



Family Finding Evaluations: A Summary of Recent Findings **APPENDIX**

Appendix A. Study overviews

ST	Grantee	Program	Grant/funding structure	Target population (for outcome evaluation)	Staffing structure	Model	Intervention goal	Evaluator	Design	Ns (T=treatment, C=control)	Study enrollment	Study end date	Notes
WI	Children's Services Society of Wisconsin	Family Finding Program for WI Youth in Out-of-Home Care	Family Connection Discretionary Grant: Family Finding	<u>New to care and in care.</u> Children new to care or in care beyond ASFA guidelines in Milwaukee County (urban)	<u>Specialized.</u>	Kevin Campbell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish meaningful, permanent connections with relatives/kin who can provide emotional and legal permanency Improve child safety, permanency and well-being 	Child Trends	RCT	T=83, C=92	09/30/09-03/31/12	9/29/2012	
FL	Kids Central	Families for Florida's Children	Family Connection Discretionary Grant: Family Finding	<u>New to care and in care.</u> All youth in foster care in 6 counties.	<u>Other.</u> Coaching for caseworker	Kevin Campbell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Help case managers integrate FF into daily practice Improve youth connections with adult relatives/kin Achieve permanency more quickly Improve safety and well-being outcomes 	J.K. Elder and Assoc., with Child Trends	RCT	<u>Hillsborough:</u> T=308, C=246 <u>Kids Central:</u> T=88, C=30	10/1/2009-12/31/2011	<u>Kids Central:</u> 9/2012 <u>Hillsborough:</u> 4/2012	FF coaches were randomly assigned to casework units, rather than children being randomly assigned. T and C groups all received FF; evaluation tested the assignment of a FF coach.
IA	Four Oaks Family and Children's Services	Families for Iowa's Children	Family Connection Discretionary Grant: Family Finding	<u>New to care and in care.</u> New non-emergency entries and re-entries; 12 counties in Ames Service Area & 14 counties in Cedar Rapids Service Area. All ages. Urban/rural mix.	<u>Specialized.</u>	Kevin Campbell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify and engage connections upon foster care (re-)entry Place children with appropriate relative resources Achieve permanency as expeditiously as possible Maximize the contributions from connections who are not placement/permanency resources 	The University Of Iowa School Of Social Work	RCT	T=125, C=118	10/2009-?	09/2012	
MD	Maryland DHR	Making Place Matter through Family Kin Connections (Family Kin Connections)	Family Connection Discretionary Grant: Kinship Navigator, Family Finding, Family Involvement Meetings	<u>In care.</u> Youth with permanency goal of APPLA or youth with little/no family involvement in Baltimore and Prince George's Counties	<u>Specialized.</u>	Kevin Campbell (completion of discovery and some engagement activities)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep children in their communities of origin Place children in families first; reduce use of group homes Minimize stay in out-of-home care; increase permanence 	U of MD School of Social Work, with Child Trends	RCT	T=77, C=55	05/2010-10/2011	Final report date: 6/30/2013	
HI	Hawaii DHS	Family Connections Hawaii	Family Connection Discretionary Grant: Family Finding, Family Group Decision-making	<u>New to care and in care.</u> Children entering and at risk of placement in the City and County of Honolulu. Children age 4-16 in care >= 12 months with no permanent legal and/or emotional family connections.	<u>Specialized.</u>	Kevin Campbell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prevent foster care entry Place children who do enter care with relatives/kin 	The Catalyst Group	RCT	<u>New to care:</u> T=109, C=235 <u>In care:</u> T=120 families, C=120 families	not reported	6-month and 12-month follow-up	In Hawaii, the intervention group received immediate and expedited FF, and the control group received FF upon referral up to one year from intake.
SF, CA	Seneca Center for Children and Families (San Francisco, CA)	Family Finding	Private funding: Stuart Foundation	<u>New to care.</u>	<u>Specialized.</u>	Kevin Campbell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Find and engage relatives and other kin to provide more options for legal and emotional permanency 	Child Trends	RCT	T=116, C=123	9/2008-2/2011	1/31/2012	
NC	Children's Home Society of NC	Family Finding	Private/local funding: Duke Endowment, Children's Home Society of NC, NC Department of Social Services.	<u>In care.</u> Age 10-17 at referral with no reunification plan and no identified permanent placement resource in 9 counties (3 served by private agency; 6 served by public agency)	<u>Specialized.</u>	Kevin Campbell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase emotional permanency for youth Secondary: Increase legal permanency 	Child Trends	RCT	<u>Full sample:</u> T=267, C=265 <u>Interviewed @ 12 mos:</u> T=143, C=162 <u>Interviewed @ 24 mos:</u> T=132, C=149	6/2008-9/2011	10/2012	
RI	Rhode Island Foster Parent Association	Rhode Island Partnership for Family Connections	Family Connection Discretionary Grant: Family Finding, Family Group Decision-making, Kinship Navigator	<u>New to care and in care.</u> In care from 0-90 days, 90 days to 18 months, 18 months and older, re-entry, and in Another Permanent Planned Living Arrangement (APPLA)	<u>Other.</u> Specialized worked with caseworker	Integrate intensive FF state-wide. 1) Consultat with PST, 2) inform bio and foster parents, 3) record mining, 4) eco-mapping, 5) internet search, 6) interview child, 7) family teaming model, 8) consultants for visitation, kinship support, domestic violence as needed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase physical, emotional, legal permanency Increase stability in living arrangements 		RCT	Intervention: N=416 Comparison: N=467	10/2009-05/2012	03/2013	Ecomapping: Discussion of relationships that youth has with family, friends, and others; student draws diagram with relationships noted and described, then talks about each of them.

ST	Grantee	Program	Grant/funding structure	Target population (for outcome evaluation)	Staffing structure	Model	Intervention goal	Evaluator	Design	Ns (T=treatment, C=control)	Study enrollment	Study end date	Notes
WA	Catholic Family and Child Service	Family Connections Demonstration Project	Family Connection Discretionary Grant: Family Finding, Family-Team Decision-making, Kinship Navigator/Tribal Navigator	<u>In care and new to care.</u> In Washington's Congressional District 4 and 5	<u>Specialized.</u>	Kevin Campbell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce the number of dependent children and youth Increase the rate of adoptions by relatives Increase family involvement Reduce the time to achieve pre-permanency length of stay Increase the percentage of relative placements Reduce the number of placement moves for children Identify connections to build long-term support options 	Applied Research Center for Strong Communities & Schools, U of WA, Tacoma	outcome s for served group	N=258	not reported	Date of final report: 12/2010	
CA	Lilliput Children's Services	Kinnections Initiative	Family Connection Discretionary Grant: Family Finding, Kinship Navigator Combination	<u>New to care (and in care).</u> First-time entries in Sacramento County in care < 6 months (and siblings) age 0-17 who are African American and who are not in kin placements	<u>Specialized.</u>	Kevin Campbell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Place children with relatives 	Stanford Youth Solutions	pre/post	N=191	04/2011-6/2012	06/2012	CA's report notes that 211 children were enrolled into the evaluation, but only the 191 whose FF cases were closed were used in the outcomes analysis.
ME	Maine DHHS	Maine Kinship Connections Project	Family Connection Discretionary Grant: Family Finding, Family Group Decision-making, Kinship Navigator	<u>In care.</u> Older youth, usually ages 15-17, in danger of aging out of the system with few to no connections	<u>Other.</u> Partnering agency staff.	Extreme Recruitment: 12- to 20-weeks, weekly 30-minute task-oriented meetings to present results of case-mining aimed at identifying and locating potential kin connections. Professional detective assists with location efforts.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify and locate, with a sense of urgency, kin connections Foster connections and a sense of family history for the youth 	U of Maine Center on Aging	outcome s for served group	N=72	09/30/09-09/29/12	09/2012	Partnering team may include caseworker, Casey Family Services FF worker, GAL/CASA, clinicians, other agency/service providers, adult connections of youth.
OK	Oklahoma DHS	Oklahoma Kinship Bridge	Family Connection Discretionary Grant: Family Finding, Kinship Navigator	<u>New to care (or at risk of entering).</u> Children entering emergency shelters in Oklahoma and Tulsa Counties (state's largest metropolitan areas)	<u>Specialized.</u>	Intensive FF in first 24 hours, model developed in Clark County, NV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce emergency shelter care use Increase placement with kin within 24 hours 	OKDHS Office of Planning, Research and Statistics (OPRS)	comparis on group	Intervention N=5,973 Comparison: N=6821	8/1/2010-9/29/2013	6-month follow up	Data for 7/1/2008-7/31/2010 were used for comparison.
SC	South Carolina D	SC Connecting for Kids	Family Connection Discretionary Grant: Family Finding, Kinship Navigator	<u>In care.</u> Youth in 11 counties age 12 and older at risk of aging out of care and who had less than three identified connections	<u>Other, specialized.</u> GALS	Kevin Campbell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase permanency and stability in living arrangements Enhance families' capacity to provide for children's needs Develop at least three enduring connections per youth 	The Center for Child and Family Studies, USC (CCFS)	pre/post, comparis on group	Intervention: N=322 Comparison: N is not noted	9/30/2009-9/29/2012	3/31/2013	Comparison group children included those in 5 counties not participating in FF.

Appendix B. Findings from experimental evaluations of Family Finding programs serving youthnew to care and in care

	WI		IA ²		FL (K.C.)		FL (Hillsb.)		RI	
	I	C	I	C	I	C	I	C	I	C
Relational permanency										
Achieved relational permanency ⁴	--	--	81%	65% ***	--	--	--	--	--	--
Permanency⁵										
Discharged to reunification, adoption, or guardianship ⁶	27%	20%	--	--	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	--	--
Discharged to adoption or guardianship	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Discharged to reunification ⁷	--	--	29%	33%	--	--	--	--	19%	18%
Discharged to relative (regardless of legal arrangement)	--	--	--	--	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	--	--
Permanency in process	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Discharged to relative/discharged and last placement was relative	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Discharged to relative adoption	--	--	13%	2% ***	--	--	--	--	--	--
Discharged to non-relative adoption	--	--	13%	18%	--	--	--	--	--	--
Discharged to emancipation	--	--	5%	12% **	--	--	--	--	--	--
Remained in foster care (IA: family setting only)	63%	77%	22%	16%	--	--	--	--	--	--
Remained in foster care (congregate care)	--	--	13%	9%	--	--	--	--	--	--
Placement step-down while in care⁸										
Last placement setting while in foster care⁹										
Relative care	17%	7%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Adoptive care	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Family foster home	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Congregate care	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Independent living	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Placement with siblings	--	--	--	--	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	--	--
Placement with relatives considered at case closure	--	--	--	--	n.s.	n.s.	58%	0%	--	--
Type of setting (regardless of whether still in foster care)¹⁰										
Non-relative foster care @ 12 mos.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Relative foster care @ 12 mos.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Non-kin foster home	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
With relatives ^x	--	--	18%	9% *	--	--	--	--	13%	13%
With kin or adoptive/biological parents	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Group home/residential	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Independent or with roommate/significant other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Connections identified/engaged										
# of connections @ 6 mos	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
# of connections @ 12 mos	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
# of child's connections increased	--	--	--	--	80%	51%	98%	17%	--	--
# of relatives and informal supports involved in case	--	--	11.7	4.2 ***	--	--	--	--	--	--
# of relatives willing to be involved @ 6 mos.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
# of relatives willing to be involved @ 12 mos.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Frequency of Family Team Meetings	--	--	4.0	1.2 ***	--	--	--	--	--	--
Contact with ≥ 1 grandparent ≥ monthly @ 12 mos. ¹¹	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Contact with ≥ 1 sibling but < monthly ¹¹	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Contact with ≥ 1 other relative ≥ monthly ¹¹	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Close with ≥ 1 grandparent ¹¹	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Foster care placement stability										
No placement changes	53%	53%	--	--	--	--	--	--	19%	9% **
Mean # of placements (excluding moves toward permanency)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Mean # of placements ¹²	--	--	3.2	3.3	--	--	--	--	--	--
Placement change after discharge	--	--	--	--	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	--	--
Foster care status										
Entered care (if not already in care)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Length of stay: # of months ¹³	12.9	13.5 **	15.5	13.1 **	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	--	--
Length of stay: # of mos. excluding time with relatives	--	--	12.9	12.4	--	--	--	--	--	--
Latest case plan goal¹⁴										
Adoption, reunification, or guardianship	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Adoption, reunification, or relative guardianship/placement	--	--	--	--	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	--	--
Reunification	59%	69%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Adoption	21%	22%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Long term foster care	21%	16%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Transfer of guardianship	18%	7%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Independent living	5%	4% *	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Termination of parental rights	3%	1%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Placement with fit, willing relative ¹⁵	1%	7%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Safety										
Maltreatment re-allegation	--	--	23%	18%	--	--	--	--	--	--
Substantiated maltreatment re-allegation	--	--	--	--	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	--	--

Appendix B. Findings from experimental evaluations of Family Finding programs serving youth new to care¹

	SF, CA		HI ³		WI	
	I	C	I	C	I	C
Relational permanency						
Achieved relational permanency ⁴	--	--	--	--	--	--
Permanency⁵						
Discharged to reunification, adoption, or guardianship ⁶	--	--	--	--	34%	28%
Discharged to adoption or guardianship	--	--	--	--	--	--
Discharged to reunification ⁷	57%	47%	72%	66%	--	--
Discharged to relative (regardless of legal arrangement)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Permanency in process	--	--	--	--	--	--
Discharged to relative/discharged and last placement was relative	--	--	--	--	--	--
Remained in foster care (IA: family setting only)	17%	30% *	--	--	57%	70%
Remained in foster care (congregate care)						
Placement step-down while in care⁸	--	--	--	--	--	--
Last placement setting while in foster care⁹						
Relative care	48%	52%			23%	8% *
Adoptive care	--	--	--	--	--	--
Family foster home	--	--	--	--	--	--
Congregate care	--	--	--	--	--	--
Independent living	--	--	--	--	--	--
Placement with siblings	--	--	--	--	--	--
Placement with relatives considered at case closure	--	--	--	--	--	--
Type of setting (regardless of whether still in foster care)¹⁰						
Non-relative foster care @ 12 mos.	--	--	10%	13%	--	--
Relative foster care @ 12 mos.	--	--	18%	21%	--	--
Non-kin foster home	--	--	--	--	--	--
With relatives	--	--	--	--	--	--
With kin or adoptive/biological parents	--	--	--	--	--	--
Group home/residential	--	--	--	--	--	--
Independent or with roommate/significant other	--	--	--	--	--	--
Connections identified/engaged						
# of connections @ 6 mos	--	--	--	--	--	--
# of connections @ 12 mos	--	--	--	--	--	--
# of child's connections increased	--	--	--	--	--	--
# of relatives and informal supports involved in case	--	--	--	--	--	--
# of relatives willing to be involved @ 6 mos.	--	--	--	--	--	--
# of relatives willing to be involved @ 12 mos.	--	--	--	--	--	--
Frequency of Family Team Meetings	--	--	--	--	--	--
Contact with ≥ 1 grandparent ≥ monthly @ 12 mos. ¹¹	--	--	--	--	--	--
Contact with ≥ 1 sibling but < monthly ¹¹	--	--	--	--	--	--
Contact with ≥ 1 other relative ≥ monthly ¹¹	--	--	--	--	--	--
Close with ≥ 1 grandparent ¹¹	--	--	--	--	--	--
Foster care placement stability						
No placement changes	50%	33% *	--	--	66%	43% *
Mean # of placements (excluding moves toward permanency)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Mean # of placements ¹²	--	--	--	--	--	--
Placement change after discharge	--	--	--	--	--	--
Foster care status						
Entered care (if not already in care)	--	--	--	--	--	--
Length of stay: # of months ¹³	--	--	18.8	21.3	11.5	12.1
Length of stay: # of mos. excluding time with relatives	--	--	--	--	--	--
Latest case plan goal¹⁴						
Adoption, reunification, or guardianship	--	--	--	--	--	--
Adoption, reunification, or relative guardianship/placement	--	--	--	--	--	--
Reunification	66%	47% **	--	--	73%	86%
Adoption	--	--	--	--	20%	14%
Long term foster care	--	--	--	--	3%	2%
Transfer of guardianship	--	--	--	--	13%	4%
Independent living	--	--	--	--	3%	2%
Termination of parental rights	--	--	--	--	0%	0%
Placement with fit, willing relative ¹⁵	--	--	--	--	3%	2%
Safety						
Maltreatment re-allegation	--	--	--	--	--	--
Substantiated maltreatment re-allegation	--	--	--	--	--	--

Well-being¹⁶

Clinical level internalizing behavior problems @ 24 mos.

Has savings account @ 12 months

SF, CA		HI ³		WI	
--	--	--	--	--	--
--	--	--	--	--	--

Appendix B. Findings from experimental evaluations of Family Finding programs serving youth already in care

	WI		NC		MD		HI ³	
	I	C	I	C	I	C	I	C
Relational permanency								
Achieved relational permanency ⁴	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Permanency⁵								
Discharged to reunification, adoption, or guardianship ⁶	18%	8%	23%	23%	--	--		
Discharged to adoption or guardianship							24%	16%
Discharged to reunification ⁷	--	--	7%	6%	--	--	18%	17%
Discharged to relative (regardless of legal arrangement)	--	--	12%	11%	--	--	--	--
Permanency in process	--	--	--	--	--	--	27%	28%
Discharged to relative/discharged and last placement was relative	--	--	22%	21%	--	--	--	--
Remained in foster care	69%	87% *	--	--	54%	49%	31%	40%
Placement step-down while in care⁸	--	--	43%	40%	--	--	--	--
Last placement setting while in foster care⁹								
Relative care	10%	5%	26%	24%	18%	21%	--	--
Adoptive care	--	--	--	--	0%	0%	--	--
Family foster home	--	--	--	--	41%	38%	--	--
Congregate care	--	--	--	--	30%	29%	--	--
Independent living	--	--	--	--	11%	12%	--	--
Placement with siblings	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Placement with relatives considered at case closure	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Type of setting (regardless of whether still in foster care)¹⁰								
Non-relative foster care @ 12 mos.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Relative foster care @ 12 mos.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Non-kin foster home	--	--	40%	54% **	--	--	--	--
With relatives	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
With kin or adoptive/biological parents	--	--	30%	20% *	--	--	--	--
Group home/residential	--	--	22%	18%	--	--	--	--
Independent or with roommate/significant other	--	--	4%	6%	--	--	--	--
Connections identified/engaged								
# of connections @ 6 mos	--	--	--	--	--	--	46	25
# of connections @ 12 mos	--	--	--	--	--	--	49	26
# of child's connections increased	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
# of relatives and informal supports involved in case	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
# of relatives willing to be involved @ 6 mos.	--	--	--	--	--	--	16	6
# of relatives willing to be involved @ 12 mos.	--	--	--	--	--	--	19	6
Frequency of Family Team Meetings	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Contact with ≥ 1 grandparent ≥ monthly @ 12 mos. ¹¹	--	--	47%	37% **	--	--	--	--
Contact with ≥ 1 sibling but < monthly ¹¹	--	--	10%	6% *	--	--	--	--
Contact with ≥ 1 other relative ≥ monthly ¹¹	--	--	47%	33% **	--	--	--	--
Close with ≥ 1 grandparent ¹¹	--	--	52%	42% *	--	--	--	--
Foster care placement stability								
No placement changes	38%	67% **	--	--	--	--	--	--
Mean # of placements (excluding moves toward permanency)	--	--	2.6	2.7	--	--	--	--
Mean # of placements ¹²	--	--	3.2	3.2	11.2	11	--	--
Placement change after discharge	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Foster care status								
Entered care (if not already in care)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Length of stay: # of months ¹³	14.6	15.4	--	--	108	118	--	--
Length of stay: # of mos. excluding time with relatives	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Latest case plan goal¹⁴								
Adoption, reunification, or guardianship	--	--	42%	42%	--	--	--	--
Adoption, reunification, or relative guardianship/placement	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Reunification	44%	46%	15%	17%	10%	19%	--	--
Adoption	22%	33%	--	--	1%	3%	--	--
Long term foster care	42%	33%	--	--	19%	20%	--	--
Transfer of guardianship	25%	10% *	--	--	1%	1%	--	--
Independent living	8%	8%	--	--	68%	52% *	--	--
Termination of parental rights	6%	3%	--	--	--	--	--	--
Placement with fit, willing relative ¹⁵	0%	13% **	23%	18%	0%	4%	--	--
Safety								
Maltreatment re-allegation	--	--	14%	17%	--	--	--	--
Substantiated maltreatment re-allegation	--	--	2%	5%	--	--	--	--

Well-being¹⁶

Clinical level internalizing behavior problems @ 24 mos.

Has savings account @ 12 months

	WI		NC		MD		HI ³	
Clinical level internalizing behavior problems @ 24 mos.	--	--	16%	6% ***	--	--	--	--
Has savings account @ 12 months	--	--	28%	22% **	--	--	--	--

Notes

T: Treatment group; C: Control group

Statistically significant favorable impacts (in which the treatment group fared better than the control group) are highlighted in green; unfavorable impacts in red.

n.s.: For FL, estimates were not provided but it was reported that none of the outcomes differed statistically significantly for T vs. C.

?: Outcome was examined, but findings were not included in final report.

¹ The HI new-to-care program also served youth at risk of entering care. HI's final report notes a favorable impact on entry into foster care, (i.e., treatment group youth were less likely to enter foster care than control group children) but documents neither the percentage estimates nor the statistical significance of the finding. Other outcomes seem to be assessed for the subgroup of children who entered foster care; as such, they are not technically experimental impacts, particularly if the program impacted the likelihood of foster care entry.

² The wording of IA's findings suggests that one-tailed tests were carried out.

³ HI's final report does not indicate the statistical significance of impacts.

⁴ IA defined relational permanency based on case notes regarding contact and relationship with family.

⁵ For HI, outcomes were assessed at 6- and 12-month follow-ups. We report here the 12-month outcomes.

⁶ For FL, this analysis may have excluded children not discharged from foster care during the study period.

⁷ For IA, reunification includes trial home visits and "aged out in birth home."

⁸ This was the confirmatory outcome for the NC evaluation; other impacts should be viewed with caution.

⁹ MD reported the distributions of children across 13 placement settings, including a 14th category of "missing" (14% of the treatment group and 13% of the control group at the end of the study). We recalculated the percentages, collapsing into 5 placement setting types and excluding the missing youth from the denominator. We found no statistically significant differences between T and C in the percentages in each of the 5 placement settings.

¹⁰ For NC, information was obtained from interviews with the subset of youth age 13 or older at referral and pertains to the time 12 months following study enrollment. By the 24-month follow-up, T group continued to be less likely than C group to be in a non-relative foster home (26 vs. 37%, $p < .10$). 3% of treatment and 1% of treatment group youth were in some other type of setting.

X For IA, this category excludes children who had been adopted by relatives.

¹¹ The NC interviewed the subset of youth ages 13 and older at referral about contact with and closeness with parents, siblings, grandparents, relatives, and other important adults 12 and 24 months following study enrollment. In the interest of space, the findings shown here are limited to those that differed for T and C.

¹² IA reported on the number of placement changes (2.2 and 2.3 for the treatment and comparison groups, respectively). We added 1 to convert to mean number of placements.

¹³ For MD, it is not clear whether these figures are for youth who exited or for all youth. For HI youth new to care, point estimates were obtained from the cross-site report (James Bell Associates, 2013), as they were not published in the site's final report.

¹⁴ For MD, we re-calculated percentages excluding the missing cases (9% for T and 12% for C) from the denominator. We also calculated the statistical significance of differences between T and C (which not noted in MD's report). Note that the difference between T and C for the share of youth with a case goal of independent living was also statistically significant at baseline, suggesting that the difference is not a program impact but an artifact of differences between the groups at random assignment.

¹⁵ For NC, this was adoption with a relative or guardianship with a relative.

¹⁶ For NC, well-being was assessed by interviewing the subset of youth age 13 or older at study enrollment. In the interest of space, only the indicators that differed for T and C are reported in this table.

Appendix C. Barriers and Facilitators Identified in Family Finding Evaluations

Barriers	Sites* that explicitly noted each barrier/facilitator											
	WI	SF	NC	FL	IA	MD	ME	HI	CA	OK	RI	SC
<u>Child factors</u>												
Child characteristics and behaviors	WI	--	NC	FL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Child resentment/frustration toward family/reliving bad memories	--	--	NC	FL	--	MD	--	--	--	--	--	--
Resistance from children in participation	--	--	--	FL	--	MD	ME	--	--	--	--	--
Unaccompanied and undocumented minors	--	SF	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Youth feel they already have enough connections	--	--	--	FL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<u>Family factors</u>												
Logistical problems scheduling meetings with family	--	--	NC	FL	--	MD	--	--	--	--	RI	--
Reluctance to become involved	--	SF	NC	FL	--	MD	--	--	--	--	--	--
Difficult family dynamics/sensitive/traumatic family history	--	SF	NC	FL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Lack of follow-through	--	--	NC	FL ²	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Difficulty meeting licensing requirements	WI	--	NC	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Lack of guardianship subsidies/limited support resources for relatives	WI	--	--	--	IA	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Confusion about Family Finding	--	SF	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Birthparent resistance to involving family members	--	--	--	FL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Criminal or child welfare histories	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	OK	--	--
<u>FF agency/FF worker factors</u>												
FF workers unprepared to deal with sensitive/traumatic family issues	--	SF	--	FL ¹	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Difficulty using internet search tools	--	--	--	FL	--	--	--	--	--	--	RI	--
Staff vacancies/staff turnover	--	--	--	FL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	SC
Insufficient boundaries b/w FF worker and families	--	SF	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Difficulty following up on leads found in searches	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	RI	--
Large geographical area (travel time)	--	--	--	--	IA	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Difficulty establishing paternity	--	SF	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Lack of a sense of urgency to find connections (case length too long)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	SC
Value on permanent placements rather than establishing enduring connections	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	SC
<u>Public agency factors</u>												
Culture favoring only limited family engagement/bias against relatives	--	SF	NC	FL	--	MD ³	--	--	--	--	--	--
Culture favoring placement stability	--	SF	--	FL	--	--	ME	--	--	--	--	--
Lack of buy-in to FF (suspicion of private agency/specialized FF worker; feeling that FF is not necessary)	--	--	NC	FL	--	MD	--	--	--	--	--	--
Caseworker burden/workload	WI	--	NC	FL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Resistance/lack of cooperation from public agency	--	--	NC	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	SC
Priority for legal permanency, not emotional/relational permanency	--	--	--	--	--	MD ³	--	--	--	--	--	SC
FF as a prerequisite for referral to adoption unit slowed adoptions	--	--	--	FL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Bias against fathers	--	--	--	--	IA	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Confusion over FF vs. absent parent locator services	--	--	--	--	--	MD	--	--	--	--	--	--
Cuts in public agency budget/staff layoffs	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	CA	--	--	--
Difficult relationship b/w FF workers in private agency and public agency	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	CA	--	--	--
Turnover in staff	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	RI	--
<u>Court factors</u>												
Delays with TPRs	WI	--	--	FL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Communication with/ education of caseworkers/courts	--	SF	--	FL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Lack of buy-in to FF	--	--	NC	FL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<u>FF model factors</u>												
Service period too short	--	SF	--	FL	--	--	ME	--	--	--	RI	--
Transitioning case from FF worker to regular caseworker	--	SF	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Insufficient training, need for guidance on "how" to do tasks	--	--	--	FL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Caseload burden to great	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	SC
Too much time case mining/too little time establishing relationships with connections	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	SC
<u>Other factors</u>												
Interstate issues	--	--	NC	--	IA	--	--	--	--	OK	--	--
Participation in the FF evaluation	--	--	NC	--	--	--	--	--	CA	--	--	--
Restrictive policies of group care facilities	--	--	--	--	IA	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Access to criminal records history after business hours	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	OK	--	--

Appendix C. Barriers and Facilitators Identified in Family Finding Evaluations

Barriers	Sites* that explicitly noted each barrier/facilitator											
	WI	SF	NC	FL	IA	MD	ME	HI	CA	OK	RI	SC
Slow inter-department communication and interaction	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	OK	--	--
Federal/state bureaucracy for contracting (when revisions were needed)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	SC
Facilitators												
<u>Child factors</u>												
Opportunity for child to have a "voice"	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	RI	--
<u>Family factors</u>												
Concrete resources/supports for kin	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	RI	--
<u>FF agency/FF worker factors</u>												
Relationship and accessibility to families	--	SF	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Worker characteristics (experience, dedication)	--	--	NC	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
<u>Public agency factors</u>												
Agency culture favoring (or shifting to favor) family involvement	WI	--	--	FL	--	--	--	--	CA	--	--	--
Buy-in/support from program administrators	--	--	--	--	--	MD	--	--	CA	--	RI	--
Good relationship/communication b/w FF agency/workers, public agency	--	SF	NC	--	--	MD	--	--	--	--	--	--
Caseworker buy-in	--	SF	NC	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Co-location of FF and public agency staff	--	SF	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Training for FF workers and public agency staff on FF	--	--	NC	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Preexisting relationship b/w agency and FF staff	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	RI	--
<u>Court factors</u>												
Buy-in from organization providing legal representation for children	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	CA	--	--	--
<u>FF model factors</u>												
Dedicated specialist position (FF worker) given caseworker caseloads	--	SF	NC	FL ⁴	--	MD	--	--	--	--	--	--
Practices that empower family members	--	--	NC	FL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Detailed instructions and rationales for tasks from FF coach	--	--	--	FL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Feedback after observations by FF coach	--	--	--	FL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Scheduled times for feedback from FF coaches	--	--	--	FL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Training for coaches on how to serve as FF coach	--	--	--	FL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Processes/staff to hold FF staff accountable for work	--	--	--	FL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Having a neutral third party involved to address sensitive issues	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	HI	--	--	--	--
Family Conference developed consensus, was informative	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	HI	--	--	--	--
Family Conference helped everyone understand roles and services	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	HI	--	--	--	--
To find connections, start with case mining, then internet searches, then interview relatives. (Steps build on each other.)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	HI	--	--	--	--
To find connections, face-to-face interviews of relatives, parents, and children	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	OK	--	--
Having family conferences earlier rather than later in the case	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	HI	--	--	--	--
Child welfare liaison	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	CA	--	--	--
Cross-training workers in FF and other tasks allows workers to fill in for each other	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	OK	--	--
<u>Other factors</u>												
Community programs/resources	--	--	--	FL	--	--	--	--	--	OK	--	--
Identifying/engaging key partners early in the project	--	--	--	--	IA	--	--	--	--	--	RI	--
Subject experts/practitioners providing training/TA	--	--	--	--	IA	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Implementation team/group meetings of project staff/public agency staff	--	--	--	--	IA	MD	--	--	--	--	--	--
Solicit input from all stakeholders in addressing problems	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	CA	--	RI	--
Policy/procedural changes in public agency that facilitate FF	--	--	--	--	--	--	ME	--	CA	--	--	--
Assistance from parent advocates	--	SF	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Availability of specialist to help with searches	--	--	--	FL	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Permanency supports (coordinated services team, permanency consultants, parent-run Family Team Meetings, Parent Caregiver Family Assessments)	WI	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Diverse, multi-disciplinary advisory board	--	--	--	--	IA	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

¹ Case managers felt some workers did not have sufficient experience/skills to engage family, also workers were uncomfortable facilitating meetings.

² Family members often did not show up at meetings.

³ This improved over the life of the project.

⁴ In FL, the FF coach helped with the burden of the caseworker carrying out FF responsibilities.

* See Appendix A for site study overviews.