

**Session 6.08 – Findings and Implications From the Federal Evaluation of Independent Living Programs for Youth in Foster Care**

**Panelists:**

Mark E. Courtney  
Matthew Stagner  
Maria Woolverton  
Andrew Zinn

*Please note: The following is a direct transcription and has not been edited.*

---

Maria Woolverton: So good afternoon everyone. My name is Maria Woolverton, I'm with the Administration for Children and Families Office of Planning Research and Evaluation. For about the last 7 years, I've been the project officer for the Multi-site Evaluation of Foster Youth Programs.

This was a random assignment evaluation of independent living programs funded through the Chafee Foster Care Independence Act. And the study is actually has been going on since around 2002, so my co-presenters today who are Mark Courtney, Matt Stagner, Andy Zinn actually been involved in the study from its beginning as well as I see some folks in the audience too, Karin Malm and Roseana Bess, anybody else who is in the study.

So this has been going on for quite a while and I'm very excited to say that this today's presentation is actually the first time that we can stand up here and say the study has been completed after all these years. We are presenting, interim finding, so what we wanted to do today is not only present the final results and the impact findings from the study but also to kind of think about what we learned in doing this study 10 years ago, random assignment evaluations in this field were not common still are not incredibly common but it was a population that was very difficult to track youth aging out of foster care so there was a lot of skepticism of whether the study could even be accomplished.

So one of the things we wanted to reflect on is what we learned in doing this study from an evaluation perspective methodologically in addition to telling you about the findings and then also talk a bit about kind of what this means for the field -- independent living field moving forward.

So in terms of what we are going to be talking about today, I'm going to and along with Matt Stagner, be giving you a little of information about the background and the particularly the legislative history for the study and then the design of the study. We began it with an Evaluability Assessment before the full evaluation was funded. And then Matt also going to talk about the four programs that were evaluated, one was in Los Angeles county, it was a Life Skills Training program another also in Los Angeles county was a tutoring, mentoring program for younger youth, the ESTEP Program. We had an independent living employment services program in Kern county, California and the Massachusetts Adolescent Outreach Program which was sort of like a case management approach and statewide in Massachusetts and then Andy is going to talk about the impact

**Session 6.08 – Findings and Implications From the Federal Evaluation of Independent Living Programs for Youth in Foster Care**

findings from each side. And then Mark Courtney is going to talk about the lessons learned like I mentioned, what we learned about conducting the evaluation but also for the independent living field.

So in terms of the legislative background for the study this was in what we call the Chafee Act which was the Foster Care Independence Act of 1999. And so that act doubled annual funding for Independent Living Services and did a number of other things such as expanded eligibility criteria for IL Services down to age 14 allow states to use up to 30% of their funds for housing, they have greater flexibility in using Medicaid and require accountability efforts on behalf of state so those of you familiar with the NYTD the National Youth in Transition Database that was mandated by the Chafee Act but also the evaluation study that we are talking about today was mandated in the act. And so I'm just going to read to you a little bit from the legislation, it said that the Secretary means Secretary of Health and Human Services shall conduct evaluations of such state programs funded under the section that were deemed to be innovative or of potential national significance and the evaluation should include information on the effects of the program on education, employment and personal development and here is kind of where we get into the design of the study to the maximum extent practicable evaluation should be based on rigorous scientific standards including random assignment to treatment and control group. So we took this very seriously and moving forward with our plans to implement a random assignment study.

So in terms of some of the study questions that ACF was tasked with addressing, first and foremost was – what is the impact of the identified programs on youth short and long-term functioning and by this we mean the outcome specified in the act like education, employment and personal development. And what are the features of the identified programs that are likely to influence their impact on youth clients. And then to what extent might these programs be adopted to other locals I think when Mark kind of talks in the end, we might think about what we learned from this about program development more generally moving forward.

So I just wanted to mention the evaluation team that's been with us throughout the last 10 years was led by the Urban Institute and also Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago, the National Opinion Research Center was responsible for the data collection including locating and tracking of the Youth and then I'm with the office of Planning, Research and Evaluation and their funding for their study is from the children's grant.

So now I'm going to turn it over to Matt. He is going to talk about the evaluation design starting with where we began with the Evaluability Assessment.

Matthew Stagner: Thanks Maria. So, we will – I will just give you some background on site selection and the design of the study we were trying to do, and of course those two things, interact and that we had an idea of what the design needed to be and we are looking for sites that were doing innovative programs but would also be willing and it would be possible for them to participate in that.

**Session 6.08 – Findings and Implications From the Federal Evaluation of Independent Living Programs for Youth in Foster Care**

So the act did not require random assignment but it very strongly suggested that random assignment was the way to go here and we felt that it was possible to conduct random assignment study here that it was desirable to the field and in approaching sites we were really looking to find places that could do that.

We had the funding to look at youth for three points in time, one of the struggles I think in all longitudinal designs is as youth age we really care about very long term outcomes we want to see them complete their educational trajectories, we want to see them establish themselves in positive relationships and in employment but policy makers also don't have lot of patients to wait for years and years and years for the result. So we were able to do a two-year follow-up here a baseline set of interviews, a one year interview and a two year interview. We also did a process study two site visits fairly intensive look at the programs and its context and we decided that really this four programs sites needed to be analyzed separately and from the beginning we were thinking that way.

I'm sure some of you have seen studies that have lump together different sites that are doing some interventions or since was here the interventions varied too much and the sites varied too much we really needed to have not one evaluation but four separate evaluations that we can look at together.

Maria mentioned that the outcomes were articulated in the law but we did some work at the very beginning to try to refine it and add to those key at the top our educational attainment and employment status as youth exit foster care we want to make sure they are on positive educational trajectories, we want them to have access to the labor market and related to that of course is economic well-being and financial assistance. We also wanted to look at residential stability and homelessness with the hopes that these interventions might stabilize youth at a very uncertain point in their life. Involvement in juvenile justice delinquency, pregnancy, interesting for foster youth which I don't think you had seen a lot of other youth programs is the need for them to have the documentation and the basic things that one needs to operate independently, bank accounts access to their birth certificates, ability to know where those documents are and use them to move ahead in life. And preparedness here means preparedness for adults, did we change their sense that they are ready to make a transition to adulthood and are feeling better about that we also look to gain a job preparedness in the case they weren't actually already working.

So as most of you probably know there are literally hundreds of programs for foster youth and by doubling funding for this in the Chafee law a lot programs at the time we were going out were either expanding or states were creating new programs and they are very different programs. They focus on different outcomes, they focus on different subsets of youth some of them have very targeted outcomes on education or employment some of them are focused on males versus females focused on kids and group homes versus youth that are in guardianship or other types of arrangements. And they vary a lot in size and scope. So we had to begin to understand what type of program is important for the field to learn about but how do we overlay that with the type of program that fit this type of rigorous evaluation.

## **Session 6.08 – Findings and Implications From the Federal Evaluation of Independent Living Programs for Youth in Foster Care**

The categories of services that we thought about were Life Skills Training which is a very commonly used form of the Chafee funds to put youth in some setting where they learn more about what the transition to adulthood looks like what types of skills are going to need apartment hunting, job hunting, ways to maneuver the healthcare system et cetera.

Mentoring programs housing which you will know that one of the changes in the law was that Chafee funds could be used for housing programs and advocates for youth told us that housing programs were an essential part of this transition so we've put a special effort in looking for those, you will see later those efforts did not succeed but we really wanted to include a housing program, health and behavioral health including planning of pregnancies, monitoring and measuring their own health and education and employment services. So when you think of both the type of service and all the different context and all the different things that are being done with this – what is essentially a block grant, it was quite a challenge to figure out how can we best use these evaluation resources to do something that will help move the field forward.

So we were looking for a focus on youth who are going to stay in care for emancipation so another longitudinal trade-off is the new Chafee law in 1999 allowed services to go to younger youth down to age 14, but as those of you know about the dynamics of the foster care system know many youth who are in care up to 14 will not be there at the age of emancipation generally at this time 18. So we could look at programs that were early prevention programs that might be an ideal for the field but a lot of the youth receiving those programs won't actually be in care at age 18.

On the other hand you can look at kids programs in the six months prior to it emancipation most of those youth will emancipate from the system but we are getting at them fairly late and the hope would be to balance those two things. We were looking for programs that were with one exception innovative of national significance and something that if we found out what was working for youth might be something other states and localities will pick up, the exception I refer to again is LifeSkills Training, we felt it was important to include life skills training program not necessarily because that was an innovative approach but because it was a very prevalent approach and a prevalent use of the dollars and we needed to inform policy about the use of those dollars.

We needed sites that would at least engage us in a conversation about random assignment and help us explore its possibility and importantly have sufficient sample size which will get into in the results whether we actually achieve that. There are 10s of 1000s of foster youth exiting care nationwide every year but when you start to think about whose touching a particular program at a particular time with youth spread across the 50 states, its very hard to find very large programs. Many programs in this field serve a dozen youth, some of them serve a few dozen, very few of them serve 100s of youth and yet to detect the types of differences in trajectories that we wanted we really needed to look toward the large end. And as we talk about the programs we have selected you will see how that desire affected us. These were some of the things we were looking for in this programs as well stability of programs.

**Session 6.08 – Findings and Implications From the Federal Evaluation of Independent Living Programs for Youth in Foster Care**

So innovation is good but you also don't want to come in with a rigorous evaluation on something that's just being implemented, its developer is not yet certain that its going to work out the way that he or she had planned. So you wanted to have had some period of stability. We were looking for intensity on the theory that the youth who were subject to the study face significant challenges and unless we really had an intensive intervention it was very unlikely to change the four trajectories, Mark will come back I'm sure and talk about some of his work that proceeded us looking for these sites which documented that youth exiting foster care don't do very well and the severity of those challenges suggest we need to think intensively about a service approach.

We were looking for what we call here well-defined theories of intervention maybe theory should be in quotes there, its not that it have an academic theory base, so much is that there is a logic model behind that somebody can articulate and say this is why we talk deal with these youth at this time and why we do these activities because we want to get to those outcomes. And those of you engaged in evaluation know sometimes programs are at varying points of articulating that. There is often some crenel of an idea that a program implementer might have but their ability to actually explain all of those connections varies.

We wanted consistent implementation across the site again given the size of these programs that's often not so much of a concern but with two other programs that we then looked at in Los Angeles county that was an issue, if we are out in 23 different community colleges, are we really looking at the same program implemented in the same way. We wanted sites with some existing data collection. The most important piece of data collection and the biggest challenge here was really the length of service and the case load dynamics within that program.

And going out and talking with programs we would initially hear numbers of youth served that without some data to back them up would often turn out not to be true. I think its just universal law of service provision that service providers feel their serving a lot more people for a lot more time than they might be. And when you start to look at how many youth are actually coming in, how long they stay, getting a handle on that so that you really know who do you want to include in an evaluation becomes very complicated.

And again willingness to implement random assignment we were very concerned about not altering the intervention but we were willing to alter the referral process to the intervention to allow for random assignments. So in some cases because programs often operate at capacity that might mean changing an outreach procedure. So that you would still serve the 300 youth as you did last year but you would recruit or make outreach to 600 to be able to serve 300. You would try to protect the integrity of the program but change the referral process and we can talk more about that later on.

Through all of this process and I guess about three years of effort of making phone calls to states and looking at Roseana Bess who made many of these calls talking to them about the use of Chafee dollars which local programs were involved, trying to target

**Session 6.08 – Findings and Implications From the Federal Evaluation of Independent Living Programs for Youth in Foster Care**

about 30 programs that we conducted site visits with talking with ACF about the number of programs that we should be looking for initially we were thinking of six, we came up with four. We came up with eventually these four sites. And again one of the key drivers was simply size, these were programs that appear to be touching enough youth that rigorous evaluation on the outcomes that we looked at with their intensity they seem to be giving would have the possibility of affecting those trajectories for youth.

Los Angeles county as you know now is the, I call it the largest county in the universe since we don't know what's on other planets yet but even then I'm sure we will find there is nothing quite like Los Angeles county. It is the largest Child Welfare System in the country and a place where if you are looking for a lot of youth who might be exposed to a single program is a logical place to go. So two of our sites ended up there and were the two largest programs that we looked at.

Kern county is Bakersfield, California in the Central Valley not a large county but a willingness to give a program to everyone turning age 16 in their system and our belief at the time was that we would then have enough youth to do that. And Massachusetts, its outreach program is a statewide program so we had large area of draw from. So these are some combination of the factors we talked about fairly stable programs moderately intensive we felt at the beginning, fairly well-defined theories of intervention appear to be consistently implemented but all of these are qualitative assessments that we made and this is relative to other programs for these youths. So there was no absolute scale that people have to reach so much as of the 30 year so programs we've looked at intensively. These four appear to give us most what we felt to feel needed.

So I'm going to very briefly talk about what the interventions were and then turn it over to Andy who will present the findings.

Life Skills Training is again in Los Angeles, it's a Life Skills curriculum. We felt that in the range of life skills curriculum, this was one of the more intensive one, 10, three hour classes held twice a week. Again given through the community colleges in Los Angeles so there were concerns about if you are going to 19 different community colleges are you doing the same program and we felt that that was true.

The unique aspect of the program was that the instructors were connected to the community colleges. So if the community colleges are likely to be the next step for the educational trajectory of foster youth, we felt that this was a fairly innovative place to life skills, it's not going to the group homes where the youth live or doing it in a community center, its exposing them to the community college environment at the same time teaching them some life skills. Importantly also there was a very intensive outreach program. So again a fairly typical Life Skills program but with a couple of elements that we felt made it worthy of being the national model that we looked at in this evaluation. Outreach advisors very aggressively went out to recruit youth and importantly for Los Angeles provide transportation to get them to the program. So we felt that there was a good hope that the youth selected for the program would actually show up and be able to receive the treatment.

**Session 6.08 – Findings and Implications From the Federal Evaluation of Independent Living Programs for Youth in Foster Care**

A second program in Los Angeles, we looked at is the tutoring component of something called ESTEP or Early Start to Emancipation Program. This was an educational in-home tutoring program for youth. This one if you look at our portfolio the Life Skills Training program is one of those kind of last minute things that child welfare system does catch them at age 17 right before the transition. This one on the other hand is a real prevention program. It's trying to catch youth who are one to three years behind school give them some fairly intensive in-home tutoring on math and reading and trying to improve their educational trajectories to keep them in school. It also was connected to the community colleges and used college student tutors, importantly as a tutoring program it focused on basic skills in math and reading. So it was not the kind of tutoring program like I was doing last night at home which was here is my homework help me do it, it was how do we improve the basic skills.

In Bakersfield, we had another focus which was employment so this was a program unique use of the resources of the TANF system combined with the Child Welfare System to use employment services workers who were traditionally in the TANF world and say they could work with 16 to 17 year olds in the foster care system to give them a leg-up on employment, help them understand job search, help them with job search in particular help them connect to employers but also understand what it means to look for a job. And it was offered this is one where we change the referral process where this was now then offered to every youth who turn 16 while in care in Bakersfield and the four surrounding communities.

They entered after their 16<sup>th</sup> birthday and would be referred then to one of these EAS, Employment Services Workers we'll talk a little bit more about the intensity of this one, this one is one that in the first look appear to be a very intensive program. And it was intensive for the youth who got a full dose of it. But what we found out was, in just give away a little bit of where Andy will go very few...

Andrew Zinn: That's great.

Matthew Stagner: ...very few of the youth took up this offer of service. A newsletter was sent out to them, some phone calls were made basically I think the concept of connecting with 16 year old rather in foster care around employment seem not to make sense in the way that the original logic model of the program might have.

So these program activities, weekly mailings, assessment and then ongoing assistance with job search in retention ended up being delivered to a fairly small proportion of the treatment group.

Finally, at Massachusetts the Adolescent Outreach Program which again is a statewide program with the case-management model and individualize services, the concept there which I'm sure is a common concept in the field is that the transition to adulthood requires a different sort of case work than the ongoing management of being in care and if you assign someone particularly to that who comes into the youth life fairly close to the

**Session 6.08 – Findings and Implications From the Federal Evaluation of Independent Living Programs for Youth in Foster Care**

point of transition and begins to assess the needs of the youth, is there an education plan, is there a plan for housing stability, is there a pregnancy prevention that needs to be happening and then either provides or connects those services to the youth. Eligible youth were 16 or older and referrals were made by a case worker at the point where the ongoing case worker felt now is the time for this youth to begin planning for the transition.

Youth nearing 18, pregnant or parenting or homeless were prioritized but the idea was almost any youth preparing their transition could benefit from this type of intervention. It was again a fairly intensive program, outreach workers would work weekly with the youth. This was one where it was very hard for us to understand the duration of the service until we really started collecting data. But on average 16 months of active service and interaction with the case workers, referrals and a case plan and individual engagement in youth with activities such as apartment hunting, shopping that type of things at a Life Skills program might do.

Importantly there was an overlap with the education, and this is something that both Andy and Mark will come back to the Massachusetts was one of the early states to allow children, allow youth to stay in care but to stay in care you needed to be engaged in an educational activity. So the workers would work both to help that you see the advantage of staying connected to the child welfare system but at the same time help them find the next step in their education process and those two things naturally went hand on -- hand to hand.

Employment housing and mental health, other services really a broad range of case work services were provided. So I'm going to turn it over to Andy now to go through each of those sites in some detail and to talk about the findings and then Mark will reflect on some of the major lessons that we learned over this process.

Andrew Zinn: Good afternoon. I'm going to take a little enough time now to walk through the – find the impact findings for each of this site, I'm going to talk about them in turn. A part of that is obviously we are going to be talking about the outcomes that we found or that we ask youth about it at second follow-up interview.

But I'm also going to talk a little about the characteristics of the samples, about program take up, service receipt from other sources, especially to the extent to which those things help us understand the impact findings, I'm going to talk about and put those in context.

Now, I'm going to give away the – in the spirit of Matt having stones into my thunder, I'm just going to give it all the way right now. Across, for the most part across all four sites, we found a few or no findings of the impact. With the one, I think notable exception in Massachusetts, and I will talk about this further and in a few minutes. There we found that the youth have participated in the average program we are more likely to a 10 college and more likely to stay involved with the child welfare system and we think that those two things are related.

**Session 6.08 – Findings and Implications From the Federal Evaluation of Independent Living Programs for Youth in Foster Care**

But for the most part across the other three sites we found few if any differences at all and I will talk a little bit about kind of the reasons we think this is the case, when I talk about each of the different sites but in general I think its fair to say that that two other things we think are closely related to this, this is a lot of the services in spite of our efforts to find programs that were intense. So a lot of these programs were relatively light in a way that they sort of light touch program, slow intensity programs and as Matt described the needs of these of youth served by this programs are anything but yield mild, I mean, they are intense.

So there was a bit of a disconnect there and then also we found that in many cases especially in the California sites if they – the types of programs or types of assistance that programs we're providing, we are already being provided by programs either through schools, or through community and so in essence we weren't comparing like the impact of tutoring versus no tutoring, we are comparing the impact of tutoring from the program that we are evaluating versus tutoring from different sources.

And I will kind of get back to that in a couple of minutes. Before I'm going to skip ahead because I neglected to put a slide on with the sample size that's free but I did put it at the end of this, so I'm want to close your eyes so no one gets -- has a seizure, okay.

So the table we are looking at here, the table of sample size for each of the site, LST, ESTEP and Kern the Outreach program. LST and Kern both had in excess of 400, almost 500 per site with – equally divided between control and program groups. Kern was smaller with 250 and then the adolescent -- average program was even smaller than that and that had to do primarily correct me if I'm wrong, I actually haven't been on the project as long as everybody else. But it's been a number of years but now we think the decade plus.

But that was really an issue of the rate of accrual into the program it took I think two years, two plus years to get this many kids into the study and to some extent those sample numbers compromise our ability to observe the impacts between the sites. I'm not going to talk about the response rates, I think Mark is going to talk a little bit about those. But I'm suffice to say the ever good baseline response rate is really high, second follow-up which is the survey that we base, our impact findings on, we see all around with 90%. So there are good response rates there.

Right, close your eyes, I'm going to whip back to that. Okay, all right, so first let me talk a little bit about the LST program. What we are looking at here is a table of the baseline characteristic for youth actually having for all four sites, but the LST site is circled in that blue square there. I just want to briefly review these. You can see that the average age of youth served or actually involved in the evaluation served and controlled 17 years old but half the kids were African American and almost half were Hispanic which Latino or Hispanic from elsewhere in the world. And you see that I mean that makes sense given that the sample was drawn from Los Angeles sizable proportions of youth reported having been told by some teacher or other school professional that they had a learning disability and all recorded participating in special education and forget about the third

**Session 6.08 – Findings and Implications From the Federal Evaluation of Independent Living Programs for Youth in Foster Care**

reported ever being employed about half of the kids report, we administered the Achenbach Youth Self Report to all the kids in both all across, all four sites and in both groups.

And about half of the kids in or youth in the LST sample reported problems that qualified them in borderline the youth self-report is a clinical level and then a borderline level which is a little bit below that. And so about half of them scored on the youth self-report in the borderline or higher range on one or more different subscales which include the subscales that make up the externalizing and people who are familiar with Achenbach, the externalizing scale and the internalizing scale and there was some independent scale. And that relatively high level of reported mental health promises reflected in some of the other variables concerning placement history. We see about 40% have had prior residential care about a third report prior run away.

And then the last bit of information we have here is where youth are where at the time of baseline survey and we could see that there is a bit of mix there with some residential care and about three quarters a little less in either a relative or non-relative foster home.

With respect to differences between the LST program and the controlled group, we found few only a couple of differences one was that LST youth reported slightly higher proportionate, excuse me, report there, slightly higher proportion of them reported having ever been in residential care before baseline survey and similarly a slight higher percent reported having been told that they have a learning disability then with the case in the control group.

But across all the other characteristics, the groups were statistically equivalent and then in addition to the comparisons like by very comparisons we also managed a number of different regressions sort of six ways to Sunday to make sure that we are accounting for these inadvertent differences across groups.

All right with respect to service receipt there were only a few differences between LST and the program group with respect to reported receipt of assistant for services, excuse me, one they reported being a little more unlikely to have gotten some help finding an apartment and then perhaps predictably the higher percentage of LST youth report attending independent living classes or groups which make sense given that was the nature of the program -- LST program itself. I think it's notable although you see even among the control group pretty large percentage of them almost half reported also attending some sort of class or group session that was focused on independent living skills.

All right, with respect to outcomes at second follow-up, we found a few are no differences as I mentioned at the top of the – at the top of my session. LST youth were more likely to report having received financial assistance either formal assistance from some source like TANF or informal support through like church or family member. And they also reported feeling more prepared those measures of preparedness that Matt mentioned there was a statistically higher proportion of those reported LST youth

**Session 6.08 – Findings and Implications From the Federal Evaluation of Independent Living Programs for Youth in Foster Care**

reported being prepared then the comparison group youth but across other domains education employment and the other like the half dozen domains that Matt talked about there were no statistically significant differences across groups.

Okay, so I'm going to – in turn as I talk about each of these programs, give a couple of thoughts about program implications. First and foremost, I think that the characteristics of this sample and it will be borne out on samples of the other evaluations is that foster youth are not doing well at the time – at the point in time that they are about to emancipate from care this is consistent with work that Mark's done in Illinois and Wisconsin and consistent with other work that suggested these youth are in real need of assistance at the point in time that they are about to leave the system.

With respect to the program I think that one of the important takeaways is to help us, or is to bake the question whether classroom based with the short-term training programs are really appropriate given the level of need that youth emancipating from care have. Like this is one of the question because these programs are relatively pervasive, I mean, I was an independent living coordinator in Wisconsin and that's what I did, I mean, at the time it seemed like an important thing to be doing but its not surprising that these things don't have an impact on the kind of programs that people – these kids have maybe they are more likely to have a bank account maybe they are more likely to understand the requirements of being independent. But the kind of support and significant help that they need is just not provided through this context.

Another I think important thing that this finally suggest is to help raise the question of whether classrooms are really the appropriate venue through which these skill should be taught. I mean, kids, we all learn these skills to some degree before we leave our homes whether we are in foster care or not. And most of the time that kind of information comes from peers, it comes from parents, it comes from sources that more organic than a class, I mean, probably a very few of us attended an independent living class.

And so one of the questions is important to ask is whether a classroom based training is really the point of departure where those – that information should be provided.

All right, let's move on to the ESTEP program here, we are looking at the same table, the couple of things we have just pointed out have a contrast to LST, the sample is younger 14.5 on average at the time of the baseline survey reflect as the sampling design. The proportion of children who are African American and Hispanic are approximately the same as they are in the LST sample with some slight differences. About equal proportion as with the case in LST report having learning disability or participating in special education classes, lower percentage report ever being employed partly probably because that this sample is younger.

About the same pretty much exactly the same, this rounded to a whole number scored on the borderline or above range in the Achenbach Youth Self Report. And then there was some differences with respect to placement history, you can see the fewer of them report

**Session 6.08 – Findings and Implications From the Federal Evaluation of Independent Living Programs for Youth in Foster Care**

having runaway again because they are younger at this point in time and had less time to figure out to runaway or to be placed in residential care.

And then there was some differences with respect to their current placement, fewer of them are in residential care and most of in fact are in non-kin or kin foster homes at the time of the baseline survey. And there were no differences in this case on baseline characteristics between the youth assigned to the ESTEP program and those assigned to the controlled group.

Okay. So with respect to I think the service probably most relevance in the case of ESTEP, equal proportions of the youth in the ESTEP and the controlled groups reported receiving educational tutoring, if we don't worry about the source they receive the tutoring. However, there were significant differences with respect to where they got their tutoring in particular ESTEP youth were more likely to have received in home which makes sense because ESTEP is a home-based tutoring program and in contrast the youth in the control group are more likely to report having received tutoring through their local school. And this was – the sample was drawn shortly after no child left behind was in action. So a lot of schools including those in California and Los Angeles were implementing tutoring programs to help kids to meet the requirements of that legislation.

As was the case with LST, we found no significant differences or a few significant, I think I should know in this case. Differences between ESTEP and control group on the range of outcomes at the year to follow-up interview, these include a several outcomes of particular relevance to education including school grades, educational team whether they have graduated high school, their grade – the grade that they were in at the time of the second follow-up interview, school behaviors.

And then we also administered Woodcock-Johnson Achievement Test which measured things like reading comprehension and vocabulary and again there were no differences between ESTEP and control group on any of these outcomes.

All right, so implications for ESTEP in particular I would like the case with LST program one of the implications is that foster youth, the educational trajectories outcome status of foster youth are poor in general and findings here suggested they are in need of a program whether it would be tutoring or something else to help with that.

Based on reports from controlled group youth, it seems that these in Los Angeles county the tutoring was widely available for youth through the schools and in light of that it raises a question of the appropriateness of home-based tutoring provided by the foster care system. I mean, one because we – because of the fact that tutoring is being provided already through schools but also if you think about the nature of home-based tutoring and whether its appropriate from – for kids in foster care.

There are a couple of questions that I think are important to ask. One is whether home-based tutoring serves to stigmatize you more than they already are as foster youth like having them engage in tutoring outside of school. And also one of the important tends of

**Session 6.08 – Findings and Implications From the Federal Evaluation of Independent Living Programs for Youth in Foster Care**

home-based tutoring is one of the claims or one of the reasons why its claimed to be ineffective intervention is that it's able to involve parents in the tutoring process and the education of the kids.

And I think it's important to ask whether that is in fact able to happen in the context of substitute care by the kids in group homes or being held the group home staff for the foster parents who are willing to do that. And in this case, the impact of findings certainly suggest the very least that there is no advantage to home-based tutoring over school-based tutoring.

All right, so the third set of findings I'm going to talk about come from Kern county, the independent living employment services program. Again we are looking at the table of baseline characteristics, the age – average age of youth in this sample was 16 at baseline proportions of race and ethnicity are little different than they were in LST and ESTEP probably because these in Kern county, Bakersfield, you see a much larger proportion of youth are report being white, equal or larger proportion however our Latino or Hispanic. The about equal proportions again as it was the case in LST and ESTEP report having the learning stability or special education or participating in special education and relatively low proportion of them reported being ever employed which we are talking about whether this would be genesis of this finding and one of the issues may come into play is that we -- this – the evaluation was rolled out more or less the beginning of the current economic malaise and in Kern county in particular employment was higher than the rest of the country. So it was particularly difficult for teenagers and one could imagine for teen whoever in substitute care to find employment which is reflected in the low number there.

Again as was the case in LST and ESTEP, about half scored borderline or above on the Achenbach Self Report. About three quarters report a prior residential care and then there was a mix of current placement types here with about 1/5<sup>th</sup> in residential care and then equal proportions in kin and non-kin.

Okay, so across IOES or the program group and the comparison group there were a few differences in terms of service receipt ILES group reported more – were more likely to report excuse me receiving help of career counseling, help of resume writing. They also were less likely to report not having received a service they wanted – I know was a double negative I apologize for that. That's the way question was worded.

Interestingly however when asked about receiving, whether received help for employment two things, one is that the proportion was statistically equivalent, the two, both groups were very likely the vast majority of each of them reported receiving some help with employment.

This slide here, this refers to something that Matt was talking about earlier on is that in our search for in program that were intensed the way that this program is described seem to fit that bill and in fact if one was to ask how many youth participated or took up the program, it seem that would be supported by 98% were enrolled in the program in some

**Session 6.08 – Findings and Implications From the Federal Evaluation of Independent Living Programs for Youth in Foster Care**

way. But as you go down and ask yourself – we ask ourselves how intense was that program participation, the proportion of youth who participated in what we call the most intensive services which included things like help with job interviews or shopping for clothes for job interview was very low was about one in five.

And in this case it represents the voluntary nature of the program, youth are essentially enrolled into the program and then they could then make the decision when they are ready to sell out for a job to make use of this service and it looks like at the end only minority of them did.

Okay, again here in Kern county as was the case in LST and ESTEP there were no statistically significant differences on any of the evaluated outcomes between the two groups. We see that in general in terms of the whole sample that about 60% reported having been ever employed at the time of the second follow-up interview. The self-reported earnings per year is – are clearly not high about \$2000, \$1500 actually for the program group. And then the proportion of youth reported economic hardships things like homelessness are having to borrow money from friends or having to double up was fairly high about quarter of the comparison group and almost – excuse me a slightly more than the third in the ILES group.

Now some of the reasons – excuse me some of the reasons we think that are sort of behind the lack of finding of statistically significant differences, in this case was again because the program was volunteer and there were some real challenges with respect to engaging youth and doing the kind of outreach that was required to get youth to participate again about 5<sup>th</sup> of the youth participated in the most intensive services.

Also skip down to the third one here, is that through – particularly through the high schools in Bakersfield and I think the rest of the Kern county there were several programs that offered help with employment services and so in addition to the ILES program there are a lot of venues through which adolescents both in foster care are not who could take advantage of to help find employment and so that in some ways could have served to dilute the difference between the Kern county program youth and the comparison youth on outcomes like employment and income.

All right, so the last one, on this one we actually found an impact since this is the fun one to talk about. So okay, so this is again that table of baseline characteristics. I haven't talked much about gender here but we see here that about 2/3rds of the youth in this sample are female. And remember this sample and I think Matt described this. These were kids who are referred to Achievement foster homes, right, this program is I think in general, yeah, yeah, we are – we served kids in all – in both foster homes and in therapeutic foster homes, right, right. And the program itself serves kids in traditional foster homes but in this case because the negotiations over implementing the evaluation, the evaluation piece was limited to those who are in Achievement foster home at the time, I don't know if there is anything that we can do with the high proportion of girls in the sample but it served to jog your memory.

**Session 6.08 – Findings and Implications From the Federal Evaluation of Independent Living Programs for Youth in Foster Care**

About an average youth were 17 years old at baseline about three quarters of them were white and about a quarter were African American and again this is over Massachusetts over the entire state, Boston has a lot of youth of color but the rest of the state has a lot of is somewhat in margin with respect to race and ethnicity. And then slightly higher proportions reported having been told that they have learning disability or participating in special education and what's the case from samples from the other sites and again about half reported or who scored over the borderline on any subscale on the YSR, see if there is anything else of note here. Oh, just in reflection of the sample characteristics of all most all of the youth had time at the baseline survey when a non-kin foster home in this case is treatment or specialized foster home.

And there were some couple of differences between outreach youth and control group youth at baseline in particular AOP youth were more likely to have run away and more likely to be a residential care than control group youth.

Okay, so I don't know if you remember but in addition to it, there are being no differences in outcomes in the other sites also across most of the other sites there were very little differences in reported assistance or service receipt. Here in Massachusetts we found that there actually were a number of important differences. AOP youth reported being more likely to have received assistance with college applications, writing resumes and helping up a financial account, help with money management help making a down payment on housing.

And perhaps in reflection to some of those differences we found statistically significant differences between groups between AOP and comparison group on a couple, on several key – I want to first jump down to the third one there, we found that AOP youth were assumingly more likely to report having attended college and also who use data from the National Higher Student....

Unidentified Speaker: National Higher Student Clearinghouse.

Andrew Zinn: Thank you very much. Which records all reticulation right across colleges all over the country. So based on both youth self-report and then administrative data youth in the AOP sample were more likely to have attended college and more likely to have persisted in college from one year to the next then youth in the comparison sample. Also AOP youth report being more likely to – these involve with the child welfare system and second follow-up then with the case with comparison group. And last but not least they are more likely to have a driver's license than the comparison group youth.

The finding that the youth – both more likely to be in care and more likely to have attended college, bake the question of whether that these things were related right was, in fact the case that staying in care longer which is something that a lot of work, and Mark's work and another people's work suggest us in confirms important benefits on kid. Was that essentially thing that was driving usability to attend college and accounted for the differences between the two groups. In an effort to drill down on that we connected a

**Session 6.08 – Findings and Implications From the Federal Evaluation of Independent Living Programs for Youth in Foster Care**

number of different analysis one of which was a mediation analysis that suggested that the relationship between or the variation excuse me in the – proportion of kids who ended up attending college that a much larger proportion of that was associated with the variation and staying in care than it was. I'm saying this, I know unnecessarily twisted way but much more of that variation was accounted for or attributable to staying in care than it was to participation in the outreach program itself or suggest that the impact of the AOP program is in a sense mediated through their efforts to. I don't know, if I can describe this but one of the things that they try to do was to encourage youth to stay in care, plus 18 which is possible in Massachusetts, so was essentially an indirect or like indirect consequent result of that efforts then which then led to their higher proportion of them being attending college and persisting at college.

Okay, and now are getting moved to the lessons learned section and this is going to be Mark.

Mark Courtney: So lessons learned, first lesson learned you can actually start with a project like this in survival few of us here that bear witness to this. I'm going to talk about in terms of lessons learned it touches on the impact findings but its more an effort to talk about what have we learned about evaluating services for older youth making the transition to adulthood in foster care through this evaluation and I think one could look at the impact findings and say well, gee, why do we do this, three of the four interventions had no impact, one has an impact but it appears to be mediated by this sort of policy driven possibility, I mean, what if we are in a state where you can't extend care plus 18. We've learned nothing from this evaluation. I'm throwing that out there has a strong, I don't think that's true, I think that actually these projects were important to the field so I'm going to try to share what we think are some of the lessons learned.

First of all, to put this first slide in perspective, back in 2006, Paul Montgomery colleagues who is at Oxford, what's called a systematic review of what's the evidence for an independent living services and they employed the Cochrane Collaboration model looked at all the research tried to identify research that actually was rigorous enough to draw any conclusions and they basically concluded there is no evidence and supported the effectiveness of independent living services primarily because we haven't really used any rigor to evaluate any of these interventions. So the fact that we now have four rigorous evaluations, randomized trials of four interventions that represent different approaches to helping youth make the transition to adulthood is in and of itself I think very important.

Now, if we did a systematic review, we still going to find a long list of evidence-based interventions but I think we are moving in the right direction. So we have demonstrated I think conclusively that in a variety of settings random assignment experimental evaluation is in fact possible and gives unbiased estimates or program in fact even in a place like LST where we had some, Andy didn't talk about it much but we had some violations in program assignment. Whatever one thinks about the challenge that you hear that well you try to do random assignment sometimes those contamination effects.

**Session 6.08 – Findings and Implications From the Federal Evaluation of Independent Living Programs for Youth in Foster Care**

The reality is random assignment in and of itself gives you the tools to look at issues of selection into program much better than any alternative. Had we tried to evaluate any of these things using experimental methods we would be in much, much worse shape. Even in Los Angeles where we had something on people do to the – partly to the all results, this from the program of getting control group youth into the program we are able to use the experimental condition to see whether that made a difference or not, we use it, we will get into the statistics here but using it from a variable model.

So I think we've demonstrated that we are able to do this and it gives you a sense of the impacts to these programs. I think we learned some other things that next round of these hopefully if we are going to evaluate a program that is a life touch program like the current program, right where it essentially offer something to young people maybe we should have known this going into what they thought many more young people took up their program beyond the newsletter than in fact did, and we informed that the fact that wasn't the case and they accept that because of the rigor of our methods.

But one of the consultants to us along the way, Dave Gutiérrez said this isn't a necessarily a bad program. There are a lot of things out there that you offer to people, right, and many of them don't take it up. And as long as it's not a very costly intervention to offer it maybe that's not a bad idea. But if we are going to go with something like that again if we didn't have a massive sample size I think we would say let's not do that, right.

You are offering something doesn't look – it looks like a lot of people won't take that up so if we do an intent to treat evaluation really the only chance we have finding an impact is on the subgroup that takes it up. This is a method that allows to do that but it's going to take a larger sample. And so I think along the way in terms of the next round we've learned a lot of things that we wouldn't necessarily have known going into it.

A foster youth can be interviewed in spite of a parental obstacles, I mean, I'd hope that that would be accepted at this point the Midwest study that I have been at PMI for a number of years and in Illinois, Iowa and Wisconsin that people referred to we've started with 95%. We have retained 80% of that original sample that every single way we are doing interviews at 26, we got 82% response rate from the original sample. So it can't be done but I constantly get asked, can you really do that.

So I think that we now have a series of studies that demonstrate that young people aging out in foster care want to tell you about their experiences if you give them a chance.

And we've also found that administrative data can be used to enhance the analysis of service provision and program impact. We use administrative data, in some cases to see what kind of take up there was, the data from East – from the Kern county program for example on how many got a newsletter and how many met with the work et cetera. Those are all administrative data. So those didn't come from a survey and in fact in some ways, you need to have those data. Because you can ask a young person about did you have – sometimes they can't answer those questions very accurately, right. Same thing

**Session 6.08 – Findings and Implications From the Federal Evaluation of Independent Living Programs for Youth in Foster Care**

with the National Student Clearinghouse data having those data on college enrollment independent of surveys is nice for a variety of reasons not least which is even if you have a 90% follow-up rate there is 10% you don't necessarily have a survey date on but we do have NSC date on.

So this just I think emphasize that Andy went on to that the response rates are great I think that North deserves a lot of credit for obtaining these response rates over two year period of time. You have learned a lot in the process I'm actually involved in, there is another RCT going on, it's not federal government but the Youth Villages program in Tennessee, MDRC is doing an RCT of that that I'm involved in. And they are using Mark kind of thing it's because Mark has developed a lot of expertise in this regard.

Okay, that was the good news. This isn't bad news but this is news that I think we had to take into account in terms of the lessons learned. There are a lot of implementation challenges in evaluating independent living services. A lot of them have been alluded to hearing, I'm just going to restate them and hopefully emphasize them. Towards the end of the presentation and hopefully if you agree with these observations, you will go out and share them with the field, and you disagree we will have a few minutes that you can disagree with us.

Program managers often have limited knowledge about the program features important for evaluation. They know something about their programs but referral processes, length of service in pretty much every case folks were quite sure that they knew about how this process has worked and how long young people are being served and they were wrong in every case.

Sometimes one direction, sometimes the other area, Massachusetts they actually ended up serving on people longer than they thought and that had big implications for an RCT, right, you are dealing with program flow, the program flows are a lot slower than what people are telling you. You are going to be in the field a lot longer than you thought you are going to be in the field and that creates all kinds of potential problems, things change, leadership changes, all kinds of things going to happen the longer you are in the field.

Multiple institutional players can create challenges for evaluation of limitation. In Los Angeles county we thought we had the okay we sat down with the agency, even met with the Chief Juvenile Court Judge by everybody had bought on this we literally started the evaluation only to have the children's attorneys at some point figure this out and go in and demand that the whole thing stop. And it was actually stopped for a while. But we are able to work it out and go but we thought, we had all the institutional players we needed at the table who have agreed to this and it turned it we were wrong. And it turned that the head of the agency and the juvenile court judge were wrong about who we need.

Changes in program leadership can affect programs and the evaluation that happened in a couple of places by the time we are done in Kern, they had basically had several turnovers of leadership and they discontinued the program. I mean, some way the good

**Session 6.08 – Findings and Implications From the Federal Evaluation of Independent Living Programs for Youth in Foster Care**

news, when you have to go get people bad news about your program is not working, its not really not that painful when people say, well, we are done with that anyway.

Staff turnover can similarly disruptive limitation lack of adherence to logic model can reduce the validity of the evaluation design. So if you are not doing, if you are doing what should do as an evaluator, you design the evaluation to take into account what the logic model is, what people say they are doing. But if they end up not doing what they say they are doing then your evaluation design might not work and actually people can come and get into the examples here but you can go across all of these examples in there. Examples of this playing out and then lastly, lack of staff buying can jeopardize the experimental design. So I think the best example that is in the LST program where some of the outreach workers in spite of great efforts by us in the agency to say look we are trying to evaluate the impact of this, if you sneak control group youth into one of the LST sessions that makes our life difficult. Nevertheless, that ended up happening.

But maybe in some ways those things are I think generally true in evaluation of human services nothing hear that any evaluator who has worked with human services programs have – would have been counted along the way if they are round long enough.

I think there is some lessons for this state of this field of services for youth making the transmission to adulthood out of foster care that are really important for the next round of knowledge development.

As we have already said many of the programs are very small and few interventions have been taken to scale. But that's challenging from an evaluation standpoint particularly if - -I'm jumping out of the bottom here, I will come back to it particularly if a lot of the interventions are weaken on the dosage end, right. If you have a small program and its not really intensive okay, the ability to evaluate that program from an impact standpoint is basically zero. It would take many, many, many years because your effects sizes aren't going to be large anyway because it's not at all that intensive. And you don't serve many people. So we would have to be watching you for a long, long time in order to get sample sizes adequate enough to pick up this sort of small effects that you would be expecting to deliver. And that's true for a lots of things in this field. Lot of interesting programs that were small, some of them are pretty intensive but they are so small that we encountered housing programs that served like 12 young people a year.

Any of you, basic statistics class you want to look at differences in homelessness for example, kind of an obvious outcome of a housing program. I mean, you need fairly larger numbers than we had certainly for percentage differences say in Massachusetts and we are talking 10 years that you have to be in the field unless you are able to expand our programs on it.

Many programs most programs I would assert, I will report my team any, I will say notes this point have very poorly developed logic models. If they have a logic model at all and in fact they put folks back here who had the write the lot of models for some of the sites we choose which we considered to be some of the best out there in terms of being able to

**Session 6.08 – Findings and Implications From the Federal Evaluation of Independent Living Programs for Youth in Foster Care**

talk about what they were doing. But when you said what you ask can you give us a written logic model the answer was almost always no. And so we will develop it with them. That's a challenge from an evaluation standpoint.

Many programs have insufficient understanding of the broader service context in which interventions are delivered and how that context affects the programs likely impact. There is all kinds of examples. Every single program we evaluated in LA, for example LST if you talk to the folks in the county they honestly believe that for the – if they weren't delivering this Life Skills Training program my folks in the county I mean, agency and the judge, all the folks if they don't get LST, Life Skills Training they are not going to get Life Skills Training. Well, no, in fact 40 something percent of the control group said they got a Life Skills class of some sort some other way, okay.

So there is a lot going out there that people are not aware of, right. Maybe it's in high school, maybe their group home does this, and the agency just not thinking about that. For ESTEP the context that had changed that nobody including us really had taken into account was no child left behind. I mean, I'm really convinced that's what was going on. I don't think LA county that all the kids who needed tutoring prior to that where getting tutoring in their classrooms, but anybody who works in education and knows what's happen in terms of tutoring to low income, and low income communities and so called failing schools it's a cottage industry within those schools right. So we are implementing this evaluation at the time that no child left behind is being implemented in LA county 89 different school districts.

And in the control group the fact is what's the target population, kids that are one to three years behind in math, reading, right. Well, those are the kids at the school are going to be giving tutoring, right, and sure enough 60% of them in the control group are getting some kind of tutoring but that wasn't something that people were thinking about, right. So trying to evaluate an intervention you really have to have a sophisticated understanding of the counterfactual. What else is out there that the control group is likely to be getting. Because you are not going to be able to change that in all likelihood at least you need to be aware of that. If you are going to try to change that now you not only got around some assignment to intervention you are going to somehow suppress the counterfactual which is hard to do.

And then as I said, many programs have relatively dosages arguably although I have to say the ESTEP tutoring program while you could view I think was an average of 25 hours of tutoring across math and reading as a week dosage compared to other tutoring programs out there that's not week in fact in the middle of our evaluation a funder of child welfare programs actually got up in a meeting and said that's a week intervention. We have this other tutoring intervention and when I went to looked at what they are tutoring intervention provides is half of this, right. So, but, nevertheless from in a tutoring going outside of child welfare the research and tutoring suggest that if you don't have at least 50 hours, that's when you start to see an impact.

**Session 6.08 – Findings and Implications From the Federal Evaluation of Independent Living Programs for Youth in Foster Care**

So it's a relatively weak program AOP being the exception to that and actually we didn't get the cheer when we said we have an impact when we presented this at the Independent Living Conference, everybody -- you can see they are just getting progressively depressed. And then there is an impact everybody cheered except when somebody raised their hand and said wait a minute you are telling me that these folks had a case load of 15 or 16 kids and they were able to serve them for 20, whatever 16 weeks, 22 weeks and said yeah, hell, we will never be able to do that months, yeah, months, sorry, months.

And the response from the practice world was that's ridiculously intensive we can't possibly do that. Well, that's the only intervention we would evaluate here folks that has an impact. And so week dosages are a problem. So what can we do to improve the prospects of identifying evidence-based intervention for foster youth transition. I think we need to provide more scrutiny of program context prior to launching an evaluation. So what is the existing availability of services that approximate those being provided by an intervention target for evaluation, what else is out there?

That is likely to provide the same kind of input to these young people in their lives as what you are trying to do. What's the likelihood of program continuity throughout the evaluation period. We did I think we paid a lot of attention of that. But nevertheless things happen during the context of these evaluations that I think call for even more scrutiny of that.

And then what's the likelihood of policy change that fundamentally alters the comparison of the treatment condition of the comparison condition, no child left behind was an example looking at these evaluations fostering connections is a huge policy contextual issue for anything you are going to do for foster youth who are going to go from being 18 to over 18 during the period of evaluation, right. For state extents care that – extended care doesn't mean anything until you know what it means to extent care on a particular jurisdiction, right. So that a change in that policy during the context of an evaluation going forward and unless you thought it through very carefully could basically render your evaluation of very little use in terms of understanding the impact of intervention.

Just to give one example changing policy context. A better population targeting, in the tutoring program, it didn't look like they actually ended up targeting the folks they were supposed to target. We had our own test we administered to the young people. There were many of them who are more than three years behind some of that weren't a year behind, right. So the targeting of that program was not what they thought it would be and you could argue about whether that you also should be targeting anyway.

Same thing with employment, do you want to target employment particularly a light touch employment program to somebody just turning 16 and out of home care may be may be not. I mean, at a certain level it made sense they are able to work now. They can get a permit on another level they don't have to work. It's kind of when they reach the age of 18 that they have to work, right because that sports themselves. So where do you want to target, I think, tie in the logic model to targeting is do a better job that's very important.

**Session 6.08 – Findings and Implications From the Federal Evaluation of Independent Living Programs for Youth in Foster Care**

And then tied into all that is time and resources to invest in developmental programs prior to rigorous evaluation in every case here with the exception of maybe altering the referral process to make it more transparent. So you are not going to select among all 16 years old now so it's like any 16 year old you think is eligible you are going to round the assigning. In the absence of that we didn't work with these folks to develop a new logic model, we didn't work with them to tailor their program or target anything like that. And I think that the main lesson for us is that going forward that's the kind of partnership that would be wise for people investing in evaluation in this field to have with the field. That's not just take what's given out there and then go try to rigorously evaluate it. Let's do these steps that we are talking about here targeting logic model development et cetera understanding the context with the folks in the field then do the rigorous evaluation.

So these are the four site reports and I think that's the last slide, right. So we have time for some questions. You want to moderate.

Unidentified Speaker: 10 minutes.

Unidentified Speaker: Any questions or comments? Hey, John.

Unidentified Speaker: Hi, there first of all, I want to thank you all for your hard work, I'm a former foster youth and now I'm a researcher in this area and I really want to applaud your tenacity and your hard work so thank you very much.

With that said, as a researcher however I continue to struggle with randomization. And I know that Matt, is it Matt.

Matthew Stagner: Yeah.

Unidentified Speaker: Yeah, alluded to the fact that this was almost like a four separate site evaluation, randomization occurred differently amongst each, is it a possible that you can describe briefly one of the procedures that's used for one of the sites and how you achieved randomization?

Matthew Stagner: Sure. And it did very tremendously across sites. So in the Los Angeles Life Skills Training program, we received a list of all youth in foster care. A few exceptions were made especially for youth with severe disabilities who might not be able to actually participate in the program. But it was a basically 98% of youth in foster care, in that entire list at one point in time of youth who would be turning 17 during the next quarter was randomized to select approximately, half of them having access to the program and then that list was given to the community colleges to say go find these 100 youth and bring them into your program this quarter and we did that three quarters in a row to reach the size of the population, now we are interested in.

Massachusetts had a unique situation and it was just an assertion on random assignment where we are talking about the disappointment as well as disruption to work at a series of

**Session 6.08 – Findings and Implications From the Federal Evaluation of Independent Living Programs for Youth in Foster Care**

control selections have if you are not taking a long list but you are taking youth one at a time who arrive at a door or get referred to a door.

And if you get 12 controls in a row people start to wonder what's going on, you got to worker, he doesn't have anybody to work with, you have an angry program. So in Massachusetts we actually we took paired referrals. We said we will only take referrals when you have two youth to bring and more randomly assign one to the treatment and one to control. That probably distorted the referral process somewhat in that if one youth was available, it might have looked a little bit harder for a youth to pair, but we still had the random assignment aspect of that.

In Kern, it was like Los Angeles, LST but it was youth turning 16 rather than 17, and then in the tutoring program it was a referral process which was over-subscribed. So there we did just assign referrals as a cane and try to – there was not the same concern about the flow and the possibility of the series of controls.

So, all of those have advantages and disadvantages and I think I would just echo something Mark said which is that even when random assignment fails in some sense, we had crossovers in human services, you almost always have low take up to some extent not everybody deemed eligible for a program actually shows up for it. So then you have the dilution in and an intent to treat model. But it still does give you something to play with, it gets around some of the selection issues it mainly using the assignment processes and instrumental variable. So it gives you an advantage if you think selection is a problem.

One of my pet peeves around the focus on whether random assignment is the right thing or not, is there so many other elements of a good design an important one is, did we actually who did we lose to follow-up ended we follow-up a large proportion. So I think sometimes we think, yeah, we've got a great study. We did random assignment although we followed up 30% of the control group.

So there are many elements of it and a need I think for creativity and some flexibility in applying it because if we just went in and said look, this is the way it works, we've got this program you are going to send us names, we are going to randomly assign the buy in at the program level will be difficult.

Mark Courtney: One that doing around, one of the advantages of these four different programs and random assignment I think there is a lot to be learned just about youth engagement in the services by looking at program take up and the structure of these programs, right, I mean you have take-up ranging from arguably 20% in the employment program. Two, 100% really in Massachusetts why because they don't really have a choice, if they get assigned, the case worker and the case worker goes to visit them. But you got to arrange the LST program may be didn't have an impact but it did get 76% of the young people to go to these classes and basically complete the program. And they put a lot of work into that.

**Session 6.08 – Findings and Implications From the Federal Evaluation of Independent Living Programs for Youth in Foster Care**

So I think that the design allows you to learn a lot of things other than just the impact and we don't a lot about engaging foster youth and services and I think across these four programs that's an analysis somebody could do and we feel, the field could learn a lot from it.

Matt Stagner: Other questions? I don't know, is this the last time we are going to present all of this? We don't, I'm just kind of having overwhelming feeling of loss and sadness after this seven years.

[Laughing]

Matt Stagner: But we are doing this alone.

Matt Stagner: But we really appreciate you listening and these data will ultimately become available to researchers that's always a complicated process and if you have other follow-ups with us.

Maria Woolverton: Right. So this is the OPRE website at where we have the reports and we do have some project summary that kind of gets and a lot of issues that Mark was talking about that is still in preparation as well as a bunch of research briefs on different targeted topics that are in preparation and we will post in this on the website when they are available as well. And I really do want to thank the evaluation team and I think Roseana has Kern still there but we are hanging in there had a quite a bit of continuity and the people have kind of switched around in organization state with the evaluation. So I will just – never thought we would get to this point. Anyway thank you for your efforts on this and children's bureau for the funding, this evaluation.

Unidentified Speaker: Thank you for listening.

Maria Woolverton: Thank you.