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SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This report provides new findings on three outcome areas within the Roots and Wings Initiative: 1) systems change to promote concurrent planning and permanency (Staff Permanency Survey results), 2) recruitment and licensing outcomes, 3) Resource home questionnaire results, and 4) long-term outcomes related to permanency, placement stability and sibling placements.

Overall, there are a number of indicators that are changing in the intended direction, suggesting that Roots and Wings activities are influencing key outcomes. In particular, findings in this report indicate:

- **Staff philosophy, knowledge and skills around permanency are improving or remaining steady compared to 2012 survey results:**
  - There is a continuing shift in staff attitudes toward acceptance of a broader range of permanency outcomes compared to baseline data (pre-2011).
  - Staff knowledge of permanency practices increased in 2013 to its highest measured level.
  - Staff perception of their skills in implementing permanency practices increased in 2013 (in comparison to 2012), and remained higher than baseline data (pre-2011).

- **Recruitment and licensing outcomes are improving:**
  - The number of heads-of-household attending resource parent orientations has increased from 55 in 2009 to 134 in 2012 (the last calendar year). Data through October 2, 2013 indicate 84 heads-of-household have attended a resource parent orientation. These data indicate steady increases in orientation attendance.
  - Data comparing 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012 indicate that the total number and the percentage of heads-of-household progressing through the recruitment and licensing process are increasing steadily.
  - The total number of newly licensed homes has also increased during the time of Roots and Wings Implementation from 13 in 2008-2009 (baseline data) to 20 in 2012-2013.
  - Findings from the Staff Permanency Survey indicated that staff perceive an improvement in their ability to find placements for teens and sibling sets.

- **Long-term outcomes related to permanency and placement stability continue to improve:**
  - Overall the rate of adoption within 24 months has increased from 11.5% at the time of R&W implementation to just over 15% in the last available quarter, and the overall
permanency rate for children 6-12 is markedly improved (from about 50% at implementation to almost 80% in the last available quarter). For children in long-term care, the rate of exits to guardianship has increased from about 3% to over 7%. Placement stability has also improved, with one and two-year stability rates increasing since implementation, with distinct increases in the one-year rate for very young children and children 6-12.

- **Resource home questionnaire results indicate resource parents are accessing supports and also have continuing needs:**
  
  o The majority of families (51.7%) responded that they had clothing for their foster children most of the time and 85.1% reported having the food they need most of the time.
  
  o Of those families with school age children, 43.5% stated that their foster children participate in extracurricular activities most of the time, while about a third (39.1%) stated their foster children participated sometimes. Just over half of these families reported that they provided a lot of homework support, and about one third (32%) reported they provided a little assistance. Approximately 28 percent reported that their foster children were not performing well in school.
  
  o Nearly 62% are working with a foster/relative mentor and 51% are using respite services and 67% reported utilizing support groups.
OVERVIEW OF INITIATIVE

The Santa Cruz County Roots and Wings initiative has completed its final year of implementation. The overall goal of the Initiative is to improve permanency and stability for children in care. The primary means by which the Initiative aims to improve these outcomes is by providing a comprehensive model of recruitment and support services for resource families in Santa Cruz County.

The initiative pursues several courses of action aimed at achieving these goals.

• **General recruitment activities.** These include a marketing campaign involving developing relationships with businesses, a general media campaign, incentives to caregivers for referrals, moving orientations into the community, and the institution of a comprehensive engagement process by which those individuals who indicate interest in caregiving are supported throughout the application and licensure process by Initiative personnel.

• **Targeted recruitment activities for high removal communities.** These include hosting events at Family Resource Centers in these communities, conducting outreach at existing community events in these communities, and initiating a media campaign for older youth and siblings.

• **Child-specific recruitment activities and services.** These include developing practices to find and secure permanent placements for older youth, convening consultation/review group meetings to help social workers move toward permanency with these children, and instituting family finding at the detention hearing.

• **Systems-change to promote concurrent planning / permanency.** Activities in this area include: Revision of policy and procedures, providing behaviorally based case plan training, developing and distributing a set of guiding permanency principles, providing training on permanency principles, facilitating values discussions, initiating adoptions presentations at unit meetings, and creating systems work groups to solve system issues contributing to permanency hurdles.

• **Enhanced resource family support, training, and services.** These include developing a training guide on permanency work for social workers and mandating training, holding acknowledgement and support events for caregivers, streamlining licensing/adoptions procedures, providing permanency funds to support placements, developing community volunteer supports, and providing one-on-one support and outreach from Liaisons.

The essential elements of the initiative are detailed in the Logic Model as “Core Services” (see Figure below). The logic model also outlines the short-term, intermediate, and long-term outcomes initiative activities are anticipated to affect.
Roots and Wings Logic Model

Core Services

**General Recruitment (Public Awareness/Marketing Campaigns)**
- Developing relationships with businesses
- General media campaign
- Incentive award system
- Orientations in community
- Following up with people who attend orientation and do not complete an application

**Targeted Recruitment Activities for High Removal Communities**
- Host events at FRCs in these communities
- Conduct outreach at existing community events
- Media campaign for older youth and siblings

**Child-Specific Recruitment Activities & Services**
- Finding and securing a permanent plan for older youth
- Consultation/review group convenes to help social workers move toward permanency
- Family finding at detention hearing

**Enhanced Resource Family Support, Training, Services**
- Training guide on perm. work so SW can do it
- Increased acknowledgement/support events
- Streamlined licensing/adoptions procedures
- Icebreaker meetings
- Permanency funds to support placements
- Wings – community volunteer supports
- One-on-one support and outreach from Liaisons
- Kin caregivers attend Caregiver’s College w/ child care

**Systems Change to Promote Concurrent Planning / Permanency**
- Revision of policy and procedures
- Behaviorally based case plan training
- Developed and distributed set of guiding permanency principles
- Training on permanency principles
- Values discussions
- Adoptions presentations at unit meetings
- Systems work groups to solve system issues contributing to permanency hurdles

S/T Outcomes

Increased recruitment of resource families

I- Outcomes

Increased # of approved resource homes willing to provide concurrent planning

L/T Outcomes

Reduced time to permanency

Increased exits of older youth to a permanent placement

More siblings placed together

Fewer placement disruptions

Resource families have improved morale, coping skills and satisfaction

Increased retention of resource families

Shift in staff members’ philosophy regarding permanency

Improve in staff members’ knowledge & skills around permanency

Improved community and agency support of resource families

Increased # of licensed resource homes reflective of CW population (older youth, siblings & targeted communities)
OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION

The evaluation of the Roots and Wings initiative has the primary aim of tracking outcomes outlined in the logic model achieved under the initiative and comparing these to baseline data when possible. As noted in previous reports, the Roots and Wings Initiative is a county-wide operation, so there is no comparison group available. Instead, we track outcomes likely to be affected by initiative activities over time, and look for changes in outcome indicators subsequent to implementation of the initiative. This type of research design cannot establish that changes in outcomes are due to the intervention, but any notable change in the expected direction provides evidence in support of the hypothesis that the program has had its intended effect.

All levels of outcomes are tracked: short term, intermediate, and long term. Some outcomes have several indicators identified.Indicator measures come from a variety of data sources, including a staff permanency survey, a resource parent satisfaction survey, internal agency data on recruitment and licensing, and data from CWS/CMS available from the Performance Indicators Project at the Center for Social Services Research at UC Berkeley. Some of the indicators have measures that closely capture the construct of interest; for other outcomes only a relatively rough proxy is available.

In the report, each outcome is listed, the indicators used to measure it are detailed, and any findings are reported.

Overview of Evaluation Activities within this Report

Systems Change to Promote Permanency and Concurrent Planning

Outcomes related to systems change to promote permanency and concurrent planning are reflected in findings from the Staff Permanency Survey that are intended to measure staff members’ philosophy, knowledge and skills around permanency. The Staff Permanency Survey was developed in collaboration with FCS, based on literature in the field and in consultation with federal consultants. Data were collected in 2011, 2012 and 2013. In 2011, the survey was administered on-line to the population of social workers in the county. Because the county hoped to gain a sense of the impact of their initiative activities, we utilized a “then-test” or “retrospective pre-test” design, in which survey participants first respond to a set of questions about their current beliefs or knowledge, and immediately afterwards (during the same survey administration) respond to the identical set of questions but in regards to a previous time period. The pre-2011 and post-2011 findings are compared to findings collected in July 2012 and August 2013 (see Appendix A for survey methods, questions and full data report for 2012 and 2013).

Recruitment and Licensing Outcomes

Recruitment and licensing outcomes are being measured with an agency data system. Staff began entering data into this system in March 2012. All data from the new system (through October 2,
2013) was used in this report. These data were merged with the dataset that was used for the 2012 final evaluation report. Data from 2009, through October 2, 2013 were used to track orientation attendance and data from 2009 through 2012 were used to track progress through the recruitment pipeline (from orientation to licensure).

**CSSR data summary and analysis**

Long-term indicators related to permanency, placement stability, and sibling placements are measured with data from the UCB CSSR Performance Indicators website. In addition, the agency provided supplementary data from Safe Measures for several outcomes, which we incorporated into the findings.

**Other ongoing evaluation activities:**

**Caregiver Satisfaction Survey 4th administration**

Results from the 4th administration of the Caregiver Satisfaction Survey (2012) were presented in the April 2013 progress report and will be included in the Final Evaluation Report to be submitted in December 2013.

**Data presentations**

Several presentations were given to FCS and initiative staff to review and discuss evaluation findings and their implications. In addition a member of the evaluation team (Kathy Lemon) and the R&W Grants Manager (Melissa Delgadillo) presented an overview of the Roots and Wings Evaluation at a national child welfare conference (“One Child, Many Hands: A Multidisciplinary Conference on Child Welfare”) on June 14, 2013 in Philadelphia.
Roots and Wings Logic Model with Evaluation Results

**Core Services**
- General Recruitment (Public Awareness/Marketing Campaigns)
- Targeted Recruitment Activities for High Removal Communities
- Child-Specific Recruitment Activities & Services
- Systems Change to Promote Concurrent Planning/Permanency
- Enhanced Resource Family Support, Training, Services

**S/T Outcomes**
1. Increased recruitment of resource families
   - A. ✔ Total Number of heads-of-household attending resource parent orientations in the county comparing 2009-2013
   - C. ✔ The number of newly licensed foster homes 2008-2013

2. Shift in staff members' philosophy regarding permanency
   - A. ✔ Score on Permanency Attitudes scale [Staff Survey]

3. Improvement in staff members' knowledge & skills around permanency
   - A. ✔ Score on Permanency Knowledge scale [Staff Survey]
   - B. ✔ Score on Permanency Skills scale [Staff Survey]

4. Improved community and agency support of resource families
   - A. ✔ % of caregivers referred to community resources [#25 on Caregiver Survey]
   - B. ✔ Score on “Perceived Support” scale [Caregiver Survey]

**I- Outcomes**
1. Increased # of approved resource homes willing to provide concurrent planning
   - A. ✔ % of caregivers indicating willingness to adopt [item #4 on Caregiver Survey]
   - B. ✔ % of caregivers indicating they considered becoming forever family to child [#29 on Caregiver Survey]

2. Increased # of approved resource homes reflective of cw population (older youth, siblings & targeted communities)
   - A. ✔ % of workers able to find placements for teens [#26 of Staff Survey]
   - B. ✔ % of workers able to find placements for sibling sets [#27 of Staff Survey]
   - C. ✔ % of caregivers who are caring for child’s siblings [#6A of Caregiver Survey]
   - D. O % of workers able to find appropriate placements for children who speak English only

3. Resource families have improved morale, coping skills and satisfaction
   - A. ✔ % of caregivers able to find child care [#27 on Caregiver Survey]
   - B. ✔ Score on “Satisfaction” scale [Caregiver Survey]
   - C. Descriptive findings from the Resource Homes Questionnaire

**L/T Outcomes**
1. Reduced time to permanency
   - A. O % of children entering care attaining permanent home within 24 months [CSSR]
   - B. ✔ % of children in care 24+ months attaining permanent home within 12 months [CSSR]

2. Increased exits of older youth to a permanent placement
   - A. O % of children entering care 13 or older attaining permanent home within 24 months [CSSR]
   - B. O % of children in care 24+ months 13 or older attaining permanent home within 12 months [CSSR]

3. More siblings placed together
   - A. O % of children placed with some or all siblings [CSSR]

4. Fewer placement disruptions
   - A. O % of children entering care with 2 or fewer placements at 1, 2 & 3 years [CSSR]
   - B. O % of children entering care with 2 or fewer placements at 1 year, by age [CSSR]

5. Increased retention of resource families
   - A. % of caregivers indicating an intent to continue caregiving

---

**Key**
- ✔ = Outcome is changing in the intended direction
- X = Outcome is changing in the opposite direction as intended
- O = No change or no clear trend
- B = Baseline (cannot see change yet)
- Yellow highlight indicates new findings in this report
SHORT-TERM OUTCOMES

The short-term outcomes of the Roots & Wings Initiative are the first stages of change in the logic model.

Through a public awareness marketing campaign, targeted recruitment activities for high removal areas, and child-specific recruitment activities, FCS aims to increase the number of resource families recruited. Through activities aimed at promoting concurrent planning and permanency, FCS aims to shift staff members’ attitudes to broaden their notion of permanency beyond reunification, and to increase their knowledge and skills in terms of pursuing alternative permanent placements such as adoption and guardianship. And through a set of enhanced supports to resource parents, and outreach to the community on their behalf, FCS aims to improve supports for resource families from the community as well as from the agency itself.

Short-term Outcome 1: Increased recruitment of resource families
Short-term Outcome 2: Shift in staff attitudes regarding permanency (broader definition)
Short-term Outcome 3: Increase in staff knowledge and skills around permanency
Short-term Outcome 4: Increased community and agency support of resource families

Short term Outcome 1: Increased recruitment of resource families

Measures

Indicator B: The number of heads-of-household remaining in the recruitment pipeline at each point (merged dataset).

Indicator C: The number of newly licensed homes 2008 – 2013 (agency data)

Findings

The number of households attending an orientation to learn about becoming a foster home increased since the start of the Roots and Wings initiative. The chart below shows the number of households attending an orientation in the last 5 calendar years. There has been marked increase in orientation attendance since 2009. The highest number in a full calendar year was 2012, with approximately 130 households attending an orientation.
Overall, during Roots and Wings implementation, there has been a 140% change in households attending orientation between 2009 and 2012 indicating very positive results for the orientation recruitment efforts.

**Figure 1: Head-of-household attendance at orientation**  
(2013 data is through Oct. 2, 2013)

Indicator B: **The percentage of heads-of-household remaining in the recruitment pipeline at each point INCREASE**

Another indicator of successful recruitment activities is reflected in the number and percentage of heads-of-household progressing through the licensure process to become licensed. Data comparing 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012 indicate that the total number and the percentage of heads-of-household progressing through the recruitment and licensing process is increasing (see Figure 2):

- In 2009, of the 55 heads-of-household who attended an orientation, 16 went on to complete PRIDE (29%), and among those who completed PRIDE, 8 became licensed (50%). All 8 have had a child placed with them (100%).

- In 2010, of the 87 heads-of-household who attended an orientation, 30 went on to complete PRIDE (34%), and among those who completed PRIDE, 15 became licensed (50%). Among those 15, 11 have had a child placed with them (73%).

- In 2011, of the 93 heads-of-household who attended an orientation, 37 went on to complete PRIDE (40%) and among those who completed PRIDE, 20 became licensed (54%). Among those 20, 13 have had a child placed with them (65%).
• In 2012, of the 132 heads-of-household who attended an orientation, 41 went on to complete PRIDE (31%) and among those who completed PRIDE, 16 (39%) became licensed. Data on placement is not available.

![Figure 2: Number of Heads-of-household progressing through the recruitment & licensing process](image)

**Indicator C: The number of newly licensed homes 2008 – 2013 INCREASE**

A primary measurement for the success of recruitment and licensure activities is the number of newly licensed homes. In Table 1 the number of newly licensed homes in the last county fiscal years is displayed. Please note this does not include homes licensed in prior years (new homes only). Since the start of the grant recruitment activities, which began in 2009/10 there has been an increase in newly licensed foster homes as demonstrated in Table 1. The fiscal year with the highest number of newly licensed homes was 2011/12 with 24 new homes.

**Table 1: Number of New Licensed Foster Homes by Fiscal year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Short-term Outcome 2: Shift in staff attitudes toward a broader definition of permanency

Staff attitudes, knowledge and skills were measured with a Permanency Survey that was developed for this evaluation. During the first administration of the Permanency Survey (in 2011) a “then-test” or “retrospective pre-test” design was used. This type of survey asks participants to first respond to a set of questions about their current beliefs or knowledge (referred to as “post-2011” in this report), and immediately afterwards (during the same survey administration) respond to the identical set of questions but in regards to a previous time period (referred to as “pre-2011” in this report).

In 2013, the population consisted of active social workers and supervisors in the county (n=52). Participants were invited to complete a paper-and-pencil survey by a member of the evaluation team during regularly scheduled unit meetings during the month of August. An incentive of a $5 gift card was provided to people who completed a survey. A total of 36 surveys were completed for a response rate of 69% (up from 38% in 2011 and 51% in 2012). See Appendix A for additional details about the study methods, sample characteristics, and full data summary.

Indicators A1-A6: Items 2, 3, 5, 10, and 18 on the Staff Permanency Survey (SPS).

2. Reunification is always the best form of permanency
3. After 12 months of reunification services, if there is a hope that a family will reunify within the next 6 months, then the parent should be granted another 6 months of reunification services
5. If parents do not reunify with their children, legal guardianship should be pursued before adoption, so that the birth parents maintain their ability to reunify should they become able to in the future
10. If a child has a placement that is loving and stable but the caregivers cannot commit to permanency, it’s better to leave the child there than to search for a new home that will commit to permanency
18. Concurrent planning can interfere with reunification

These items were intended to capture workers’ attitudes toward different forms of permanency. Scores on each item could vary from 1-5. A higher score suggests a reunification over other forms of permanency; a lower score suggests acceptance of a broader range of permanency outcomes, or a greater emphasis on permanency over reunification. For the most part, response scores from prior to the initiative (pre-2011) were higher than responses subsequent to the initiative, indicating a decrease in the strong preference for reunification since R&W implementation. Scores have not continued to decrease, and four of the five items appear to show a slight upward trend since the initial drop - but scores have stayed lower than pre-2011 scores.
Short-term Outcome 3: Increase in staff knowledge and skills around permanency

Indicator A:  **Knowledge**: Score on a composite measure assessing staff members’ knowledge of agency practice and child welfare phenomena

The knowledge measure included questions about actual policies and practices of the agency as well as various child welfare phenomena (for example: “Children eligible for the Adoption Assistance Programs are eligible for Medical”). There were 7 questions on the measure, and thus scores could vary from 0 (all incorrect) to 7 (all correct). The average knowledge score has been increasing over time, with the highest score obtained in the most recent administration of the survey. See Appendix A for specific details on each knowledge question.
Indicator B: **Skills: Score on a measure combining 10 questions assessing staff members’ skills in permanency practices**

The skills measure was composed of statements assessing the respondents’ confidence employing various best practices in concurrent planning and permanency work (for example, “I am skilled at communicating to resource parents the importance of permanency in order to encourage them to consider becoming a concurrent home”). There were 10 items on the measure, each with a possible answer from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree); thus scores could vary from 10-50, with higher scores indicating greater skill (or greater confidence in skills). Scores have increased subsequent to R&W implementation, with gains appearing to be persistent.

**Figure 5. Staff Skills in Permanency Practice**

Intermediate Outcome 2: **Number of approved resource homes willing to care for older youth / siblings / special populations**

Measure: Scores on single-item measures on the SPS assessing the perceived availability of homes for teens, siblings, and English-speaking children **INCREASE**

For each population, this outcome was measured with a single-item on the SPS: “I am able to find appropriate placements for [group].” Possible answers ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), with higher scores indicating greater ease of finding placement homes. Across all populations, the perceived availability of homes increased in the most recent administration of the survey. For teens and siblings, the increase was part of a consistent trend over time, with perceived availability increasing each year. For English speaking placements, the increase was slight and not part of a trend, though the starting score was highest for this group. For teen placements, the most recent average score was still below a 3 (neutral) indicating that most
respondents are still reporting challenges in finding teen placements; however, the perceived difficulty appears have lessened substantially over time.

![Figure 6. Perceived Availability of Foster Homes for Special Populations](image)

**Intermediate Outcome 3: Morale, coping skills and satisfaction of resource parents**

**Measures**

**Indicator A:** *Coping skills:* The percentage of caregivers able to find child care; item 25 on the 2012 Caregiver Satisfaction Survey *COMPLETED – SUMMARY OF RESULTS TO BE INCLUDED IN FINAL REPORT*

**Indicator B:** *Satisfaction:* A score on a scale measuring satisfaction; scale composed of items 13, 14, 18, 24, and 26 on the 2012 Caregiver Satisfaction Survey *COMPLETED – SUMMARY OF RESULTS TO BE INCLUDED IN FINAL REPORT*

**Indicator C:** *Findings from the Resource Home Questionnaire.* Descriptive results from the Resource Home Questionnaire.

A questionnaire was internally developed to better understand the on-going needs of resource parents. The primary purpose of the questionnaire is to assist and shape sustainability efforts of resource parent support in the last year of the grant funding. Questionnaires were provided to resource families by the Resource Parent Liaisons. In 2012 and 2013, a total of 87 resource families completed a Resource Home Questionnaire.

**Findings**

Among respondents, approximately 30% were non-kin caregivers and 54% were relative caregivers (with the remaining respondents not answering this question). The majority of respondents (59.7%) had at least one foster child age 5 or under, 42.5% had at least one child age
6 to 13, 18.4% had at least one child age 13-16 and 7% had at least one child age 17 or over. Approximately 41% of the respondents had biological children in the home.

The majority of families (51.7%) responded that they had clothing for their foster children most of the time and 85.1% reported having the food they need most of the time. Of those families with school age children, 43.5% stated that their foster children participate in extracurricular activities most of the time, while about a third (39.1%) stated their foster children participated sometimes. Just over half of these families reported that they provided a lot of homework support, and about one third (32%) reported they provided a little assistance. Approximately 28 percent reported that their foster children were not performing well in school.

Forty percent of families take their foster children to counseling twice a month, one third take them twice a week, and 21.8% do not take their foster children to counseling. The majority (65.2%) of families with biological children in the home reported that their biological children sometimes become frustrated or have conflicts with their foster children more than they would expect.

Nearly 68% of respondents reported having regular contact with the biological parents. Among respondents, 43.4% reported that the biological families of the children in their care are no longer receiving CWS services. For the families that reported that the biological families are no longer receiving CWS services, most (81.8%) reported they are providing a permanent home for the foster children in their care.

Nearly 62% are working with a foster/relative mentor and 51% are using respite services and 67% reported utilizing support groups.

Respondents were asked open ended questions on the challenges and benefits of fostering. Primary themes noted as challenges included parenting and/or supporting children’s behavioral needs and coordination with providers. A common theme described in the benefits of fostering was the emotional rewards of being with grandchildren/relatives and providing care for children in foster care. A summary of these key findings follows.

The majority of comments on the challenges of fostering focused on child/youth special needs or behavioral issues. Examples include:

- “Caring for a child with mental disabilities can be difficult at times”
- “Grandchild has anger problems & can be violent & demanding. Have difficulty dealing with his out bursts”
- “Early defiance/acting out in school, immature behaviors @ home & school-ADHD, Anxiety Disorders
- “Mood difficulties/special needs”
• “Confrontive, adversarial behavior; brain wiring issues-undetermined; inability to initiate child into home, he has need to keep school, home, & relative separate; lack of child's socialization w/peers & me
• “Having to care for 4 grandchildren has been challenging & tiring. The most difficult part is that they are all different ages & stages”
• “Anger management; need teen parenting support”
• “Caring for a child with mental disabilities can be difficult at times”
• “It is difficult to take care of child with emotional problems and mental temperature especially when there's other children at home.”
• “My 'daughter' is behind, developmentally, cannot/does not meet all appropriate expectations but there is/has been no work and/or effort to help and/or educate, learn her up to an appropriate level and now w/AB12, well, it is incredibly frustrating, often disappointing”

Another theme in the challenges comments highlighted the difficulties of coordination of services, and difficulties in communication with service providers:

• “Communication between RP & S/W. S/W does not call, reply to emails, or follow-up”
• “Difficulty understanding & knowing who to contact for certain needs or questions. Don't know what services are available, embarrassed to ask for help. Have experienced being helped by rude people”
• “Finding qualified respite; financial aid for extracurricular activities for child”
• “My 'daughter' is behind, developmentally, cannot/does not meet all appropriate expectations but there is/has been no work and/or effort to help and/or educate, learn her up to an appropriate level and now w/AB12, well, it is incredibly frustrating, often disappointing”
• “Receiving assistance from therapist. More communication w/teen's mental health worker, not aware of service plan/goals of mental health; have plan for all other kid”
• “Just difficulty with CCS therapist. We are not on same page and I believe my child would benefit with more PT and respite hours. He is special needs and unable to do anything for himself”
• “More communication w/teen's mental health worker, not aware of service plan/goals of mental health; have plan for all other kids”
• “New to this, still trying to figure out what services are available.”
• “The child is 5 years old and still does not know the # 1-10 or A-G. Information and learning not retained, I want you to make evaluation.”

Resource parents also answered an open-ended question on the benefits of fostering.
One of the key themes among the benefits comments involved relatives detailing that they were happy to care for their relatives. Examples include:

- “Have the opportunity to take care of [my] grandchildren”
- “I know my grandchildren are safe with me and I can take care of them”
- “Happy to take care of grandchild. Don’t want grandchild to be placed in foster care”
- “Get to be grandchildren every day & know what's happening”
- “I am very happy to see my grandchildren, the keep me company and bring happiness to my life”
- “Grateful to be able to keep them home with family”
- “I have the opportunity to help and care for my nephew”
- “I’m happy to be there for my grandson”

Another central theme focused on the emotional rewards of fostering. Some examples include:

- “Helped me grow as a mother to understand children w/emotional needs - very touching role.”
- “So happy to share our family”
- “It is a blessing to serve these children and work with them to give them a loving, stable environment”
- “Keeps me young!”
- “It's amazing to have little ones again”
- “Knowing that the kids have stable environment even though I want to cry a lot”
- “My confidence has grown a lot through parenting classes...I learned to re-parent”
- “I would like to become a foster parent again, very good experience”
- “Changed their life after 17 years of life, the benefits is the happiness the girls bring”
- “We learn from the children, they help you analyze difficult situations in other children. A child's smile is worth being a resource parent”
- “My work and work colleagues are very supportive of my fostering other resource parents are awesome and great sources for info, questions, and resources.”
LONG TERM OUTCOMES

As detailed in the logic model, Roots & Wings (R&W) initiative efforts are intended to affect important long terms outcomes of 1) decreased time to permanency, 2) increased exits to permanency for older youth, 3) more siblings placed together, 4) fewer placement disruptions, and 5) increased retention of resource families. The first four of these outcomes are measured with several indicators drawn from the California Child Welfare Indicators Project at U.C. Berkeley. Data from the 3 years prior to the initiative provides a baseline to compare outcomes achieved after Roots & Wings (R&W) implementation, represented by a red line (see Appendix B for methodological details).

Long-term Outcome 1: Reduced time to permanency

Measure A: Percentage of children entering care, in permanent homes within 24 months (CSSR Measure C1.3)

The first indicator shows the percentage of children entering care over a 6 month period who attain a permanent home within 24 months. While there does not appear to be an increase overall in the 24 month permanency rate compared to the baseline period, there does seem to be a slight but steady increase since R&W implementation, fueled by an increased in adoption, up from 11.4% in January 2010 to 15.1% at the last available timepoint (see Figure 7). In raw numbers,

![Figure 7: % of children entering care, in permanent home within 24 months](image)

Measure B: Percentage of children still in care at 24 months, attaining permanent home within the next 12 months (CSSR Measure C3.1)

While early permanency is important, it is also critical to help children who have spent a longer time in care attain permanency. The next indicator represents the percentage of all children still in care after 24 months who attain a permanent home within the next 12 months. While the rate has
varied, it does appear to have increased slightly overall after R&W implementation, and there has been a distinct increase in the proportion of these children exiting to guardianship (see Figure 8).

**Figure 8: % of children in care 24+ months, in permanent home within 12 months**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Adoption</th>
<th>Guardianship</th>
<th>Reunification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Long-term Outcome 2: Increased exists of older youth to permanency**

**Measure A: Percentage of children entering care, in permanent homes within 24 months, by age (CSSR Measure C1.3)**

A particular focus of the initiative is on permanency and home-finding for older youth. To examine the circumstances for these youth, we consider how Long-term Outcome 1 indicators vary by three age groups of children: children 5 and under, children 6-12, and children 13-18. In general, children 0-5 are more likely to attain permanency than are older youth: roughly 70-80% of children 0-5 attain permanency by 24 months, compared to approximately 60% of children 13-18 (see Figure 9). While there is no apparent increase in the rate for the youngest and eldest children since the implementation of R&W, there is a distinct increase for children 6-12, from about 50% in January 2010 to almost 80% at the last available time point.

**Figure 9: % of children entering care, in permanent home within 24 months, by age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-12</th>
<th>13+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measure B: Percentage of children in care at 24 months or longer, in permanent home within 12 months, by age (CSSR Measure C3.1)

After 24 months, the difference by age in the rate at which children attain permanency becomes more stark. Although the number of very young children still in care after 24 months is too low for trends to be discerned, still the rate is almost always higher for this group compared to children 6-12 and 13-18. An upward trend for children 6-12 begun before the initiative appears to have continued through R&W implementation.

Long-term Outcome 3: More siblings placed together

Measure A: Percentage of children with siblings who are placed with some or all siblings, by placement type and ethnicity (CSSR Measure Siblings)

Providing enhanced services and supports to caregivers is intended to increase the numbers of caregivers willing and able to care for sibling sets, and so increase the percentage of children placed with siblings. The relevant indicator is a point-in-time measure of the percentage of children with siblings in care who are placed with some or all of those siblings. There are no clear changes in this measure, considered either by placement type or ethnicity (see Figures 11 & 12).
Long-term Outcome 4: Fewer placement disruptions

Measure A: Percentage of children entering care with 2 or fewer placements at one year, by years in care (available through CSSR Measure Placement Stability [Entry Cohort] in Caseload)

Enhanced supports to caregivers are also intended to decrease placement disruptions. The indicator measuring this outcome calculates the percentage of children in care for one, two or three years who have had two or fewer placements during their time in care. The long-term nature of this measure means we are unable to examine outcomes after R&W implementation for children in care.
3 years. However, placement stability rates for children at one and two years in care appear to have increased after R&W implementation, reversing a downward trend (see Figure 13).

Figure 13: Percentage of children with 2 or fewer placements, by time in care

Measure B: Percentage of children entering care with 2 or fewer placements at one year, by age (available through CSSR Measure Placement Stability [Entry Cohort] in Caseload)

In general, a lower degree of stability is found for older children, but the low numbers of these children in care at one year limit our ability to identify trends. One year placement stability rates have been improving since R&W implementation for children 0-5 and 6-12 (see Figure 14).

Figure 14: Percentage of children with 2 or fewer placements at one year in care, by age

Because these measures do not capture children in care for less than one year, we also include a point-in-time measure of the percentage of children in care less than 12 months who had two or fewer placements, by age. It shows an increase in the placement stability rate subsequent to R&W implementation for children 0-5, but no change for children 6-12, and a possible slight decline for children 13+ (see Figure 15).
Figure 15: Percentage of children in care less than one year, with 2 or fewer placements, by age
IMPLICATIONS OF FINDINGS

The data presented in this report suggest four main implications:

- **General recruitment activities appear very effective in increasing the number of heads-of-household who attend an orientation**

  Orientation attendance data indicate that the number of heads-of-household attending resource parent orientations has increased from 55 to 2009 (baseline, prior to Roots and Wings implementation) to 134 in 2012 (the last full calendar year). These data suggest that **general recruitment activities** implemented through the Roots and Wings Initiative are effective in increasing the number of people who attend an orientation.

  General recruitment activities include: a general media campaign that included print, radio, TV and internet advertising; a marketing campaign that involved developing relationships with businesses and community groups; an incentive program that provided gift cards to people who referred others to an orientation (with increasing incentives as the person progressed through the process) and conducting orientations in the community (rather than at the child welfare agency offices).

- **Specialized support and assistance through the licensing process also appears very effective in increasing the number and percentage of heads-of-household progressing through the licensing process**

  In addition to increases in orientation attendance, there have also been accompanying increases in the number of heads-of-household who are completing PRIDE, becoming licensed and having a child placed with them. These data suggest that **specialized support and assistance** provided by the Resource Family Specialist, and other county staff throughout the process of licensure is effective. These supports may include a variety of types of assistance, such as helping people complete required forms or obtaining needed documents, being available to answer questions throughout the process, identifying needed community resources (i.e. child care, after school programs, etc...), and other assistance as needed.

- **Systems-level changes to promote concurrent planning and permanency appear successful in most areas.**

  Overall, the data regarding staff members’ beliefs, skills and knowledge about permanency suggest that initiative training activities have had positive effects. Changes in permanency
beliefs, skills and knowledge have occurred after implementation, and for the most part, are either continuing to move in the intended direction, or continuing as a persistent change. These findings suggest that systems-change activities to promote a broader acceptance of a range of permanency options and practices are largely being maintained or improved.

- **Long-term outcomes show continued improvement in most areas**

Overall, information from the CSSR data provide evidence of slight to moderate improvement in several long-term outcomes set as goals for the R&W initiative. Overall the rate of adoption within 24 months has increased from 11.5% at the time of R&W implementation to just over 15% in the last available quarter, and the overall permanency rate for children 6-12 is markedly improved (from about 50% at implementation to almost 80% in the last available quarter). For children in long-term care, the rate of exits to guardianship has increased from about 3% to over 7%. While there has been no discernable increase in the percentage of children living with siblings, placement stability has improved, with one and two-year stability rates increasing since implementation, with distinct increases in the one-year rate for very young children and children 6-12.
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Staff Permanency Survey Methods and Data Summary

Methods
In 2013, the population consisted of active social workers and supervisors in the county (n=52). Participants were invited to complete a paper-and-pencil survey by a member of the evaluation team during regularly scheduled unit meetings during the month of August. An incentive of a $5 gift card was provided to people who completed a survey. A total of 36 surveys were completed for a response rate of 69% (up from 38% in 2011 and 51% in 2012). Table 1 contains information on the characteristics of the sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant’s Unit</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigations Unit</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Unit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forever Families</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Bob Lewis training or consultation in last 12 m</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A survey was developed via an iterative and collaborative process with agency staff and research team members, with consultation from the federal evaluation consultant Eliot Graham. The survey was developed and incorporated into the evaluation contract after implementation of the initiative. During the first administration of the Permanency Survey (in 2011) a “then-test” or “retrospective pre-test” design was used. This type of survey asks participants to first respond to a set of questions about their current beliefs or knowledge referred to as “post-2011” in this report), and immediately afterwards (during the same survey administration) respond to the identical set of questions but in regards to a previous time period (referred to as “pre-2011” in this report). Within the survey were demographic questions, questions regarding workers’ knowledge, skills, and beliefs, and questions related to resource home availability.

Staff attitudes: An attempt was made to use a scale composed of average scores across items # 2,3,4,5,10 and 18 from the survey, but this was abandoned due to low alphas. Instead, these items are presented individually. Scores on each item could vary from 1-5, with a higher score...
indicating a preference for reunification over other forms of permanency and a lower score indicating acceptance of a broader range of permanency outcomes.

**Staff knowledge:** To measure workers’ knowledge, a composite measure was created consisting of the total number correct of 7 items assessing workers’ knowledge of agency policies and child welfare phenomena: #1, 6, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25. In 2011, each of the 7 items in the measure was a statement with a Likert-like scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) as a response option. Each item was coded “correct” if the respondent indicated she or he agreed or strongly agreed with correct statements, and disagreed or strongly disagreed with incorrect statements. In 2012 and on, knowledge questions were changed to True/False questions and a correct answer was scored as a “1.” The knowledge score consisted of the total number of correct items, ranging from 0-7.

**Staff skills:** To measure workers’ skills, a composite measure was created composed of the sum of scores from items # 7, 8,9,12,13,14,16,17,21, and 22 from the survey, intended to assess workers’ confidence employing various practices in concurrent planning and permanency work. Each of the 10 items on the measure was a statement with a Likert-like scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) as a response option. For example, “I am skilled at communicating to resource parents the importance of permanency in order to encourage them to consider becoming a concurrent home.” The Skills score consisted of the sum of the 10 items, with higher scores indicating greater skill (or confidence in skills).

Item #15 (“The county as a clearly defined concurrent planning policy and procedure”) is presented individually in the appendix.

**Limitations**
The response rate for the survey was 69%, the highest across administrations of the survey. Of course, it is possible that respondents may differ in important and unknown ways from non-respondents, and the result may not accurately represent the perspectives of non-respondents.

### SCALES AND COMPOSITE MEASURES FROM STAFF PERMANENCY SURVEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>TRUE</th>
<th>FALSE</th>
<th>MISSING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. If parental rights are terminated, it is unlikely that children or youth would continue to have contact or a relationship with their birth parents REVERSE CODED</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(8.3%) (91.6%)}
6. A child that has been removed from the home should be referred to a secondary worker (from the Forever Families Unit) when the case is initially opened (Item #7 in 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>MISSING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(86.1%)</td>
<td>(11.1%)</td>
<td>(2.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Children eligible for the Adoption Assistance Program are eligible for MediCal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>MISSING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(83.3%)</td>
<td>(11.8%)</td>
<td>(5.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Foster children can lose their eligibility for a number of important higher education grants or financial aid opportunities if they are adopted REVERSE CODED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>MISSING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13.9%)</td>
<td>(80.6%)</td>
<td>(5.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. A Forever Families Team worker can provide an assessment of caregivers to determine if they are able or desire to adopt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>MISSING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(94.4%)</td>
<td>(2.8%)</td>
<td>(2.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. A Forever Families Team worker can provide an assessment of the top two or three relatives for placement in order to determine the best concurrent/permanent plan for a child

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>MISSING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(83.3%)</td>
<td>(11.1%)</td>
<td>(5.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. The secondary worker (Forever Families Team worker) makes the final decision regarding whether a home is a good match for a child

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>MISSING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(33.3%)</td>
<td>(58.3%)</td>
<td>(8.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SKILLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SKILLS</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
<th>MISSING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. I am skilled at communicating to resource parents the importance of permanency in order to encourage them to consider becoming a concurrent home</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (2.8%)</td>
<td>5 (13.9%)</td>
<td>19 (52.8%)</td>
<td>11 (30.6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am skilled at communicating to resource parents that if they are not able to commit to being a permanent placement, then other permanency options will need to be pursued</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (5.6%)</td>
<td>3 (8.3%)</td>
<td>20 (55.6%)</td>
<td>11 (30.6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sometime resource parents hope to adopt the child in their care, but reunification is likely or a real possibility. In these situations, I am skilled at communicating to caregivers on a monthly basis the birth parent’s progress toward reunification, and supporting the caregivers in dealing with the implications of this situation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (2.8%)</td>
<td>3 (8.3%)</td>
<td>24 (66.7%)</td>
<td>17 (19.4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. When searching for a permanent home for a child, I consult with the child about what he or she thinks and wants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (2.8%)</td>
<td>2 (5.6%)</td>
<td>20 (55.6%)</td>
<td>13 (36.1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for a child, I talk to the current resource parents to determine their level of commitment to permanency for the child

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Reunification is always the best form of permanency</td>
<td>6 (16.7%)</td>
<td>10 (27.8%)</td>
<td>8 (22.2%)</td>
<td>6 (16.7%)</td>
<td>6 (16.7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. After 12 months of reunification services, if there is a hope that</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 (22.2%)</td>
<td>5 (13.9%)</td>
<td>17 (47.2%)</td>
<td>6 (16.7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a family will reunify within the next 6 months, then the parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should be granted another 6 months of reunification services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It is more important for children to have a permanent home than it</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (16.7%)</td>
<td>7 (19.4%)</td>
<td>18 (50.0%)</td>
<td>5 (13.9%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is for them to stay within their own communities REVERSE CODED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. If parents do not reunify with their children, legal guardianship</td>
<td>12 (33.3%)</td>
<td>19 (52.8%)</td>
<td>4 (11.1%)</td>
<td>1 (2.8%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should be pursued before adoption, so that the birth parents maintain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their ability to reunify should they become able to in the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. If a child has a placement that is loving and stable but the</td>
<td>7 (19.4%)</td>
<td>17 (47.2%)</td>
<td>6 (16.7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caregivers can't commit to permanency, it's better to leave him or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>her there than to search for a new home that will commit to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permanency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Concurrent planning can interfere with reunification</td>
<td>8 (22.2%)</td>
<td>15 (41.7%)</td>
<td>7 (19.4%)</td>
<td>6 (16.7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Supply of Resource Homes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supply of Resource Homes</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. I am able to find appropriate placements for teens</td>
<td>2 (5.6%)</td>
<td>12 (33.3%)</td>
<td>16 (44.4%)</td>
<td>5 (13.9%)</td>
<td>1 (2.8%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I am able to find appropriate placements for siblings</td>
<td>2 (5.6%)</td>
<td>4 (11.1%)</td>
<td>10 (27.8%)</td>
<td>13 (36.1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I am able to find appropriate placements for children who speak English only</td>
<td>1 (2.8%)</td>
<td>8 (22.2%)</td>
<td>10 (27.8%)</td>
<td>15 (41.7%)</td>
<td>2 (5.6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Added for 2012 (Skills)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Added for 2012 (Skills)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. I know how to prepare a child/youth for moving to a permanent home.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (16.7%)</td>
<td>6 (16.7%)</td>
<td>20 (55.6%)</td>
<td>4 (11.1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Not Used in Composite Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Used in Composite Measure</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 The county has a clearly defined concurrent planning policy and procedure</td>
<td>1 (2.8%)</td>
<td>5 (13.9%)</td>
<td>11 (30.6%)</td>
<td>15 (41.7%)</td>
<td>4 (11.1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments

2. It depends.
3. Need more that "hope"
4. In some circumstances, this could be true, depending on the family--their engagement in services and their success.
5. If under 3, parents entitled to 6 months if substantial prob. of return then extend to 12 months. For older children, I feel it is important for their voice to be heard re: what they feel is an appropriate perm. plan esp. with teens, this can cre
6. Degrees of connection to community vary depending on age and attachment. For older children, I feel it is important for their voice to be heard re: what they feel is an appropriate perm. plan esp. with teens, this can cre
7. A lot of these questions depend on the age of the child
8. I do not feel that guardianship is giving kids permanency
9. On question 3, my opinion is directly related to the age of the child, a young child should not have to wait past 12 months for permanency.
10. Question 6 needs a sometimes answers as per our policy, not all cases are assiged a secondary worker
11. Reunification services should only be offered after 12 months if there is a high likelihood that the parents can reunify in that time frame.
12. #10 it depends.
13. #10: Depends on situation, relationship & age of child
14. #10: strongly agree for an older youth. #12: I will consult with youth if they are older, say 11 years and up. #15: The county needs to focus more on initial dependency and concurrent planning
15. #17: Typically not possible during the initial steps.
16. 10 & 12: Depends on age of child
17. 14: I am usually not involved at this stage of the process, but I do attend difficult case staffings and provide input
16: I do not work at this end. I do not have info to talk to family monthly, although believe it should be done. 10: This is something that is case by case
17: Some parents choose to not be involved.
A lot of these questions do not pertain to my current position as you do not do these things in all units
Many times the bio parents do not want their relatives to know their situation and for this reason they don’t talk to them about their children being in foster care. The search for relatives is often difficult.
Questions 8 to 17 do not pertain much to ER decision making. Adoptions and ongoing make these assessments.
The county has a plan, but does not always follow it
#18: It can, but doesn't have it. #25: I believe it is more than just that one worker. #26, & 27 I am able to do this, but it is hard because of our lack of options
#18: it can interfere or negatively influence a parent who is vulnerable during the crisis of removal. #26 to #28: Still a BIG problem
#25 It is a team effort to who is a good match
18. Sometimes resource families or relatives can interfere with the reunification process. Willfully or unintentionally.
19: Do not know the answer to this. 25: I believe there is more to it than that, yes, they have a decision in it—but dept. decides.
20: I don't really know. 25: We make the decision as a team (most of the time)
20. There are other opportunities available
24. According to current policy, the front-end workers are to determine the top 2 or 3 placements
25: It's a collaborative effort. 22. I am not involved in the case at this place in the process. 27. Relatives are usually more willing to take on siblings
26 to 28: Sometimes, not always
26. Not enough homes for teens. 27. Need more homes that are interested in concurrency for sibs.
26. Permanent homes for teens are so limited
If the Forever Families unit does not assign a SW to the child, the ongoing SW must assess the relatives. (#24)
In my experience as an ER worker, family members have usually come forward requesting placement, and requesting concurrency.
I have not had to utilize foster homes for long term placement thus far.
Santa Cruz County has limited placement options, especially for teenagers
We need to improve efforts as a dept. to secure not just concurrent, but even regular foster homes for older children
Appendix B

Methodological details for long-term outcome data

Outcomes were measured using publically available data provided by the California Child Welfare Indicators Project housed at the Center for Social Services Research (CSSR) at the University of California at Berkeley (http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare/). In partnership with the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), CSSR reconfigures administrative child welfare data to enable California counties to report outcomes to CDSS for accountability purposes. For long-term outcomes, data were collected in September 2013 from the CWS/CMS 2013 Q1 data extract for all entries in care 8 days or more. For most outcomes, the indicators used reflect the related federal outcome measures. For placement stability, we also use an alternative measure that provides a more accurate understanding of performance. The federal measure groups together children with varying amounts of time in the system, which overestimates the proportion of children with 2 or fewer placements at each time point, and makes the measure vulnerable to distortion based on changing population dynamics. The alternative measure examines children’s placement number at exactly the time point of interest.

In considering these results, it is important to understand the limitations of this type of data for assessing outcomes. First, these are observational data of a population over time, and many other variables beyond the control of the agency, and/or other than initiative-related activities, may have caused or contributed to changes. Additionally, the relatively small size of the foster care population limits the reliability of the trend lines for some indicators. When a small number of children make up the population, there is too much variability in the proportion of children experiencing the outcome from time period to time period for trends to be reliably determined. However, data do provide evidence supporting the conclusion that practice changes initiated by R&W have resulted in positive improvements in some long-term outcomes for children and youth in foster care in Santa Cruz.
### RESOURCE HOME QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

Table 1. Resource Home Questionnaire Results (N=87)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Type of home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-kin caregiver</td>
<td>26 (29.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kin caregiver</td>
<td>47 (54.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1. At least one foster child 5 or younger</td>
<td></td>
<td>52 (59.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2. At least one foster child 6 to 13 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>37 (42.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.3. At least one foster child ages 14 to 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 (18.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.4. At least one foster child age 17 or older</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total foster children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47 (54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23 (26.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9 (10.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 (4.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 (3.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Total biological children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51 (58.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17 (19.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 (6.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7 (8.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. How often do you have the clothing you need?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>45 (51.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>40 (46.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>2 (2.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How often do you have the food you need?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>74 (85.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>13 (14.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you have school-age children? Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>70 (81.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A. How often does child participate in extracurricular activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>30 (43.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>27 (39.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>12 (17.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B. How much do you assist with homework?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>38 (55.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>22 (31.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>9 (13.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D. Are there any children not performing well</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 (27.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. How often do you take the child to the doctor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Do any children need to go to the doctor more? Yes

6. How often do you take the child to counseling?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2x/month</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2x/week</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3x/week</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How often do you take the child to visit family?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2x/month</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2x/week</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3x/week</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. How often do your biological children become frustrated with the foster children in your care, beyond typical?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11A. If yes, do you provide foster teen with training on skills?

11. Do you have a foster teen?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12A. If no, are you providing a permanent home?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12A. If no, are you involved with providing a permanent home?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Do you have regular contact with birth parent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Do you talk/work with a mentor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Are you using respite?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Do you use support groups?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>