

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 July 1, 2017, through December 31, 2017. During this time, the Department has begun initial implementation in eight additional offices in Maricopa, Pinal and Pima counties, and several offices in Northern Arizona. Northern Arizona has identified a Regional Site Based Team to begin orientating FSC in early 2018. Two additional Young Adult Program (YAP) units in Maricopa County are targeted to begin initial implementation during the next reporting period.

The Department continues to employ three internal Family Engagement Specialists (FESs), and has contracted with a community partner for ten additional FESs. To date, the FESs have worked with 123 children in Maricopa, Pinal and Pima counties. Of the 123 children served, 72 have closed from Fostering Sustainable Connections and 51 remain open with the program. Of the 72 children that have been closed from the program, there have been 25 (35%) placed with relatives, four (5%) placed in a less restrictive family-like setting, and five (7%) are pending placement with relatives.

Arizona State University (ASU) is actively engaged in the evaluation of Fostering Sustainable Connections. A data sharing agreement was processed November 2017, that allows for the continuation of additional work on the outcome study. Additionally, ASU continues to collect primary data for the sub-study on child well-being.

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 children receiving Blended Perspective and Life Long Connections Meetings

To date, the FESs have worked to engage 123 children and their family/fictive kin. The children's ages ranged from five to 17 years old, all of whom were in either shelter or group home settings at the start of the FES becoming involved. Innovative Family Finding activities have included 33 connectedness maps, two eco maps, seven genograms, 63 mobility maps, 27 safety circles, and 18 trees of life, and Family Finding interviews of 106 children. Database searches have been conducted through the DCS Family Locate Unit, Lexis Nexis, Seneca, White pages, Zaba Search, and social media. For the 72 children whose services have been closed, these search and engagement activities have resulted in 25 (35%) children being placed with relatives, 5 (7%) pending placement with relatives, and four (5%) placed in less restrictive family-like settings. These activities also identified an additional 608 family members and other individuals as supports for the children. Upon working with the children and their family/fictive kin, services put in place included 14 referrals for behavioral health services, 15 linked to community-based services, and four referrals for in-home services.

Ensuring a structure is in place to support implementation is essential to the success of FSC. The statewide team continues to meet monthly to ensure implementation is occurring as intended. Each implementation office has a site-based team established, consisting of office leadership, DCS Specialists, TDM facilitators, provider liaisons, and others the office has identified to participate. Each team is supported by the Department's Program Development Unit. Program Development has been working on a sustainability plan once the Waiver Demonstration project ends.

Utilizing the FSC implementation guide, the process of orienting new sites has been streamlined from three to two orientation meetings that are held for each site. This is to provide an overview on Implementation Science, site readiness and assessment, the FSC evaluation process, and financial components of the title IV-E waiver. This occurs after the site receives the initial FSC overview training by the Department's training unit. During the orientation process, children are assigned by the site to the FES working with their office. By the end of the four week orientation period, site leadership assumes responsibility for the site team. The Department's Program Development Unit continues

to participate monthly with the sites to provide technical assistance via telephone or in person as needed, and ensures fidelity of the use of site-based teams.

Of the eight offices that began initial implementation during this reporting period, seven are actively operationalized while the remaining office is in the beginning stages of this process. It is expected the site-based team in Northern Arizona will be orientated and operational by mid-February 2018. Additionally, it is anticipated that the two YAP offices in Maricopa County will be operational by mid-March 2018.

- 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 needed 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. Four contracted staff received the FSC overview training and the Department's database training during this reporting period. Three additional contracted staff will receive these trainings in January 2018, while all seven receive facilitation training in February 2018. Furthermore, a second six-series Family Finding training started the first week in July 2017 and concluded in December 2017. A third cohort also began in December 2017 and runs through April 2018.

In addition to training, contracted staff continue to participate in the statewide implementation team and site-based teams. Furthermore, six of the contracted FESs have begun working with children from the eight offices, and four more will attend training and begin initial implementation activities in their assigned offices.

A peer-to-peer learning convening is offered quarterly as additional support to members of the site-based teams, most recently in July 2017. Success stories were shared by the FESs and common topics/challenges were discussed. Future learning collaborates will include members from the new site-based teams and the expansion offices.

The FSC communication committee is being reconvened and extended to include internal and community stakeholders, including court personnel and child advocacy group representatives. The last meeting was in November 2017, and the next is scheduled for January 2018. The goal of the committee is to develop ongoing communication about the progress of FSC, which will include implementation updates and success stories. Additionally, the committee will assist in spreading the word about the impact FSC is having on children in congregate care and further orient stakeholders about the program.

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 improved data collection in the master summary report.

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. Thus far, there have been 36 BPMs held with a total of 250 family members and supports. Fidelity monitoring continues through observation of BPMs. One fidelity observation per FES is completed each quarter by a member of the Program Development Unit utilizing a monitoring tool, the BPM Quality Assurance summary report.

At this milestone, the Department has been actively working with the Family Finding purveyor to transition training and coaching to Department staff. Training on techniques used within the Family Finding model is required for FESs. The Department's training team, Program Development Unit, and contracted staff have been working with the purveyor to build curriculum. As noted, a third cohort of the Family Finding training began in December 2017; whereas, the built curriculum is used with Department staff providing the training.

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

Fostering Sustainable Connections has faced some challenges during this reporting period that required use of adaptive measures to continue the program with minimal interruption or negative effects. Challenges faced include:

- Change in site-based team leadership at one of the implementation sites.
- Turnover in a DCS FES position.
- Contracted staff turnover and the wait time for onboarding contracted FESs.
- TDM facilitators not scheduling the TDM Life Long Connection meetings outside of normal business hours.

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 Program Development Unit continues to be actively involved with each office to address and overcome barriers.

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 used¹
- Number of children/youth assessed for well-being/trauma
- Type of trauma-focused evidence-based interventions (EBI's) used

¹ Include any trauma and well-being assessments for which data is available.

- Number of children/youth receiving trauma-focused EBIs²
- Percentage of children and youth receiving trauma-informed EBIs who report positive functioning at follow up³
- Number of parents/caregivers:
 - Screened for trauma
 - Assessed for trauma
 - Treated for trauma
- Number of clinicians trained in trauma-focused EBIs⁴

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.

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.

At the end of the first year of the waiver demonstration project (June 30, 2017), 60 children had been interviewed for the child well-being sub-study, including 30 from FSC and 30 from a matched comparison group. This met the goal of the first year sub-study of the evaluation. In addition, 10 qualitative interviews with children examined engagement and satisfaction, and three interviews with adult caregivers were completed as part of the process evaluation study. Three of the 30 intervention group children interviewed were found to be over 18 years of age, reducing the total number of eligible children to 57 rather than 60. As a result, Year Two will include 33 intervention children, to make up for the three children who did not meet the age criterion in Year One.

For Year Two of the waiver demonstration project (beginning July 1, 2017), 26 of the targeted 63 children have been interviewed as of December 21, 2017, all of whom received the FSC intervention in Maricopa, Pima or Pinal counties. Additionally, 20 of the 57 Year One children were re-interviewed in Year Two. Therefore, as of December 21, 2017, there remained 37 follow-up interviews, and 37 Year Two interviews to be completed in the second half of Year Two, consistent with the proposed sample size in the evaluation plan. In order to identify the comparison group (n = 33) for Year Two, ASU requested a data file from DCS and once received will use Propensity Score Matching to create a matched comparison group as they did for Year One.

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.

ASU conducted propensity score matching to create the comparison group sample for Year One of the project. The matching procedure involved determining the common variables available for the children in the intervention group and the pool of potential matches in the non-intervention offices. ASU used the birthdate of the individual, age of the individual at removal, congregate care type, number of placements, number of removals, and gender and race as the covariates to match the children who had received FSC to those who had not received FSC. ASU matched the entire waiver-implemented population in the intervention offices (e.g. the Avondale and Tempe sites) and this same procedure will be repeated for the newly added intervention offices once the updated data are received from DCS.

The 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 is still not possible in Year Two. Although it appeared the capacity would increase with additional FESs from contracted providers; due to turnover and other barriers, the capacity of the FESs has not increased to the extent it allows for random selection. Thus, selecting cases/children occurs as new cases served by the FESs become available. This will allow in-person data collection to proceed for the 30 additional comparison group children and their caretakers. The in-person data collection protocols are working well and will continue until the sample size ($n = 60$) is reached for Year Two of the evaluation. Second year data collection includes follow up on the Year One sample that is in process ($n = 57$). Additional engagement/satisfaction interviews will be completed to include the ten youth and ten adult caregivers for Year Two, and seven additional caregivers as only three were interviewed in Year One.

- 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:

- 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 with individuals responsible, deadlines, and priority. A decision was made with the FSC evaluation committee to update the action plan at each monthly meeting (see updated report attached in Exhibit A).
- ASU conducted the second administration of the Wilder Collaboration survey (Mattessich, Murray-Close, & Monsey, 2001) and reported a comparison between Year One and Year Two administrations of the Wilder Collaboration survey in October 2017 (see report in Exhibit B).
- Approval for children and adult caregiver engagement/satisfaction questions was obtained from the DCS Evaluation Committee and ASU Institution Review Board (IRB). The data from first year interviews with children are currently being

analyzed. Only three adult caregivers agreed to an interview in Year One. Therefore, ASU will attempt to oversample adult caregivers in Year Two to obtain 20 adult participants by the end of Year Two.

- Individuals for key stakeholder interviews were identified and ASU created a semi-structured interview guide, with which 15 interviews were completed. The results of the interviews were reported in July 2017 (see Exhibit C). The report found that the stakeholders were motivated and excited about FSC and the FESs.
- ASU conducted Organizational Readiness for Change (ORC) surveys and completed the reports as the intervention offices rolled out. Year Two offices include: Gilbert, two locations in Pima County, Thunderbird, Casa Grande, Apache Junction, Glendale, and Peoria (report not yet available) (see Exhibits D through J).

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

- ASU developed an electronic scoring program for the Behavioral and Emotional Rating Scale-2 (BERS-2) instrument and scored all first year instruments for the child well-being sub-study.
- 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. A separate data sharing agreement was required by DCS and was approved November 2017. Thus, as of December 2017 data are being shared and case file reviews are underway.
- 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.
- ASU analyzed change in restrictiveness of living environments from July 1, 2016 through December 31, 2016 and plotted graphs for children in congregate care during the intervention period in two of the intervention offices (Tempe and Avondale). Specifically, the graphs show the changes in restrictiveness through placement type changes, and number of placement movements (stability) (see Exhibit K and L). The chart on placement movements show a relatively high level of movement from group home to group home.
- ASU plotted graphs of entry and exit from congregate care for 12 urban offices in Maricopa County, which were reviewed in a FSC evaluation committee meeting. Tempe and Avondale offices were charted six months into the intervention period and 24 months prior to the intervention to establish a baseline (see Exhibit M). Further, ASU compared pre and post entry and exit rates from congregate care in the Tempe and Avondale offices. Exits were classified as favorable, neutral, or

unfavorable. The results of Mood's Median test showed a statistically significant difference in the Avondale office with a higher number of exits from congregate care in the intervention period than in the pre-intervention period; however, there was no significant difference in the Tempe office at six months (see Exhibit N).

Cost Evaluation Overview:

Costs at the individual level are currently being document as reported in the case records. ASU will follow up with DCS for additional cost data at the individual level to develop the most thorough cost estimate. 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 Year One.

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

There are no barriers to report at this time.

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. NIRN Drivers Assessment action plan summary (Exhibit A)
2. Combined Collaboration Survey report (Exhibit B)
3. Context report (Exhibit C)
4. Organizational Readiness Survey reports (Exhibits D-J)
5. Restrictiveness graph(s) (Exhibit K and L)
6. Entry and Exit graph(s) (Exhibit M and N)
7. Conceptual manuscript on child well-being submitted for publication and currently being revised for resubmission (Exhibit O)
8. Draft article on measurement of socioemotional well-being reviewed with DCS for approval to submit for publication, with an article of qualitative responses on children's perceptions of well-being in preparation (Exhibit P)

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 is in the process of onboarding additional FESs with a contacted provider. Most of the contracted FESs have received foundational training and the Family Finding techniques hands-on training. Additional FESs began the hand-on training in December 2017 and January 2018, with the anticipated completion date of April 2018. Initial implementation has begun in eight additional offices in Maricopa, Pinal, and Pima counties, and several offices in Northern Arizona. Over the course of the next several weeks, the number of children receiving FSC services will increase. It is also anticipated that two additional YAP units in Maricopa County will begin initial implementation during the next reporting period, also increasing the number of children served.

The Department's Program Development Unit 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 to be provided to the team while working through any barriers. This support will be provided to the newest locations in the form of initial orientation, as well as continuing technical support once leadership from each site assumes responsibility for the site-based team.

ASU will continue to review case files and complete the following tasks:

1. Administer the Stakeholder survey and report results for Year Two.
2. Administer the Organizational Readiness for Change assessment and report results for the Peoria and Northern Region offices. As new offices are included in FSC, additional organizational readiness assessments will be administered.
3. Conduct site visits at the DCS intervention offices using a semi-structured interview guide to gather data on implementation strengths and challenges; as well as observe TDM Life Long Connections meetings and Blended Perspective Meetings
4. Analyze data from the FES's fidelity instrument that are included in the case files.
5. Analyze DCS data to June 30, 2017 allowing for a full year of analysis on entry and exit from congregate care, days in congregate care for those achieving permanency, legal permanency, safety (substantiated reports post permanency), stability (re-entry post permanency), and changes in restrictiveness. The data ASU currently has ends at December 31, 2016.
6. Update and complete the Waiver Implementation Context report to include Year Two Waiver and non-Waiver activities that may influence FSC (interviews began in December 2017 and are scheduled to conclude in January 2018).