



# Guilford County (Greensboro), North Carolina

## OVERVIEW

**G**uilford County, North Carolina, became involved in the third phase of Family to Family beginning with initial discussions in late 2000. At this stage, the initiative involved the state Division of Social Services, which oversees the child welfare program in North Carolina, and five counties. In the mid-1990s, Guilford County had been one of the counties that participated in the Families for Kids initiative sponsored by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation and in 1997 it was one of the counties participating in a federally authorized Title IV-E waiver demonstration that continued until 2007. In addition, the state began implementing a new approach to child protective services called the Multiple Response System (MRS). Under MRS, counties were encouraged to conduct family team meetings following a family group conferencing approach that was not entirely compatible with the Team Decisionmaking (TDM) approach promoted in Family to Family. In 2007, when Family to Family moved into the anchor site phase, two North Carolina counties, Guilford and Wake, were invited to continue as anchor sites.

The county had an estimated population in 2007 of 465,931 persons, including 247,183 in the city of Greensboro and 100,432 in the city of High Point.<sup>1</sup> The local Department of Social Services (DSS) operates from service centers in each of these cities. The number of children from Guilford County in out-of-home placement has been steadily declining in the last four years. In December 2005 there were 556 children in placement (7.8 per 1,000 children in the population) compared to 397 in 2008 (5.8 per 1,000 children). This was a reduction of 29% in four years.

## SITE-LEVEL PLACEMENT EXPERIENCE INDICATORS

**I**nitial entries to out-of-home care in Guilford County declined from 225 in 2005 to 159 in 2007, but rose to 189 in 2008. This stands in contrast to a statewide decline in North Carolina from 6,094 entrants in fiscal year 2006 to 5,043 entrants in 2008.<sup>2</sup> During the anchor-site period, infants have accounted for between 36.0% and 40.8% of initial admissions. Among initial entrants in 2008 in Guilford County, 55.6% were five or younger, slightly higher than the statewide rate of 51.1% for this group in fiscal year 2008.

<sup>1</sup> Population estimates for 2007 obtained from *City-data.com*, Retrieved June 23, 2009, from <http://www.city-data.com/>.

<sup>2</sup> State-level data obtained from Duncan, D.F., Kum, H.C., Flair, K.A., Stewart, C.J., and Weigensberg, E.C. (2009). *NC Child Welfare Program*. Retrieved June 23, 2009, from University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Jordan Institute for Families website. URL: <http://ssw.unc.edu/cw/>.

More than half of the children and youth entering care for the first time in Guilford County from 2005 through 2008 were black, ranging from 55.6% to 64.6% of each cohort. This stands in contrast to a rate of 29.3% for black persons in the general population of the county. The number of children of Hispanic descent entering care for the first time has declined consistently from 21 in 2005 to 5 in 2008. The percentage of children entering out-of-home care without at least one sibling also declined from 56.1% in 2006 to 41.3% in 2008.

**Exhibit A.3.1: Demographic Characteristics of Children Initially Entering Out-of-Home Care—Guilford County, NC**

Characteristic	2005 (N=225)	2006 (N=206)	2007 (N=159)	2008 (N=189)
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	113 (50.2%)	90 (43.7%)	77 (48.4%)	90 (47.6%)
Female	112 (49.8%)	116 (56.3%)	82 (51.6%)	99 (52.4%)
<b>Race</b>				
White Non-Hispanic	71 (31.6%)	41 (19.9%)	46 (28.9%)	66 (34.9%)
Black Non-Hispanic	125 (55.6%)	133 (64.6%)	91 (57.2%)	106 (56.1%)
Hispanic	21 (9.3%)	17 (8.3%)	11 (6.9%)	5 (2.6%)
Native American/Alaska Native	1 (0.4%)	4 (1.9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Asian American/Pacific Islanders	7 (3.1%)	11 (5.3%)	11 (6.9%)	12 (6.3%)
Other	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Age</b>				
Birth - 1 year	68 (30.2%)	84 (40.8%)	57 (35.8%)	68 (36%)
2-5 years	50 (22.2%)	44 (21.4%)	35 (22%)	37 (19.6%)
6-11 years	43 (19.1%)	40 (19.4%)	35 (22%)	47 (24.9%)
12-14 years	31 (13.8%)	24 (11.7%)	16 (10.1%)	16 (8.5%)
15-17 years	33 (14.7%)	14 (6.8%)	16 (10.1%)	21 (11.1%)
18-21 years	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Siblings entering care at same time</b>				
Single child	122 (54.5%)	115 (56.1%)	80 (50.3%)	78 (41.3%)
2	50 (22.3%)	32 (15.6%)	34 (21.4%)	52 (27.5%)
3	26 (11.6%)	18 (8.8%)	30 (18.9%)	27 (14.3%)
4	16 (7.1%)	24 (11.7%)	8 (5%)	16 (8.5%)
5	10 (4.5%)	10 (4.9%)	0 (0%)	10 (5.3%)
6 or more	0 (0%)	6 (2.9%)	7 (4.4%)	6 (3.2%)

Guilford County has consistently relied on foster homes and placements with unlicensed relatives across all four cohorts shown in **Exhibit A.3.2**; however, the combined rate of initial entries for the two types of placements rose from approximately two-thirds of placements in 2005 and 2006 to nearly three-fourths of placements in 2007 and 2008. In the more recent cohorts, however, foster homes have accommodated a larger percentage of children while the percentage

placed with unlicensed relatives has declined. As a result, the percentage of initial placements with a “family connection” (i.e., placed with a relative or placed with a sibling) has fluctuated from 46.5% to 52.9%.

Compared to other Family to Family anchor sites, Guilford County has generally been able to place a relatively high percentage of youth in family settings. Across the four cohorts, the rates of family placements ranged from 57.1% to 72.7%, roughly comparable to other age groups. Among youth aged 12-14, rates ranged from 75.0% to 87.5% from 2005 to 2007, but declined to 50% for the 2008 cohort; however, given the relatively small numbers in this age group, the significance of this change should be interpreted cautiously.

<b>Exhibit A.3.2: Characteristics of Placement: Guilford County, NC</b>				
<b>Characteristic of Initial Placement</b>	<b>2005 (N=225)</b>	<b>2006 (N=206)</b>	<b>2007 (N=159)</b>	<b>2008 (N=189)</b>
<b>Initial Placement</b>				
Foster Home	86 (38.2%)	71 (34.5%)	76 (47.8%)	90 (47.6%)
Relative Home - Licensed	2 (0.9%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.6%)	0 (0%)
Relative Home - Unlicensed	62 (27.6%)	62 (30.1%)	43 (27%)	48 (25.4%)
Group Home	3 (1.3%)	6 (2.9%)	2 (1.3%)	2 (1.1%)
Residential Treatment	5 (2.2%)	5 (2.4%)	2 (1.3%)	2 (1.1%)
Emergency Shelter	15 (6.7%)	3 (1.5%)	7 (4.4%)	11 (5.8%)
Other Institutional	30 (13.3%)	34 (16.5%)	18 (11.3%)	19 (10.1%)
Own Home	3 (1.3%)	5 (2.4%)	4 (2.5%)	2 (1.1%)
Adoptive Home	0 (0%)	1 (0.5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Other	19 (8.4%)	19 (9.2%)	6 (3.8%)	15 (7.9%)
<b>Sibling Placement Status for Children Initially Placed in Foster Homes</b>				
No Siblings Entered Placement	41	39	33	40
Placed with All Siblings	37 (82.2%)	9 (28.1%)	24 (55.8%)	30 (61.2%)
Placed with Some Siblings	6 (13.3%)	17 (53.1%)	11 (25.6%)	11 (22.4%)
Placed with no Siblings	2 (4.4%)	6 (18.8%)	8 (18.6%)	8 (16.3%)
<b>Family Connection at Initial Placement<sup>1</sup></b>				
No	110 (48.9%)	109 (52.9%)	74 (46.5%)	98 (51.9%)
Yes	115 (51.1%)	97 (47.1%)	85 (53.5%)	91 (48.1%)

<sup>1</sup> Family connection components include: placed with relative and sibling placed together.

To facilitate comparisons across cohorts, **Exhibit A.2.3** describes the number of placement moves for two groups—children and youth whose length of stay was more than one week, but less than one year and those who remained in care for more than one year, but less than two years. Consistent with the measure of placement stability used in the federal Child and Family Service Review (CFSR) process, the indicator in this table measures the percentage of children with three or more placements. The data indicate that children with shorter lengths of stay were less likely to experience three or more placements in every cohort. In contrast, children and youth with longer

lengths of stay were much more likely to have this many placements, although the rate declined from the 2005 to the 2006 cohort. More importantly, in 2007 the percentage of children remaining in care less than one year who had 1 or 2 placements increased from 80% to 89%; and in 2006 the percentage of children remaining in care one to two years who had one or two placements increased from 57% to 69%.

The table also provides a more focused analysis of youth who were 12 years of age or older when they entered out-of-home care. This age group is of concern because in many places they have been vulnerable to placement moves. The basic pattern remains the same in that more of the youth with longer lengths of stay tend to have three or more placements. It is important to note, however, that these results are based on very small numbers of youth in each cohort, and therefore, must be interpreted cautiously.

<b>Exhibit A.3.3: Placement Stability by Year of Initial Entry — Guilford County, NC</b>			
	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>All Children</b>			
<b>No. of Placements in 1st Spell for Children Remaining In Care 8 - 365 days</b>			
1 or 2 placements	43 (82.7%)	41 (80.4%)	50 (89.3%)
3 or more placements	9 (17.3%)	10 (19.5%)	6 (10.7%)
<b>No. of Placements in 1st Spell for Children Remaining In Care 1 - 2 years</b>			
1 or 2 placements	43 (56.8%)	55 (68.8%)	na
3 or more placements	32 (43.2%)	25 (31.3%)	na
<b>12 - 17 years</b>			
<b>No. of Placements in 1st Spell for Teens Remaining In Care 8 - 365 days</b>			
1 or 2 placements	15 (71.4%)	9 (81.8%)	12 (85.7%)
3 or more placements	6 (28.6%)	2 (18.2%)	2 (14.3%)
<b>No. of Placements in 1st Spell for Teens Remaining In Care 1 - 2 years</b>			
1 or 2 placements	6 (35.3%)	5 (45.5%)	na
3 or more placements	11 (64.7%)	6 (54.5%)	na

The rates of predicted exit from care within six months, one year, and two year appear not to have changed very substantially across cohorts. The only notable changes are an increased likelihood of adoption within two years of entry from 2005 to 2006 (0.22 to 0.34), an increase in likelihood of reunification within 1 year from 2006 to 2007 (.13 to .19) and increased likelihood of exit to a relative at each stage for both the 2006 and 2007 cohorts. Rates of reentry to care following the end of a child's first spell did not change very substantially across cohorts. Although these results are consistent with the low rate of reentry to care and the relatively long lengths of stay that tend to prevail throughout North Carolina, they run counter to lengths of stay that have changed little in the past few years in the state as a whole.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> State-level data obtained from Duncan, D.F., Kum, H.C., Flair, K.A., Stewart, C.J., and Weigensberg, E.C. (2009). *NC Child Welfare Program*. Retrieved June 23, 2009, from University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Jordan Institute for Families website. URL: <http://ssw.unc.edu/cw/>.

### Exhibit A.3.4: Time in Care and Reentry—Guilford County, NC

	2005	2006	2007
<b>Probability of Exit by:</b>			
<b>Exit to Reunification</b>			
6 months	0.06	0.06	0.08
1 year	0.12	0.13	0.19
2 years	0.25	0.26	--
<b>Exit to Adoption</b>			
6 months	0.00	0.00	0.00
1 year	0.01	0.03	0.03
2 years	0.22	0.34	--
<b>Exit to Relative</b>			
6 months	0.04	0.08	0.13
1 year	0.09	0.12	0.18
2 years	0.17	0.19	--
<b>Probability of Reentering Care After 1st Spell by Number of Days in First Spell</b>			
0-7 days <sup>1</sup>	na	na	na
>7 days	0.06	0.08	0.06

<sup>1</sup> Guilford County has very few children who enter placement and stay for less than 8 days.

The longer that children remain in custody, the more challenging it becomes to help them achieve a permanent placement. As **Exhibit A.3.5** shows, this is evident in the fact that no more than 37.3% of the children and youth who had been in care for two years or more on December 31 in any of the years from 2004 through 2007 achieved a permanent placement in the subsequent year. In light of this problem, it is fortunate that the number of children and youth remaining in care for two years declined from 202 at the end of 2005 to 140 at the end of 2007. As a result, fewer children and youth are reaching a stage in the placement process at which permanency becomes such a challenging goal.

### Exhibit A.3.5: Achieving Permanency for Children and Youth in Care for Two Years or More—Guilford County, NC

	2004	2005	2006	2007
Number in care for two years or more	180	202	177	140
Number who exited to reunification, adoption, relative in the subsequent year	35	69	66	44
Percent achieving permanency	19.4%	34.2%	37.3%	31.4%

## PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING CORE STRATEGIES

Using grant resources obtained to implement Family to Family, Guilford County DSS created four workgroups, each corresponding to one of the four Family to Family Core Strategies. With the initial funds received in 2001, the agency hired two new positions, a full-time facilitator and data analyst. Using its own funds, Guilford County DSS also hired a program coordinator. Given that it had first embarked on Family to Family in 2001, Guilford County had gained considerable experience with each of the core strategies by 2005, the baseline year for the anchor-site phase. As a result, the implementation of Family to Family core strategies in the anchor years focused on going deeper in each strategy except self-evaluation. The repeated loss of the analyst required a rebuilding of self-evaluation capacity during this time period.

A key characteristic of Guilford County's 'going deeper' strategy work was its focus on eliminating racial disparities and disproportionality in child welfare outcomes. DSS began this work as one of 13 jurisdiction selected to participate in the Casey Family Program Breakthrough Series Collaborative (BSC) that addressed disproportionality and disparate outcomes for children and families of color involved with child welfare. The continued implementation of the four core strategies of Family to Family during the anchor phase provided a vehicle for Guilford DSS to sustain its efforts to eliminate racial disparities for children involved with child welfare. Each strategy was viewed through the lens of eliminating disparities. Additionally, Guilford DSS supplemented these efforts by partnering with the People's Institute to provide "Undoing Racism" training to agency staff and partners. These trainings are offered on a regular basis with the expectation that all staff complete the training. The training is also offered to community partners and stakeholders at no cost to participants. Not only did the Undoing Racism training provide a working definition of racism and the language needed to have candid conversation, but it also provided another vehicle for engaging community partners.

### Building Community Partnerships

**Connecting with the Community.** Guilford County's service area is divided into three demographically different geographic zones: the East Zone consists of inner city Greensboro and rural areas with small towns and is over 55% African American, the West Zone includes parts of Greensboro and is approximately 19% African American, and the High Point Zone consists of a population that is 31% African American. Neighborhoods and communities with high child welfare referrals were selected from each zone. Prior to Family to Family, Guilford County DSS had worked with a large and fairly active group of traditional community partners representing various organizational systems such as, public systems (including law enforcement and schools), for-profit and non-profit service agencies, and other collaborative entities; however, Guilford staff reported that previous partnership efforts were cursory at best. In particular, staff reported that organizations involved in these traditional partnerships were not committed to the goals and values of DSS and Family to Family. Thus, the BCP strategy provided the opportunity to begin thinking about how to build a strong collaborative network, one agency was identified as having the strongest ties and greatest understanding of community-based organizations in Guilford County. This agency acted as a key player in Guilford County's burgeoning Family to Family Community Partnership-Building Strategy.

**Site Infrastructure.** A community partnership committee was created to build upon and extend community agency connections and strengthen the resources and services provided to families involved with the child welfare system. One of Guilford County's strengths is that several community leaders also serve as employees of the agency. In addition, the BCP Chair serves as Co-Chair of the Community Child Protection Team, and the agency Assistant Director has served as Chair of the Mental Health Protection Team. Guilford DSS also engaged the Children's Cabinet in its community partnership efforts and, as a result of Guilford County's efforts, more than 30 additional community partners were recruited.

Finally, BCP efforts also built upon work in other core strategies. For example, the self-evaluation team noted that the most frequent source of child maltreatment reports concerning African-American children in Guilford County was the school system. Consequently, DSS leaders began a dialogue with the office of the Guilford County superintendent of education to find ways that the two systems might collaborate. This work is ongoing, but one area identified for closer collaboration was Team Decisionmaking.

**BCP Activities.** Guilford County continues its efforts to meet practice goals related to the BCP Core Strategy in a variety of ways. Children's Cabinets are held in neighborhoods and communities to address the need for foster and adoptive parent recruitment. In addition, the site holds Meet and Greet functions with community representatives in each of the three zones. One of these zones provided a refresher TDM training for the staff and community representatives at the meeting. TDMs are held in community locations through the collaborative partnerships with a continuing emphasis on maintaining community partner representation and advocacy for families at all TDMs. The agency provides training that includes agency staff and collaborative representatives, including Anti-Racism Training opportunities to address the issue of disproportionality in child welfare outcomes. The site has also completed a handbook for parents and foster parents with children in multiple systems to help them navigate these systems in the most efficient and beneficial way. Provider fairs that highlight community and agency resources are conducted as well as continuing training provided to foster parents.

**Impact on TDM Meetings.** One way that community partnerships can affect the experience of children and families that encounter the child welfare system is in the decisionmaking process. Exhibit A.3.6 shows how community partnerships were reflected in Team Decisionmaking (TDM) meetings in Guilford County. A family member or friend attends 56% of removal TDMs and 36% of meetings related to changes in placement. Service providers attend approximately one-third of all meetings and caregivers attended 43% of COP meetings in 2008. In spite of these positive characteristics of practice in Guilford County, some worrisome trends have emerged in recent years. For example, while Guilford County DSS has been more successful than many other anchor sites in holding TDM meetings in community locations, rates have declined. Whereas 29% of removal TDMs in 2005 were held in community locations, only 16% of those conducted in 2008 were in community locations. Discussions with DSS staff indicate that TDMs held in community locations are primarily those held for children from the High Point area which had inadequate meeting space for holding TDMs in the DSS offices. Similarly, only 28% of COP meetings in 2008 were held in the community, steadily down from a high of 54% in 2005.

### Exhibit A.3.6: Community Partnerships Reflected in TDM Meetings

	2005	2006	2007	2008
<b>Removal TDMs</b>				
Community representative present	10%	20%	19%	19%
Service provider present	29%	34%	32%	35%
Family member or friend present	56%	47%	47%	56%
Held in a community location	29%	21%	17%	16%
<b>Change of Placement TDMs</b>				
Community representative present	0%	5%	9%	14%
Service provider present	13%	47%	54%	30%
Family member or friend present	50%	13%	11%	36%
Held in a community location	54%	42%	34%	28%

## Resource Family Development and Support

Like other anchor counties Guilford uses public agency foster homes, as well as private foster homes. The number of public agency foster homes has decreased slightly during the last two years. On July 1, 2007 Guilford DSS reported having 143 public agency foster homes. At the end of March 2009 (the most recent data available) there were 134 homes about a 6% reduction in number of public agency foster homes. Even with this reduction, the number of children initially placed in a foster home increased from 2007 to 2008.

During the past year Guilford DSS has shifted to more targeted recruitment of home. The DSS has completed all steps necessary to implement a therapeutic foster care program which will allow more effective monitoring of the reduction in the number of moves children experience, as well as the inclusion of family advocates. Guilford has received the first license from state for a therapeutic foster home and has already identified three additional potential new therapeutic homes.

In 2008 Guilford County made concerted efforts to maintain children in the same school when placing in foster care. Of the 78 school age children placed during the year, 56% were able to remain in the same school. Twenty nine children remained in the same school because foster parents were able to transport the children. The rest of the children, 15, were placed within the same school district.

Throughout the anchor period, Guilford staff has been working on implementing a data system that would allow them to track the recruitment, training and licensing of foster parents. This data system when operational will allow staff to calculate the percentage of resource families completing different phases of the recruitment and training process.

One of the key elements of Family to Family RDS practice is active participation of caregivers in decisionmaking about appropriateness of placement settings for children in their care. As a result, they are encouraged to participate in COP meetings when the child welfare agency is deciding whether a change in placement is necessary and appropriate for a child or youth. Foster parents or relative caregivers participated in 43% of COP meetings in Guilford County in 2008, lower than

the median participation rate of 55% across all anchor sites for that year. This rate was down from a rate of 63% for meetings held in 2007, but up from a rate of 37% for 2006.

Finally, DSS completed a handbook for parents and foster parents who have children involved in multiple public systems. The handbook serves to help families navigate these systems in the most efficient and beneficial way possible.

## Team Decisionmaking

Guilford DSS began TDM implementation in 2002 starting with removal TDMs. The start-up of placement change TDMs followed about a year later in 2003. Implementation of permanency TDMs did not begin until 2008. Guilford DSS hired three full-time facilitators who all completed TDM training. Additionally, Guilford DSS identified a total of 28 other staff persons to act as back-up facilitators and to conduct other family team meetings required by the state. These back-up facilitators were trained through a combination of in-house trainings and training offered by the TDM technical assistance providers.

Although estimates of the “penetration rates” for TDMs have declined somewhat in recent years, rates in Guilford County remain among the highest achieved by Family to Family anchor sites. As **Exhibit A.3.7** indicates, for example, comparing the number of removal recommendations to the number of children entering care in the county, rates have ranged from 72% to 81%. A similar comparison of placement data and TDM data indicates that between 61% and 72% of children who had a placement moves among each annual cohort of children also had a COP TDM.

The most notable characteristic of Team Decisionmaking (TDM) meetings in Guilford County is that they include, on average, more Family to Family key elements than any other anchor site outside California. As **Exhibit A.3.7** shows, removal TDMs average 4.8 key elements while change of placement (COP) TDMs average 4.0 key elements. Several patterns of participation in 2008 meetings influence these high ratings. First, more than one DSS staff member attends virtually every removal TDM (99%) while 94% of COP meetings involve multiple DSS staff. In Guilford County multiple initiatives in recent years have focused on engaging fathers. Attendance of fathers at removal TDMs increased from 32% of removal meetings held in 2005 to 45% of those in 2008. Likewise youth engagement was a critical part of the work of the county in recent years. Youth attendance at removal TDMs consistently increased from 45% of removal meetings in 2005 to 67% of 2008 meetings and from 48% to 76% of change of placement meetings held in 2005 and 2008 respectively.

**Exhibit A.3.7: TDM Implementation Progress in Guilford County, NC**

	2005	2006	2007	2008
<b>Removal TDMs</b>				
Percentage of children entering care for 1st time each year who had a removal TDM during this time period	72%	81%	79%	74%
No. of removal TDMs held	348	307	351	376
No. of removal recommendations made	665	617	667	710
Parents present	87%	87%	88%	89%
More than 1 DSS staff person present	98%	97%	98%	99%
Experienced Facilitator	63%	83%	53%	65%
<b>Change of Placement TDMs</b>				
Percentage of children entering care for 1st time each year and experiencing more than 1 placement who had a change of placement TDM during these years	72%	64%	64%	61%
No. of COP TDMs held	348	349	254	243
No. of COP recommendations made	470	476	351	299
Parents present	67%	53%	63%	67%
More than 1 DSS staff person present	96%	84%	88%	94%
Service provider present	13%	47%	54%	30%
Experienced Facilitator	63%	82%	43%	74%

**Exhibit A.3.8** indicates that the pattern of recommendations produced by removal TDM meetings in Guilford County has changed in some important ways during the anchor-site phase of Family to Family. Recommendations to remove have declined from 34% in 2005 to 22% among the 2008 cohort with a corresponding increase in recommendations for children to remain in the home or to be returned home immediately. Specifically, the rate of recommendations to maintain or return to the child’s home rose from 41% in 2005 to 57% in 2008. Again, this occurred in the context of relatively stable numbers of potential removals, ranging from 598 in 2006 to 698 in 2008.

**Exhibit A.3.8: Recommendations of Removal TDM Meetings by Year—Guilford County**

Recommendation	2005	2006	2007	2008
Remove	34%	28%	22%	22%
Maintain in own home or return immediately	41%	46%	54%	57%
Remove, no custody	25%	26%	24%	22%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	637	598	656	698

Since making the best placement is the goal of a TDM, it is important to examine what happens after the TDM to be sure that the child was not placed in jeopardy as a result of the recommendation. Given the increase in the recommendation to remain in own home this is particularly important. As shown in **Exhibit A.3.9** the percentage of children having a substantiated referral within 6 months of the TDM was 10% in 2005, 11% in 2006 and 7% in 2007 and 2008.

<b>Exhibit A.3.9: CPS Referrals Following TDM Recommendation Not to Remove</b>				
<b>Post-TDM Status</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>
Number of Children	217	221	275	253
No subsequent referral	46%	58%	69%	87%
Unsubstantiated referral	19%	15%	12%	3%
Substantiated referral within—				
1 - 7 days	0%	0%	0%	0%
8 - 30 days	2%	0%	0%	0%
31 - 180 days	8%	11%	7%	7%
More than 180 days	25%	15%	12%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

As a consequence of the improving placement stability described previously, **Exhibit A.3.10** shows a slight decline in the annual number of change-of-placement (COP) meetings in Guilford County from 2006 through 2008. The number conducted in 2006 was 382, but it had dropped to 242 in 2008. Across this period, the percentage of children who were maintained in their current placements ranged from 32% of COP TDM meetings in 2007 to 28% in 2008. The rate of lateral moves generally declined from 33% in 2005 to 21% in 2008, a pattern suggesting that Guilford County was having some success in finding resources to support caregivers who were facing challenges.

<b>Exhibit A.3.10: Recommendations of Change of Placement TDM Meetings by Cohort— Guilford County</b>				
<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>
Maintain placement	24%	30%	32%	28%
Move less restrictive	27%	28%	23%	31%
Move more restrictive	15%	16%	18%	21%
Move same level	33%	25%	27%	21%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	336	382	311	242

## Self-Evaluation

During the early years of Family to Family in Guilford County, the self-evaluation process benefited significantly from having on staff a very skilled analyst who also had significant child welfare practice experience. This person had analytic skills and knowledge of database management that enabled her to pursue issues independently and produce newsletters and other materials for broad consumption. In addition, the process received encouragement from supportive child welfare managers who modeled the effective use of data in presentations to staff and community constituents. Unfortunately, as a result of the loss of this analyst and subsequent difficulties in filling the position, Guilford DSS found it necessary at the beginning of the anchor period to rebuild its self-evaluation capabilities. The county's commitment to self-evaluation was demonstrated by the hiring of an analyst, but at the same time, the self-evaluation team in Guilford was undergoing a leadership change. These circumstances led to a period of uncertainty over the direction of self-evaluation in Guilford. Ultimately, as the anchor-site period progressed, Guilford rebuilt their capacity for data analysis and worked towards implementing a new data system to track recruitment, development and support of resource families. The managers in Guilford county are committed to the use of data to inform practice as demonstrated by their regular participation in the monthly self-evaluation team meetings.

## The Evaluation of the Anchor-Site Phase of Family to Family

In 1992, the Annie E. Casey Foundation embarked on an initiative entitled *Family to Family: Reconstructing Family Foster Care*. By the time it concluded in 2009, dozens of large urban areas in more than 20 states had participated in Family to Family. The final phase from 2006 through 2009 focused on a smaller set of “anchor sites” in nine states. Drawing on earlier experience with the initiative, each anchor site developed a workplan to integrate efforts across four core strategies designed to achieve the transformation of policy and practice envisioned for Family to Family. To assess the impact of resulting changes in policy and practice on outcomes for children and their families, the Foundation sponsored an evaluation by a team of researchers from the University of North Carolina, Wildfire Associates, the University of California at Berkeley, and Case Western Reserve University. The evaluation team included: Judith Wildfire of Wildfire Associates, Inc., Co-Principal Investigator; Daniel Webster of the Center for Social Services Research (CSSR) at the University of California at Berkeley, Co-Investigator; David Crampton of Case Western Reserve University, Co-Investigator; and Lynn Usher of the School of Social Work at the University of North Carolina, Principal Investigator.

Reports from the evaluation include an executive summary, a comprehensive report with technical appendices, and profiles of each anchor site. Each report is available online at:

<http://www.unc.edu/~lynnu/f2feval.htm>

The evaluation team appreciates the cooperation it received from Family to Family participants in each site and from state child welfare officials who provided the data on which this evaluation is based. We also appreciate the efforts of Regional Operations Managers and Site Team Leaders in coordinating the review of draft site profiles, including: Suzanne Barnard; Bill Bettencourt; Fred Harris; Lisa Paine-Wells; Jana Rickerson; Sheila Spydell; and Kate Welty.

We could not have undertaken this work without financial support from the Annie E. Casey Foundation, for which we are very appreciative. Of course, the opinions and conclusions presented in this report are those of the evaluation team and are not necessarily shared by the Foundation’s board of directors, managers, or staff.

For further information, please contact one of the following members of the evaluation team:

Lynn Usher, Principal Investigator: [lynnusher@unc.edu](mailto:lynnusher@unc.edu)

Judith Wildfire, Co-Principal Investigator: [jwildfire@wildfireassociates.com](mailto:jwildfire@wildfireassociates.com)

Daniel Webster, Co-Investigator: [dwebster@berkeley.edu](mailto:dwebster@berkeley.edu)