



In Focus: Title IV-E Waivers November 17, 2010

OVERVIEW: TITLE IV-E WAIVERS

Federal IV-E waivers (also referred to as child welfare demonstration projects) were first introduced into federal law under Public Law 103-432 in 1994.¹ This law provided that under the Social Security Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS) was to be given the authority to approve 10 demonstration projects for a length of five years each, funded primarily through reimbursements to states under Title IV-E.²

Title IV-E, the foster care maintenance program, operates to partially reimburse states for certain expenditures made on behalf of an eligible child: administration and placement expenses, adoption assistance, payments for child welfare agency employee training, and foster care maintenance.³ Due to federal restrictions, IV-E funding is largely limited to services for children who have been removed from their homes rather than given to preventative and post-permanency services that help children and their families remain together.

Congress' intention in authorizing these demonstration projects was to give states an opportunity to implement innovative programs to address their child welfare needs with less categorical funding restrictions, as well as to find more effective ways to align federal dollars with effective child welfare practices and achieve better outcomes.⁴ States with approved demonstration projects are granted the flexibility with otherwise restricted Title IV-E funding.⁵ Each demonstration project had to include an evaluation process and stay cost neutral to the federal government.⁶

Title IV-E waivers gained momentum in 1997 with the passage of the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA), which for a limited time, authorized up to 10 new demonstration programs each year.⁷ The authority to grant waiver projects was reauthorized and expanded again by a series of Public Laws from 2003 to 2006.⁸ As of November 2010, there are active waiver agreements in seven states out of 23 total States that had implemented projects – California, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Oregon and Wisconsin.⁹

Resulting demonstration projects have focused on providing guardianship and kinship caregiver subsidies, intensive services options, managed care payment models to provide a network of service providers, flexible funding options, services for caregivers struggling with substance abuse, adoption and post-permanency services, and enhanced training for child welfare staff, among other more state-specific projects. Some states, such as Florida, implemented waiver projects statewide, while others like California allowed their counties to decide participation (Alameda and Los Angeles).¹⁰

As of March 2006, HHS no longer has authority to grant new demonstration projects.¹¹ There are five states that currently operate a waiver under the previous authority and each of these five states have expressed a desire to extend their waivers and have been granted limited extensions HHS based on their ability to demonstrate positive outcomes for children and families. In addition, several states have expressed interest in a renewed waiver authority to support reforms and innovations.

¹ Social Security Act, section 1130, 103rd Cong. (1994).

² Administration for Children and Families, *Summary of the Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstrations*, p.1.

³ Committee on Ways and Means, p.105-108.

⁴ Testa, *Encouraging Child Welfare Innovation Through IV-E Waivers*, p. 1.

⁵ Committee on Ways and Means, p. 105-108.

⁶ Committee on Ways and Means, p. 105-108.

⁷ Administration for Children and Families, *Summary of the Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstrations*, p.1.

⁸ Committee on Ways and Means, p. 105-108.

⁹ Email correspondence with U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

¹⁰ Committee on Ways and Means, p. 105-108.

¹¹ Administration for Children and Families, *Summary of the Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstrations*, p.1.



Advocates have called on Congress to renew HHS' authority to approve waivers crediting waivers as the impetus for many recent state-based reforms and innovations. Governors and child welfare administrators from states with ongoing demonstrations have also raised concerns that if the waivers are allowed to expire and they are forced to return to the non-waiver system, it might derail their collective success in reducing the number of children in out of home care.

A concern that has been raised about Congress' continued extension of waiver authority is that the structure of federal child welfare financing "fails to support key system priorities," and reauthorizing authority to grant more IV-E waivers prohibits or delays reformatory efforts.¹² Some have argued that rather than continue demonstrations, Congress should instead use the lessons learned by the 23 waiver states as a blueprint for designing national foster care financing policy.

For a full list of waiver projects and a summary of their results, please see the Appendix at the end of this report.

DETAILED LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 103-432 (1994)

Established in section 1130 of the Social Security Act, Congress gave HHS the authority to grant 10 demonstration projects to experiment with different programs to effectuate federal child welfare policy goals.¹³ Some IV-E compliance is still required by federal waivers, including meeting the requirements for foster care reviews, safety in out-of-home placements, permanency hearings, and case plan documentation.¹⁴ States may not exceed the federal funding limits made available to them prior to the waiver enactment and are also required to conduct extensive evaluations to analyze the programs' effectiveness.¹⁵

¹² DeVooght, *Federal, State, and Local Spending to Address Child Abuse and Neglect in SFY 2006*, p. 23.

¹³ Committee on Ways and Means, p. 105-108.

¹⁴ Synthesis UHHS (History and Legislative Context for Waivers section)

¹⁵ Synthesis UHHS (History and Legislative Context for Waivers section)

Seven projects were approved under the initial authority established in P.L. 103-432 and implemented in five states: North Carolina, Delaware, Illinois, Ohio and Oregon.¹⁶ These projects involved assisted guardianship programs, services for caregivers with substance abuse problems, and flexibility or capped allocation in IV-E funding.¹⁷ The investment of authority in the Secretary to approve waiver projects would have expired under this law at the end of fiscal year 2002 absent congressional action.¹⁸

Adoption and Safe Families Act (1997)

The Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) extended and expanded HHS's authority to grant demonstration projects by permitting up to 10 new projects lasting up to five years for each fiscal year between 1998 and 2002.¹⁹ ASFA also specified that if a project focused on foster care adoption, parental substance abuse issues, or kinship care, the Secretary of HHS was required to consider these project applications.²⁰

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The Role of Waivers in Child Welfare Financing Reform

The federal government provides 48% of overall child welfare spending. The remaining 52% comes from a combination of state and local sources. Of all the federal funding streams for child welfare, Title IV-E represents the largest share (48%) at \$6 billion in 2006.²¹ Other federal funding sources for foster care include Title IV-B of the Social Security Act (5 percent), Social Security Block Grants (SBBG) (12 percent), Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) (19 percent), and Medicaid (13 percent).²² Since 1995, there has been a national increase in child welfare federal funding, but this is largely attributable to increases in Medicaid and Social Service Block Grants, as

¹⁶ Committee on Ways and Means, p. 105-108.

¹⁷ Committee on Ways and Means, p. 105-108.

¹⁸ Committee on Ways and Means, p. 105-108.

¹⁹ Administration for Children and Families, *Summary of the Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstrations*, p.1.

²⁰ Committee on Ways and Means, p. 105-108.

²¹ Casey Family Programs, *Federal Finance Reform*, p.6

²² Casey Family Programs, *Title IV-E*, p. 2; Committee on Ways and Means, p. 3-4.



there have only been slight increases in spending under IV-E and IV-B.²³ Unlike the other four sources listed above, IV-E is an open-ended entitlement program that supports only those children in foster care who are eligible.²⁴

Foster care for children who are ineligible to receive Title IV-E dollars are funded entirely by the state or with the assistance of TANF dollars.²⁵ States report numerous factors resulting in the ineligibility of children in care to receive such federal funding, most significantly, the income of the child's family as set out by the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program being too high above the July 16, 1996 eligibility standard to qualify them. Additional reasons for ineligibility include the child's residence in unlicensed or unapproved placements, no judicial determination indicating that the child could no longer reside safely in the home, and the age of the child.²⁶

Over the past decade, child welfare advocates have called on the federal government to consider changing the way it provides funding to states for child welfare services. Suggested reforms have been aimed at making the federal financing structure more flexible, providing services to a wider group of youth and holding states more accountable for outcomes. Reforming the federal child welfare financing structure has proven challenging for a variety of reasons. First and foremost, the context and needs of each state are unique, and there are significant variances among states in the degree that federal funding is relied upon, the source from which funding is drawn, and the rate of change in total spending.²⁷ In addition, it is difficult to reach consensus on a finance structure that facilitates an appropriate balance in providing flexible assistance to states to ensure positive outcomes for children and families in need of services.

Proponents of continuing the waiver program argue that it has allowed for states to achieve some of the flexibility called for by finance reform advocates. At the same time, the demonstration aspect of the waiver program has

allowed States to experiment with different models and services in a way that was cost neutral to the federal government and without permanent changes in federal law.

A recent example of the waiver process serving as an impetus for nationwide reform is the inclusion of optional federally funded guardianship programs in the [Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008 \(P.L. 110-351\)](#).²⁸ In fact, ten states had implemented such projects in the past, seven of whom had active subsidized guardianship waivers at the time of this bill was passed in 2008 – Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Montana, Oregon, Tennessee, and Wisconsin. These seven states are allowed to claim IV-E reimbursement for children who exited to guardianship under the states' waivers prior to September 30, 2008.²⁹ This legislation also extended another benefit often exercised under a waiver demonstration, allowing funding to be directed toward adoption assistance for children irrespective of whether their family met AFDC standards.³⁰

Accountability and Evidence-based Innovations

Waivers stemmed from concerns for the need to improve the effectiveness of how federal funds are utilized to improve the outcomes for children and families impacted by the child welfare system. The overarching objective of waivers was to test how to improve child outcomes by increasing the service array and/or service population.³¹ To realize this goal, IV-E waivers were designed as an intersection of flexible funding and state accountability to encourage innovation while also requiring extensive evaluations to ensure that investments were made in programs that are proven to be successful.

Waiver demonstration projects are required to include approved evaluation plans with procedural and outcome assessments as well as a cost analysis.³² Within six months of the demonstrations' completion, states have to also

²³ Committee on Ways and Means, p. 105-108.

²⁴ Casey Family Programs, Title IV-E,; Green Book 2008

²⁵ Committee on Ways and Means, p. 105-108.

²⁶ Committee on Ways and Means, p. 105-108.

²⁷ Child Trends

²⁸ Casey Family Programs, Title IV-E, p. 3.

²⁹ Committee on Ways and Means, p. 105-108.

³⁰ Child Trends

³¹ Synthesis UHHS

³² Summary of the Title IV-E Child Welfare Demonstrations (Prepared for Children's Bureau)



issue a final report.³³ Eighteen states' projects met this requirement by using a "random assignment" evaluation, considered to provide the best indication of whether a program is an improvement from existing practices.³⁴ This evaluation method consists of randomly assigning subjects to either an experimental group (with access to waiver-funded services) or to a control group without access to waiver-funded services.

Other states, such as New Mexico which allocated IV-E funds to improve services for Native American children,³⁵ chose designs that compared two geographic regions ("comparison sites"). Additionally, Florida and California have utilized an analysis that looks at changes in child welfare outcomes over time ("time series analysis").³⁶ Indiana matches children with similar cases receiving demonstration services with those who are not ("matched cases analysis").³⁷

While these evaluations have been helpful in assessing the success in meeting the state's stated objectives, what is not yet clear is the degree to which the waiver demonstration programs are leading to better outcomes in national performance standards such as reduced time to reunification, reduced time to adoption and the reduction in the number of placements while in care. Some experts assert that the waiver programs that have been authorized to date have not encouraged substantial child welfare reform or innovative practices.³⁸ One key factor noted after more than a decade of experience with project waivers in reviews of state evaluations and reports, was that "leadership" has proven to be essential to effective practices.³⁹

Cost Neutrality

All demonstration projects must remain cost neutral to the federal government. This means that the states cannot claim more additional federal child welfare reimbursements than they would have been able to

without the waiver projects.⁴⁰ Different means have been used to measure cost neutrality, depending on the design of the demonstration project. For projects employing an experimental design using random assignment, the states establish a control group of children and families who receive services according to the standard IV-E federal categorical reimbursements,⁴¹ and then multiply the cost per child in the control group by the total number of children to receive services in the demonstration project.⁴² If the states successfully implement new services that are indeed more cost-effective, then they are allowed to retain and reinvest the savings between the new costs and the higher IV-E reimbursement.⁴³ If the new services were not cost-effective, no additional federal money has been spent.⁴⁴ As a result, states are encouraged to experiment with new approaches to child welfare practice without increasing the investment risk to the federal government.⁴⁵

It should be noted, however, that a few states have faced difficulties in maintaining cost neutrality. For example, North Carolina terminated its flexible funding/subsidized guardianship waiver extension prematurely due to problems with adhering to the waivers cost neutrality requirement.

PENDING IV-E WAIVER-RELATED LEGISLATION IN THE 111TH CONGRESS

CCAI does not take a formal position for or against legislation. Information on legislation contained in this report is for educational purposes only. CCAI encourages congressional staff to directly contact a bill's sponsor for additional information.

H.R.6156: To renew the authority of the Secretary of Health and Human Services to approve demonstration projects designed to test innovative strategies in State child welfare programs.

³³ Summary of the Title IV-E Child Welfare Demonstrations
³⁴ Encouraging Child Welfare Innovation Through IV-E Waivers
³⁵ Summary of the Title IV-E Child Welfare Demonstrations; Synthesis
³⁶ Summary of the Title IV-E Child Welfare Demonstrations
³⁷ Summary of the Title IV-E Child Welfare Demonstrations
³⁸ Child Trends
³⁹ Committee on Ways and Means, p. 105-108.

⁴⁰ Encouraging Child Welfare Innovation Through IV-E Waivers
⁴¹ Encouraging Child Welfare Innovation Through IV-E Waivers
⁴² Encouraging Child Welfare Innovation Through IV-E Waivers
⁴³ Encouraging Child Welfare Innovation Through IV-E Waivers
⁴⁴ Encouraging Child Welfare Innovation Through IV-E Waivers
⁴⁵ Encouraging Child Welfare Innovation Through IV-E Waivers



Passed in House: 9/23/10 Sponsor: Rep. Jim McDermott

This bill would renew the Secretary of Health and Human Services' authority to approve child welfare demonstration projects from FY 2011 to 2016. Demonstration projects to be considered for approval would include those that would identify and address barriers that result in delays to kinship guardianship for children in foster care; those that provide early intervention and crisis intervention services; as well as those that address domestic violence that put children in danger and at risk of being placed in foster care. Indian tribes are considered states for the purposes of this legislation.

OTHER PENDING IV-E-RELATED LEGISLATION IN THE 111TH CONGRESS

[S.2837: Child Welfare Workforce Improvement Act](#)

Introduced: 12/04/09 Sponsor: Sen. Blanche L. Lincoln

Section 5 of this bill would provide for a demonstration program geared toward improving child welfare staff, which is divided into two phases—planning and an implementation. The bill would give authority for 15 state agencies to initiate the planning phase and an additional 15 state agencies to initiate the implementation phase. This bill also de-links the funding providing pursuant to the act from the former ADFC program.

[H.R. 3329: Look-back Elimination Act of 2009](#)

Introduced: 7/24/09 Sponsor: Rep. John Lewis

The Look-back Elimination Act is a bill to eliminate the ADFC standards as it related to foster care maintenance and adoption assistance and to install new standards that are based on current balanced eligibility criteria.

RESEARCH & REPORTS

Casey Family Programs. (2010). *The Need to reauthorize and expand Title IV-E waivers*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from:
<http://www.casey.org/resources/publications/NeedForWaivers.htm>

Casey Family Programs (2010). *The Need for Federal Finance Reform*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from:

<http://www.casey.org/resources/publications/NeedForFinanceReform.htm>.

DeVooght, K., Allen, T., & Geen, R. (2008). *Federal, state and local spending to address child abuse and neglect in SFY 2006*. Washington, DC: Child Trends. Retrieved June 8, 2010, from

http://www.childtrends.org/Files//Child_Trends-2009_02_17_FR_CWFinancePaper.pdf

Golden, O., Macomber, J.E., & Notkin, S. (2009). *Intentions and results: A Look back at the Adoption and Safe Families Act*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute. Retrieved from

http://www.urban.org/uploadedpdf/1001351_safe_families_act.pdf

James Bell Associates. (2008). *Summary of the Title IV-E child welfare waiver demonstrations*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved June 8, 2010, from
http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/programs_fund/cw_waiver/2008/summary_demo2008.pdf

[Social Security Act. Public Law 103-432. § 1130.](#)

Testa, M. (2005). *Encouraging child welfare innovation through IV-E waivers*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Retrieved June 8, 2010, from
<http://www.cfrc.illinois.edu/pubs/briefpdfs/cfrc.guard-evolution.pdf>

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families. (2010). *Profiles of child welfare waiver demonstration projects*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from
http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/programs_fund/cw_waiver/2010/profiles_demo2010.pdf

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families. (2010). *Summary of the Title IV-E child welfare waiver demonstrations*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from
http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/programs_fund/cw_waiver/2010/summary_demo2010.htm#1



U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families. (2005). *Synthesis of findings: Title IV-E flexible funding waiver demonstrations*. Retrieved June 8, 2010, from http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/programs_fund/cw/waiver/flexfund/index.htm

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families. (2009). Title IV-E-Foster Care FY 2008 Expenditures as Reported by States (May 12, 2009) [Figure]. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Office of Human Services Policy. (2009). *Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF): Overview*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved August 5, 2010, from <http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/abbrev/afdc-tanf.htm>

U.S. General Accounting Office. (1999). *Foster care: States' early experiences implementing the Adoption and Safe Families Act*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved from <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/he00001.pdf>

Committee on Ways and Means. *Background material and data on the programs within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means*. (2008). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

APPENDIX: IV-E WAIVER PROJECT SUMMARIES*

Below please find a list of all Title IV-E Waivers to date:

Capped Title IV-E Dollars and Flexible Funding

California

Start Date: 7/1/2007 End Date: 4/30/2013

* The information under this section was gathered from the Green Book and HHS Profiles, which are cited in full under the Research and Reports section found at the end of CCAI's *In Focus: Title IV-E Waivers* Report. The "start date" indicates when the state implemented the project, which differs from when the project was approved.

Project Status: In progress. Approved for a short-term extension on 8/6/2010.

Evaluation Design: Time series analysis

This project targets children age 19 and younger and gives a capped IV-E allotment to two counties with large foster care populations. The demonstration provides funding for interventions such as pre-placement services, increased efforts to find kinship placements, efforts to decrease the time for children in out-of-home placements, assistance to relative guardianships, and a new position to help manage the waiver project. The evaluation design is set up to provide a longitudinal report in children's outcomes.

Florida

Start Date: 10/1/2006 End Date: 7/31/2012

Project Status: In progress. Approved for a short-term extension on 8/26/2010.

Evaluation Design: Time series analysis

Eligible children include those who are 18 or younger and are either receiving child welfare services in their home or in an out-of-home placement, or who have been reported to have suffered maltreatment. The state receives a capped IV-E allocation, which is utilized by contracted child welfare service providers to increase the availability of community-based services. Since the project's implementation, the state has reported a significant decrease in out-of-home placements and improvement in permanency outcomes.

Indiana

Start Date: 1/1/1998 End Date: 5/1/2011

Project Status: In progress. Approved for short term extension on 3/8/2010.

Evaluation Design: Matched comparison

This nearly statewide project was for IV-E and a limited number of non-IV-E eligible children age 18 or younger who have reports of (or are at risk of) abuse, neglect, or delinquency. A fixed payment was allotted for developing new services to reduce the need for children's removal from homes and the time in which children obtain permanency. Children participating in the project tended to be less likely to be removed from their family and spent less time in care. Difficulties in implementing the project included identifying IV-E eligible children and a lack of



knowledge and training with respect to the waiver requirements.

North Carolina

Start Date: 7/1/1997 End Date: 2/28/2008

Project Status: Approved for 5 year extension in 2004 but terminated early

Evaluation Design: Comparison site

Less than 20 percent of the state's counties participated in this project, which allowed counties to create initiatives to target children who were either at risk of out-of-home placements or were already removed from their homes. The most common initiatives included encouraging court reform and creating contracts for additional services. The project received a five-year extension in 2004 but terminated early in 2008 due to difficulties with maintaining the waiver's cost neutrality requirement. See the section entitled "Guardianship and Kinship Subsidies" for a description of the subsidized guardianship component of North Carolina's waiver.

Ohio

Start Date: 10/1/1997 End Date: 12/31/2010

Project Status: In progress. Approved for 5 year extension in 2004 as well as a short-term extension on 9/22/2010.

Evaluation Design: Comparison sites

The state selected a small number of counties that would receive a capped allocation of IV-E funds. In Phase I the counties implemented financing and management strategies to improve the cost-effectiveness of services provided to children in care or at risk of being brought into care. In Phase II five distinct interventions are being utilized to prevent removal and increase permanency rates. While reports assessing both phases of the project indicated that more children were able to have permanency with the demonstration in place, there were less clear findings with respect to safety outcomes.

Oregon

Start Date: 7/1/1997 End Date: 12/31/2010

Project Status: In progress. Approved for 5 year extension in 2004 as well as a short-term extension on 6/15/2010.

Evaluation Design: Comparison sites

Oregon's flexible funding waiver allows participating state child welfare agencies and Tribes to use Title IV-E funds

for a variety of child welfare services, including post-permanency, maltreatment prevention, crisis intervention, and reunification services. Overall, child welfare agencies with access to flexible IV-E dollars have not observed significantly stronger performance on key child welfare outcomes, in part due to other state child welfare reform initiatives that have made it more difficult to discern the specific impacts of the waiver. See the section entitled, "Guardianship and Kinship Subsidies" below for a description of the subsidized guardianship component of the state's waiver.

Child Welfare Staff Training

Illinois

Start Date: 1/1/2003 End Date: 6/30/2005

Project Status: Terminated early

Evaluation Design: Random assignment

New child welfare employees, including workers from private child welfare agencies, were given the opportunity to receive enhanced training, which was geared to help them achieve better outcomes for children more effectively and efficiently. While children who worked with staff who had completed the additional training did tend to spend somewhat less time in foster care before achieving permanency, there were no major statistically significant findings, and the ability to achieve significant statistical data was hindered by the small size of the experimental groups.

Guardianship and Kinship Subsidies

Delaware

Start Date: 7/1/1996 End Date: 12/31/2002

Project Status: Completed

Evaluation Design: Pre-post comparison

This project set out to give assistance for guardianships for ten children per year in all of the state's three counties. To qualify for the project, Children eligible had to be IV-E eligible, have a strong bond with potential guardian, and be identified for options other than reunification or adoption. Guardians were given subsidies equal to the subsidies given to state foster care homes. After establishing a guardianship, children could still receive certain services pursuant the project. While findings showed a positive outlook for assisted guardianships,



Delaware indicated that it was difficult to implement the evaluation component of the demonstration in part due to a lack of caseworker participation.

Illinois

Start Date: 5/1/1997 End Date: 10/31/2009
Project Status: Completed
Evaluation Design: Random Assignment

For children who have been wards of the state and lived with the prospective guardian for at least one year, the project made it possible to obtain assisted guardianships. To be eligible, children must not have reunification or adoption as a permanency option. The program targeted children living with relatives. Evaluation findings indicated that children assigned to the experimental group that had access to assisted guardianship were 6.6 percent more likely to achieve permanency compared to children in the control group – a statistically significant difference.

Iowa

Start Date: 2/1/2007 End Date: 9/1/2010
Project Status: Terminated early
Evaluation Design: Random Assignment

Irrespective of IV-E eligibility, children whose permanency goals were guardianship or another planned permanent living arrangement, who have been a ward of the state for at least one year and have lived with a prospective guardian for at least 6 months, could qualify for subsidized guardianships. Eligible children were either age 12 or older, or if under age 12, were a member of a sibling group with a child who is above the age of 12. As of 2009, 20 children in the experimental group had exited to subsidized guardianship, and another 19 were being considered for an assisted guardianship.

Maryland

Start Date: 5/1/1998 End Date: 9/30/2004
Project Status: Completed
Evaluation Design: Random Assignment

This project gave assisted guardianships to children who had been living in a kinship caregiver or relative's home for at least 6 months. Demonstration participation was extended to all children irrespective of IV-E eligibility. Report findings indicated that experimental group participants were more likely to end up in the custody of

relatives but the rate at which children achieved permanency—through adoption, guardianship, or reunification—did not differ largely between the control and the experimental groups.

Minnesota

Start Date: 11/17/2005 End Date: 9/30/2010
Project Status: Completed. Final evaluation report due 3/31/2011.
Evaluation Design: Random Assignment

Children in five counties who have lived with a prospective guardian or adoptive parent for at minimum of 6 consecutive months and for whom reunification and adoption is not a viable permanency plan were eligible for an assisted guardianship or adoption assistance subsidy set at the same benefit level as the foster care payment. (Normally, subsidies for both adoption and guardianship in Minnesota are substantially lower than the foster care maintenance payments provided while a child is in care.) This project targeted certain minority children in long-term foster care as well as those children who are older, a member to a sibling group, or who have additional medical or therapy needs. This program extended benefits to foster homes who became legal guardians for children in their care. Initial numbers indicated that more experimental group participants have obtained permanency through adoption or guardianship than the children in the control group.

Montana

Start Date: 6/21/2001 End Date: 12/31/2008
Project Status: Completed
Evaluation Design: Random Assignment

This project set out to provide assisted guardianships across the state and within seven Tribes for children who are IV-E eligible, considered to have special needs, and in the custody of a Tribe or the State. The project's age restrictions were later changed to include members of sibling groups, but were eliminated entirely by the demonstration's completion. There were no significant statistical differences between the experimental group participants and the members of the control group.

New Mexico

Start Date: 7/1/2000 End Date: 12/31/2005
Project Status: Completed



Evaluation Design: Random Assignment

For IV-E eligible children who were age 18 or younger and either in Tribal or State custody, this project offered assisted guardianships. To participate in this demonstration, a child's permanency options could not include adoption or reunification. While evaluation findings demonstrated no substantial difference in achieving permanency or length of placement, children in the experimental group tended to be placed in closer proximity to relatives and achieved permanency sooner.

North Carolina

Start Date: 7/1/1997 End Date: 2/28/2008

Project Status: Approved for 5 year extension but terminated early

Evaluation Design: Comparison sites

This assisted guardianship demonstration, which was part of the state's larger flexible funding waiver, was limited to certain counties and was available to children who were either in state custody or at risk of being removed from the home. Any additional eligibility criteria were left to the participating counties. A descriptive study conducted by the state suggested that assisted guardianship may be particularly appropriate for older African American children for whom adoption or reunification are not viable permanency options.

Oregon

Start Date: 7/1/1997 End Date: 12/31/2010

Project Status: Approved for 5 year extension in 2004 as well as a short-term extension on 6/15/2010

Evaluation Design: Comparison sites

This guardianship project, which was part of the state's larger flexible funding waiver demonstration, targeted children age 18 or younger, specifically between the ages of 4 and 17, who had been under the care of a prospective guardian for 6 months and resided in out-of-home placements for at least one year. Findings from the state's most recent evaluation suggest that children who exited to guardianship on average spent less time in out-of-home placement than children who were reunified with their birth families, and that children who exited to guardianship were less likely to re-enter foster care 24 months following permanency than children who were reunified.

Tennessee

Start Date: 12/7/2006 End Date: 3/31/2009

Project Status: Terminated early

Evaluation Design: Random assignment

Both IV-E eligible and non-IV-E eligible children who are age 17.5 or younger, who have been in state custody for at least 9 months, and in the care of a prospective guardian for 6 months can receive guardianship subsidy payments as well as other assistance and services related to the obtaining a guardianship. Findings showed significantly better permanency outcomes among experimental group participants than among members of the control group. Nearly 75 percent of children assigned to the experimental group exited to permanency, compared with 66 percent of children in the control group – a statistically significant difference of 9 percent.

Wisconsin

Start Date: 10/14/2005 End Date: 7/31/2011

Project Status: In progress. Approved for a short-term extension on 9/22/2010

Evaluation Design: Random assignment

This project focuses on one county's children who have been in foster placements with relatives for at least one year. Children who have been in such placements for less than a year are also eligible to the extent that reunification is no longer one of their permanency options or if they have a sibling who has already obtained an assisted guardianship. IV-E eligibility is not a prerequisite to participate in the demonstration. The project's services focus on keeping children within their immediate family, or in the alternate, promoting children's placement with extended family members. To date, reports have shown that participants of the demonstration stayed in care for shorter periods of time and were 18 percent more likely to achieve some form of permanency – a statistically significant difference.



Intensive Services

Arizona

Start Date: 4/17/2006 End Date: 12/31/2008
Project Status: Terminated early
Evaluation Design: Random assignment

This demonstration set out to provide intensive services such as individual and group counseling, family assessments, and case-specific family and child services for children regardless of IV-E eligibility in select counties. The evaluations showed that children participating in the project were more likely to remain in their homes and had slightly higher reunification rates. This demonstration was terminated early at the request of the state due to financial issues. In August 2008, Arizona's contracted service providers (those providing the services being tested in this demonstration) requested an increase of 20-25 percent in case rates. The state felt it was unable to meet this request due to budget concerns and opted to terminate the project early.

California

Start Date: 12/1/1998 End Date: 12/31/2005
Project Status: Completed
Evaluation Design: Random assignment

California's Intensive Service Option project targeted IV-E eligible children in seven counties to provide services geared at eliminating the need for children to be removed from their homes. The state reported several barriers faced when implementing the project, which included a lack of primary caregivers available to assist children, inadequate staffing, and inflexibility of financing structures. Findings from this project did not indicate significant differences between experimental group participants and members of the control groups.

Mississippi

Start Date: 4/1/2001 End Date: 9/30/2004
Project Status: Terminated early
Evaluation Design: Random assignment

Largely children already removed from their homes, without regard to IV-E eligibility qualified to participate in this intensive services demonstration. The project phased in services available to families, relative caregivers, and foster homes in eight different counties. Impediments to

the project's execution included a high turnover rate of child welfare staff and a hiring freeze. The demonstration resulted in significantly less likelihoods of maltreatment recurrence and removal to out-of-home care among experimental group participants.

Managed Care Payment Systems

Colorado

Start Date: 10/26/2001 End Date: 6/30/2003
Project Status: Terminated early
Evaluation Design: Random assignment

Colorado chose to gear this demonstration toward improving outcomes for children of one county, age 10 and older, at risk of aging out of child welfare system. Private service providers were contracted to meet the needs of these children and their families. Modest participation and insufficient lengths of implementation resulted in a lack of report findings. The project's early termination was due to state budget problems and a lack of county interest in implementing the project.

Connecticut

Start Date: 7/9/1999 End Date: 10/31/2002
Project Status: Terminated early
Evaluation Design: Random assignment

Children between the ages of 7 and 15 years with moderate mental health needs were eligible to benefit from comprehensive treatment from a coordinated effort of service providers. The state reported a difficulty in sustaining comprehensive treatments with the use of a single rate payment system. Connecticut's demonstration was discontinued due to mental health care system reform at the state level and an insufficient number of referrals to sustain serve provider contracts.

Iowa

Approval date: 3/31/2006
Project Status: Approved, never implemented

This demonstration was intended to serve children who were considered to have enhanced needs, irrespective of IV-E eligibility, between the ages of 11 and 16. Changes in Medicaid payments and service provider system contracts resulted in the project's termination.



Maryland

Start Date: 1/1/2000 End Date: 12/31/2002
Project Status: Terminated early
Evaluation Design: Random Assignment

Maryland's Managed Care Payment demonstration selected 1,000 children to receive certain support services through contracted child placement agencies. Upon electing not to extend the project, the state indicated that the placement agencies had not anticipated or addressed many of the children's needs and that there was an imbalance of agency efforts toward adoption rather than reunification.

Michigan

Start Date: 10/1/1999 End Date: 9/30/2003
Project Status: Completed
Evaluation Design: Random assignment

While the demonstration originally focused on IV-E eligible children 18 years old or younger who were either removed from their homes or in immediate risk of removal, the program was later restricted only to children already in out-of-home placements. Participation in the project was significantly less than what was originally anticipated in the state's waiver application. Project participants could receive in-home services or a managed care system for out-of-home placement and services. Evaluation findings indicated that the new services were more costly, that the services did not produce significant positive effects for children's outcomes, and that there was little statistical difference in rates of entry into care between the experimental and control groups.

Washington

Start Date: 3/27/2002 End Date: 6/20/2003
Project Status: Terminated early
Evaluation Design: Random assignment

Children between the ages of 6 and 17 years who required additional funding due to health, education, or placement-specific needs were targeted by this demonstration, which provided for more comprehensive and case-specific services in two counties. The project was terminated early on account of difficulties in service provider contracts and obtaining enough referrals as well as lack of clarity in how the project was supposed to be implemented.

Post-Adoption Services

Maine

Start Date: 4/1/1999 End Date: 9/30/2004
Project Status: Completed
Evaluation Design: Random assignment

Title IV-E-eligible children considered to have special needs qualified to participate in this demonstration. It consisted of two components: increased education for special needs adoptions and post-adoption services. Few statistical differences were found between recipients of the project's services and those who did not receive them.

Substance Abuse Programs

Delaware

Start Date: 7/1/1996 End Date: 12/31/2002
Project Status: Completed
Evaluation Design: Comparison site

This statewide demonstration set out to establish a multi-disciplinary service team to meet the needs of children who had either entered care or were at risk of entering care due to parental substance abuse problems. The project treated only about 30 percent of the number of families who were referred for treatment. While the length of time children spent in care decreased for those who received these services, a lack of resources and an underestimation of the length of time families would need care contributed to the program's failure to support the vast needs families in this project faced.

Illinois

Start Date: 4/28/2000 End Date: 12/31/2011
Project Status: In progress. Approved for a 5 year extension in 2007
Evaluation Design: Random assignment

This demonstration's targeted population is children who entered care on account of familial substance abuse problems on or after the first day of the project's implementation. Starting off in one county, but later expanding to two more counties, the project supplements extensive services to eligible families. While the project's intent was to help families remain intact, evaluation reports have found that systemic problems often co-exist with substance abuse problems which do not allow for children's return to the home. Therefore, Phase II of the



project includes additional service components to address co-occurring issues such as domestic violence, mental health issues, and affordable housing.

Maryland

Start Date: 10/1/2001 End Date: 12/31/2002
Project Status: Terminated early
Evaluation Design: Random assignment

Female primary caregivers were targeted by this demonstration to receive comprehensive treatment for problems surrounding substance use. An inadequate amount of eligible cases and difficulties in project execution led to the project's early termination. Certain barriers that were faced in implementing this demonstration included a lack of understanding of the program among participants and staff, an inability for intake workers to participate in the program due to high case volume, and difficulty in recruiting female caregivers.

New Hampshire

Start Date: 11/15/1999 End Date: 11/30/2005
Project Status: Completed
Evaluation Design: Random assignment

Families with allegations of child abuse or neglect were targeted by this project regardless of IV-E eligibility.

Licensed substance abuse counselors made initial assessments and implemented treatment for families with alcohol and drug related problems. While the project did not yield significant statistical improvement among demonstration participants, the evaluations did indicate a positive trend in their outcomes.

Tribal Services

New Mexico

Start Date: 7/1/2000 End Date: 12/31/2005
Project Status: Completed
Evaluation Design: Comparison site

Children in the custody of Tribes who did not already have an agreement with the State that enhanced their involvement in child welfare cases were targeted by this demonstration. Its purpose was to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of child welfare services provided to Native American children. New Mexico faced difficulties in drawing conclusions from its project evaluations due to the small sample size. Outcomes for children in the experimental group did not differ largely from those in the control group, and some outcomes in the experimental group were actually worse.