QIC-AG Site Assessment Framework

# OVERVIEW

The purpose of this document is to outline the overall assessment process. Each phase of the assessment process has its own set of instructions and tools which are detailed in subsequent sections of this document. There are a number of tasks that need to be accomplished to ensure the successful engagement and selection of the project sites. These tasks will be accomplished through executing the assessment framework activities.

The assessment process has three phases: pre assessment; initial assessment; and full assessment. Each assessment phase is focused on answering a specific question or identifying a specific outcome related to the following categories: Organizational Demographics, Population, Data Capacity, Continuum of Services/Interventions, Organizational and Evaluation Readiness, and Sustainability. As the assessment progresses through the phases, the information in each category will increase in scope and depth.

In sum, each phase will build upon the one before it. There are detailed instructions and tools in development for completing each component of the assessment to ensure completeness and uniformity. It is important to note that if more sites than QIC-AG capacity allows are interested in participating, the information gathered during each phase of the process will be used by QIC-AG leadership team to determine which sites will continue to the next phase of assessment.

Prior to the pre-assessment phase the leadership team will spend time each week reviewing the pool of potential sites. This includes a review of information gathered on sites that we have targeted as promising, as well as any new sites that have presented as a result of the outreach process. Sites can be removed or added to the pool of potential sites based on the discussion. There is no size limit for the potential pool of sites. Throughout December and January a group of potential sites will be identified for pre-assessment.

# Phase One: Pre Assessment

## December ‘14-January ‘15

The pre-assessment is an opportunity to gather limited, readily available information that has been determined most critical to understanding a site’s potential to support the QIC-AG’s efforts. Using resources that are readily available to the QIC-AG, staff will gather basic information on sites identified during the outreach phase of the process. During this phase, the specific sites will not be contacted directly and therefore, new information will not be solicited from potential participants. This information will be gathered in a template and synthesized to assist the QIC-AG leadership team evaluate and rank order candidates for partnering potential. Categories to be explored include the following: Organization Demographics, Population, Data Capacity, Continuum of Services/Interventions, Organizational and Evaluation Readiness.

**Outcome:** At the conclusion of this phase the sites that have expressed interest will be narrowed to a pool of no more than 16 potential sites.

Phase Two: Initial Assessment

## February ‘15-April ‘15

The QIC-AG will approach sites identified during the pre-assessment to provide an overview of the QIC-AG and the benefits of being a partner site, ascertain their interest in working with the QIC-AG and collect additional information from the site to determine the desirability of the partnership. Examining pre-existing relationships, a team of QIC-AG leaders will be assembled to meet/talk with the site. The team will consist of a staff with implementation experience and an evaluator. At least one person from the QIC-AG leadership team will attend the initial assessment in person. At the end of the process, the QIC-AG will confirm which sites should/will be selected to continue to the full assessment. Each assessment phase is focused on answering a specific question or identifying a specific outcome related to the following categories: Organizational Demographics, Population, Data Capacity, Continuum of Services/Interventions, Organizational and Evaluation Readiness, and Sustainability. The following will be addressed:

* Introduce QIC-AG to sites including overview of the opportunity, scope of work, goals, objective, expected outcomes, target population, requirements, resources available to them as a partner site, meeting attendance
* Review and confirm site specific information collected during the pre-assessment phase.
* Collect more detailed information on the following categories: Organizational Demographics, Population, Data Capacity, Continuum of Services/Interventions, and Organizational and Evaluation Readiness and Sustainability. This information will facilitate determining whether the site should continue on to the full assessment phase of the project.

Once the initial assessment has been completed, the leadership team members who conducted the assessment will be asked to complete an initial assessment rating form. The rating form summarizes the content gathered during the initial assessment and provides standardized ratings to allow for greater comparability between the sites.

**Outcome:** At the end of this phase the sites identified in the pre-assessment phase will be narrowed to no more than 9 potential sites that will proceed to the full assessment phase.

Phase Three: Full Assessment

## April ‘15-May ‘15

The QIC-AG will conduct Full Assessments with the remaining sites. The assessment will focus on addressing gaps in information that are deemed critical to determining whether a site should partner with the QIC-AG.

Information gathered during the full assessment will be generated by the asking site specific questions that will be developed by the QIC-AG after reviewing the content of the pre and initial assessment documents. The full assessment will be completed by phone and will be conducted by the members of the QIC-AG leadership team that performed the initial assessment. As a result of this work, the QIC-AG and the site will be able to make a final determination regarding site selection and entry into a binding work agreement.

**Outcome:** At the end of this phase, the QIC-AG will narrow the sites further, finalizing QIC-AG/site partnerships by entering into binding work agreements with 6-8 sites.

Phase One: Pre-Assessment

## December ‘14-January ‘15

# PRE-ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK (See Appendix A for Template)

The pre-assessment will be an opportunity to gather limited, readily available information that has been determined most critical to understanding a site’s potential to support the QIC-AG’s efforts. Using resources that are readily available to the QIC-AG, staff will gather basic information on sites identified during the outreach phase of the process. During this phase, the specific sites will not be contacted directly and therefore, new information will not be solicited from potential participants. This information will be gathered in a template and synthesized to allow the QIC-AG to evaluate and rank order candidates for partnering potential. Categories to be explored include the following: Organization Demographics, Population, Data Capacity, Continuum of Services/Interventions, Organizational and Evaluation Readiness.

## Organizational Demographics

* Contact information
* Children’s Bureau region
* County or state administered system
* Rural/Urban (i.e. number of counties that are rural versus urban)
* Wicked Problems involvement
* Fostering Court Improvement involvement

## Population

* Number of children in substitute care (most current data)
* Number of children receiving an adoption/guardianship subsidy (most current data)

## Data Capacity

* Existing or pending data sharing agreements with QIC partners

## Continuum of Services/Intervention

* Existing pre- and post-permanency services including unique components related to pre/post permanency services

## Organizational and Evaluation Readiness

* Experience running a successful pilot project or implementing evidence based practices
* Experience running a project using an experimental design (RCT), and lessons learned from the experience
* Successful TA relationship with NRCA, QIC partner, other NRC’s, TA providers, Professional Networks, etc.
* External issues that may enhance or detract from site’s ability to implement intervention including political climate, inter-agency issues, law suits
* Internal issues that may impact the site’s ability to implement intervention including other major initiatives, TA, consent decrees, leadership longevity/turnover

## Sustainability

* No questions during this phase.

# PRE-ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

**QIC-AG** **Decision Point:** Which sites explored during the outreach phase are the best to ask to engage in the initial assessment?

**Outcome:** At the conclusion of this phase the sites that have expressed interest will be narrowed to a pool of no more than 16 potential sites.

Phase Two: Initial Assessment

## February ‘15-April ‘15

# INITIAL ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK (See Appendix B for Template)

The QIC-AG will approach sites to provide an overview of the QIC-AG and the benefits of being a partner site, ascertain their interest in working with the QIC-AG and collect information from the site to determine the desirability of the partnership. A team of QIC-AG leaders will meet with the site to explain the initiative and gather information. Meetings will be held on site with at least one member of the QIC-AG leadership team present. At the end of the process, the QIC-AG will decide which sites will be selected to continue to the full assessment phase. Each assessment phase is focused on answering a specific question or identifying a specific outcome related to the following categories: Organizational Demographics, Population, Data Capacity, Continuum of Services/Interventions, Organizational and Evaluation Readiness, and Sustainability. During the initial assessment phase the following will be addressed:

* Introduce QIC-AG to sites including overview of the opportunity, scope of work, goals, objective, expected outcomes, target population, requirements, resources available to them as a partner site, meeting attendance
* Collect more detailed information on the following categories: Organizational Demographics, Population, Data Capacity, Outcomes, Continuum of Services/Interventions, and Organizational and Evaluation Readiness and Sustainability. This information will facilitate determining whether the site should continue to the full assessment phase of the project.

## Organizational Demographics

The QIC-AG will work with the site to review and confirm site specific information collected during the pre-assessment phase. In addition, the following will be discussed:

* Adoption program manager contact information
* Considerations for limiting the program to a specific geographic area

## Population

The QIC-AG will work with the site to obtain site specific data. To ensure consistency, whenever possible, the QIC-AG will get the numbers from existing, nationally recognized, data sources. The following data will be ascertained:

* Number of children in substitute care
* Number of children who exited care to adoption
* Number of children who exited care to guardianship
* Number of children awaiting an adoptive home:
  + Children In Care with Both TPRs
  + Children in Pre-Adoptive Home
* Children in Relative Foster Care
* Number of children discharged to relative custody
* Number of children receiving and adoption subsidy (IV-E/Not IV-E)
* Number of children receiving a guardianship subsidy (IV-E/Not IV-E)

## Data Capacity

During this phase, the QIC-AG will engage with sites to determine the current data capacity and whether plans exist to develop new capacity or augment existing systems. If capacity does not exist, willingness to develop capacity will be addressed. No specific plan details will be discussed during this phase. The following will be explored:

* Recertification process/annual check in
* Existing files that link pre-adoption IDs to post-adoption IDs
* AFCARS data
* NCANDS data
* Adoption or guardianship subsidy link files
* Pre and post-permanency service outputs and outcomes (# of referrals made to specific services, # of clients served by various programs, improvement for clients related to receipt of intervention, etc.)
* Disruptions
* Dissolutions
* Children receiving post-permanency services
* Non-child welfare adoptions

## Continuum of Services/Interventions

During this phase, the QIC-AG will confirm and enhance the information gathered during the pre-assessment phase to ensure that the QIC-AG has a full perspective on the pre-post permanency services and supports provided by the site. QIC-AG staff will confirm or gather the following information during the meeting with the sites:

* Existing pre-post permanency services
* Categorizing the services using the Continuum of Services
* Services typically available to children not adopted through the child welfare system (private domestic or international adoptions)
* The population served by each service
* Agency responsible for providing each service
* Funding source for each service
* Site leader’s perceived quality of each service being provided, and any knowledge of evaluation conducted about the services (Ask for any reports or written materials on services)
* If multiple agencies provide services (system of care), presence of a formal mechanism for coordinating the services with other entities that provide post permanency services

In addition, the QIC-AG staff will talk to site leaders to ascertain the following:

* Specific intervention(s) on which the site would like to focus
* Site willingness to consider implementation of other interventions
* Specific portion of the continuum on which the site would like to focus (pre-permanence or post-permanence)

## Organizational and Evaluation Readiness

During this phase, the QIC-AG wants to gain an understanding of the site’s ability to be an effective member of the QIC-AG team. Readiness issues will be explored in detail during the full assessment phase, but exploration of the topics listed below should provide some insight into issues that may strengthen or weaken a sites candidacy for participation.

* Existence of a champion for post permanency supports and preservation
* Anticipation of pending leadership change(s)
* Internal issues that may enhance or detract from a site’s ability to support the goals of the QIC-AG
* External issues that may enhance of detract from a site’s ability to support the goals of the QIC-AG
* Site experience implementing an initiative of this significance (including use of RCT and implementation of evidence based practices or promising practices)
* Sites experience with and willingness to disseminate findings related to both process and outcomes.
* Any barriers that might interfere with the dissemination of products
* Sites internal capacity to conduct research/evaluation
* Current partnerships with external agencies to provide pre-post permanency services and likeliness these entities will support involvement with the QIC-AG

## Sustainability

Sites must consider the feasibility of sustaining the operation of an effective intervention after the federal support has expired. During this phase, sites will consider their willingness to pursue alternative sources of funding/resources to support an effective continuum of services.

# INITIAL ASSESSMENT RATING FORM (See Appendix C for Template)

Once the initial assessment has been completed, the leadership team members who conducted the assessment for a site will be asked to complete a rating form. The rating form summarizes the content gathered during the initial assessment and provides standardized ratings to allow for greater comparability between the sites.

# INITIAL ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

**QIC-AG Decision Point**: Which sites explored during the initial assessment phase are the best to ask to engage in the full assessment?

**Outcome:** Generate list of no more than 9 sites to move to full assessment.

Phase Three: Full Assessment

## FULL ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

## April ‘15-May ‘15

The QIC-AG will conduct Full Assessments with the remaining sites. The assessment will focus on addressing gaps in information that are deemed critical to determining whether a site should partner with the QIC-AG.

Information gathered during the full assessment will be generated by the asking site specific questions that will be developed by the QIC-AG after reviewing the content of the pre and initial assessment documents. The full assessment will be completed by phone and will be conducted by the members of the QIC-AG leadership team that performed the initial assessment. As a result of this work, the QIC-AG and the site will be able to make a final determination regarding site selection and entry into a binding work agreement.

# FULL ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

**QIC-AG Decision Point:** Which sites explored during the outreach phase are the best to ask to engage in the full assessment?

**Outcome:** Identify the final 6-8 sites with which QIC-AG will enter into binding work agreements.

Appendix A: Pre-Assessment Template

# PRE-ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE

## Contact Person

1. State/County/Tribe: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
2. Name of primary contact person:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Phone Number\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ e-mail: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Name(s) of people that QIC-AG internal partnership team have spoken to about this initiative in the sites (include names, agencies, titles, and contact information):

## Organizational Demographics

1. Adoption Program Manager:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

E-Mail\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Phone Number\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Children’s Bureau region :\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
2. Administration Type: \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_County \_\_\_Hybrid
3. Describe the site with respect to its Rural/Urban composition (i.e. number of counties that are rural versus urban).
4. Has the site been involved in the Wicked Problems Institutes? YES\_\_\_\_ NO\_\_\_\_\_
5. Is the site Fostering Court Improvement involved? YES\_\_\_\_ NO\_\_\_\_\_

## Population

1. Number of Children is substitute care (most current available)? \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_(#) as of \_\_\_\_(FY)

2. Number of Children is receiving an adoption/guardianship subsidy (most current available)? \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_(#) as of \_\_\_\_\_(FY)

## Data Capacity

1. Does the site have existing or pending data sharing agreements with any QIC-AG partners? Yes\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_

If yes, indicate with whom the agreement(s) exist.

## Continuum of Services/Intervention

1. Provide a summary of the pre- and post- adoption and guardianship service continuum including any unique characteristics that would diminish or augment the sites ability to support the goals of the QIC-AG.

## Organizational and Evaluation Readiness

1. Does the site have any experience running a successful pilot project of a promising practice or implementing an existing evidence-based practice?

Yes\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_ Don’t Know\_\_\_\_

If yes, please describe:

1. Does the site have any experience implementing best practices using an RCT or other rigorous evaluation design?

Yes\_\_\_    No\_\_\_\_ Don’t Know \_\_\_\_

If yes, please describe:

1. Does the site currently have or had successful Technical Assistance relationships with a past or existing QIC partner, NRC’s, TA providers, Professional Networks, etc.?

Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_ Don’t Know \_\_\_\_

If yes, please describe:

1. Are their external issues that may enhance or detract from site’s ability to implement the intervention including political climate, inter-agency issues, and lawsuits?

Yes\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_ Don’t Know \_\_\_\_

If yes, please describe:

1. Are there internal issues that may impact the site’s ability to implement intervention including other major initiatives, TA, consent decrees, leadership longevity/turnover?

Yes\_\_\_\_ No\_\_\_\_ Don’t Know \_\_\_\_

If yes, please describe:

6. Other critical information:

Appendix B: Initial Assessment Template

QIC-AG Initial Assessment

**Date of Meeting 1:** Click here to enter a date.

**Date of Meeting 2**: Click here to enter a date.

**STATE/COUNTY/TRIBE**: Click here to enter State/County/Tribe.

The information gathered during the initial assessment phase will be completed by the QIC-AG team in conjunction with the site.

## Organizational Demographics

Please complete the following:

1. **Name of primary contact person**: Click here to enter contact person.

**Agency:** Click here to enter agency.

**Title:** Click here to enter title.

**Phone Number:** Click here to enter Phone Number. **e-mail:** Click here to enter email.

1. **Adoption Program Manager:** Click here to enter text.

**E-Mail:** Click here to enter email. **Phone Number:** Click here to enter phone number.

1. **Is the site considering limiting the geographic region that will work with QIC-AG?**

Yes:  No:  Too early to tell:

If yes, indicate which geographic region:

**Organizational Demographics Notes**:

## Population

1. **The table below reflects the number of children currently receiving an adoption or guardianship subsidy in your state. This data was provided to us from the Division of Children and Youth Policy, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. It is based on expenditures in FFY2013. In the notes section below, please let us know how closely these numbers reflect your records for FFY2013.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Per Site (State, County, Tribe) | Number of Children |
| **A. Total number of children receiving an adoption subsidy** | Click here to enter the number of Children. |
| IV-E reimbursable | Click here to enter the number of Children. |
| NOT IV-E reimbursable | Click here to enter the number of Children. |
| **B. Total number of children receiving a guardianship subsidy** | Click here to enter the number of Children. |
| IV-E reimbursable | Click here to enter the number of Children |
| NOT IV-E reimbursable | Click here to enter the number of children. |

**Notes on Population**:

## Data Capacity

1. **Please explain the current state of the following data sources.**

There are several types of data that will be required for sites to participate. These data are required to be submitted. Each type of data is defined below. Following the definitions, please provide a response to the availability and quality of each source of data listed below. *Note: This can range, for instance, from “this is data that is currently being collected and can easily be shared with the QIC-AG” to “We do not currently collect these data, and need assistance in developing a data collection system”, or something in between.*

***A. Recertification/annual check-in*.** This is defined as the ability to reach (electronically or by mail) the subsidy population (all families receiving adoption or guardianship subsidies), and ask caregivers to respond to a series of questions about their experiences as an adoptive parent or legal guardian, and share that information with the QIC-AG. For this to occur, sites will need current contact information for all adoptive parents and guardians in the subsidy population.

***Comment on availability and quality of these data:***

***B. Files that link pre-adoption IDs to post adoption IDs***. One of the challenges in tracking and understanding the long-term outcomes for children who transition from state custody through adoption is the lack, or inadequacy, of linking the IDs for children and youth in foster care with their adoption IDs. Foster-adoption link files allow for the linkages between foster and adoption IDs. These data will be used to track children who returned to state custody because of discontinuity of the placement (dissolution, post permanency disruption, or death/incapacitation) after an adoption or guardianship has been finalized.

***Comment on availability and quality of these data:***

***C. AFCARS and NCANDS data***. All states submit copies of the AFCARS and NCANDS files to the federal government. As a requirement for submission of the AFCARS and NCANDS data, child ID’s are encrypted prior to submitting the data to ACF. For this project, sites are required to supply a link file or encryption code so that AFCARS and NCANDS files can be linked back to SACWIS systems or other data supplied for the project.

***Comment on availability and quality of these data:***

***D. Adoption and guardianship subsidy files*.** These files will contain a list of all children receiving an adoption or guardianship subsidy through the child welfare system. It should include the start and end dates of the subsidy payments, IDs necessary to link these data to the AFCARS data, and will be submitted on a regular basis.

***Comment on availability and quality of these data:***

***E. Pre- and post-permanency service outputs and outcomes.***This is defined as the ability to track outputs of services being provided, for example, the number of children receiving a specific service, the specific services being offered, number of referrals to specific programs, percent of the people referred who accessed the service. It also includes the ability to track outcomes related to participating in a specific services, for example: improved skill level and increased knowledge.

***Comment on availability and quality of these data:***

**2**. **The QIC-AG is interested in what is known about disruptions, dissolutions, children currently receiving post-permanency services, and non-child welfare adoptions. For each of these items, we would like to determine what it would take to help you build a system to track these items.**

***A. Disruption:*** The term describes an adoption or guardianship that ends after the child a child is placed in an adoptive or guardianship home, but before the adoption or guardianship is legally finalized.

**Describe current efforts to track disruptions and what is known about the number of adoption or guardianship placements that disrupt before finalization:**

**Describe what it takes to build tracking system:**

***B. Dissolution:*** The term describes an adoption or guardianship in which the legal relationship that has been established between the child and the adoptive parent or guardian is legally severed.

**Describe current efforts to track dissolutions and what is known about the number of adoption and guardianships that dissolve**:

**Describe what it takes to build tracking system:**

***C. Children receiving post-permanency services:*** This includes children who were adopted or exited care through guardianship, and children who were adopted internationally.

**Describe current efforts to track children receiving post permanency services and what is known about the population:**

**Describe what it takes to build tracking system:**

***D. Non-child welfare adoptions:*** What do you know about children adopted internationally or through private domestic adoption in your site?

**Describe current efforts to track non-child welfare adoptions and what is known about the population:**

**Describe what it takes to build tracking system:**

**3. Does your site have the internal capacity to do evaluation/research?** Yes:  No:  Other:

**If yes or other, please describe:**

**Data Capacity Notes**:

## Continuum of Services/Intervention

1. **Provide a summary of the pre and post adoption and guardianship services including any unique characteristics that would diminish or augment the sites ability to support the goals of the QIC-AG.**
2. **Please indicate below the pre- and post- permanency services that are currently available to address the needs of the target population (*Please refer to the Continuum of Service Document to help complete column three, “Continuum of Service Category”.)***

**A. Service/Program Name:** Click here to enter text.

**Description:**

**Continuum of Service Category 1:** Choose an item.

**Continuum of Service Category 2:** Choose an item.

**Continuum of Service Category 3:** Choose an item.

**Provider Agency:**

**Funding Source 1:** Choose an item.

**Funding Source 2:** Choose an item.

**Funding Source 3:** Choose an item.

**Funding Source 4:** Choose an item.

**Perceived Quality:** Choose an item.

**Additional Information:**

**B. Service/Program Name:** Click here to enter text.

**Description:**

**Continuum of Service Category 1:** Choose an item.

**Continuum of Service Category 2:** Choose an item.

**Continuum of Service Category 3:** Choose an item.

**Provider Agency:**

**Funding Source 1:** Choose an item.

**Funding Source 2:** Choose an item.

**Funding Source 3:** Choose an item.

**Funding Source 4:** Choose an item.

**Perceived Quality:** Choose an item.

**Additional Information:**

**C. Service/Program Name:** Click here to enter text.

**Description:**

**Continuum of Service Category 1:** Choose an item.

**Continuum of Service Category 2:** Choose an item.

**Continuum of Service Category 3:** Choose an item.

**Provider Agency:**

**Funding Source 1:** Choose an item.

**Funding Source 2:** Choose an item.

**Funding Source 3:** Choose an item.

**Funding Source 4:** Choose an item.

**Perceived Quality:** Choose an item.

**Additional Information:**

**D. Service/Program Name:** Click here to enter text.

**Description:**

**Continuum of Service Category 1:** Choose an item.

**Continuum of Service Category 2:** Choose an item.

**Continuum of Service Category 3:** Choose an item.

**Provider Agency:**

**Funding Source 1:** Choose an item.

**Funding Source 2:** Choose an item.

**Funding Source 3:** Choose an item.

**Funding Source 4:** Choose an item.

**Perceived Quality:** Choose an item.

**Additional Information:**

1. **Does the site provide post-permanency services to children who achieve permanence through international adoptions?**

Yes:  No:  Other:  (explain):

1. **Does the site provide post-permanency services to children who achieve permanence though private domestic adoptions?**

Yes:  No:  Other:  (explain):

1. **If multiple agencies provide post-permanency services, is there a formal mechanism for coordinating service provision?**

Yes:  No:  Other:  (explain):

1. **Indicate if the site prefers to implement an intervention that focuses on the pre-permanence or post-permanence side of the Continuum of Services?**

Pre Post No Preference

**If Pre or Post please describe**

1. **Is there a specific intervention (s) your site would like to implement?**

Yes:  No:

**If yes, please describe:**

1. **If yes, is the site willing to consider other interventions?**

Yes:  No:  N/A:

**Continuum of Services notes**:

## Organizational and Evaluation Readiness

1. **Does involvement in this project support the sites existing vision, mission, strategic plan, practice model, current initiatives, or PIP goals?** Yes:  No:

**If yes, please describe:**

1. **Does the site have any experience running a successful pilot project of a promising practice or implementing an existing evidence-based practice?**

Yes:  No:  Don’t Know:

**If yes, please describe:**

1. **Does the site have any experience implementing best practices using an RCT or other rigorous evaluation design?**

Yes:  No:  Don’t Know:

**If yes, please describe**:

1. **Does the site have any concerns about evaluating an intervention using a RCT or other rigorous evaluation design?**

Yes:  No:

**If yes, please explain**:

1. **Is there an existing champion for post-permanency supports and services?**

Yes:  No:  Don’t Know:

**If yes, indicate name and title:**

1. **Are their external issues that may enhance or detract from site’s ability to implement the intervention including political climate, inter-agency issues, and lawsuits?**

Yes:  No:  Don’t Know:

**If yes, please describe:**

1. **Are there internal issues that may impact the site’s ability to implement intervention including other major initiatives, TA, consent decrees, leadership longevity/turnover?**

Yes:  No:  Don’t Know:

**If yes, please describe:**

1. **Is the site willing to assist with the dissemination of findings related to both the QIC-AG implementation process and outcomes?**

Yes:  No:  Other:  (explain):

1. **Does the site have experience disseminating information on programs to other child welfare systems, academics, or stakeholders?**

Yes:  No:

**If yes, please describe:**

1. **If the site has partnerships with external agencies to supply pre and post-permanency services, is it likely that these entities will support involvement with the QIC-AG?**

Yes:  No:  Don’t Know:  N/A:

## **Organizational and Evaluation Readiness notes**:

## Sustainability

The section will capture information pertaining to the feasibility of sustaining the operation of an effective intervention after the federal support has expired.

1. **Is the site willing to pursue alternative sources of funding to support the intervention after the terms of the project?**

Yes:  No:  Other:  (explain):

1. **Is there an existing circumstance that would prevent ascertaining funding?**

Yes:  No:  Other:  (explain): new state funds would need legislative approval

## **Sustainability notes**:

## Additional Information

**Please add any additional information that you feel is critical that may not have been captured anywhere else in the document.**

Appendix C: Initial Assessment Evaluation Rating Form Template

Site Selection Rating Form

Name of State:

Name of Rater:

Did the rater participate in site assessment? YES\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ NO\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I ORGANIZATIONAL READINESS ASSESSMENT**

A. Rate the level of engagement of the organizational leadership team at the initial assessment: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Points | Criteria |
| 5 | Exceptional. The leadership team was quick to respond to outreach by the QIC-AG in setting up the initial assessment. Leadership team was engaged in both of the initial assessment meetings, asked relevant questions, and seemed genuinely interested in the QIC-AG. |
| 4 | Good, strong. The leadership team was easy to work with in setting up the initial assessment, was available for most of the two initial assessment meetings, and seemed interested in the work of the QIC-AG. |
| 3 | Average. The leadership team showed interest, was helpful in arranging the meetings, but did not appear to be very invested in the initiative. |
| 2 | Below average. It took significant effort to engage the leadership team. There was limited engagement at the meetings. |
| 1 | Poor. There was no engagement with the leadership team. All contact and effort was initiated and maintained by QIC AG team. |

B. Rate the level of organizational leadership team preparedness for the initial assessment: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Points | Criteria |
| 5 | Exceptional. The initial assessment template was well-developed in advance of the meeting and shared with the QIC-AG. Responses were well thought-out and it was clear that the leadership team completing the assessment were invested in providing as much information as possible. |
| 4 | Good, strong. The initial assessment was well-developed. Most of the responses were well thought-out. Little confusion or dissent among the leadership team about the responses. |
| 3 | Average. It was difficult to gauge how prepared the leadership team was. They provided conflicting answers or did not seem to have the right people at the table to answer the questions. |
| 2 | Below average. Something seemed to be missing…Communication was difficult; people did not know internally what was going on among themselves. |
| 1 | Poor. It was not working….it was very difficult to get congruent and consistent answers and agreement was not possible. |

C. How well does the work of the QIC-AG fit with the organizational mission or vision? \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Points | Criteria |
| 5 | Very well aligned |
| 4 | Good alignment |
| 3 | Average |
| 2 | Not well aligned |
| 1 | No alignment |

D. Is there a geographic area that the site would like to focus on?

YES\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ NO\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

If yes, please describe:

**II EVALUATION READINESS ASSESSMENT**

A. Rate the site’s internal capacity to do evaluation or research: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Points | Criteria |
| 5 | Exceptional |
| 4 | Good, strong |
| 3 | Average |
| 2 | Below average |
| 1 | Poor |

B.Rate the site’s external capacity (has existing relationship outside the agency) to do evaluation or research: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Points | Criteria |
| 5 | Exceptional |
| 4 | Good, strong |
| 3 | Average |
| 2 | Below average |
| 1 | Poor |

C. Rate the level of experience with RCTs: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Points | Criteria |
| 5 | Have conducted multiple RCTs in their site, including at least one large-scale RCT |
| 4 | Have conducted at least one large-scale RCT in their site |
| 3 | Have conducted a pilot RCT |
| 2 | Have never conducted an RCT |
| 1 | Will not or cannot do an RCT |

D. Rate willingness to conduct an RCT : \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Points | Criteria |
| 5 | They see the value of experimental designs and are willing to conduct an RCT |
| 4 | The see the advantages of an RCT and are willing to consider it |
| 3 | They are cautious about conducting an RCT |
| 2 | They object to an RCTs |
| 1 | Will not/cannot do an RCT |

E. Are there external issues that impact the site’s ability to implement an evaluable intervention?

YES\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ NO\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

If yes, please explain:

F. Are there internal issues that impact the site’s ability to implement an evaluable intervention?

YES\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ NO\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

If yes, please explain:

G. Rate the level of experience with implementing promising practice or EBP?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Points | Criteria |
| 5 | Lots of experience |
| 4 | Moderate amount experience |
| 3 | Some experience |
| 2 | Little experience |
| 1 | No experience |

**III DATA CAPACITY**

A. Rate the data capacity:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Data Source  Availability of data, *please check one*: | Can supply now | Needs to be developed | Has capacity to develop |
| Foster-adoption link files |  |  |  |
| Active subsidy population |  |  |  |
| AFCARS data |  |  |  |
| NCANDS data |  |  |  |
| Annual check-in |  |  |  |
| Ability to track disruptions |  |  |  |
| Ability to track dissolutions |  |  |  |
| Ability to track children receiving post-permanency services |  |  |  |

B. List 3 strengths regarding data capacity:

1.

2.

3.

C. List 3 weaknesses regarding data capacity:

1.

2.

3.

**IV CONTINUUM OF SERVICES**

A. How much work would it take to build a pre-permanence continuum (targeted services)? (circle one)

* Minimal work, much of it is already in place
* Some work, but good foundation
* A ton of work, nothing is in place

B. How much work would it take to build a post-permanence continuum? (circle one)

* Minimal work, much of it is already in place
* Some work, but good foundation
* A ton of work, nothing is in place

C. Does the same agency administer both pre and post permanency services?

YES\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ NO\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ OTHER (please explain):\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

D. How flexible is the site in the selection of their intervention? (circle one)

* They have a clear idea of a pre-permanence intervention that they want to implement
* They have a clear idea of a post-permanence intervention that they want to implement
* They have given it some thought, are open to suggestions, but want to focus on pre-permanence
* They have given it some thought, are open to suggestions, but want to focus on post-permanence
* They are open to suggestions

E. List three key initiatives that are in place for pre and post adoption and guardianship supports and services:

PRE-PERMANENCE

1.

2.

3.

POST-PERMANENCE

1.

2.

3.

F. Services for non-child welfare adoptions

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Availability of services, *please check one*: | Currently offers | Does not offer | Has capacity to offer |
| International adoptions |  |  |  |
| Private domestic adoptions |  |  |  |

G. List 3 strengths regarding the continuum of services:

1.

2.

3.

H. List 3 weaknesses regarding the continuum of services:

1.

2.

3.

**V. OVERALL SITE ASSESSMENT**

A. How do you rate this site overall?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Points | Criteria |
| 5 | Exceptional |
| 4 | Good, strong |
| 3 | Average |
| 2 | Below average |
| 1 | Poor |

B. Would you recommend that this site move to full assessment?

YES\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ NO\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ UNSURE\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

***Comments:***