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Goals for this presentation

- Attendees will be able to:
  - Describe how agencies can collaborate with each other to develop outcome benchmarks
  - Identify three ways of collecting outcomes data especially in today's economic and accountability landscape
  - Describe how the use of outcome data can best inform public policy development
Are you making a difference in the lives of children you serve?

How do you know?
What is the IARCCA Outcome Measures Project (IOMP)?

- Across-agency outcomes project developed to evaluate the effectiveness of programs and services provided by participating agencies.
- Data on youth and families served have been collected since 1998.
- Manuscripts published by IARCCA and in the professional literature.

- Results provided for:
  - Residential Care
  - Foster Care
  - Transitional Living
  - Home-Based
  - Day Treatment
  - Shelter Care
  - Crisis Stabilization
  - Outpatient Treatment
History of the IOMP

• **1995** Request from juvenile judges
  Focus groups held across the state

• **1996** Boys Town training – “Practical tips on outcome evaluation”
  Task Force initiated, development of instruments & processes

• **1997** IOMP Pilot Study – 19 agencies, nearly 2,000 cases
  First national conference presentation on IOMP

• **1998** First year of statewide implementation
  External evaluators joined IOMP

• **1999** Addition of Residential Care subtypes
  Addition of Child Risk Factor Survey
  Addition of Family Problem Checklist
History of the IOMP

- **2001**  Home-Based programs refined
- **2002**  Addition of Day Treatment program  
  - First Lilly Endowment Inc grant received  
  - Outcome Coordinator hired
- **2003**  Implementation of software interface  
  - First Special Report published
- **2004**  First out-of-state agencies using IOMP
- **2005**  Services Survey added  
  - First peer-reviewed article published
- **2006**  Addition of Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facilities (PRTF) as a Residential subtype  
  - Inclusion of outcomes in Indiana residential contracts
- **2007**  Addition of Outpatient Treatment program
History of the IOMP

- **2007**  Second Lilly Endowment Inc. grant received
- **2008**  Addition of 12-month follow-up timeframe
  Implementation of web-based Evaluate Outcomes Now (EON®)
- **2009**  Discussion with state of inclusion of outcomes in Indiana foster care contracts
- **2010**  Collaborative Outcomes Conference brings together national leaders
- **2011**  Launch of www.EvaluateOutcomesNow.org
- **2012**  Addition of Foster Caresubtypes
Growth Across the Years

IOMP Data Forms Submitted Annually

FollowUp II
FollowUp I
Discharge
Intake

Data Collection Year


Total Data Forms Submitted: 161,299
Number of Participating Agencies from 1998-2010
Collaboration

• Key to the development of a successful project
  ✓ Collaboration across multiple parties from Indiana's Juvenile Justice, Department of Child Services, IARCCA member agencies, youth and their families

• Continued use of multiple stakeholders in program development, implementation, and modification
  ✓ Attention to needs of youth and families, participating agencies, and state entities
Collaboration

• Continued focus on maintaining shared vision of benefiting youth and families
  ✓ Leadership from IOMP committee chair
  ✓ Support from IARCCA membership and Board of Directors
  ✓ Assistance from external evaluators
  ✓ Investigations by researchers and students
  ✓ Involvement with other advocacy groups (Indiana Commission on Disproportionality in Youth Services)
  ✓ National discussions about use of outcomes (NOSAC, CWLA, COA, BBI)
Why Do We Collaborate?

• Allows for greater understanding of issues and varying perspectives
• Leads to a shared vision among stakeholders
• Allows for buy-in from various stakeholder groups
## Who Are the Stakeholders?

### IARCCA and member agencies
- IARCCA staff
- Member agency staff
  - Executive directors
  - Quality assurance staff
  - Outcome coordinators
  - Therapists/counselors
  - Direct care workers
  - Foster parents

### Those outside IARCCA membership
- Youth and families served
- Non-IARCCA providers in Indiana
- Out-of-state participating agencies
- Referral & Payor Sources
  - Department of Child Services
  - Juvenile Court & Corrections
  - Department of Education
  - Family/Private referrals
  - Medicaid
- University researchers & students
- Legislators
- Foundations
How Do Collaborations Occur?

• **Focus Groups**
  ✓ At start of IOMP
  ✓ Development of Instruments (e.g., Family Problem Checklist)
  ✓ Review of program-specific outcomes (e.g., Day Treatment)

• **Researchers & Evaluators**
  ✓ Agency consultations
  ✓ Evaluation Reports
    ➢ Annual benchmark reports
    ➢ Special reports and briefs
  ✓ Contributions to the research base / body of knowledge
Where Do Collaborations Occur?

- IOMP participating agencies
  - Agency consultations on their data
  - Training
  - Technical assistance

- Government entities
  - Department of Child Services – development of service contracts
  - Indiana Commission on Disproportionality in Youth Services – understanding the issues and current status of disproportionality and disparity in service provision

- National Organizations
  - Council on Accreditation
  - Child Welfare League of America
  - Building Bridges Initiative
Analysis and Data Use

• Development of Benchmarked Analyses
  ✓ Annual Reports & Executive Summaries

• Drilling down - examining specific questions
  ✓ Special Reports & Special Report Briefs
  ✓ External research

• Agency level - addressing more specific questions
  ✓ Examine characteristics of youth and how their needs are matched with programs and services

• Ongoing quality improvement methods
  ✓ Quarterly trainings
  ✓ Agency consultations
  ✓ Mentorship program
  ✓ EON® Provider Reports
Data Use – Aggregate Level

- Annual Reports & Executive Summaries published since 1998
- Benchmarks allow agencies to compare their results with the aggregate
- Provide descriptive information on:
  - Characteristics of youth and families at intake
  - Outcomes at discharge and follow-up by program type
  - Cross-year examination of youth/family services and outcomes
- Incorporate changes in data collection methods while retaining the ability to compare data across years
Data Use – Aggregate Level

• Special Reports and Special Report Briefs
  ✓ Began in 2003
  ✓ Grant funded
  ✓ Examination at the child-level vs. the program level

• Examination of specific evaluation questions:
  ✓ Risk factor analyses
    ◦ Are there characteristics of youth placed which correspond with increased risk for successful outcomes?
    ◦ Are there particular protective factors?
  ✓ Factor analyses of IOCP-developed instruments
    ◦ Child Problem Checklist
    ◦ Family Problem Checklist
Data Use – Aggregate Level

- Discharge to Permanent Placements
  - Examined capacity of combined risk factors to predict permanent placement at discharge
  - Identified specific factors associated within and across programs
    - In Transitional Living programs, youth who were older, prescribed psychotropic medication, and stayed in care longer were more likely to achieve independent placement
    - Across 7 of the 9 program types, longer stays in care were associated with increased likelihood of permanent or independent placement
IARCCA – Published Reports
Data Use—Public Policy

How can the data be used related to public awareness & policy decision-making?

- Letters to the editor
- Newsletters from IARCCA, participating agencies
- Dissemination via internet (e.g., www.EvaluateOutcomesNow.org)
- IARCCA/agency involvement with interagency groups (Indiana Commission on Disproportionality in Youth Services)
Data Use – Public Policy

- How can the data be used related to public awareness & policy decision-making?
  - Meeting with legislators, judges, & public about the needs of children and families
  - Congratulations, Partners in Parenting
Data Use – Public Policy

Partners in Parenting Indiana’s Children

On November 2nd, you became a parent over and over again...

Don’t forget to attend the Indiana Parenting Children school on 1st and 2nd of November. It’s open to anyone who can pay. We’ll be giving even more advice on the move. And be sure to check out the workshop on transportation and support systems for appointments and activity.
Data Use– Public Policy

• How can the data be used related to public awareness & policy decision-making?
  ✓ Meeting with legislators, judges, & public about the needs of children and families
  ➢ Congratulations, Partners in Parenting
  ➢ “Children Our Best Investment” Advocacy Day
  ➢ Sharing summary sheets from Annual Report / Executive Summary
## Child Risk Factor Survey – By Program Type (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>All Programs</th>
<th>Transitional Living</th>
<th>Day Treatment</th>
<th>Home-Based</th>
<th>Foster Care</th>
<th>Shelter Care</th>
<th>Residential Care</th>
<th>Crisis Stabilization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intake packets*</td>
<td>7,486</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1,437</td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (Mean)</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Previous placements (Mean)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past home-based Services</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnant</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have child(ren)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINS</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical abuse</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual abuse</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness domestic violence</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade retention</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special education</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychotropic medication</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent substance abuse</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent incarceration</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent psychiatric diagnosis</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-parent family</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent rights terminated:</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One parent</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both parents</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoptive parents</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Score (Mean)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Sample sizes for individual items may be lower than the number of intake packets due to missing data. Unless otherwise noted, numbers refer to percentages of affirmative responses.
Data Use—Public Policy

• How can the data be used related to public awareness & policy decision-making?
  ✓ Meeting with legislators, judges, & public about the needs of children and families
    ➢ Congratulations, Partners in Parenting
    ➢ “Children Our Best Investment” Advocacy Day
    ➢ Sharing summary sheets from Annual Report / Executive Summary
  ✓ Influence Legislation (e.g., strengthen criminal penalties if domestic violence occurs in front of children)
**Data Use – Public Policy**

- How can the data be used related to public awareness & policy decision-making? (...continued)
  - Informing state agencies (DCS, DMHA, Medicaid)
  - Working with state agencies on service contracts and outcomes requirements
  - Develop strategies to address issues
    - Connections between rates of termination of parental rights and permanency planning
Data Use – Agency Level

• **Consultation Project**
  ✓ Consultant works with agency
  ✓ Focus is to increase their understanding of data use
  ✓ Specific consultation plan based on the agency’s level of understanding and their particular needs

• **Consultation Example – Regional Youth Services**
  ✓ Consultation held in November 2002
  ✓ Consultant compared agency data to state aggregate
  ✓ Shared the findings with agency staff (executive director, intake team, direct care staff)
  ✓ Consultant then challenged RYS staff to explain their results, determine their next steps
Data Use - Agency Consultation

- Regional Youth Services - comments from executive director
  ✓ Before consultation
    ➢ Without outcomes, we thought we were doing well.
    ➢ “We are social workers with big hearts who care about kids.”
    ➢ If someone had called and asked how we were doing we would have said we were doing “normal” or “average.”
  ✓ Consultation Findings
    ➢ As we were able to look at our numbers and compare them to state averages, we found we were so high above the state average on Administrative Discharges - massively higher.
    ➢ It became apparent we were saying “yes” to every child referred and letting them fail out of the program. We were accepting children into care whether they were appropriate for our program or not.
Regional Youth Services – comments from executive director

- After consultation
  - As a staff, we took that information as a starting place, like cold water in the face. We decided we needed to re-evaluate our intake process and make sure referrals were appropriate.
  - Our outcomes also changed our jargon. What used to be called “intake” is now called “assessment.”
  - Using time, effort, resources toward the assessment process, we are now way below the state average on administrative discharges. We have been more successful as we accept youth who are more appropriate for our program.
  - We then started looking at other areas and applied the same principle.
  - We talk with our direct staff to make changes, as change really starts with the staff. The Outcome Project keeps the staff informed of where we stand.
Data Use—Agency Consultation

• Regional Youth Services—comments from executive director

✓ Now...

➢ Our staff need the state averages less because they now know their own history, and can compare themselves to themselves.

➢ They see their progress over the years, which is a real bonus, because even if you are below the state average you still need to compare yourself to past performance.

✓ The Outcome Project has helped to improve the care... and effect change in an informed way.

Joe Huecker, LCSW, Regional Youth Services Executive Director
Data Use – Agency Level

- Mentorship Project
  - Regional “Outcome Mentors” identified
  - Meet with agency Outcome Coordinators in their area
  - Conduct 2- or 4-session trainings on data use and analyses
  - Designed to build both support network and knowledge related to research and evaluation

- EON® reports
  - Provider Report
## Provider Report

### Annual Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>2020 EA Data</th>
<th>2020 IA Data</th>
<th>6-19-10</th>
<th>6-19-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA EON®</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Length of Stay

- Median Length of Stay: 119.5 days
- Average Length of Stay: 23.8 days

### Nature of Discharge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>2020 EA Data</th>
<th>2020 IA Data</th>
<th>6-19-10</th>
<th>6-19-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolved</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Readmission to Long-Term/Environmental Discharge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>2020 EA Data</th>
<th>2020 IA Data</th>
<th>6-19-10</th>
<th>6-19-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Days</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Days</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 Days</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readmission</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHWs: Number of Case Views

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHW</th>
<th>2020 EA Data</th>
<th>2020 IA Data</th>
<th>6-19-10</th>
<th>6-19-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Family/Caregiver Counseling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2020 EA Data</th>
<th>2020 IA Data</th>
<th>6-19-10</th>
<th>6-19-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Consumer Satisfaction of Discharge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2020 EA Data</th>
<th>2020 IA Data</th>
<th>6-19-10</th>
<th>6-19-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cell</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readmission Rate</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readmission Rate</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Education Discharge Rates at Discharge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>2020 EA Data</th>
<th>2020 IA Data</th>
<th>6-19-10</th>
<th>6-19-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transitional</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=15,000</td>
<td>113.9%</td>
<td>113.9%</td>
<td>113.9%</td>
<td>113.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Employment Rate of Discharge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>2020 EA Data</th>
<th>2020 IA Data</th>
<th>6-19-10</th>
<th>6-19-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200.0%</td>
<td>200.0%</td>
<td>200.0%</td>
<td>200.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Readmission to Long-Term/Environmental Discharge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>2020 EA Data</th>
<th>2020 IA Data</th>
<th>6-19-10</th>
<th>6-19-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200.0%</td>
<td>200.0%</td>
<td>200.0%</td>
<td>200.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Absent Rate of Child Abuse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>2020 EA Data</th>
<th>2020 IA Data</th>
<th>6-19-10</th>
<th>6-19-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Major Focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2020 EA Data</th>
<th>2020 IA Data</th>
<th>6-19-10</th>
<th>6-19-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Abuse</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Delay</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Education</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Rights</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

(1) Includes Children's Bureau, Family and Adult Services, and American Indian Housing Coalition (AIHCC). (2) Includes children's Bureau, Family and Adult Services, and American Indian Housing Coalition (AIHCC).
Research

• Sample topics examined through research activities
  ✓ Disproportionality of youth / disparity of outcomes
  ✓ Risk factors of youth in residential treatment
  ✓ Risk factors for youth with intellectual disabilities in foster care
  ✓ Agency use of consultations / organizational learning
  ✓ Reliability of the Child Problem Checklist
  ✓ Risk factors for youth with autism in foster & residential care
  ✓ Relationship between delinquency and parental-risk factors for youth in residential treatment
  ✓ Which combination of risk factors best predicted discharge placement into a permanent home placement (reunification, relative placement or adoption)?
Expanding the Knowledge Base

Cumulative publications, presentations & dissertations
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Graph showing the increase in publications, presentations, and dissertations from 1997 to 2011.
Research Posters
Where do we go from here?

- Collaborations
  - Development of a youth and family strengths-based tool.
    - Collaboration for its creation should include researchers, agency staff and youth and families served.
  - Continue to partner with researchers and evaluators.
  - Having a national-level dialogue on outcome research and evaluation.
    - Partnering with national organizations (e.g., CWLA) to support the dialogue
    - Consensus building on key indicators to measure nationally for use in accreditation and performance accountability
Where do we go from here?

- **Data use**
  - Continued discussions with participating agencies
    - The use of their outcomes
    - Expand the Mentorship Program - build agency-level infrastructure and across-agency supports for data analyses and use
    - EON® reports
  - Continued partnership with state government agencies
    - The use of outcomes with agency contracts
    - Monitoring of disproportionality and disparity of services
  - Expand out-of-state participation / develop national benchmarks
Questions

• Are welcomed.

• For more information, please contact:
  ✓ Cathy Graham cgraham@iarcca.org
  ✓ Steve Koch smkoch@iupui.edu
  ✓ Jacquie Wall jwall@indy.edu

✓ http://www.EvaluateOutcomesNow.org

Thanks for attending.

Special thanks to Jeannie Bellman, IARCCA Outcome Coordinator, for her help with this presentation.