**Appendix**

Analysis of Systematic Review Articles

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Author | Country | Article type | Participant recruitment | Participant numbers | Target group | Purpose of the study |
| Anderson, J. A. (2011). | USA | Implementation  (target population) | Participants in the Dawn Project | 365 | Students with emotional and behavioural disorders, average age 12.55 years | To study the relationship between school and clinical functioning over time for students enrolled in a wraparound style program. |
| Anderson, J. A. (2016). | USA | Survey of practice  (editorial) |  |  |  | Discussion of research relating to community-based interagency collaboration. |
| Anderson, J. A., Chen, M.-E., Min, M., & Watkins, L. L. (2017). | USA | Implementation study  (target population) | Seven elementary full-service community schools | 18 (2009)  16 (2013) | Stakeholders that included families, and various agencies and systems | To compare changes in stakeholder perceptions from a baseline (2009) and 4-year follow-up study of the implementation of a full-service school. |
| Anderson, J. A., Cousik, R., & Dare, M. J. (2016). | USA | Survey of practice  (position paper) |  |  |  | Argues for schools taking more responsibility for children in foster care and state custody. Recommends models that include wraparound. |
| Anderson, J. A., Houser, J. H. W., & Howland, A. (2010). | USA | Survey of practice  (multiple case study) | Four elementary schools involved in the Full Purpose Partnership program | 35 | Stakeholders from within each school | To present findings from a process evaluation of the first four schools adopting the Full Purpose Partnership approach in order to increase understanding of the dynamics of the program both within and among the four schools. |
| Anderson-Butcher, D., Paluta, L., Sterling, K., & Anderson, C. (2018). | USA | Implementation  (multiple case studies) | Four elementary schools | 325 | Students from low socio-economic backgrounds | To explore outcomes associated with the adoption and implementation of a community schools approach that included wraparound. |
| Anello, V., Weist, M., Eber, L., Barrett, S., Cashman, J., Rosser, M., & Bazyk, S. (2017). | USA | Survey of practice  (survey development) | National conference attendance followed up by email | 346 | National sample of professionals working with positive behavioural interventions and support (PBIS) and school-based mental health (SMH) programs and/or community members who support these services | To detail a first step in the process of improved interconnection of PBIS and SMH by describing the development of a process and tool for schools/districts to assess readiness for connecting PBIS and SMH through an integrated system. |
| Bartlett, N. A. (2018). | Canada | Implementation study  (multiple case study) | Three established community schools – two urban and one rural – were purposefully sampled | 15 | Key stakeholders in the schools; among them principals, teachers, a counsellor, community school connectors, parents, and partnering services | To examine the extent to which collaborative practice was occurring in community schools from the perspective of key stakeholders; to inform enhanced practice and/or to highlight the need for organisational and system-level reform to practices and policies. |
| Bartlett, N. A., & Freeze, T. B. (2018). | Canada | Implementation study  (multiple case study) | Three established community schools – two urban and one rural – were purposefully sampled | 15 | Key stakeholders in the schools; among them principals, teachers, a counsellor, community school connectors, parents, and partnering services | To explore the experiences and perspectives of stakeholders in community schools as they relate to practices that reflect the 10 guiding principles of the wraparound approach. |
| Biag, M., & Castrechini, S. (2016). | USA | Implementation study  (controlled; targeted population) | Six K-8 full-service community schools | 5,003 | Students from low socio-economic backgrounds | To investigate how short- or long-term engagement in single and multiple strategy areas (family engagement, extended learning, and social support services) influenced students’ attendance and academic achievement. |
| Bruns, E. J., Duong, M. T., Lyon, A. R., Pullmann, M. D., Cook, C. R., Cheney, D., & McCauley, E. (2016). | USA | Survey of practice  (targeted population) | Seattle Public schools in partnership with the School Mental Health Assessment, Research and Training (SMART) Center | Descriptive only | Students with both academic and behavioural problems | To review the empirical support for school-based delivery of mental health interventions by multiple tiers and describe a community–academic partnership. |
| Caldas, S. J., Gómez, D. W., & Ferrara, J. (2019). | USA | Implementation study  (controlled; targeted population) | Two schools in New York State, one a full-service community school (FSCS) | 128 FSCS students closely matched with 187 non-FSCS students | Students who attended FSCSs | To report the effects of attending an elementary FSCS on a variety of student academic outcomes in high school. |
| Charlton, C. T., Sabey, C. V., Dawson, M. R., Pyle, D., Lund, E. M., & Ross, S. W. (2018). | USA | Survey of practice  (targeted incidents) | State education agency leaders | 27 | Students with academic and behaviour problems | To identify the specific events, resources, and supports that helped or hindered the work of scaling up an integrated multitiered system of supports (MTSS) approach as viewed from the perspective of MTSS leaders in state education agencies. |
| Coldiron, J. S., Bruns, E. J., & Quick, H. (2017). | USA | Literature review |  |  |  | Three main research questions: What characterises the wraparound research over the past 25 years, including the aims, foci, and predominant methods and measures? What evidence is emerging? What notable gaps exist and should be addressed in future research? |
| Eber, L., Hyde, K., & Suter, J. C. (2011). | USA | Implementation study  (targeted population) | Schools in Illinois collaborating with Illinois PBIS Network to provide wraparound as Tier 3 PBIS | 395 | Students with emotional and behavioural disabilities | To explore how wraparound can be implemented successfully in schools to meet the needs of students with emotional and behavioural challenges. |
| Effland, V. S., Walton, B. A., & McIntyre, J. S. (2011). | USA | Implementation study  (targeted population) | 65 community-based service sites in Indiana | 515 | Youth (*M* age = 13.67, *SD* = 3.1) with severe emotional and behavioural needs | To examine the relationships among the implementation of necessary support conditions for wraparound, wraparound fidelity and youth outcomes. |
| Fallon, L. M., & Mueller, M. R. (2017). | USA | Implementation study  (targeted population: case study) | Mainstream school in Massachusetts | 1 | Student with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), depression and a specific learning disability | To provide a description of culturally responsive wraparound supports and present data from a preliminary case study. |
| Farrell, P., & Humphrey, N. (2009). | UK | Survey of practice (discussion paper) |  |  |  | To discuss challenges of educating pupils with social emotional and behavioural difficulties in five areas: working with families, educational attainments, inclusion, transition from school to college/work, and early intervention and prevention. |
| Farmer, T.W., Sutherland, K. S., Talbott, E., Brooks, D. S., Norwalk, K., & Huneke, M. (2016). | USA | Survey of practice  (position paper) |  |  |  | To argue the application of ecological theory and a dynamic systems perspective to students with emotional and behavioural disorders. |
| Fries, D., Carney, K. J., Blackman-Urteaga, L., & Savas, S. A. (2012). | USA | Implementation study  (targeted population) | Mainstream schools in Michigan | 42 | Young people aged 13–21 already pregnant or parenting who met other criteria that indicated a high risk of school dropout | To review and disseminate findings involving the use of wraparound service to support teen parents who were at high risk of school dropout. |
| Goldenson, J. (2011). |  | Literature review |  |  |  | To review current strategies used to address mental health in the broader school-based context and to highlight specific risk factors endemic in youth placed in alternative education programs. |
| Golding, K. S. (2010). | UK | Survey of practice (targeted population) |  | Descriptive case examples only | Children and youth in foster care or who have been adopted and have complex mental health issues | This paper explores the strengths, challenges and barriers of multi-agency and specialists working to meet the needs of fostered or adopted individuals. |
| Hess, R. S., Pearrow, M., Hazel, C. E., Sander, J. B., & Wille, A. M. (2017). | USA | Survey of practice  (targeted population) | School psychologists working in a comprehensive behavioural health model (Boston) and coordinated care in juvenile justice (Texas) | Descriptive case examples only | Students with complex mental health needs | To argue that school psychologists should advocate for, and lead in the delivery of, formalised collaborative efforts with community agencies to address students’ mental and behavioural health. |
| Kazak, A. E., Hoagwood, K., Weisz, J. R., Hood, K., Kratochwill, T. R., Vargas, L. A., & Banez, G. A. (2010). | USA | Survey of practice  (position paper) |  |  | Children and adolescents with emotional or behavioural needs | To describe a meta-system approach to improving mental health outcomes for children and adolescents with a focus on the evidence-based assessment and interventions, including prevention. |
| Kern, L., Mathur, S. R., Albrecht, S. F., Poland, S., Rozalski, M., & Skiba, R. J. (2017). | USA | Survey of practice  (position paper) |  |  |  | In this paper, the authors present arguments for the development of future policy relative to the need for school-based mental health services and make recommendations for implementation of these services. |
| Kutash, K., Duchnowski, A. J., & Green, A. L. (2011). | USA | Implementation study  (multiple case studies) | Convenience sample of four different schools that represent the most frequent structural types used by school districts to provide mental health services to students | 148 students from 4 schools | Students with emotional disorders | To provide a rich description of procedures schools use to provide school-based mental health services to youths educated in special education programs and to compare changes over time in their emotional and academic functioning. |
| Leonard, J. (2011). | USA | Implementation study  (Historical case study) | High school in Boston | 850–2,000 students at times over past 60 years | Students from a “troubled urban high school” (p. 988) | To examine 60 years of various community partnering strategies at one urban high school, using Bronfenbrenner’s ecological systems theory to better understand the effect on student development as measured by variables such as graduation, attendance, and dropout rates. |
| Malloy, J. M., Sundar, V., Hagner, D., Pierias, L., & Viet, T. (2010). | USA | Implementation study  (targeted population; controlled) | Two high schools in New Hampshire that offered the RENEW (rehabilitation, empowerment, natural supports, education and work) wraparound-style program | 20 participants;  26 controls | Students at risk of dropping out of high school | To assess the efficacy of a secondary transition model (RENEW) on the social and emotional functioning of youths at risk of dropping out of high school. |
| Maximoff, N., Taylor, S. S., & Abernathy, T. V. (2017). | USA | Survey of practice  (targeted population) | Professionals (including case managers, probation officers, counsellors, psychologists, social workers, teachers, administrators) in a large suburban community in the western United States | 12 | Youth with emotional and behavioural disorders (EBD) transitioning from most- to less-restrictive environments (e.g., hospital, residential facilities to home/school) | To compare the transition practices from most-to-least restrictive environments for adolescents with EBD as currently utilised by service providers with practices recommended in the literature. |
| McKay-Brown, L., McGrath, R., Dalton, L., Graham, L., Smith, A., Ring, J., & Eyre, K. (2019). | Australia | Implementation study  (targeted population) | Students from Travancore School (special education setting with a focus on mental health) in Victoria, Australia, who took part in the In2School pilot program for school refusal treatment | 7 | Youth, 11–15 years old, diagnosed with severe and complex mental health problems, and presenting with school refusal | To report on an action research study in which an intervention to counter school refusal (the In2School program) was piloted. |
| McLean, S. (2012). | Australia | Survey of practice  (targeted population) | Participants were teachers, foster parents, child welfare workers, child mental health professionals and residential care workers, all of whom were experienced in supporting children in out-of-home care | 92 | Children with extremely challenging behaviour who were being supported through collaborative practice | To understand key stakeholder experiences and inherent tensions of collaborative practice using the specific example of supporting children with extremely challenging behaviour. |
| Muñoz, M. A., Owens, D., & Bartlett, C. (2015). | USA | Survey of practice  (multiple case study) | Three urban middle schools acting as hubs for Family Resource and Youth Services Centers (FRYSC) in Kentucky | 19 | Participants in FRYSC provision including teachers and FRYSC coordinators, school counsellors and principals | To examine school-linked social services.Primary research question that guided this study was what are middle school teachers and administrators’ perceptions of the YSC’s design, role and function? |
| Nisbet, I., Graham, A., & Newell, S. (2012). | Australia | Implementation study  (targeted population) | Families and juvenile justice clients involved with the Family Inclusion Project | Four families; four juvenile justice clients | Families and juvenile justice clients involved with the Family Inclusion Project | To report on the Family Inclusion Project,which trialled a ‘wraparound’ casework approach to working with young offenders in order to reduce youth reoffending and improve interagency collaboration. |
| Painter, K. (2012). | USA | Implementation study  (targeted population) | Students from 5 to 18 years admitted to a wraparound program as a result of a systems of care grant in Texas. | 160 | Students children experiencing serious emotional disorders | To evaluate the outcomes for children experiencing serious emotional disorders who received wraparound services in school-based centres. |
| Peterson, A., & Durrant, I. (2013). | UK | Survey of practice  (targeted population) | School leaders from four individual schools and service coordinators of a cluster of 48 schools in a large local education authority in England | Not clear, likely 6 | School leaders | To explore school leaders’ perceptions of the impact of extended services on families and communities. |
| Puddy, R. W., Roberts, M. C., Vernberg, E. M., & Hambrick, E. P. (2012) | USA | Implementation study  (targeted population) | Students attending half a day at a therapeutic classroom and half a day at their neighbourhood school | 51 | Elementary students with serious emotional disturbances in a half-day special program | To examine the relationship between service coordination activities and adaptive functioning in a school-based model of service delivery. |
| Sanders, M. (2016). | USA | Survey of practice (multiple case study) | Variety of stakeholders in three purposefully selected full-service community schools in an urban district in eastern USA | 53 interviews | Students in full-service community schools | To explore how the components of principal leadership, community partnerships, and organisational development independently and collectively influence the effectiveness of full-service community schools in improving students’ academic and behavioural outcomes, family engagement, and family engagement. |
| Savina, E., Simon, J., & Lester, M. (2014). |  | Literature review |  |  |  | To describe an ecological perspective on school reintegration of children after hospitalisation for mental health reasons. |
| Senior, E., Carr, S., & Gold, L. (2016). | Australia | Implementation study  (single case study) | One lower socio-economic urban primary school | Family support worker, 6 client families, teachers, and the principal | School and teaching staff | To explore if having a family support worker based at a primary school for 3 days a week for 15 months saved the school staff time and money and enhanced the quality of service available to the school community. |
| Shailer, J. L., Gammon, R. A., & de Terte, I. (2013). | New Zealand | Survey of practice  (opinion paper) |  |  | Youth with serious mental health disorders and their families. | To discuss the limitations of community-based interventions used in New Zealand and introduce ‘wraparound’ as a potential model for youth with serious mental health disorders and their families. |
| Strnadová, I., Cumming, T. M., & O’Neill, S. C. (2017). | Australia | Survey of practice (targeted population) | Six NSW rural and urban juvenile justice facilities | 44 staff working with incarcerated youth | School and juvenile justice centre staff | To examine the transition process for youth incarcerated in juvenile justice centres, from the stance of both the education and juvenile justice systems. |
| Suter, J. C., & Bruns, E. J. (2009). | USA | Literature review |  |  |  | The meta-analysis was conducted to increase understanding of the empirical support base for the process of wraparound. |
| Test, D. W., Fowler, C. H., White, J., Richter, S., & Walker, A. (2009). | USA | Literature review |  |  |  | To reviews evidence-based transition practices that show promise for enhancing secondary school completion of students with high incidence disabilities in the USA. |
| Thielking, M., Skues, J., & Le, V.-A. (2018). | Australia | Survey of practice  (targeted population) | Sample of convenience; school psychologists and counsellors working across the government, Catholic and independent education sectors who were attending a school counselling conference in 2015 | 42 | Professionals who would be participants in collaborative teamwork in wraparound models | The purpose of the study was (1) to investigate the actual and preferred depth of collaboration within a sample of school psychologists, guidance officers and school counsellors; and (2) to seek qualitative feedback from participants about (a) the main drivers and barriers to collaborative practice, (b) the perceived impact of collaborative practice on student outcomes, and (c) the key ingredients of collaborative practice in the context of school psychology and school counselling. |
| Ungar, M., Liebenberg, L., & Ikeda, J. (2012). | Canada | Survey of practice  (multiple case studies) | Youth undertaking a specific program of integrated services | Files of 116 youth condensed into two illustrative case summaries | Youth with complex needs who were multiple service users | Through case studies drawn from research with multiple service–using youth with complex needs, the article aims to explore how uncoordinated services increase young people’s exposure to risk. |
| Valli, L., Stefanski, A., & Jacobson, R. (2018). | USA | Survey of practice  (targeted population) | A previous review of the literature that indicated four basic types of school–community partnership, each with a different scope and purpose and different implications for leadership | Four partnership models | Leaders in schools and community agencies | To deepen understanding of leadership in the different partnership models necessary to strengthen the conditions for school–community partnership success. |
| Walker, S. C., Kerns, S. E. U., Lyon, A. R., Bruns, E. J., & Cosgrove, T. J. (2010). | USA | Implementation study  (controlled) | 13 schools with either onsite school-based mental health centres or one very close by | Students who used the health centre (*n* = 444) and a control group who did not (*n* = 1,861 | Students who made use of a school-based or closely school-linked mental health centre | To examine school-based mental health centre (SBHC) service use as a predictor of academic outcomes, including attendance, discipline referrals, and grade point average. The second goal was to examine how the effects of SBHC use on academic outcomes vary across the different services, specifically medical and mental health. |
| Weist, M. D., Mellin, E. A., Chambers, K. L., Lever, N. A., Haber, D., & Blaber, C. (2012). |  | Literature review |  |  |  | To review challenges to collaboration in school mental health and present practical strategies for overcoming them. |