

# THE IARCA OUTCOME MEASURES PROJECT

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

# 2016



INDIANA ASSOCIATION OF RESOURCES  
AND CHILD ADVOCACY

**INDIANA ASSOCIATION OF  
RESOURCES AND CHILD ADVOCACY**  
5519 East 82nd Street • Suite A  
Indianapolis, IN 46250  
**P** 317.849.8497 • **F** 317.576.5498  
[www.iarca.org](http://www.iarca.org)



INDIANA ASSOCIATION OF RESOURCES  
AND CHILD ADVOCACY

# THE IARCA OUTCOME MEASURES PROJECT

## Executive Summary Report for Calendar year 2016

**Steven M. Koch, Ph.D.**

**Jacqueline Remondet Wall, Ph.D., CRC**

Indiana Association of Resources and Child Advocacy (IARCA)  
5519 East 82nd Street, Suite A, Indianapolis, IN 46250  
Phone (317) 849-8497 Fax (317) 576-5498  
[www.iarca.org](http://www.iarca.org) [www.evaluateoutcomesnow.org](http://www.evaluateoutcomesnow.org)

Published August 15, 2017, Copyright © 2017, Indiana Association of Resources and Child Advocacy (IARCA).  
We encourage you to share this Executive Summary with others. Permission to copy, disseminate and otherwise use  
this document or parts of it is granted as long as appropriate acknowledgement is given.

### What is the IARCA Outcome Measures Project?

The primary aim of the IARCA Outcome Measures Project (referred to as the IOMP) is to evaluate the effectiveness of programs provided to children and families. *The Project*, conceived in 1995 and initiated on a statewide scale in 1998, has since continuously collected information on youth receiving treatment from participating IARCA member agencies. Agencies provide data on youth who are placed into care, who leave care, and several months after being discharged in 12 distinct program types: Transitional Living; Day Treatment; Home-Based; Traditional Family Foster Care; Treatment Foster Care; Shelter Care; Residential Programs Utilizing Public Schools; Residential Programs Utilizing Both Public and On-Grounds Schools; Residential Locked and Staff-Secure Programs; Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facilities; Crisis Stabilization; and Outpatient Treatment<sup>1</sup>. In 2016, 52 agencies participated in *the Project*, by contributing information on youth receiving services in their programs.

### Youth Entering Services in 2016

- ✓ Across all programs, 6,384 children were assessed at intake.
  - ✓ Also across all programs, the average age of youth entering services was 11.4 years, with a range from under 1 to 20 years of age.
  - ✓ Nearly three-fifths of all youth entering care in 2016 were Caucasian (57.9%), one-fourth were African American (24.3%), and one in 20 were Latino/Hispanic (4.3%). About 1 in 8 youth (13.5%) were of other ethnicities or identified as multiracial.
  - ✓ The average number of prior out-of-home placements is 1.7, ranging from 0 to 50 previous placements.
  - ✓ Half of the youth have a history of reported / substantiated neglect (50.1%).
  - ✓ Histories of suspected or substantiated physical abuse were reported in just over one-fifth of youth (20.5%).
  - ✓ Approximately half of the youth came from a single parent family (48.7%) and / or had a parent who had abused substances (50.1%).
  - ✓ Nearly 2 of every 5 youth had a parent with an incarceration history (38.1%).
  - ✓ Almost 1 of every 6 youth entering care had experienced the termination of parental rights for at least one parent (14.8%).
- ✓ Youth placed into **Transitional Living** programs were on average 17.3 years of age when admitted. Parent rights were terminated for nearly 1 in 4 youth (23.5%).
- ✓ Three of every five youth (59.6%) who were placed into **Day Treatment** programs were referred by Probation programs; another one in six youth were referred by the Department of Education (17.5%), and from private sources (15.8%).
- ✓ Over 3 of every 5 youth in **Home-Based** programs (61.6%) had a parent with known or suspected substance abuse. Over half had a parent with an incarceration history (50.5%).
- ✓ Youth in **Traditional Foster Care** programs were on average 5.4 years of age at program admission. Over 4 of every 5 youth (81.0%) were victims of substantiated or suspected neglect.

---

<sup>1</sup> Outpatient Treatment is included as a separate program type in the IOMP; however, in 2016 few agencies participated and thus information is not reported on this program type.

## Characteristics of Youth Served in 2016

- ✓ Youth in **Treatment Foster Care** programs were on average 7.6 years of age at program admission. Over 3 of every 4 youth (75.2%) were victims of substantiated or suspected neglect.
- ✓ Two of every three (67.9%) youth entering **Shelter Care** programs were from a single-parent household.
- ✓ Three of every 5 youth (60.5%) entering **Residential Care Programs using Public Schools** programs had previously received home-based services. Over half (55.6%) were identified as CHINS, while 2 of every 5 (42.6%) were classified as Delinquent.
- ✓ Approximately three of every five youth entering **Residential Care Programs using both Public & On-Grounds Schools** programs were classified as Delinquent (61.4%), and / or referred from Probation (59.0%).
- ✓ Youth entering **Residential Care Locked and Staff-Secure** programs had one of the higher average number of behavior concerns as identified on the CPC, with an average of 9.8 items endorsed at intake. Verbal aggression (72.9%) and peer relationship problems (67.1%) were two of the more commonly identified concerns for youth.
- ✓ Nearly 9 of every 10 youth (86.0%) entering **Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facilities** were privately placed. These youth had the highest average CPC items endorsed (10.7 items). Depression (83.3%) and verbal aggression (83.3%) were two of the more commonly identified concerns.
- ✓ Nearly 9 of every 10 youth entering **Crisis Stabilization** programs were on psychotropic medication at admission (86.0%), and/or had a parent with a known or suspected psychiatric diagnosis (89.3%).

# Characteristics of Youth Served in 2016

**Child Risk Factor Survey – By Program Type (2016)**

Variable	All Programs	Transitional Living	Day Treatment	Home-Based	Foster Care	Shelter Care	Residential Care	Crisis Stab.	Outpatient Treatment
Intake packets*	6,384	262	183	1,077	2,089	543	1,879	218	133
Age (Mean)	11.4	17.3	14.5	9.7	7.0	14.8	14.8	13.0	11.7
Gender									
Male	54.2	46.6	67.6	52.2	51.4	54.5	59.9	42.7	50.0
Female	45.8	53.4	32.4	47.8	48.6	45.5	40.1	57.3	50.0
Ethnicity									
Caucasian	57.9	51.9	54.9	52.3	48.4	62.2	66.7	84.4	81.8
African-American	24.3	12.6	31.3	24.0	33.7	21.9	19.2	4.1	6.8
Hispanic	4.3	3.8	1.1	3.9	5.2	3.9	4.5	1.8	1.5
Other	13.5	31.7	12.6	19.8	12.6	12.0	9.6	9.6	9.8
# Previous placements (Mean)	1.7	1.9	2.1	0.9	1.5	1.5	2.5	0.6	0.6
Past home-based Services	34.1	31.9	29.1	33.6	24.8	31.6	47.8	34.9	11.3
Pregnant	0.5	1.1	0.5	0.3	0.3	1.3	0.6	0.0	0.8
Have child(ren)	2.3	10.7	2.7	2.4	1.2	1.1	3.0	0.9	0.8
CHINS	53.3	53.8	4.4	58.8	84.8	29.8	35.1	8.3	8.3
Delinquent	22.2	17.6	36.1	14.4	1.8	40.3	47.1	0.0	5.3
Neglect	50.1	28.2	9.3	53.1	76.6	39.6	36.1	2.8	25.6
Physical abuse	20.5	11.5	11.5	13.6	15.1	30.2	29.6	23.9	15.0
Sexual abuse	13.1	7.3	4.4	8.4	6.3	12.7	24.7	17.9	12.0
Witness domestic violence	31.1	19.3	27.3	37.1	21.6	26.4	37.9	63.8	27.1
Grade retention	11.5	8.5	18.1	14.7	9.0	7.7	12.8	9.6	9.5
Special education	20.4	13.6	33.1	14.9	12.5	25.9	31.9	5.1	23.7
Psychotropic medication	33.0	15.1	18.6	16.7	14.4	37.1	59.2	86.0	34.4
Parent substance abuse	50.1	36.3	35.7	61.6	42.6	46.9	54.7	67.4	38.9
Parent incarceration	38.1	28.5	46.2	50.5	29.3	41.1	41.5	34.4	27.5
Parent psychiatric diagnosis	21.0	11.4	11.7	26.4	7.3	11.3	29.2	89.3	35.9
Single-parent family	48.7	31.8	59.9	54.2	35.7	67.9	53.3	68.4	50.4
Parent rights terminated:	14.8	23.5	16.7	8.6	7.5	19.1	24.6	9.3	16.8
One parent	4.9	4.1	9.4	3.4	2.0	8.4	8.0	1.9	4.6
Both parents	9.5	18.9	7.2	5.0	5.2	10.3	15.8	7.4	12.2
Adoptive parents	0.4	0.5	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.8	0.0	0.0
Risk Score (Mean)	4.2	3.1	3.3	4.3	3.6	4.3	5.2	4.8	3.3

\* 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.

## Youth Leaving Services in 2016

- ✓ 5,573 children were assessed at discharge.
- ✓ Across all programs, a positive educational outcome at discharge was reported for the majority of youth (77.8% for the combined IARCA sample). Positive education is achieved if the youth graduates from high school, or is rated positively in 2 of the following 3 areas: attendance, behavior, and/or achievement. Thus, a child would receive a positive outcome if they were attending school and not engaging in problematic behavior.
- ✓ At discharge, an average of 26.4% of youth 16 years of age and older were employed.
- ✓ Over 3 of every 5 youth in the combined IARCA sample (61.7%) were discharged to a placement of less restrictiveness.
- ✓ When a permanency plan was identified, 3 in 5 youth (60.5%) achieved their permanency plan when discharged.
- ✓ Youth in **Transitional Living** programs had a positive education outcome at discharge for over 4 of every 5 youth (83.3%); about half (49.4%) were employed at discharge.
- ✓ Youth in **Day Treatment** programs had a positive education outcome at discharge for about half of the youth (46.2%); about 3 of every 10 (29.6%) youth age 16+ were employed at discharge.
- ✓ Youth discharged from **Home-Based** program had a positive education outcome for over 7 of every 10 youth (70.7%); about one-third (31.5%) of youth age 16+ were employed at discharge.
- ✓ Youth from **Traditional Foster Care** programs had a positive education outcome at discharge for over 4 of every 5 youth (81.6%); about one-third (35.0%) of youth age 16+ were employed at discharge.
- ✓ Youth discharged from **Treatment Foster Care** had a positive education outcome at discharge for about 3 of every 4 youth (72.0%); about one-third (34.5%) of youth age 16+ were employed at discharge.
- ✓ Nearly 3 of every 5 youth (57.7%) placed into **Shelter Care** programs were discharged to a less restrictive setting.
- ✓ Youth leaving **Residential Care Programs using Public Schools** had a positive education outcome at discharge for nearly 3 of every 4 youth (73.3%); about one-third (36.0%) of youth age 16+ were employed at discharge.
- ✓ Youth from **Residential Care Programs using both Public & On-Grounds Schools** had a positive education outcome at discharge for over 4 of every 5 youth (85.8%); one-fifth of the youth (20.0%) age 16+ were employed at discharge.
- ✓ Youth leaving **Residential Care Locked and Staff-Secure** programs had a positive education outcome at discharge for over 4 of every 5 youth (83.3%); less than 1 in every 10 (8.0%) youth age 16+ were employed at discharge.
- ✓ Youth from **Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facilities** had a positive education outcome at discharge for over 9 of every 10 youth (90.9%); about 1 in 20 (5.8%) youth age 16+ were employed at discharge.
- ✓ Nearly all youth placed into **Crisis Stabilization** programs (98.6%) were discharged to a less restrictive setting.

**Discharge Outcome Summary – By Program Type (2016)**

Variable	All Programs	Transitional Living	Day Treatment	Home-Based	Foster Care	Shelter Care	Residential Care	Crisis Stab.	Outpatient Treatment
Discharge packets*	5,573	178	122	986	1,670	452	1,835	217	113
<b>Length of Stay: Mean</b>	225.5	378.0	112.6	224.3	305.8	29.2	217.4	5.0	272.1
<b>Median</b>	150.0	262.0	57.0	179.0	167.0	18.0	172.0	5.0	182.0
<b>Clinical Outcomes</b>									
CPC at discharge (Mean)	4.0	2.1	2.6	3.1	3.4	5.6	5.0	2.0	3.7
FRS at discharge (Mean)	0.41	n/a	0.43	0.43	0.41	n/a	0.40	n/a	0.37
FPC at discharge (Mean)	2.8	n/a	2.0	2.5	2.5	n/a	2.3	n/a	2.1
<b>Functional Outcomes</b>									
Positive education at discharge	77.8	83.3	46.2	70.7	74.7	n/a	84.4	n/a	65.5
Employed at discharge	26.4	49.4	29.6	31.5	34.7	n/a	18.1	n/a	43.3
<b>Placement Outcomes</b>									
ROLES at discharge									
More restrictive	13.4	19.1	21.3	11.1	10.3	36.1	12.9	0.9	7.1
Similar restrictiveness	21.5	12.4	74.6	65.0	11.6	3.1	7.7	0.5	85.0
Less restrictive	61.7	59.6	1.6	23.0	75.1	57.7	74.7	98.6	6.2
Runaway	3.3	9.0	2.5	0.9	3.1	3.1	4.7	0.0	1.8
Permanency plan achieved	46.5	49.7	7.4	40.3	55.6	32.0	55.1	i/n	15.2
(only those with required plan)	60.5	63.8	90.0	57.5	57.4	49.7	66.5	i/n	81.0
Nature of Discharge**									
Planned	70.9	60.1	74.6	64.1	68.3	83.1	72.4	99.5	53.6
Removed by referring source	5.4	3.4	9.0	4.1	5.8	2.0	6.7	0.5	13.4
Administrative discharge	19.7	26.4	12.3	29.9	21.9	10.6	16.0	0.0	30.4
Runaway	4.0	10.1	4.1	1.9	4.0	4.2	4.9	0.0	2.7

\* Sample sizes for individual items may be lower than the number of discharge packets due to missing data. Unless otherwise noted, numbers refer to percentages of affirmative responses. CPC=Child Problem Checklist. FRS=Family Risk Scales, Parent Centered Risk. FPC=Family Problem Checklist. ROLES=Restrictiveness of Living Environment Scale. Permanency Plan achieved refers to either primary or concurrent plan achieved. Education and employment are reported for the percent of youth who are of appropriate age. n/a = data not collected on this item for the program type. i/n = insufficient n (e.g., n = 1) \*\* One youth died in placement FC-Treatment).

## Follow-Up I from Youth Leaving Services in 2016

- ✓ Over two of every 5 (43.8%) eligible youth (1,429 out of 3,261) were contacted at follow-up I. Across the program types, the proportion of youth contacted at Follow-up I ranged from just over 1 in 4 youth (28.1% in Treatment Foster Care) to just under 3 in 4 youth (71.4% in Day Treatment programs).
- ✓ Of the youth contacted at follow-up I, 9 in 10 had a positive education outcome (92.4%); about 3 in 10 youth who were age 16 and older were employed (29.0%); most had no newly substantiated abuse (97.3%); and over 8 of 10 had not returned to court on new charges (85.2%).
- ✓ Nearly 9 in 10 youth contacted from **Transitional Living** programs had a positive education outcome at follow-up I (89.7%); about 3 in 5 were employed (58.7%); since discharge, no new abuse was substantiated; and 9 of 10 had not returned to court on new charges (i.e., 90.2%).
- ✓ Most (97.9%) youth contacted from **Day Treatment** programs had a positive educational outcome; since discharge, no new abuse was substantiated (100.0% no abuse) and no families had experienced newly substantiated abuse (100.0% no abuse in families); and most had no new court involvement for new offenses (87.7%).
- ✓ Most youth contacted from **Home-Based** programs had no new abuse substantiated since being discharged (98.6% reported no new abuse); few were living in homes where abuse was substantiated (99.5%); and more than 9 of every 10 experienced no new court involvement (96.2%).
- ✓ For youth contacted from **Traditional Foster Care** programs, nearly all those contacted (97.3%) had positive educational outcomes; most of the youth had no new substantiated abuse since discharge (94.5%); few (94.5%) had no substantiated instances of abuse in the home; and nearly all youth had no new court involvement (99.3%).
- ✓ For youth contacted from **Treatment Foster Care** programs, nearly all youth (99.1%) had positive educational outcomes reported; most had no newly substantiated abuse since discharge (95.2%); and nearly all had no new court involvement (98.4%).
- ✓ For youth contacted from **Residential Care Programs using Public Schools**, nearly 3 out of 4 youth contacted (76.2%) had positive educational outcomes; over 1 in 4 (27.6%) were employed; no new abuse was substantiated (100.0%); and about 2 of 3 youth (66.3%) were not involved with the court on new charges.
- ✓ For youth contacted from **Residential Care Programs using both Public & On-Grounds Schools**, more than 9 of every 10 (93.5%) had a positive educational outcome; 3 in 10 (30.7%) were employed; most had no new abuse substantiated (98.5%); and approximately 3 of every 4 youth had no new court involvement (75.7%).
- ✓ For youth contacted from **Residential Care Locked and Staff-Secure** programs, more than 4 of every 5 (84.3%) had a positive educational outcome; 1 in 10 (9.7%) were employed; most had no new abuse substantiated (95.4%); and about 5 in every 8 (63.6%) were not in court on new charges.
- ✓ For youth contacted from **Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facilities**, more than 9 of every 10 (94.7%) had a positive educational outcome; 28.6% were employed; no new abuse was substantiated for most of the youth (96.5%); and most had no new court involvement (94.7%).

**Follow-up I Outcome Summary – By Program Type (2016)**

Variable	All Programs	Transitional Living	Day Treatment	Home-Based	Foster Care	Residential Care	Outpatient Treatment
Follow-up packets completed*	1,429	52	65	213	354	687	58
Could not contact at follow-up	1,832	83	26	477	651	578	17
<b>Functional Outcomes</b>							
Positive education at follow-up	92.4	89.7	97.9	97.8	98.4	89.4	n/a
Employed at follow-up	29.0	58.7	29.4	40.0	28.3	24.9	n/a
No new abuse of child	97.3	100.0	100.0	98.6	94.9	97.3	100.0
No new abuse in family	97.7	94.7	100.0	99.5	95.7	98.0	100.0
No new court involvement	85.2	90.2	87.7	96.2	98.8	73.2	93.0
<b>Placement Outcomes</b>							
ROLES at follow-up							
More restrictive	11.8	21.6	10.9	4.3	10.5	15.2	0.0
Similar restrictiveness	73.1	60.8	81.3	87.4	74.2	66.1	98.2
Less restrictive	14.6	17.6	7.8	8.2	15.0	17.8	1.8
Runaway	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.9	0.0

\* Sample sizes for individual items may be lower than the number of follow-up packets due to missing data. Unless otherwise noted, numbers refer to percentages of affirmative responses. ROLES=Restrictiveness of Living Environment Scale. Education and employment are reported for the percent of youth who are of appropriate age. n/a = data not collected on this item for the program type. i/n = insufficient n (e.g., n=1).

**Follow-up II Outcome Summary – By Program Type (2016)**

Variable	All Programs	Transitional Living	Day Treatment	Home-Based	Foster Care	Residential Care	Outpatient Treatment
Follow-up packets completed*	967	46	53	169	140	525	34
Could not contact at follow-up	1,615	91	17	440	435	600	32
<b>Functional Outcomes</b>							
Positive education at follow-up	89.3	79.3	100.0	92.9	95.7	87.4	n/a
Employed at follow-up	30.7	57.8	35.7	30.2	25.0	27.4	n/a
No new abuse of child	97.3	97.8	100.0	98.8	91.5	98.0	97.1
No new abuse in family	98.0	100.0	98.0	100.0	96.6	97.5	97.1
No new court involvement	85.5	91.1	96.1	95.9	97.7	76.3	97.1
<b>Placement Outcomes</b>							
ROLES at follow-up							
More restrictive	12.6	11.1	9.4	6.7	19.0	13.9	2.9
Similar restrictiveness	66.0	73.3	84.9	80.6	59.9	58.3	94.1
Less restrictive	20.7	15.6	5.7	12.7	21.2	26.6	0.0
Runaway	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	2.9

\* Sample sizes for individual items may be lower than the number of follow-up packets due to missing data. Unless otherwise noted, numbers refer to percentages of affirmative responses. ROLES=Restrictiveness of Living Environment Scale. Education and employment are reported for the percent of youth who are of appropriate age. n/a = data not collected on this item for the program type. i/n = insufficient n (e.g., n=1).

## Summary and Conclusions

Since 1998, the IARCA Outcome Measures Project (the IOMP) has monitored youth placed into member agency programs across Indiana, examining characteristics of these youth and the outcomes of their care. The programs examined in 2016 for the Annual Report and Executive Summary include the following 12 broad programs and program subtypes: Transitional Living; Day Treatment; Home-Based; Traditional Family Foster Care; Treatment Foster Care; Shelter Care; Residential Programs Utilizing Public Schools; Residential Programs Utilizing Both Public and On-Grounds Schools; Residential Locked and Staff-Secure Programs; Psychiatric Residential Treatment Facilities; Crisis Stabilization; and Outpatient Treatment. For the last 19 years, an Annual Report and Executive Summary (formerly Executive Summary with Cross-Year Comparisons) have been published. These reports provide stakeholders with benchmarks, or aggregated information, for programs within participating IARCA member agencies.

The information collected suggests that youth who entered services have histories of multiple identified placement risks, including many with families having histories of multiple difficulties. In addition, youth exiting services have in general fewer reported problems than are present in youth entering care. However, as this Executive Summary and its accompanying Annual Report examines data at a programmatic level rather than at the level for individual youth, it is not possible to conclude that individual youth and families improve from intake to discharge. That is, the same youth and families may not be measured at these different time points during any given year. Therefore, it is not possible to conclude that any changes occur during a youth's placement or participation in any program.

Finally, referral sources, parents, researchers, and other interested parties are encouraged to review this year's *Annual Report* to examine the benchmark data identified for youth across the twelve program and sub-programs. An exploration of this data by the many stakeholders should be used when contacting IARCA and individual agencies, to inquire about the relationship between individual agency results and the statewide benchmark data. Such a discussion should also explore how youth from the agencies' referral sources, particularly problems and risk factors identified in youth the agency serves, are similar to and different from the IARCA aggregate. The results of these conversations could explain similarities and differences in outcomes.