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The decision to place a child in out-of-home care is the net result of an individualized assessment that—

- identifies risks to safety and well-being and
- judges how those risks can be offset by resources and capabilities in the child’s family and community—

- formal services (such as IFPS)
- informal supports (such as kinship care)

Agencies provide a tailored response to individual children and families
Some Underlying Premises

- Valid and reliable assessment instruments are available to support objective, evidence-based decision-making by workers and their supervisors.

- The child welfare agency can draw on an array of home-based services and placement resources in deciding when and where to place children.

- Staff of the child welfare agency actually make decisions about when and where to place children.
Decision-making and decisions about individual children and families are highly constrained by agency policy, programming, and structure.

- Prevailing values and public opinion within the state, locality, and agency
  - Policy expressed in legislation, regulations, and judicial behavior
    - Agency structure and organization
      - Agency programming
        - Agency practice
Why is it so difficult to assess the competing effects of individual factors and contextual constraints on practice?

- Reliance on cross-sectional data blinds us to an accurate understanding of prevailing patterns of care and children’s experiences
- Absence of systematic needs and risk assessment data precludes rigorous modeling of service responses to children with particular characteristics
- Even basic demographic data are not captured entirely reliably
Observing and Measuring Variations in Programs and Practice Across Localities Within States

- Since 1992, the *Family to Family* initiative has produced longitudinal data for each participating site.

- **Phase I:** Alabama, Maryland, New Mexico, Ohio, and Pennsylvania

- **Phase II:** Los Angeles and New York City

- **Phase III:** Colorado, Illinois, Kentucky, Michigan, North Carolina, Oregon, Tennessee, and other California localities
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Data Describing Local Variations in the Experiences of Children in Out-of-Home Care Reveal Underlying Policies, Programs, and Practices

- Dominant patterns of out-of-home care *within a locality* define the boundaries of practice in that locality.

- Distinct patterns of care *across localities* within a state are evidence of the extent to which individualized practice is constrained by policies and programs as they are implemented in each local agency.
Implications for Evidence-Based Practice

- EBP oftens amounts to marginal tweaking when what is needed is a major overhaul

  - Taking nighttime removals out of the hands of police and putting resources in place to ensure that a child welfare worker is present any time a child is at risk of removal—establishing a true 24/7 child welfare system

  - Recognizing the potential of relatives and neighbors in helping ensure the safety of children and helping them retain important linkages to family and community

  - Investing time and resources in broadly inclusive decision-making processes that provide support to over-stressed workers and produce alternatives to out-of-home care
Implications for Social Intervention Research

- Case mix issues are relevant to provider agencies and programs within the public child welfare agency, but agency policy and not merely “natural” variation in the service population plays a stronger role who is served by the child welfare system in a given locality.

- Intervention research must place a higher priority on external validity and test interventions in specifically defined contexts that are appropriate to the test practice.

- Randomization is as important at the site level as it is at the case level.

- First things first—evidence-based policy, then evidence-based programs, and finally, evidence-based practice.