



PUBLIC RESEARCH &
EVALUATION SERVICES

SEMI-ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

For the period

October 1, 2011- March 31, 2012

I-CARE 365

(The Inter-Agency Community Adoption/Foster Family Recruitment Exchange)



Diligent Recruitment Grant
Michigan Department of Human Services

Submitted by:
Public Research and Evaluation Services, Inc.
April 24, 2012

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The **I-CARE 365** project has made significant implementation and outcome progress. During this semi-annual period, October 1, 2011 – March 31, 2012, the project made the following progress toward the goals.

Comprehensive Recruitment Efforts

Project Representatives conducted 13 general and targeted recruitment events during this semi-annual period, of which five were through faith-based partnerships. Recruitment efforts were also conducted at schools and at one of the county offices as part of their National Adoption Day event. As a result of the recruitment efforts that the I-CARE 365 project conducted, 2,500 individuals were reached and 29 individuals expressed an interest in becoming foster or adoptive parents. While this indicates progress toward the goal, the Project Team recognizes this result as indicative of the need to determine what other strategies might be needed to improve this outcome.

Integration of Diligent Recruitment to Facilitate Concurrent Planning

The Service Integration/Coordination Sub-Committee is in the process of developing an integrated model of planning using Michigan Department of Human Services Child Welfare Practice Model, known as MiTEAM. This model emphasizes family, child(ren) and caregiver involvement throughout the planning process. The **I-CARE 365** team will use the Mi-Team model with 10 cases representing the target populations. The Project Director, Project Manager and Service Integration Project Specialist were all trained on the MiTEAM model during the second quarter of this reporting period.

Comprehensive Evaluation

During this semi-annual period, Public Research and Evaluation Services presented what has been learned thus far from the baseline study and the pre-assessment results from the needs assessment process to the Oversight Committee and the Data and Evaluation Sub-Committee (DESC). The DESC experts provided feedback (clarification and challenges) regarding the presented data and promising strategies/next steps for gathering additional baseline/needs assessment data.

During this semi-annual period, the Project Team determined that the training strategies used to prepare individuals for successful parenting of children/youth included in the target audience will be based on information resulting from the Serious Emotional Disturbance (SED-Waiver) Focus Groups. The focus groups, which are part of the comprehensive needs assessment process, will be convened to also determine the support and training needs of staff and families working with children in Michigan's Child Welfare System with an emphasis on adolescents, juvenile sex offenders, youth in residential treatment settings, youth in psychiatric in-patient settings, children with disabilities or other physical needs, African Americans and large sibling groups. Sessions are planned for staff, parents and youth.

Summary

Much of the progress of the **I-CARE 365** project can be attributed to strong collaboration. The **I-CARE 365** team has not only created a strong collaborative atmosphere among the partners, but at the State level as well. The trust and openness of the collaborative partners is evidenced through their effortless teaming and problem solving. The shared focus on *putting the needs of the children/youth first* is evidenced by the discussions and decisions observed at the Oversight Committee meetings. The willingness and support that the Project

Evaluator has experienced in planning the SED Waiver focus groups reveals a cross-system perspective and standard that will be documented as part of the project evaluation. These data will provide important lessons for learning how to sustain a collaborative such as this as well as providing critical aspects for project replication.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary 2

Introduction..... 6

Background..... 6

Overview of Program Model 6

Project Implementation/Process Evaluation 25

 Intervention Goal/Activity No.1 25

 Intervention Goal/Activity No.2 29

 Intervention Goal/Activity No.3 30

Evaluation Update..... 31

 Intervention Goal/Activity No.4 37

Project Outcome Evaluation 38

Contextual Influences, Facilitators, Barriers and Lessons Learned..... 39

References..... 41

Appendix A: SED Waiver Focus Group Questions..... 42

INTRODUCTION

Background

The **I-CARE 365** (The Inter-Agency Community Adoption/Foster Family Recruitment Exchange) project is a multi-faceted diligent recruitment program in Michigan which is designed to recruit, retain, train, utilize, and support a range of resource families for children/youth in Michigan's Child Welfare System with a special focus on juvenile sexual offenders, as well as youth placed in psychiatric treatment facilities and residential settings. To address this special focus population, **I-CARE 365** is collaborating with Havenwyck Center, a component of Havenwyck Hospital which is the largest free standing psychiatric and residential treatment facility in Michigan and located in one of the target counties of the project (Oakland). On average, 20- 45% of all youth in care at Havenwyck are permanent court wards and have no comprehensive permanency plan.

The project is being implemented in Wayne, Oakland, and Macomb Counties. These three counties were selected because they are contiguous, they account for 40% of the children in care and they were already collaborating on a diligent recruitment project with Spaulding for Children. Also at the time of proposal development, Wayne, Oakland, and Macomb had 1,913 children or 31% of all waiting children out of 83 counties.

In addition to the targeted populations mentioned above the, **I-CARE 365** project will focus on adolescents, children with disabilities or other physical care needs, African Americans and large sibling groups

Overview of Program Model

The **I-CARE 365** project is based on the philosophy that recruitment should occur every day. To that end, the project is designed to promote safety, permanence and well-being for

Michigan children and to increase positive permanency outcomes for children by 1) increasing awareness of the need for resource families, 2) improving timely achievement of permanency goals for children, 3) increasing appropriate placement resources for teens, juvenile sex offenders, youth in residential treatment settings, youth in psychiatric in-patient settings, children with disabilities or other physical care needs, African Americans and large sibling groups, and 4) improving customer service and increasing retention rates among newly recruited resource families. As mentioned earlier, the project is being conducted in three counties in Michigan: Oakland, Macomb and Wayne. The goals of the project are to:

- Coordinate and integrate Michigan's many plans to recruit, retain, train, and support resource families for children in Michigan's child welfare system into one comprehensive recruitment and retention plan that is flexible enough to accommodate county specific needs.
- Integrate and coordinate the diligent recruitment program with other programs including foster care case planning and permanency planning processes to facilitate concurrent planning activities.
- Evaluate the implementation of the comprehensive diligent recruitment programs to document processes and potential linkages between diligent recruitment and improved outcomes.

The objectives for each of the goals are presented below in tables 1-4.

Table 1: Goals and Objectives for the I-CARE 365 Project

| Goals | Objectives |
|---|---|
| <p>Coordinate and integrate Michigan’s many plans to recruit, train and support resource families for children in Michigan’s child welfare system into one comprehensive recruitment and retention plan that is flexible enough to accommodate county specific needs.</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assess current need and description of the characteristics of children in care by identifying and reviewing current recruitment plans, all relevant data elements required to develop an informed plan including analysis of AFCARS, the current pool of available foster, kinship, concurrent and adoptive placement resources and other data. 2. Complete a projection of the type of foster, concurrent, kinship and adoptive families that may be needed based on trends for different characteristics and assessments. 3. Assess the current pool of available foster, concurrent and adoptive placement resources. 4. Analyze barriers and current processes of (Department of Human Services) DHS and private agencies to improve customer service and increase retention of prospective foster, concurrent, kinship and adoptive parents to reduce drop-out rates. 5. Develop and provide training to prospective resource parents regarding the characteristics, needs and issues of children who have experienced trauma and removal as well as adoption clinical issues. 6. Explore barriers and identify the strengths of utilizing a “customer service” model in collaboration with AdoptUSKids to retain and respond to kin as well as prospective foster and adoptive parents. |
| <p>Integrate the diligent recruitment program with other programs including foster care case planning and permanency planning processes to facilitate concurrent planning activities.</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assess the current status (barriers and strengths) of DHS Licensing regarding the dual licensure of foster and adoptive homes and determine barriers to implementation in I-CARE 365 counties. 2. Develop and enhance the current “Community Adoption/Foster Recruitment Exchange (CARE) to include representation from the service communities, including business owners, faith-based organizations, resource families and youth that represent the ethnic and cultural make-up of the communities served. 3. Identify representatives from relevant DHS programs to form an Advisory Committee to oversee the implementation and integration of the I-CARE 365 Project into current programs. 4. Assess the strengths and challenges of the existing Concurrent Planning Pilot process, identify barriers and solutions as it relates to the I-CARE 365 recruitment and retention plan. 5. Assess and assist ICARE 365 Agencies in using a family-centered model of concurrent planning with families involved in the child welfare system and strategies to improve performance as needed. 6. Develop methodology to capture successful elements of the project so that it can be replicated in other Michigan counties. |
| <p>Evaluate the implementation of the comprehensive diligent recruitment programs to document processes and potential linkages between diligent recruitment and improved outcomes.</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collect descriptive data on characteristics of individuals and families served, types and nature of needs identified and met, the services provided, measures of client outcomes, child development and well-being. 2. Evaluate data on client satisfaction, parenting skills, parent/child interaction, cost benefit, service utilization and any other information required by the Children’s Bureau. |

Grantees are expected to use a model for designing and managing their project. A logic model is a tool that presents the conceptual framework for a proposed project and explains the linkages among program elements. The logic model for the **I-CARE 365** project is provided on the following page.

| Program Logic Model: I-CARE 365 Process | | Outcomes | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| Goals | Resources/Inputs | Activities/Outputs | Short-Term | Long-Term |
| To integrate current recruitment efforts into a comprehensive Diligent Recruitment program for resource families | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Established Collaborative Preliminary Campaign Public/Private Partnership Experienced Staff | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive Recruitment Retention plan Viable Public/Private relationship Replicable Model of recruitment strategies # and percent of satisfied and retained resource families # of staff DHS and agency staff trained # and percentage of satisfied staff trainees # of training sessions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased numbers of resource families available for children for children with severe behavior problems, adolescents; children with disabilities or other physical care needs; and large sibling groups. Decreased timeliness to permanency Increased youth involvement in recruitment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better placement options to reduce child's wait for permanent home Decrease in the average length of stay for children/youth in care Decrease the number of placements |
| To Integrate Diligent Recruitment into other Child Welfare Programs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Established Concurrent planning and Permanency Projects Policy and Procedures requiring diligent recruitment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coordinated effort among departments working for permanency for children Consistent policy and procedures that support permanency for children | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased crosssystems collaboration and service provision Implementation of philosophy of permanency planning from day child enters care | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If not reunified with family, the Initial placement is the only placement |
| To Implement a rigorous evaluation of project to document process and linkages between recruitment and outcomes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experienced Evaluator already working with CARE Collaborative | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A set of comprehensive tools to collect data Data documented results of the successes and challenges of the Project A data collection process that will support the collection, analysis of data and inform project refinements. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain data to document need for Project | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence that Project goals and objectives lead to better permanency outcomes for children |

Funding Information

The Administration on Children, Youth, & Families (ACYF) - Children's Bureau implements the Adoption Opportunities program to provide discretionary funds for projects designed to eliminate barriers to adoption and to help find permanent families for children who would benefit from adoption, particularly children with special needs. Funds were released by ACYF in October, 2008 (Diligent Recruitment Cluster 1) and 2010 (Diligent Recruitment Cluster 2) for awarding cooperative agreements to develop comprehensive multi-faceted diligent recruitment programs for a range of resource families for children in foster care, including kinship, foster, concurrent, and adoptive families. Michigan State Department of Human Services – Oakland County, Lansing, MI was granted a cooperative agreement as part of Cluster 2 and received \$400,000 annually for five years (2010-2015). The other 2010 grantees are:

- Texas Department of Family and Protective Services, Austin, TX
- State of New Mexico, Santa Fe, NM
- Los Angeles County Department of Children and Family Services, Los Angeles, CA
- Mississippi Department of Human Services, Jackson, MS
- Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, Chicago, IL
- Clark County Department of Family Services, Las Vegas, NV

Each of these projects were expected to develop and submit a "Phase II - Version A" implementation plan during the first year of the grant. This strategy development phase ended September 30, 2011. The implementation plan for the **I-CARE 365** project was submitted in June, 2011 and approved by the Federal Project Officer in August, 2011.

Overview of the Evaluation

Public Research and Evaluation Services, Inc. (PRES) under the direction of Sharonlyn Harrison, PhD, provides evaluation assistance to the **I-CARE 365** (The Inter-Agency Community Adoption/Foster Family Recruitment Exchange). The goal of the evaluation is to measure the effects of project implementation on the safety, permanency and well-being of families in three Michigan counties: Wayne, Macomb and Oakland counties. The evaluation includes sufficient and appropriate rigor to demonstrate potential linkages between project activities and improved outcomes. It will also yield data that can be compared to, and contrasted with, regional State and national Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) data. Evaluation of the **I-CARE 365** is strongly guided by the logic model uses a mixed-methods approach for both process (progress, fidelity and quality of implementation) and outcome data.

Evaluation Methods

Process Evaluation (Progress and Quality of Implementation): The process evaluation examines *progress of implementation*. The purpose of the progress component is to assess the **I-CARE 365**'s status in meeting its goals and objectives and its alignment with the logic model as previously described. This essential component of the evaluation is not intended to be a monitoring activity, but an early and ongoing check by the **I-CARE 365** team and PRES to see if progress is being made on the essential elements/activities. These status checks involve collecting information from key partners and stakeholders during bi-monthly Oversight Committee meetings in order to determine and document progress toward specific goal attainment, while highlighting the strengths and challenges.

The *quality of implementation* component serves a quality assurance function. It is used to examine whether the critical contextual factors of implementation are in place (e.g., the extent to which it utilizes a *customer service model* in collaboration with AdoptUsKids). The process evaluation will also assess the critical elements of the collaborative structure and determine how these partnerships helped to ensure that the identified needs of children and families were met. It is anticipated that all aspects of the process evaluation (progress and quality) will provide information for determination of the linkages among activities and outcomes.

Outcome Evaluation: This aspect of the evaluation process uses a sufficiently rigorous approach to examine how the strategies used in this demonstration project affect key outcomes of interest (e.g., CFSR outcomes) and other outcomes of interest of value to the field of child welfare (e.g., To what extent was there an increase in the number of siblings placed in the same home?) Natural experiment methodology is being used to determine the influence of the project activities on outcomes. According to Rog (1994), natural experiments refer to designs that utilize naturally occurring bases of comparison to control for plausible confounding factors; or designs in which existing information is used to confirm or distinguish these factors as rival explanations for the results. For this evaluation study, the **I-CARE 365** counties (Macomb, Oakland and Wayne) will be compared to counties with similar demographic characteristics, but that are not conducting an integrated and coordinated diligent recruitment effort as described in the proposal. Additionally, there will be a study of type and extent of participation (analogous to a dosage study) to ascertain if level of family involvement has an impact on child outcomes and timeliness to permanency.

Data Collection Procedures

The Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System, as well as other data available to the State, Region, or County and new data capturing instruments, will be used to get descriptive information regarding the characteristics of children in care at baseline and annually. A Resource Family Parent Satisfaction survey will be used to gather information semi-annually regarding participants' satisfaction with services provided by the **I-CARE 365** project. Focus groups and/or interviews will also be conducted annually with resource families to gain a more in-depth understanding of their perceptions of barriers and attitudinal issues that impacted them. Training Feedback Surveys will be developed for gathering feedback from training participants. The surveys will be developed based on an adaptation of 3 of the 4 critical levels of professional development evaluation proposed by Kirkpatrick, 2007. The levels are: 1) Participants' Reaction; 2) Participants' Learning; and 3) Participants' Use of New Knowledge and Skills. Changes in participants' capacity, ability and knowledge will be assessed using a Retrospective Post-then Pre Test Design. This design takes less time, is less intrusive and, for self-reported change, avoids pretest sensitivity and response shift bias that results from pretest overestimation or underestimation (Howard, 1980). In the Retrospective Post-then-Pre design, both before and after information are collected at the same time.

Evaluation Questions

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Administration on Children Youth and Families describes evaluation as a systematic method for collecting, analyzing, and using information to answer basic questions about a program and to ensure that those answers are supported by evidence (The Program Manager's Guide to Evaluation, Second Edition, 2010).

The evaluation questions that will facilitate the process and outcome components are included in the following tables and are categorized. For some of the questions, plans for appropriate data analysis will be confirmed once there is greater knowledge of the data collection processes, availability of the data to the project, formats of the data files and the units of analysis.

| Program Objectives/Goals | Phase(s) | Evaluation Questions | Process or Outcome | Domain | Data Sources | Populations/Sample | Data Analysis |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|--|---------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Comprehensive Diligent Recruitment | I and II | <i>Measure C.14:</i> Of all children who were discharged from foster care to reunification in the 12-month period prior to the target 12 month period, what percent re-entered foster care in less than 12 months from the date of discharge? | O | Impact on permanency outcomes for children | AFCARS data, other data available to the State and county reviewed at baseline and annually | Participating and comparison counties | TBD |
| Comprehensive Diligent Recruitment | I and II | <i>Measure C2.1:</i> Of all children who were discharged from foster care to a finalized adoption during the twelve month target period, what percent were discharged in less than 24 months from the date of the latest removal from home? | O | Impact on permanency outcomes for children | AFCARS data, other data available to the State and county reviewed at baseline and annually | Participating and comparison counties | TBD |
| Comprehensive Diligent Recruitment | I and II | <i>Measure C2.2:</i> Of all children who were discharged from foster care to a finalized adoption during the 12 month target period, what was the median length of stay in foster care in months from the date of latest removal from home to the date of discharge to adoption? | O | Impact on permanency outcomes for children | AFCARS data, other data available to the State and county reviewed at baseline and annually | Participating and comparison counties | TBD |

| Program Objectives/Goals | Phase(s) | Evaluation Questions | <u>Process</u> or <u>Outcome</u> | Domain | Data Sources | Populations/Sample | Data Analysis |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|--|---|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Comprehensive Diligent Recruitment | I and II | <i>Measure C2.4:</i> Of all children who were in foster care on the first day of the 12 month target period, who were in foster care for 17 continuous months or longer, and who were not legally free for adoption prior to that day, what percent became legally free for adoption during the first 6 months of the 12 month target period? | O | Impact on permanency outcomes for children | AFCARS data, other data available to the State and county reviewed at baseline and annually | Participating and comparison counties | TBD |
| Comprehensive Diligent Recruitment | I and II | <i>Measure C3.1:</i> Of all children who were in foster care for 24 months or longer on the first day of the 12 month target period, what percent were discharged to a permanent home by the last day of the 12 month period and prior to their 18th birthday Note: A child is considered discharged to a permanent home if the discharge reason is adoption, guardianship, reunification, or to live with relative. | O | Impact on permanency outcomes for children | AFCARS data, other data available to the State and county reviewed at baseline and annually | Participating and comparison counties | TBD |

| Program Objectives/Goals | Phase(s) | Evaluation Questions | Process or Outcome | Domain | Data Sources | Populations/Sample | Data Analysis |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|---|---------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Comprehensive Diligent Recruitment | I and II | <i>Measure C3.2:</i> Of all children who were discharged from foster care during the 12-month target period, and who were legally free for adoption (i.e., there is a parental rights termination date) at the time of discharge what percent were discharged to a permanent home prior to their 18th birthday? | O | Impact on permanency outcomes for children | AFCARS data, other data available to the State and county reviewed at baseline and annually | Participating and comparison counties | TBD |
| Comprehensive Diligent Recruitment | I and II | <i>Measure C3.3:</i> Of all children who either (1) were prior to age 18, discharged from foster care during the 12-month target period with a discharge reason of emancipation, or (2) reached their 18th birthday while in foster care, but had not been discharged from foster care, what percent were in foster care for 3 years or longer? | O | Impact on permanency outcomes for children | AFCARS data, other data available to the State and county reviewed at baseline and annually | Participating and comparison counties | TBD |
| Comprehensive Diligent Recruitment | I and II | <i>Measure C4.1:</i> Of all children who were served in foster care during the 12-month target period, and who were in foster care for at least 8 days but less than 12 months, what percent had two or fewer placement settings? | O | Impact on permanency outcomes for children | AFCARS data, other data available to the State and county reviewed at baseline and annually | Participating and comparison counties | TBD |

| Program Objectives/Goals | Phase(s) | Evaluation Questions | <u>Process or Outcome</u> | Domain | Data Sources | Populations/Sample | Data Analysis |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|--|----------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Comprehensive Diligent Recruitment | I and II | <i>Measure C4.2:</i> Of all children who were served in foster care during the 12-month target period, and who were in foster care for at least 12 months but less than 24 months, what percent had two or fewer placement settings? | O | Impact on permanency outcomes for children | AFCARS data, other data available to the State and county reviewed at baseline and annually | Participating and comparison counties | TBD |
| Comprehensive Diligent Recruitment | I and II | <i>Measure C4.3:</i> Of all children who were served in foster care during the 12 month target period and who were in foster care for at least 24 months, what percent had two or fewer placement settings? | O | Impact on permanency outcomes for children | AFCARS data, other data available to the State and county reviewed at baseline and annually | Participating and comparison counties | TBD |

| Program Objectives/Goals | Phase(s) | Evaluation Questions | Process or Outcome | Domain | Data Sources | Populations/Sample | Data Analysis |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|--|---------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| Integration and Coordination | II | What linkages between the collaborative partners helped to ensure that the identified needs of children and families were met? | P | Effectiveness of program services and project strategies Efficiency of implementation Changes in recruitment and retention practices | Logic model, Advisory Committee minutes, I-CARE meeting minutes | Oversight and Advisory Committees | Qualitative analysis of process data (interviews, observations, etc. |
| Comprehensive Diligent Recruitment | I and II | By what percentages have the racial and ethnic distribution of approved foster homes changed to more closely mirror the racial and ethnic distribution of children and youth in foster care? | O | Effectiveness of program services and project strategies | State and current and new county data reviewed at baseline and annually | Participating counties | TBD |
| Comprehensive Diligent Recruitment | I and II | By what percentages have the racial and ethnic distribution of approved adoptive homes either awaiting placement of a child or awaiting finalization changed to more closely mirror the racial and ethnic distribution of children and youth in foster care awaiting adoptive placement? | O | Effectiveness of program services and project strategies | Current and new county data reviewed at baseline and annually | Participating counties | TBD |

| Program Objectives/Goals | Phase(s) | Evaluation Questions | Process or Outcome | Domain | Data Sources | Populations/Sample | Data Analysis |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|---------------------------|--|
| Comprehensive Diligent Recruitment | I and II | Does the racial and ethnic distribution of approved foster homes in local jurisdictions more closely mirror the racial and ethnic distribution of children in youth in foster care in that jurisdiction? | O | Effectiveness of program services and project strategies | Current and new county data reviewed at baseline and annually | Participating counties | Chi square goodness of fit prior to the program; chi square goodness of fit after the program. |
| Comprehensive Diligent Recruitment | I and II | By what percentage has the number of placements with relatives increased? | O | Impact on permanency outcomes for children | Current and new county data reviewed at baseline and annually | Participating counties | TBD |
| Comprehensive Diligent Recruitment | I and II | By what percentage has the length of time in care been reduced for children leaving foster care to a permanent placement? | O | Impact on permanency outcomes for children | Current and new county data reviewed at baseline and annually | Participating counties | TBD |
| Integration and Coordination | II | What percentage of families inquiring about relative care, foster, concurrent, or adoptive licensure received a return call within five working days, and by what percentage has this increased? | O | Efficiency of implementation Changes in recruitment and retention practices | Family Feedback Surveys New county data reviewed annually | Participating counties | TBD |
| Integration and Coordination | II | What was the average length of time for home study approval of families inquiring about relative care or foster, concurrent, and adoptive licensure from the time of inquiry, and by what percentage has this decreased? | O | Efficiency of implementation Changes in recruitment and retention practices | New county data reviewed annually | Participating counties | TBD |

| Program Objectives/Goals | Phase(s) | Evaluation Questions | Process or Outcome | Domain | Data Sources | Populations/Sample | Data Analysis |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|---|---------------------------|--|--|---------------------------|---|
| Integration and Coordination | II | What was the average length of time to placement of a child or youth for families approved for relative care or foster, concurrent, and adoptive licensure from the date of the home study approval, and by what percentage has this decreased? | O | Impact on permanency outcomes for children | New county data reviewed annually | Participating counties | TBD |
| Integration and Coordination | I and II | To what extent were there increased numbers of foster, adoptive homes for children with severe behavior problems, adolescents; children with disabilities or other physical care needs and large sibling groups? | O | Effectiveness of program services and project strategies | New county data reviewed annually | Participating counties | TBD |
| Integration and Coordination | II | To what extent was there an increase in the involvement of youth in their own recruitment efforts? | O | Service Utilization | New county data reviewed annually | Participating counties | TBD |
| Integration and Coordination | II | How was increased cross-systems collaboration and service provision achieved? | P | Achievement of Project Objectives | Advisory Committee minutes, I-CARE meeting minutes | Participating counties | Qualitative analysis of process data (interviews, observations, etc.) |

| Program Objectives/Goals | Phase | Evaluation Questions | Process or Outcome | Domain | Data Sources | Populations/Sample | Data Analysis |
|---------------------------------|--------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|---------------------------|---|
| Integration and Coordination | II | How was increased provision of adoption information/re: adoption/foster care achieved? | P | Achievement of Project Objectives | Advisory Committee minutes, I-CARE meeting minutes | Participating counties | Qualitative analysis of process data (interviews, observations, etc.) |
| Integration and Coordination | II | To what extent was there an increase in post adoption support? | O | Effectiveness of program services and project strategies | Advisory Committee minutes, I-CARE meeting minutes | Participating counties | Qualitative analysis of process data (interviews, observations, etc). Repeated measures analysis of variance |
| Integration and Coordination | II | To what extent were there increased training opportunities for DHS and Private agency staff? To what extent were training participants satisfied with the training? | O Output | Effectiveness of program services and project strategies | Advisory Committee minutes, I-CARE meeting minutes | Participating counties | Qualitative analysis of process data (interviews, observations, etc.) Repeated measures analysis of variance |
| Integration and Coordination | II | To what extent was there increased guardianship or permanent placement with paternal and maternal relatives? | O | Impact on permanency outcomes for children | New county data reviewed at baseline and annually | Participating counties | Repeated measures analysis of variance |
| Integration and Coordination | I and II | To what extent was there an increase in the number of siblings placed in the same home? | O | Impact on permanency outcomes for children | New county data reviewed at baseline and annually | Participating counties | TBD |

| Program Objectives/Goals | Phase | Evaluation Questions | Process or Outcome | Domain | Data Sources | Populations/Sample | Data Analysis |
|---------------------------------|--------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| Integration and Coordination | I and II | To what extent was there a decrease in the average length of stay for children/youth in care? | O | Impact on permanency outcomes for children | New county data reviewed at baseline and annually | Participating counties | TBD |
| Integration and Coordination | I and II | To what extent was there an increase in two or fewer placements for children youth in care 12-24 months? | O | Impact on permanency outcomes for children | New county data reviewed at baseline and annually | Participating counties | TBD |
| Integration and Coordination | II | To what extent were families satisfied with services provided? | Output | Client satisfaction | Resource Family Satisfaction Survey, Focus Groups and Interviews | Caregivers in participating counties | Frequencies and descriptive statistics for feedback survey |
| Integration and Coordination | II | To what extent did caregiver/child/youth interactions improve? | O | Caregiver/child youth interactions | NSCS PSI SIPA | Caregivers in participating counties | Repeated measures analysis of variance |
| Integration and Coordination | II | To what extent did caregiver/child/youth parenting skills improve? | O | Parenting skills Child well-being | NSCS | Caregivers in participating counties | Repeated measures analysis of variance |
| Integration and Coordination | II | To what extent was this collaborative effort of a cost-benefit? | P | Cost Benefit | Cost comparison pre and post participation in project | Participating counties | Cost analysis |
| Evaluation of Implementation | II | To what extent is there fidelity to the logic model? | P | Achievement of Project Objectives | Advisory Committee minutes, I-CARE meeting minutes | Participating counties | Qualitative analysis |

| Program Objectives/Goals | Phase | Evaluation Questions | <u>Process</u> or <u>Outcome</u> | Domain | Data Sources | Populations/Sample | Data Analysis |
|---------------------------------|--------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|--|---------------------------|---|
| Evaluation of Implementation | I and II | What, if any, features of the program contributed to achievement of intended and unintended outcomes? | P | Achievement of Project Objectives | Advisory Committee minutes, I-CARE meeting minutes | Participating counties | Correlational analysis, predicting outcomes from participation measures |
| Integration and Coordination | I and II | What were the characteristics of the individuals and families served and the services provided? | P | Service Utilization | New county data reviewed at baseline and annually Resource Family Needs Assessment Resource Family Satisfaction Survey Resource Family Focus Groups | Participating counties | Demographic descriptions; Actuarial descriptions of service utilization |

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION/PROCESS EVALUATION

This section of the report provides information about the progress made on project goals/intervention activities. The proposed goal/activity is listed first, followed by the outputs.

Intervention Goal/Activity No.1

To coordinate and integrate Michigan's many plans to recruit, train and support resource families for children in Michigan's child welfare system into one comprehensive recruitment and retention plan that is flexible enough to accommodate county specific needs.

Outputs

Baseline Study and Projection Efforts

In the prior semi-annual report, the data describing the characteristics of children in care as of March 31, 2011, the 2010 recruitment plans and the pool of available foster, kinship, concurrent and adoptive placement resources as reported in those 2010 plans were presented.

Analysis of the data revealed that in 2011, all of the participating counties experienced a slight decrease in the number of licensed foster homes (Oakland: -4; Macomb: -7; and Wayne: -48). Furthermore, it was revealed that the length of time from initial inquiry to licensure of non-relative homes in each of the counties is as follows (as of March 9, 2012): Oakland: (179 days); Wayne: (273 days); and Macomb (296). Macomb's number was erroneously listed as 2 days in the last semi-annual report.

The next planned steps in finalizing the baseline study are to:

- Determine, if available, the numbers of foster and adoptive homes needed for children with severe behavior problems.
- Obtain characteristics of children in care for 2009 and 2010 for the purposes of determining trends which will be used to form projections regarding the extent of resource families needed.
- Determine the extent of goal attainment for the 2010 licensing goals.

- Plan strategies for annual reassessment of how many families are available and needed.

The Project Team is in the process of scheduling a meeting with the AFPRR Coordinator to address these tasks and others identified through the meeting with the DESC. The outcome of this effort will be reported in the next semi-annual report.

The Comprehensive Recruitment Plan

The Recruitment Events subcommittee received the approved county plans for Oakland, Macomb and Wayne counties in December, 2011. These documents will be used to develop a consolidated plan that includes the planned efforts of the participating counties, private agencies, state regional entities and faith-based organizations.

Project Representatives conducted 13 general and targeted recruitment events during this semi-annual period, of which five were through faith-based partnerships. Recruitment efforts were also conducted at schools and at one of the county offices as part of their National Adoption Day event. As a result of the recruitment efforts that the **I-CARE 365** project conducted, 2,500 individuals were reached and 29 individuals expressed an interest in becoming foster or adoptive parents. While this indicates progress toward the goal, the Project Team will work to determine what other strategies might need to be utilized to achieve greater numbers for this outcome.

Training of Recruiters/Staff of Resource Families

On February 14 and 21, 2012, 146 DHS staff members from Macomb County participated in Spaulding for Children's *Recruitment is Everyone's Business* training. Feedback surveys were completed by n=116 (79.4%) of the participants. Analysis of the data revealed that a large majority of respondents strongly agreed and agreed that the information presented was

easy to understand (80.0%) and that the topic was important (79.6%). Moderate percentages of respondents reported that the information discussed would be useful to them (63.1%) and that the training helped to strengthen their knowledge and skills (66.0%). A lesser percentage, (34.3%), of individuals *strongly agreed* and *agreed* that they were “excited” and “fired up” about the recruitment and retention of Foster Parents.

The participants were also asked to provide suggestions for improving the training. They suggested or commented as follows (presented verbatim):

- *Enjoyed it.*
- *Excellent training.*
- *Liked the first half of the training - very informative - although it tried not to be negative it's good to know what the foster parents don't like.*
- *More idea of how to recruit families while at home visits.*
- *There could be more group discussions.*
- *Talk more about requirements for a foster parent license.*
- *The afternoon presentation was entirely too long. It should have been conducted to one hour. Much of the information was repetitive in sharing the ICARE is a collaborative effort and need for active recruitment.*
- *Give more detail on what CPS interaction with clients should look like in regards to licensing education*
- *Glossary of terms.*

Development of Satisfaction Survey for Current and Foster Parent/Relatives

During the last semi-annual period, the Foster Parent Satisfaction Survey was drafted. In this semi-annual period, discussions between the **I-CARE 365** and PRES teams led to a prioritization of learning about the target populations. To this end, planning of the SED Waiver Focus Groups took precedent. Information regarding these focus groups is included in this

report. However, during the next semi-annual period, the **I-CARE 365** and PRES teams will revise the Foster Parent Satisfaction Survey to not only help the project learn about the experiences of foster parents of both the targeted and general populations of children/youth in foster care, but also the perceptions of families in regards to customer service. The **I-CARE 365** Project Manager attends the AFPRR Coordinator's regional meetings and this group has committed to assisting the project with designing and disseminating the final survey. As previously planned, the survey will also be distributed through MAFAK (Michigan Association of Foster, Adoptive and Kinship Families).

Intervention Goal/Activity No.2

To integrate the diligent recruitment program with other programs including foster care planning and permanency planning processes to facilitate concurrent planning activities.

Outputs

Integration of Diligent Recruitment to Facilitate Concurrent Planning

The Service Integration/Coordination Sub-Committee is in the process of developing an integrated model of planning using the Michigan Department of Human Services Child Welfare Practice Model, known as MiTEAM. This model emphasizes family, child(ren) and caregiver involvement throughout the planning process. The goal is to engage and empower families, children and youth to fully participate and utilize their voice to influence their case planning. This new model will be used, throughout this project, for concurrent planning involving 10 youth from in-patient hospitalization and residential treatment. It is very relevant to **I-CARE 365** because it focuses on 3 core outcomes: safety, well-being and permanence and is designed to engage families in case planning via the *Family Team Meeting* process. This process ensures that all service providers are *at the table*, and that they make referrals for additional service support, engage the child's family, engage any extended/kin relationships, develop permanency goals, include relative search activities, mine existing relationships and provide active recruitment for a permanent home with appropriate adult supports.

During this report period, DHS began training supervisors and permanency planning conference facilitators. Once trained, these individuals are charged with training all frontline staff. Training will be completed for all of the participating counties prior to implementation. The Project Director, Project Manager and Service Integration Project Specialist were all trained on the MiTEAM model during the second quarter of this reporting period.

Intervention Goal/Activity No.3

To evaluate the implementation of the comprehensive diligent recruitment programs to document processes and potential linkages between diligent recruitment and improved outcomes.

Outputs

Data Evaluation and Subcommittee (DESC) Progress

The Data-Evaluation Sub-committee (DESC) met on January 18, 2012. The meeting was convened in person and by conference call. Attendees included representatives from PRES, I-CARE 365 staff and the data units from each of the participating counties. Representatives from the Michigan Department of Human Services (Adoption Foster Parent Recruitment Retention Plans (AFPRR) office) and Michigan Adoption Resource Exchange (MARE) also attended.

During the meeting, Public Research and Evaluation Services presented what has been learned thus far from the baseline study and the pre-assessment results from the needs assessment process. The DESC members also gave their expert comments/recommendations regarding promising strategies/next steps for gathering additional baseline/needs assessment data. These findings and other activities related to the project evaluation are presented below in the Evaluation Update section.

EVALUATION UPDATE

This section provides a status report of the evaluation process as required by the Federal Project Officer.

Changes to the Proposed Evaluation Design

In the original proposal, questions from the CFSR process were included to ensure that this evaluation study had information that can be compared and contrasted to State, Regional and National data. During the planning year, three of the CFSR indicators were deleted from the original evaluation plan included in the proposal because they were related to reunification and that is not the focus of this project. However, C.14 was retained because it measures the percent of re-entry into foster care during the 12 months following the date of discharge to reunification. This measure may be considered an indicator of the child's well-being and quality of service delivered prior to reunification.

During this semi-annual period, the Project Team determined that the training strategies used to prepare individuals for successful parenting of children/youth included in the target audience will be based on information resulting from the Serious Emotional Disturbance (SED-Waiver) Focus Groups. The focus groups, which are part of the comprehensive needs assessment process, will be convened to also determine the support and training needs of staff and families working with children in Michigan's Child Welfare System with an emphasis on adolescents, juvenile sex offenders, youth in residential treatment settings, youth in psychiatric in-patient settings, children with disabilities or other physical needs, African Americans and large sibling groups. Sessions are planned for staff, parents and youth.

Each staff focus group will include a group totaling 10-12 diverse representatives of the child/youth's mental health team. This team is defined as staff members that come in contact with the foster parent or relative caregivers on a regular basis; and are part of their planning process (e.g. The Caseworker, Case Aide, Parenting Support Partner, Wrap-around Worker, Behaviorist, and Respite Care Provider). SED Waiver Coordinators will assist PRES with making contact and recruiting staff respondents and will have a pivotal role in coordination of family and youth involvement.

Parents will be randomly selected for participation in the focus groups. To develop the random sample, each county will provide a numbered list of families who are parenting the target populations. The spreadsheet will include codes for each eligible family and will not include identifiable information. Using this list, PRES will select a stratified random sample (including adolescents, juvenile sex offenders, youth in residential treatment settings, youth in psychiatric in-patient settings, children with disabilities or other physical needs, African Americans and large sibling groups). The selected parent numbers will be provided to the SED Waiver Coordinators who will also notify staff members so that they can contact and notify families. Staff members will also coordinate consent completion and transportation. The random sample will include 10-12 parents per county.

Youth (5-6 per focus group) will be invited to participate using convenience sampling and include representation from the aforementioned target populations. To participate in the groups, the youth must have the cognitive and social capacity/stamina to participate in a 1-2 hour focus group discussion. Both youth that have been successful and not successful with the SED Waiver will be included in the focus group. The Coordinators will ensure youth attendance. A

therapist will be provided in each of the focus groups to assist youth as needed. The tentative focus group questions for each of the groups are included in Appendix A.

Confirmation of the Needs Assessment Participant Group

As discussed above, the evaluation team is in the process of planning focus groups for SED Waiver parents, staff and youth. These efforts will provide the project with data specific to the training, support and resource *needs* of the **target** populations, including for the parents, staff and youth. This is a unique opportunity to contribute much needed data to the project as well as the field of child welfare. The next step for the focus group is submission of the focus group plan to the Institutional Review Board.

Modifications in Proposed Data Collection Procedures

On January 18, 2012, the Data and Evaluation Subcommittee met to discuss the results of the baseline results and to determine next steps for reassessment. Specifically, the DESC is working to determine the most realistic timeline (semi-annually or annually) for collection of data around the CFSR and other similar indicators. To this end, a meeting has been scheduled with the Department of Human Services, AFPRR Coordinator for Wednesday, May 2, 2012. Confirmation of the data collection reassessment timeline will be reported in the next semi-annual report.

Key Accomplishments of the Local Evaluation

There were two key accomplishments during this period. One was the progress made in planning the SED Waiver Focus Groups. The Oversight Committee and SED Waivers from each of the participating counties have been integrally involved in the process

The second key accomplishment is the identification of promising approaches for addressing the data challenges that directly impact the project. The **I-CARE 365** and PRES

teams are pleased with the active involvement of the AFPRR Coordinator and look forward to meeting with her next month to plan effective strategies for data sharing and timely reporting.

Challenges to the Local Evaluation

During this semi-annual period, Public Research and Evaluation Services presented what has been learned thus far from the baseline and needs assessment studies to the Data Evaluation Sub-Committee (DESC) and the Oversight Committee. The DESC experts provided feedback (clarification, challenges and promising strategies) regarding the presented data. These findings are presented below.

- **Baseline Data:**
 - Number of foster homes for special populations as reported in 2010 recruitment plans (includes FY 2009 and 2010)
- **Clarification**
 - Adolescents refers to children/youth 14-17 years
 - Other age groups are 0-3; 4-7; and 8-13 years
- **Challenges:**
 - These data were not reported for Macomb. Representatives reported that they focus on homes that will take all children.
 - For Wayne, 2009 data was not reported for adolescents, sibling groups and children with disabilities.
 - Another challenge indicated during the meeting was that homes may be licensed for several different types of children/youth.
 - Also, it may be difficult to count this data because this information is not always reflective in the licensure documents.
- **Promising Strategies/Next Steps**
 - The Bureau of Child and Licensing (BCAL) has started to track these data since the Modified Settlement Agreement (MSA).
 - The Adoption and Foster Parent Recruitment and Retention (AFPRR) Coordinator indicated that they may have data available that is more accurate. However, they only have 2011 data. She will provide this data for the participating as well as the matched counties (Kent, Washtenaw and Saginaw).
- **Baseline Data:**
 - Licensing goals for special populations reported in 2010 recruitment plans (includes FY 2009 and 2010)
- **Challenges:**
 - Not sure if these data include goals proposed by private agencies.

- Private agencies may recruit and license for more than one county. So their goals may overlap in counties.
 - Relatives may be counted with non-relatives.
- **Promising Strategies/Next Steps**
 - Scorecards for 2011 began to be published the week following January 18th meeting.
 - The AFPRR Coordinator reported that she will provide 2011 data; as well as information for the match counties (Kent, Washtenaw and Saginaw).
- **Baseline Data:**
 - Characteristics of Children in Care (3/31/2011): FY 2011 for participating (Oakland, Macomb and Wayne) and matched counties (Kent, Washtenaw and Saginaw).
- **Clarification:**
 - These data reflect a day in time. That is, the characteristics of children in care on 3/31/2011. It does not include an entire fiscal year.
 - The data were obtained in June, 2011.
- **Challenges:**
 - PRES does not have this data for FY 2009, 2010 and 2011.
- **Promising Strategies/Next Steps**
 - The AFPRR Coordinator reported that she will check and determine the feasibility of obtaining this data for FY 2009, 2010 and 2011.
- **Baseline Data:**
 - Number of Foster Homes as of 8/1/2011 for participating (Oakland, Macomb and Wayne) and matched counties (Kent, Washtenaw and Saginaw).
- **Clarification:**
 - All homes licensed in the county are counted.
 - This does not include the full fiscal year.
- **Promising Strategies/Next Steps**
 - The AFPRR Coordinator reported that there is data for entries as well as exits that may be provided to the project.
- **Baseline/Needs Assessment Data**
 - Status of the selected CFSR indicators for the participating and matched counties for 2009, 2010 and 2011
- **Promising Strategies/Next Steps**
 - Need to determine how to obtain this data. It was indicated that it is included in SWSS (Service Worker Support System)
- **Baseline/Needs Assessment Data**
 - Determine redundancies, completeness and gaps in AFCARS (Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System), SWSS MARE.

- **Challenges**
 - SWSS ends in 2013. Michigan SACWIS (Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System) is AFCARS compliant.
- **Promising Strategies/Next Steps**
 - DESC members will provide user's guides for data sets. The representative from MARE has promised to provide information regarding the fields in both MARE and SWSS.

Intervention Goal/Activity No.4

Develop the Phase II-Version A plan. (The plan to be implemented by the project in years 2-5).

Outputs

The I-CARE 365 plan was completed on June 27, 2011. It was then reviewed and approved by the Oversight Committee on June 28, 2011. The final plan was submitted on 6/30/11 and approved by the FPO on 8/3/11. The project team continues to use the Phase II plan to guide their work, determine their progress and to plan for Year 3.

PROJECT OUTCOME EVALUATION

Project implementation began in October, 2011. Multiple recruitment events were attended during this semi-annual period and led to the following results.

Output

- #7 – Number of families trained: (5)

Short-term Outcome

- #16 - Number of families recruited: (29)

Intermediate Outcome

- #23 - Number of families who have a home study approved. (To date, no families have participated in home studies)

Additional data pertaining to the outcome questions will be reported annually as the evaluation team learns about data availability and timelines as a result of their meeting with the AFPRR Coordinator that is scheduled in May, 2012.

CONTEXTUAL INFLUENCES, FACILITATORS, BARRIERS AND LESSONS LEARNED

Influential Contextual Events

The Modified Settlement Agreement (MSA) which requires licensing of 1,300 nonrelative foster homes by June 30, 2012 and finalization of 2,205 adoptions by September 30, 2102, continues to create a sense of heightened urgency for improving permanency outcomes in Michigan. To assist in tracking these goals, county scorecards are provided by the Michigan Department of Human Services to the county directors. It is worthy of note that Oakland County is one of the 7 counties recognized by the Permanency Division for being on track with meeting their non-relative foster home goals.

Project Facilitators

The AFPRR Coordinator continues to be extremely helpful to the **I-365** project. She has attended important strategic planning meetings and welcomed the Project Director, Project Manager and Technical Specialist to related State and organizational meetings. Her commitment to the baseline, needs assessment and reassessment processes ensure that the data needed for evaluation project will be available and analyzable.

The trust and openness of the collaborative partners is evidenced through their effortless teaming and problem solving. The shared focus on *putting the needs of the children/youth first* is evidenced by the discussions and decisions observed at the Oversight Committee meetings, which includes the Child Welfare Directors from each of the participating counties. The **I-CARE 365** team has not only created a strong collaborative atmosphere among the partners, but at the State level as well. The willingness and support that the Project Evaluator has experienced in planning the SED Waiver Focus groups reveals a cross-system perspective and standard that

will be documented as part of the project evaluation. These data will provide important lessons for learning how to sustain a collaborative such as this as well as providing critical aspects for successful replication.

Project Barriers/Lessons Learned

The **I-CARE 365** is a multi-faceted project and therefore has to continually assess how the numerous objectives and activities align for effective project implementation. To address this, the Project Team conducts weekly meetings to review and plan activities. Additionally, the Project Director and Project Manager meet monthly with the Evaluation Team to discuss those activities and to plan appropriate evaluation strategies. Continued review of the project work plan and logic model will help ensure that the project stays on target and that it has the data to make informed decisions regarding next steps and continued improvement.

REFERENCES

- Howard, G. S. (1980). Response-shift bias: A problem in evaluating interventions with pre/post self-reports. *Evaluation Review*, 4 (1), 93-106.
- Kirkpatrick, D.L. (1959). Techniques for evaluating training programs. A four-part series beginning in the November issue, *Training and Development Journal*, Vol. 13 No 11.
- Lam, T. C. M. & Bengo, P. (2003). A comparison of three retrospective self-reporting methods of measuring change in instructional practice. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 24 (1), 65-80.
- Pratt, C. C., McGuigan, W. M. & Katzev, A. R. (2000). Measuring program outcomes: Using retrospective pretest methodology. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 21 (3), 341-349.
- Rockwell, S. K. & Kohn, H. (1989). Post-then-pre evaluation: measuring behavior change more accurately. *J Extension (serial online)*, 27: 1-7. Available at: <http://www.joe.org/joe/1989summer/a5.html>.
- Rog, D. J. (1994). Constructing natural experiments. In Wholey, J. S., Hatry, H. P. & Newcomer, K. E. (Eds.). *Handbook of practical program evaluation*. San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.
- The Program Manager's Guide to Evaluation, Second Edition. Administration for Children and Families (2010). Available at: http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/opre/other_resrch/pm_guide_eval/reports/pmguide/pmguide_toc.html
- W.K. Kellogg Foundation Evaluation Handbook, W.K. Kellogg Foundation Publishers (1998). Available at: <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA/evaluation/links/WK-Kellogg-Foundation.pdf>

APPENDIX A: SED WAIVER FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

| Type of Questions | Time Allotment in minutes | <u>FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:</u> <u>Family and Staff</u> |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| <i>Opening/Introduction</i> | 10 | <i>What are some of the strengths you have seen from youth included in these special groups? (adolescents, juvenile sex offenders, youth in residential treatment settings, youth in psychiatric in-patient settings, children with disabilities or other physical needs, African Americans and large sibling groups)</i> |
| <i>Transition</i> | 5 | <i>Have you heard about the I-CARE 365 project prior to this focus group? If yes, what have you heard about it? If no, what would you suggest as effective strategies for spreading the word?</i> |
| <i>Key 1</i> | 15 | <i>What are the top three things (strategies, resources, staffing structure) the I-CARE 365 project needs to have in place to effectively recruit, train, and support families from these special groups?</i> |
| <i>Key 2</i> | 15 | <i>What training topics are needed to prepare families to parent youth from these special groups?</i> |
| <i>Key 3</i> | 20 | <i>How would you describe the top three characteristics of families successfully parenting youth from these special groups? In other words, if you could create the perfect family for youth from these special groups what would they think, know and be able to do?</i> |
| <i>Key 4</i> | 15 | <i>What type of training is needed to help staff be more effective in their efforts to recruit, support and retain families from these special groups? Also, if you could create perfectly prepared staff member, what would they think, know and be able to do?</i> |
| <i>Key 5</i> | 15 | <i>If you could create the ideal foster care system for the children/youth like the ones in these groups, how would it be different or the same as the one we have now?</i> |
| <i>Ending</i> | 15 | <i>If you were a youth in one of these special groups, what is the one thing you think they would say to the I-CARE 365 project as the project seeks to 1) find families; 2) prepare families; 3) retain families; 4) support families; and 5) help staff to be more effective in working on their behalf?</i> |

| Type of Questions | Time Allotment in minutes | <u>FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:</u> <u>Youth</u> |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Ice-Breaker | 10 | What is your favorite song and what does it help us know about you? (Prompt: Does it tell us that you are funny, loving, serious, cool, over it?) |
| Opening/Introduction | 10 | What do you do well? What are you good at doing? |
| Transition | 5 | How does a project, that is working to find families, make sure that they do a good job of spreading the word? |
| Key 1 | 15 | What do families need to learn so that they can be parents to youth that are in the foster care system and are in or coming out of residential treatment or hospitals? |
| Key 2 | 15 | If you could create the ideal family for the children/youth that are in the foster care system, and that are in or coming out of residential treatment or hospitals what would they think, know and be able to do? |
| Key 3 | 15 | If you could create the ideal staff member for the children/youth that are in the foster care system and are in or coming out of residential treatment or hospitals, what would they think, know and be able to do? |
| Key 4 | 10 | If you could create the ideal foster care system for the children/youth that are in the foster care system and that are in or coming out of residential treatment or hospitals, how would it be different or the same as the one we have now? |
| Key 5 | 15 | What could the system have done differently to keep you from going into residential treatment or the hospital? What could have been done more quickly to keep you from going into residential treatment or the hospital? What types of supports were missing that would have helped you not go into residential treatment or the hospital? |
| Key 6 | 10 | For those of you that have returned home (to the home of your foster or birth parent), what helped you to return? Were there some supports and services that helped you to return home? |
| Ending | 15 | What is the one thing you would like to say to a project that is seeking to 1) find families; 2) train and prepare families; 3) keep and help families; and 4) train and prepare staff? |