



DATA INSIGHTS AND OUTCOMES

FY 2015-22 Enrollment Cohort
Juvenile Probation Department (JPD)

San Francisco Wraparound Collaborative

Seneca Family of Agencies
Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice
Edgewood Center for Children and Families
St. Vincent's / Catholic Charities

Prepared by Seneca Family of Agencies
In Partnership with SFDPH, SFHSA, and SFJPD

Introduction

Goal of this document:

Explore outcomes for youth who participated in San Francisco (SF) Wraparound.

Sample for this document includes youth who are:

- JPD-referred
- Enrollment Cohort Youth (youth enrolled in Wraparound for the first time)
- Entered Wraparound during the following fiscal years: 2015/2016, 2016/2017, 2017/2018, 2018/2019, 2019/2020, 2020/2021, 2021/2022
- Served by provider agencies: Seneca, CJCJ, Edgewood, and St. Vincent's

Document Layout and Data Sources

Data for this report come from several different sources:

Report Section	Data Source(s)
Who Was Referred? (p. 3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• SF Multi-Agency Support Team (MAST)
Who Participated? (p. 4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Seneca (and subcontractor) agency Electronic Health Records (EHRs)
What Services Were Provided? (p. 6)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Seneca (and subcontractor) EHRs• SF Avatar EHR
Wraparound Outcomes (p. 8)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Seneca (and subcontractor) EHRs

What is Wraparound?

Wraparound is a collaborative approach to care that encourages coordination across agencies, disciplines, and communities to enhance outcomes for children and families. It provides children and youth who have complex needs with comprehensive and cost-effective intensive, coordinated, highly individualized interventions and linkage to services. The Wraparound model enhances prevention, safety, permanency, and well-being for youth and families, consistent with state and federal mandates.

Waiver Eligibility: (see Appendix for full Wraparound Eligibility Criteria)

Juvenile probation youth who are pre-adjudicated or not found competent to stand trial may be eligible for Wraparound.


Data Notes:

- Most data in this document are reported through the end of the fiscal year (6/30/22). Due to this data cut point, in addition to the nature of enrollment cohort analyses, as more time passes, data points in this document are subject to change. For example, next year an additional year of data will be included in the Annual Report, more youth will have discharged and/or have a year post-discharge data available, etc.
- Data from SF JPD's internal database was as of 5/24/23. Youth for whom JPD was unable to match have been removed from analyses involving this data. Information on law violations of individuals over age 18 at the time of the violation is not available. Information from "sealed" records was included this year.
- Additional data tables are available in the Appendices (pp. 16-22).




Who Was Referred?

SF Wraparound Referral Process




Referrals Received in FY 2015-2022

(appendix tables 1 & 2)



Wraparound Enrollments in FY 2015-2022





Who Participated?

JPD-Referred Enrollment Cohort: FYs 2015-22


(tables 2-6)

189 Youth enrolled in Wraparound for the first time.


- 102 Seneca
- 43 CJCJ
- 32 St. Vincent's
- 12 Edgewood

W **79 Waiver** (Juvenile probation youth who are pre-adjudicated or not found competent to stand trial.)


Over two-thirds of youth were assigned a sex of Male at birth



Nearly two-thirds identified as Black / African American.



Client Age at Wraparound Intake



Median Age at Wraparound Intake: 16 years

W Waiver youth tended to be slightly younger (median age of 15) but were similar across sex and race/ethnicity.



Who Participated?

System Involvement Before Wraparound

In the year prior to Wraparound enrollment: (for 181* youth with matching JPD records out of 189 enrollment cohort youth)

92% of youth (166 of 181) had not entered an out-of-home placement (court mandate that youth live outside current home, with a relative or in a group home).

2.27 average law violations per youth (misdemeanor or felony arrest [including both citations & bookings] with a petition filed)

1.44 average felonies per youth

W 100% of waiver youth (78 of 78) had not entered an out-of-home placement

**Note.* The data on this page is pulled from SF JPD's internal database as of 5/24/23. Youth for whom JPD was unable to match have been removed from these outcome analyses, resulting in the removal of 8 youth from the enrollment cohort (189) leaving 181 youth with data. Information on law violations of individuals over age 18 at the time of the violation is not available. 58%, or 105 out of 181, of enrollment cohort youth with JPD data had not turned 18 during or in the year post-Wraparound.




What Services Were Provided?

Duration of Enrollment

(table 7)

Number of Youth by Months Enrolled



Half of youth discharged within **6.1 months** (median) of enrollment.



Waiver median: 7.2 months
Non-Waiver median: 6.1 months

96% of 185 youth who have discharged as of 6/30/22 did so within 18 months.

As of 6/30/22, 185 youth out of 189 youth in FY 2015-22 enrollment cohort had discharged.


Services Documented

(table 8)

Average hours per client, per month

13 total hours of service per client, per month

Data from CJCJ was not provided for this section.





What Services Were Provided?

Child and Family Team (CFT) Meetings


(table 9)

Background: Regular Child and Family Team (CFT) meetings that include the youth, family, Seneca Wraparound team, natural supports, and other professionals involved in the family's life are a foundation of Wraparound. Services are driven by the youth and family's needs and desired goals as discussed in CFT meetings, which are held in easily accessible locations chosen by the family.


0.36 Average # of CFT meetings per client, per month, for SF Wraparound during FY 2015-22.

Overall, SF Wraparound's average number of CFTs per client, per month, has **decreased** for enrollment cohort clients who enrolled in the past two fiscal years.

By fiscal year: Average # of CFTs per client, by date of enrollment, per month enrolled



By agency: Average # of CFTs per client, per month enrolled




Data from CJCJ was not provided for this section.



Wraparound Outcomes

Discharges by Report Date (6/30/22)

Discharged Clients in FY 2015-22



98% (185 of 189) of enrollment cohort youth had discharged from Wraparound as of 6/30/22.

95% (180 of 189) had completed a full year post-discharge.

Enrollment Cohort, Discharges, and Youth Discharged who Completed a Full Year Post-Discharge

Fiscal Year	Enrollment Cohort Youth	# of Discharged Youth	% of Discharged Youth	# Discharged Youth who Completed a Full Year Post-Discharge	% Discharged Youth who Completed a Full Year Post-Discharge
2015-16	54	54	100%	54	100%
2016-17	36	36	100%	36	100%
2017-18	46	46	100%	46	100%
2018-19	19	18	95%	18	95%
2019-20	22	22	100%	22	100%
2020-21	9	9	100%	4	44%
2020-22	3	0	0%	0	0%
Total	189	185	98%	180	95%

Rates for waiver youth are comparable.

Note: Since not all enrollment cohort youth have discharged (or completed a full year post-discharge) as of the report date, outcome figures in the following pages are subject to change in the future as new data is collected.



Wraparound Outcomes

Keeping Youth in the Community

(table 10)



71% of youth (128 of 181 with JPD data*) did not enter out-of-home placement during or in the year following Wraparound.


Ⓜ Rates for waiver youth are comparable.

Increasing Youth and Community Safety

(table 11)

Definition of Subsequent Law Violation: a misdemeanor or felony arrest (including both citations & bookings) with a petition filed.

48% of youth (87 of 181) had no subsequent law violations during or in the year following Wraparound.



Ⓜ Figures for waiver youth are comparable.

*181 enrollment cohort youth with matching records in JPD data (see page 5 for details).




Wraparound Outcomes

Increasing Youth and Community Safety

(tables 12-13)


Only for Youth Under 18: Since information on law violations is not available for youth over 18, the analyses below only include youth who had not turned 18 during the year following their discharge from Wraparound, or prior to 6/30/22, whichever is earlier (105 out of 181 JPD records).

44% of youth (46 of 105) had no subsequent law violations during or in the year following Wraparound.



Bookings Only: An arrest may result in a citation (notice to appear at probation at a future date), or a booking into juvenile hall, depending on the severity of the law violation and legal circumstances.

56% of youth (101 of 181) had no subsequent violations with a booking during or in the year following Wraparound.





Wraparound Outcomes


The *Child and Adolescent Needs and Strengths (CANS)* assessment is completed by the Wraparound clinician at entry to Wraparound, every six months after entry, and at discharge from services.

Data represent the number or percent of youth who are "Actionable" on each item. An "Actionable" item indicates an area that should be considered a focus for intervention.

The following pages show data on change in emotional and behavioral health as measured in change in CANS items from Actionable to Non-Actionable status. Please see below for information about how to read these visuals.


How to Read CANS Visuals

Youth Who Were Actionable at Initial Assessment and No Longer Actionable at Discharge



Youth Who Were Ever Actionable and No Longer Actionable at Discharge

Change in % of youth who were **Ever Actionable** during treatment and were **Still Actionable at Discharge** for each CANS item.





Wraparound Outcomes

Youth Actionable Status at Initial and at Discharge

(table 10)

	Number of Clients Actionable and Non-Actionable at Initial		Clients with Item Scores (N)	% Still Actionable vs No Longer Actionable at Discharge		Clients Actionable at Initial (N)
Legal	149	10	159	58%	42%	149
Anger Control	97	62	159	55%	45%	97
Recreational	91	68	159	67%	33%	91
Family Functioning	86	73	159	65%	35%	86
School Achievement	84	64	148	63%	37%	84
Delinquent Behavior	84	75	159	57%	43%	84
Depression	76	83	159	64%	36%	76
Adjustment to Trauma	72	87	159	63%	38%	72
School Behavior	70	78	148	49%	51%	70
Danger to Others	68	91	159	49%	51%	68
Oppositional	67	90	157	58%	42%	67
Talents and Interests	64	95	159	67%	33%	64
Anxiety	64	95	159	61%	39%	64
School Attendance	62	86	148	63%	37%	62
Living Situation	61	96	157	59%	41%	61
Impulsivity/Hyperactivity	60	99	159	77%	23%	60
Relationship Permanence	59	100	159	54%	46%	59
Emotional and/or Physical Dysregulation	58	98	156	50%	50%	58
Family Strengths	54	105	159	61%	39%	54
Interpersonal	51	108	159	47%	53%	51
Runaway	31	126	157	68%	32%	31
Substance Use	31	41	72	74%	26%	31
Attachment Difficulties	30	118	148	47%	53%	30
Intentional Misbehavior	27	132	159	48%	52%	27
Intrusions/Re-Experiencing	19	127	146	26%	74%	19
Other Self-Harm (Recklessness)	19	140	159	68%	32%	19
Conduct	19	138	157	63%	37%	19



Wraparound Outcomes

Youth Who Were Ever Actionable and Still Actionable at Discharge

(table 14)

Change in % of youth who were **Ever Actionable** during treatment and were **Still Actionable at Discharge** for each CANS item.





Wraparound Outcomes

Criminogenic Risk Factors

Eight criminogenic risk factors have been cited in research as being associated with recidivism¹. In a presentation by the California Board of State and Community Corrections², they note seven factors which can be the target of programs. Research also indicates that when programs target at least 4-6 of these, they may show a larger change in recidivism rate than those who target 1-3³.

We selected CANS items which are conceptually similar to these 7 factors (based on the definitions in the San Francisco CANS 2.0 manual), The **risk factors** and their corresponding CANS items (shown in parentheses) are noted below.

1. **Pro-Criminal Attitudes** (Delinquent Behavior)
2. **Anti-Social Personality** (Conduct)
3. **Anti-Social Peer Associations** (Interpersonal)
4. **Substance Abuse** (Substance Abuse)
5. **Family** (Family Functioning)
6. **Education/Employment** (School Achievement, School Attendance and School Behavior)
7. **Leisure Time** (Recreation)


¹Andrew, D.A., Bonta, J., & Wormith, J.S. (2006). The Recent Past and Near Future of Risk and/or Need Assessment. *Crime & Delinquency*, (52), 1, 7-27.

²<http://www.bscc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/Principles-of-Effective-Interventions.pdf>

³Gendreau P., French S.A., and A. Taylor (2002). What Works (What Doesn't Work) Revised 2002 Invited Submission to the International Community Corrections Association Monograph Series Project

Change in CANS Items Conceptually Similar to Criminogenic Risk Factors (table 14)

Change in % of youth who were **Ever Actionable** during treatment and were **Still Actionable at Discharge** for each CANS item.





Wraparound Outcomes

Reasons for Discharge

Background: When a youth discharges from Wraparound, the clinician completes a Discharge Summary form in the agency's EHR. The data on this page are pulled from the provider agencies' EHRs (not from the dataset provided by SF HSA).

151 Discharges with discharge data collected (out of 185 total discharges).


Duration of Wraparound Enrollment

Average **7.4 Months**

Median **6.1 Months**

Reasons for Discharge

(Multiple reasons may be selected)




■ Positive reasons for discharge

Treatment Goal Progress at Discharge



Next Level of Service at Discharge



Over half of discharges with data (83 out of 149) fully or partially reached their treatment goals.

Two-fifths of discharges with data (56 out of 137) stepped down to a lower level of service (or no service).



Appendix

Definitions:

Eligibility for Wraparound:

- The child and/or family is experiencing a disturbance in one or more of the following areas: school, community relations, emotional functioning (SED) or family relations; AND/OR
- Intensive service coordination, delivery, and/or support is required to assist the family or caretaker in meeting the child’s needs; AND
- The child has family, a relative, legal guardian, or other significant person in his/her life that is open to participating in a strengths-based, family-centered process and resides within or in close proximity to any of the Wraparound geographic service areas such as Alameda, Contra Costa, San Mateo, Solano, Marin or, when necessary, family finding efforts can be used to identify such persons; AND
- The child is eligible under California Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) 602 (i.e., is a dependent or ward of the Juvenile Court); OR
- The child has a juvenile probation petition pending at the time of referral.

Waiver Eligibility:

Additionally, juvenile probation youth who are pre-adjudicated or not found competent to stand trial may be eligible for Wraparound.

Note: Since not all enrollment cohort youth have discharged (or completed a full year post-discharge) as of the report date, some numbers in the following tables are subject to change in the future as new data are collected.

Table 1. Number of referrals to Wraparound by waiver status.

Enrollment Year	Non-Waiver	Waiver	Total
2015-16	50	13	63
2016-17	28	25	53
2017-18	41	37	78
2018-19	25	19	44
2019-20	35	16	51
2020-21	7	6	13
2021-22	8	1	9
Total	194	117	311

Table 2. Number of enrollment cohort youth by waiver status.

Enrollment year	Non-waiver	Waiver	Total
2015-16	41	13	54
2016-17	18	18	36
2017-18	21	25	46
2018-19	9	10	19
2019-20	14	8	22
2020-21	4	5	9
2021-22	3	0	3
Total	110	79	189



Appendix

Table 3. Number of enrollment cohort youth by agency.

Enrollment year	CJCJ	Edgewood	St. Vincent's	Seneca	Total
2015-16	18	6	8	22	54
2016-17	9	1	9	17	36
2017-18	11	2	10	23	46
2018-19	5	1	3	10	19
2019-20	0	0	2	20	22
2020-21	0	2	0	7	9
2021-22	0	0	0	3	3
Total	43	12	32	102	189

Table 4. Number of enrollment cohort youth by gender.

Gender	# of enrollment cohort youth
F	59
M	130
Total	189

Table 5. Number of enrollment cohort youth by age at intake.

Age at intake	# of enrollment cohort youth
11	1
12	5
13	10
14	20
15	44
16	61
17	34
18	13
19	1
Total	189



Appendix

Table 6. Number of enrollment cohort youth by ethnicity.

Ethnicity	# of enrollment cohort youth
African-American	118
Two or More	32
Hispanic/Latino	29
Caucasian	16
Latin American	13
Filipino	11
Mexican-American/Chicano	9
Samoan	3
Arab-American	3
Chinese	2
Other	2
Unknown	1
Pacific Islander	1
Vietnamese	1
No Ethnicity Reported	1
Japanese	1

Table 7. Duration of enrollment in Wraparound.

Enrollment Year	# of discharged enrollment	
	cohort youth	median length of stay in months
2015-16	54	5.50
2016-17	36	4.67
2017-18	46	7.13
2018-19	18	6.88
2019-20	22	7.93
2020-21	9	9.57
2021-22	0	n/a
Total	185	6.03



Appendix

Table 8. Total service hours per month enrolled by Wraparound service category.

Enrollment Year	Case Management	Crisis Intervention	Educational Services	Medication Support	Mental Health Services	Non-Billable	Total
2015-16	2.24	0.00	0.00	0.10	11.44	4.43	18.20
Edgewood	1.60	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.76	11.05	29.42
Seneca	2.83	0.00	0.00	0.11	11.66	3.66	18.26
St. Vincent's	0.71	0.00	0.00	0.14	6.00	1.34	8.18
2016-17	2.06	0.00	0.00	0.11	8.76	2.72	13.65
Edgewood	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	38.53	19.39	57.92
Seneca	2.97	0.00	0.00	0.08	8.34	3.49	14.86
St. Vincent's	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.20	9.64	0.96	10.80
2017-18	1.65	0.02	0.00	0.15	7.68	2.46	11.96
Edgewood	1.42	0.43	0.00	0.12	13.84	5.11	20.92
Seneca	2.01	0.00	0.00	0.18	7.60	2.59	12.38
St. Vincent's	0.22	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.42	1.24	7.89
2018-19	0.86	0.00	0.00	0.03	8.94	3.13	12.96
Edgewood	1.28	0.00	0.00	0.00	11.21	6.89	19.38
Seneca	0.65	0.00	0.00	0.00	9.07	3.15	12.87
St. Vincent's	1.89	0.00	0.00	0.23	7.14	1.32	10.58
2019-20	1.85	0.00	0.00	0.05	5.52	2.11	9.53
Seneca	1.82	0.00	0.00	0.04	5.37	2.18	9.41
St. Vincent's	2.50	0.00	0.00	0.22	8.66	0.81	12.20
2020-21	1.69	0.00	0.00	0.34	2.96	2.29	7.27
Edgewood	1.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.16	2.12	11.74
Seneca	1.71	0.00	0.00	0.38	2.38	2.30	6.78
2021-22	0.65	0.00	0.00	0.44	5.41	0.60	7.10
Seneca	0.65	0.00	0.00	0.44	5.41	0.60	7.10
Total	1.79	0.01	0.00	0.12	8.14	2.95	13.00

Table 9. Number of Child/Family Team meetings per client, per month enrolled, by agency

Enrollment Year	Edgewood	Seneca	St. Vincent's	Total
2015-16	0.77	0.21	0.18	0.29
2016-17	0.00	0.22	0.16	0.20
2017-18	0.68	0.35	0.35	0.37
2018-19	0.79	0.30	0.47	0.35
2019-20		0.57	0.63	0.57
2020-21	0.76	0.49		0.51
2021-22		0.25		0.25
Total	0.75	0.35	0.27	0.36



Appendix

Table 10. Enrollment cohort youth out-of-home placements prior, during, and one year post entry year.

Enrollment year	number of enrollment cohort youth	# of youth who did not enter JPD placement during one year prior to first Wraparound enrollment	% of youth who did not enter JPD placement during one year prior to first Wraparound enrollment	# of youth who did not enter JPD placement during first Wraparound enrollment or one year post discharge	% of youth who did not enter JPD placement during first Wraparound enrollment or one year post discharge
2015-16	49	47	96%	39	80%
2016-17	34	29	85%	23	68%
2017-18	45	44	98%	30	67%
2018-19	19	17	89%	12	63%
2019-20	22	19	86%	14	64%
2020-21	9	8	89%	7	78%
2021-22	3	2	67%	3	100%
Total	181	166	92%	128	71%

Table 11. Enrollment cohort youth with subsequent law violations during Wraparound or one year post.

Enrollment year	# of enrollment cohort youth	# of youth with zero violations	% of youth with zero violations	# of youth with 1+ violations (1+ felonies)	% of youth with 1+ violations (1+ felonies)	# of youth with 1+ violations (no felonies)	% of youth with 1+ violations (no felonies)
2015-16	49	30	61%	12	24%	7	14%
2016-17	34	11	32%	16	47%	7	21%
2017-18	45	13	29%	22	49%	10	22%
2018-19	19	9	47%	9	47%	1	5%
2019-20	22	15	68%	5	23%	2	9%
2020-21	9	6	67%	2	22%	1	11%
2021-22	3	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	181	87	48%	66	36%	28	15%



Appendix

Table 12. Enrollment cohort youth with subsequent law violations during Wraparound or one year post under 18 at one year post.

Enrollment year	# of enrollment cohort youth	# of youth with zero violations	% of youth with zero violations	# of youth with 1+ violations (1+ felonies)	% of youth with 1+ violations (1+ felonies)	# of youth with 1+ violations (no felonies)	% of youth with 1+ violations (no felonies)
2015-16	24	13	54%	8	33%	3	13%
2016-17	22	5	23%	11	50%	6	27%
2017-18	28	6	21%	16	57%	6	21%
2018-19	9	4	44%	5	56%	0	0%
2019-20	13	10	77%	2	15%	1	8%
2020-21	6	5	83%	1	17%	0	0%
2021-22	3	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	105	46	44%	43	41%	16	15%

Table 13. Enrollment cohort youth with subsequent law violations (bookings only) during Wraparound or one year post.

Enrollment year	# of enrollment cohort youth	# of youth with zero violations	% of youth with zero violations	# of youth with 1+ violations (1+ felonies)	% of youth with 1+ violations (1+ felonies)	# of youth with 1+ violations (no felonies)	% of youth with 1+ violations (no felonies)
2015-16	49	31	63%	12	24%	6	12%
2016-17	34	15	44%	14	41%	5	15%
2017-18	45	20	44%	20	44%	5	11%
2018-19	19	10	53%	8	42%	1	5%
2019-20	22	16	73%	4	18%	2	9%
2020-21	9	6	67%	2	22%	1	11%
2021-22	3	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	181	101	56%	60	33%	20	11%



Appendix

Table 14. Number of Youth Who Moved from Actionable to No Longer Actionable on CANS items

Domain	Item	# of Clients with Item Scores on Both Initial and Discharge (All Initials and All Discharges)	# of Clients Actionable (Initial) (Matched to Discharge, All Initials and Discharges)	# of Clients Non-Actionable (Initial) (Matched to Discharge, All Initials and Discharges)	# of Clients Still Actionable at Discharge (of Those Actionable at Initial, All Initials and Discharges)	# of Clients No Longer Actionable at Discharge (of Those Actionable at Initial, All Initials and Discharges)	% of Clients Still Actionable at Discharge (of Those Actionable at Initial, All Initials and Discharges)	% of Clients No Longer Actionable at Discharge (of Those Actionable at Initial, All Initials and Discharges)	# of Clients with Item Scores (Discharge) (no matching filter, All Discharges)	# of Clients Ever Actionable (Of Clients Who Have Scores on Discharge, All Discharges)	% of Clients Ever Actionable (Of Clients Who Have Scores on Discharge, All Discharges)	# of Clients Actionable (Discharge) (no matching filter, All Discharges)	% of Clients Actionable (Discharge) (no matching filter, All Discharges)	
Behavioral/Emotional Needs	Adjustment to Trauma	159	72	87	45	27	63%	38%	159	85	53%	55	35%	
	Anger Control	159	97	62	53	44	55%	45%	159	103	65%	59	37%	
	Anxiety	159	64	95	39	25	61%	39%	159	71	45%	46	29%	
	Attachment Difficulties	148	30	118	14	16	47%	53%	148	39	26%	23	16%	
	Conduct	157	19	138	12	7	63%	37%	157	28	18%	20	13%	
	Depression	159	76	83	49	27	64%	36%	159	91	57%	62	39%	
	Impulsivity/Hyperactivity	159	60	99	46	14	77%	23%	159	74	47%	59	37%	
	Oppositional	157	67	90	39	28	58%	42%	157	78	50%	49	31%	
	Psychosis	159	6	153	3	3	50%	50%	159	8	5%	4	3%	
	Somatization	159	5	154	5	5	0%	100%	159	6	4%	1	1%	
	Substance Use	72	31	41	23	8	74%	26%	74	41	55%	31	42%	
	Life Domain Functioning	Developmental/Intellectual	159	4	155	1	3	25%	75%	159	7	4%	4	3%
		Family Functioning	159	86	73	56	30	65%	35%	159	104	65%	71	45%
		Legal	159	149	10	87	62	58%	42%	159	155	97%	93	58%
Living Situation		157	61	96	36	25	59%	41%	157	86	55%	57	36%	
Medical/Physical		148	5	143	1	4	20%	80%	148	7	5%	3	2%	
Recreational		159	91	68	61	30	67%	33%	159	111	70%	78	49%	
School Achievement		148	84	64	53	31	63%	37%	148	106	72%	71	48%	
School Attendance		148	62	86	39	23	63%	37%	148	91	61%	61	41%	
School Behavior		148	70	78	34	36	49%	51%	148	80	54%	41	28%	
Sexual Development		159	2	157	1	1	50%	50%	159	2	1%	1	1%	
Risk Behaviors		Danger to Others	159	68	91	33	35	49%	51%	159	78	49%	40	25%
		Delinquent Behavior	159	84	75	48	36	57%	43%	159	104	65%	63	40%
		Fire Setting	159		159					159	1	1%	1	1%
		Intentional Misbehavior	159	27	132	13	14	48%	52%	159	37	23%	19	12%
	Other Self-Harm (Recklessness)	159	19	140	13	6	68%	32%	159	28	18%	16	10%	
	Runaway	157	31	126	21	10	68%	32%	157	52	33%	38	24%	
	Sexual Aggression	159	3	156		3	0%	100%	159	4	3%	1	1%	
	Sexually Reactive Behavior (High Risk Sexual Activity)	102	2	100	1	1	50%	50%	102	3	3%	2	2%	
	Suicide Risk	159	8	151	2	6	25%	75%	159	11	7%	4	3%	
	Strengths Domain	Family Strengths	159	54	105	33	21	61%	39%	159	70	44%	48	30%
Interpersonal		159	51	108	24	27	47%	53%	159	64	40%	35	22%	
Relationship Permanence		159	59	100	32	27	54%	46%	159	75	47%	48	30%	
Talents and Interests		159	64	95	43	21	67%	33%	159	73	46%	52	33%	
Traumatic Stress Symptoms	Dissociation	156	5	151		5	0%	100%	156	7	4%	2	1%	
	Emotional and/or Physical Dysregulation	156	58	98	29	29	50%	50%	156	68	44%	39	25%	
	Intrusions/Re-experiencing	146	19	127	5	14	26%	74%	146	21	14%	7	5%	

Note. Seneca SF Wraparound program leadership and SF JPD have agreed that every youth referred by JPD to Wraparound should be marked “actionable” (scored a 2 or 3) on their initial CANS “Legal” item. Staff training on CANS item scoring is ongoing. All clinical staff are certified on their CANS scoring annually by an external certification entity.