

AspireMN

All Programs

2017 Annual Outcomes Report



Student Data Reporting System (SDRS)

Data for students discharged from AspireMN programs 2017

*Note SDRS Forms are not matched by student across Intake, Discharge, & Follow-up

Prepared by

Kristine N. Piescher, PhD, Director of Research & Evaluation

Misty Blue, MPH, Minn-LInK Researcher

Jordan St. Charles, Research Assistant

Center for Advanced Studies in Child Welfare

University of Minnesota

Table of Contents

List of Tables	2
Executive Summary	3
Background	5
Results	6
Treatment and Service Receipt	8
Satisfaction Data Analysis	9
Appendix A-Tables.....	10
Appendix B-SDRS Participant Organizations 2017	23

List of Tables

TABLE 1 GENDER OF STUDENTS BY TYPE OF PROGRAM-----	10
TABLE 2 RACE/ETHNICITY AT INTAKE BY TYPE OF PROGRAM-----	10
TABLE 3 AGE OF STUDENTS AT INTAKE BY TYPE OF PROGRAM-----	11
TABLE 4 HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS BY TYPE OF PROGRAM AT INTAKE-----	11
TABLE 5 PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WITH PRESENTING PROBLEMS AT INTAKE BY TYPE OF PROGRAMS-----	12
TABLE 6 SOURCE OF PER DIEM SUPPORT BY TYPE OF PROGRAM-----	13
TABLE 7 PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WITH SUSPECTED OR DOCUMENTED ABUSE/NEGLECT PRIOR TO ADMISSION BY TYPE OF PROGRAM-----	13
TABLE 8 SUMMARY OF PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WITH SUSPECTED OR DOCUMENTED ABUSE/NEGLECT PRIOR TO ADMISSION BY TYPE OF PROGRAM-----	13
TABLE 9 PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WHOSE CURRENT PLACEMENT IS COURT ORDERED BY TYPE OF PROGRAM -	14
TABLE 10 PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WITH HISTORY OF DELINQUENCY BY TYPE OF PROGRAM-----	14
TABLE 11 PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WITH PREVIOUS OUT-OF-HOME PLACEMENTS BY TYPE OF PROGRAM-----	14
TABLE 12 LIVING ARRANGEMENT JUST BEFORE INTAKE, AT DISCHARGE, AND AT FOLLOW-UP FOR ALL PROGRAMS -----	15
TABLE 13 LIVING ARRANGEMENT JUST BEFORE INTAKE, AT DISCHARGE, AND AT FOLLOW-UP FOR RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT PROGRAMS-----	15
TABLE 14 LIVING ARRANGEMENT JUST BEFORE INTAKE, AT DISCHARGE, AND AT FOLLOW-UP FOR TREATMENT FOSTER CARE PROGRAMS-----	16
TABLE 15 PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WITH NO ADJUDICATION/CONVICTION AT SIX MONTH FOLLOW-UP BY TYPE OF PROGRAM-----	16
TABLE 16 PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS ATTENDING OR COMPLETED SCHOOL AT SIX MONTH FOLLOW-UP BY TYPE OF PROGRAM-----	17
TABLE 17 PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS LIVING IN PRIMARY HOUSEHOLD AT SIX MONTH FOLLOW-UP BY TYPE OF PROGRAM-----	17
TABLE 18 PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WHO RECEIVED THERAPEUTIC SERVICES-----	17
TABLE 19 PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WHOSE FAMILY RECEIVED SERVICES-----	18
TABLE 20 PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WHO RECEIVED SKILL DEVELOPMENT SERVICES-----	18
TABLE 21 PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WITH THE FOLLOWING LENGTH OF CARE-----	18
TABLE 22 PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WHO COMPLETED THE PROGRAM-----	19
TABLE 23 PERCENTAGE OF ADULT RESPONDENTS WHO RATED EACH SATISFACTION QUESTION FOR ALL RESIDENTIAL PROGRAMS-----	19
TABLE 24 PERCENTAGE OF YOUTH RESPONDENTS WHO RATED EACH SATISFACTION QUESTION FOR ALL RESIDENTIAL PROGRAMS-----	21

Executive Summary

The *2017 AspireMN Annual Report* contains information about clients served by 11 AspireMN member organizations that contributed data to the Student Data Reporting System (SDRS). These participating organizations operated 23 unique youth programs in 2017 serving children, youth, and families statewide in the areas of children’s mental health, child welfare, juvenile justice, homeless and exploited youth, and related community based interventions. For these programs, service delivery models included children’s residential treatment, group home care, shelter care, therapeutic and treatment foster care, children's therapeutic services & supports [CTSS] including day treatment and a range of community based interventions.

The collaborative data efforts of AspireMN are not only unique in Minnesota (as most public systems collect minimal data on the well-being of children and youth they serve) but also unique on a national scope. In fact, only a handful of entities across the United States harness data similar to that of AspireMN. Thus, AspireMN’s SDRS data collaborative has significant potential to inform programs and policies across the state of MN.

This *2017 AspireMN Annual Report* is based on data collected at time of intake, discharge, and approximately six months following discharge for children and adolescents who were admitted/and or discharged from participating AspireMN agencies during 2017. Follow-up information about children and adolescents represents those individuals who had a completed six-month follow-up in 2017. To maintain the confidentiality of member agencies, data for this report are aggregated by program type.

At the time the *2017 Annual Report* was being written, the Student Data Reporting System was being updated; during this transition not all AspireMN member organizations provided data to the SDRS. The current report is based on data from AspireMN member organizations that participated in SDRS in 2017, hereafter “AspireMN SDRS programs” or “SDRS programs”.

Demographic Information

A total of 568 youth were discharged from AspireMN SDRS programs during 2017 with Residential Treatment Programs serving 46% of youth, Treatment Foster Care serving 43% of youth, and Children’s Therapeutic Services and Supports serving 11% of youth.

- Across all participating programs, 51% of youth were white, 23% of youth were Native American, 14% of youth were multiracial, 11% of youth were black, and 7% of youth were Hispanic.
- The ages of youth served by SDRS programs were mostly evenly split between the age groupings of 6-11 (27%), 12-14 (27%), and 15-18 (33%). The average age of SDRS program participants was 10 years old.
- Most youth (46%) lived with their birth parent prior to placement. 43% of youth entering programs come from single-parent households. 13% of youth were wards of the state upon entering their AspireMN SDRS program.
- 25% of youth had five or more placements upon entering in 2017.

- For AspireMN SDRS program participants, the average length of stay was 238 days.

Outcome Information

75% of the 568 youth that were discharged in 2017 completed their AspireMN SDRS program. Of those, 88% went on to an agency-recommended discharge arrangement afterward. After discharge, 87% of youth were either attending or had completed school.

- 86% of youth were living in their primary household at the six-month follow-up.
- At six months post-discharge, 93% of youth had no status offense, crime against person, crime against property, or felony adjudication or conviction.

Family Satisfaction

Both parents and youth are given the opportunity to rate the programs after discharge on 21 different elements of the program. Responses were collected on a 6-point scale (Terrible, Poor, OK, Good, Very Good, and Outstanding).

- For all program elements such as daily care and support, recreation opportunities, outcomes or results of services, most parents (95% or more) rated the program elements as acceptable (OK or higher).
- Similarly, most of the youth rated the program elements as acceptable (OK-Outstanding). Food and access to dental care were the two program elements that had lower ratings by youth, rated as unacceptable (poor or terrible) for 19% and 16% of the youth respectively.

Background

AspireMN is an association of organizations that serve children, youth, and families statewide in the areas of children’s mental health, child welfare, juvenile justice, homeless and exploited youth, and related community based interventions. Service delivery models include children’s residential treatment, group home care, shelter care, therapeutic and treatment foster care, children's therapeutic services & supports [CTSS] including day treatment, and a range of community based interventions.

Since founding the Student Data Reporting System (SDRS) in 1984, AspireMN member organizations have collected data to support quality service delivery and to understand service reach and client demographics, service utilization, and post-discharge outcomes for clients. Collected data are provided to the SDRS and are used to offer uniform information about children, youth, and families served by AspireMN member organizations.

The collaborative data efforts of AspireMN are not only unique in Minnesota (as most public systems collect minimal data on the well-being of children and youth they serve) but also unique on a national scope. In fact, only a handful of entities across the United States harness data similar to that of AspireMN. Thus, AspireMN’s SDRS data collaborative has significant potential to inform programs and policies across the state of MN.

The *2017 Annual Report* contains information about clients served by 11 SDRS participant organizations who operated 23 unique youth programs in 2017 (see Appendix B). The report is based on data collected at time of intake, discharge, and approximately six months following discharge for children and adolescents who were admitted/and or discharged from participating AspireMN organizations during 2017. Follow-up information about children and adolescents represents those individuals who had a completed six-month follow-up in 2017. At the time the *2017 Annual Report* was being written, the SDRS was undergoing an update, thus limiting the number of member organizations contributing data to the system. All member organizations will have access to the updated SDRS in future years.

SDRS data used for the *2017 Annual Report* were comprised of the following:

Data Source	Data Collection	Informant(s)	Format
Intake form	At intake	Placing social worker, probation officer, member agency staff and family member	Written
Discharge form	At discharge	Member agency staff	Written
Follow-Up form	Six months after discharge	Parent, social worker or probation officer	Written or Telephone
Adult/Professional Satisfaction Survey	After discharge	Parent, social worker or probation officer	Written
Youth Satisfaction Survey	After discharge	Youth	Written

The *2017 Annual Report* includes data from residential treatment programs, group homes, treatment foster care, correctional programs, shelters, and CTSS. To maintain the confidentiality of member

organizations, data for this report are aggregated by program type. Aggregate data are reported independently for residential treatment programs and treatment foster care (inclusive of foster care and group homes), but are not reported independently for CTSS due to small numbers of participating organizations in this category. However, totals presented throughout the report are based upon data inclusive of *all* program types.

As previously noted, the SDRS was undergoing a transition in 2017; during this transition, not all programs were able to deliver data to the SDRS. Programs falling in the Shelter and Corrections category were not able to include their data, but will have access in future years. The programs that were able to deliver data to SDRS are a subset of all AspireMN programs and are listed in Appendix B. These programs will be referred to as the Sample or SDRS participants throughout the report.

Results

This section of the *2017 Annual Report* provides a summary of the characteristics and experiences of youth served by a sample of AspireMN member programs, information about youth's treatment and service receipt, and outcomes of youth six months post-discharge. It is important to note that data presented in this report are not linked across data collection time-points (intake, discharge, and follow-up). Additional detailed information about youth served by SDRS participants can be found in Appendix A.

Youth Characteristics and Experiences

Number of Youth. A total of 568 youth were discharged from the SDRS participants during 2017. Almost half (46%) were cared for in residential treatment programs; 43% were cared for in treatment foster care and 11% were provided CTSS.

Gender of Youth. Overall, SDRS participants served more males (62%) than females (38%). This pattern was similar for youth served in residential treatment programs (64% male/36% female) and in treatment foster care (57% male/43% female; see Table 1 in Appendix A).

Race and Ethnicity of Youth. Half (51%) of all youth served by the sample were white. Smaller proportions of youth served by SDRS participants identified as Native American (23%), Multiracial (14%), and Black (11%). White youth comprised the largest group served at residential treatment programs (64%) while Native American youth comprised the largest group served in treatment foster care (45%; see Table 2 in Appendix A).

Ages of Youth. Approximately one-third of youth served by the sample were aged 15-18 (33%). A quarter of all youth were aged 6-11 (27%) and 12-14 (27%). These patterns were similar for youth served in residential treatment programs (where 15-18 year olds comprised 37% of youth served) and in treatment foster care (where 15-18 year olds made up 34% of youth served). The mean age for youth across the sample was 10 years old. The mean age for youth served in residential facilities was 13 years old, slightly higher than the mean age (10) for youth served in treatment foster care (see Table 3 in Appendix A).

Household Characteristics of Youth. At intake, almost half of all youth lived in households with their birth parents (46%). However, 43% of youth were part of single parent households. Public

Assistance helped to support 39% of youth across SDRS participants. Thirteen percent of youth were wards of the State. Household characteristics of youth were similar across program type with two exceptions – a higher proportion of youth served in residential treatment programs were living with one birth/one step parent or permanent live-in (13%) or adoptive parent (22%) than youth served in treatment foster care (4% and 5%, respectively) and a smaller proportion of youth served in residential treatment programs were living with foster parents (4%) than youth served in treatment foster care (21%; see Table 4 in Appendix A).

Presenting Problems of Youth. Youth entering AspireMN programs are assessed for challenges across 38 different areas. For SDRS participants, the most common challenges faced by youth at program intake were: parent/parent figure relationship difficulty (80%); disobedient/oppositional (77%); impulsive, acts without thinking (76%); depressed, sad or unhappy (73%); peer relationship difficulty (70%); stubborn, sullen, irritable (64%); verbal tantrums (61%); self-esteem problems (59%); lying or cheating (58%); hyperactive, restless, can't sit still (53%); and verbally abusive, threatens people (53%). Overall, the incidence of many presenting problems was substantially higher for youth served in residential treatment programs than for youth served in treatment foster care (see Table 5 in Appendix A).

Source of Per Diem Financial Support. Financial Support for the care of most youth came from county funding (79%); this rate was higher for youth in treatment foster care (92%) than youth in residential treatment programs (80%). Private insurance as another significant source of funding for youth, accounting for the costs of 8% of all youth (14% of youth in residential treatment programs and 0% of youth in treatment foster care; see Table 6 in Appendix A).

Abuse and Neglect Prior to Placement. Upon starting any AspireMN member program, youth are assessed for possible prior abuse or neglect (emotional abuse, physical abuse, physical neglect or sexual abuse). From the sample of programs that contributed data to the SDRS, the vast majority of youth (64%) were positively assessed as having either suspected or documented abuse that occurred prior to program intake. Documented abuse was more commonly noted for youth in residential treatment programs whereas suspected abuse was more commonly noted for youth in treatment foster care (with the exception of suspected sexual abuse). Across all programs, emotional abuse was the most noted form of maltreatment – both for suspected (16%) and documented (34%) abuse (see Tables 7 and 8 in Appendix A). It is important to note that multiple instances of abuse and/or neglect were not counted separately.

Legal Status. The vast majority of placements into treatment foster care were court ordered (88%) while only a quarter (25%) of Residential Treatment Center placements were court ordered. Court-ordered placements were split between CHIPS (79%) and delinquency (21%) placements (see Table 9 in Appendix A).

Across SDRS participants, 9% of youth had a history of a status offense, 13% had been convicted of crimes against persons, 7% had been convicted of crimes against property, and 4% had been convicted of a felony offense. Rates were slightly higher for youth served in treatment foster care than for youth in residential treatment programs (see Table 10 in Appendix A).

Previous Out-of-Home Placement(s). Four out of every five youth (81%) experienced an out-of-home placement prior to intake at SDRS participant programs. Out-of-home placements could

include living with a relative or extended family, living in foster care or a foster home, living in a group home, living in a shelter or shelter foster care, living in a residential treatment program, living in an inpatient psychiatric facility or hospital, living in a chemical dependency treatment program, living at a correctional facility (jail, prison, etc.), living in a detention center, or other out-of-home placement. Rates of placement were higher for youth in treatment foster care than youth in residential treatment programs across all placement settings, with the exception of previous placements in residential treatment programs (38% for youth in residential treatment programs; 25% for youth in treatment foster care) and inpatient psychiatric facilities (54% for youth in residential treatment programs; 14% for youth in treatment foster care.) The mean number of prior placements for youth was four placements. The number of total placements for youth across the sample ranged from 0-210. One out of every five youth (19%) had no previous out-of-home placement experiences but 26% of youth experienced five or more placements prior to intake (see Table 11 in Appendix A).

Living Arrangement for Youth. Prior to intake, 37% of all youth were living in their parent's or adoptive parent's home. A smaller proportion of youth were living with their relatives or extended family members (11%) or in a residential treatment center (11%). The most common living situation for youth at discharge and follow-up was living with parent/adoptive parent (49% and 53%, respectively). In general, youth moved from more restrictive living arrangements (e.g., detention, residential treatment programs, etc.) at intake to less restrictive living arrangements (e.g., with parent/adoptive parent) at discharge and follow-up (see Table 12-14 in Appendix A).

Post Discharge Adjudications and Convictions. The vast majority (93%) of youth surveyed at six months follow-up had not been adjudicated nor convicted of crimes since their discharge from SDRS participants. None of the youth discharged had a felony conviction, 99% had not been adjudicated for crimes against property, 98% had not been adjudicated for crimes against persons, and 96% had no status offenses since discharge (see Table 15 in Appendix A). The proportion of youth without an adjudication or conviction post-discharge were higher for youth served by residential treatment programs (95%) than youth served in treatment foster care (89%).

Post Discharge School Attendance and Completion. The majority (87%) of youth surveyed at six months follow-up were either attending or had already completed school (see Table 16 in Appendix A). A greater proportion of youth served in residential treatment programs were attending or had completed school (94%) than youth served in treatment foster care (73%).

Post Discharge Primary Household. The majority (86%) of youth served by the sample had returned to their primary household (the place where the youth calls home) at six month follow-up (see Table 17 in Appendix A). Rates of returning to the youth's primary household were higher for those discharged from residential treatment programs (93%) than treatment foster care (72%).

Treatment and Service Receipt

Services and Development Received While in Care. Youth and their families received a variety of therapeutic services from AspireMN member organizations and programs. Across programs,

the majority of youth received individual therapy (83%) and group therapy (64%). Intensive behavior modification (50%) and spiritual development (19%) were also common interventions for youth (see Table 18 in Appendix A). Youth in residential treatment programs were more likely to receive services than youth in treatment foster care across almost all service types.

Across programs, 48% of families received therapeutic services with their child and 40% received these services without their child. Approximately one third (30%) of families received parent education services from SDRS participants (see Table 19 in Appendix A). Families of youth in residential treatment programs were more likely to receive services (89%) than families of youth in treatment foster care (27%).

Across programs, the most commonly received skills development for youth was in the following areas: self-help skills and daily living skills (82%), independent living skills (75%), recreational/leisure skills development (78%), and emotional/social skills (81%; see Table 20 in Appendix A). Youth in residential treatment programs were more likely to receive skills development (99%) than youth in treatment foster care (78%).

Length of Care. The vast majority of youth in care stayed for one year or less, with 13% staying 1-3 months, 18% staying 3-6 months, 17% staying 6-9 months, and 16% staying 9-12 months. The mean number of days that youth stayed in care was 238 days (approximately 8 months). The standard deviation for the number of days in care was 324 days, indicating that there is great variation with respect to length of stay in care across youth (see Table 21 in Appendix A). On average, youth in residential treatment programs stayed 287 days (approximately nine and a half months) and youth in treatment foster care stayed 336 days (approximately 11 months).

Program Completion and Discharge Arrangement. Most youth completed the programs they started (75%). Of those who were discharged, 88% left the program in compliance with an agency recommended discharge arrangement (see Table 22 in Appendix A). Rates of completion and compliance with an agency recommended discharge arrangement were higher for residential treatment programs (81% and 92%, respectively) than for treatment foster care (69% and 81%, respectively).

Satisfaction Data Analysis

Satisfaction surveys were used to assess 21 areas of satisfaction about residential programming rated on a six-point scale (1 = terrible to 6 = outstanding). Adult surveys and youth surveys were designed to assess similar elements of care at the programs. Program satisfaction surveys were completed by 65 adults. Respondents were either parents (82%) or relatives (7%), county social workers (8%), or probation agents (3%). Ninety-seven youth completed surveys upon discharge from SDRS participants. In general, both adults and youth noted they were satisfied with the aspects of programming included on the survey. Adult ratings of satisfaction were slightly higher than youth ratings of satisfaction; ratings of satisfaction (inclusive of ratings of 3 = OK to 6 = outstanding) ranged from 95-100% for adults and 81-99% for youth. Youth reported lowest levels of satisfaction with the food provided (81% satisfied) and access to dental care (84% satisfied; see Table 23-24 in Appendix A).

Appendix A-Tables

This section of the *2017 Annual Report* provides a detailed information about the characteristics and experiences of youth served by Student Data Reporting System (SDRS) participants, youth's service receipt, and outcomes of youth six months post-discharge. It is important to note that data presented in this report are not linked across data collection time-points (intake, discharge, and follow-up). In the following tables aggregate data are reported independently for residential treatment programs and treatment foster care (inclusive of foster care and group homes), but not independently for CTSS due to small numbers of participating organizations in this category. However, totals presented throughout this section of the report are based upon data inclusive of *all* program types.

At the time of the *2017 Annual Report*, the SDRS is being updated; programs falling in Shelter and Corrections categories were unable to submit data for this report, and are not included in any of the columns below. However, these programs may contribute to SDRS in future years. For a list of programs that participated in the SDRS for 2017, please see Appendix B.

Table 1 Gender of Students by Type of Program

Gender	Residential Treatment Programs (n=278)	Treatment Foster Care (N=223)	Total Programs (N=565)
Male	64%	57%	62%
Female	36%	43%	38%

Table 2 Race/Ethnicity at Intake by Type of Program

Race/Ethnicity	Residential Treatment Programs (n=279-280)	Treatment Foster Care (N=223)	Total Programs (N=566-567)
White	64%	34%	51%
Black	11%	10%	11%
Native American	8%	45%	23%
Eskimo-Aleutian	0%	0%	0%
Asian-Pacific Islander	0%	0%	0%
Other	3%	1%	2%
Multiracial	13%	10%	14%
Hispanic	8%	6%	7%
Hmong	0%	0%	0%
Somali	0%	0%	0%

Table 3 Age of Students at Intake by Type of Program

Age Range/Mean	Residential Treatment Programs (n=279)	Treatment Foster Care (N=223)	Total Programs (N=565)
0-5	0%	32%	13%
6-11	28%	16%	27%
12-14	36%	18%	27%
15-18	37%	34%	33%
19-21	0%	0%	0%
Mean Age (years)	13	10	10

Table 4 Household Characteristics of Students by Type of Program at Intake

Child's Primary Household	Residential Treatment Programs (n=273-278)	Treatment Foster Care (N=219-223)	Total Programs (N=558-565)
Birth Parent(s)	44%	49%	46%
One Birth/One Step Parent or Permanent Live-In	13%	4%	10%
Adoptive Parent(s)	22%	5%	14%
Foster Parents	4%	21%	11%
Relatives	7%	9%	8%
No Permanent Living Arrangement	8%	10%	8%
Other	3%	2%	2%
Primary Household on Public Assistance	37%	34%	39%
Single Parent Household	38%	49%	43%
Child is Ward of State	12%	14%	13%

Table 5 Percentage of Students with Presenting Problems at Intake by Type of Programs

	Residential Treatment Programs (n=268-278)	Treatment Foster Care (N=209-220)	Total Programs (N=540-558)
Chemical use/abuse (alcohol/drugs)	21%	22%	20%
Communication disorder	7%	5%	7%
Compulsive, repeats certain acts	34%	10%	25%
Cruel to animals	22%	4%	14%
Depressed, sad or unhappy	85%	57%	73%
Disobedient, oppositional	92%	53%	77%
Eating disorder, bulimia, anorexia	8%	2%	6%
Fights or physically attacks people	69%	21%	50%
Fire Setting	10%	2%	7%
Guiltless after misbehaving	55%	27%	44%
Hyperactive, restless, can't sit still	64%	30%	53%
Impulsive, acts without thinking	91%	53%	76%
Loss or grief suffering	41%	48%	44%
Lying or cheating	66%	42%	58%
Messes pants, encopretic	6%	6%	6%
Parent/parent figure relationship difficulty	82%	77%	80%
Peers relationship difficulty	84%	47%	70%
Phobias, unreasonable fears	23%	5%	17%
Prostitution or pimping	1%	1%	1%
Racial/ethnic identity confusion	11%	1%	7%
Reality perception distorted	36%	7%	24%
Runs away	47%	27%	38%
Verbal tantrums	75%	35%	61%
Self-harm, head banging, scratching, hair pulling	57%	15%	39%
Self-esteem problems	73%	38%	59%
Sexually assaultive, molesting	16%	7%	11%
Sexual problems, behavior, identity	26%	9%	18%
Sibling(s) relationship difficulty	58%	28%	47%
Sleeping problems	46%	19%	36%
Smears or plays with bowel movements	3%	0%	2%
Stealing	48%	19%	37%
Stubborn, sullen, irritable	80%	37%	63.7%
Suicidal thoughts or behaviors	66%	11%	42%
Vandalism, destroys property	54%	14%	37%
Verbally abusive, threatens people	74%	22%	53%
Wets bed/wets during day, enuretic	14%	6%	11%
Younger acting than own age	45%	14%	33%
Gang involvement	2%	2%	2%

Table 6 Source of Per Diem Support by Type of Program

Primary Source of Per Diem	Residential Treatment Programs (N=272)	Treatment Foster Care (N=223)	Total Programs (N=559)
County	80%	92%	79%
School	1%	0%	1%
Parent	3%	0%	4%
Private Insurance	14%	0%	8%
Tribal Funds	0%	8%	3%
Consolidated Funds	0%	0%	0%
State	2%	0%	5%
Other	0%	0%	0%

Table 7 Percentage of Students with Suspected or Documented Abuse/Neglect Prior to Admission by Type of Program

Type of Abuse/Neglect	Residential Treatment Programs (N=268-270)	Treatment Foster Care (N=223)	Total Programs (N=555-557)
Emotional			
No or Unknown	52%	11%	49%
Suspected	9%	23%	16%
Documented	39%	30%	34%
Physical Abuse			
No or Unknown	52%	22%	58%
Suspected	7%	22%	14%
Documented	41%	15%	28%
Physical Neglect			
No or Unknown	55%	16%	55%
Suspected	7%	22%	13%
Documented	38%	26%	32%
Sexual Abuse			
No or Unknown	57%	39%	71%
Suspected	11%	5%	9%
Documented	32%	8%	20%

Table 8 Summary of Percentage of Students with Suspected or Documented Abuse/Neglect Prior to Admission by Type of Program

	Residential Treatment Programs (N=271)	Treatment Foster Care (N=223)	Total Programs (N=558)
Suspected Abuse/Neglect prior to intake	20%	37%	29%
Documented Abuse/Neglect prior to intake	63%	35%	49%
Suspected OR Documented Abuse/Neglect prior to intake	71%	57%	64%

Table 9 Percentage of Students whose Current Placement is Court Ordered by Type of Program

Court Ordered Placement	Residential Treatment Programs (N=270)	Treatment Foster Care (N=223)	Total Programs (N=557)
Placement Court Ordered	25%	88%	49%
Placement NOT Court Ordered	75%	12%	51%
If placement Court Ordered	(N=65)	(N=200)	(N=275)
CHIPS	69%	81%	79%
Delinquency	31%	20%	21%

Table 10 Percentage of Students with History of Delinquency by Type of Program

Adjudicated/ Convicted Offense	Residential Treatment Programs (N=250-254)	Treatment Foster Care (N=194-200)	Total Programs (N=510-517)
Status Offense	8%	13%	9%
Crime Against Persons	13%	15%	13%
Crime Against Property	6%	11%	7%
Felony Offense	2%	9%	4%

Table 11 Percentage of Students with Previous Out-of-Home Placements by Type of Program

Previous Placements	Residential Treatment Programs (N=280)	Treatment Foster Care (N=223)	Total Programs (N=567)	Number of Out of Home Placements (Range)
Relative(s)/ Extended family	12%	33%	20%	0-5
Foster Care/Home	24%	53%	35%	0-21
Group Home	7%	9%	7%	0-4
Shelter/ Shelter Foster Care	18%	35%	23%	0-11
Residential Treatment Program	38%	25%	32%	0-11
Inpatient/ Psychiatric Facility/ Hospital	54%	13%	34%	0-17
Chemical Dependency Treatment Program	3%	8%	5%	0-15
Correctional Facility (jail, prison, etc.)	2%	4%	3%	0-3
Detention	8%	14%	10%	0-5
Other	4%	3%	3%	0-2

*One entry was removed and coded as missing due to concerns about data accuracy.

Table 12 Living Arrangement Just Before Intake, at Discharge, and at Follow-Up for All Programs

Percentage of Students Living at:	Just Before Intake (N=559)	At Discharge (N=552)	At Follow-Up (N=174)
Correctional Facility	1%	1%	0%
Detention	6%	3%	0%
Inpatient Psychiatric Facility/Hospital	9%	3%	0%
Chemical Dependency Treatment Program	1%	0%	0%
Residential Treatment Program	11%	5%	6%
Shelter/Shelter Foster Care	8%	3%	3%
Group Home	3%	4%	7%
Foster Care/Home	9%	15%	16%
Board and Care	0%	0%	0%
Relative(s)/Extended Family	11%	9%	10%
Parent(s) Home/Adoptive	37%	49%	53%
Pre-Adoptive Placement	1%	4%	5%
Independent Living	0%	3%	2%
Other	1%	2%	0%

Table 13 Living Arrangement Just Before Intake, at Discharge, and at Follow-Up for Residential Treatment Programs

Percentage of Students Living at:	Just Before Intake (N=223)	At Discharge (N=256)	At Follow-Up (N=99)
Correctional Facility	1%	2%	0%
Detention	7%	2%	0%
Inpatient Psychiatric Facility/Hospital	15%	4%	0%
Chemical Dependency Treatment Program	0%	0%	0%
Residential Treatment Program	10%	5%	5%
Shelter/Shelter Foster Care	4%	0%	2%
Group Home	3%	6%	9%
Foster Care/Home	5%	13%	8%
Board and Care	0%	0%	0%
Relative(s)/Extended Family	8%	6%	9%
Parent(s) Home/Adoptive	44%	57%	64%
Pre-Adoptive Placement	0%	2%	2%
Independent Living	0%	0%	1%
Other	1%	2%	0%

Table 14 Living Arrangement Just Before Intake, at Discharge, and at Follow-Up for Treatment Foster Care Programs

Percentage of Students Living at:	Just Before Intake (N=559)	At Discharge (N=235)	At Follow-Up (N=)
Correctional Facility	2%	0%	0%
Detention	8%	5%	0%
Inpatient Psychiatric Facility/Hospital	3%	2%	0%
Chemical Dependency Treatment Program	4%	0%	0%
Residential Treatment Program	13%	3%	7%
Shelter/Shelter Foster Care	16%	8%	5%
Group Home	3%	1%	3%
Foster Care/Home	14%	16%	25%
Board and Care	0%	0%	0%
Relative(s)/Extended Family	15%	11%	11%
Parent(s) Home/Adoptive	20%	37%	36%
Pre-Adoptive Placement	1%	8%	10%
Independent Living	0%	6%	3%
Other	2%	3%	0%

Table 15 Percentage of Students with No Adjudication/Conviction at Six Month Follow-up by Type of Program

Percentage of Students with:	Residential Treatment Programs (N=91-92)	Treatment Foster Care (N=56-57)	Total Programs (N=160- 162)
At least one status offense	1%	9%	4
No status offense	99%	91%	96%
At least one crime against person	4%	0%	2%
No crime against person	96%	100%	98%
At least one crime against property	0%	4%	1%
No crime against property	100%	96%	99%
At least one felony	0%	0%	0%
No felony offense	100%	100%	100%
At least one status offense, crime against person, crime against property, or felony offense	5%	11%	7%
No status offense, crime against person, crime against property, or felony	95%	89%	93%

Table 16 Percentage of Students Attending or Completed School at Six Month Follow-up by Type of Program

Percentage of Students:	Residential Treatment Programs (N=94-99)	Treatment Foster Care (N=53-61)	Total Programs (N=165-174)
Attending School	90%	62%	81%
Completed School	3%	10%	5%
Total Attending or Completed School	94%	73%	87%
Not applicable-Too Young	0%	12%	4%

Table 17 Percentage of Students living in Primary Household at Six Month Follow-up by Type of Program

Percentage of Students:	Residential Treatment Programs (N=91-92)	Treatment Foster Care (N=56-57)	Total Programs (N=160-162)
Living in Primary Household	93%	72%	86%
Not Living in Primary Household	7%	28%	14%

Table 18 Percentage of Students who Received Therapeutic Services

Therapeutic Service	Residential Treatment Programs (N=260)	Treatment Foster Care (N=246)	Total Programs (N=568)
Intensive behavior modification	76%	13%	50%
Individual therapy	98%	64%	83%
Group therapy	96%	22%	64%
Play therapy	18%	3%	13%
Art therapy	24%	2%	15%
Spiritual development/ counseling	33%	3%	19%
Eating disorders therapy	0%	0%	0%
Chemical use/abuse services	2%	6%	4%
Chemical dependency evaluation	2%	5%	3%
Chemical dependency treatment	2%	5%	3%
AA/Alateen	0%	1%	0%
Sex offender therapy	10%	1%	5%
Sex abuse therapy	11%	0%	5%
Loss/grief therapy	17%	2%	9%
Crisis hospitalization (psychiatric)	4%	5%	5%
Other services	6%	16%	11%

Table 19 Percentage of Students whose Family Received Services

Family Service	Residential Treatment Programs (N=260)	Treatment Foster Care (N=246)	Total Programs (N=568)
Family therapy (with child)	80%	15%	48%
Family therapy (without child)	68%	7%	40%
Marital therapy	1%	0%	1%
Parent support groups	12%	1%	9%
Parent education	49%	9%	30%
Other	1%	3%	2%
None	11%	73%	41%

Table 20 Percentage of Students who Received Skill Development Services

Skills Development Services	Residential Treatment Programs (N=260)	Treatment Foster Care (N=246)	Total Programs (N=568)
Self-help skills/daily living skills	96%	64%	82%
Independent living skills	93%	52%	75%
Recreational/ leisure skills development	95%	54%	78%
Emotional/social skills	96%	61%	81%
Employment training	20%	23%	21%
Other services	4%	3%	5%
None	1%	22%	10%

Table 21 Percentage of Students with the Following Length of Care

Length of Care	Residential Treatment Programs (N=260)	Treatment Foster Care (N=246)	Total Programs (N=568)
1 Month or Less (0-30 days)	7%	7%	7%
1-3 Months (31-90 days)	10%	19%	13%
3-6 Months (91-180 days)	17%	21%	18%
6-9 Months (181-270 days)	17%	17%	17%
9-12 Months (271-365)	21%	10%	16%
12-15 Months (366-455 days)	12%	6%	10%
15-18 Months (456-546 days)	6%	3%	5%
18-21 Months (547-636 days)	3%	3%	3%
21-24 Months (637-730 days)	6%	1%	3%
Over 2 years (731 days or more)	2%	12%	7%
Mean (days)	287	336	238
Standard Deviation (days)	196	431	324

Table 22 Percentage of Students who Completed the Program

Program Completion	Residential Treatment Programs (N=260)	Treatment Foster Care (N=246)	Total Programs (N=568)
Completed Program	81%	69%	75%
Did NOT Complete Program	19%	31%	25%
Discharge Arrangement			
Agency Recommended Discharge Arrangement	92%	81%	88%
Agency Did NOT Recommend Discharge Arrangement	8%	19%	12%

Table 23 Percentage of Adult Respondents who Rated Each Satisfaction Question for All Residential Programs

Questions: How do you rate:	Terrible	Poor	OK	Good	Very Good	Outstanding	OK-Outstanding
The overall daily care and support of the child?	0%	0%	3%	25%	49%	22%	100%
The child's recreation opportunities?	0%	2%	3%	24%	57%	14%	98%
The program's food service?	0%	2%	22%	26%	37%	13%	98%
The bedrooms/sleeping arrangement?	0%	2%	8%	33%	45%	12%	98%
The knowledge and skills of staff?	0%	2%	7%	24%	34%	34%	98%
The staff's ability to identify the child's needs?	0%	0%	6%	21%	41%	32%	100%
The staff's ability to identify the child's strengths?	0%	0%	6%	16%	47%	31%	100%
The staff's support of the child's education needs?	0%	0%	6%	20%	38%	36%	100%
The progress the child made in achieving his/her goals?	0%	0%	2%	20%	44%	34%	100%
The staff's efforts to meet the child's mental health needs?	0%	2%	5%	18%	44%	32%	98%
The staff's efforts to meet the child's medical needs?	0%	0%	11%	19%	47%	23%	100%
The staff's efforts to meet the child's dental needs?	0%	0%	4%	36%	36%	24%	100%
The child's safety in the program?	2%	2%	5%	19%	40%	32%	96%

Questions: How do you rate:	Terrible	Poor	OK	Good	Very Good	Outstanding	OK-Outstanding
The staff's respect for the child's rights?	0%	3%	5%	15%	47%	31%	97%
The outcomes or results of the services?	0%	0%	6%	22%	38%	33%	100%
The staff's efforts to involve the family in treatment planning and services?	2%	3%	14%	18%	29%	34%	95%
The staff's ability to relate to or understand the child's culture/ethnicity?	0%	2%	7%	20%	39%	32%	98%
The match between what the child needed and the services received?	0%	0%	10%	23%	35%	32%	100%
The opportunities for family visits or contact?	0%	2%	8%	23%	38%	29%	98%
The staff's efforts to prepare the child and family for discharge?	0%	2%	3%	27%	34%	34%	98%
The usefulness of screens and assessments used to identify the child's needs?	0%	0%	4%	30%	34%	32%	100%

Note: Number of respondents per question ranges from 49-65 respondents. The response options included a "Not Applicable" options, and those responses were omitted from these percentages.

Table 24 Percentage of Youth Respondents Who Rated Each Satisfaction Question for All Residential Programs

Questions: How do you rate:	Terrible	Poor	OK	Good	Very Good	Outstanding	OK-Outstanding
Your care?	0%	1%	11%	30%	42%	16%	99%
Your chances for play or recreation?	0%	1%	15%	22%	40%	23%	99%
The food?	7%	12%	26%	31%	16%	9%	81%
The knowledge and skills of staff?	0%	4%	20%	25%	28%	23%	96%
The staff understanding your needs?	1%	4%	19%	40%	23%	13%	95%
The staff understanding what you do well?	0%	5%	11%	36%	31%	17%	95%
The staff's help with your school/education?	0%	5%	16%	29%	26%	23%	95%
The progress you made in achieving your goals?	0%	1%	4%	21%	32%	42%	99%
The staff getting you care from a doctor?	4%	6%	12%	35%	22%	20%	90%
The staff getting you care from a dentist?	7%	9%	12%	35%	20%	17%	84%
The staff getting you care from a therapist?	1%	3%	5%	32%	29%	30%	96%
The bedroom or sleeping arrangements?	4%	4%	24%	40%	16%	11%	92%
Your safety with peers?	1%	5%	26%	37%	22%	10%	94%
The staff's respect for you rights?	2%	5%	13%	40%	19%	20%	93%
Your safety with staff?	0%	1%	12%	29%	30%	28%	99%
The outcomes or results of the services?	0%	2%	10%	30%	32%	26%	98%
The staff's work to involve your family in treatment planning and services?	1%	4%	13%	29%	24%	21%	95%
The staff's understanding of your culture/ethnicity?	1%	5%	10%	33%	30%	21%	94%
The match between what you needed and the services you received?	0%	4%	14%	32%	27%	23%	96%
The rules for family visits and contact?	4%	1%	10%	33%	29%	22%	95%

Questions:	Terrible	Poor	OK	Good	Very Good	Outstanding	OK-Outstanding
How do you rate: Staff help with getting you ready for discharge?	2%	5%	8%	25%	27%	32%	93%

Note: Number of respondents per question ranges from 82-96 respondents. The response options included a “Not Applicable” options, and those responses were omitted from these percentages.

Appendix B-SDRS Participant Organizations 2017

Residential Treatment Programs

Bar None - VOA - Sunrise
Children's Residential Treatment Center - VOA
Children's Residential Treatment Center - VOA - Unit A
Avanti - VOA
Gerard - Nexus
Northwood Children's Services - Northwood Children's Home
Northwood Children's Services - Northwood West
Northwood Children's Services - Oaks Residential Treatment Program
St. Joes
Leo A. Hoffmann Center - Evergreen
Leo A. Hoffmann Center - North

Children's Therapeutic Services & Supports (CTSS), including Day Treatment

Northwood Children's Services - Day Treatment Merritt
Northwood Children's Services - Day Treatment Rule 29
Northwood Children's Services - Day Treatment ISD# 709 Piedmont
Northwood Children's Services - Day Treatment Lincoln
Northwood Children's Services - Myers Day Treatment
Northwood Children's Services - Laura MacArthur

Treatment Foster Care, including Group Homes

North Homes - Foster Care
North Homes - Group Home (TNT)
McLeod Treatment Programs - Group Home 1
McLeod Treatment Programs - Group Home 2
Community Family Supports (formerly FTP)
Therapeutic Services Agency