ARIZONA CHILD WELFARE WAIVER DEMONSTRATION
SEMI-ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT

I.   Overview

Provide a brief summary of major demonstration activities completed to date, as well of any significant evaluation findings. Summarize any major changes to the design of the demonstration or to the evaluation since the previous semi-annual report (NOTE: Any significant changes to the design of the proposed demonstration or evaluation must be approved by the Children's Bureau before they are implemented).

The Arizona Department of Child Safety (DCS, Department) began initial implementation of Arizona's Title IV-E waiver demonstration project, known as Fostering Sustainable Connections (FSC), on July 1, 2016. The reporting period of this semi-annual report is January 1, 2019 through June 30, 2019.

During this time, the contracted agency, Arizona's Children Association has maintained two Supervisors and 13 Family Engagement Specialists (FES). These FES support multiple Site Based Teams (SBT), and continue to focus on youth placed in group homes. One implementation office merged with a new section and became eligible to submit referrals for Fostering Sustainable Connections. It was determined that this new section had a large population of youth placed in Congregate Care who could benefit from FSC services.

A Peer Mentor Program was implemented to FSC in January 2019. FSC data revealed that in 2018, 22% of youth engaged in the Family Finding intervention who had relative or kinship placements identified, chose to remain in congregate care. FSC Peer Mentoring Program is designed to provide the youth valuable education or resources to assist them in making informed decisions to improve their well-being, support permanency and nurture meaningful connections. Since the implementation of this program, FSC has found that youth enjoyed learning from someone with shared lived experience and having a relatable advocate.

During this IV-E waiver project FSC has not only demonstrated an ability to improve the outcomes for children who have been placed in congregate care, it possesses the capacity to bridge the gap between the system and the communities that we serve by nurturing and empowering the networks that were preexisting to the Department involvement. Due to the FSC's success the waiver team proposed to the DCS leadership the program continue and be implemented into the DCS service array after the ending of the waiver, as it is a programmatic approach to provide the services and resources needed by families to reduce the amount of children in congregate care. The DCS leadership agreed with the waiver team's proposal and FSC will continue as part of the work the DCS does to support children exiting congregate care, and finding permanent connections.

II.   Demonstration Status, Activities, and Accomplishments

Provide a detailed overview of the status of the demonstration in the following areas:

A.   Numbers and types of services provided to date. Note in particular the implementation status of any innovative or promising practices.

Fostering Sustainable Connections attempts to reduce the time children spend in congregate care settings by enhancing family/fictive kin search and engagement activities, introducing a new Team Decision-Making (TDM) type, and supporting the action plans created in partnership with the family/fictive kin with available in-home reunification, placement stabilization, and other needed services. The work of the Family Engagement Specialists is a key factor for achieving the desired outcomes. In order to track the work the FESs are completing, they are required, monthly, to enter data into the FES Tracking Workbook. This assists the FES supervisors, the Department, and ASU to evaluate program fidelity and outcomes. The data collected in the workbook include:

- Total number of children referred to FSC
- Age of child
- 'Before FSC' placement type
- Engagement activities the FES completed with child/youth
- Pre-FSC Family/Supports identified
- Database searches used
- 'After FSC' placement type
- Post-FSC Family/Supports found
- Services identified & referred during FSC
- The number of children receiving Blended Perspective and Life Long Connections Meetings

To date, the FESs have worked to engage 513 children and their family/fictive kin. The children's ages ranged from four to eighteen years old, all of whom were in either in shelter or group home settings at the start of the FES's involvement. Innovative Family Finding activities have included 162 connectedness maps, three eco maps, 25 genograms, 252 mobility maps, 54 safety circles, and 50 trees of life, and Family Finding interviews 496 of children. Database searches have been conducted through the DCS Family Locate Unit, Lexis Nexis, Seneca, White pages, Zaba Search, and social media. FES staff report that Seneca searches and the use of social media have been the most effective electronic resources in family finding. For the 371 children whose services have been closed, these search and engagement activities have resulted in 99 (27%) children being placed with relatives, 30 (8%) pending placement with relatives, and 62 (17%) placed in less restrictive family-like settings. These activities also identified an additional 3,423 family members and other individuals as supports for the children. Services put in place for children and their family/fictive kin included 52 referrals for behavioral health services, 46 linked to community-based services, and 18 referrals for in-home services. FSC would like to see an increase in preservation services in the future as we understand there is a need for additional support for families/supports and connections.

B.   Other demonstration activities begun, completed, or that remain ongoing (e.g., introduction of new policies and procedures, staff training).

With the advent of using contracted FESs to perform the work of FSC, the contracted staff need to receive the same training as the Department's FESs. This is to maintain fidelity to the FSC model and to fully prepare them for this work. In addition to training, contracted staff continue to participate in the statewide implementation team meetings and site-based team meetings. A peer-to-peer learning convening is offered quarterly as additional support to the FES staff, most recently in June 2019. Success stories were shared by the FESs and common topics/challenges were discussed.

The FSC Statewide Implementation Meeting continues to include internal and community stakeholders, including court personnel and child advocacy group representatives. The last meeting was in May of 2019. The goal of the Implementation meeting is to develop ongoing communication about the progress of FSC, which includes implementation updates and success stories. The Implementation meeting also spotlights one implementation site and one Family Engagement Specialist. The Family Engagement Specialist shares success stories about positive outcomes for youth who engaged with FSC. The Implementation meeting has been successful in continuing to spread the word about FSC and has been an immense support in identifying the right type of communication to reach the courts, Department staff, and community.

During one of the Implementation Meetings, a Family Engagement Specialist presented on a sibling group who had been taken into custody at a young age and placed with an Aunt and Uncle who adopted the children. The children re-entered care a few years later when the adoption disrupted. The children were then adopted by another family member, but unfortunately after the adoption was finalized the children disrupted from the family member and returned to foster care, which resulted in the children reentering care for a third time. When FSC was referred, the oldest child had aged out of the system. The other siblings were placed in separate group homes which negatively affected one of the children severely. The Family Engagement Specialist was able to contact the oldest sibling, work collaboratively with the Department and service providers to place the younger siblings with this elder sibling under a Guardianship. Since reunifying, there was drastic improvements in the social-emotional wellbeing of the children who are currently thriving. Without the intervention and advocacy by FSC we might not have been able to facilitate such a positive outcome for these children.

Updates have been made to the FSC procedures and FES standard work to include clarification regarding the process workflow, the selection of children for FSC, and documentation of FES activities. In addition, the FES Tracking Workbook was updated

and streamlined in a way to gather the data in a more efficient manner. This has expedited data collection of the master summary report. Additional updates have been made to the documentation of the family and child contacts made by the FESs. The Statewide Coordinator created two data roll ups evaluating the outcomes of individual FES as well as individual implementation offices. This data has been helpful in identifying where outstanding efforts are being made and where there is need for additional coaching. The monthly report was amended to include stage of service, referral date and ongoing action items. The context and documentation of the monthly report is currently being monitored for Quality Assurance.

Blended Perspectives Meetings (BPMs) are facilitated by the FESs, and bring the family and other key participants together to connect or reconnect the child and family. This meeting brings together the family network and others who support the child to provide a blended perspective so family/fictive kin that do not know the child or have not been in contact with the child for some time can learn about the child and his or her greatest strengths and needs. There have been 110 BPMs held with a total of 737 family members and supports. Additional coaching to FES staff to conduct BPM's for each child/children served and ensuring the completion of this meeting was provided. Fidelity monitoring continues through observation of BPMs. One fidelity observation per FES is completed each quarter by the FSC Statewide Coordinators utilizing a monitoring tool, and the BPM Quality Assurance summary report.

FSC Statewide Coordinators observe many positive outcomes during BPM's. Supports/connections may attend in person or via telephone and often include those who live out of state. BPM's allow for discussions about strengths of the child/children, the family strengths and to asses needs. The child/children and connections feel heard by the team and are encouraged to keep open dialogue throughout the meeting. The FSC Statewide Coordinators observe interactions between the child/children with their siblings/other family connections during the meeting. These interactions with family/fictive kin lead to many smiles, laughter and excitement by all. Food is often provided by the Family Engagement Specialist which is shared and leftovers are offered to the child/children. The child/children are elated when picking out what treats they get to take with them at the end of the meeting.

The Department's training team, Permanency & Youth Services Team can facilitate the Family Finding Training Curriculum, but the contracted staff have been facilitating training to New Hire employees. The Department has the full ability to facilitate the training for internal or external stakeholders as needed.

C.   Challenges to implementation and the steps taken to address them.

Fostering Sustainable Connections had one challenge during this reporting period that required use of adaptive measures to continue the program with minimal interruption or negative effects. The Department has contracted to provide FESs staff and this contracted agency has experienced turnover and delays in onboarding new staff over the course of the contract. The FSC Statewide Coordinators made great efforts to collaborate with the contractor so these staffing issues did not affect the amount of children served. The design

of the program was to have one FES staff at each site base team, or office. Now to ensure children are being served timely the FES staff are taking referrals from all site based teams to keep their caseloads full. The structure of the site based team meetings has remained the same while enhancing the volume of children to be served in each office.

Each site-based team has remained motivated and supportive of implementation. New staff and leadership have embraced FSC while balancing all priorities of the Department. The Department's Permanency and Youth Services Team continues to be actively involved with each office to address the barriers due to FES staff turnover impacting the number of children served in the program.

D.   All demonstrations with a trauma focus (e.g., implementing trauma screening, assessment, or trauma-focused interventions) should report on each of the data elements listed below. For activities that are not being implemented as part of the demonstration, please indicate this with "N/A." If information is currently unknown, please indicate an approximate date that the data will be available.

- Target population(s) age range(s)
- Type of trauma screens used
- Number of children/youth screened for trauma
- Type of trauma/well-being assessments used[1]
- Number of children/youth assessed for well-being/trauma
- Type of trauma-focused evidence-based interventions (EBI's) used
- Number of children/youth receiving trauma-focused EBIs[2]
- Percentage of children and youth receiving trauma-informed EBIs who report positive functioning at follow up[3]
- Number of parents/caregivers:
  - Screened for trauma
  - Assessed tor trauma
  - Treated for trauma
- Number of clinicians trained in trauma-focused EBIs[4]

Section II should address both activities and accomplishments that have been completed to date as well as any that remain in progress or that have been delayed. It may be helpful to include an updated work plan or Gantt chart that highlights progress in implementing the demonstration.

The Arizona Title IV-E waiver demonstration project does not include a trauma focus; thus this section does not apply.

---

[1] Include any trauma and well-being assessments for which data is available.
[2] Include all children that have received any portion of the EBI(s).
[3] A jurisdiction may define "positive functioning" in any manner that is consistent with the definition used for the local evaluation of the waiver demonstration.
[4] This may include initial training and follow-up training.

III.   Evaluation Status

Provide a detailed overview of the status of the evaluation in the following areas:

A.   Numbers of children and families assigned to the demonstration (including to any comparison/control groups if appropriate); note if current sample sizes differ significantly from original sample size estimates.

For the first year of the waiver demonstration project (July 1, 2016 - June 30, 2017), 60 children had been interviewed for the child well-being sub-study as planned, including 30 from FSC and 30 from a matched comparison group. It was later discovered that three of the comparison group children were 18 years of age at the time of the interview, thus bringing the total of matched pairs for Year 1 to 27. In addition, 10 qualitative interviews with children and four interviews with adult caregivers were completed as part of the process evaluation study on engagement and satisfaction, the plan was for 10 and 10.

For Year 2 (July 1, 2017 - June 30, 2018), 66 children were interviewed for the child well-being study, or 33 matched pairs bringing the total to 60 which met the goal for Years 1 and 2. Permission to use social media (Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and Snapchat) was granted by DCS to help locate and contact youth for follow-up interviews once they turned 18 years of age. Fifty of the 57 Year 1 cohort children were re-interviewed in Year 2 (28 intervention and 22 comparison group children). The seven children from Year 1 who were not interviewed in Year 2 were unable to be located or were unwilling to participate in follow-up interviews. In addition, for Year 2, 10 qualitative interviews with children and 15 interviews with adult caregivers were completed as part of the process evaluation study that examines engagement and satisfaction. At the end of Year 2, the goal was met for 20 child interviews, and was one person short of 20 adult caregiver interviews as the interview was scheduled and rescheduled; thus, not completed.

For Year 3 (July 1, 2018 - June 30, 2019), all 30 of the targeted intervention children were interviewed as of January 30, 2019, and all 30 comparison children were interviewed as of July 16, 2019, in Maricopa, Pima, and Pinal Counties. Thirty-four of the 57 Year 1 cohort children were re-interviewed (19 intervention and 15 comparison), and 47 of the 66 Year 2 cohort (24 intervention and 23 comparison) were re-interviewed. For youth that were not able to be re-interviewed in Year 3 they were either unable to be located, refused to be interviewed, or AWOL. Attempts to arrange interviews will continue for children in cohorts 1 and 2 whose interviews were due in the later part of Year 3. For Year 4, we will attempt to contact all Year 1, 2, and 3 cohort children regardless of whether or not they participated in the second or third interview. It was decided to use a random sample for the Year 4 intervention group, however, no interviews will be conducted for this cohort. Year 4 will be examined in terms of fidelity and outcomes from the CHILDS database. ASU conducted propensity score matching to create the comparison group sample for Years 1, 2, and 3 of the project and will continue this method for the Year 4 comparison group. This matching procedure involves determining the common variables available for the children in the implementation offices and the pool of potential matches of children in the non-intervention offices. ASU uses the birthdate of the individual child, age of the individual

child at removal, congregate care type, number of placements, number of removals, gender, and race as the variables to match the children who receive FSC to those who do not receive FSC.

Also in Year 3, 10 children and six caretaker qualitative interviews on engagement and satisfaction were completed of the targeted 10 children and 11 adult caregiver interviews for the total of 30 children and 25 adult interviews for the 3 years. In Year 4 we will recruit another five adults for engagement and satisfaction interviews.

The Year 1 cohort of 30 intervention children were not randomly selected as planned, as there were fewer FESs than anticipated; thus, fewer children served. As a result, ASU interviewed children from the intervention group as they became available. A random selection procedure was still not possible in Year 2, nor in Year 3. Although it appeared the capacity would increase with additional FESs from contracted providers, due to turnover and other barriers, the capacity of the FESs did not increase to the extent it would allow for random selection. Thus, selecting cases/children occurred as new cases served by the FESs became available. The in-person data collection protocols worked well and were continued until the sample size (n = 60) was reached for Year 3 of the evaluation.

B.   Major evaluation activities and events (e.g., primary and secondary data collection, data analysis, database development).

Process Evaluation Activities: The major process evaluation activities completed to date include the following:

a. **Context:** In Years 1 and 2, individuals for key stakeholder interviews were identified and ASU created a semi-structured interview guide. In Year 1, 15 interviews were completed and the results of the interviews were reported in July 2017. Year Two focused on non-Waiver activities that occurred within the Department and outside through partner agencies and state, local, and legislative changes that may directly or indirectly have influenced the Waiver outcomes.

b. **Fidelity**: Fidelity measures (adapted from the Family Finding Model) were collected from the case file reviews from the intervention offices. To date, 30 of the targeted 60 intervention case files for Years 1 and 2 have been reviewed. A database was created to enter data from the fidelity measures to analyze and report. A second database was created to enter service data from the case file reviews upon completion of Year 1 case file reviews, these data are being analyzed now that the 57 Year 1 case file reviews are complete. Fidelity is also assessed through observation, including 14 site-based team meetings, one Blended Perspective, and two Life Long Connection meetings. An online survey targeting FESs was conducted and a report of findings was shared with the evaluation committee. For Year 3, 10 SBT meetings have been observed and two are scheduled. ASU is working with DCS to arrange observations at Blended Perspective and Lifelong Connection meetings.

- **Readiness:** ASU conducted Organizational Readiness for Change (ORC) surveys and completed the reports as the intervention was rolled out. Year 2 offices included; Gilbert, three locations in Pima County, Thunderbird, Casa Grande, Apache Junction, Glendale, Peoria, South Mountain, Permanency, Northern Region, and West 101 . In Year 3, there were not any new intervention rollouts.

- **Collaboration:** ASU conducted the third and final administration of the Wilder Collaboration survey (Mattessich, Murray-Close, & Monsey, 2001) and reported a comparison between Year 1, 2 and 3 administrations of the Wilder Collaboration survey in December 2018.

- **Implementation Drivers and Action Plan Adherence:** ASU initially completed the Implementation Drivers Assessment Process, National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) (Fixsen, Blasé, Naoom, & Duda, 2015) for the initial implementation stage and created an action plan listing individuals responsible, deadlines, and priority. A decision was made with the FSC evaluation committee to update the action plan at each monthly meeting. In April 2018, the Department of Child Safety took over responsibility for updating the action plan items and leading the FSC evaluation committee monthly discussion meetings). This change was purposeful to contribute to the sustainability of the practice beyond the evaluation.

- **Engagement and Satisfaction:** Discussed in Section III A. above.

Outcome Evaluation Overview: The major outcome evaluation activities completed in this reporting period include the following:

- **Services and Family/Fictive Kin Identified**: ASU met with DCS on transfer of case record information: 1) service needs, referrals, and timely access of services; and 2) number of family/fictive kin identified and involved in the case (includes number of searches). The secure file transfer protocol information was shared. Currently, ASU is developing an updated data sharing agreement. In October 2018, ASU received all Year 1 case files (30 intervention and 27 comparison group children) to review and document identified services and family/fictive. As of March 2019, ASU had received 27 of the Year 2 case files. Currently, ASU has received all 66 Year 2 case files and has completed 17. DCS has communicated to ASU that all Year 3 files will be received by the end of July 2019.

  A case file review tool was developed to identify service needs and chart service referrals, as well as receipt of services, and people involved in the child's life. The tool was reviewed and approved at a FSC evaluation committee meeting and is being used as a data collection tool to conduct case file reviews. A database was created to enter service and identified family data from the case file reviews. All 57, Year 1 case files were reviewed by January 2019. Currently, ASU has completed 17, Year 2 case reviews with a deadline to complete all 66 case file reviews set for the end of September 2019. Year 3 case reviews will begin once Year 2 are completed.

- **Permanency**:

  Safety: The safety domain addressed one research question: "Does the likelihood of safety vary between intervention and comparison groups controlling for practice component and type of permanency achieved?" Safety was operationalized as the absence of a report of child abuse and/or neglect that occurred within the 12 month period following the end date of the child's last congregate care placement, plus one week. Safety is reported separately for those children achieving legal permanency, and those who moved from congregate care to a family-like setting such as foster care or living with a relative, absent legal permanency. Reports to the Hotline were counted if they were made on the 8th day following the transition from congregate care, as earlier reports may relate to incidents from the most recent placement in congregate care. The data are shown in in Exhibit A. There was no statistically significant difference between intervention and comparison groups in the number of children with child abuse and neglect reports within one year post permanency. Further analysis of this outcome domain will utilize information on the intervention components from the matched sample. There was a slight difference in the number of reports to the Hotline within one year post transition from congregate care to placement in a family-like setting (See Exhibit A). The difference, however, was not statistically significant between children case managed through intervention or comparison offices. Further analysis of this domain will utilize information on the intervention components from the matched sample.

- Stability & Restrictiveness of Living Environment: ASU analyzed change in restrictiveness of living environments from Year 1 and the first half of Year 2, July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017 and plotted graphs illustrating change in restrictiveness for children in congregate care during the intervention period in two of the intervention offices (Tempe and Avondale). Specifically, the graphs showed the changes in restrictiveness through placement type changes, and number of placement moves (stability). The chart on placement stability showed a relatively high level of movement from group home to group home.

- **Days in Congregate Care after Implementation**: See Section V, Number 5 below.

- **Social/Emotional Wellbeing**: ASU developed an electronic scoring program for the Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale-2 (BERS-2) instrument and scored all first and second year cohort instruments for the child well-being sub-study as well as the second administration of the BERS-2 for Cohort 1 Year 2. Year 3 data will be analyzed after all interviews are conducted and a second-entry is completed.

- **Rate of Exit from Congregate Care:** It was hypothesized that intervention offices would have higher monthly rates of exit from congregate care than comparison offices, and in comparison to within office rates prior to implementation of the intervention. For the purpose of the waiver evaluation, an exit was considered to have occurred when there was a placement end date for a placement type coded as

group home or shelter. Children in residential treatment and behavioral health group facilities were not included in this analysis. ASU analyzed exit rates using data extracted from CHILDS in spring 2018. Exhibit B shows plotted graphs of the frequency of entry to and exit from congregate care for 12 intervention offices in Maricopa, Pima, and Pinal counties (and the Northern Region) by month and year. Also plotted is the implementation date of FSC by office, and for the Tempe and Avondale offices the pilot dates. The exit graphs show the frequency of Favorable, Neutral, and Unfavorable exits from congregate care. Exits associated with added in error, transfer, death, and runaway were not included. The following are examples of each exit types by classification.

- Favorable: Reunification, Adoption, Guardianship, Kinship, Case Closed
- Neutral: Family Health Reason, No Jurisdiction
- Unfavorable: Detention, Abused by Provider, License Revoked, Placement Disruption
- Of the four offices selected for detailed analysis to date, Tempe had the greatest decline in entries to congregate care after the implementation of the intervention, a difference which was significantly lower post intervention ($p. < .05$) (see Figure 7). All four offices experienced a lower number of entries over time into congregate care. Efforts to calculate exit rates between offices and within offices over time are ongoing.

Cost Evaluation Overview:

ASU will follow up with DCS for cost data at the individual level to develop the most thorough cost estimate for all years of the waiver. The analysis will be reported by yearly cohort. The comparison group is from the matched sample and is comprised of children served by those offices yet to implement FSC within Years 1, 2, and 3. These data will be requested in September to allow for a 3 month lag for data completion.

C.   Challenges to the implementation of the evaluation and the steps taken to address them.

Accessing case files for review has been a significant barrier of the evaluation. Out of a total of 120 case files scheduled for review, 75 were accessed, and 60 were completed by the first half of Year 3. However, the Permanency & Youth Services team found a solution to overcome this barrier and case files are now received on a bi-monthly or monthly basis. ASU anticipates that all Year 3 case files will be received from DCS by July 31, 2019.

IV.   Significant Evaluation Findings to Date

Summarize any significant process, outcome, or cost evaluation findings available to date. (NOTE: Evaluation findings may also be presented in a separate report or addendum to the semi-annual progress report prepared by the jurisdiction's evaluator).

Please see reports including:

1. Permanency-Safety & Stability 12 month post legal permanency (as of 12/31/17) (Exhibit A)
2. All Entries and Exits in Arizona DCS Offices graph(s) (Exhibit B)
3. Article entitled: Social-emotional well-being among youth living in out-of-home care was published in Children and Youth Services Review (Vol 96 (2019) 381-385) (Exhibit C)
4. Article entitled: How am I doing? Narratives of youth living in congregate care on their social emotional well-being was published in Children and Youth Services Review (Vol 103 (2019) 255-263). (Exhibit D)

V. Recommendations and Activities Planned for Next Reporting Period

Describe major demonstration and evaluation activities that will be started, continued, or discontinued during the subsequent reporting period. Highlight any recommendations for changes to the design and implementation of the demonstration or evaluation based on challenges encountered during the current or prior reporting period, or based on evaluation findings to date (please see earlier caveat about securing prior approval from the Children's Bureau).

As mentioned in the previous semi-annual report, the Department continues the process of onboarding new FESs with a contacted provider. All will be provided with foundational training and Family Finding techniques hands-on training. Full implementation is now in place in fifteen offices and across all the majority of regions in the state. In the remaining time of the demonstration project, it is anticipated that the number of children receiving FSC services will increase.

The Department's Permanency & Youth Services Team will continue to support each office by providing ongoing technical assistance and peer-to-peer learning opportunities. Members of each office's site-based team are also on the statewide implementation team, which allows for continual feedback and technical support to be provided to the team while working through any barriers.

ASU will continue to complete the following tasks:

1. Continue to conduct Year 4 site visits at the intervention offices using a semi-structured interview guide to gather data on implementation strengths and challenges; as well as observe LLC, BPM, and site-based team meetings until the end of the waiver on September 30, 2019.
2. Begin interviews to update and complete the Waiver Implementation Context report to include Year 3 Waiver and non-Waiver activities that may influence FSC outcomes as well as solicit additional feedback on the current Context Report.
3. Complete 5 caregiver engagement/satisfaction interviews.
4. Analyze and report data from Year 2, 3 and 4 fidelity tools.
5. Analyze and report data on Family Finding kin identification that are included in the case file reviews – make a comparison to the workbook.

6. Analyze data from cohort 3 BERS2 and YQOL surveys, along with data from follow-up cohorts 1, 2, and 3 (social-emotional well-being study)
7. Continue to receive Year 3 case files and complete Year 2 and 3 case reviews; then complete analysis of permanency outcomes (safety and stability by intervention component) using this data and data from the workbooks.
8. Complete any outstanding Year 3 interviews with children and caretakers and then conduct follow-up interviews for cohorts 1, 2, and 3.
9. Implement random selection procedure to Year 4 entry cohort, conduct PSM matching.
10. Continue to enter CAPMIS data from the case file review tools into SPSS, analyze, and report on service needs and referrals for years 1, 2, and 3.
11. Develop a methodology to analyze exit rates by office and compare within and between offices.
12. Request DCS cost data for all years to analyze cost changes in congregate care and services; and case level costs between the intervention and comparison group children.