



CR-sent
6-19-89 MPK

114975



HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

HUMPHREY CENTER
301 19TH AVENUE SOUTH
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA 55455

114975

114975

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by
Humphrey Center
Institute of Public Affairs

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

NCJRS

JAN 10 1988

ACQUISITIONS

**HOME-BASED SERVICES
AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO PLACEMENT
FOR ADOLESCENTS AND THEIR FAMILIES:
A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF
PLACEMENT RESOURCE UTILIZATION**

JUNE 1987

A joint evaluation study conducted by
the Hennepin County Community Services Department
and the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute
of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota

Principal Investigators:

Philip AuClaire, Ph.D.
Hennepin County Community Services Department
Adjunct Faculty, Humphrey Institute
University of Minnesota

Ira M. Schwartz
Senior Fellow and Director
Center for the Study of Youth Policy
Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs
University of Minnesota

INTRODUCTION

Consistent with Federal and State legislative mandates, family-centered, home-based service programs have emerged as an innovative service strategy to address family preservation, placement prevention and family reunification issues. In response to these mandates and consistent with its mission to strengthen and preserve families and assure permanency for children, Hennepin County's Child Welfare Division developed five specialized home-based service units. The first of these units began operation in August 1985 and worked exclusively with families in which an adolescent had been approved for out-of-home placement. A comprehensive report prepared by the Center for the Study of Youth Policy in December 1986 evaluated the program's effectiveness in delivering family-centered, home-based services and the impact of such services on client utilization of substitute care (placement) resources.¹ In its design the evaluation paid particular attention to clearly defining the population eligible for home-based services, identifying equivalent treatment and non-treatment groups, and conducting long-term follow-up for treatment and non-treatment group clients.² The report prepared by the Center included a comprehensive and multidimensional analysis of the placement experiences of home-based and comparison group clients through June 30, 1986; this report extends the analysis through December 31, 1986.³

TREATMENT AND COMPARISON GROUP DIFFERENCES IN THE UTILIZATION OF OUT-OF-HOME PLACEMENT.⁴

Placement Episodes. Tables 1 through 5 present a detailed breakdown of post-assignment placement episodes experienced by home-based service and comparison group clients. Overall, there are only slight differences between the two groups in terms of the total number of placement episodes experienced; treatment group children experienced 76 episodes and comparison group children experienced 81 episodes (Table 1).

TABLE 1. TOTAL PLACEMENT EPISODES BY STUDY GROUP (ALL TYPES)

	Home-Based Services (N=55)	Comparison (N=58)	
		Adjusted	Unadjusted
Total Episodes	76	81	134

In addition, there are only marginal differences between the two groups when one examines post-assignment, multiple placement episodes (Table 2).

TABLE 2. MULTIPLE PLACEMENT EPISODES BY STUDY GROUP (ALL TYPES)

Placement Episodes	Home-Based Services (N=55)		Comparison Group (N=58)			
	N	Percent	Adjusted		Unadjusted	
			N	Percent	N	Percent
0	24	43.6	24	41.4	5	8.6
1	14	25.5	17	29.3	19	32.8
2	5	9.1	3	5.2	17	29.3
3	4	7.3	7	12.1	3	5.2
4	4	7.3	3	5.2	7	12.1
5	2	3.6	1	1.7	3	5.2
6	1	1.8	1	1.7	1	1.7
7	0	0	2	3.4	1	1.7
8	1	1.8	0	0	2	3.4
Total Episodes	76	100.0	81	100.0	134	100.0

While there are only minimal differences between the two groups in terms of total number of placement episodes and in the incidence of multiple placement episodes, the distribution of these episodes across the type of placement resource utilized is

significantly different (Table 3). The most striking difference between the two groups concerns the utilization of shelter placements. Within the treatment group, for example, shelter placements comprise 57 percent of all episodes; by way of contrast, the figure for the comparison group is 37 percent.

TABLE 3. TOTAL EPISODES BY PLACEMENT TYPE

Placement Type	Home-Based Service Group (N=55)		Comparison Group (N=58)			
	Episodes	Percent of all Episodes	Adjusted		Unadjusted	
			Episodes	Percent of all Episodes	Episodes	Percent of all Episodes
Shelter	43	56.6	30	37.0	48	35.8
Chemical Dependency	2	2.6	4	4.9	8	6.0
Group Foster Home	2	2.6	1	1.2	2	1.5
Treatment Foster Home	0	0	3	3.7	3	2.2
Group Home	10	13.2	13	16.0	21	15.7
RTC	15	19.7	18	22.2	36	26.9
Correctional	0	0	1	1.2	1	0.7
Psychiatric Hospital	0	0	1	1.2	2	1.5
Mental Retardation	0	0	1	1.2	1	0.7
Foster Home	3	3.9	8	9.9	11	8.2
Family	<u>1</u>	<u>1.3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1.2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0.7</u>
Total	76	100.0	81	100.0	134	100.0

Placement Days Utilized. Home-based service clients differ significantly from comparison group clients in terms of the total number of post-assignment placement days utilized; overall, the home-based group utilized nearly 1,900 fewer placement days than did comparison group clients (Table 4).

TABLE 4. TOTAL PLACEMENT DAYS UTILIZED BY STUDY GROUP (ALL TYPES)

Total Days	Home-Based Services (N=55)	Comparison (N=58)	
		Adjusted	Unadjusted
	4,777	6,666	12,037

TABLE 5. TOTAL DAYS IN PLACEMENT, AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY,
AND PERCENT OF TOTAL DAYS BY PLACEMENT TYPE AND STUDY GROUP

Placement Type	<u>Home-Based Service Group</u>			<u>Comparison Group</u>					
	<u>Days</u>	<u>ALOS</u>	Percent of all <u>Days</u>	<u>Adjusted</u>		Percent of all <u>Days</u>		<u>Unadjusted</u>	
Shelter	1,464	34.0	30.6	364	12.1	5.5	1,453	30.3	12.1
Chemical Dependency	6	3.0	0.1	181	45.3	2.7	558	69.8	4.6
Group Foster Home	142	71.0	3.0	244	244.0	3.7	428	214.0	3.6
Treatment Foster Home	0	-	-	586	195.3	8.8	586	195.3	4.9
Group Home	802	80.2	16.8	924	71.1	13.9	1,441	68.6	12.0
RTC	2,026	135.1	42.4	3,097	172.1	46.5	5,823	161.8	48.4
Correctional	0	-	-	1	1.0	0	1	1.0	0
Psychiatric Hospital	0	-	-	9	9.0	0.1	334	167.0	2.8
Mental Retardation	0	-	-	7	7.0	0.1	7	7.0	0
Foster Home	336	112.0	7.0	1,252	156.6	18.8	1,405	127.7	11.7
Family	<u>1</u>	<u>1.0</u>	<u>0.1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1.0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	4,777	62.9	100.0%	6,666	82.3	100.0%	12,037	89.8	100.0%

In addition, treatment group clients differ from comparison group clients in terms of the distribution of placement days utilized by type of placement as well as by the average length of stay (ALOS) in a given placement type (Table 5). Within the treatment group nearly one-third (31 percent) of all placement days utilized are stays in shelter placement. By way of contrast, only 5.5 percent of the total placement days utilized by the comparison group are shelter stays (364 out of 6,666 days). The average length of stay in shelter, however, is significantly longer for treatment group children than it is for comparison group children (34 days versus 12 days, respectively). Overall, with the exception of shelter placements, comparison group clients utilized more days in each placement type, and had a longer average length of stay in each placement type than did home-based service clients.

Placement Completion Rates.⁵ Differences are evident between the home-based service and comparison groups with reference to the proportion of clients who complete a placement episode; a higher proportion of home-based service clients, for example, completed their placements than did comparison group clients (Tables 6: 58 percent versus 40 percent, respectively).

TABLE 6. PLACEMENT EPISODES BY COMPLETION STATUS AND STUDY GROUP

<u>Completion Status</u>	<u>Home-Based Services (N=55)</u> Percent	<u>Comparison (N=58)</u>	
		<u>Adjusted</u> Percent	<u>Unadjusted</u> Percent
Complete	57.9	39.5	48.5
Not Complete	28.9	38.3	37.3
Open	<u>13.2</u>	<u>22.2</u>	<u>14.2</u>
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

It is also evident that the proportion of clients successfully completing placement differs between the two groups by type of placement (Tables 7, 8, 9).

TABLE 7. PLACEMENT COMPLETION STATUS
BY TYPE OF PLACEMENT:
HOME-BASED SERVICE GROUP (N=55)

<u>Type of Placement</u>	<u>Number of Episodes</u>	<u>Percent of Clients</u>		
		<u>Complete</u>	<u>Not Complete</u>	<u>Open</u>
Shelter	43	65.1	27.9	7.0
Chemical Dependency Tx	2	0	50.0	50.0
Group Foster Home	2	100.0	0	0
Tx Foster Home	0	-	-	-
Group Home	10	50.0	30.0	20.0
RTC	15	40.0	33.3	26.7
Correctional Placement	0	-	-	-
Family Placement	1	100.0	0	0
Foster Home	3	66.7	33.3	0
Total	76			

TABLE 8. PLACEMENT COMPLETION STATUS BY
TYPE OF PLACEMENT: COMPARISON GROUP-ADJUSTED (N=58)

<u>Type of Placement</u>	<u>Number of Episodes</u>	<u>Percent of Clients</u>		
		<u>Complete</u>	<u>Not Complete</u>	<u>Open</u>
Shelter	30	53.3	43.3	3.3
Chemical Dependency Tx	4	75.0	25.0	0
Group Foster Home	1	100.0	0	0
Tx Foster Home	3	0	66.7	33.3
Group Home	13	38.5	46.2	15.4
RTC	18	22.2	22.2	55.6
Correctional Placement	1	100.0	0	0
Family Placement	1	100.0	0	0
Private Residential Mental Retardation	1	0	100.0	0
Psychiatric Hospital	1	0	0	100.0
Foster Home	8	12.5	50.0	37.5
Total	81			

TABLE 9. PLACEMENT COMPLETION STATUS BY
TYPE OF PLACEMENT: COMPARISON GROUP-UNADJUSTED (N=58)

Type of Placement	Number of Episodes	Percent of Clients		
		Complete	Not Complete	Open
Shelter	48	54.2	34.5	4.2
Chemical Dependency Tx	8	50.0	50.0	0
Group Foster Home	2	50.0	50.0	0
Tx Foster Home	3	0	66.7	33.3
Group Home	21	42.9	47.6	9.5
RTC	36	52.8	19.4	27.8
Correctional Placement	1	100.0	0	0
Family Placement	1	100.0	0	0
Private Residential Mental Retardation	1	0	100.0	0
Psychiatric Hospital	2	50.0	0	50.0
Foster Home	<u>11</u>	27.3	45.4	27.3
Total	134			

Differences between the home-based service group and the comparison group are also evident when total days in placement is broken down by completion status (Table 10). Of all placement days utilized by the treatment group, 46 percent fall into the complete category; by way of contrast, 31 percent of all placement days utilized by comparison group clients fall into the same category.

TABLE 10. PLACEMENT DAYS UTILIZED
BY COMPLETION STATUS AND STUDY GROUP

Status	Home-Based Services (N=55)		Comparison (N=58)			
	Total Days	Percent	Adjusted Total Days	Adjusted Percent	Unadjusted Total Days	Unadjusted Percent
Complete	2,181	45.6	2,059	30.9	5,671	47.1
Not Complete	959	20.1	1,611	24.2	2,882	23.9
Open	<u>1,637</u>	<u>34.3</u>	<u>2,996</u>	<u>44.9</u>	<u>3,484</u>	<u>28.9</u>
Total	4,777	100.0	6,666	100.0	12,037	100.0

The average length of stay in placement by completion status also differs by group (Table 11). In general, home-based service clients complete placements in a shorter period of time and spend fewer days in placements not completed than do comparison group clients. An exception to this general pattern concerns shelter placements; treatment clients have a longer average length of stay in completed shelter placements, as well as a longer average length of stay in shelter placements not completed than do comparison clients (Tables 12 and 13).

TABLE 11. AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY IN PLACEMENT
BY COMPLETION STATUS AND STUDY GROUP

<u>Status</u>	<u>Home-Based</u> <u>Services (N=55)</u>	<u>Comparison (N=58)</u>	
	<u>ALOS</u>	<u>Adjusted</u> <u>ALOS</u>	<u>Unadjusted</u> <u>ALOS</u>
Complete	49.6	64.3	87.5
Not Complete	43.6	52.0	57.6
Open	<u>163.7</u>	<u>166.4</u>	<u>183.4</u>
Group Average	62.9	82.3	89.8

Potential Time in Placement Actually Utilized. There is a large and significant difference between the home-based treatment group and the comparison group in the proportion of potential placement days actually utilized (Table 15). Although home-based service clients had a greater number of potential placement days available to them than did comparison group clients, the home-based service group utilized significantly fewer available days than did comparison group clients (4,777 versus 6,666 days, respectively) in placements of all types. Through December 31, 1986, home-based service clients had utilized 21 percent of all available days in placement; the comparable figure for the comparison group is 32 percent.

TABLE 12. PLACEMENT DAYS UTILIZED AND AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY
 BY PLACEMENT COMPLETION STATUS:
 HOME-BASED SERVICE GROUP (N=55)

Type of Placement	Placement Status								
	N of Episodes	Complete Total Days	ALOS	N of Episodes	Not Complete Total Days	ALOS	N of Episodes	Open Total Days	ALOS
Shelter	28	674	24.1	12	344	28.7	3	446	148.7
Chemical Dependency Tx	0	-	-	1	4	4.0	1	2	2.0
Group Foster Home	2	142	71.0	0	-	-	0	-	-
Tx Foster Home	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-
Group Home	5	210	42.0	3	258	86.0	2	334	167.0
RTC	6	838	139.7	5	333	66.6	4	855	213.8
Family Placement	1	1	1.0	0	-	-	0	-	-
Foster Home	2	316	158.0	1	20	20.0	0	-	-
Correctional Placement	0	-	-	0	-	-	0	-	-
Totals	44	2,181	49.6	22	959	43.6	10	1,637	163.7

TABLE 13. PLACEMENT DAYS UTILIZED AND AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY
 BY PLACEMENT COMPLETION STATUS:
 COMPARISON GROUP (ADJUSTED, N=58)

Type of Placement	Placement Status									
	N of Episodes	Complete			Not Complete			N of Episodes	Open	
		Total Days	ALOS		N of Episodes	Total Days	ALOS		Total Days	ALOS
Shelter	16	245	15.3		13	103	7.9	1	16	16.0
Chemical Dependency Tx	3	180	60.0		1	1	1.0	0	-	-
Group Foster Home	1	244	244.0		0	-	-	0	-	-
Tx Foster Home	0	-	-		2	476	238.0	1	110	110.0
Foster Home	1	130	130.0		4	254	63.5	3	868	289.3
Group Home	5	347	69.4		6	420	70.0	2	157	78.5
RTC	4	911	227.8		4	350	87.5	10	1,836	183.6
Family Placement	1	1	1.0		0	-	-	0	-	-
Correctional Placement	1	1	1.0		0	-	-	0	-	-
Psychiatric Hospital	0	-	-		0	-	-	1	9	9.0
Residential Mental Retardation	0	-	-		1	7	7.0	0	-	-
Totals	32	2,059	64.3		31	1,611	52.0	18	2,996	166.4

TABLE 14. PLACEMENT DAYS UTILIZED AND AVERAGE LENGTH OF STAY
 BY PLACEMENT COMPLETION STATUS:
 COMPARISON GROUP (UNADJUSTED, N=58)

Type of Placement	Placement Status								
	Complete			Not Complete			Open		
	N of Episodes	Total Days	ALOS	N of Episodes	Total Days	ALOS	N of Episodes	Total Days	ALOS
Shelter	26	631	24.3	20	318	15.9	2	504	252.0
Chemical Dependency Tx	4	307	76.8	4	251	62.7	0	-	-
Group Foster Home	1	244	244.0	1	184	184.0	0	-	-
Tx Foster Home	0	-	-	2	476	238.0	1	110	110.0
Foster Home	3	276	92.0	5	261	52.2	3	868	289.3
Group Home	9	597	66.3	10	687	68.7	2	157	78.5
RTC	19	3,289	173.1	7	698	99.7	10	1,836	183.6
Family Placement	1	1	1.0	0	-	-	0	-	-
Correctional Placement	1	1	1.0	0	-	-	0	-	-
Psychiatric Hospital	1	325	325.0	0	-	-	1	9	9.0
Residential Mental Retardation	0	-	-	1	7	7.0	0	-	-
Totals	65	5,671	87.5	50	2,882	57.6	19	3,484	183.4

TABLE 15. POTENTIAL PLACEMENT DAYS
ACTUALLY UTILIZED BY STUDY GROUP

	Home-Based Services (N=55)	Comparison (N=58)	
		Adjusted	Unadjusted
Potential Days:	22,740	20,609	25,980
Actual Days Utilized:			
All	4,777	6,666	12,037
Excluding Shelter	3,313	6,302	10,584
Shelter Only	1,464	364	1,453
Percent of Potential Days Utilized:			
All	21.0	32.3	46.3
Excluding Shelter	14.6	30.6	40.7
Shelter Only	6.4	1.8	5.6

Within each group there are significant differences in the proportion of available placement days utilized when this measure is broken down by selected client and family characteristics (Tables 16 and 17). The characteristics examined include: age, sex and race of child; post-placement experience; family structure (household headship and the presence of other siblings); whether or not the child was in a placement at the time of assignment to either the treatment or comparison group; and child and parental attitude to the proposed placement.

Within both the home-based service and comparison groups, younger children as well as female children utilized a higher proportion of available time in placement than did older children, or children who are male. When the proportion of available time utilized is examined by the race of the child, differences within and between groups also are evident. Within the home-based service group, for example, Black children utilized the highest proportion of available placement days (31 percent of available time). White and Native American children in the home-based service group utilized a significantly lower proportion of available days in placement; White and Native American children each utilized approximately 17 percent of available placement days, approximately one-half of the proportion utilized by Black children. A somewhat different pattern by race of child, however, is found within the comparison group. Black children utilized a lower proportion of available days in placement (21 percent) than did white or Native American children (34 percent and 37 percent, respectively).

TABLE 16. PERCENT OF POTENTIAL PLACEMENT DAYS
UTILIZED BY SELECTED CLIENT/FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS:
HOME-BASED SERVICE GROUP (N=55)

<u>Client Characteristic</u>		<u>Percent of Potential Days Utilized</u>
<u>Age</u>		
13 or under	(14)	32.3
14	(12)	10.7
15	(17)	22.7
16, 17	(12)	15.7
<u>Sex</u>		
Male	(26)	20.2
Female	(29)	21.7
<u>Past Placements</u>		
None	(33)	12.9
One or more	(22)	33.2
<u>Race</u>		
White	(38)	18.4
Black	(6)	31.4
Native American	(6)	16.0
Other	(5)	34.5
<u>In Placement at Assignment Date</u>		
Yes	(14)	39.7
No	(41)	14.6
<u>Family Structure</u>		
Single parent	(29)	24.5
Two parent	(24)	18.2
Other	(2)	3.3
<u>Other Siblings</u>		
None	(14)	25.5
One or more	(41)	19.4
<u>Child Attitude To Placement</u>		
Negative	(20)	13.8
Ambivalent	(12)	21.5
Positive	(19)	31.5
<u>Parent's Attitude To Placement</u>		
Negative	(3)	3.7
Ambivalent	(8)	21.1
Positive	(39)	22.0

Note: All placement types.

TABLE 17. PERCENT OF POTENTIAL PLACEMENT DAYS
UTILIZED BY SELECTED CLIENT/FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS:
COMPARISON GROUP (N=58)

<u>Client Characteristic</u>		<u>Percent of Potential Days Utilized</u>	
		<u>Adjusted</u>	<u>Unadjusted</u>
<u>Age</u>			
13 or under	(11)	58.6	70.6
14	(13)	40.6	57.8
15	(20)	18.9	34.4
16, 17	(14)	21.8	31.6
<u>Sex</u>			
Male	(34)	32.3	46.5
Female	(24)	31.5	44.9
<u>Past Placements</u>			
None	(28)	30.7	48.4
One or more	(30)	32.2	43.4
<u>Race</u>			
White	(40)	34.4	47.8
Black	(8)	21.1	33.7
Native American	(7)	37.0	44.7
Other	(3)	16.9	54.6
<u>In Placement at Assignment Date</u>			
Yes	(23)	47.2	54.0
No	(35)	22.0	40.5
<u>Family Structure</u>			
Single parent	(21)	39.4	49.1
Two parent	(32)	30.4	47.7
Other	(5)	11.2	20.0
<u>Other Siblings</u>			
None	(5)	28.6	34.2
One or more	(53)	32.3	46.9
<u>Child Attitude To Placement</u>			
Negative	(10)	31.7	39.7
Ambivalent	(14)	33.9	43.5
Positive	(28)	36.6	51.9
<u>Parent's Attitude To Placement</u>			
Negative	(0)	-	-
Ambivalent	(8)	10.8	29.4
Positive	(44)	39.1	52.0

Note: All placement types.

A child's out-of-home placement history, as well as the location of the child at the time of assignment to either the home-based or comparison group also are related to the proportion of available placement days utilized. Within each group, children who had experienced past out-of-home placements utilized a significantly higher percent of available placement days than did children who had no history of out-of-home placement. In addition, children who were in a placement at the time of assignment to either of the two study groups utilized significantly higher proportions of available placement days than children who were at home. Within the home-based group, for example, children in a placement at the time of study assignment utilized 40 percent of available placement days compared to 15 percent for children not in placement; for the comparison group, the figures are 47 percent and 22 percent, respectively.

In terms of family structure, a higher proportion of available days in placement is utilized by children in single-headed (predominately female-headed) households than is utilized by children in two-parent households. (The small number of children and the ambiguity of family composition prevent a meaningful interpretation of the relatively low figures found in the "Other" category.) In addition, at least within the home-based service group, children in households without other siblings utilize a higher proportion of available days than do children with siblings. The difference for this indicator of family structure within the comparison group is quite small.

A child's attitude (uncooperative versus cooperative, for example) also appears to be related to the proportion of available time that he/she spent in placement; in each group, children who were opposed/uncooperative with the proposed placement utilized proportionately fewer days in placement than did cooperative children. Parental attitude, however, appears to have had minimal impact for the home-based service group, but significant impact for comparison group children. Given the relatively small number of parents opposed to (or even ambivalent about) the proposed placement, however, this relationship must be interpreted with caution.

PROPORTION OF AVAILABLE TIME IN PLACEMENT UTILIZED: VARIATION WITHIN THE HOME-BASED SERVICE GROUP BY PROGRAM INDICATORS.

The proportion of available time in placement utilized by home-based service clients also is examined with reference to three key program-level indicators: the extent of family engagement with the home-based service, level of service intensity, and

program completion status. The relationship between each program-level indicator and post-service placement outcome is considered below.

Service Engagement. Goal-setting and, to a lesser extent, the degree of progress in achieving goals are treated as proxy measures of the extent to which family members are willing to invest and actively engage in the treatment process. The willingness of family members and the ability of a treatment team to cooperatively establish a problem-relevant set of treatment goals is central to the home-based service model implemented within the Child Welfare Division. Implicit within the service model is the assumption that families who are engaged in the treatment process to the extent that they are willing to set goals and actively work toward goal achievement are more likely to have a positive outcome than are families less willing (or able) to actively participate in the treatment process. Based on the results presented in Tables 18 and 19, this assumption appears to be well founded. From Table 18 it may be seen that the proportion of available time in placement utilized by families who set treatment goals (or a goal) is significantly lower than the percent of available time utilized by families who did not set goals. Considering placements of all types, for example, children in families not setting goals utilized 26 percent of available placement time. By way of contrast, children in families who did set treatment goals utilized 17 percent of the time in placement available to them. Furthermore, the difference between the two sub-groups is even larger if shelter placements are excluded from this calculation. In examining shelter placements only, however, the difference between the two sub-groups is quite small.

TABLE 18. PERCENT OF POTENTIAL PLACEMENT DAYS
UTILIZED BY FAMILY GOAL-SETTING:
HOME-BASED SERVICE GROUP

<u>Family Goal-Setting</u>	<u>Percent of Time Utilized</u>		
	<u>All Placement Types</u>	<u>Shelter Only</u>	<u>Excluding Shelter</u>
None Set (N=22)	26.3	4.3	22.2
At Least One Goal Set (N=33)	17.4	7.4	10.2

While goal-setting is related to the percent of available placement time utilized, the relationship between level of goal progress achieved and the latter outcome measure is more ambiguous. From Table 19, for example, it may be seen that the degree of goal progress achieved by children is not consistently related to the percent of available

time in placement utilized. The level of goal progress achieved by a child's parent(s), however, is related to the percent of available time utilized. Children in families where parents are judged by a treatment team as having achieved significant goal progress utilize 5 percent of placement days available. By way of contrast, children whose parents exhibited minimal goal progress utilized 25 percent of available placement days. These data appear to support the view that a family's degree of active involvement with a home-based service team, as well as parental problem-solving, are significantly related to a child's likelihood of out-of-home placement.

TABLE 19. PERCENT OF POTENTIAL PLACEMENT DAYS UTILIZED BY CHILD AND PARENT GOAL ACHIEVEMENT: HOME-BASED SERVICE GROUP

<u>Level of Goal Achievement</u>		<u>Percent of Time Utilized</u>		
		<u>All Placement Types</u>	<u>Shelter Only</u>	<u>Excluding Shelter</u>
<u>Child</u>				
Minimal	(16)	12.4	4.9	7.5
Moderate-High	(13)	18.1	11.5	6.6
<u>Parent</u>				
Minimal	(16)	25.2	11.0	14.2
Moderate-High	(15)	4.9	4.0	0.9

Service Intensity. Service intensity is measured by two variables: the total number of days that a family was active with a home-based treatment team and total hours of direct and indirect service. While higher total service hours are associated with smaller proportions of available time in placement utilized, the relationship is not particularly strong (Table 20). In addition, the possibility that the relationship is non-linear is evident in Table 21.

TABLE 20. CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SERVICE INTENSITY MEASURES AND PERCENT OF POTENTIAL PLACEMENT DAYS UTILIZED: HOME-BASED SERVICE GROUP (N=55)

<u>Service Intensity</u>	<u>All Placement Types</u>	<u>Shelter Only</u>	<u>Excluding Shelter</u>
Days	+ .01	+ .03	- .01
Total Hours	- .10	+ .05	- .15

TABLE 21. PERCENT OF POTENTIAL PLACEMENT DAYS
UTILIZED BY LEVEL OF SERVICE INTENSITY:
HOME-BASED SERVICE GROUP (N=55)

<u>Service Intensity Measures</u>	<u>All Placement Types</u>	<u>Shelter Only</u>	<u>Excluding Shelter</u>
<u>Treatment Days</u>			
Low (less than 29)	20.6	4.3	16.3
Medium (29-45)	26.8	10.4	16.4
High (46-114)	16.7	4.2	12.5
<u>Total Treatment Hours</u>			
Low (less than 12)	20.6	1.5	19.1
Medium (12-20)	28.4	11.4	17.0
High (21-50)	14.4	5.3	9.1

Program Completion Status. The proportion of available time in placement actually utilized by home-based service clients varies markedly by program completion status. From Table 22, for example, it may be seen that those clients who completed the program utilized 10 percent; by way of contrast, clients referred to the program, but refusing participation, utilized 29 percent of the time in placement available to them. A difference between these two sub-groups also is evident when the proportion of available time utilized is calculated excluding shelter placements; there is a 22 percentage point difference between those clients completing the program and those refusing program participation (3 percent versus 25 percent respectively). The differences in the proportion of available time utilized in placement by termination status are relatively small when one considers shelter placements only.

TABLE 22. PERCENT OF POTENTIAL PLACEMENT DAYS
UTILIZED BY PROGRAM COMPLETION STATUS:
HOME-BASED SERVICE GROUP (N=55)

<u>Program Completion Status</u>	<u>All Placement Types</u>	<u>Shelter Only</u>	<u>Excluding Shelter</u>
Complete Successfully (22)	10.1	7.0	3.1
Fail to Complete (23)	28.0	6.2	21.8
Refused Services (10)	28.9	3.7	25.2

SUMMARY AND OVERVIEW

Overall, there are only minimal differences between the two groups with reference to total number of placement episodes experienced and in the incidence of multiple placement episodes. Although there are only marginal differences between the two groups in terms of the number of placement episodes, there is a marked difference between the two groups when examined by the types of placement resources utilized. Most notable in this regard is the differential utilization of shelter placements: Of all placement episodes experienced by home-based service clients, 57 percent were shelter placements; the comparable figure for comparison group clients is 37 percent.

In addition, home-based service clients utilized nearly 1,900 fewer days in placement than did comparison group clients. With the exception of shelter placements, home-based service clients also experienced significantly shorter placement stays than did comparison group clients. Overall, the average length of stay in placement for home-based clients was 62.9 days; for comparison group clients, the average length of stay was 82.3 days. Home-based clients also successfully completed placement episodes at a higher rate than did comparison clients, and nearly one-half (46 percent) of the placement days utilized by home-based clients were completed successfully; for comparison group clients this figure is 31 percent. Finally, it is also evident that home-based clients successfully completed placements in a shorter time period and spent fewer days in "failed" placements than did comparison clients.

A significant difference between the two groups also is evident in terms of the proportion of available placement days utilized. Overall, home-based clients utilized 21 percent of available placement days; by way of contrast, comparison clients utilized 32 percent. The proportion of available placement time utilized within and between groups also varies when broken down by selected client characteristics, particularly client age, sex, race, and placement history.

Table 23 examines the major indicators of placement activity for the home-based service and comparison groups through June 1986 and December 1986; it is evident from these data that home-based service clients continue to utilize a significantly lower level of placement resources than comparison group clients.

TABLE 23. INDICATORS OF PLACEMENT ACTIVITY,
JUNE 1986 AND DECEMBER 1986

	<u>Home-Based Service Group</u>		<u>Comparison Group</u>	
	<u>August 1985- June 1986</u>	<u>July 1986- December 1986</u>	<u>August 1985- June 1986</u>	<u>July 1986- December 1986</u>
<u>Number of Placement Episodes</u>	54	76	55	81
<u>Percent of Total Placement Episodes, by Type:</u>				
Shelter	63%	57%	35%	37%
Group Home	11%	13%	16%	16%
RTC	19%	20%	22%	22%
Other	7%	10%	27%	25%
<u>Average Length of Stay in Placement (Days)</u>	43.9	62.9	69.2	82.3
<u>Distribution of Placement Days Utilized by Placement Completion Status:</u>				
Complete	42%	46%	23%	31%
Not Complete	13%	20%	24%	24%
Open	45%	34%	53%	45%
<u>Percent of Available Placement Days Utilized</u>	19%	21%	35%	32%

SECTION 3. NOTES

1. For a detailed presentation and discussion of the study's design, methodology and findings, see: Philip AuClaire and Ira M. Schwartz, "An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Intensive Home-Based Services as an Alternative to Placement for Adolescents and Their Families." Minneapolis, MN Center for the Study of Youth Policy, University of Minnesota, December 1986. See also, Philip AuClaire and Ira Schwartz, "Are Home-Based Services Effective? A Public Child Welfare Agency's Experiment." Children Today, May-June 1987:6-9.
2. The evaluation also includes a comprehensive set of interviews with home-based and comparison group clients. A separate report focusing on the results of these interviews will be available by September 1987.
3. The time-frame over which client placement activity has been tracked is from the date that a study-eligible client was assigned to either of the two groups through December 31, 1986. The number of days between these two points reflects the number of days that a client could have been in placement; this is referred to as potential (or available) placement days. This measure varies by client; a client assigned to the home-based service group in September, for example, would have a higher number potential placement days than a client assigned in November. Furthermore, as used in this report, a placement episode refers to one discrete and continuous stay in a placement of a particular type, regardless of the length of that stay. Two related adjustments are made for comparison group clients; the first has to do with the calculation of placement episodes and the second concerns the calculation (and definition) of available placement days. For comparison group clients, the first post-assignment placement episode is excluded from the calculation of total placement episodes experienced from the date of assignment through December 31, 1986. Similarly, the total days associated with a client's first post-assignment placement episode are subtracted from that client's number of available placement days. In the tables in the text, both adjusted and unadjusted figures are presented for the comparison group, although the discussion focuses on adjusted figures. For home-based service clients, all placement episodes experienced by a client from the date of assignment to the group through December 31, 1986 are included. The number of available placement days for a

home-based service client is equal to the number of days between the date of assignment and December 31, 1986, minus the number of days that a client was actively involved with a treatment team. The appropriate adjustment is included in all calculations involving either placement episodes or available placement days.

4. The analysis includes 55 home-based service clients. Three clients assigned to the home-based service unit remained in placement throughout the study period; as a consequence, home-based workers had no opportunity to work with these families.
5. A "completed" placement is defined as a placement episode where the major goals of the placement plan developed on conjunction with the child's parent(s), Child Welfare Division social worker, and placement facility staff are met. A placement is not completed in those instances when placement plan goals are not met, for whatever reasons. "Open" placements are open as of December 31, 1986.