



INDIANA ASSOCIATION OF RESOURCES
AND CHILD ADVOCACY

THE IARCA OUTCOME MEASURES PROJECT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 2017

**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



INDIANA ASSOCIATION OF RESOURCES
AND CHILD ADVOCACY

THE IARCA OUTCOME MEASURES PROJECT

Executive Summary Report for Calendar year 2017

Aaron Kivisto, 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 www.evaluateoutcomesnow.org

Published September 7, 2018, Copyright © 2018, 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 IOMP, created 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 when they are placed into care, when they leave care, and several months after they've been discharged. Currently, there are 12 distinct program types / subtypes participating in the IOMP: 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 Treatment¹. In 2017, 51 agencies contributed information on youth receiving services in their programs.

Youth Entering Services in 2017

- ✓ Across all programs, 6,141 children were assessed at intake.
 - ✓ Also across all programs, the average age of youth entering services was 11.3 years, with a range from under 1 to 20 years of age.
 - ✓ Nearly three-fifths of all youth entering care in 2017 were Caucasian (58.6%), approximately one-fourth were African American (23.9%), and one in 20 were Latino/Hispanic (4.5%). About 1 in 8 youth (12.9%) were of other ethnicities or identified as multiracial.
 - ✓ The average number of prior out-of-home placements is 1.8, ranging from 0 to 36 previous placements.
 - ✓ More than half of the youth have a history of reported / substantiated neglect (54.3%).
 - ✓ Histories of suspected or substantiated physical abuse were reported in just over one-fifth of youth (20.4%).
 - ✓ Approximately half of the youth came from a single parent family (48.1%) and / or had a parent who had abused substances (52.6%).
 - ✓ Nearly 2 of every 5 youth had a parent with an incarceration history (39.5%).
 - ✓ 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 17.2 years of age when admitted. Parent rights were terminated for nearly 1 in 3 youth (29.2%).
- ✓ Nearly three of every five youth (56.0%) who were placed into **Day Treatment** programs were referred by Probation programs; another one in six youth were referred by the Department of Education (16.0%), and one in ten from private sources (10.7%). One-fifth (20.9%) had parent rights terminated for at least one parent.
- ✓ Over 3 of every 5 youth in **Home-Based** programs (60.8%) had a parent with known or suspected substance abuse. Nearly half had a parent with an incarceration history (46.8%). Nearly 2 in 5 of youth in Home-Based programs were classified as CHINS (58.3%).

¹ Outpatient Treatment and program sub-types for Foster Care and Residential Care are included in the IOMP; information is not reported on these program types and sub-types in the Executive Summary.

Characteristics of Youth Served in 2017

- ✓ Youth in **Foster Care** programs were on average 6.6 years of age at program admission. Over 4 of every 5 youth (82.3%) were victims of substantiated or suspected neglect.
- ✓ More than one in two (55.8%) youth entering **Shelter Care** programs were from a single-parent household. Nearly half (44.6%) had previously received home-based services.
- ✓ More than one in two youth (55.3%) entering **Residential Care** programs had previously received home-based services. Nearly two of every five youth (39.6%) were identified as CHINS and almost half were classified as Delinquent (47.3%).
- ✓ Nearly 8 of every 10 youth entering **Crisis Stabilization** programs were on psychotropic medication at admission (78.6%), and 3 of every 4 had a parent with a known or suspected psychiatric diagnosis (74.4%).

Characteristics of Youth Served in 2017

Child Risk Factor Survey – By Program Type (2017)

Variable	All Programs	Transitional Living	Day Treatment	Home-Based	Foster Care	Shelter Care	Residential Care	Crisis Stab.	Outpatient Treatment
Intake packets*	6,141	154	225	1,229	1,850	491	1,886	168	138
Age (Mean)	11.3	17.2	14.4	10.0	6.6	14.8	14.7	12.9	12.1
Gender									
Male	56.4	46.1	75.6	56.5	51.0	52.7	62.8	41.1	51.4
Female	43.5	53.9	24.4	43.4	49.0	47.3	37.0	58.9	48.6
Ethnicity									
Caucasian	58.6	74.7	55.1	53.0	48.4	68.0	64.6	90.5	79.0
African-American	23.9	11.7	30.7	17.9	33.6	16.5	23.1	4.2	10.9
Hispanic	4.5	4.5	5.3	5.0	5.2	3.9	4.1	1.2	0.7
Other	12.9	9.1	8.9	24.0	12.7	11.6	8.0	4.1	9.4
# Previous placements (Mean)	1.8	2.5	1.3	0.9	1.5	2.0	2.7	0.4	0.6
Past home-based services	38.5	36.4	34.7	29.5	28.9	44.6	55.3	30.4	12.3
Pregnant	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.1	0.8	0.8	0.0	0.7
Have child(ren)	1.6	6.5	0.0	1.6	1.0	1.0	2.3	0.0	0.7
CHINS	54.5	51.3	7.6	58.3	84.3	42.0	39.6	2.4	11.6
Delinquent	24.1	20.1	38.7	18.5	1.3	42.4	47.3	0.0	9.4
Neglect	54.3	41.6	7.1	52.7	82.3	46.4	42.9	1.2	32.6
Physical abuse	20.4	18.2	6.7	15.4	14.3	27.7	30.0	22.0	13.8
Sexual abuse	13.0	7.8	11.6	9.8	6.6	14.3	20.5	25.0	14.5
Witness domestic violence	31.2	26.0	15.6	36.6	20.4	29.5	40.6	39.3	25.4
Grade retention	8.3	9.7	12.9	9.0	4.3	3.9	12.2	14.9	3.6
Special education	20.3	22.1	29.8	15.1	11.5	24.4	30.2	22.0	13.8
Psychotropic medication	29.6	16.2	18.7	16.0	14.8	37.3	49.3	78.6	25.4
Parent substance abuse	52.6	45.5	20.4	60.8	48.4	48.5	56.0	69.0	45.7
Parent incarceration	39.5	29.9	27.6	46.8	30.3	41.5	45.7	36.3	37.7
Parent psychiatric diagnosis	19.7	6.5	5.8	26.9	9.0	16.7	24.3	74.4	15.2
Single-parent family	48.1	31.2	48.9	52.3	34.1	55.8	56.5	70.8	48.6
Parental rights terminated	14.8	29.2	20.9	9.2	8.2	19.3	22.4	4.8	13.7
One parent	4.4	7.8	6.7	2.5	1.5	7.5	7.5	0.6	2.9
Both parents	10.0	20.1	13.8	6.7	6.3	11.8	14.4	4.2	10.1
Adoptive parents	0.4	1.3	0.4	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.7
Risk Score (Mean)	4.3	3.6	2.7	4.3	3.7	4.5	5.2	4.6	3.1

* Sample size 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 2017

- ✓ 5,091 children were assessed at discharge.
- ✓ Across all programs, a positive educational outcome at discharge was reported for the majority of youth (70.4% 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, 22.8% of youth 16 years of age and older were employed.
- ✓ Nearly 2 of every 3 youth in the combined IARCA sample (62.5%) were discharged to a placement of less restrictiveness.
- ✓ When a permanency plan was identified, more than half of all youth (52.8%) achieved their permanency plan when discharged.
- ✓ Youth in **Transitional Living** programs had a positive education outcome at discharge for nearly 4 of every 5 youth (78.8%); more than half (58.6%) were employed at discharge.
- ✓ Youth in **Day Treatment** programs had a positive education outcome at discharge for half of the youth (50.3%); about 1 of every 10 (10.2%) youth age 16+ were employed at discharge.
- ✓ Youth discharged from **Home-Based** program had a positive education outcome for approximately 2 of every 3 youth (64.6%); about one-quarter (23.2%) of youth age 16+ were employed at discharge.
- ✓ Youth from **Foster Care** programs had a positive education outcome at discharge for over 3 of every 4 school-aged youth (75.7%); over one-third (33.5%) of youth age 16+ were employed at discharge.
- ✓ More than half of all youth (55.1%) placed into **Shelter Care** programs were discharged to a less restrictive setting.
- ✓ A positive education outcome at discharge was reported for 9 of every 10 youth (85.4%) leaving **Residential Care** programs; about one in six (16.3%) youth age 16+ were employed at discharge.
- ✓ Nearly all youth placed into **Crisis Stabilization** programs (99.4%) were discharged to a less restrictive setting.

Discharge Outcome Summary - By Program Type (2017)

Variable	All Programs	Transitional Living	Day Treatment	Home-Based	Foster Care	Shelter Care	Residential Care	Crisis Stab.	Outpatient Treatment
Discharge packets*	5,091	116	161	955	1,686	490	1,711	162	135
Length of Stay: Mean	222.2	364.6	134.6	219.5	292.3	29.0	191.6	5.2	413.4
Median	146.0	265.5	72.0	163.0	171.0	19.0	166.0	5.0	274.0
Clinical Outcomes									
CPC at discharge (Mean)	4.0	2.1	3.3	3.1	3.3	5.7	4.8	1.5	4.9
FRS at discharge (Mean)	0.41	n/a	0.44	0.41	0.41	n/a	0.40	n/a	0.41
FPC at discharge (Mean)	2.4	n/a	1.4	2.3	2.4	n/a	2.4	n/a	2.4
Functional Outcomes									
Positive education at discharge	70.4	78.8	50.3	64.6	75.7	n/a	85.4	n/a	49.2
Employed at discharge	22.8	58.6	10.2	23.2	33.5	n/a	16.3	n/a	22.2
Placement Outcomes									
ROLES at discharge									
More restrictive	12.5	10.3	13.0	10.6	7.5	34.7	14.2	0.6	8.9
Similar restrictiveness	21.8	8.6	72.7	60.0	9.9	5.7	6.9	0.0	79.3
Less restrictive	62.5	75.9	11.8	26.5	80.1	55.1	74.6	99.4	11.1
Runaway	3.2	5.2	2.5	2.8	2.4	4.5	4.2	0.0	0.7
Permanency plan achieved	42.3	45.7	i/n	41.3	56.2	42.7	53.2	n/a	10.3
(only those with required plan)	52.8	68.8	i/n	59.8	58.5	52.8	63.6	n/a	82.3
Nature of Discharge**									
Planned	70.5	75.0	83.2	60.5	71.2	81.9	72.6	94.4	54.1
Removed by referring source	6.5	4.3	3.1	5.2	6.6	2.1	7.6	1.3	15.6
Administrative discharge	19.1	12.1	10.6	31.1	19.1	2.6	14.8	1.9	29.6
Runaway	3.7	8.6	3.1	3.1	2.6	6.0	5.0	0.0	0.7

* 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 available on this item.

Follow-Up I from Youth Leaving Services in 2017

- ✓ Over two of every 5 (42.7%) eligible youth (1,283 out of 3,003) were contacted at follow-up I. Across the program types, the proportion of youth contacted at Follow-up I ranged from 1 in 3 youth (30.0% in Foster Care) to just over 3 in 4 youth (76.8% in Day Treatment programs).
- ✓ Of the youth contacted at follow-up I, 9 in 10 had a positive education outcome (91.0%); about 1 in 3 youth aged 16 and older were employed (34.6%); most had no newly substantiated abuse (98.0%); and just fewer than 1 in 10 had returned to court on new charges (86.2% had not been back in court).
- ✓ Nearly 3 in 4 youth contacted from **Transitional Living** programs had a positive education outcome at follow-up I (76.0%); about 3 in 5 were employed (60.6%); since discharge, no new abuse was substantiated in this group of youth (100.0% no abuse); and nearly 9 of 10 had not returned to court on new charges (i.e., 87.9%).
- ✓ Most (98.1%) youth contacted from **Day Treatment** programs had a positive educational outcome. Since discharge, no new abuse was substantiated (100.0% no abuse) in those youth contacted and no families experienced newly substantiated abuse (100.0% no abuse in families); and most had no court involvement for new offenses (83.1%).
- ✓ None of the youth contacted from **Home-Based** programs had new abuse substantiated after being discharged from treatment (100.0% reported no new abuse); none were living in homes where abuse was substantiated (99.3%); and more than 9 of every 10 had not experienced court involvement (95.1%) for a new infraction.
- ✓ For youth contacted from **Foster Care** programs, most had positive educational outcomes rated (95.2%) or new substantiated abuse since discharge (96.4%). Few of those contacted had substantiated instances of abuse in the home (92.2%) or had returned to court for new infractions (98.2%).
- ✓ For youth contacted from **Residential Care** programs, nearly 9 out of 10 (89.5%) had positive educational outcomes; 1 in 3 (34.4%) youth over the age of 16 were employed; few had been subject to substantiated abuse (98.8%); and about 4 of 5 youth (77.8%) were not involved with the court on new charges.

Follow-up I Outcome Summary - By Program Type (2017)

Variable	All Programs	Transitional Living	Day Treatment	Home-Based	Foster Care	Residential Care	Outpatient Treatment
Follow-up packets completed*	1,283	33	86	146	356	620	42
Could not contact at follow-up	1,720	62	26	344	687	582	19
Functional Outcomes							
Positive Education at follow-up	91.0	76.0	98.1	92.5	95.2	89.5	n/a
Employed at follow-up	34.6	60.6	17.6	19.6	43.1	34.4	n/a
No new abuse of child	98.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	96.4	98.8	97.6
No new abuse in family	98.9	100.0	100.0	99.3	92.2	98.9	97.6
No new court involvement	86.2	87.9	83.1	95.1	98.2	77.8	97.6
Placement Outcomes							
ROLES at follow-up							
More restrictive	14.6	19.4	9.4	4.2	17.0	16.5	9.5
Similar restrictiveness	70.5	67.7	84.7	91.0	70.5	62.6	85.7
Less restrictive	14.2	12.9	5.9	4.9	11.6	19.9	4.8
Runaway	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	1.0	0.0

n/a = data not available on this item.

Follow-up II Outcome Summary - By Program Type (2017)

Variable	All Programs	Transitional Living	Day Treatment	Home-Based	Foster Care	Residential Care	Outpatient Treatment
Follow-up packets completed*	943	35	75	108	162	513	44
Could not contact at follow-up	1,428	62	31	341	373	595	20
Functional Outcomes							
Positive Education at follow-up	88.6	75.0	95.5	97.8	94.6	86.8	n/a
Employed at follow-up	40.6	60.0	13.8	50.0	29.2	40.9	n/a
No new abuse of child	97.5	100.0	98.7	99.1	92.3	97.9	100.0
No new abuse in family	98.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	98.7	98.6	93.2
No new court involvement	82.7	91.4	85.3	99.1	95.5	73.3	90.7
Placement Outcomes							
ROLES at follow-up							
More restrictive	11.5	15.6	14.9	1.9	10.7	13.8	2.4
Similar restrictiveness	64.1	53.1	77.0	87.7	69.2	54.3	81.0
Less restrictive	23.3	25.0	6.8	10.4	17.6	31.2	16.7
Runaway	1.1	6.3	1.4	0.0	2.5	0.6	0.0

n/a = data not available on this item.

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 2017 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 20 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 from 2017 suggests that youth entering care during the year are similar to those in past years – many have histories of multiple identified placement risks, in their own and in their family’s background and experiences. Also, similar to previous years, youth leaving care in 2017 generally had fewer reported problems than were identified in youth entering care. However, the information collected as part of the IOMP examines data at a programmatic level rather than at a level examining individual youth; therefore, it is not possible to conclude that individual youth and families improve from intake to discharge. Consequently, it is not possible to conclude that changes occur during a youth’s placement or participation in any program.

Referral sources, youth and their parents/families, and other interested parties are encouraged to review this year’s *Annual Report* to examine the benchmark data identified for youth across the program and sub-program types. An exploration of this aggregate data with stakeholders should be used to inquire if contacting member agencies about how their agency data relates to 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.



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