



Maricopa County (Phoenix), Arizona

OVERVIEW

Maricopa County is a large and growing area of Arizona. Its population in 2007 was estimated at 3,880,181 with more than 1.5 million located in the city of Phoenix. Two-thirds of the population is white and one-fourth are of Hispanic descent. Similar to other areas in which persons of Hispanic descent reside, 11.9% describe their racial and ethnic heritage as “other.” Only 3.7% of the population is black and 2.5% are American Indians. In January 2005 there were 4,559 children in out-of-home placement in Maricopa County. By the end of June 2008 this number had increased to 5,166.¹

Arizona has made a commitment to implement Family to Family statewide, beginning in District 1, an area comprising Maricopa County, Phoenix, and other nearby municipalities. Similar to a number of Family to Family sites initial efforts by site participants and the Foundation’s technical assistance team focused on the jurisdiction’s reliance on emergency shelter care and group homes for initial placements of many children and youth entering care. As a result, congregate care accounted for more than half of initial placements for children and youth entering care for the first time in 2005 (52.3%). Among children and youth who entered care in the first half of 2008, this rate had declined to 28.4%.

Unlike most of the other anchor sites, Maricopa County is part of a state-administered child welfare system with central office staff playing a key role in Family to Family implementation. In fact, the Family to Family technical assistance providers often worked with staff from both the district and central office. This child welfare system also differs from other anchor sites in that it is totally privatized in the area of foster care, thus, requiring a partnership between the district and the private providers to move forward in many Family to Family areas. Like other anchor sites during this period Maricopa County experienced budget constraints.

SITE-LEVEL PLACEMENT EXPERIENCE INDICATORS

The data shown in **Exhibit A.5.1** show that in 2005, a total of 3,414 children and youth from Maricopa County entered out-of-home care for the first time, but admissions subsequently declined to 3,293 in 2006 and 3,161 in 2007. The data for the first half of 2008 suggest that this trend may have changed in that 1,905 children and youth entered care in that period. Among the children initially entering care in the last three year, about 30% remained in placement for less than 1 week up from about 25% in 2005. Although not counted in the CFSR measures, these ‘short stay’ children present particular challenges to a system that must ask itself why is it necessary to

¹ See *Family to Family Semi-Annual Outcome Report*, January 2009.

remove children for such a short period of time. With the exception of reentry measures subsequent analyses in this section to do not include children with short stays in care. Statewide data for the period through September 2008 also indicate a significant rise in admissions throughout Arizona as well as increased lengths of stay for children placed in shelters.²

The data in **Exhibit A.5.1** show some shifts in the characteristics of entrants. By mid-2008, Hispanic children and youth had come to represent the largest number of initial entries to care (42.4%) while white children represented 39.3% of entrants. Black non-Hispanic children represented 14.1% of entrants in early 2008, up from 11.6% of entrants in 2005. Each year, slightly more than half of the children and youth entering care were male. Children younger than six represented slightly less than half of entrants each year while youth aged 15 to 17 made up one in six entries. Unfortunately, it is not possible to determine from the data for Arizona whether children are entering care with siblings.

Exhibit A.5.1: Demographic Characteristics of Children Initially Entering Out-of-Home Care—Maricopa County, AZ

Characteristic	2005 (N=3,414)	2006 (N=3,293)	2007 (N=3,161)	2008* (N=1,905)
Gender				
Male	1752 (51.4%)	1698 (51.6%)	1672 (52.9%)	979 (51.4%)
Female	1657 (48.6%)	1594 (48.4%)	1489 (47.1%)	926 (48.6%)
Race				
White Non-Hispanic	1462 (44%)	1331 (41.7%)	1265 (41.5%)	727 (39.3%)
Black Non-Hispanic	386 (11.6%)	367 (11.5%)	396 (13%)	261 (14.1%)
Hispanic	1346 (40.5%)	1363 (42.7%)	1296 (42.5%)	783 (42.4%)
Native American/Alaska Native	111 (3.3%)	108 (3.4%)	84 (2.8%)	59 (3.2%)
Asian American/Pacific Islanders	14 (0.4%)	16 (0.5%)	6 (0.2%)	17 (0.9%)
Other	7 (0.2%)	8 (0.3%)	2 (0.1%)	1 (0.1%)
Age				
Birth - 1 year	912 (26.7%)	965 (29.3%)	872 (27.6%)	510 (26.8%)
2-5 years	748 (21.9%)	677 (20.6%)	662 (20.9%)	397 (20.8%)
6-11 years	759 (22.2%)	694 (21.1%)	648 (20.5%)	432 (22.7%)
12-14 years	450 (13.2%)	409 (12.4%)	431 (13.6%)	262 (13.8%)
15-17 years	545 (16%)	546 (16.6%)	548 (17.3%)	304 (16%)
18-21 years	0 (0%)	2 (0.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

* Data for children initially entering placement between January 1, 2008 and June 30, 2008

² See *Child Welfare Reporting Requirements Semi-Annual Report For The Period Of April 1, 2008 through September 30, 2008*, Arizona Revised Statutes [Laws 2006, Chapter 203], Arizona Department Of Economic Security Division Of Children, Youth And Families Administration For Children, Youth And Families available from: https://egov.azdes.gov/CMS400Min/InternetFiles/Reports/pdf/child_welfare_apr_08_sept_08.pdf

The slight decline in the numbers of children entering care for the first time in Maricopa County conceals a significant shift in the pattern of admissions from 2005 through early 2008. More than half of admissions in 2005 were to group homes or emergency shelters. In the first half of 2008, fully 62.8% of initial admissions were to foster homes and relatives. The number of children placed with licensed relatives did not change very substantially, going from 193 in 2005 to 190 in 2006, and to 168 in 2007. Similarly, 692 initial placements were made with unlicensed relatives in 2005, 610 in 2006, and 608 in 2007. In contrast, the first half of 2008 alone saw 472 placements with unlicensed relatives, perhaps indicating a significant rise in numbers of this type of placement.

In spite of its increased reliance on family-based care, Maricopa County has made only marginal improvements in this area for youth 12 and older. Although some improvements have occurred since 2005, the initial placement for most youth entering care continues to be in non-family settings, such as group homes or emergency shelters. In 2008, 38.9% of youth aged 12-14 were initially placed in a family setting, up from 30.4% of entries of this age in 2005. Among those aged 15-17 in 2008, 28.0% entered care in a family setting compared to 21.3% of 2005 entrants. Rates for youth 12-14 in other anchor sites outside California range from a low of 38.9% to 79.1%, with most exceeding 50%. Similarly, rates for youth 15-17 range from 28% to 81.9%, with four sites having rates of 53.8% or higher. Therefore, immediately providing care in family settings for youth continues to be a challenge in Maricopa County.

Exhibit A.5.2: Characteristics of Placement: Maricopa County, AZ

Characteristic of Initial Placement	2005	2006	2007	2008*
Initial Placement				
Foster Home	544 (15.9%)	869 (26.4%)	834 (26.4%)	654 (34.3%)
Relative Home - Licensed	193 (5.7%)	190 (5.8%)	168 (5.3%)	70 (3.7%)
Relative Home - Unlicensed	692 (20.3%)	610 (18.5%)	608 (19.2%)	472 (24.8%)
Group Home	607 (17.8%)	432 (13.1%)	405 (12.8%)	132 (6.9%)
Emergency Shelter	1177 (34.5%)	983 (29.9%)	866 (27.4%)	410 (21.5%)
Own Home	18 (0.5%)	11 (0.3%)	21 (0.7%)	11 (0.6%)
Other	183 (5.4%)	198 (6%)	259 (8.2%)	156 (8.2%)
Sibling Placement Status ¹				
No Siblings Entered Placement	--	--	--	--
Placed with All Siblings	--	--	--	--
Placed with Some Siblings	--	--	--	--
Placed with no Siblings	--	--	--	--
Family Connection ²				
No	--	--	--	--
Yes	--	--	--	--

¹ Sibling data are not available in evaluation data files for Maricopa County.

² The family connection variable provides an aggregate indicator on 3 ways that sites to keep children connected to their families including: placing with siblings, placing in own neighborhood and placing with a relative. In Maricopa County the only data

* Data for children initially entering placement between January 1, 2008 and June 30, 2008

To facilitate comparisons across cohorts, **Exhibit A.5.3** 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 who entered care from 2005 through 2007 were less likely to experience changes in placements. The data also suggest that little improvement was made in the rate of placement changes across this period.

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. Consistent with this experience, youth in Maricopa County were very likely to have three or more placements. This is especially the case among those with longer lengths of stay. Almost two-thirds to three-fourths of the 2005 and 2006 cohorts that remained in care longer than a year had three or more placements.

Exhibit A.5.3: Placement Stability by Year of Initial Entry—Maricopa County, AZ			
	2005	2006	2007
All Ages			
No. of Placements in 1st Spell for Children Remaining in Care 8 - 365 days			
1 or 2 placements	833 (85.7%)	780 (81.1%)	1288 (81.5%)
3 or more placements	139 (14.3%)	182 (18.9%)	293 (18.5%)
No. of Placements in 1st Spell for Children Remaining in Care 1 - 2 years			
1 or 2 placements	435 (58.2%)	597 (58.4%)	na
3 or more placements	312 (41.8%)	426 (41.6%)	na
12 - 17 years			
No. of Placements in 1st Spell for Teens Remaining in Care 8 - 365 days			
1 or 2 placements	260 (78.1%)	270 (76.9%)	391 (74.1%)
3 or more placements	73 (21.9%)	81 (23.1%)	137 (25.9%)
No. of Placements in 1st Spell for Teens Remaining in Care 1 - 2 years			
1 or 2 placements	59 (36.6%)	63 (27.9%)	na
3 or more placements	102 (63.4%)	163 (72.1%)	na

na: insufficient follow-up time to report the data

The rates of predicted exit from care within six months, one year, and two year appear to have remained fairly stable over this period of time. The only notable changes are an increased likelihood of reunification within one year from 2005 to 2007 (0.27 to 0.32) and adoption within two years of entry from 2005 to 2006 (0.14 to 0.19). Also, across the three cohorts, the likelihood of reunification within 12 months of entry rose from 0.27 to 0.32. Rates of reentry to care following the end of a child's first spell did not change for the 2005 and 2006 cohorts; however, it appears that reentry rates for the 2007 cohort were higher than those of the previous cohorts. It is possible, however, that this increase is related to reduced follow-up time for this cohort given the truncated 2008 data.

Exhibit A.5.4: Time in Care and Reentry—Maricopa County, AZ

	2005	2006	2007
Probability of Exit by:			
Exit to Reunification			
6 months	0.19	0.21	0.22
1 year	0.27	0.30	0.32
2 years	0.42	0.44	--
Exit to Adoption			
6 months	0.00	0.00	0.00
1 year	0.01	0.01	0.01
2 years	0.14	0.19	--
Exit to Relative			
6 months	0.05	0.04	0.03
1 year	0.09	0.08	0.05
2 years	0.20	0.18	--
Probability of Reentering Care After 1st Spell by Number of Days in the First Spell			
0-7 days	0.18	0.18	0.23
>7 days	0.18	0.17	0.24

* Data for children initially entering placement between January 1, 2008 and June 30, 2008

PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING CORE STRATEGIES

In contrast to other anchor sites, Maricopa County (District 1 region of Arizona’s Department of Human Services) was relatively new to Family to Family implementation when the anchor period began. District 1 did not have substantial experience with family team meetings nor did it have experience with building community partnerships. As a result, during the anchor period, the implementation of Family to Family core strategies required a significant amount of effort to lay the groundwork for each strategy.

Building Community Partnerships

Site Infrastructure. The Maricopa site involves eight community strategy teams. A Section Assistant Program Manager heads each team and takes responsibility for leading and setting the direction for their team. BCP liaisons, called Community Partnership Specialists (CPS), are allocated one to every two teams. They are responsible for completing the leg work for each team. Maricopa County uses geographic assignment of cases based on zip codes in order to organize and focus specific community efforts. Community partners are invited to participate on community strategy teams in their respective zip codes in order to build relationships with other community agencies and to assist in identifying strategies for recruitment of resource families in the community. In addition, Community Partnership Specialists attend community meetings. Recently, the site held a Community Partnerships Strategic Planning Day where CPS and Assistant Program Managers developed action plans for their continued

work in BCP. With the help of consultants from the Annie E. Casey Foundation, the site created volunteer job descriptions for their community partners.

BCP Activities. Maricopa County continues to build its efforts to meet practice goals relating to the BCP Core Strategy in a variety of ways. Community events, such as spring flings and community fairs are organized to facilitate community engagement with the agency and various community partners as well as to serve as a vehicle for recruitment of new community partners, potential resource families, and TDM representatives. Other information and recruitment strategies, such as community forums and distributing educational materials, serve to visibly connect the agency to the community. Although the site has experienced challenges in utilizing community members in TDM meetings, community partners are being trained in the TDM process and encouraged to participate in TDM meetings. Another specific challenge experienced by the Maricopa site involves communities with a high percentage of undocumented individuals. To address this challenge, the site has partnered with a local migrant worker organization that advocates on behalf of migrant workers and undocumented residents. In addition, partnerships with faith-based communities, such as the Church of Latter Day Saints and Catholic churches have helped strengthen BCP-related activities. These and local service organizations provide tangible items for residents in need (clothing, food, furniture, baby supplies, etc.). All of the community strategy teams have created, or are in the process of creating, an email network among all community partners within their specific area that allow service providers to determine other resources available when the agency cannot meet the needs of the client. The site also has addressed specific community needs through the creation of subcommittees, such as the foster care recruitment subcommittee that reaches out to various levels of government, agencies, and businesses to provide incentives for becoming licensed resource care providers.

Impact on Facilitated Staffings. 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.5.5** shows how community partnerships were reflected in Team Decisionmaking (TDM) meetings in Maricopa County. By 2008, more than half of both removal and change of placement (COP) meetings included a service provider from an agency or organization other than ACYF. Very few meetings of either type included a community representative, but family members or friends invited by the birth family attended two-thirds of removal staffings in 2007 and 2008. The apparent decline that seems to have occurred from 2005 to 2008 is attributable to the fact that very few COP meetings were held prior to 2008. Therefore, the rate of participation in 2008 represents a more reliable baseline figure for future assessments of progress in this area.

Exhibit A.5.5: Building Community Partnerships Reflected in Team Decisionmaking Meetings				
	2005	2006	2007	2008
Removal TDMs:				
Community representative present	3%	7%	5%	4%
Service provider present	24%	30%	51%	50%
Family member or friend present	54%	62%	67%	66%
Change of Placement TDMs:				
Community representative present	0%	2%	2%	2%
Service provider present	20%	38%	60%	50%
Family member or friend present	80%	66%	52%	48%

Resource Family Development and Support

Arizona relies exclusively on foster homes that are recruited and supervised by private agencies. As a result much of the RDS work completed as part of Family to Family was focused at the state-level. In spite of the apparent increase of children entering out-of-home placement during 2008, private providers in the county were able to accommodate children more frequently with a foster home placement due to increased numbers of families recruited, trained and licensed. During the initial years of Family to Family state and district staff worked closely with private provider partners to more quickly place children in a family setting. Private agencies were encouraged to recruit in the neighborhoods from which children came and to target recruitment towards homes that would take sibling groups, teens and children with special needs.

The number of foster homes increased 30% from 1,185 to 1,537 during the anchor period. Consistent with this, as shown in **Exhibit A.5.6**, the number of families expressing interest in becoming a foster family consistently increased. Although the percentage of families completing training remained about the same, the number of families completing training increased from 794 to 843.

Exhibit A.5.6: Inquiries from Prospective Foster Families and Progress Toward Licensure—Maricopa County, AZ

Time Period	Initial Inquiries	Started Training	Completed Training	Families Licensed
July–December 2007	3,620	48.3%	21.9%	6.5%
January–June 2008	3,827	23.3%	17.8%	9.2%
July– December 2008	4,113	39.6%	20.5%	7.1%

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. Again, COP meetings were not held in significant numbers until 2008, but 52% of them included the child's caregiver. Given the early stage of implementation of this type of meeting, this compares favorably to a median participation rate of 55% across all anchor sites for 2008.

Team Decisionmaking

The persistent effort to implement removal Team Decisionmaking (TDM) meetings in Maricopa County is evident in **Exhibit A.5.7**. The number of removal meetings rose rapidly from 328 in 2005 to 2,047 in 2006, and reached 3,255 in 2008, a year during which the rate of removal TDM meetings relative to total removals was 81%. TDM rollout began in June 2005 with removal meetings held in 3 offices in the District. In 2007 they began having permanency TDM meetings. To accommodate the workload associated with continually increasing numbers of TDM meetings, District 1 expanded staffing to include 17 full-time facilitators with two assistant program managers.

Several characteristics are common in the pattern of participation in removal TDMs in Maricopa County. First, by 2008, parents attended nearly nine out of ten meetings, as did more than one ACYF District 1 staff member. Second, two-thirds of the meetings included a family member or friend. Third, at least one service provider from outside ACYF District 1 attended half the meetings.

Finally, the rate at which removal TDMs were conducted by an experienced facilitator rose steadily from 41% of meetings in 2006 to 63% of meetings in 2007 and 83% of meetings in 2008.

Change of placement (COP) TDMs were implemented in phases in 2008, beginning with placements in congregate-care settings in February, family resource homes in March, and relative homes in April. As a result, the “penetration rate” for COP meetings had only reached nine percent in this early stage of implementation. As COP TDMs began to roll out more broadly in 2008, however, participation was marked by relatively high rates of participation by caregivers. More than half of the meetings included a caregiver.

Exhibit A.5.7: TDM Implementation Progress in Maricopa County				
	2005	2006	2007	2008
Removal TDMs				
Percentage of children entering care for 1st time each year who had a removal TDM during this time period	17%	62%	77%	81%
No. of removal TDMs held	328	2047	2835	3255
No. of removal recommendations made	672	3817	5032	6120
TDM held prior to placement	46%	50%	51%	47%
Parents present	82%	86%	88%	87%
More than 1 DSS staff person present	85%	90%	86%	83%
Experienced Facilitator	0%	41%	63%	83%
Change of Placement TDMs				
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	2%	4%	7%	9%
No. of COP TDMs held	4	23	26	389
No. of COP recommendations made	5	47	50	585
Parents present	100%	96%	82%	54%
More than 1 DSS staff person present	60%	96%	92%	82%
Experienced Facilitator	0%	70%	68%	88%

Exhibit A.5.8 indicates that the rate of recommendations to remove children from their homes rose to 51% of the cases for which removal TDM meetings were held in 2008. This was an increase from 41% in 2006 and 43% in 2007. Part of this change may be attributable to the substantial increase in the number of removal TDM meetings held in 2008, 6,120 compared to 5,032 in 2007.

Exhibit A.5.8: Recommendations of Removal TDM Meetings by Cohort—Maricopa County

Recommendation	2005	2006	2007	2008
Remove	47%	41%	43%	51%
Maintain in own home or return immediately	42%	44%	45%	49%
Reunify	10%	13%	11%	0%
Custody to relative or non-custodial parent	1%	1%	1%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
N	672	3817	5032	6120

Since the goal of a TDM meeting is to make the best decision for the child, it is important to be sure that children are not exposed to subsequent harm after the meeting. **Exhibit A.5.9** summarizes information on subsequent abuse and neglect referrals experienced by children following a TDM recommendation to remain in own home or subsequently return to home. From 2005 through 2007 the percent of children with a subsequent referral decreased from a high of 46% to 27% in 2007. Among these children virtually none had a substantiated referral suggesting that the child remained safe at home.

Exhibit 5.9: Child Protective Services Referrals Following a TDM Meeting

Post-TDM Status	2005	2006	2007
No. of Children	214	1,309	1,648
No subsequent referral	53%	63%	71%
Unsubstantiated referral	46%	35%	27%
Substantiated referral within—			
1 - 7 days	0%	0%	0%
8 - 30 days	0%	0%	0%
31 - 180 days	0%	1%	2%
More than 180 days	0%	1%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%

As **Exhibit A.5.10** shows, a similar increase in workload occurred with regard to change of placement (COP) TDM meetings in 2008. Only 41 COP meetings were held in both 2006 and 2007, but the number grew to 564 in 2008. As a result, the pattern of recommendations for 2008 provides a baseline against which future meeting results can be assessed. Only about one-fourth (27%) of meetings resulted in a recommendation to maintain the current placement. More typically, the recommendation was for a lateral move to a placement setting of the same level of restrictiveness (32%). The next most common recommendation was for a change to a more restrictive placement setting. The relatively high rate of lateral moves and moves to more restrictive settings is consistent with Family to Family coordinator survey reports that Maricopa County was only in the planning stages as far as efforts to meet the needs of current resource families.

**Exhibit A.5.10: Recommendations of Change of Placement TDM Meetings by Cohort
—Maricopa County**

Recommendation	2006	2007	2008
Maintain placement	15%	7%	27%
Move less restrictive	34%	7%	12%
Move more restrictive	46%	56%	28%
Move same level	5%	29%	32%
Total	100%	100%	100%
N	41	41	564

Self-Evaluation

Maricopa County was slow to start self-evaluation. This was mostly related to a lack of outcome data to longitudinally measure child welfare outcomes and limited analytic support for the self-evaluation team. Somewhat early in implementation DHS decided to join the State Data Center operated by Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago. This arrangement meant, in part, that Chapin Hall would regularly produce longitudinal outcome data files needed to measure Family to Family outcomes. The initial process involved central office staff providing data extracts to Chapin Hall staff and having extensive discussions with them about the structure of the data files and the meaning of variables within the files. Although this process began early in the implementation period, ACYF District 1 did not have outcome data files to support evaluation until 2007.

A key resource needed to support self-evaluation is an analyst. The state made a commitment to provide analytic support to the District 1 self-evaluation team at the beginning of Family to Family implementation. However, the identification and hiring of the additional staff to support this was hampered by many things including the original analyst hired remained with the agency for a short period of time. In 2008 the District 1 director decided to identify a District 1 staff person to act as analyst for their self-evaluation efforts. This was the turning point for self-evaluation efforts there. With analytic support in place, regular downloads of outcome data files, easy access to management data maintained in CHILDS (the state’s SACWIS system) and a diverse self-evaluation team that regularly meets, District 1 is poised to move to full implementation of self-evaluation, i.e. self-evaluation as the way we do business at all levels of the agency.

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

Judith Wildfire, Co-Principal Investigator: jwildfire@wildfireassociates.com

Daniel Webster, Co-Investigator: dwebster@berkeley.edu