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:***