

# The Implementation of Wraparound Model in Israel - An Alternative to Out-of-Home Placement of Delinquent Juveniles

Ety Elisha<sup>1,\*</sup>, Efi Braver<sup>2</sup>, Varda Rappaport<sup>3</sup> and Tali Samuel<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Criminology, the Max Stern Yezreel Valley College, Israel*

<sup>2</sup>*Former Director of the Juvenile Probation Service in Israel*

<sup>3</sup>*The Deputy Director of the Juvenile Probation Service in Israel*

<sup>4</sup>*The National Supervisor of the Juvenile Probation Service in Israel*

**Abstract:** Wraparound model refers to community-based programs designed to rehabilitate youth; characterized by multiple risk factors, through "wrapping" them with a variety of assistance agencies, first and foremost their families. The purpose of the current paper was to describe the way of implementation of the Wraparound model in Israel, named the Ma'atefet<sup>1</sup>, which is operated by the Juvenile Probation Service (JPS), as an alternative to out-of-home placement of convicted juvenile offenders. The paper presents an overview of the program's background, objectives and goals, as well as findings of evaluation studies designed to examine the program effectiveness, and case studies of convicted minors that participated in the program in Israel. In consistent with previous studies from different countries in the world, it was found that the program in Israel achieves its main goals, reflected in improvements in the educational, familial and mental condition of the treated youth; reducing recidivism; and preventing out-of-home placement. In light of these many advantages, we recommend policy-makers to expand the program, for the benefit of young offenders, their families and the community as a whole.

**Keywords:** Wraparound, Juvenile Probation Service (JPS), offender rehabilitation, youth at risk, community-based program.

## INTRODUCTION<sup>1</sup>

The wraparound model was developed in the US in the 1980s, as a community-based care alternative for youth with complex emotional and behavioral problems (Nisbet, Graham & Newell, 2012; Wilson, 2008). The model premise is that the effective way to address the needs of high-risk youth is through the cooperation of various community agencies, both formal and informal, first and foremost their family members. The wraparound model is characterized in flexibility, sensitivity and responsively adapted to the characteristics and needs of the treated youth and their families. As the name suggests, the process involves "wrapping" the youth in a variety of community supporters, rather than integrating them into a general, unify inflexible care program or out-of-home placement (Coldiron, Bruns, & Quick, 2017).

## WRAPAROUND MODEL - BACKGROUND

Wraparound is a definable planning process with a unique set of community services supports that are

individualized for most challenging youth and their families to achieve positive outcomes (Burchard, Bruns, & Burchard, 2002). The benefits of the model expressed as being more effective and also cheaper compared to placement in an out-of-home setting, which may be a traumatic event for the youngest and their families (Burt, Resnick, & Novick, 1998; Moon, Applegate, & Latessa, 1997).

The rationale underlying the intervention programs based on the Wraparound model is based on Bronfenbrenner's social-ecological approach (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; 1994). According to the ecological approach, dangerous behavior in youth is the result of interactions between individual characteristics and various environmental factors, i.e., family members, peer groups, educators, and community institutions. Therefore, effective interventions should be based on comprehensive support from a variety of community support agencies, first and foremost parents (Pullmann, Kerbs, Koroloff, Veach-White, Gaylor & Sieler, 2006).

Effective interventions, often based on ecological approach, which endorses two elements of effective treatment programs: focusing on multiple domains of a youth's life (education, peers, family, etc.), and providing broad social support for youth at risk and their families (Borduin, 1994; Henggeler, Melton,

---

Address correspondence to this author at the Department of Criminology, the Max Stern Yezreel Valley College, Israel; Tel: +972-52-2929730; E-mail: etye@yvc.ac.il

<sup>1</sup>Ma'atefet is the Hebrew term for "Wraparound" in English.

Brondino, Scherer, & Hanley, 1997). For youth with complex problems, this involves collaboration and coordination among agencies, services, and informal stakeholders such as families and friends (Colvin, Cullen & Vander Ven, 2002).

Wraparound is a prominent example of the ecological multi-system approach, as it is based on joint teamwork, aiming at rehabilitating and integrating high-risk youth and their families in the community by addressing their particular needs and characteristics (Burchard *et al.*, 2002; Efland, Walton & McIntyre, 2011). Compared to an out-of-home placement, the Wraparound model is favorable for the juveniles and their families, more effective and costs less than most other intervention programs (Burt, Resnick & Novick, 1998; Moon, Applegate & Latessa, 1997).

Programs based on the Wraparound model have been in use for decades in the USA for children and adolescents with complex emotional and behavioral problems. Over the past two decades, the model has become a convenient alternative to out-of-home placement of high-risk youth. Today, almost every US state runs programs based on the Wraparound model, involving about 75,000 youngsters and their families (Sather & Bruns, 2016).

### **PROGRAMS BASED ON THE WRAPAROUND MODEL - RESEARCH FINDINGS**

Many studies have been conducted in various countries to examine the effectiveness of intervention programs based on the Wraparound model (e.g., Howard, Misch, Burke & Pannell, 2002; Zhang & Zhang, 2005). However, it is difficult to obtain a clear picture of the model's efficiency, due to lack of clear definitions, discrepancies in practices, and methodological problems found in some studies (e.g., Nisbet, Graham & Newell, 2012).

Yet, most studies point out the many advantages of these programs in comparison to other intervention programs in the community as well as out-of-home placement of high-risk youth characterized with mental and/or behavioral problems (e.g., Burns & Suter, 2010; Coldiron, Hensley, Parigoris, & Bruns, 2019; Fries, Carney, Blackman-Urtega & Savas, 2012a; Pullmann *et al.*, 2006; Rast, Walker, Peterson & Bosworth, 2006). These advantages reflect in the reduction of violent and delinquent behavior, greater achievements at school, and improving relationships with family (Clark *et al.*, 1996; Coldiron *et al.*, 2019; Colvin *et al.*, 2002;

Lipsey, Wilson & Cothorn, 2000; Myaard *et al.*, 2000; Reay, Garbin & Scalora, 2003).

### **ISRAEL'S JUVENILE PROBATION SERVICE - BACKGROUND**

Israel's Juvenile Probation Service (JPS) serves as the primary institution for the care of delinquents juveniles (ages 12-18) in Israel. JPS's employees are social workers who undergo special training for work with minor delinquents. JPS's main goal is to stop the abnormal behavior and to improve his/her personal and social functioning. Besides, the probation officers present the minors' needs to the authorities and mediate between them (Elisha & Braver, 2015).

Criminal statistics indicate a general trend of declining numbers of referrals to the JPS over the last decade: from 20,000 referrals in 2007 to 14,168 in 2016. However, the severity of the offenses for which the minors were referred to has increased. While in 2007 property offenses were the most common ones, in 2016 the most common ones were violent offenses (37.3%), followed by property offenses (22%), drug use and trafficking (15.9%), offenses related to public order (11.3%), offenses related to vehicle use (10%), and sexual offenses (3.1%) (Israel Police, Statistical Yearbook, 2017).

### **Characteristics of the Minors Referred to the JPS**

JPS's data reveals that most of the minors referred to the JPS are boys (88%), while the minority are girls (12%); Most of them are aged 16–18 (60%); most of them (67%) are studying; 11% are studying and working; 9% are working and not studying, and 13% are "disconnected" (neither studying nor working). All the referred minors are youth at risk, characterized by personal and familial problems. These include emotional difficulties (lack of anger control and impulses); problems with parents and/or other family members; financial difficulties in the family; learning difficulties; Lack of boundaries, and non-normative behavior (socializing with peer delinquents, substances abuse) (Kahan-Strawczynski & Levi, 2011).

As for the family characteristics of the referrals, it was found that many of them (59%) lives in large families, with more than 4 children, compared to 17% of all minors in Israel. At the same time, a high percentage (38%) of the referred minors lives in single-parent families, compared to 8.7% of all minors in Israel. In two-thirds of the referred families, the head of

the family is working, while in one-quarter there is no breadwinner (Tzionit *et al.*, 2008). Yet, 44% of the referred families are only able to provide for the basic subsistence need, while an additional 20% of the families are unable to do so. Also, about 60% of the referred minors have experienced a family crisis event, such as divorce, prolonged unemployment of a parent, serious illness, arrest or imprisonment of a parent (Kahn-Strabachinski & Levi, 2011).

### **THE IMPLEMENTATION OF WRAPAROUND MODEL IN ISRAEL - MA'ATEFET PROGRAM**

Ma'atefet program, which based on the Wraparound model in the U.S., operates by Israel's JPS from 2010 to the present. The program designed for juvenile offenders with complex personal and family backgrounds and serves as an alternative to their out-of-home placement. The goal of the program is to rehabilitate high-risk youth in their natural environment, by "wrapping" them with services provided to them by various relevant factors in the community (education, welfare, non-profit organization, etc.). The program is "tailored" individually to each patient according to his/her needs and characteristics and according to the objectives of the intervention.

Juveniles that referred to the program are those who found guilty of committing an offense by the Juvenile Court, as an alternative to their out-of-home placement. However, there are several conditions for participation in the program, as follows: (1). a probation officer's recommendation (after meeting and explaining to the minor and his/her parents about the programs, its benefits and difficulties inherent in it due to its intensity and their great involvement). (2). consent of the minor and his parents to participate in the program and to comply with all its terms; and (3). consent of the youth judge. Since the FPS is responsible for the care and supervision of law-abiding minors in the community, is therefore required to report to the juvenile court about the progress of the referral youth in the program, as well as any violation or non-compliance with the program, on the part of the referred youth, which may lead to termination. In such a situation, the minor will again face a juvenile judge who decides what to do with him (for example, to warn him or impose another sentence, such as out-of-home outreach).

Currently, the program operates in 15 localities throughout Israel, in the cooperation with the municipal welfare services of each locality. At any given time,

about five juveniles from each locality participate in the program.

Participation in Ma'atefet program is based on a juvenile court order, which also determines the duration (usually one or two years), taking into account the recommendation of a juvenile probation officer. All minors participating in the program are characterized by complex personal and family backgrounds and are candidates for out-of-home placement.

### **FST (Family Support Team)**

Ma'atefet program places the juvenile and their family in the center and strives to mobilize the familial support network. A Family Support Team (FST) is set up to support the family, which meets the treated youth and their family at their houses. The FST consists of formal professionals, including probation officer, coordinator welfare counsel), teacher, school counselor, therapist; as well as significant supporters from the family and social environment of the treated youth, such as parent(s), sibling(s), grandparent(s), uncle, neighbor, guide and so on. A broad support team enables a comprehensive view of the treated youth and their family needs and thereby to reach consensual responses. It is assumed that open, free, transparent, and collaborative discussion will increase the responsiveness of the treated youth and their family. This is in contrast to most traditional intervention programs, where professionals come up with pre-prepared solutions and thus may encounter resistance and even hostility that could damage the rehabilitation process.

The FST is responsible for planning and implementing the program together with the family, based on the discerned problems, needs, and strengths of the juvenile and his/her family. The program sets goals and objectives at intervals determined in advance and adapt the solutions offered to the juveniles and their families. This is a unique, creative "tailoring" of the treatment measures to the family's characteristics and needs, based on the cooperation of various agencies in their place of residence. In order to achieve the required cooperation, the coordinator together with the probation officer, coordinates the services, organizations, and public and private agencies to recruit them to the benefit of the treated youth (Rivkin & Somekh, 2010).

FST's meetings at the family home is a unique and significant component of the program. The purpose of

these sessions is to give the treated youth and their family members a sense of comfort and closeness ("we are with you, in your natural and comfortable place"), and to reach families that have difficulty coming out of their homes to get help. Also, these meetings serve as a diagnostic tool, enabling the professional staff to directly understand the juvenile's environment of growth, and accordingly identify the strengths and challenges to work. FST's meetings are usually held once a week; each meeting lasts for about an hour and a half.

Entering at the family home often causes ambivalent feelings among FST's members and the juvenile and his/her parents. On the one hand, the families are afraid of exposure. On the other hand, the FST may feel that they are penetrating the family's privacy and therefore concerned that they will not be able to address all of their concerns and needs. However, usually, these feelings are present at the beginning of the process. Gradually, mutual trust builds up, and FST's members succeed in positioning themselves as positive contributors.

### **"All Voices are Equal": The Egalitarian Model of the FST**

As mentioned, the program is based on principles of equality and partnership, manifested in holding the FSTs' meetings at the patient house and the full partnership of the treated youth and their supporters in the FSTs' discussions. It should be borne in mind that these are usually families that have experienced disappointment and mistrust in the establishment. To overcome this, the program convey a message that professionals are working for them, together with them ("we are in the same boat" as opposed to "we versus them"), which may provide them with a remedial experience.

In practice, the concept of "all voices are equal" is expressed by the fact that each of the participants can choose the issue that is raised for discussion in the FST meetings, about concerns raised by the treated youth functioning. For example, the concern arises from violent outbursts of the patient resulting from his difficulty in controlling anger and regulating emotions. There can be many ways to deal with this concern, and each of the FST partners can come up with an idea. Indeed, this is a complex process, as each of the participants, especially the professionals, comes with an agenda and a different approach. The coordinator is

responsible for allowing each member of the FST to express him selves and led them to the consensual response.

This process requires trust, listening, openness and thoughtfulness.

It is an egalitarian approach to problem-solving through ideological values of democracy and empowerment, an approach that challenges the traditional asymmetric interventions held by experts (service provider) with their clients (recipient patient) (Burns, Schoenwald, Burchard, Faw, & Santos, 2000; Freymond & Cameron, 2006).

However, despite the difficulty and complexity of achieving equality in treatment, this seems possible, especially through striving for an open dialogue and equality in voices. Support for this can be found in the studies who found that using equality in voices (hearing all voices, and giving weight to each voice, especially of patients), while using negotiation and persuasion techniques, rather than coercion, led to reaching consensus and alliances in the treatment process of at-risk youth (Forkby, 2009).

### **FSTs' Training**

As part of their position at the FST, the professionals undergo training for their job, separately, in the agency to which they belong. For example, the probation officer is trained by the probation service; the welfare workers are trained in the welfare service unites. However, once a month there is joint training at the welfare service unite, attended by the probation officer, the social workers who are charge of the program and the coordinator. It should be noted that joint training for all the FST's partners does not take place in a routine, but in times of crisis or when a special need arises, that requires their convergence.

The coordinator undergoes job-specific training. This includes an individual professional training held once in a week and lasts about an hour and a half each session that addresses his role in the program. Besides, the coordinator undergoes group training that is shared by all program coordinators (from across the country), which takes place once a month and lasts for

about 5 hours each session. During these sessions, the coordinators raise issues, difficulties, problems and also strengths in which they encounter during their work, for reflection and mutual learning, and the attempt to find creative solutions through brainstorming.

### **Support Programs**

During the last decades, the JPS, in cooperation with other agencies in the community (welfare, education, non-profit organizations), has developed a various program that provide solutions according to the type of offense and the needs of the treated youth. These programs are available to the probation officer when he/she draws up a suitable plan for the juvenile participating in the program. These programs include group therapy in specific areas of offense, such as violence, sex, and traffic. There are also personal tutoring programs, often delivered by students, and programs that constitute as an alternative to the criminal proceedings or parts thereof, such as Community Service (Shalatz), Family Discussion Groups and Mediation.

### **MA'ATEFET PROGRAM IN ISRAEL – EVALUATION STUDIES**

To date, two evaluation studies have been conducted to examine the effectiveness of the Ma'atefet program in Israel. The first study examined the program during the years it was implemented as a pilot (2001–2009) in two cities. The evaluation study included interviews with 22 youngsters and their parents who participated in the pilot program during those years (Rivkin & Somekh, 2010).

This study yielded some positive findings regarding the program's components and its operation. First, it was found that the FST established a good relationship with the treated youth and their families, based on acceptance and lack of judgment, which increased their involvement and contributed to the effectiveness of the program. Moreover, most of the juveniles' parents expressed their satisfaction with the program and noted that their participation was beneficial to their children concerning school, social life, and behavior. In addition, the parents reported that the program gave them practical tools to strengthen their authority, to empower them as parents, and to establish positive communication within the family (Rivkin & Somekh, 2010).

The second evaluation study was conducted between 2012-13 in order to examine the effectiveness

of Ma'atefet program and its way of operation by Israel's JPS. The study included interviews with the 33 juveniles (aged 14–18) and with professionals who participated in the FST sessions -- probation officers and coordinators (Kahan-Strawczynski, Kahan, Sher, & Levi, 2014). The juveniles who participated in the program were characterized by a multiple personal and family problems and increased risk situations (e.g., divorce/separation of the parents, death of a sibling, serious illness of a family member, imprisonment of a parent/brother), along with an extensive record of delinquent behavior. At the time of the entrance to the program, most of the participating juveniles were candidates for out-of-home placement, which in most cases was denied due to their participation in the program.

This study identifies several points of strength as well as challenges regarding the program. Interviews with FST professionals (coordinators, probation officers) and the revealed that they perceived the main values of the program as positive, while indicated several points of strength of the program: providing a framework for treating the juveniles within the community; designing a unique program for each juvenile in accordance to his/her particular needs and characteristics; meetings in the juvenile's home; intensive and ongoing intervention in the life of the juvenile and his/her family; working in a multi-disciplinary team, which enables to see the juvenile's needs from different angles and to search for varied suitable solutions; the flexibility and wider range of intervention options in comparison to other programs (Kahan-Strawczynski *et al.*, 2014).

The study also indicates that all juveniles were integrated into a normative framework and improved their functioning. In most cases, there was also an improvement in the relationship with family members, especially with parents. On the other hand, it was found that for about half of the participating juveniles, the main goals of the program were not achieved, such as not committing another offense, accepting boundaries and authority, and avoiding socializing with delinquent (Kahan-Strawczynski *et al.*, 2014).

### **THE MA'ATEFET PROGRAM - JPS' UP-TO-DATE DATA**

To date, 214 juveniles have been referred to the Ma'atefet program, of which 126 completed it successfully. Another 35 juveniles are currently participating in the program, while 53 juveniles have

dropped out. The reasons for dropping out of the program, as identified by JPS' probation officers, were: the juvenile's and/or his/her family's resistance to continuing participation in the program; lack of responsiveness to perform tasks as prescribed in the treatment plan; the juvenile's involvement in further criminal offenses; the juvenile's resistance to integrating into a normative framework (work or school); juvenile's request for out-of-home placement.

In recent years, the JPS has collected accurate data regarding the participants in the program, in various indices, in order to examine their compliance with the program's terms and objectives, such as the juveniles' integration into a normative framework (work or school); refraining from committing the offense; no out-of-home placement; and the parents' participation in guidance sessions for parents. In relation to the years 2015-2017, it was found that in more than 90% of the juveniles who participated in the program stayed at their parents' homes; about 85% of the juveniles did not commit another offense; among 85% of the juveniles, there was an improvement in their performance at work/school; and more than 80% of the parents participated in the guidance sessions for parents.

## CASE STUDIES

In order to illustrate the way of the Ma'atefet program is implemented, from the subjective perspective of the participants, we present here case studies of three juveniles who participated in the program; two of them completed the program and can be defined as success cases, while the third dropped out from the program<sup>2</sup>.

### Case 1 – Nati

Nati (pseudonym), aged 15 and a half, was referred to the JPS for committing a violent offense. He was arrested and the juvenile court asked the probation officer to submit a report regarding his detention and to recommend an alternative. After the probation officer had a meeting with the juvenile in the detention center and with his parents at the JPS, the family was offered the possibility of participating in the Wraparound program. The juvenile's parents were hesitant

regarding the proposal, expressing their distrust and suspicion toward care and education agencies, along with their disappointment with previous treatment attempts. Yet, despite their fears and doubts, they agreed to participate in the program, and a report was submitted recommending the juvenile's release to full house arrest and his inclusion in the Wraparound program. Gradually, as the program progressed, the court was asked to ease his detention conditions, and Nati returned to school and was integrated into the care of the probation officer and into a program for his leisure time.

Nati's background: Delinquency – this was the second time he had been involved in violent offenses; previously he had refused to participate in treatment to help him develop self-control and skills to handle difficult situations in order to avoid impulsive and violent outbursts and reactions. School – Nati rarely went to school; when he did, he did not function properly and did not accept the boundaries of the framework. Family – the relationship with his parents was described as tense; the father said that he had high expectations of his son and was disappointed that they were not met; the father referred to Nati as "black sheep" and expressed despair and contempt for him; the mother was busy taking care of the other children at home and hence not available for Nati's needs. Free time – Nati often slept during the morning and wandered about in the afternoons and at night, socializing with delinquent youths among whom he found acceptance.

The Family Support Team (FST) assembled by the coordinator that met in the home of Nati's parents once a week included Nati and his parents, the probation officer, Nati's grandfather, a tutor supporting Nati on behalf of the municipal's Youth Advancement Unit, and a teacher from the school that Nati attended. The program plan that was drawn up jointly by the FST, aimed to address the identified needs. It included the following:

*Therapeutic treatment* – Nati was referred to a therapy group for anger control at the JPS, in combination with challenging outdoor activities, and therapeutic horseback riding. These measures were meant to help him identify his motives for committing the offenses, to strengthen his self-confidence, help him to develop self-control and find alternative ways of behavior.

*School* – Nati gradually returned to a school framework, based on a personal study program built for

---

<sup>2</sup>The case studies described here are based the professional experience of some of the paper writers who are JPSs' employees in Israel. For obvious reasons of secrecy and privacy, information on minor patients and their families is limited.

him according to his needs and abilities. As part of the program, it was defined what was expected of Nati within the school framework and who would help him meeting these expectations. Nati's grandfather made sure to wake him up every morning and bring him to school on time. The school staff was recruited to assist Nati during school hours by providing individual help for his learning needs.

*Parental guidance* – during the first six months, a parent counselor came for weekly instruction sessions to the home of Nati's parents. With the consolidation of their relationship and the development of trust between them, the sessions were held at the municipality's parents' center, where the parent counselor works. In addition, Nati and his parents went on joint outings every two weeks, in order to improve their relationship and the communication between them. Furthermore, Nati and his father participated in a fitness program at a gym. During the last third of the program, Nati and his mother spent one afternoon a week with a joint activity, usually in the kitchen. She used his help, while he liked to learn cooking and baking.

*Free time* – A framework with the general rules was set up together with Nati, deciding on the hours he could leave, the time he had to return, the need to report his whereabouts, and his inclusion into Chances (Sikuim) Program, in which a personal mentor was assigned to him.

The treatment plan was gradually built, and each week Nati's progress was assessed and adjustments were made. The program demanded a lot from Nati and his parents. In the early stages, Nati expressed his despair and his difficulties in complying with the rules set for him. At a certain stage, there was growing concern over a decline in his functioning. A hearing in the matter before the court became necessary in order to bring Nati to commit himself to full compliance with the program that was set up. After a year and a half in the program, Nati completed the 11<sup>th</sup> grade at school successfully. In addition, he completed his participation in the group for anger control; and there were no further criminal charges filed against him. Nati and his parents reported a significant improvement in their relationship and the communication between them.

At the concluding meeting the father said: "You restored our trust, first in ourselves as parents, second in our son, and third in the care and education agencies." Nati told that until he entered the program, he had been in the care of a number of frameworks,

"Everywhere I went and said what I wanted, and got the better of everyone. Here in the Wraparound [program] all sit together, I cannot play games with myself and/or my surroundings; everybody came to my home and is really concerned about me; I have to prove myself."

## Case 2 – Dan

Dan (pseudonym), aged 16 and a half, was referred to the JPS following several properties and driving offenses.

Dan's background: many transitions between educational frameworks and dropping out of school; repeated involvement in criminal offenses; his parents' difficulties in supervising him; and unsuccessful attempts of out-of-home placement. His referral to the Wraparound program as an alternative to another attempt of out-of-home placement or a prison sentence.

The FST included the juvenile and his parents, a family social worker, an officer supervising regular school attendance, a youth counselor, probation officer, and Dan's employer. Dan agreed to participate in the program, stating: "I have nothing to lose." In the beginning, his cooperation was very limited. He expressed his opposition to proposals raised in the treatment plan; and only gradually did he show his willingness to begin a process of change. Dan's treatment plan included the following areas:

*Education* – integration into a program providing complementary education for school-excluded youth. In addition, he received private lessons in mathematics and Hebrew, after many learning gaps were discovered that had not been identified until he turned to the program. At the end of the program, he received a certificate of completing 12 school years.

*Employment* – alongside his studies, Dan was integrated into work. He worked three days a week. His employer joined the FST and attended the meetings once a month.

With his progress and success in his studies and work, Dan's self-confidence grew as well as his motivation to continue and expand the process of change.

*Therapeutic treatment* – Dan began individual cognitive-behavioral therapy and group therapy that focused on processing his criminal offenses. Dan

successfully completed his participation in both treatments, from which he benefited widely. Change found expression in the way he interprets the events, in his thinking and reactions.

At the same time, Dan went to regular individual meetings with a youth counselor, in order to work on joining a normative peer group. He established a significant relationship and felt safe in these meetings. It was clear that the relationship and its objectives helped him.

During his participation in the program, Dan did not commit another criminal offense. His parents received parental guidance and even asked at the end of the program to continue for another series of ten sessions.

At the end of the program, the mother pointed out the program's contribution, saying: "For years, we, the parents, have worried a lot about Dan. I went to all the offices and asked for help, in education and social services. Now, in the program, a social worker from the social service department, an officer supervising school attendance, and a probation officer come to me, and the three of them say to me: 'Ms ... what can you do to advance Dan?'"

During the court proceedings in his case, the juvenile referred to the process of change he was undergoing, saying: "In the end, I understood that change has to begin with me. I took matters into my own hand, with the help of those who did not give up on me, the tutor, my parents, who supported me, and the Wraparound [program] that believed in me. Every time I was about to fall, they held me. I am thanking all of them."

The juvenile court decided not to convict him because of the lengthy treatment he received and put him one year under probation. In its decision the juvenile court referred to the significant process Dan had undergone, saying: "By the way, I find it appropriate to point out again the extraordinary process that the defendant underwent with the support of therapeutic agencies in the community and also those in the Wraparound program that gave the defendant tools to realize his abilities. And that after so many entanglements, for which the defendant had also been detained for certain periods and been placed in various alternative frameworks, and after so many reports had been submitted attesting to the defendant's severely deteriorating situation over time..."

Upon the completion of the Wraparound program, Dan appealed against his exemption from service to the army. His appeal was accepted and he began his military service.

### Case 3 – Ronen

Ronen (pseudonym), aged 16 and a half, was referred to the JPS following three property and drug-related offenses. In the first meetings with him and with his parents it was reported that Ronen does not attend school regularly, wanders about and associates with delinquent youth from marginal social strata, that the relationship between him and his parents is tense, and that his parents have difficulties exerting parental control and supervising him. The general picture forming at the end of the process of collecting psychological and social information gave rise to concern, mainly because of the turbid relationship between Ronen and his parents, which led to unrestrained behavior and many risk situations. Against this background, Ronen and his parents were offered to participate in the program, while out-of-home placement was also an option. At first, Ronen objected to participating in the Wraparound program and also to out-of-home placement, saying that they are exaggerating about his situation and his problems, and that "everything will be all right," if his parents do not constrain him. For him, the only concerns were the criminal charges and the legal process. On the other hand, his parents supported his inclusion in the Wraparound program but were unable to change his mind. In the court hearing, the two options were brought before the court, and the JPS recommended postponing the hearing in order to fully explore the possibility of his inclusion in the Wraparound program. During the hearing, Ronen for the first time declared his consent to participate in the Wraparound program.

The FST included Ronen's schoolteacher; a tutor from the municipal's Youth Advancement Unit; a mentor who accompanied him; his older brother; his parents; and the probation officer. The treatment plan was gradually developed and designed to address all the concerns raised by the members of the FST. For example, Ronen's concerns, which were focused on the legal process, were taken into account and translated into corresponding measures, and thus the plan was designed to facilitate a positive outcome of the legal process for the juvenile. Ronen was told what he needed to do in order to achieve that goal.

Yet, despite the fact that the program plan was built gradually, with very focused assignments set for Ronen



every week, and with a great deal of assistance from the members of the FST (for example, in getting up early in the morning, getting to school on time, remaining at school until the end of his classes), Ronen did not cooperate in fulfilling his assignments, even those he defined as his goals, such as finding employment. He had no motivation to change, although his parents and all other members of the FST were very active and involved. Ronen's parents began attending a parental guidance program, but Ronen could not be mobilized for change, not even in small steps. At the same time, the JPS received alarming reports from the school about Ronen's suspected involvement in further property offenses, and traces of drugs were found during a search conducted on Ronen. Therefore, it was decided to stop Ronen's participation in the program, and a meeting was held at the JPS, with Ronen, his parents and all other members of the FST. At this meeting, Ronen declared that the program was too demanding for him and that the requirements of the programs for weekly meetings and for ongoing assignments constrained him. He expressed his opposition to continuing the program. He refused to talk about the concerns regarding the drug use, and despite his participation in the program for five-month, during which he attended the weekly meetings of the FST at his home, it was evident that he still did not trust the members of the team and that he concealed a lot. During this meeting, the members of the FST formed the impression that Ronen was not at all committed to the program and that there were no indications that he had the strength to function in the program, which requires the juvenile's cooperation, and that he continued to be in many risk situations, despite the commitment of his parents and of all other members of the FST. Therefore, it was decided to discontinue his participation in the program.

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of the current paper was to describe the implementation of the Wraparound model in Israel, named Ma'atefet, which based on the Wraparound model in the U.S. The program in Israel is operated by the JPS, as an alternative to out-of-home placement of convicted minors. In addition to the authors' professional experience, we presented evaluation studies that examined the effectiveness of the program in Israel, as well as case studies of juvenile offenders who participated in the program, of which two successfully completed it and one dropped out.

Wraparound is a unique community-based philosophy of care that emphasizes the socio-

ecological context, which combines individualized treatment along with social bonds as a crucial part of its guiding principles (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; 1994; Payne, 1995). Individualized services are ensured by a team that works in conjunction with the treated youth, their families and community supporters to provide tailored made responses to the specific needs of the treated youth (Borduin, 1994; Colvin *et al.*, 2002; Henggeler *et al.*, 1997; Lewis, Nash, & Kelleher, 2003; Pullmann *et al.*, 2006; Toffalo, 2000). A shared feature of the different approaches and methods included in this model, express in addressing the responses to the treated youth and their families, based on trustful relations and the collaboration of formal and informal community supporters (Burns *et al.*, 2000; Forkby, 2009; Freymond & Cameron, 2006).

Studies conducted to evaluate the Wraparound model programs, stress their advantages for the treated minors and their families, over other programs. These advantages expressed, among other things, in reducing risk behavior, improving relationships within the family and the prevention of out-of-home placement (e.g., Burns & Suter, 2010; Carney & Buttell, 2003; Cox *et al.*, 2010; Fries, Carney, Blackman-Urtega & Savas, 2012; Pullmann *et al.*, 2006; Sather & Bruns, 2016).

The premise of intervention programs based on Wraparound model is that community care is more effective in reducing recidivism than out-of-home placement or incarceration (Carney & Buttell, 2003; Shumaker, 1997). In line with this trend, the Israeli JPS developed over the last two decades various community-based programs, which the most prominent is the Ma'atefet program.

Ma'atefet program aims to rehabilitate and integrate into the community teens characterized by multiple risk factors that convicted of committing an offense by the Juvenile Court, as an alternative to their out-of-home placement. It is an intensive community-based, individualized tailored-made program, on the characteristics and needs of the treated youth and their families. The program is implemented based on the collaboration of the FST (Family Support Team), which includes professional, the treated youth, his/her family member(s), and other relevant community supporters.

Studies conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of the Ma'atefet program indicate a high satisfaction among all participants - probation officers, professional, treated minors and their parents. In addition, these studies indicated an improvement in the minor's

relationship with their parents. Furthermore, it was found that most of the treated minors manage to integrate into normative community frameworks (work, school), while avoiding of out-of-home placement (Kahan-Strawczynski *et al.*, 2014; Rivkin & Somekh, 2010). These findings are in consistence with previous studies conducted in different countries among high-risk youth treated in programs based on the Wraparound model (e.g., Clark *et al.*, 1996; Lipsey, Wilson & Cothorn, 2000; Myaard *et al.*, 2000; Pullmann *et al.*, 2006; Reay *et al.*, 2003).

Case studies of convicted minors who participated in the program also illustrate the program's advantages in the rehabilitation and integration process of delinquent juveniles. Alongside the professional guidance from the professionals, the minors needed the emotional and practical support of their relatives, especially their parents which are, unsurprisingly, the most significant characters to them. These emphasize the importance of receiving support from a variety of supporters, both formal and informal, in the process of change and rehabilitation (Cox, Baker & Wong, 2010). Rosenfeld and Sykes (1998) refer to this as providing "good enough services", a dynamic process of matching the family's needs with the provided services and the relationship through which the services are provided. Such an adjustment occurs when there is an ongoing dialogue between the service provider and their recipient, a dialogue that allows both parties to influence each other and work together.

Recent data from the JPS show that most of the minors (70%) completed successfully the program. The main reasons for dropping out of the program are as follows: lack of motivation from the part of the minor and his/her family; committing an additional offense; difficulties in accepting boundaries and authority; and socializing with delinquent friends. It was also found that most of the dropped out were younger and characterized by many risk factors (Kahan-Strawczynski *et al.*, 2014; Rivkin & Somekh, 2010). Age seems to play an important role here, probably because as the minors grow older, they acquire the ability to internalize their situation and the meaning of the program and its benefits. However, similar features have emerged from other studies (e.g., Fries, Carney, Blackman-Urtega & Savas, 2012; Nisbet, Graham & Newell, 2012).

In sum, our review of the Ma'atefet program indicates that it operates according to the key values of the Wraparound model. This includes "tailoring" a

unique plan for each minor and his/her family, based on their particular needs and characteristics; holding meetings at the home of the minor's parents, to increase their cooperation with the program; working with a multi-disciplinary team, which enables viewing the minor's needs from different angles; and flexibility, allowing to the usage of various means of intervention, in cooperation with various community agencies.

## Conclusions and Prospects

The positive results of intervention programs based on the Wraparound model, as evidenced by the Israeli experience as well as studies from many other countries, reinforce its basic values and principles. Furthermore, the success of the program in preventing out-of-home placement of most of the treated minors is good news for the juveniles, their families, the enforcement system and society as a whole.

In conclusion, rehabilitation in the community has many socio-economic advantages, reflecting in saving costs of out-of-home placement as well as welfare services, and in the reduction in recidivism. In light of its clear advantages, we call for policymakers to expand the program to additional communities in Israel while the inclusion of more participants in the program.

## REFERENCES

- Borduin, C. M. (1994). Innovative models of treatment and service delivery in the juvenile justice system. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 23, 19-25.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1994). Ecological models of human development. *International Encyclopedia of Education*, 3, 37-43.
- Burns, B. J., Schoenwald, S. K., Burchard, J., Faw, L., & Santos, A. B. (2000). Comprehensive community-based interventions for youth with severe emotional disorders: Multisystemic therapy and the wraparound process. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 9(3), 293-314. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026440406435>
- Bruns, E.J., & Suter, J.C. (2010). Summary of the Wraparound evidence base. In E.J. Burns & J.S. Walker (Eds.), *The Resource Guide to Wraparound*. Portland, OR: National Wraparound Initiative.
- Bruns, E. J., Walker, J. S., Zabel, M., Matarese, M., Estep, K., Harburger, D., & Pires, S. (2010). Intervening in the lives of youth with complex behavioral health challenges and their families: The role of the Wraparound process. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 46(3-4), 314-331. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-010-9346-5>
- Burchard, J. D., & Clarke, R. T. (1990). The role of individualized care in a service delivery system for children and adolescents with severely maladjusted behavior. *Journal of Mental Health Administration*, 17(1), 48-60. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02518579>

- Burchard, J.D., Bruns, E.J., & Burchard, S.N. (2002). The Wraparound approach. In B.J. Burns & K. Hoagwood (Eds.), *Community Treatment for Youth: Evidence Based Interventions for Severe Emotional and Behavioral Disorder* (pp. 69 – 90). New York: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195134575.003.0004>
- Burt, M.R., Resnick, C., & Novick, E.R. (1998). *Building Supportive Communities for At-Risk Adolescents: It Takes More Than Services*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10255-000>
- Carney, M.M., & Buttell, F. (2003). Reducing juvenile recidivism: Evaluating the Wraparound services model. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 13(5), 551 – 568. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731503253364>
- Coldiron, J.S., Bruns, E.J., & Quick, H. (2017). A Comprehensive Review of Wraparound Care Coordination Research, 1986–2014. *Journal of Child Family Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-016-0639-7>
- Coldiron, J. S., Hensley, S. W., Parigoris, R. M., & Bruns, E. J. (2019). Randomized control trial findings of a Wraparound program for dually involved youth. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*. [Online First.] <https://doi.org/10.1177/1063426619861074>
- Colvin, M., Cullen, F. T., & Vander Ven, T. (2002). Coercion, social support, and crime: An emerging theoretical consensus. *Criminology*, 40, 19-42. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2002.tb00948.x>
- Cox, K. (2005). Examining the role of social network intervention as an integral component of community-based, family-focused practice. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 14, 443-454. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-005-6855-1>
- Cox, K., Baker, D., Wong, M.A. (2010). Wraparound retrospective: Factors predicting positive outcome. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral disorders*, 18(1), 3 – 13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1063426609336955>
- Effland, V.S., Walton, B.A. & McIntyre, J.S. (2011). Connecting the dots: Stages of implementation, Wraparound fidelity and youth outcomes. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 20(6), 736 – 746. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-011-9541-5>
- Forkby, T. (2009). The power and ethics of social network intervention in working with at-risk youth. *Child and Adolescent Social Work*, 26(6), 545 – 560. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10560-009-0186-9>
- Freymond, N., & Cameron, G. (Eds.). (2006). *Towards positive systems of child and family welfare: International comparisons of child protection, family service, and community caring systems*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press Inc. <https://doi.org/10.3138/9781442682726>
- Fries, D., Carney, K.J., Blackman-Urtega, L., & Savas, S.A. (2012a). Wraparound services: Infusion into secondary schools as a dropout prevention strategy. *NASSP Bulletin*, 96(2), 119 – 136. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192636512443282>
- Fries, D., Carney, K.J., Blackman-Urtega, L., & Savas, S.A. (2012b). Development of an outcome measurement tool for a teen parent Wraparound program. *School Social Work Journal*, 37(1), 36 – 53. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.65.5.821>
- Henggeler, S. W., Melton, G. B., Brondino, M. J., Scherer, D. G., & Hanley, J. H. (1997). Multisystemic therapy with violent and chronic juvenile offenders and their families: The role of treatment fidelity in successful dissemination. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology*, 65, 821-833.
- Howard, L., Misch, G., Burke, C., & Pennell, S. (2002). *San Diego County Probation Department's Repeat Offender Prevention Program - Final Evaluation Report*. San Diego, Calif.: San Diego Association of Governments.
- Israel Police – Statistical Yearbook, 2017. Retrieved from [https://www.gov.il/BlobFolder/reports/police\\_statistical\\_abstract\\_2017/he/shanton\\_2017.pdf](https://www.gov.il/BlobFolder/reports/police_statistical_abstract_2017/he/shanton_2017.pdf) [Hebrew]
- Kahan-Strawczynski, P., & Levi, D. (2011). Characteristics and needs of minors treated in the Juvenile Probation Service. Jerusalem: Myers-JDC-Brookdale Institute, Ministry of Social Affairs and Services. [Hebrew]
- Kahan-Strawczynski, P., Sher, N., & Levi, D. (2014). *Wraparound Program for Youth in the Care of the Juvenile Probation Service: Evaluation Study*. Jerusalem: Myers-JDC-Brookdale Institute, Ministry of Social Affairs and Services. [Hebrew]
- Elisha, E., & Braver, E. (2015). Juvenile Probation Service in Israel: Developments in legislation and methods of intervention. In U. Timor, S. Ben-Baruch, & E. Elisha (eds.), *Youth in a Mess: Juvenile Offenders in Israel – Ways of Prevention, Enforcement, and Rehabilitation* (pp. 38-66). Jerusalem: Magnes. [Hebrew]
- Lewis, E.N., Nash, D., & Kelleher, K. (2003). Lorenz Curves: A New Model for the Distribution of Psychiatric Services. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 12(4), 475 – 482. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026072209070>
- Lipsey, M. W., Wilson, D. B., & Cothorn, L. (2000). *Effective intervention for serious juvenile offenders*. Washington, DC: Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. <https://doi.org/10.1037/e306462003-001>
- Mendenhall, A.N., Kapp, S.A., Rand, A., Robbins, M.L. & Stipp, K. (2013). Theory meets practice: The localization of Wraparound services for youth with serious emotional disturbance. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 49, 793 – 804. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10597-013-9646-y>
- Moon, M.M., Applegate, B.K., & Latessa, E.J. (1997). RECLAIM Ohio: A politically viable alternative to treating youthful felony offenders. *Crime & Delinquency*, 43, 438-456. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128797043004003>
- Nisbet, I., Graham, A., & Newell, S. (2012). A letter from Australia – The potential of a 'Wraparound' approach to reducing juvenile offending in New South Wales. *Crime Prevention and Safety*, 14(3), 225 – 234. <https://doi.org/10.1057/cpcs.2012.6>
- Payne, M. (1995). *Social Work and Community Care*. Basingstoke: Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-24013-5>
- Pullmann, D.P., Kerbs, J., Koroloff, N., Veach-White, E., Gaylor, R., & Sieler, D. (2006). Juvenile offenders with mental health needs: Reducing recidivism using Wraparound. *Crime & Delinquency*, 52(3), 375 – 397. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128705278632>
- Rivkin, D., & Somech, S. (2010). *The Ma'atefet (Wraparound) Program: Evaluation Study*. Jerusalem: Myers-JDC-Brookdale Institute. [Hebrew]
- Rosenfeld, J.M., & Sykes, J.S. (1998). Toward "good enough" services for inaptly served families and children: Barriers and opportunities. *European Journal of Social Work*, 1(3), 285 – 300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691459808413790>
- Sather, A., & Bruns, E.J. (2016). National trends in implementing Wraparound: Results of the State Wraparound Survey, 2013. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 25, 3160 – 3172. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-016-0469-7>
- Shumaker, A.W. (1997). Preventing juvenile delinquency through early family intervention. *Journal of Family Social Work*, 2, 73-85. [https://doi.org/10.1300/J039v02n03\\_06](https://doi.org/10.1300/J039v02n03_06)
- Toffalo, D.A. (2000). An investigation of treatment integrity and outcomes in wraparound services. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 9, 351–361. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026496524181>

- VanDenBerg, J. E., & Grealish, E. M. (1996). Individualized services and supports through the Wraparound process: Philosophy and procedures. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 5, 7-21.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02234675>
- Walker, J. S., & Bruns, E. J. (2006). Building on practice-based evidence: Using expert perspectives to define the Wraparound process. *Psychiatric Services*, 57(11), 1579–1585.  
<https://doi.org/10.1176/ps.2006.57.11.1579>
- Walker, J. S., & Matarese, M. (2011). Using a theory of change to drive human resource development for Wraparound. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 20(6), 791–803.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-011-9532-6>
- Wilson, K.J. (2008). *Literature review: Wraparound Services for Juvenile and Adult Offender Populations*. A Report Prepared for the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. Davis, Calif.: University of California, Davis, Center for Public Policy Research. Retrieved from [https://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/Wraparound\\_Process.pdf](https://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/Wraparound_Process.pdf)
- Zhang, S.X., & Zhang, L. (2005). An experimental study of the Los Angeles County Repeat Offender Program: Its implementation and evaluation. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 4(2), 205–36.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9133.2005.00017.x>

Received on 09-02-2020

Accepted on 30-03-2020

Published on 26-04-2020

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.6000/1929-4409.2020.09.11>

© 2020 Elisha *et al.*; Licensee Lifescience Global.

This is an open access article licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>) which permits unrestricted, non-commercial use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the work is properly cited.