your Name (optional): _____

Over the past year, how many clients did you assist?

- 1 2 3 4 5 or more

What services did you as a facilitator connect your clients to that were helpful?

- Facilitator/ support New Friend Social Service Provider Neighbour
 Other, please note: _____

Would you say that clients' situations improved as a result of help from the Wraparound Project?

Check one box: Yes (Always) Sometimes No (Not at all)

If yes, how has it improved?

- Feel better about themselves More success with work Improved friendships
 Improved relationship with their children More success with school
 Other, please note: _____

In your opinion, could the program be improved or be more helpful to families?

Check one box: Yes No

If yes, how?

(Please turn over and continue)

Has the financial position of clients improved over the past year?

Check one box: Yes No

If yes, please describe:

Are you satisfied with the support and supervision received from the Stoney Creek United Church Wraparound Project?

Check one box:
Very Satisfied Satisfied Acceptable Unsatisfied Very Unsatisfied

Would you like to provide more comment about this rating? If so, please add your comments below:

Are there other benefits, lessons or comments that you would like to note for the evaluation of the project?

If you have any questions about this survey or would like to speak to the evaluator directly, please contact:

SPRC Hamilton at (905) 522-1148

or

Colleen Cavanaugh at Stoney Creek United Church at (905) 662-4963 Ext. 224

Please return this survey by mail in the postage paid return envelope provided.

Thank you for taking time to tell us about your experiences with the Stoney Creek United Church Wraparound Project!