

DFCS-Casey Permanency Roundtables Project Evaluation

Logic Models

January 2009

A stylized, layered mountain range graphic in shades of blue, located in the bottom right corner of the slide.

Logic Model Development

- ◆ Lays out assumptions/hypotheses:

Population/Needs →

Interventions →


Outputs →

Short-term Outcomes →

Intermediate Outcomes →

Long-term Outcomes

Logic Models for the Permanency Roundtable Process

A stylized, low-poly silhouette of a mountain range is positioned in the bottom right corner of the slide. The mountains are rendered in various shades of blue, creating a sense of depth and texture against the dark blue background.

Target Populations

- ◆ DFCS Case Managers & Supervisors
 - NEED: Staff development/support regarding permanency
- ◆ Children in Foster Care (Kenny A Outcomes 9 and 10 Children and similar cases)
 - NEED: Permanency

Child Characteristics (SHINES)

- ◆ County:
 - 61% Fulton, 39% DeKalb
- ◆ Legal status
 - 73% temporary custody
 - 22% permanent custody
- ◆ Placement
 - 30 % in CPA foster home
 - 21% in DFCS foster home
 - 15% in child caring institution
 - 12% in group home
 - 8% in relative home

99 of first
115 children;
SHINES data
week of
1/19/09

Child Characteristics (SHINES)

99 of first
115 children;
SHINES data
week of
1/19/09

- ◆ Permanency Plan
 - 17% reunification
 - 16% APPLA – long term foster care
 - 14% adoption
 - 10% APPLA – emancipation
 - 6% live with fit and willing relative
 - 2% guardianship

Child Characteristics (SHINES)

- ◆ Median Age: 15
 - 10% ages 6 and under
 - 14% ages 7-10
 - 24% ages 11-14
 - 42% ages 15-17
- ◆ Median time in care: 55 months
 - Range: 11-196 months
 - 46% more than 5 years

99 of first
115 children;
SHINES data
week of
1/19/09

Interventions

- ◆ DFCS-Casey Permanency Roundtable Process
 - Permanency Experts
 - Master Practitioners
 - Case summaries and oral presentations
 - Facilitated brainstorming
 - State experts on call
 - Permanency planning
 - Debriefings
 - Follow-up

Summary Logic Model

Case Managers and Supervisors →

Permanency Roundtable Process →

Increased Knowledge of Permanency
Strategies/Planning →

Improved Case Practice (and child
outcomes) →

Improved Staff Morale, Retention;
Reduced Caseloads

Outcomes: Case Managers & Supervisors

Short-Term Effects	Intermediate-Term Effects	Long-Term Effects
<p>Case Managers & Supervisors more knowledgeable about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case presentations Permanency strategies Timeliness <p>Case Managers supported in planning/decision-making</p>	<p>Case practices reflect increased use of five strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Family engagement Youth involvement Comprehensive assessments (individualized) Concurrent planning Individualized service planning <p>Improved follow-through on assessment recommendations and case plans</p> <p>Improved/more aggressive permanency planning</p> <p>Improved responsiveness to changes in child's situation</p>	<p><i>Contributes to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced caseloads Improved job satisfaction Sense of accomplishment, making a difference Reduced turnover/ increased staff experience/tenure

Summary Logic Model

Outcome 9 & 10 (and similar) children →

Permanency Roundtable Process →

Increased Case Manager focus on Permanency
and Permanency Resources →

Less Restrictive Living Environment/
Improved Permanency Status for Children →

Improved Child Welfare Outcomes

Outcomes: Children in Foster Care

Short-Term Effects	Intermediate-Term Effects	Long-Term Effects
<p><i>Increased focus on:</i> Family and child Paternal relatives Others in the child's life (relatives and non-relatives) Creating permanent ties for child Developing permanency resource alternatives Providing appropriate services/supports Reassessing/identifying appropriate permanency goals/plans</p>	<p>Improved permanency status for children in foster care *</p> <p>Less restrictive living environment for children in foster care *</p> <p>* Roundtable evaluation outcome measures</p>	<p><i>Contributes to:</i> Shorter stays for children in foster care</p> <p>Improved timeliness to permanency</p> <p>Fewer children in foster care</p> <p>Permanency and permanent connections for children</p>

Restrictiveness of Living Environment Scale (ROLES)

Independent living by self	Specialized foster care	Medical hospital (inpatient)
Independent living with friend	Individual-home emergency shelter	Drug-alcohol rehabilitation center (inpatient)
Home of natural parents, for a child	Foster-family-based treatment home	Intensive treatment unit
School dormitory	Group home	Youth correction center
Home of a relative	Residential Job Corps center	County detention center
Adoptive home	Group emergency shelter	State mental hospital
Supervised independent living	Residential treatment center	Jail
Regular foster care	Wilderness camp (24-hour, year-round)	

Permanency Status Scale

Child has legal permanency (adoption or legal guardianship).	Permanency achieved
Child is in a family setting that the child, the caregivers and the casework team believe is lifelong; OR Child is in stable living situation with own parents (not a trial visit) and identified safety risks have been eliminated.	Very good permanency status
Child is in a family setting that the child, caregivers and case workers believe is lifelong; a plan is in place to ensure safety and stability have been achieved; the child, if old enough, and the caregiver(s) are committed to the plan; and adoption/guardianship/reunification issues, if any, are near resolution.	Good permanency status
Child is in a family setting that the child, caregivers and case workers believe will last until maturity; a plan is in place to ensure safety and stability is being achieved, and the child, if old enough, and the caregiver(s) are committed to the plan; and adoption/guardianship/reunification issues, if any, are being addressed; OR Child is in temporary placement but transition is planned and child is ready to move to identified safe, appropriate, permanent home; a child and family plan for safety and permanency is being implemented; and the child, if old enough, and caregiver(s) are committed to the plan.	Fair permanency status
Child is in a family setting that the child, caregivers and casework team feel could endure lifelong and they are developing a plan to achieve safety and stability; OR Child is in a temporary placement, and likelihood of reunification or permanent home is uncertain; adoption/guardianship issues are being assessed; and concurrent permanency plan(s), if any, are uncertain or problematic.	Uncertain permanency status
Child is living in a home that is not likely to endure or is moving from home to home due to safety and stability problems, failure to resolve adoption/guardianship issues, or because the home is unacceptable to the child; OR Child remains in temporary home without a realistic or achievable permanency plan; and concurrent permanency plan(s), if any, have stalled or failed.	Poor permanency status

Child Current Permanency Status

Very good	15	13%
Good	21	18%
Fair	22	19%
Uncertain	40	35%
Poor	11	10%
Unknown	6	5%
Total (Week 1)	115	100%

Ratings from Permanency Roundtable Form 3

Logic Model for the Permanency Roundtable Strategies



Target Populations

- ◆ Children in foster care
- ◆ Children at risk for removal

Interventions

Strategies for Permanency:

- ◆ Family engagement
- ◆ Youth involvement
- ◆ Comprehensive assessments (individualized)
- ◆ Concurrent planning
- ◆ Individualized service planning

Permanency Strategies Logic Model

Strategy	Case Process	Short-Term Effects
Family Engagement	Diligent Search CCFA Case Planning Family Team Meeting MDT Meeting LIPT Meeting Family/Sibling Visitation Caseworker-Child Visitation Caseworker-Family Visitation (maternal & paternal) Court Hearings/Legal Process	Family engaged in planning and decision-making

Permanency Strategies Logic Model

Strategy	Case Process	Short-Term Effects
Youth Involvement	Case Planning Family Team Meeting MDT Meeting LIPT Meeting ILP/WTLP Family/Sibling Visitation Caseworker-Child Visitation Caseworker-Family Visitation Court Hearings/Legal Process	Child/youth engaged in planning and decision-making

Permanency Strategies Logic Model

Strategy	Case Process	Short-Term Effects
<p>Comprehensive Assessment (initial & follow-up)</p>	<p>Risk/Safety Assessment Family/Relative Assessments Psychological Assessment Medical/Dental Assessment Educational Assessment CCFA Provider Selection/Engagement</p>	<p>Improved identification of current individual needs of child/youth</p> <p>Improved understanding of current family situation/resources</p>

Permanency Strategies Logic Model

Strategy	Case Process	Short-Term Effects
Concurrent Planning	Diligent Search Case Planning Family Team Meeting Permanency Staffing Independent Living Program Caseworker-Child Visitation Caseworker-Family Visitation Home Evaluations	Identify and pursue alternate permanency goals at the same time Increased use of concurrent planning

Permanency Strategies Logic Model

Strategy	Case Process	Short-Term Effects
Individualized Service Planning (initial & follow-up)	Case Planning Family Team Meeting MDT Meeting LIPT Meeting Permanency Staffing Caseworker-Child Visitation Caseworker-Family Visitation Provider Selection/Engagement	Placement and services based on identified needs and desires of the child/youth/family Improved community involvement

Permanency Strategies Logic Model

All Strategies:

Intermediate Effects	Long-Term Effects
<p>Improved safety Improved well-being Improved permanency plan selection Improved permanency status * Less restrictive living environment *</p>	<p><i>Contributes to:</i> Fewer children entering foster care Fewer children in foster care Shorter stays for children in foster care Increased placement stability Fewer foster care re-entries More timely permanency Permanency and permanent connections for children Reduced recurrence of maltreatment</p>

* Roundtable evaluation outcome measures

Evaluation

- ◆ Follow-up outcome measures
 - ROLES
 - Child permanency status
- ◆ What contributed to improved outcomes
 - Strategies
 - Specific types of actions in permanency and concurrent action plans
- ◆ Sharing best strategies/practices
- ◆ Review assumptions/hypotheses and refine logic models
- ◆ Recommendations moving forward

Glossary of Terms and Acronyms Used in the January 2008 DFCS- Casey Permanency Roundtable Project Logic Model Presentation

This logic model presentation for the DFCS-Casey Permanency Roundtable Project was developed for and delivered to staff of the Division of Family and Children Services (DFCS); this glossary is to assist those from outside the agency in understanding this presentation.

APPLA: Another planned, permanent living arrangement

Casey: Casey Family Programs, a division of the Annie E. Casey Foundation

CCFA: Comprehensive child and family assessment

Concurrent Planning: The development of an alternative permanency goal and plan that is executed concurrently with the primary permanency goal and plan

CPA: Child Placing Agency, a private agency that places children in state custody in foster homes

DFCS: Division of Family and Children Services (DFCS) of the Georgia Department of Human Resources

Diligent Search: The process of identifying and contacting the relatives (maternal and paternal) and significant adults in the life of a child in state custody

Emancipation: Child in state custody aging out of foster care

Guardianship: Legal responsibility for a child (can be relative or non-relative)

ILP: Independent Living Program, a program for older youth in state custody that includes life skills assessment and training

Kenny A Outcomes: The court-specified outcomes for DeKalb and Fulton county children in state custody who fall under the purview of the Kenny A consent decree

LIPT: Local inter-agency planning team, a team that includes agency staff and local service providers that meet to discuss the needs of and services for children in state custody

Logic Model: A systematic and visual way to present the relationships among program resources, activities, and the changes or results expected from those activities

Master Practitioners: Experienced DFCS casework staff provided additional training in permanency and facilitation to conduct permanency roundtables

MDT: Multi-disciplinary team, a team that includes agency staff and external service providers and meets to discuss the needs of and services for a child in state custody

Permanency Experts: Staff and contractors of Casey Family Programs who provided consultation to DFCS staff on permanency for children in state custody

Permanency Roundtables: Case consultations on permanency facilitated by a permanency expert or master practitioner with case managers, supervisors and administrators, and others as appropriate to the case

Reunification: Reunifying child in state custody with birth family

SHINES: Georgia's statewide automated child welfare information system (SACWIS)

Staffing: Internal meeting of case staff and supervisors?

WTLP: Written transitional living plan, a plan developed for any child in state custody over the age of 14