

Formative Evaluation of Family Finding

FINAL REPORT

APPENDICES

August, 2016



Appendix A: Data Sources

Appendix B: Fidelity of Implementation

Appendix C: Method for Calculating Component Fidelity

Appendix D: Discharge Reasons

Appendix E: Associations between Programs and Outcomes after Accounting for Time/Case Status and Child/Case Characteristics

Appendix F: Bivariate Fidelity Analyses

Appendix G: Multivariate Fidelity Analyses

Appendix H: Variable Definitions

Appendix I: Permanency Readiness Measure

Appendix J: Child and Adolescent Needs and Strengths Assessment

Appendix A

Data Sources

	ECHO	CANS	PRM	WWK Database	Administrative Data
Populations for whom each data source is available					
FF Tier 1	X				X
FF Tier 2	X				X
FF Tier 3	X	X	X		X
CSR	X	X		X	X
Fidelity					
Fidelity items	X (FF Tier 2 and 3 only)				
Child/case characteristics					
Case goal					X
Extended family extensively explored before referral/extensive recruitment efforts made before referral	X (FF only)			X	
Race					X
Age					X
Medical/developmental or behavioral impairments					X
Gender					X
Number of removals					X
Time in foster care					X
Parental rights terminated					X
Placement setting					X
Number of prior placements					X
Number of prior therapeutic placements					X
Reason for entry into foster care					X
Prepared for the adoption and recruitment process				X	
Receiving in-home services					X
Permanency and placement outcomes					
Discharge outcome					X
Stepdown in placement					X
Moves to relative care					X
Commitments to legal and relational permanency	X (FF only)				
Child-related outcomes					
Number of discovered connections	X (FF only)				
Child knowledge of family			X		
Child permanency readiness			X		
Well-being (CANS domain scores)		X			
Trauma symptoms		X			
Physical health		X			

Appendix B

Fidelity of Implementation

TABLE B1. Fidelity with which each fidelity item was delivered, among closed FF cases, by tier and by case opening date

	Overall	TIER 2 Early	Late	Overall	TIER 3 Early	Late
Discovery and Engagement Activities						
Initial meeting with youth held (%)	86.7^a (n=30)	76.9 (n=13)	94.1 (n=17)	97.8^a (n=134)	100.0 (n=72)	95.2 (n=62)
Completed Stories from the Heart (%)	67.9 (n=28)	53.9 (n=13)	80.0 (n=15)	64.7 (n=133)	71.8 (n=71)	56.5 (n=62)
Completed mobility mapping (%) ¹	83.3 (n=24)	69.2 (n=13)	100.0 (n=11)	93.8 (n=128)	97.2 (n=71)	89.5 (n=57)
File mining completed (%)	90.0 (n=30)	92.3 (n=13)	88.2 (n=17)	96.3 (n=135)	98.6 (n=72)	93.7 (n=63)
Had 2-way contact with at least 5 family members after file mining and before BP meeting (%) ²	28.0^a (n=25)	50.0^b (n=12)	7.7^b (n=13)	61.2^a (n=129)	69.0^c (n=71)	51.7^c (n=58)
40 connections identified (%)	80.7 (n=31)	57.1^b (n=14)	100.0^b (n=17)	69.7 (n=132)	74.7 (n=71)	63.9 (n=61)
Assessments						
Initial child assessment conducted (%)	100.0 (n=30)	100.0 (n=13)	100.0 (n=17)	100.0 (n=135)	100.0 (n=72)	100.0 (n=63)
Well-being baseline interview with youth held (%) ³	54.6^a (n=33)	40.0 (n=15)	66.7 (n=18)	86.8^a (n=136)	87.5 (n=72)	85.9 (n=64)
Follow-up well-being survey completed with youth (%) ^{3,4}	0.0 (n=18)	0.0 (n=6)	0.0 (n=12)	11.9 (n=118)	19.1^c (n=63)	3.6^c (n=55)
CANS “risk” assessment completed (%)				97.0 (n=134)	100.0^c (n=72)	93.6^c (n=62)
Complete CANS assessment conducted (%) ³				94.9 (n=136)	97.2 (n=72)	92.2 (n=64)
CANS caregiver needs/strengths section administered (%) ³				39.0 (n=136)	45.8 (n=72)	31.3 (n=64)
Completed initial Permanency Readiness Measure (PRM) (%) ³	45.5^a (n=33)	40.0 (n=15)	50.0 (n=18)	94.9^a (n=136)	100.0^c (n=72)	89.1^c (n=64)
Completed quarterly PRMs after the initial PRM (%) ^{3,5}				66.4	52.3^c	83.3^c

	Overall	TIER 2 Early	Late	Overall (n=119)	TIER 3 Early (n=65)	Late (n=54)
Child and Family Preparation						
First child preparation activity occurred (%) ⁶				71.3 (n=136)	65.3 (n=72)	78.1 (n=64)
Monthly child preparation activities occurred (%) ^{7, 8}				23.4 (n=94)	13.3^c (n=45)	32.7^c (n=49)
First family or family/child preparation for permanency activity occurred (%) ⁹				64.5 (n=93)	57.1 (n=56)	75.7 (n=37)
Monthly family/child preparation occurred after DM meeting (%) ^{10, 11}				16.0 (n=75)	21.4 (n=42)	9.1 (n=33)
BP Meeting						
Family prepared for BP meeting (%)	58.3 (n=24)	72.7 (n=11)	46.2 (n=13)	70.0 (n=130)	75.4 (n=69)	63.9 (n=61)
Family Finding Specialist met with and prepared social worker before BP meeting (%)	64.3 (n=28)	92.3^b (n=13)	40.0^b (n=15)	74.8 (n=131)	85.7^c (n=70)	62.3^c (n=61)
BP meeting held (%)	67.9 (n=28)	84.6 (n=13)	53.3 (n=15)	74.1 (n=131)	84.3^c (n=70)	62.3^c (n=61)
Social worker attended BP meeting (%) ¹²	52.6^a (n=19)	72.7 (n=11)	25.0 (n=8)	80.4^a (n=97)	83.1 (n=59)	76.3 (n=38)
Child's history, strengths, and needs reviewed at BP meeting (%) ¹²	73.7^a (n=19)	72.7 (n=11)	75.0 (n=8)	100.0^a (n=96)	100.0 (n=58)	100.0 (n=38)
Connect-o-gram completed at BP meeting (%) ¹²	63.2 (n=19)	63.6 (n=11)	62.5 (n=8)	77.1 (n=96)	77.6 (n=58)	76.3 (n=38)
Greatest unmet need statement created at BP meeting (%) ¹²	73.7 (n=19)	72.7 (n=11)	75.0 (n=8)	90.6 (n=96)	86.2 (n=58)	97.4 (n=38)
Average number of people invited to BP meeting	10.5 (n=22)	13.8 (n=14)	4.6 (n=8)	8.2 (n=104)	8.0 (n=61)	8.3 (n=43)
Average number of people attending BP meeting ¹²	6.1 (n=19)	7.2 (n=11)	4.5 (n=8)	4.9 (n=97)	4.5 (n=59)	5.4 (n=38)
Average percent of invitees attending BP meeting ¹²	80.5 (n=19)	58.2 (n=11)	111.3 (n=8)	63.4 (n=97)	63.1 (n=59)	63.9 (n=38)
DM Meeting						
Family prepared for DM meeting (%)	53.9 (n=26)	76.9^b (n=13)	30.8^b (n=13)	69.2 (n=130)	76.5 (n=68)	61.3 (n=62)
Family Finding Specialist met with and prepared social worker before DM meeting (%)	61.5 (n=26)	84.6^b (n=13)	38.5^b (n=13)	71.3 (n=129)	79.4^c (n=68)	62.3^c (n=61)

	Overall	TIER 2 Early	Late	Overall	TIER 3 Early	Late
DM meeting held (%)	65.4 (n=26)	84.6 (n=13)	46.2 (n=13)	71.5 (n=130)	82.4^c (n=68)	59.7^c (n=62)
Social worker attended DM meeting(%) ⁹	70.6 (n=17)	63.6 (n=11)	83.3 (n=6)	82.8 (n=93)	85.7 (n=56)	78.4 (n=37)
Mobility map/connect-o-gram reviewed at DM meeting (%) ⁹	64.7^a (n=17)	63.6 (n=11)	66.7 (n=6)	86.1^a (n=93)	82.1 (n=56)	91.9 (n=37)
Child's unmet needs reviewed at DM meeting (%) ⁹	70.6^a (n=17)	72.7 (n=11)	66.7 (n=6)	93.6^a (n=93)	89.3 (n=56)	100.0 (n=37)
1 or more adults committed to be a permanency resource at the DM meeting (%) ^{9, 13}	75.0 (n=16)	80.0 (n=10)	66.7 (n=6)	52.7 (n=93)	41.1^c (n=56)	70.3^c (n=37)
5 or more adults committed to provide emotional support for the child at the DM meeting (%) ⁹	70.6 (n=17)	72.7 (n=11)	66.7 (n=6)	65.2 (n=92)	61.8 (n=55)	70.3 (n=37)
Family leader identified at DM meeting (%) ⁹	70.6 (n=17)	81.8 (n=11)	50.0 (n=6)	77.4 (n=93)	75.0 (n=56)	81.1 (n=37)
Average number of people invited to DM meeting	7.9 (n=21)	9.3^b (n=13)	5.5^b (n=8)	8.7 (n=97)	8.3 (n=58)	9.4 (n=39)
Average number of people attending DM meeting ⁹	5.4 (n=17)	6.8 (n=11)	2.8 (n=6)	5.1 (n=92)	4.8 (n=55)	5.5 (n=37)
Average percent of invitees attending DM meeting ⁹	67.1 (n=17)	65.3 (n=11)	70.4 (n=6)	65.9 (n=92)	65.6 (n=55)	66.4 (n=37)
Post-DM Meeting Activities						
Family connections report given to family leader (%) ⁹	64.7 (n=17)	72.7 (n=11)	50.0 (n=6)	69.0 (n=87)	60.4^c (n=53)	82.4^c (n=34)
Referred family/child to resources/training before case closure (%) ^{1, 9}				70.6 (n=34)	77.8 (n=18)	62.5 (n=16)
Completed Comprehensive Assessment for Guardianship (%) ¹				0.0 (n=8)	0.0 (n=3)	0.0 (n=5)
Assisted family with application for licensing (%) ^{1, 14}				50.0 (n=4)	50.0 (n=4)	N/A (n=0)
Discussed incorporating plans created during the DM meeting into the DSS case plan (%) ⁹				80.0 (n=89)	73.1 (n=52)	89.2 (n=37)
Plans created during DM meeting incorporated into DSS case plan (%) ⁹				67.4 (n=89)	61.5 (n=52)	75.7 (n=37)
Made any post-case closure contact (%) ^{1, 15}				100.0 (n=5)	100.0 (n=3)	100.0 (n=2)
Family was referred to services post-case closure (%) ¹⁵				16.7	14.3	20.0

	Overall	TIER 2 Early	Late	Overall	TIER 3 Early	Late
				(n=12)	(n=7)	(n=5)
Team Member Relationships						
Initial meeting with child's social worker held (%)	100.0 (n=30)	100.0 (n=13)	100.0 (n=17)	100.0 (n=135)	100.0 (n=72)	100.0 (n=63)
Collaborative meeting held (%)	96.8 (n=31)	93.3 (n=15)	100.0 (n=16)	99.3 (n=136)	98.6 (n=72)	100.0 (n=64)
Average percent of collaborative team members informed and in agreement with FF (%) ¹⁶	67.4^a (n=30)	82.1 (n=14)	54.5 (n=16)	82.9^a (n=133)	88.2^c (n=70)	77.0^c (n=63)
Transitioned case to Adoption Specialist (%) ¹				64.3 (n=14)	71.4 (n=7)	57.1 (n=7)
Final report delivered to child's social worker (%)	86.4 (n=22)	70.0 (n=10)	100.0 (n=12)	94.6 (n=111)	96.6 (n=59)	92.3 (n=52)
Family Finding Specialist had weekly contact with the child's social worker (%)	100.0 (n=3)	100.0 (n=3)	N/A (n=0)	83.6 (n=122)	81.3 (n=64)	86.2 (n=58)
Family Finding Specialist had weekly contact with the child's Adoption Specialist (%) ¹				50.0 (n=6)	33.3 (n=3)	66.7 (n=3)
Family Finding worker attended at least 1 professional team meeting per month (%)	65.4 (n=26)	69.2 (n=13)	61.5 (n=13)	69.1 (n=123)	66.2 (n=65)	72.4 (n=58)
Child's social worker was an active participant in the Family Finding services (1-5) ¹⁷	4.0 (n=30)	4.1 (n=15)	3.9 (n=15)	3.5 (n=124)	3.5 (n=64)	3.6 (n=60)

Figures presented are the percent of cases that had an activity completed, unless otherwise noted. Cases opened before August 1, 2014 are considered "early" cases; cases opened on or after August 1, 2014 are considered "late" cases. All tests of statistical significance in this table were chi-square tests, except for (1) Fisher's exact tests were used in cases when cell sizes were less than 5 and (2) t-tests were used for continuous variables. Superscripts of the same letter show which programs were different from each other, per row, at the $p < 0.05$ level.

¹ Among cases for which this activity was applicable.

² Among cases that had completed file mining.

³ A child was considered to have this instrument/assessment completed if at least half of the questions were answered.

⁴ Among cases that had the well-being baseline interview completed.

⁵ Among cases that had the initial PRM completed, and it had been at least one quarter since the first PRM was completed OR it had been less than a quarter but a follow-up PRM was already done.

⁶ A child preparation activity was considered to have occurred if a child ever had any child or child/family preparation activity.

⁷ Among cases that had the first child preparation activity completed, and it had been at least one month since the first child preparation activity OR it had been less than a month but a follow-up child preparation activity was already done.

⁸ We define having the activity completed monthly as long as the actual number of activities was equal to or greater than the number of months between the first activity and the end of the FF case.

⁹ Among cases that had a DM meeting completed.

	Overall	TIER 2 Early	Late	Overall	TIER 3 Early	Late
--	---------	-----------------	------	---------	-----------------	------

¹⁰ Or family and child preparation activities within the same 30 days. Among cases that had a DM meeting completed, and it had been at least one month since the DM meeting OR it had been less than a month but the relevant activity already occurred.

¹¹ We define having the activity completed monthly as long as the actual number of activities was equal to or greater than the number of months between the DM meeting and the end of the FF case.

¹² Only valid if a BP meeting occurred.

¹³ Comparisons cannot be made between Tier 2 and Tier 3 cases because this fidelity item was documented differently based on tier.

¹⁴ Only valid among cases that are to be licensed.

¹⁵ Only valid among cases that have been closed for at least 90 days and achieved permanency.

¹⁶ Only valid among cases that had a collaborative team meeting and there were team members listed.

¹⁷ Rated on a scale of 1-5. 1 represents a very inactive social worker and 5 indicates a very active social worker.

Table B2. Average percent of component items delivered, per component, among closed FF cases

	Tier 2	Tier 3
	%	%
Discovery and engagement activities	60	73
Assessments	53	73
Child and family preparation activities	N/A	37
BP meeting	51	68
DM meeting	49	60
Post-DM meeting activities	42	50
Team member relationships	87	90

See Appendix C for how these component scores were calculated.

TABLE B3. Percent of all cases¹ that had each item delivered within the prescribed timeframe, by tier and by case opening date

	Overall %	TIER 2 Early %	Late %	Overall %	TIER 3 Early %	Late %
Discovery and Engagement Activities						
Initial meeting with youth held within 2 weeks ²	39.4 ^a (n=33)	30.0 (n=10)	43.5 (n=23)	19.0 ^a (n=263)	8.9 ^c (n=90)	24.3 ^c (n=173)
Completed Stories from the Heart within 50 days ²	52.6 ^a (n=19)	28.6 (n=7)	66.7 (n=12)	26.8 ^a (n=179)	17.9 ^c (n=67)	32.1 ^c (n=112)
Completed mobility mapping within 50 days ²	96.2 ^a (n=26)	88.9 (n=9)	100.0 (n=17)	62.6 ^a (n=230)	61.2 (n=85)	63.5 (n=145)
Completed file mining within 50 days ²	100.0 (n=18)	100.0 (n=6)	100.0 (n=12)	92.9 (n=198)	88.1 (n=67)	95.4 (n=131)
Assessments						
Initial child assessment conducted within 3 business days ²	43.6 (n=39)	30.8 (n=13)	50.0 (n=26)	34.9 (n=269)	17.8 ^c (n=90)	43.6 ^c (n=179)
Well-being baseline interview with youth held within 2 weeks ²	50.0 ^a (n=18)	50.0 (n=6)	50.0 (n=12)	21.8 ^a (n=225)	7.9 ^c (n=76)	28.9 ^c (n=149)
CANS “risk” assessment completed within 2 weeks ²				19.6 (n=260)	7.8 ^c (n=90)	25.9 ^c (n=170)
Complete CANS assessment conducted within 30 days ²				50.8 (n=263)	44.3 (n=88)	53.7 (n=175)
CANS caregiver needs/strengths section completed within 30 days of DM meeting ³				46.7 (n=60)	33.3 ^c (n=33)	63.0 ^c (n=27)
Completed initial Permanency Readiness Measure (PRM) within 50 days ²	47.6 (n=21)	50.0 (n=6)	46.7 (n=15)	66.8 (n=262)	58.4 ^c (n=89)	71.1 ^c (n=173)
Child and Family Preparation						
First child preparation activity occurred within 50 days ²				32.1 (n=218)	10.9 ^c (n=64)	40.9 ^c (n=154)
First family or family/child preparation activity occurred within 30 days of DM meeting ³				34.6 (n=78)	36.8 (n=38)	32.5 (n=40)
BP Meeting						
BP meeting held within 75 days ²	42.1 ^a (n=19)	63.6 (n=11)	12.5 (n=8)	10.2 ^a (n=167)	5.3 (n=75)	14.1 (n=92)
DM Meeting						
BP and DM meetings held at least 2 days apart ⁴	58.8 (n=17)	63.6 (n=11)	50.0 (n=6)	56.1 (n=157)	58.3 (n=72)	54.1 (n=85)

	TIER 2			TIER 3		
	Overall %	Early %	Late %	Overall %	Early %	Late %
DM meeting held within 120 days ²	94.1^a (n=17)	100.0 (n=11)	83.3 (n=6)	17.8^a (n=157)	11.1^c (n=72)	23.5^c (n=85)
Post-DM Meeting Activities						
Referred family/child to resources before case closure and within 30 days of DM meeting ³				14.3 (n=42)	14.3 (n=21)	14.3 (n=21)
Team Member Relationships						
Initial meeting with child's social worker held within 3 business days ²	44.7 (n=38)	30.8 (n=13)	52.0 (n=25)	37.9 (n=269)	18.9^c (n=90)	47.5^c (n=179)
Collaborative meeting held within 2 weeks ²	56.8^a (n=37)	25.0^b (n=12)	72.0^b (n=25)	39.2^a (n=240)	27.1^c (n=85)	45.8^c (n=155)
Final report delivered to child's social worker within 14 days of case closure ⁵	94.4 (n=18)	85.7 (n=7)	100.0 (n=11)	82.4 (n=91)	78.9 (n=52)	87.2 (n=39)

All tests of statistical significance in this table were chi-square tests or Fisher's exact tests (the latter was used in cases when cell sizes were less than 5).

Superscripts of the same letter show which programs were different from each other, per row, at the p<0.05 level.

¹ This analysis was conducted among all closed and open FF cases that indicated that the fidelity item was delivered at some point during the case.

² Among cases that ever completed the activity, had a date for completion, and had a case opening date.

³ Among cases that ever completed the activity, had a date for completion, had a DM meeting, and had a date for the DM meeting.

⁴ Among cases that had a BP meeting, had a DM meeting, and had a date for both meetings.

⁵ Among cases that ever completed the activity, had a date for completion, are closed, and have a date of case closure.

Appendix C

Method for Calculating Component Fidelity

To create summary fidelity measures, we combined various fidelity items into fidelity components. The following items comprised each component (Tier 3 cases were expected to fulfill all fidelity items listed below. Tier 2 cases were only expected to fulfill items marked with an asterisk):

- ***Discovery and engagement activities***
 - Initial meeting with youth held*
 - Completed Stories from the Heart*
 - File mining completed*
 - Had two-way communication with at least 5 family connections after file mining and prior to holding the BP meeting*
 - At least 40 new connections discovered by case closure*
- ***Assessments***
 - Initial child assessment conducted*
 - CANS “risk” assessment completed
 - Complete CANS assessment conducted
 - Complete initial Permanency Readiness Measure (PRM)*
 - Quarterly PRMs completed
 - Well-being baseline interview with youth held*
 - Complete follow-up Well-Being Survey with youth*
 - CANS caregiver needs/strengths section done
- ***Child and family preparation***
 - Whether first child preparation activity occurred
 - Whether monthly child preparation occurred
 - Whether first family placement preparation or family/child placement preparation activity occurred
 - Whether monthly family/child placement preparation activities (or both family preparation and child preparation activities within same 30 days) occurred after DM meeting
- ***Blended Perspectives Meeting***
 - Family was prepared for BP meeting *
 - FF met with social worker before BP meeting *
 - BP meeting held*
 - Social worker in attendance at BP meeting*
 - Child’s history strengths/needs discussed at BP meeting*
 - Connect-o-gram at BP meeting*
 - Greatest unmet need statement created at BP meeting*
- ***Decision Making Meeting***

- Family was adequately prepared for DM meeting *
- FF met with social worker before DM meeting *
- DM meeting held*
- Social worker in attendance at DM meeting*
- Mobility mapping/connect-o-gram reviewed at DM meeting*
- Greatest unmet needs reviewed at DM meeting*
- At least 1 plan for legal permanence developed with clear timeline at DM meeting*
- At least 5 or more family connections commit to plans for emotional support with clear timelines at DM meeting*
- Establish the family leader at DM meeting*
- ***Post-Decision Making Meeting Activities***
 - Connections report given to family leader*
 - Had discussions with the DSS worker about incorporating plans created during the DM meeting into the DSS case service plan
 - Plans created during the DM meeting incorporated into the child’s DSS case service plan
- ***Team Member Relationships***
 - Initial meeting with child’s social worker held*
 - Collaborative team meeting held*
 - Maintained weekly contact with social worker*
 - FF attended at least 1 professional team meeting per month during case*
 - Delivered final report to social worker*

All variables that allow “not applicable” as a response option were not included when calculating the summary measure.¹ This ensured all cases were held to the same standard regardless of case characteristics.

For each fidelity item within each component, a case was marked as having the activity completed (1), not having the activity completed (0), or missing. Within each component, we summed the number of items marked as 1 and divided that number by the total number of items in the component. The resulting percentage indicates the percent of items in that component that the case had completed.

For all components except for team member relationships, we only calculated a percentage if there was a valid response for all items in the component (i.e., no missing responses). For team member relationships, we calculated a percentage as long as 75% of the items in the component were non-missing because of the high level of missing data for Tier 2 cases for items in this component.

¹ This included: completed mobility mapping, referred to resources after DM meeting and before case closure, completed Comprehensive Assessment for Guardianship, assisted with licensure application, transitioned to adoption specialist, weekly contact with adoption specialist, whether any contact was made with family after case closure, and whether family was referred to supportive services after case closure.

Appendix D

Discharge Reasons

Table D1. Percent of closed FF/CSR cases experiencing each child welfare discharge outcome

	Tier 1 (n=50) %	Tier 2 (n=30) %	Tier 3 (n=135) %	CSR (n=34) %
Reunification	10	20 ^{3,C}	7 ²	0 ²
Adoption	0 ^{2,C}	10 ¹	4 ^C	21 ^{1,3}
Guardianship with relative	4	7	6	6
Guardianship with other court approved caretaker	0	0	2	0
Custody with non-removal parent or relative	4	0	1	3
Custody with other court approved caretaker	2	0	2	3
Emancipation	6 ^C	3 ^C	10 ^C	24 ^{1,2,3}
Transfer to another agency	0	0	0	0
Runaway	0	0	1	0
Unknown	0	0	0	0
Authority revoked for other reasons	0	0	1	0
Still in foster care	74^C	60	67^C	44^{1,3}

All tests of statistical significance in this table were chi-square tests or Fisher's exact tests (the latter was used in cases when cell sizes were less than 5). Superscripts show which programs were different from each other, per row, at the p<0.05 level (1=Tier 1, 2=Tier 2, 3=Tier 3, C=CSR). For example, a superscript of "1" in the Tier 3 column denotes that Tier 1 and Tier 3 values for that variable were statistically significantly different.

Appendix E

Associations between Programs and Outcomes after Accounting for Time/Case Status and Child/Case Characteristics

Table E1. Associations between programs and achievement of legal permanency

	Model 1 (n=476)	Model 2 (n=461)
Tier 1	1.54 (0.68)	1.32 (0.94)
Tier 2	3.12*** (1.01)	2.68* (1.27)
Tier 3	(omitted)	(omitted)
CSR	0.87 (0.34)	1.29 (0.56)
Accounts for time/case status?	Yes	Yes
Accounts for child/case characteristics?	No	Yes

Figures presented are sub-hazard ratios from a competing risks survival analysis model. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

Model 2 controlled for all characteristics presented in Table 2 (child/case characteristics) except family history extensively explored (because the variable is not comparable between FF and CSR cases), and prepared for the adoption process (since it is only available for CSR).

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

Table E2. Associations between programs and ever experiencing a stepdown

	Model 1 (n=451)	Model 2 (n=448)
Tier 1	1.37 (0.40)	1.72 (0.53)
Tier 2	1.52 (0.36)	2.58*** (0.67)
Tier 3	(omitted)	(omitted)
CSR	1.04 (0.21)	1.25 (0.34)
Accounts for time/case status?	Yes	Yes
Accounts for child/case characteristics?	No	Yes

Figures presented are sub-hazard ratios from a competing risks survival analysis model. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

Model 2 controlled for all characteristics presented in Table 2 (child/case characteristics) except family history extensively explored (because the variable is not comparable between FF and CSR cases), and prepared for the adoption process (since it is only available for CSR).

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

Table E3. Associations between programs and having a stepdown as a final placement

	Model 1 (n=144)	Model 2 (n=143)
Tier 1	2.87 (2.52)	2.04 (2.26)
Tier 2	1.72 (1.18)	1.30 (1.15)
Tier 3	(omitted)	(omitted)
CSR	0.94 (0.45)	0.81 (0.50)
Accounts for time?	Yes	Yes
Accounts for child/case characteristics?	No	Yes

Figures presented are odds ratios from a logistic regression model. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

Both models controlled for the amount of time between FF/CSR opening and child welfare closure date (or the end of the study period for open child welfare cases). Analyses were conducted only on cases that ever experienced a stepdown.

Model 2 controlled for all characteristics presented in Table 2 (child/case characteristics) except family history extensively explored (because the variable is not comparable between FF and CSR cases), prepared for the adoption process (since it is only available for CSR), and reason for entry into foster care (due to perfect prediction issues).

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

Table E4. Associations between programs and ever experiencing a move from non-relative to relative care

	Model 1 (n=439)	Model 2 (n=433)
Tier 1	2.14 (0.83)	2.81* (1.27)
Tier 2	3.53*** (1.06)	4.59*** (1.66)
Tier 3	(omitted)	(omitted)
CSR	0.59 (0.23)	0.85 (0.40)
Accounts for time/case status?	Yes	Yes
Accounts for child/case characteristics?	No	Yes

Figures presented are sub-hazard ratios from a competing risks survival analysis model. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

Model 2 controlled for all characteristics presented in Table 2 (child/case characteristics) except family history extensively explored (because the variable is not comparable between FF and CSR cases), and prepared for the adoption process (since it is only available for CSR).

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

Table E5. Associations between programs and experiencing a move to relative care as a final placement

	Model 1 (n=65)	Model 2 (n=65)
Tier 1	0.50 (0.47)	0.16 (0.37)
Tier 2	4.54 (4.27)	4.45 (4.90)
Tier 3	(omitted)	(omitted)
CSR	3.94 (3.46)	145.86 (607.10)
Accounts for time?	Yes	Yes
Accounts for child/case characteristics?	No	Yes

Figures presented are odds ratios from a logistic regression model. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

Both models controlled for the amount of time between FF/CSR opening and child welfare closure date (or the end of the study period for open child welfare cases). Analyses were conducted only on cases that were in non-relative care at FF/CSR case opening and ever experienced a move from non-relative to relative care.

Model 2 controlled for all characteristics presented in Table 2 (child/case characteristics) except family history extensively explored (because the variable is not comparable between FF and CSR cases), prepared for the adoption process (since it is only available for CSR), and reason for entry into foster care (due to perfect prediction issues).

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

Table E6. Associations between programs and obtaining a commitment to legal permanency from at least one adult

	Model 1 (n=163)	Model 2 (n=156)
Tier 2	4.65** (2.28)	5.56* (4.18)
Tier 3	(omitted)	(omitted)
Accounts for time?	Yes	Yes
Accounts for child/case characteristics?	No	Yes

Figures presented are odds ratios from a logistic regression model. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

Both models controlled for the length of time between FF opening and FF closure.

Both models were only analyzed among closed FF cases. Tier 1 was omitted because no Tier 1 cases obtained, nor were expected to obtain, a commitment to legal permanency.

Model 2 controlled for all characteristics presented in Table 2 (child/case characteristics) except family history extensively explored (because the variable is not comparable between FF and CSR cases), and prepared for the adoption process (since it is only available for CSR cases).

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

Table E7. Associations between programs and obtaining a commitment to legal permanency from one relative

	Model 1 (n=163)	Model 2 (n=156)
Tier 2	2.99* (1.39)	3.98* (2.75)
Tier 3	(omitted)	(omitted)
Accounts for time?	Yes	Yes
Accounts for child/case characteristics?	No	Yes

Figures presented are odds ratios from a logistic regression model. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

Both models controlled for the length of time between FF opening and FF closure.

Both models were only analyzed among closed FF cases. Tier 1 was omitted because no Tier 1 cases obtained, nor were expected to obtain, a commitment to legal permanency.

Model 2 controlled for all characteristics presented in Table 2 (child/case characteristics) except family history extensively explored (because the variable is not comparable between FF and CSR cases), and prepared for the adoption process (since it is only available for CSR cases).

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

Table E8. Associations between programs and obtaining a commitment to relational permanency

	Model 1 (n=211)	Model 2 (n=199)
Tier 1	0.02** (0.03)	0.01*** (0.01)
Tier 2	4.45** (2.50)	2.20 (1.80)
Tier 3	(omitted)	(omitted)
Accounts for time?	Yes	Yes
Accounts for child/case characteristics?	No	Yes

Figures presented are odds ratios from a logistic regression model. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

Both models controlled for the length of time between FF opening and FF closure.

Both models were only analyzed among closed FF cases.

Model 2 controlled for all characteristics presented in Table 2 (child/case characteristics) except family history extensively explored (because the variable is not comparable between FF and CSR cases), and prepared for the adoption process (since it is only available for CSR).

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

Table E9. Associations between programs and number of discovered connections

	Model 1 (n=211)	Model 2 (n=199)
Tier 1	-4.59 (6.38)	3.25 (7.03)
Tier 2	-5.66 (6.50)	8.61 (7.00)
Tier 3	(omitted)	(omitted)
Accounts for time?	Yes	Yes
Accounts for child/case characteristics?	No	Yes

Figures presented are coefficients from an OLS regression model. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

Both models controlled for the length of time between FF opening and FF closure.

Both models were only analyzed among closed FF cases.

Model 2 controlled for all characteristics presented in Table 2 (child/case characteristics) except family history extensively explored (because the variable is not comparable between FF and CSR cases), and prepared for the adoption process (since it is only available for CSR).

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

Appendix F

Bivariate Fidelity Analyses

Table F1. Percent of Closed Tier 3 FF Cases Achieving Positive Outcomes, by Number of Fidelity Component Items Completed

Number of Fidelity Component Items Completed	Achieved legal permanency	Commitment to legal permanency	Commitment to relational permanency	Positive or no change in permanency readiness	Ever stepdown	Stepdown as final placement ¹
Discovery and engagement activities						
0-2	20.0	44.0	56.0	54.6*	43.5	77.8
3	25.8	51.6	74.2	87.5*	37.9	72.7
4	10.7	53.6	85.7	85.7*	44.4	81.8
5	22.2	68.9	82.2	90.5*	46.5	77.8
Assessments						
0-5	17.8	30.2*	62.8*	90.9	35.6	64.3
6	24.0	62.0*	74.0*	85.0	41.7	77.8
7-8	15.8	76.3*	89.5*	82.4	54.6	83.3
Child and Family Preparation						
0	25.0	33.3*	50.0*	71.4*	40.0	80.0
1	9.7	41.9*	74.2*	68.2*	42.9	66.7
2	25.0	81.3*	83.3*	93.0*	45.7	89.5
3-4	11.1	50.0*	100.0*	91.7*	44.4	62.5
Blended Perspectives Meeting						
0	41.9*	39.3*	32.1*	75.0	31.0	88.9
1-5	13.3*	40.0*	60.0*	85.7	46.7	83.3
6	18.5*	81.5*	92.6*	91.3	42.3	70.0
7	8.9*	57.1*	92.9*	83.3	46.2	78.3
Decision Making Meeting						
0	41.2*	37.5*	34.4*	66.7	34.4	90.9
1-7	5.3*	39.5*	76.3*	85.0	40.5	76.9
8	13.5*	70.3*	100.0*	87.9	44.4	68.8
9	23.5*	100.0*	100.0*	93.3	64.3	87.5
Post-Decision Making Meeting activities						
0	27.5	28.6*	49.0*	64.7	30.6*	78.6
1-2	5.0	75.0*	85.0*	88.9	30.0*	80.0
3	18.4	71.4*	95.9*	88.1	61.4*	76.9
Team Member Relationships						
0-3	42.1*	70.6	76.5	100.0	33.3	80.0
4-5	16.7*	53.9	76.5	81.7	43.8	77.5

All tests of statistical significance in this table were chi-square tests, except Fisher's exact tests were used in cases when cell sizes were less than 5. Asterisks denote that there was a statistically significant relationship (at the $p < 0.05$ level) between number of fidelity items completed and outcomes.

¹Among cases that ever had a stepdown.

Appendix G

Multivariate Fidelity Analyses

All analyses in this section were conducted on Tier 3 cases that have had their FF case closed.

For each of the models presented in this section, we first multiplied the component measures by 100 so that the interpretation of sub-hazard ratios, odds ratios, and coefficients can be made on the scale of a one percentage point change. As noted in the main report, we treated the component measures as continuous even though there were limited values for each measure. This was done because we lacked sample size to conduct a more fine-grained analysis. This approach assumes the relationship between outcomes and each additional fidelity item completed within a component is linear (i.e., the relationship between fidelity and outcomes is the same if you go from completing 1 fidelity item to 2 fidelity items as it would be if you went from completing 5 fidelity items to 6 fidelity items). It is possible that the relationships are not linear.

The reader should also be aware that for the BP meeting, DM meeting, and post-DM meeting activities components, the distribution of the component scores showed that many cases (close to, or greater than half) either had all or none of the fidelity items within that component completed. This means that the relationships documented for these components were driven heavily by a move from no fidelity items completed to all fidelity items completed.

As a result, these results can only be interpreted at broad levels (i.e., greater fidelity is associated with better/worse outcomes). It would be inappropriate to use these results to estimate a change in expected outcomes given the completion of one additional fidelity item.

Table G1. Associations between fidelity components and achievement of legal permanency

	Model 1 (n=111)	Model 2 (n=98)
Discovery and engagement activities	1.00 (0.02)	1.14** (0.05)
Assessments	1.01 (0.02)	1.14** (0.05)
Child and family prep	1.00 (0.01)	1.09 (0.05)
BP meeting	0.95* (0.03)	0.33*** (0.09)
DM meeting	1.02 (0.04)	2.65*** (0.72)
Post-DM meeting activities	1.02 (0.02)	0.97 (0.03)
Team member relationships	1.00 (0.01)	0.98 (0.07)
Accounts for time/case status?	Yes	Yes
Accounts for child/case characteristics?	No	Yes

Figures presented are sub-hazard ratios from a competing risks survival analysis model. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

Model 2 controlled for all characteristics presented in Table 2 (child/case characteristics) except prepared for the adoption process (since it is only available for CSR cases), and reason for entry into foster care (due to the inability of the model to converge with the variable included).

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

Table G2. Associations between fidelity components and obtaining a commitment to legal permanency

	Model 1 (n=111)	Model 2 (n=98)
Discovery and engagement activities	1.00 (0.01)	1.02 (0.03)
Assessments	1.07** (0.03)	1.45** (0.17)
Child and family prep	1.01 (0.01)	0.99 (0.02)
BP meeting	0.92** (0.03)	0.75** (0.08)
DM meeting	1.10** (0.04)	1.42** (0.19)
Post-DM meeting activities	1.00 (0.01)	0.93 (0.05)
Team member relationships	0.96* (0.02)	0.89** (0.04)
Accounts for time?	Yes	Yes
Accounts for child/case characteristics?	No	Yes

Figures presented are odds ratios from a logistic regression model. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

Both models controlled for the length of time between FF opening and FF closure.

Model 2 controlled for all characteristics presented in Table 2 (child/case characteristics) except prepared for the adoption process (since it is only available for CSR cases), and reason for entry into foster care (due to a failure of the model to converge).

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

Table G3. Associations between fidelity components and obtaining a commitment to relational permanency

	Model 1 (n=111)	Model 2 (n=98)
Discovery and engagement activities	1.00 (0.02)	1.01 (0.03)
Assessments	1.04 (0.03)	1.03 (0.03)
Child and family prep	1.01 (0.02)	1.02 (0.02)
BP meeting	1.00 (0.02)	1.00 (0.03)
DM meeting	1.03	1.06

	(0.02)	(0.05)
Post-DM meeting activities	1.02	0.99
	(0.01)	(0.03)
Team member relationships	0.95*	0.94
	(0.02)	(0.03)
Accounts for time?	Yes	Yes
Accounts for child/case characteristics?	No	Yes

Figures presented are odds ratios from a logistic regression model. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

Both models controlled for the length of time between FF opening and FF closure.

Model 2 controlled for all characteristics presented in Table 2 (child/case characteristics) except prepared for the adoption process (since it is only available for CSR cases), and reason for entry into foster care (due to perfect prediction issues).

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

Table G4. Associations between fidelity components and ever experiencing a stepdown

	Model 1 (n=104)	Model 2 (n=94)
Discovery and engagement activities	1.00	1.00
	(0.01)	(0.01)
Assessments	0.99	1.03
	(0.01)	(0.03)
Child and family prep	0.99	1.01
	(0.01)	(0.01)
BP meeting	1.01	0.99
	(0.01)	(0.01)
DM meeting	0.98	0.99
	(0.01)	(0.02)
Post-DM meeting activities	1.03**	1.01
	(0.01)	(0.02)
Team member relationships	1.01	1.00
	(0.01)	(0.02)
Accounts for time/case status?	Yes	Yes
Accounts for child/case characteristics?	No	Yes

Figures presented are sub-hazard ratios from a competing risks survival analysis model. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

Model 2 controlled for all characteristics presented in Table 2 (child/case characteristics) except prepared for the adoption process (since it is only available for CSR cases).

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

Table G5. Associations between fidelity components and improvements in permanency readiness

	Model 1 (n=72)	Model 2 (n=62)
Discovery and engagement activities	0.003*	0.003*
	(0.001)	(0.001)
Assessments	-0.001	-0.0004
	(0.003)	(0.003)
Child and family prep	0.001	0.002
	(0.001)	(0.001)

BP meeting	-0.002 (0.001)	-0.001 (0.002)
DM meeting	0.005* (0.002)	0.005* (0.002)
Post-DM meeting activities	-0.002 (0.002)	-0.003 (0.002)
Team member relationships	0.003 (0.002)	0.002 (0.003)
Accounts for time?	Yes	Yes
Accounts for child/case characteristics?	No	Yes

Figures presented are coefficients from an OLS regression model. Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

Both models controlled for length of time between PRM surveys.

Model 2 controlled for all characteristics presented in Table 2 (child/case characteristics) except prepared for the adoption process (since it is only available for CSR cases), and reason for entry into foster care (due to perfect prediction issues).

*p<0.05; **p<0.01; ***p<0.001

Appendix H

Variable Definitions

The variables defined in this section are those that warrant additional explanation beyond what was provided in the main body of the report.

Medical/Developmental or Behavioral Impairments

Defined as a social worker believes the child has developmental disabilities, is deaf or hard of hearing, is blind or visually impaired, is physically disabled, is emotionally disturbed, has a learning disability, has a medical condition, has a substance abuse problem, is considered an undisciplined child, or is a delinquent child. A child was also marked as having a medical/developmental or behavioral impairment if they have been formally diagnosed as having a mental, visual/hearing, physical, emotional, or other disability.

Note that only data on formal diagnoses were available for children from the previous evaluation, therefore it is inappropriate to compare the current study cases to the old study cases. The statistically significant differences between groups in Table 2 only apply to Tier 1, Tier 2, Tier 3 and CSR cases. However, when one compares all five groups using a variable that only accounts for the formal diagnoses, the same patterns emerged (previous study cases had a higher prevalence of disabilities than Tier 1 and Tier 2 cases).

Ever Experienced a Stepdown

This variable was based on the variable Living_Arrangement_Type_Code from the North Carolina administrative data. It was coded dichotomously. If a child made any move from a higher level placement to a lower level placement during the study period, the child was coded as having stepped down his or her placement (for instance, a move from a Level 7 Small congregate-care setting to a Level 5 Non-relative's home was considered a stepdown). The placements were categorized as follows, based on the value of the placement setting field in the administrative data. (Moves to several placement types were disregarded in the creation of this variable, including placements where Living_Arrangement_Type_Code= 59 (Childrens Camp), 76 (Runaway), 98 (Respite), and 99 (Other).)

1. Parents' home: Living_Arrangement_Type_Code=50
2. Parents' home – temporary: Living_Arrangement_Type_Code=75 (Trial home visit)
3. Relative's home: Living_Arrangement_Type_Code=66 (Adoptive Home (Relative)),52 (Home of Relative),71 (Family Foster Home, Relative)
4. Relative's home – specialized: Living_Arrangement_Type_Code=73 (Specialized Family Foster Home, Relative)
5. Non-relative's home: Living_Arrangement_Type_Code=65 (Adoptive Home (Non-relative)), 67 (Adoptive Home (Foster Home)), 51 (Home of Legal Guardian), or 56 (Family Foster Care Home)

6. Non-relative's home – emergency, specialized or therapeutic: Living_Arrangement_Type_Code=60 (Specialized Family Foster Care Home (DSS)), 53 (Therapeutic Home (MH/DD/SAS), or 70 (Emergency Shelter)
7. Small congregate-care setting: Living_Arrangement_Type_Code=55 (Residential School), 68 (Maternity Home), 57 (Small Group Home (Residential)), 58 (Small Group Home (Treatment
8. Independent living: Living_Arrangement_Type_Code=64 (Independent Living Arrangement)
9. Large congregate-care setting: Living_Arrangement_Type_Code=61 (Large Group Facility (Residential)), 62 (Large Group Facility (Treatment)), 63 (Hospital), 54 (Dept of Juvenile Justice & Del Prevention), 69 (Jail, Lock-up, Detention Facility)

Experienced a Move from Non-relative to Relative Care

This variable was based on the variable Living_Arrangement_Type_Code from the North Carolina administrative data. It was coded dichotomously. If a child made any move from non-relative care to relative care during the study period, the child was coded as 1. Analysis of this variable was only conducted on children that were in non-relative care at FF/CSR opening. The placements were categorized as follows, based on the value of the placement setting field in the administrative data. (Moves to several placement types were disregarded in the creation of this variable, including placements where Living_Arrangement_Type_Code= 59 (Childrens Camp), 76 (Runaway), 98 (Respite), and 99 (Other).)

- Relative care:
 - Parents' home: Living_Arrangement_Type_Code=50
 - Relative's home: Living_Arrangement_Type_Code=66 (Adoptive Home (Relative)),52 (Home of Relative),71 (Family Foster Home, Relative)
 - Relative's home – specialized: Living_Arrangement_Type_Code=73 (Specialized Family Foster Home, Relative)
 - Parents' home – temporary: Living_Arrangement_Type_Code=75 (Trial home visit)
- Non-relative care or unknown:
 - Non-relative's home: Living_Arrangement_Type_Code=65 (Adoptive Home (Non-relative)), 67 (Adoptive Home (Foster Home)), 51 (Home of Legal Guardian), or 56 (Family Foster Care Home)
 - Non-relative's home – emergency, specialized or therapeutic: Living_Arrangement_Type_Code=60 (Specialized Family Foster Care Home (DSS)), 53 (Therapeutic Home (MH/DD/SAS), or 70 (Emergency Shelter)
 - Small congregate-care setting: Living_Arrangement_Type_Code=55 (Residential School), 68 (Maternity Home), 57 (Small Group Home (Residential)), 58 (Small Group Home (Treatment
 - Independent living: Living_Arrangement_Type_Code=64 (Independent Living Arrangement)
 - Large congregate-care setting: Living_Arrangement_Type_Code=61 (Large Group Facility (Residential)), 62 (Large Group Facility (Treatment)), 63 (Hospital), 54 (Dept of Juvenile Justice & Del Prevention), 69 (Jail, Lock-up, Detention Facility)

This variable could over count the moves from non-relative care to relative care because the non-relative care status includes the placements where relative status is unknown (such as “home of legal guardian”).

Knowledge of Family History

This variable was based off answers to family history related questions in the Permanency Readiness Measure (see Appendix I for a copy of the instrument). The variable was created by summing the responses to the following questions:

- Youth discusses birth history
- Youth identifies elements of his or her family culture, history & traditions and those of the different families the youth has lived with
- Youth identifies own traits, abilities & interests & how these relate to birth family
- Youth gives an explanation of how he/she came into care with some accuracy
- Youth explains why he/she is unable to live with birth parents
- Youth discusses foster care history
- Youth gives an account of history of losses experienced through foster care

For each question, the response options were not observed (0), partially observed (0.50), fully observed (1), and not applicable. Not applicable responses were counted as 0. After summing the responses, we then divided the sum by the number of non-N/A and non-missing responses. This resulted in a number between 0 and 1 that represents the percentage of total possible points, with higher values indicating more knowledge of family history.

Change in knowledge of family history was calculated by subtracting the child’s first family history score from the child’s last (or most recent) score. Change in knowledge was only measured if the two PRMs were taken at least 90 days apart.

Overall Permanency Readiness

This variable was based off answers to family history related questions in the Permanency Readiness Measure (see Appendix I for a copy of the instrument). The variable was created by summing the responses to all 20 of the questions on the PRM.

For each question, the response options were not observed (0), partially observed (0.50), fully observed (1), and not applicable. Not applicable responses were counted as 0. After summing the responses, we then divided the sum by the number of non-N/A and non-missing responses. This resulted in a number between 0 and 1 that represents the percentage of total possible points, with higher values indicating more permanency readiness.

Change in permanency readiness was calculated by subtracting the child’s first permanency readiness score from the child’s last (or most recent) score. Change in permanency readiness was only measured if the two PRMs were taken at least 90 days apart.

Appendix I

Permanency Readiness Measure

	Not Observed	Partially Observed	Fully Observed	Not Applicable
Youth can answer "Who am I?"		Sum Score _____		
Youth discusses birth history	0	.50	1	N/A
Youth identifies elements of his or her family culture, history & traditions and those of the different families the youth has lived with	0	.50	1	N/A
Youth identifies own traits, abilities & interests & how these relate to birth family	0	.50	1	N/A
Youth talks about his or her feelings	0	.50	1	N/A
Youth can answer "What happened to me?" Youth demonstrates trust		Sum Score _____		
Youth gives an explanation of how he/she came into care with some accuracy	0	.50	1	N/A
Youth explains why he/she is unable to live with birth parents	0	.50	1	N/A
Youth discusses foster care history	0	.50	1	N/A
Youth gives an account of history of losses experienced through foster care	0	.50	1	N/A
Youth can answer "Where am I going?" Youth displays attachment behaviors		Sum Score _____		
Youth discusses feelings about the past and present people and caregivers in his or her life	0	.50	1	N/A
Youth expresses love & loyalty for parents	0	.50	1	N/A
Youth discusses differences in love for parents and their capacities for parenting	0	.50	1	N/A
Youth can explore "How will I get there?"		Sum Score _____		
Youth shows appropriate affection to caregivers	0	.50	1	N/A
Youth has age appropriate friends	0	.50	1	N/A
Youth picks up on cues on how to behave	0	.50	1	N/A
Youth asks permission from caregiver to engage in activities	0	.50	1	N/A
Youth displays discriminate affection	0	.50	1	N/A

	Not Observed	Partially Observed	Fully Observed	Not Applicable
Youth can show appropriate remorse when caught doing something wrong	0	.50	1	N/A
<i>Youth explores "When will I know I belong?" Youth can express safety, security and belongingness with new family</i>	Sum Score _____			
Youth identifies family who is committed to him or her	0	.50	1	N/A
Youth verbalizes self as part of new family	0	.50	1	N/A
Youth verbalizes future with these family connections	0	.50	1	N/A

Appendix J

Child and Adolescent Needs and Strengths Assessment

CHILD AND ADOLESCENT NEEDS AND STRENGTHS (CANS)					COMPREHENSIVE- 5+					
Please ✓ appropriate use: <input type="checkbox"/> Initial <input type="checkbox"/> Reassessment <input type="checkbox"/> Transition/Discharge					Date: <input type="text" value="M"/> <input type="text" value="M"/> <input type="text" value="D"/> <input type="text" value="D"/> <input type="text" value="Y"/> <input type="text" value="Y"/>					
Child's Name		DOB		Gender		Race/Ethnicity				
Current Living Situation: _____					Signature _____					
Assessor (Print Name): _____					Relation _____					
Caregiver Name: _____										
LIFE DOMAIN FUNCTIONING					CAREGIVER STRENGTHS & NEEDS					
0 = no evidence of problems 2 = moderate					○ Not applicable – no caregiver identified 0 = no evidence 2 = moderate needs					
1 = history, mild 3 = severe					1 = minimal needs 3 = severe needs					
	NA	0	1	2	3	NA	0	1	2	3
Family	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Supervision	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Living Situation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Involvement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Recreational	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Job Functioning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Organization	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Developmental ¹	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Social Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Legal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Residential Stability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Medical	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Physical	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Physical	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mental Health	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sexuality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Substance Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sleep	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Developmental	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
School Behavior	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Safety	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
School Achievement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
School Attendance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
YOUTH STRENGTHS					YOUTH BEHAVIORAL / EMOTIONAL NEEDS					
0 = centerpiece 2 = identified					0 = no evidence 1 = history or sub-threshold, watch/prevent 2 = causing problems, consistent with diagnosable disorder 3 = causing severe/dangerous problems					
1 = useful 3 = not yet identified										
	NA	0	1	2	3	NA	0	1	2	3
Family	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Psychosis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Interpersonal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Impulse / Hyper	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Optimism	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Depression	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Educational	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Anxiety	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vocational	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Oppositional	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Talents / Interests	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Conduct	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Spiritual / Religious	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Adjustment to Trauma ²	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Community Life	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Anger Control	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Relation Permanence	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Substance Use ³	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Resiliency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Resourcefulness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
ACCULTURATION					YOUTH RISK BEHAVIORS					
0 = no evidence 2 = moderate needs					0 = no evidence 2 = recent, act					
1 = minimal needs 3 = severe needs					1 = history, watch/prevent 3 = acute, act immediately					
	NA	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	
Language	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Suicide Risk	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Identity	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Self Mutilation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ritual	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other Self Harm	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cultural Stress	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Danger to Others ⁴	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
						Sexual Aggression ⁵	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
						Runaway ⁶	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
						Delinquency ⁶	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
						Fire Setting ⁷	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
						Social Behavior	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

MODULES

- ¹ go to DD Module
- ² go to Trauma Module
- ³ go to SUD Module
- ⁴ go to Violence Module
- ⁵ go to SAB Module
- ⁶ go to Runaway Module
- ⁷ go to JJ Module
- ⁸ go to FS Module

See Back for
Module Scoring