

High-Centered on the Speed Bump of Life

-or-

I got my vision in a sling 'cause my paradigm just won't shift

by John Franz and Pat Miles

As that short Texan with the long ears used to say, all right, here's the deal. You've been working at system change for about 4 or 5 years. You've attended more damn interagency collaborative meetings than Carter has little liver pills. You're just about as strength-based, family-centered and outcome-focused as a body can be and still get up and go to work in the morning. But something still doesn't feel right.

You've seen some amazing things happen when families finally got their needs met. Yet other families aren't doing so well. Out of home placements are rising. Staff burnout is endemic, again. Good programs that know better are instituting waiting lists because of budget cuts. The gap between what people say and what they do is growing. Collaboration at the interagency level has reverted to open warfare.

Everything feels stuck. The idea of quitting your job, becoming a computer geek and designing web pages for a living is sounding increasingly attractive.

Friends, you are experiencing what the folks back home in Northern Iowa call being "high centered on a speed bump." It's as if your car had enough oomph to get the front wheels over that protuberance in the road, but now the frame is hung up. The harder you push on the gas, the quicker you go nowhere. While the engine roars, you teeter back and forth, leaning a little bit towards the future then rocking back into the past.

When you're singing the wraparound speed bump blues, the only answer is to relax a moment and take a step back. Surviving system change requires balance and perspective. If you can see where things are stuck, it may be easier to decide how to get them rolling again. To help get your project over the hump, this article will introduce an analytical method designed to reveal some of the hidden factors that cause resistance to innovation in organizations.

We're suffering from impaired diffusion

For over 30 years, Everett M. Rodgers has studied the ways in which new ideas have been adopted by individuals and social groups. His most recent book, *Diffusion of Innovations*, presents a detailed analysis of the factors that promote and inhibit the spread of new technologies of all sorts, from the use of hybrid seed corn in Iowa to the adoption of family planning strategies in India.ⁱ From his book, we learn that the road from the introduction of an innovation to its widespread use is steep and treacherous, with plenty of opportunities for our best designed efforts to run off track.

He has found that organizations and social groups go through five stages in testing and adopting a new idea or approach. These stages occur in two phases divided by a decision about whether or not to use the idea on a widespread basis.

The first phase is *initiation*, in which the group decides whether or not to try out a new idea. The second phase is *implementation*, in which the idea, once tested, becomes incorporated in the standard activities of the group. The initiation phase has two stages: *agenda setting* and *idea matching*. During the agenda setting stage problems experienced by the group become severe enough to support a sense that it's time to try something different. Often people experience these system problems as a performance gap, when expectations routinely exceed results.ⁱⁱ This leads them to scan the environment for new options.

This examination of potential solutions happens all the time in larger organizations, but usually only a few group members will try out a given innovation. The idea matching phase begins when the group stops churning ideas and decides to investigate one or two in more detail.

For example, a local human service agency may be experiencing a performance gap because the number of children being placed outside their homes for extended periods of time is increasing. During the agenda setting stage, agency staff will attend conferences and workshops to discover ideas for changes in practice and system design. The organization may also retain consultants to demonstrate various options. It may test several different innovations in small pilot projects. The transition to idea matching takes place when the agency selects one of the pilot projects and decides to scale it up into broader application. In a moderate sized community, an innovation at the agenda setting stage might be serving from 10 to 30 clients. At the idea matching stage, the number served might increase to 100 or more. But in both stages of the initiation phase, the agency would keep the new technology separate from its standard practice.

| Table 1 | |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Steps in the Diffusion of an Innovation | |
| Phase | Stages |
| Initiation | 1. Agenda setting |
| | 2. Idea matching |
| (The decision to incorporate the innovation) | |
| Implementation | 3. Redefinition/restructuring |
| | 4. Clarifying |
| | 5. Routinizing |

Selecting an innovation is just the beginning

The second phase, implementation, begins when an organization decides to incorporate a specific innovation throughout its operations. The implementation phase is complete when what was once a new idea has become an integral part of the way the organization does business. Rodgers describes three stages in this phase: *redefinition/restructuring*, *clarifying* and *routinizing*.

Redefinition/restructuring combines two reciprocal actions. The innovation is re-invented to align more closely with the organization’s needs and existing structure while, at the same time, the organization modifies that structure to better fit with the innovation. This mutual adaptation often occurs in a growth spurt during a brief window of opportunity, but must happen if the innovation is to be fully incorporated. (As introduced, a new approach rarely fits perfectly in the context where it will be used.) However, these growth spurts can be tumultuous. As Rodgers explains, during this stage, “A fair degree of creative activity is required to avoid, or to overcome, the misalignments that occur between the innovation and the organization.”

Assuming the group or organization comes up with a way of completing the redefinition/restructuring stage, the next step is clarifying. “Clarifying occurs as the innovation is put into more widespread use, so that the meaning of the new idea gradually becomes clearer to the organization’s members.” The risk at this stage is to try to incorporate the innovation before a critical mass of the group really understands it. This can also lead to misalignments, but at the personnel rather than the structural level.

When both staff understanding and organizational structure are aligned with the new technology, stable arrangements for its use emerge and the final stage, routinizing, begins. Even at this stage implementation can fail.

Entrenched resistance to the innovation may gather sufficient power to cancel the process, or the innovation may be changed so much that it is essentially lost.

Misalignments during the 5 stages of initiation and implementation are the speed bumps that can sidetrack system transformation. To overcome them, we need to figure out the nature and location of the conflict and choose strategies for improving the fit. At least three elements are required to make this determination:

1. The innovation must be defined in operational and measurable terms;
2. The points of introduction of the innovation must be mapped and the degree of adoption of the innovation at these points must be assessed; and,
3. The factors impeding and encouraging adoption must be clarified.

Who was that masked innovation anyway?

Some innovations are easily defined and tracked. For example, music recording has gone through several innovations in the last 30 years: vinyl records, eight track tapes, cassette tapes, compact discs and now digital audio tapes. Because each innovation uses different devices and media, tracking their diffusion is straightforward and objective.

Other innovations are harder to pin down. American football, as played in the National Football League, has seen the rapid spread of an ambiguous innovation called the “West Coast Offense.” The professional football team in San Francisco was highly successful for several years using a pattern of formations and plays that emphasized short passes, often to a tight end or a running back. Assistant coaches who learned this pattern moved on to coach other teams, such as the team in Green Bay. These teams are now also described as using a West Coast Offense. However, as several sports analysts have commented, most fans would be hard pressed to point out the difference between it and any other offensive strategy in the context of actual games.

Wraparound as an innovation is closer to the West Coast Offense than the compact disc. When fully realized, wraparound consists of a complex and inter-related cluster of human service technologies that are implemented at the direct service, program, system and community levels.ⁱⁱⁱ

These technologies include:

- The use of child and family teams
- Single plans uniting services from multiple service systems
- A structured, strength-based service planning and delivery process
- Creative development of unique services and supports for each family
- Formal incorporation of family access, voice and choice at both the direct service and policy development levels
- Cross-disciplinary and cross-organizational integration of structures and practices
- Proactive incorporation of natural family and community supports
- Implementation of no-reject, no-eject unconditional care by lead agencies in the system of care
- Top down and bottom up incorporation of an explicit value base to guide system change.

Within each of these elements, in turn, there are sets of skills and practices that must also be defined. For example, to implement the child and family teams component of the wraparound approach, an agency or system of care has to decide upon:

- The procedures to be used to determine when teams will be used
- The makeup of the teams

- The assignment of responsibility for convening and supporting the teams
- The planning process to be followed by the teams
- The resources available to the teams, and the authority of the teams to access and use resources, and
- The length of time during which teams will be formally supported by the system of care as well as the process for concluding formal support if involvement was not indefinite.

Each of the other components would require a similar set of definitions and decisions.

In our work with communities who are creating strength-based, family-centered systems of care, we have found that the elements of wraparound each chooses are often similar, but are never identical. No community has implemented all 8 of the technology clusters listed above, and no single technology has been put in practice in the same way. Each community borrows some of these components, mixes them with others and applies them in varying degrees. The process of self-definition is less one of measuring what you are doing against a fixed external standard, as it is deciding which variation on a basic pattern fits best with a community's culture, preferences, needs and strengths.

Nonetheless, once a community selects an approach, the implementation plan should be rigorously monitored to avoid a loss of focus. Unlike the West Coast Offense, a careful and informed observer should be able to determine whether and to what degree the new technology is being used. As we clarify our description of what we hope to accomplish, we improve our ability to identify the barriers impeding system change.

Beginning our search for the speed bumps

Let's say that Kenyon County is experiencing speed bump-itis. (Kenyon is a hypothetical mid-sized county on the West Branch of the Wisconsin River that we visit from time to time in these articles.) To help them address their concerns, we might take a look at the key elements Kenyon has selected as the core of its system transformation. Our goal is to determine the degree to which the chosen innovations have diffused into the various service systems participating in the wraparound effort. By looking at differences in the patterns of incorporation of the new practices, we can determine where the misalignments, or speed bumps, are located.

In Kenyon, the key innovation is the use of child and family teams. An interagency organization formed cooperatively by the juvenile justice, mental health, and child welfare systems and some of the school districts in the county hires and supports the individuals who facilitate the teams. The county mental health agency hosts the intersystem group, but any of the four systems can request that a team be formed to support one of their clients. Plans of care developed by the teams access a shared pool of flexible funds contributed by all of the systems, plus traditional resources found within the separate systems. The intersystem group hopes to make the single child and family team plan applicable to all of the systems, but at this point the teams create multiple linked plans for each system in which the child and family are involved.

They have defined a child and family team as being made up of about 4 to 8 people who know and care about a child and family and who are willing to commit themselves to work over time to help the child and family have a better life. No more than half of the team should be people who are paid to provide services to the family. The teams develop plans of care across all of the life domains in which the child and family have critical unmet needs, but the plans must be approved by the interagency organization (for access to the combined resource pool) and the participating systems (for access to traditional system resources) before they are funded.

Kenyon has asked for help because the use of teams seems to be falling off. Certain key staff who began the system transformation process have moved along for various reasons, and those taking over seem confused by the concept and less comfortable with the use of teams. A preliminary survey provides the following overview of attitudes about the use of teams in the 4 participating agencies.

Table 2
Use of Child and Family Teams (C&FTs) in Kenyon County

| code agency operational level | Juvenile Justice | Mental Health | Child Welfare | Special Education |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| Direct Service (Units specifically accessing the C&FTs) | Of 4 units serving 4,000 youth per year, 1 unit is using C&FTs for 50 of its clients and their families. | Of 3 sections serving 2,000 children and families, 2 sections are serving 300 clients and their families through the C&FT process. | Of 4 divisions serving 3,000 children and families, 2 divisions are serving 100 families per year using teams | Of 9 school districts in the county, two pilot projects in two districts serving 20 children and families have accessed C&FTs |
| System Managers (Acceptance at the management and administrative levels and in policies) | Chief Probation Officer (CPO) supports use of C&FTs as does 1 of the unit managers; it is not mentioned in internal policies. | Department director has mixed opinions. 1 section chief strongly supports, 2 others have moderate support. The use of teams is specifically adopted in the annual mission statement for the agency. | Division director expresses reservations, one unit manager supports; this year's strategic plan emphasizes an increase in the use of teams. | 2 district superintendents endorse concept; 2 more are interested; 3 special education directors support use of C&FTs, no formal policies, but some districts are considering establishing their own teams, rather than using the collaborative |
| Multi system and community (Participation in collaborative activities related to the innovation) | Representative attends multi-agency leadership group sporadically; agency contributes the equivalent of 1 FTE position to the interagency organization, and \$25,000 to the flex fund pool. | MH dept. hosts the multi-agency group using 80% grant funds and 20% agency funds. Its representative often attempts to persuade group to train in more depth on team facilitation. | Representative actively participates in multi-agency group, but expresses reservations about use of C&FTs; agency contributes two FTEs to the interagency org., and \$50,000 to the flex fund. | Two districts are part of multi-agency team. One participates regularly and strongly endorses C&FTs, the other attends 50% of the meetings and is quiet. Each district contributes \$5,000 and no staff to the interagency org. |

These results indicate that education is in the early agenda setting stage, probation is somewhere between agenda setting and the idea matching stage, child welfare is getting moving into the restructuring stage but is experiencing some turmoil in the transition, and that mental health is in the midst or towards the end of restructuring. Because this is a multi-system effort, there are both internal speed bumps, and interagency difficulties. Depending on the hopes and dreams of those attempting to incorporate the use of child and family teams on a wider scale, these results may be heartening or threatening, but at least they give a preliminary sense of where things stand.

In part two of this article, we will begin a deeper analysis of the diffusion of this innovation in Kenyon County and show how additional tools developed by Dr. Rodgers can not only pinpoint the location and nature of the speed bumps, but also help us develop strategies for getting the process moving again.

Roundin' up the strays with diffusion grids

We suggest that to the degree possible, leaders and change agents find methods to graphically present the nature and degree of adoption of the innovations they are hoping to incorporate in their system change efforts. To do this at least two things are needed:

- A framework for gathering and interpreting information about the use of the innovation
- A simple method for presenting the results of the analysis of this information

Besides identifying the stages an innovation passes through on the way to becoming incorporated in a community or organization, Everett Rodgers has also created a series of tools for assessing and interpreting this process of adoption.^{iv} In this part of the article we will describe some of these tools and show how they can help us focus on the specific points where the innovation process has been sidetracked. In addition, we have developed a method for presenting the results of these analyses, which we call diffusion grids. These grids can display the degree of adoption an innovation has achieved at various levels of inquiry.

In part one of this article, a preliminary analysis of the Kenyon County system of care indicated that child and family teams were used more in some of the primary service systems than in the others. We learned that the special education system is at the agenda setting stage, because child and family teams are just one of the many options that they are exploring. Probation is at the idea matching stage. They have a pilot project supporting 50 youth and their families using this innovation. Child welfare has decided to adopt the innovation and is in an early stage of the redefining/restructuring stage because they are just beginning to develop new protocols for the use of teams and are shifting personnel around to make their structures more compatible with the process. Finally, the mental health system was found to be further along in redefinition/restructuring. They have adopted child and family teams as a regular part of their service response, but staff vary in their acceptance of the approach and their ability and willingness to use it. Some staff might actually be in the clarifying stage, but the organization as a whole has not completed the prior step. In table 3, this information is represented as a simple diffusion grid in which the number of X's indicates the progress through each phase, with four X's indicating completion of the phase.

Table 3
Diffusion Grid for the Child and Family Team Innovation in Kenyon County

| | Agenda Setting | Idea Matching | Redefinition/ Restructuring | Clarifying | Routinizing |
|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Special Ed. | XX | | | | |
| Probation | XXXX | XX | | | |
| Child Welfare | XXXX | XXXX | X | | |
| Mental Health | XXXX | XXXX | XXX | | |

This information, while helpful, fails to pin down the specific sources of concern and what can be done about it. To learn more we would survey each of the organizations participating in Kenyon’s multi-system collaborative to see how much and in what form child and family teams are being used, and the range of attitudes toward the use of teams held by staff at the direct service, supervisory and administrative level. We might also interview consumers, members of the boards of directors or advisory boards of the organizations and key community stakeholders, such as advocates, business people and religious leaders.

Within each organization, we could then examine the degree of adoption in more detail. For example, in Kenyon County’s child welfare system, we might learn that at the direct service level 10% of the staff had fully adopted the innovation, 20% were showing limited use of it, 40% were either neutral or hadn’t heard about it, 20% were exerting passive resistance to the use of teams and 10% were actively resisting their use. Table 4 provides these results as well as those for the organization’s supervisory staff, administrators, community advisory board and consumers.

Table 4
Attitudes toward the use of Child and Family Teams in Kenyon County’s Child Welfare System

| | Active Resistance | Passive Resistance | Neutral or Unaware | Limited Adoption | Full Adoption |
|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Direct Service | 10% | 20% | 40% | 20% | 10% |
| Super-visory | 30% | 20% | 20% | 20% | 10% |
| Adminis-tration | 5% | 10% | 10% | 45% | 30% |
| Board | 5% | 20% | 10% | 35% | 30% |
| Consumers | 0% | 10% | 50% | 20% | 20% |

This grid points out a speed bump in the attitude of the supervisory staff. Similar grids could be derived for each system and each of the key innovations within Kenyon’s wraparound cluster. In combination, these will produce a three-dimensional map of bumps throughout the system of care. But that map in itself is not enough to resolve the problem. More information is needed.

Some dogs hunt better than others

The purpose of identifying resistance is not to punish those who are uncomfortable with the innovation, but to understand the driving forces that make it difficult for them to accept or use the proposed changes. Rodgers has identified an extensive list of variables that affect the rate of adoption of an innovation. These include:

- The perceived attributes of the innovation,
- The type of decision required to determine if the innovation will be adopted,
- The channels through which the proposed innovation is communicated,
- The nature of the social system in which the innovation is being introduced and,
- The level of effort by those who are promoting the adoption of the innovation.

For the purpose of this essay, we'll focus on the first group of variables. Rodgers suggests that we look closely at how those who are expected to adopt an innovation see it in the context of their overall responsibilities. For example, how does a social worker providing direct services feel about using a child and family team in her or his work? We can find out a lot about that opinion by asking five questions:

1. Does the worker believe that using a child and family team will make it easier or harder to get his or her work done? (Rodgers calls this attribute *relative advantage*.)
2. To what degree does the worker believe that using the team is consistent with his or her values and beliefs, past experiences and training, and current practice and procedures? (*Compatibility*)
3. How hard does the worker think it will be to understand and use a child and family team? (*Complexity*.)
4. How easy is it for the worker to try out the use of teams on a limited basis? (*Trialability*.)
5. How much is the worker able to view the results of the use of teams by other people in similar positions to him or herself? (*Observability*)

Resistance to the adoption of innovations often occurs because one or more of these attributes are perceived negatively. Leaders and change agents responsible for the effective introduction of an innovation must first address these factors through training, support, incentives and the design of the system in which the innovation will be used. Once implementation begins, the response to speed bumps can be more focused. For example, if the child welfare supervisors report that they feel the innovation lacks relative advantage, to get moving again it will be necessary to demonstrate effectiveness in terms that make sense from their perspective. However, if the conflict stems from a lack of compatibility with their basic values, other strategies may be more appropriate.

Know your audience

As the response of an organization or community to a proposed innovation moves from agenda setting to idea matching to redefining/restructuring to clarifying to routinizing, different members of the organization or community are more active. Rodgers has found that when new ideas are initially presented, the first to try them out are a venturesome group he calls the *innovators*. Innovators are characterized by a near obsession with novelty that continually leads them to test new opportunities. Innovators play a gatekeeping role in groups. The rest of the members let the innovators try things out to see what happens. In his research Rodgers has found that innovators usually make up 2 or 3% of a group. They are most active in the agenda setting and in early parts of the idea matching stages.

If no one but innovators tries a new idea it quickly fades. For example, aqua-cars that ran on both land and water had their moment in the fifties, but never really caught on. For an innovation to make inroads, a second group, called *early adopters*, must decide to give it a try. Rodgers has found that the early adopters are opinion leaders in an organization. They may not be the boss of a company or mayor of a town, but they are the "individuals to check with" before trying out something new. Early adopters are usually less than 15% of the

population. However, if the early adopters pick up on an innovation it will move rapidly from the initiation to the implementation phase. Thus they are the major players in the idea matching and the early part of the redefinition/restructuring stages.

Once the early adopters get on board another group will usually follow. Rodgers calls them the *early majority*. Usually constituting 30% or more of the group, they are more deliberate about adopting new practices and are less likely to proactively assist in the innovation process. If it doesn't work right, they will hold back until someone else pursues the redefinition/restructuring process. Rodgers states that their motto is "Be not the first by which the new is tried, nor the last to lay the old aside." The early majority begin their work during the later part of redefinition/restructuring and dominate the clarifying stage.

The next group Rodgers identifies are the *late majority*, again consisting of from 30 to 40% of the population. The late majority usually pick up innovations after they have been clarified. Through their efforts the innovation becomes standard practice for the organization. In the case of a service innovation like the use of child and family teams, the bulk of an agency's clients do not begin receiving the new service until the late majority adopts it. They are the primary actors in the routinizing stage.

In most groups, there are some who choose not to adopt certain innovations or who are unable to do so. Rodgers calls this group the *laggards*. They fill out the remaining 10 to 15% of the bell curve. Rodgers takes pains to state that the term laggards is not meant to be pejorative. The innovation may be wrong for them, or they may not be able to purchase the necessary tools. For example, the use of voice mail and answering machines has moved well into the late majority in North America. Those who don't use them are either of very limited means or else have made a value choice that they don't like talking and listening to machines. The laggards might begin using the innovation at the end of the routinizing stage, or may never adopt it at all.

Each group is important to the ongoing survival of an organization. The innovators are continually opening up the organization to new possibilities they hear about from outside change agents. The early adopters are bringing the best of the new ideas in to be tested and adapted to the organization's needs. The early majority are moving the innovation into standard practice. The late majority are delivering the mature form of the practice and the laggards are holding onto the old ways so that what was learned before is not forgotten. (Of course by this time the innovators are picking up on some new idea.)

These are ideal types. This means that these categories are abstractions Rodgers has drawn based on observations of many populations. The concepts are designed to make comparisons possible, but real people rarely fall into strictly defined groups. People vary in the way they respond to innovations. In some areas we are innovators or opinion leaders, in others laggards and in many we are part of the early or late majority.

However, knowing the differences between the groups, and knowing which stage of adoption the innovation is at helps to target a response. For example, since the speed bump in child welfare is occurring during the transition from idea matching to restructuring/redefinition, it will be critical to identify and engage the opinion leaders among the supervisors when working out the factors that caused the process to stall. On the other hand, if there is also a bump in the mental health system, the focus would shift to the members of that agency's early majority. For early adopters, the question may be a sense that the new innovation isn't the best answer to closing the perceived gap in performance. For the early majority, the issue is likely to be more one of comfort with the new process and procedures.

Table 5 - Actors During the Stages of Innovation Adoption

| Stage of Innovation | Principal Actors | % of Population |
|----------------------------|--|------------------------|
| Agenda Setting | Demonstrations by external change agents | |
| Idea Matching | Innovators | 2.5% |
| Restructuring/Redefinition | Early Adopters | 13.5% |
| Clarifying | Early Majority | 34% |
| Routinizing | Late Majority | 34% |
| Full Incorporation | Laggards | 16% |

In conclusion, become one with your bumps

This article barely scratches the surface of the observations and analyses in Rodgers’ book. He discusses the decision about whether or not to adopt an innovation in detail. He develops a sophisticated analysis of the communication networks through which new ideas are transmitted in social groups. He also discusses the role of the external change agent who brings innovations to a population and encourages their adoption.

Most importantly, he takes the time to point out that widespread adoption of an innovation may or may not have beneficial outcomes. Often, however, we concentrate so fully on the issue of implementation that we fail to keep track of the consequences. In wraparound our goal is to create a flexible, responsive network to help support people who have complex and enduring needs. If what we are doing is contributing towards that goal, we should do more of it. But if an element of the innovation is causing problems, it may have to be presented differently or even redesigned. The better we know the speed bumps, the easier it will be to decide if the difficulties stem from flaws in implementation or the unexpected repercussions of our best intentions.

Meanwhile, to help you survive the situation, here’s a little tune we hum when the frustration starts to get us down:

The Wraparound Speed Bump Blues

Well you can take your c’laboration, you can keep that strength-based plan
 I’m done with multi-taskin’, ‘cuz it’s more than I can stand
 I need a simple problem, one I can handle by myself
 You know those wrap’round blues, they ‘bout to put me on the shelf

I got the wraparound blues, you know I've gone so far adrift
That my vision's turned to cloudy and my paradigm just won't shift

Infrastructure, practice change, consensus-driven teams
I got to tell you brother, I'm splittin' at the seams
These consultants keep on preachin' that life is awful sweet
I'm wond'rin' where they're livin', 'cuz it sure ain't on the street

I got those wrap'round blues, you know I feel 'em all day long
I'd like to go back to categorical, but I know that would be wrong

It's hard to get those outcomes, it's tough to meet those needs
Negativity keeps on growing, multiplyin' just like weeds
So help me won't you people, as you roll down life's long road
You know I'm high centered on a speed bump, and I'm sure to loose my load

If you've had those wraparound blues, you know just how I feel
One moment you're sweet and flexible, the next time you're a heel.

Well, I've managed care and blended funds, I've even pooled my risk
I've been to all the conf'rences, I've 'viewed those research tools
But now my life is misery, I'm really so upset
You better love me unconditional, baby, 'cuz my paradigm ain't shifted yet.

You know those wraparound blues, you can feel 'em in your heart
You gonna keep on hurtin' darlin', less you're family-centered from the start.

©1998 by John Franz and Patricia Miles. Permission is granted to reproduce this article for educational purposes so long as it is distributed without cost to the recipients and this notice is included. John and Pat can be reached at their website www.paperboat.com.

ⁱ Rodgers, Everett M. (1995). *Diffusion of Innovation*. New York: The Free Press.

ⁱⁱ Ideally, a need is carefully defined and then potential innovations are proposed and reviewed to see which offer the most potential. In reality, a vague impression of unease often spurs groups to buy a solution first and then look around for problems to solve.

ⁱⁱⁱ For a detailed discussion of one author's perspective of the core elements of the wraparound approach see *Strategic Compassion: Developing Strength-Based Community Care Alliances*, by John Franz, to be published by the Wisconsin Council on Children and Families later this spring. For information, contact the Council at 608-284-0580.

^{iv} Rodgers, Everett M. (1995). *Diffusion of Innovation*. New York: The Free Press.