



**NATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER  
FOR FOSTER CARE  
& PERMANENCY PLANNING**

at the Hunter College  
School of Social Work

# **INFORMATION PACKET: *Placement Stability***

By Kristine Schuerger

**AUGUST 2002**

# INFORMATION PACKET

## *Placement Stability*

*Prepared by Kristine Schuerger, MSW Intern, NRCFCPP*

---

### INTRODUCTION

An Indianapolis Star editorial – Feb. 11, 2000

#### **Foster Cycling**

By age 10, Amanda had joined 13 families.

She and three younger brothers entered Indiana's foster care system in 1992 because of parental neglect. By December, Amanda had lived in 11 foster homes and had been removed from one adoptive family because of abuse. Combined with the removal from her birth parents' home, Amanda had moved on average once every nine months for the first 10 years of her life.

Her brothers had fared little better. One had been in nine foster homes; the other two in eight.

The siblings had been apart for so long that they had little emotional attachment to one another. To help them forge bonds, their adoption caseworker began taking them on weekly outings.

But the children and more than 11,400 others like them in the state's foster care and institutional systems are at risk of never being able to bond with anyone.

For years, studies have warned about the dangers of children drifting among foster homes. The American Psychiatric Association in 1994 specifically cited foster care drift as a cause of reactive attachment disorder in its Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders.

The inability to bond with others can have devastating consequences. Researchers have referred to children who've experienced multiple placements as "psychopaths in the making."

A study by the National Association of Social Workers found that 80 percent of inmates in Illinois prisons had at one time been foster children. Other studies have found disproportionate numbers of former foster children in homeless missions, runaway shelters and drug and alcohol rehabilitation clinics.

The break up of the American family seems to be the leading cause of not only imprisonment but drug usage and emotional illness.

The more kids raised in broken homes, sent to foster care, or even raised by single moms seems to be the fuel that is causing our social structure to be so dysfunctional.

Even though caseworkers know of the consequences, they still frequently move children from home to home. Child advocates say the moves are seldom warranted and at times violate state policy.

"Caseworkers still move kids because they've become 'too attached' to their foster parents," says James Kenny, a Rensselaer psychologist and a foster parent for 25 years. "I want to tell them, 'You've become too attached to your husband. We're going to give you a new one tonight.'"

Yet, caseworkers are not solely to blame. The problems are systemic, and the responsibility for continuing to allow children to wander among homes must be spread throughout the Division of Family and Children.

---

**Contained in this Information Packet on *Placement Stability* are:**

- **Fact Sheets**
- **Identification of Best Practices**
- **Review of Policies and Legislation**
- **References and Suggested Readings**
- **Web Resources**

---

## **Placement Stability**

### ***Fact Sheet #1 - Statistics***

---

Excerpted from: [Child Welfare Outcomes 1999: Annual Report](#)

□ **What was the variation among States in the rate of children entering the foster care system in FY 1999?**

States varied with respect to the rate of entry into foster care per 1,000 children in the state population. This variation was found to be unrelated to State variations in the rate of child victims, the percentages of children living in poverty, and the percentages of children living in metropolitan areas. The rate of entry into foster care for children of color per 1,000 children of color in the population was higher in all States than the rate of entry for Caucasian children...In all States, more children entered than exited foster care in FY 1999. In 16 States, the difference between entries and exits exceeded 20 percent, while in 17 States the difference was 10 percent or less.

□ **What was the variation among States in the median length of stay of children in foster care on the last day of FY 1999?**

Median length of stay in foster care ranged widely across States. In general, the median length of stay was longer for children in care on the last day of FY 1999 than it was for children who exited foster care in FY 1999...The median length of stay of children in foster care on the last day of FY 1999 ranged from 9.9 months in Florida to 40.9 months in Illinois, with a median of 16.5 months.

□ **What was the variation among State child welfare systems with respect to their success in achieving permanency for children?**

Although States demonstrated some differences in the percentages of children exiting to permanent homes through reunification with their families, adoption, or guardianship, the vast majority of children who left the foster care system in FY 1999 exited to permanent homes. However, children who were older than 12 years at the time of entry into foster care were less likely than other children to exit to permanent homes and more likely to exit to emancipation...The percentages of children exiting foster care to reunification with their families ranged from 30.8 in Illinois to 84.7 in Idaho, with a median of 66.3. IN 7 States, at least 7r percent of exits from foster care were reunifications. Exits to adoption ranged from 4.6 percent in Wyoming to 45.6 percent in Illinois, with a median of 12.5 percent. Only one state reported a greater percentage of adoptions than reunifications. The percentages of children who did not exit to adoption, reunification, or guardianship ranged from 4.3 in Maine to 22.8 in Wisconsin, with a median of 10.1.

□ **What was the variation among States in reunifying children in a timely manner?**

Although most states appear to achieve reunifications in a timely manner, a significant positive correlation was found between the percentage of reunifications in FY 1999 occurring within 12 months of entry into foster care and the percentage of entries into foster care in FY 1999 that were reentries within 12 months of a prior foster care episode... Although these data suggest that most states are reunifying children in a timely manner, when the incidence of reentries into care is considered, a different picture emerges. The percentages of entries into foster care in FY1999 that were reentries within 12 months of a prior episode ranged from 0 in West Virginia to 26.7 in Iowa, with a median of 10.8. For 9 states, 20 percent or more of entries into foster care were reentries within 12 months.

□ **What was the variation among States with respect to providing stable placements for children in foster care?**

In most states, the majority of children who are in foster care for fewer than 12 months experience no more than 2 placements while in care. However, children who are in care for more than 12 months often experience 3 or more placement settings... There is general agreement in the child welfare field that multiple placements of children while in foster care

do not promote positive growth and development. Of the 46 states reporting data for this measure, the percentages of children in foster care for fewer than 12 months who experienced no more than 2 placements ranged from 58.9 in Utah to 99.8 in West Virginia, with a median of 80.8. Despite these generally positive findings, the number of placements experienced by children increased with increasing time in foster care, with substantial percentages of children experiencing 3 or more placements while in foster care. For children who were in foster care for 48 or more months, the percentages experiencing no more than 2 placement settings ranged from 12.5 in Arizona to 90.6 in Puerto Rico, with a median of 37.0.

### *Summary of Findings...*

#### Outcome 6: Increase Placement Stability

Most states appear to be doing a good job of limiting the number of placement settings experienced by children who are in foster care for fewer than 12 months. However, as time in foster care increases, the percentage of children experiencing multiple placements also increases. For many states, greater efforts are needed to minimize the number of placement settings experienced by children, regardless of their time in foster care.

## **Placement Stability**

### ***Fact Sheet #2 – Placement Stability and Attachment Theory***

---

Taken From: Permanency Through Adoption for Children in Foster Care, by Pat Litzelfner, Ph.D.

The importance of permanency in the lives of abused or neglected children in the foster care system is recognized through attachment theories. The term “attachment” refers to the process of emotional bondage that occurs between two people. Human beings form their most important bond during the first year of life, the bond of infant to caregiver. If the infant’s emotional and physical needs are met, that infant learns to trust. If the needs, the cycle of trust is broken. These early attachments or lack of attachments forms the foundation for a child’s future psychological development and their relationship with others. A child with strong attachments is more likely to trust himself and the world around him/her. Attachment also helps a child to:

- Attain full intellectual potential
- Sort out what he perceives
- Think logically
- Develop a conscience
- Become self-reliant
- Cope with stress and frustration
- Handle fear and worry
- Develop future relationships
- Reduce Jealousy.

(Fahlberg, 1979 as cited in Magid, 1987)

Attachment is not always successful. The attachment process can be disrupted in any child’s life, but foster children who have been abused or neglected by their adult caregivers are particularly vulnerable. After entry in to the foster care system these children also often experience a lack or permanence in their lives by shifting from placement to placement. This lack of stability makes it extremely difficult to bond with anyone. Adoptive families are frequently uninformed about their child’s past history, and are thus unprepared to deal with these effects. Thus the adoption is at risk for disruption.

Detached children then often have trouble building relationships with others, and may grow up with a poor self-concept. They are also more likely to experience emotional disturbances and at the extreme end of the spectrum they are diagnosed with *attachment disorder*. Symptoms of this DSM-IV attachment disorder diagnosis include:

- Indiscriminately affectionate with strangers
- Destruction of self, others, things
- Cruel to animals, siblings
- Experience developmental lags
- Has poor peer relationships
- Engages in stealing or lying
- Lacks a conscience
- Inappropriately demanding or clinging

[cont next page]

#### Factors Associated with Successful Attachment for Adopted Children

- Youth (older children have a harder time adjusting to an adoptive home)
- A minimum number of moves and foster placements (frequent moves traumatize children)
- A permanency plan developed immediately after the child enters the system

- Pre-placement services to assess the family strengths and skills, and to ease the transition
- Full disclosure of the child’s history and a realistic appraisal of the disruption risk
- Post-placement intervention before problems become crisis
- Ongoing training and support for parents, lasting through adolescence in “special needs” adoptions

## **Placement Stability**

### ***Review of Policies and Legislation***

---

Taken from: Permanency for Children [Adapted from *Adoption 2002: Guidelines for Public Policy and State Legislation Governing Permanence for Children.*]  
<http://www.nysccc.org/linkfamily/PermanencyLegis.htm>

## LEGISLATIVE SUPPORTS FOR ACHIEVING PERMANENCY

"Permanency" means that a child has a safe, stable, custodial environment in which to grow up, and a life-long relationship with a nurturing caregiver. The concept of permanency has assumed a central place in American child welfare law and policy because permanency establishes the foundation for a child's healthy development. The basic needs of children include safety and protection; a sense of identity; validation of themselves as important and valued persons; stability and continuity of caregivers; an opportunity to learn and grow cognitively, physically and emotionally; and a protected custodial environment that is legally secure. Permanency, as epitomized by a safe, stable relationship with a nurturing caregiver, allows these basic needs to be met.

Permanency can be achieved in a number of ways. A child can be protected within his or her own home, or through reunification with his rehabilitated parents. Extended family can provide short or long term legally sanctioned care for the youngster through adoption or guardianship. Or, alternatively, a child can be adopted by non-relatives. Adoption is generally considered the optimal form of permanence when the biological parents are unable to provide a safe, stable, and nurturing home. However achieved, permanency is a cornerstone of American child welfare policy.

**Public Law 96-272, The Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980.** This was the first Federal statute to discourage excessive reliance on foster care placement and promote greater use of services to assist and rehabilitate families, preventing out of home placements. It introduced the concept of permanency planning and incorporated specified time frames for decision making for children and families.

**Public Law 103-66, The Family Preservation and Family Support Services Program** established in 1993 and amended in 1997, focused primarily on the front-end of the child welfare system by providing additional funding for preventive services and crisis services for children and families at risk. Implementation required active involvement of a broad community of stakeholders to focus on needs and services for children and families. The law also created the Court Improvement Program, and provided resources to state courts for the first time, to ensure that courts were responding to the needs of children in foster care. In effect, this legislation highlighted family services and prevention as a national priority, and provided opportunities for state agencies and courts to plan child welfare reforms.

**Multiethnic Placement Act (MEPA), (P.L. 103-382) and the Interethnic Placement Provisions (IEP), (P.L. 104-188).** Enacted in 1994, MEPA outlawed discriminatory practices, and, in 1996, the IEP clarified the original legislation and created sanctions for states and agencies which fail to comply with the act. MEPA forbids the delay or denial of a foster or adoptive placement solely on the basis of the race, color or national origin of the prospective foster parent, adoptive parent or the child involved. It also compels states to make diligent efforts to recruit and retain foster and adoptive families that reflect the racial and ethnic diversity of the children for whom homes are needed.

With the Interethnic Placement Provisions, Congress subsequently clarified MEPA and repealed that section of the law containing "permissible consideration" language which could have been used to obfuscate the law's intent. The amendment also dictates a penalty structure and corrective action planning for any state or private agency, which receives federal funds, that violates the amended section of the act. These two statutes are noteworthy for child welfare because they not

only required changes in laws and policy; they also required changes in child welfare practice to facilitate more timely placement of children into foster and adoptive homes.

**Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 (ASFA) (P.L. 105-89).** Enacted as an amendment to titles IV-B and IV-E, ASFA is the most comprehensive piece of legislation addressing critical permanency issues in child welfare and the law. The law was a bipartisan action to ensure that children's safety would be the paramount concern of all child welfare decision-making and to promote the adoption of children who cannot return safely to their own homes. The purposes of ASFA were to shorten the length of time a child spends in foster care, speed up the process of freeing children for adoption, clarify reasonable efforts requirements and hold states and counties accountable.

### **PERMANENCY PLACEMENT OPTIONS UNDER ASFA**

*Adapted from "Legal Issues Under ASFA", Erie County ABA Permanency Planning Project*

- **Return to Parent:** Timeframe must be specified in the plan, all services must be explored and offered, all relevant information must be present to the court, and non-safety issues preventing reunification identified.
- **Termination of Parental Rights with Placement for Adoption:** Adoptive resources recruitment begun as soon as TPR filed, current caretakers or relatives provided information and support re; adoption option and surrender and/or open adoption explored.
- **Referred for Legal Guardianship:** Transfers right to protection, education, care and control, custody and decision making; limited state supervision; adoption thoroughly explored first; future interactions between guardian and biological parents discussed; financial ability to care for child and available supports explored.
- **Permanent Relative Placement:** Adoption and guardianship explored first; determination made this is best plan weighed against more permanent options, quality of the relationship. Long term commitment and ability to meet child's needs assessed.
- **Alternate Planned Permanent Living Arrangement:** Compelling reasons must be documented such as a significant bond with parent, but parent can't care for child due to disability. Long term foster care is not an appropriate option under ASFA.

**Individual assessment of placement must occur at each permanency hearing!**

---

### **Child and Family Service Reviews And Title IV-E Foster Care Eligibility Reviews Fact Sheet**

*[Taken From: [Children's Bureau](#)]*

#### **History**

The 1994 Amendments to the Social Security Act (SSA) authorize the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) to review State child and family service

programs to ensure conformance with the requirements in titles IV-B and IV-E of the SSA. Traditionally, reviews have focused primarily on assessing State agencies' compliance with procedural requirements, as evidenced by case file documentation, rather than on the results of services and States' capacity to create positive outcomes for children and families. In addition, reviews have not provided States with opportunities for making improvements before penalties have been imposed.

On January 25, 2000, the DHHS published a final rule in the *Federal Register* to establish a new approach to monitoring State child welfare programs. Under the rule, which became effective March 25, 2000, States will be assessed for substantial conformity with certain Federal requirements for child protective, foster care, adoption, family preservation and family support, and independent living services. The Children's Bureau, part of the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) within DHHS, is administering the new review system. The system comprises two review components: (1) child and family services and (2) title IV-E foster care eligibility reviews.

### **Purpose**

The new child and family services reviews are an important tool that will enable the Children's Bureau to accomplish the following: (1) ensure conformity with Federal child welfare requirements; (2) determine what is actually happening to children and families as they are engaged in child welfare services; and (3) assist States to enhance their capacity to help children and families achieve positive outcomes.

Ultimately, the goal of the reviews is to help States to improve child welfare services and achieve the following outcomes for families and children who receive services:

### **Safety**

- Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.
- Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.

### **Permanency**

- Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.
- The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for families.

### **Family and Child Well-Being**

- Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.
- Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.
- Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.

The Federal government will conduct the reviews in partnership with State child welfare agency staff; peer consultants will round out the review teams. The reviews are structured to help States identify strengths and areas for improvement within their agencies and

programs. Technical assistance will be provided to the States to help them make improvements in identified areas.

### **National Standards**

The regulations at 45 CFR 1355.31-37, set forth the requirements for the child and family service reviews, including the establishment of national standards for certain statewide data indicators that will be used, in part, to determine a State's substantial conformity under titles IV-B and IV-E of the Social Security Act.<sup>2</sup> The determination of a State's substantial conformity is based on a review of certain outcomes and systemic factors using quantitative and qualitative data. A State that is found not to be operating in substantial conformity based on a CFS review has an opportunity for program improvement prior to the withholding of any Federal funds.

The national standards are based on information that is reported by States to the Detailed Case Data Component of the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System (NCANDS) and the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS).

### **Statewide Data Indicators**

In the preamble to the final rule, we listed seven statewide data indicators under the outcomes of safety and permanency that we intended to use in the child and family service reviews.<sup>3</sup> We are using only six of those indicators in determinations of substantial conformity at this point. Those six statewide data indicators are as follows:

- Recurrence of maltreatment
- Incidence of child abuse and/or neglect in foster care
- Foster care re-entries
- Length of time to achieve reunification
- Length of time to achieve adoption
- Stability of foster care placement<sup>4</sup>

ie;     Statewide Data Indicator:                             National Standard: 86.7%  
          Stability of Foster Care Placement

Description: A state meets the national standard for this indicator if of all children who have been in foster care less twelve months from the time of removal, 86.7% or more children had no more than two placement settings.

## **Placement Stability**

### *Best Practices*

---

*Taken From: [National Governors Association – Center for Best Practices](#)*

### **Improving Foster Care Placements**

Two critical pieces to child well-being in the foster care system are safe and stable short-term settings for foster children; and permanent homes for those who are ineligible for adoption. However, because the pool of available foster families is steadily declining across the country at the same time the number of children coming into care is increasing, states are facing a difficult

challenge in placing foster children appropriately. Limited resources hinder states' success in recruiting and retaining foster parents. Title IV-E of the Social Security Act provides the majority of federal funds for foster care, but these are strictly earmarked for direct costs of out-of-home placements, such as room and board. Therefore, support services for foster parents, kinship caregivers, and families must be paid for with a limited pool of alternative federal funding or solely by states and local communities.

Title IV-E waivers are a key tool by which some state and local agencies provide more flexible support services with federal funds. The Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 includes a waiver provision that allows up to 10 states a year between fiscal years 1998 and 2002 to design and test new approaches to improve the delivery, effectiveness and efficiency of services in the child welfare system.

[Click Here](#) to read how some states are using these waivers and other strategies to recruit more foster parents and to increase alternative placement settings for foster children.

---

*Taken From: [Shortening Children's Stays in Temporary Care, Innovative Programs, Part Two](#)  
[Annie E. Casey Foundation](#)*

In the fall of 1995, the Annie E. Casey Foundation began working with NACAC to explore ways to prevent long stays in foster care and to provide viable permanency options for children who could not return to their birth parents... We identified a number of innovative permanency planning practices to inform the work of Family to Family sites and other looking for new solutions to old struggles.

As this publication is designed to give an overview of each program's main components, those interested in learning more about a particular process are encouraged to contact the program directly. Far from an exhaustive list of innovative programs, this collection simply represents some of the best permanency planning work we have identifies.

[Click Here](#) to view list of innovative programs.

---

## **Placement Stability**

### *References and Suggested Readings*

---

- ↪ Adler, L.S. (2001). The meanings of permanence: A critical analysis of the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997. Harvard Journal on Legislation, 38(1), 1-36.
- ↪ American Academy of Pediatrics (2000). Developmental issues for young children in foster care. Pediatrics, 106(5), 1145-1150.
- ↪ Barbell, K. & Wright, L. (Eds.). (2001). Family foster care in the next century. Washington, DC: Child Welfare League of America.

- ↪ Barber, J.G., Delfabbro, P.H. & Cooper, L.L. (2001). The predictors of unsuccessful transition to foster care. Journal of Child Psychology & Psychiatry & Applied Disciplines, 42(6), 785-790.
- ↪ Barth, R.P., Courtney, M., Berrick, J.D., & Albert, V. (1994). From child abuse to permanency planning: Child welfare services pathways and placements. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- ↪ Beeman, S.K., Kim, H. & Bullerdick, S.K. (2000). Factors affecting placement of children in kinship and nonkinship foster care. Children and Youth Services Review, 22(1), 37-54.
- ↪ Cahn, K. & Johnson, P. (Eds.). (1993). Children can't wait: Reducing delays in out-of-home care. Washington, DC: Child Welfare League of America.
- ↪ Catalano, R.A., Lind, S.L., & Rosenblatt, A.B. (1999). Unemployment and foster home placements: Estimating the net effect of provocation and inhibition. American Journal of Public Health, 89(6), 851-855.
- ↪ Courtney, M.E. (2000). Research needed to improve the prospects for children in out-of-home placements. Children and Youth Services Review, 22(9/11), 743-761.
- ↪ Courtney, M.E. (1995). Reentry to foster care of children returned to their families. Social Service Review, 69(2), 226-241.
- ↪ Cox, R.S. (1998). Foster care reform: Can new approaches stem the crisis? CQ-Researcher, 8(1), 3-23.
- ↪ Davis, I.P., Landsverk, J.A. & Newton, R.R. (1997). Duration of foster care for children reunified within the first year of care. In J. Berrick, R. Barth & N. Gilbert (Eds.). Child welfare research review, vol. 2. New York: Columbia University Press.
- ↪ Dore, M.M. & Eisner, E. (1993). Child-related dimensions of placement stability in treatment foster care. Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 10(4), 301-317.
- ↪ Evans, B. (1997). Youth in foster care: The shortcomings of child protection services. New York: Garland.
- ↪ Farmer, E.Z., Burns, B.J., Chapman, M.V., Phillips, S.D., Angold, A. & Costello, E.J. (2001). Use of mental health services by youth in contact with social services. Social Service Review, 75(4), 605-624.
- ↪ Fein, E. & Maluccio, A.N. (1992). Permanency planning: Another remedy in jeopardy. Social Service Review, 66, 334-348.
- ↪ Fein, E, Maluccio, A.N. & Kluger, M.P. (1990). No more partings: An examination of long-term foster care. Washington, DC: Child Welfare League of America.
- ↪ Festinger, T. & Botsko, M. (1994). Returning to care: Discharge and reentry in foster care. Washington, DC: Child Welfare League of America.

- ↪ Festinger, T. (1996). Going home and returning to foster care. Children and Youth Services review, 18(4/5), 383-402.
- ↪ Frame, L. et al. (2000). Understanding reentry to out-of-home care for reunified infants. Child Welfare, 79(4), 339-369.
- ↪ Garwood, M.M. & Close, W. (2001). Identifying the psychological needs of foster children. Child Psychiatry & Human Development, 32(2), 125-135.
- ↪ Gendell, S. (2001). In search of permanency: A reflection on the first 3 years of the Adoption and Safe Families Act implementation. Family Court Review.
- ↪ Goerge, R., Wulczyn, F & Harden, A. (1996). New comparative insights into states and their foster children. Public Welfare, 54(3), 12-25.
- ↪ Hegar, R.L. & Scannapieco, M. (Eds.). (1999). Kinship foster care: Policy, practice, and research. New York: Oxford University Press.
- ↪ Henry, J. (1999). Permanency outcomes in legal guardianships of abused/neglected children. Families in Society, 80(6), 561-568.
- ↪ Inkelas, M. & Halfon, N. (1997). Recidivism in child protective services. Children and Youth Services Review, 19(3), 139-161.
- ↪ Jones, L. (1993). Decision making in child welfare: A critical review of the literature. Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 10, 241-262.
- ↪ Keller, T.E. et al. (2001). Competencies and problem behaviors of children in family foster care: Variations by kinship placement status and race. Children and Youth Services review, 23(12), 915-940.
- ↪ Kemp, S.P. & Bodonyi, J.M. (2000). Infants who stay in foster care: Child characteristics and permanency outcomes of legally free children first placed as infants. Child and Family Social Work, 5(2), 95-106.
- ↪ Kenrick, J. (2000). 'Be a kid': The traumatic impact of repeated separations on children who are fostered and adopted. Journal of Child Psychotherapy, 26(3), 393-412.
- ↪ Lee, R.E. & Lynch, M.T. (1998). Combating foster care drift: An ecosystemic treatment model for neglect cases. Contemporary Family Therapy, 20(3), 351-370.
- ↪ Leslie, L.K., Landsverk, J., Ezzet-Lofstrom, R., Tschann, J.M., Slymen, D.J. & Garland, A.F. (2000). Children in foster care: Factors influencing outpatient mental health service use. Child Abuse and Neglect, 24(4), 465-476.
- ↪ Lindsey, D. (1994). The welfare of children. New York: Oxford University Press.
- ↪ Lindsey, E.W. (2001). Foster family characteristics and behavioral and emotional problems of foster children: practice implications for child welfare, family life education, and marriage and family therapy. Family Relations, 50(1), 19-22.

- ↪ McAuley, C. (1996). Children in long-term foster care: Emotional and social development. Brookfield, VT: Ashgate.
- ↪ McAuley, C. & Trew, K. (2000). Children's adjustment in foster care: Cross-informant agreement, stability and placement disruption. British Journal of Social Work, 30(1), 91-107.
- ↪ McDonald, T.P., Allen, R.I., Westerfelt, A. & Piliavin, I. (1996). Assessing the long-term effects of foster care: A research synthesis. Washington, DC: CWLA Press.
- ↪ McDonald, T.P., Berry, M., Patterson, E. & Scott, D. (2000). Adoption trends in Kansas: Managing outcomes or managing care? Children and Youth Services Review, 22(2), 161-174.
- ↪ Minty, B. (2000). A review of the effects of living long-term in substitute care in the context of a discussion of outcome criteria. Social Work & Social Sciences Review, 8(3), 169-193.
- ↪ Moffatt, P.G. & thoburn J. (2001). Outcomes of permanent family placement for children of minority ethnic origin. Child & family Social Work, 6(1), 13-21.
- ↪ Newton, R.R., Litrownik, A.J. & Landsverk, J.A. (2000). Children and youth in foster care: Disentangling the relationship between problem behaviors and number of placements. Child Abuse and Neglect, 24(10), 1363- 1374.
- ↪ O'Brien, P. Massat, C.R. & Gleeson, J.P. (2001). Upping the ante: Relative caregivers' perceptions of changes in child welfare policies. Child Welfare, 80(6), 719-748.
- ↪ Pearce, J.W. (2001). Psychotherapeutic approaches to children in foster care: Guidance from attachment theory. Child Psychiatry & Human Development, 32(1), 19-44.
- ↪ Poertner, J., Bussey, M. & Fluke, J. (1999). How safe are out-of-home placements? Children and Youth Services Review, 21(7), 549-563.
- ↪ Redding, R.E., Fried, C. & Britner, P.A. (2000). Predictors of placement outcomes in treatment foster care: Implications for foster parent selection and service delivery. Journal of Child & Family Studies, 9(4), 425-447.
- ↪ Schuerman, J., Rossi, P.H. & Budde, S. (1999). Decisions on placement and family preservation: Agreement and targeting. Evaluation Review, 23(6), 599-618.
- ↪ Sheppard, V.B., Benjamin-Coleman, R. (2001). Determinants of service placements for youth with serious emotional and behavioral disturbances. Community Mental Health Journal, 37(1), 53-65.
- ↪ Smith, D.K. et al. (2001). Placement disruption in treatment foster care. Jouranal of Emotional & Behavioral Disorders, 9(3), 200-205.
- ↪ Stein, T.J. (2000). The Adoption and Safe Families Act: Creating a false dichotomy between parents' rights and children's rights. Families in Society, 81(6), 586-592.

- ↪ Stuck, E.N., Small, R.W. & Ainsworth, F. (2000). Questioning the continuum of care toward a reconceptualization of child welfare services. Residential Treatment for Children & Youth, 17(3), 79-92.
- ↪ Terling-Watt, T. (2001). Permanency in kinship care: An exploration of disruption rates and factors associated with placement disruption. Children & Youth Services Review, 23(2), 111-126.
- ↪ Testa, M.F. (2001). Kinship care and permanency. Journal of Social Service Research, 28(1), 25-43.
- ↪ Triseliotis, J. (2002). Long-term foster care or adoption? The evidence examined. Child and Family Social Work, 7(1), 35-45.
- ↪ Usher, C.L., Randolph, K.A. & Gogan, H.C. (1999). Placement patterns in foster care. Social Service review, 73(1), 22-36.
- ↪ Vogel, C.A. (1999). Using administrative databases to examine factors affecting length of stay in substitute care. Children and Youth Services Review, 21(8), 677-690.
- ↪ Waterhouse, S. & Brocklesby, E. (2001). Placement choice in temporary foster care: A research study. Adoption & Fostering, 25(3), 39-46.
- ↪ Webster, D., Barth, R.P. & Needell, B. (2000). Placement stability for children in out-of-home care: A longitudinal analysis. Child Welfare, 79(5), 614-632.
- ↪ Weil, T.P. (1998). Children at risk: Outcome and cost measures needed. Journal of Health and Human Services Administration, 21, 92-108.
- ↪ Wells, K. & Guo, S. (1999). Reunification and reentry of foster children. Children and Youth Services review, 21(4), 273-294.
- ↪ Whittaker, J.K. (2000). Reinventing residential childcare: An agenda for research and practice. Residential Treatment for Children & Youth, 17(3), 13-30.
- ↪ Wilson, L. & Conroy, J. (1999). Satisfaction of children in out-of-home care. Child Welfare, 78(1), 53-69.
- ↪ Wulczyn, F. (1991). Caseload dynamics and foster care reentry. Social Service Review, 65, 133-56.
- ↪ Wulczyn, F.H., Hislop, K.B. & Goerge, R.M. (2000). Foster care dynamics 1983-1998: Alabama, California, Illinois, Iowa, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, and Wisconsin. An update from the multi-state foster care data archive. Chicago, IL: The Chapin Hall center for Children, University of Chicago.
- ↪ Zima, B.T. et al. (2000). Help-seeking steps and service use for children in foster care. Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research, 27(3), 271-285.

- ↪ Zima, B.T. et al. (2000). Behavior problems, academic skill delays and school failure among school-aged children in foster care: Their relationship to placement characteristics. Journal of Child & Family Studies, 9(1), 87-103.
- ↪ Zlotnick, C., Kronstadt, D., & Klee, L. (1998). Foster care children and family homelessness. American Journal of Public Health, 88(9), 1368-1370.
- ↪ Zuravin, S. & DePanfilis, D. (1999). Predictors of child protective service intake decisions: Case closure, referral to continuing services, or foster care placement. In P.A. Curtis, G. Dale, Jr., & J.C. Kendall (Eds.). The foster care crisis: Translating research into policy and practice (pp. 63-83). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

## **Placement Stability**

### *Web Resources*

---

#### *National Organizations*

##### [Annie E. Casey Foundation](#)

The Annie E. Casey Foundation is a private charitable organization dedicated to helping build better futures for disadvantaged children in the United States. It was established in 1948 by Jim Casey, one of the founders of United Parcel Service, and his siblings, who named the Foundation in honor of their mother. The primary mission of the Foundation is to foster public

policies, human-service reforms, and community supports that more effectively meet the needs of today's vulnerable children and families.

See: [Family to Family Reform Initiative](#)  
[\[CONTACT\]](#)

### [The Brookings Institution](#)

In its research, The Brookings Institution functions as an independent analyst and critic, committed to publishing its findings for the information of the public. In its conferences and activities, it serves as a bridge between scholarship and public policy, bringing new knowledge to the attention of decisionmakers and affording scholars a better insight into public policy issues.

See: [Children in Out-of-Home Placements](#)  
[\[CONTACT\]](#)

### [Children's Rights](#)

CHILDREN'S RIGHTS, a national nonprofit organization, is at the forefront in the fight for the rights of poor children in the custody of child welfare agencies across the country. With an annual budget of nearly two million dollars, a staff of seasoned litigators, and a growing public policy department, Children's Rights combines the power of the courts and the assistance of expert partners to improve services for abused and neglected children.

See: [Policy & Research](#)  
[\[CONTACT\]](#)

### [Casey Family Programs](#)

Casey Family Programs provides an array of services for children and youth, with foster care as its core. Casey services include adoption, guardianship, kinship care (being cared for by extended family), and family reunification (reuniting children with birth families). Casey is also committed to helping youth in foster care make a successful transition to adulthood. As a direct service operating foundation, Casey Family Programs does not make grants.

See Reports: [Placement Disruption in Family Foster Care](#), [How Are the Children Doing? Assessing Youth Outcomes in Family Foster Care](#)

### [Casey Family Programs/ What Works?!](#)

What are the major milestones on the road to belonging? What can we do to make a difference that matters in a young person's life? The answers to these questions do not flow from a single source. "Best practice" in out-of-home care comes from research and practice, informed by the youth and families we serve. Sharing the answers to these powerful questions is the goal of What Works?! What Works?! is an online forum for Casey practitioners to share promising approaches to working with youth and families. The forum also serves as a resource to other interested child welfare practitioners.

See: [Family Foster Care: Practices that Work](#)

### [National Center for Children in Poverty](#)

The National Center for Children in Poverty (NCCP) announces a new policy publication series that reflects a larger effort that NCCP is undertaking with generous support from the Casey Family Program to help the nation's most vulnerable families. It continues and builds on NCCP's earlier work to document effective strategies and highlight policy opportunities and challenges to promote the emotional health of young children and families. The policy publications in this series will help policymakers, community leaders, and advocates take action to ensure the healthy development of children and their families.

See: [Improving the Odds for the Healthy Development of Young Children in Foster Care](#)  
[\[CONTACT\]](#)

### [National Association of Foster Care Reviewers](#)

The National Association of Foster Care Reviewers is dedicated to supporting quality, independent foster care review and promoting the use of review by child welfare administrators, advocates, policy makers and the courts. Whether you are new to review or a long-time believer, come explore the potential of foster care review for helping systems work for children.

See: [Redesigning Foster Care Review](#), [Foster Care Review: Past & Present](#)

CONTACT: [State & Local Review Boards](#)

### [North American Council on Adoptable Children](#)

Founded in 1974 by adoptive parents, the North American Council on Adoptable Children is committed to meeting the needs of waiting children and the families who adopt them. Since its inception, NACAC's mission has remained essentially unchanged: Every child has the right to a permanent family. The Council advocates the right of every child to a permanent, continuous, nurturing and culturally sensitive family.

See: [Publications](#)

[[CONTACT](#)]

### [National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges](#)

The National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges is dedicated to serving the nation's children and families by improving the courts of juvenile and family jurisdictions. Our mission is to better the justice system through education and applied research and improve the standards, practices and effectiveness of the juvenile court system.

See: [Permanency Planning for Children Department](#)

### [Child Welfare League of America](#)

The Child Welfare League of America (CWLA) is the nation's oldest and largest membership-based child welfare organization. We are committed to engaging people everywhere in promoting the well-being of children, youth, and their families, and protecting every child from harm. Believing that children are our most valuable resource, CWLA strives to advance national standards of excellence and sound public policies on behalf of the three million abused, neglected, and vulnerable children served by our 1200 public and nonprofit member agencies.

See: [Family Foster Care Initiatives](#)

Report: [Lifetime Connections: Achieving Excellence in Adoption](#) (CWLA 2002 National Adoption Training Conference)

### [National Governor's Association – Center for Best Practices](#)

The mission of the NGA Center for Best Practices is to help Governors and their key policy staff develop and implement innovative solutions to governance and policy challenges facing them in their states.

See: [A Place to Call Home](#) - This issue brief highlights state best practices in managing and delivering adoption and foster care services; streamlining adoption procedures; recruiting adoptive and foster parents; and implementing family-centered, neighborhood-based placement strategy.

### [National Conference of State Legislatures](#)

The National Conference of State Legislatures was founded in 1975 with the conviction that legislative service is one of democracy's worthiest pursuits. Representing the citizens of a district and the people of a state is the very essence of free government. With a focus on service, NCSL is a source for research, publications, consulting assistance, meetings and seminars.

See: [Child Welfare Project - Resources](#)

[\[CONTACT\]](#)

#### [National Coalition for Child Protection Reform](#)

The members of the National Coalition for Child Protection Reform have encountered the child welfare system in their professional capacities. Through NCCPR, we work to make that system better serve America's most vulnerable children by trying to change policies concerning child abuse, foster care and family preservation.

CONTACT: <mailto:info@NCCPR.org>

#### ***Other Organizations:***

#### [Jane Addams College of Social Work/The Kinship Care Practice Project](#)

[The Kinship Care Practice Project](#) conducts research, develops training materials, and provides educational opportunities to ensure safety, well-being, and permanent homes for children through collaborative work with extended families. The project began in 1992 as a research and demonstration project funded by the Adoption Opportunities Program of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Administration for Children, Youth and Families (ACYF). The project has received additional support through a subsequent training and curriculum development grant from ACYF, contracts with the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services, additional support from the Jane Addams College of Social Work and the Jane Addams Center for Social Policy and Research at the University of Illinois at Chicago, and in-kind contributions from many community and child welfare agencies.

Report: [Achieving Permanency for Children in Kinship Foster Care: A Training Manual](#)

[\[CONTACT\]](#)

#### [Children and Family Research Center/University of Illinois](#)

The Toolbox pages are the heart of the site and present the critical decision points and their processes along with research findings and practice implications pertinent to the critical questions addressed each day in deciding what is the best intervention for a child and family. The Index lists resources available throughout the site that can be of help in daily practice. Another major section of the site is the Dialogue area, envisioned and designed as a means for communicating with, gathering input from, and offering your own experience and knowledge to fellow workers.

See: [Decision Point: Assuring Placement Stability](#)

#### [Children's Home Society - Washington](#)

Through adoption support, family support, parent education, early childhood development, advocacy, counseling, residential and foster care, Children's Home Society of Washington has served Washington state's children and families for more than 100 years.

Report: [The Washington Permanency Framework](#)

[\[CONTACT\]](#)

#### [Center for Social Services Research - Child Welfare Research Center](#)

The Child Welfare Research Center is located at UC Berkeley's **School of Social Welfare**. We provide groundbreaking research on a variety of child welfare issues including adoption, case management, foster care, and welfare reform.

See: [CWS/CMS Reports – Placement Stability](#)

*Federal Government Web Sites:*

- ★ [Administration for Children and Families/Children's Bureau](#)
  - ↳ [Child and Family Service Reviews](#)
  - ↳ [Child Welfare Outcomes 1999: Annual Report](#)
  - ↳ [National Survey of Child & Adolescent Well Being](#)
- ★ [AFCARS – Adoption & Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System](#)
- ★ [Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation](#)
- ★ [Census Bureau](#)
- ★ [General Accounting Office](#)
- ★ [White House](#)
  - ↳ [AdoptUSKids.org](#)
- ★ [National Institute of Mental Health](#)
- ★ [National Adoption Information Clearinghouse](#)
- ★ [National Child Welfare Resource Center on Family-Centered Practice](#)
- ★ [National Clearinghouse on Families and Youth](#)
- ★ [National Resource Center for Foster Care and Permanency Planning](#)