QUALITY IMPROVEMENT CENTER ON ENGAGING YOUTH IN FINDING PERMANENCY

Outcome Workforce Survey Report: Comparing Pre-Implementation and Reassessment Survey Responses

September 2026

Written and prepared by:

Jenna Thompson, Amy Salazar, Rebecca Roten, Angelique Day, Tamarie Willis, John Fowler, Sierra Wollenhall, & Lanz Bañes

This report was funded by the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) of the United States (U.S.) Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) as part of a financial assistance award totaling $5 million dollars with 100 percent funded by ACF/HHS. The contents are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the official views of, nor an endorsement, by ACF/HHS, or the U.S. Government. For more information please visit the ACF websites, Administrative and National Policy Requirements | The Administration for Children and Families (hhs.gov).

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 4

Introduction 4

Methodology 4

Findings 5

Supervisor Overview 5

Supervisor Summary Table 5

Caseworker Overview 6

Caseworker Summary Table 7

Summary 8

Introduction 9

QIC-EY Overview 11

QIC-EY Workforce Outcome Surveys 11

Current Report 11

Methodology 12

Pilot Sites and Project Components 12

(a) QIC-EY Workforce Training and Coaching Model 12

(b) QIC-EY Court Training 12

(c) Site-Specific Capacity-Building Activities 12

(d) Site-Specific Youth Engagement Program Models 13

Participant Demographics 14

Data Collection 16

Measures 16

Analyses 18

Summary of Findings 19

Supervisor Overview 19

Supervisor Summary Table 19

Supervisor Findings in Detail 20

Caseworker Overview 22

Caseworker Summary Table 22

Caseworker Findings in Detail 23
Conclusion 26
T3 Comparison by Workforce Training Participation 26
T3 Comparison by Youth Program Model Participation 27
Implications for Practice 27
Appendices 29
Appendix A. Findings 29
Effect Sizes 29
Short-term Outcomes 29
Outcome 1: Workforce preparedness/capacity in the engagement of children and youth 29
Outcome 2: Efficacy & job satisfaction 33
Outcome 3: Youth satisfaction with the level of engagement child welfare & court staff have with them 35
Outcome 4: Children/youth participation in permanency planning 35
Outcome 5: Children/youth participation in permanency planning hearings and case planning meetings 39
Youth Engagement in Permanency Hearings (5.1-5.6) 39
Outcome 6: Philosophy and culture related to engagement of youth by child welfare staff and court personnel 43
Personal- and Agency-Wide Beliefs Regarding Youth Engagement 43
Outcome 7: Use of EY tools by child welfare & courts 50
Long-term Outcomes 50
Outcome 8: Implementation of policies & practices that reflect child welfare systems' commitment to EY practices 50
Outcome 9: Long-term efficacy & job satisfaction 55
Additional Outcome 59
Appendix B. Logic Model 61
Appendix C. Defining Terms 62
Appendix D. QIC-EY Workforce Outcome Survey Items 63

Executive Summary

Introduction

The Quality Improvement Center on Engaging Youth in Finding Permanency (QIC-EY) is a five-year cooperative agreement funded by the Administration on Children, Youth & Families and the Children's Bureau. The goal of this initiative is to support state and tribal child welfare agencies in enhancing youth engagement practices and policies, particularly around permanency planning. Four partner agencies, including Spaulding for Children, the New England Association of Child Welfare Commissioners and Directors (NECWCD), the University of Nebraska at Lincoln (UNL), and the University of Washington (UW), collaborated to develop, implement, and evaluate (a) workforce training and coaching, (b) court training, (c) system-wide capacity building, and (d) site-specific youth program models, all geared toward enhancing youth engagement in case planning and permanency planning.

The QIC-EY is being rigorously evaluated. A key component of this evaluation includes the child welfare workforce survey, which assesses the outcomes presented in the QIC-EY logic model (see Appendix B). Researchers at Washington State University developed the workforce survey based on current literature, best practices, and collaboration with individuals with lived experience within child welfare systems. Prior to implementing any QIC-EY project components, supervisors and caseworkers in the QIC-EY intervention regions at each pilot site completed the Pre-Implementation (Time 1) workforce survey. The same workers were invited to complete this survey again six months after participating in the QIC-EY training and coaching model to assess pre- and post-change differences (Time 2). Now that each project component has been implemented, workers in the QIC-EY intervention regions of each site have been surveyed again to assess longer-term, system-wide changes as part of the Post-Implementation System Reassessment (Time 3). **This report presents cross-site findings comparing Pre-Implementation (Time 1) and Reassessment (Time 3) outcomes across the child welfare workforce at QIC-EY intervention pilot sites in Michigan, Montana, Missouri, Hawai'i, and Rhode Island.**

Methodology

This report contains analyses of workforce outcome survey data collected from 456 QIC-EY intervention site participants who completed pre-implementation surveys between September 2023 and November 2024 and 272 QIC-EY intervention site participants who completed post-implementation surveys between January and March 2026. Because this assessment aims to measure system-wide change following the adoption of all four QIC-EY project components, all case-carrying caseworkers or supervisors who had been in their role for at least one month within the intervention region were eligible to take the Time 3 Reassessment survey regardless of their level of participation in the QIC-EY project components. To assess the long-term, system-wide influences of the QIC-EY, we measured differences between these two groups (T1 Pre-Implementation and T3 Reassessment; Time 2 results are available in a separate report). The analytical approaches used in this report included frequencies and descriptive statistics, effect size measures, t-tests, chi-squares, ANCOVA, and binary logistic regression, depending on the nature of the data. Statistical comparisons of Pre-Implementation (T1) and Reassessment (T3) scores were conducted using ANCOVA and logistic regression, controlling for site, level of education, and years of work in child welfare. For each scale in which statistical comparisons were conducted, statistically significant findings were reported ($p<0.05$), as well as results that approached but did not reach significance ($p<0.10$).

Additionally, we assessed differences in outcomes between those who did and did not participate in QIC-EY project components among the reassessment (T3) group only to better understand the effect of exposure to specific initiatives, above and beyond the system-level influence of working within the intervention region. Our hypothesis is that we will see improvements over time due to the various efforts

undertaken in intervention regions over the past several years. Consequently, *observed improvements from Pre-Implementation (T1) to Reassessment (T3) that persist despite supervisors and caseworkers reporting they did not participate in QIC-EY initiatives provide evidence of systemic changes within the intervention site, as the impact of the initiatives trickled down beyond those who experienced the interventions firsthand*.

The workforce outcome survey assesses the nine outcomes included in the QIC-EY logic model (See Appendix B) and one additional outcome. Each outcome is evaluated using one or more survey measures across multiple sub-outcomes. Differences between pre-intervention implementation and reassessment were assessed for statistical significance, and **effect sizes** were calculated to determine whether differences between groups were *small, medium*, or *large* (see Appendix C for statistical terms).

Findings

Findings are separated into supervisor and caseworker subgroups. Note that all findings are based on information reported *by participants* and are, therefore, subject to the participants' perceptions.

Supervisor Overview

From Pre-Implementation (T1) to Reassessment (T3), there were small statistically significant improvements on 16% of sub-outcomes (9 out of 58 total) and medium-to-large statistically significant improvements on 17% of sub-outcomes (10 out of 58 total). There were no statistically significant declines from T1 to T3 across all outcomes.

Supervisor Summary Table

Table 1 presents an overview of changes in QIC-EY outcomes for supervisors from Pre-Implementation (T1) to Reassessment (T3). Specifically, the table shows **(1)** the outcomes, **(2)** the number of sub-outcomes used to assess each outcome, **(3)** the percent of sub-outcomes for each outcome where there were **statistically significant** improvements, and **(4)** the percent of sub-outcomes for each outcome where there were **statistically significant** declines (for the supervisors, there were no statistically significant declines). Please see the ***Summary of Findings*** and ***Findings*** sections for more detail, including information on sub-outcomes that did not change.

Table 1. *Supervisor Overall Outcome Changes, N = 174*

Outcome	# of Sub-outcomes	% of Sub-outcomes with Improvement		% of Sub-outcomes with Declines	
		Medium-to-Large Improvements	Small Improvements	Small Declines	Medium-to-Large Declines
Short-Term Outcomes					
(1) Workforce preparedness/capacity in the engagement of children and youth	8	38%	50%	0%	0%
(2) Efficacy & job satisfaction	3	0%	0%	0%	0%
(3) Youth satisfaction with the level of engagement child welfare & courts staff have with them	This is captured in the youth survey.				

Table 1. *Supervisor Overall Outcome Changes, N = 174*

Outcome	# of Sub-outcomes	% of Sub-outcomes with Improvement		% of Sub-outcomes with Declines	
		Medium-to-Large Improvements	Small Improvements	Small Declines	Medium-to-Large Declines
(4) Children/youth participation in permanency planning	7	**14%**	0%	0%	0%
(5) Children/youth participating in permanency planning hearings and case planning meetings	12	0%	0%	0%	0%
(6) Philosophy and culture related to engagement of youth by child welfare staff and court personnel	11	**18%**	0%	0%	0%
(7) Use of EY tools by child welfare & courts	This outcome is measured within the next outcome and with process evaluation.				
Long-Term Outcomes					
(8) Implementation of policies & practices that reflect child welfare systems' commitment to EY practices	8	**50%**	38%	0%	0%
(9) Long-term efficacy & job satisfaction	8	0%	25%	0%	0%
Additional Outcome					
Relational Permanence	1	0%	0%	0%	0%

Reassessment (T3) Supervisor Comparisons by QIC-EY Program Model Participation

We compared outcomes among the Reassessment (T3) supervisors based on whether they reported participating in the QIC-EY workforce training and coaching model. Because the sample sizes were smaller for these groups, they were not assessed for statistical significance, and differences between groups were determined using **effect size measures only**. Among Reassessment (T3) supervisors, results were largely consistent with system-level changes attributable to exposure to intervention-region activities: 69% of sub-outcomes (40 of 58) showed no differences between those who did and those who did not participate in the QIC-EY workforce training. However, 26% of sub-outcomes (15 of 58) were better for those who participated. In the areas where training participants show stronger outcomes, these gains suggest that workforce training may have influenced outcomes beyond system-wide effects. In 5% of sub-outcomes (3 of 58), training participants showed somewhat lower outcomes. These differences may be attributable to increased awareness gained through training, which may have prompted more critical and realistic self-assessment rather than reflecting actual declines in practice.

Caseworker Overview

From Pre-Implementation (T1) to Reassessment (T3), there were small statistically significant improvements on 40% of sub-outcomes (23 out of 58 total). There was a small, statistically significant decline in 2% of sub-outcomes (1 out of 58 total).

Caseworker Summary Table

Table 2 presents an overview of changes in QIC-EY outcomes for caseworkers. Specifically, the table shows **(1)** the outcomes, **(2)** the number of sub-outcomes used to assess each outcome, **(3)** the percent of sub-outcomes for each outcome where there were **statistically significant** improvements, and **(4)** the percent of sub-outcomes for each outcome where there were **statistically significant** declines. Please see the *Summary of Findings* and *Findings* sections for more detail, including information on sub-outcomes that did not change.

Table 2. *Caseworker Overall Outcome Changes, N = 554*

Outcome	# of Sub-outcomes	% of Sub-outcomes with Improvement		% of Sub-outcomes with Declines	
		Medium-to-Large Improvements	Small Improvements	Small Declines	Medium-to-Large Declines
Short-Term Outcomes					
(1) Workforce preparedness/ capacity in the engagement of children and youth	8	0%	50%	13%	0%
(2) Efficacy & job satisfaction	3	0%	33%	0%	0%
(3) Youth satisfaction with the level of engagement child welfare & courts staff have with them	This is captured in the youth survey.				
(4) Children/youth participation in permanency planning	7	0%	43%	0%	0%
(5) Children/youth participating in permanency planning hearings and case planning meetings	12	0%	50%	0%	0%
(6) Philosophy and culture related to engagement of youth by child welfare staff and court personnel	11	0%	27%	0%	0%
(7) Use of EY tools by child welfare & courts	This outcome is measured within the next outcome and with process evaluation.				
Long-Term Outcomes					
(8) Implementation of policies & practices that reflect child welfare systems' commitment to EY practices	8	0%	63%	0%	0%
(9) Long-term efficacy & job satisfaction	8	0%	0%	0%	0%
Additional Outcome					

Table 2. *Caseworker Overall Outcome Changes, N = 554*

Outcome	# of Sub-outcomes	% of Sub-outcomes with Improvement		% of Sub-outcomes with Declines	
		Medium-to-Large Improvements	Small Improvements	Small Declines	Medium-to-Large Declines
Relational Permanence	1	0%	100%	0%	0%

Reassessment (T3) Caseworker Comparisons by QIC-EY Program Model Participation

Among the Reassessment (T3) caseworkers, we assessed **statistically significant** differences in each sub-outcome by whether they reported (a) having participated in the QIC-EY workforce training and coaching model, and (b) having worked with at least one youth who had taken part in the QIC-EY youth program model in their site. There were no statistically significant differences based on participation in the QIC-EY training-and-coaching model across all sub-outcomes, and no differences between those who did and did not work with at least one QIC-EY-participating youth for 85% of sub-outcomes (49 out of 58 total), suggesting system-level change among caseworkers regardless of their direct interaction with program-model components. However, 16% of sub-outcomes (9 out of 58 total) were better for caseworkers who had worked with at least one youth who participated in the youth program model. In these areas, direct interaction with program-engaged youth may have influenced worker outcomes beyond system-wide effects.

Summary

Child welfare supervisors and caseworkers in QIC-EY pilot regions were surveyed beginning in 2023, prior to implementation, and again in 2026 to assess long-term, system-wide changes in workforce capacity to meaningfully engage children and youth in case and permanency planning. Below, we provide a summary of the major findings. For a more detailed summary and practice implications, see the Conclusion and Implications for Practice sections.

Participating supervisors showed statistically significant improvements across some domains from pre- to post-implementation, with no statistically significant declines. Moderate gains were observed in confidence engaging youth in permanency planning—particularly around relational and cultural permanency—and in overall confidence across all areas of case and permanency planning. Supervisors also demonstrated stronger commitment to meaningful youth participation and to an agency culture of partnership with youth. At the practice level, moderate improvements were found in active and effective supervision and in agency-level youth engagement attitudes and practices, including empowering youth in planning, supporting youth participation, and facilitating youth involvement in evaluation and feedback. A small but significant reduction was found in the number of supervisors considering leaving their positions.

Among Reassessment (T3) supervisors, results were largely consistent with system-level changes attributable to exposure to intervention-region activities, with the majority of sub-outcomes showing no differences between those who did and those who did not participate in the QIC-EY workforce training and coaching model. In the areas where training participants did show stronger outcomes—greater confidence in cultural permanency, stronger compassion in practice, greater engagement of youth across

all age groups in hearings and case planning meetings, and stronger intentions to remain in their jobs—these gains suggest that workforce training and coaching influenced outcomes beyond system-wide effects. In the few areas where training participants showed somewhat lower outcomes—less youth-adult interaction in planning than those who did not participate in QIC-EY training—findings may reflect heightened critical awareness of current gaps rather than actual declines in practice.

Caseworkers showed statistically significant improvements across multiple domains from pre- to post-implementation, with all significant changes having small effect sizes. Confidence and self-rated skills in engaging youth in permanency and case planning increased, as did perceived supervisor support — a positive indicator for workforce climate. Youth participation in planning processes improved, with gains in the roles of youth aged 14–20 in permanency hearings and case planning meetings, and in the roles of transition-age youth (18–20) in permanency planning. Caseworkers also showed stronger agency-level commitments to a culture of partnership and to relational permanency practices. The one statistically significant decline was in workers' perceived competence in supporting youth with disabilities, an area warranting additional attention.

Among Reassessment (T3) caseworkers, there were no statistically significant differences based on QIC-EY training-and-coaching model participation, and no differences between those who did and did not work with at least one QIC-EY-participating youth for the majority of sub-outcomes, suggesting system-level change among caseworkers regardless of their direct interaction with program-model components. However, caseworkers who had worked with at least one youth who participated in the QIC-EY youth program model showed significantly greater confidence and skill in case and permanency planning, more agency-wide youth engagement activities, and lower rates of considering leaving their jobs. This pattern suggests that direct interaction with program-engaged youth may be a particularly powerful driver of workforce development—one that complements and, in some respects, may exceed the effects of training alone.

Implications for Practice

The findings from this evaluation offer several important lessons for child welfare agencies and workforce leaders seeking to advance meaningful youth engagement. Taken together, the data suggest that targeted investment in workforce development, sustained coaching support, and direct youth-worker interaction can yield meaningful shifts in confidence, culture, and practice. Based on the cross-site findings from the QIC-EY pilot sites, several implications for practice could be considered:

(1) Evidence of System-Level Change

Several outcomes suggest that the QIC-EY initiative contributed to meaningful shifts at the system level. Improvements in agency-level youth engagement attitudes and practices, increased reports of active supervision, stronger commitments to partnership with youth, and broader adoption of relational and cultural permanency frameworks all point to changes in organizational culture and practice environment. These broader shifts are consistent with the theory of change underlying youth engagement programming: that lasting change requires transformation of organizational culture and policy environments, not only worker behavior. To sustain these gains, agencies should embed expectations for youth engagement into policy frameworks, supervision structures, hiring and onboarding processes, and quality assurance systems, ensuring that positive changes outlast the program itself.

(2) Areas Where the QIC-EY Initiative Particularly Advanced System Change

Several findings point to areas where the QIC-EY initiative had a particularly notable influence, including gains in cultural permanency competency, compassion in practice, and supervisory effectiveness. Supervisors who participated showed greater engagement of youth across a wide age range (8–20) in permanency hearings and case planning meetings, with especially notable gains for younger children (ages 8–13) who have historically been more likely to be excluded from planning processes. One of the most striking findings was that caseworkers with direct experience working alongside youth in the youth program model demonstrated significantly stronger outcomes than those who had not—in confidence, skills, agency activities, and retention intentions—suggesting that youth themselves, when meaningfully engaged in structured program models, can serve as catalysts for worker development. Finally, supervisors play a central role in sustaining these gains: moderate improvements in active and effective supervision, combined with stronger intentions to remain in their jobs among training participants, underscore the importance of investing in supervisory capacity for facilitation, modeling, and reflective coaching.

(3) Areas for Continued Improvement

Several findings point to areas where additional attention and investment may be warranted. Declines in caseworkers' perceived competence in advocating for and supporting youth with disabilities, particularly under time constraints, highlight the need for targeted training, accessible resources, and caseload structures that account for the additional demands of inclusive practice. Workforce retention remains a complex picture: while overall intentions to leave declined and caseworkers who worked with program-engaged youth showed better retention indicators, a subset of supervisors who had participated in training and had previously considered leaving reported higher rates of actively seeking other employment. This may signal unmet organizational needs around compensation, workload, or culture that training alone cannot address. Agencies should pair workforce development with complementary strategies to address structural conditions that affect workforce stability.

Introduction

QIC-EY Overview

The Quality Improvement Center on Engaging Youth in Finding Permanency (QIC-EY) is a five-year cooperative agreement funded by the Administration on Children, Youth & Families and the Children's Bureau. The goal of this initiative is to support state and tribal child welfare agencies in enhancing youth engagement practices and policies, particularly around permanency planning. Four partner agencies, including Spaulding for Children, the New England Association of Child Welfare Commissioners and Directors (NECWCD), the University of Nebraska at Lincoln (UNL), and the University of Washington (UW), collaborated to develop, implement, and evaluate ((a) workforce training and coaching, (b) court training, (c) system-wide capacity building, and (d) site-specific youth program models, all geared toward enhancing youth engagement in case planning and permanency planning. More information about QIC-EY is available at http://qic-ey.org/.

QIC-EY Workforce Outcome Surveys

The QIC-EY is being rigorously evaluated. A key component of this evaluation includes the child welfare workforce survey, which assesses the outcomes identified in the QIC-EY logic model (see Appendix B). Researchers at Washington State University developed the workforce survey based on current literature, best practices, and collaboration with individuals with lived experience within child welfare systems. All measures, questions, answer choices, and corresponding logic model outcomes are listed in Appendix D. Prior to implementing any QIC-EY project components, supervisors and caseworkers in the QIC-EY intervention regions at each pilot site completed the Pre-Implementation (Time 1) workforce survey. The same workers completed this survey again approximately six months after participating in the QIC-EY training and coaching model (Time 2) to assess pre- and post-change differences. We assessed changes in outcomes from Time 1 to Time 2 by comparing the QIC-EY intervention with the comparison regions at each participating site (details are available in separate reports). Now that each project component has been implemented, another sample of workers in the QIC-EY intervention regions of each site has been surveyed to assess longer-term, system-wide changes as part of the Post-Intervention Implementation System Reassessment (Time 3). Comparison of outcomes from two groups, Pre-Implementation and Reassessment within the intervention regions only, is the focus of this report.

Current Report

The purpose of this report is to provide information on how the implementation of QIC-EY training and coaching, capacity-building activities, and youth program models has influenced system-wide change related to youth engagement practices throughout the project. The current report includes cross-site findings comparing Pre-Implementation (Time 1) and Reassessment (Time 3) outcomes in the **Michigan, Montana, Missouri, Hawai'i, and Rhode Island** implementation sites.

Methodology

Pilot Sites and Project Components

State and tribal child welfare systems were recruited to participate in this study. Pilot sites included both large and small child welfare agencies across the geographic United States. Participating states include Montana, Rhode Island, Michigan, Missouri, and Hawai'i. Participating tribal nations include the Yakama Nation, Nak-Nu-We-Sha in Washington State, and the Southern Plains Consortium, which includes Cheyenne and Arapaho Indian Child Welfare, Comanche Nation Social Services, Delaware Nation, Wichita Affiliated, Caddo Nation, Ft. Sill Apache, and Kiowa Tribe. The tribal nations participated in the larger study but did not implement the Reassessment (Time 3) survey. **This report presents cross-site findings from the child welfare workforce in the QIC-EY intervention pilot sites in Michigan, Missouri, Montana, Hawai'i, and Rhode Island.** Each pilot site implemented (a) the QIC-EY training and coaching model, (b) court training, (c) a site-specific capacity-building activity, and (d) a site-specific youth engagement program model. A description of the main components is provided below.

QIC-EY Workforce Training and Coaching Model

The goal of the QIC-EY training and coaching model was to support youth engagement practices within child welfare systems and enhance workforce capacity to meaningfully engage youth in case and permanency planning. Two main workforce training curricula were implemented in each pilot site: (1) workforce training, which was provided to intervention region supervisors and case-carrying caseworkers, and (2) coaching training for supervisors who then provided youth engagement-focused coaching support for their workers. The training and coaching curricula provided in the Hawai'i and Tribal Nation sites were adapted to be culturally relevant and responsive. In Hawai'i, adaptations infused Native Hawaiian values of community and connection for a holistic approach to learning about the authentic engagement of children and youth through youth voice and choice. Further, adaptations within the curriculum provided shared learning experiences in an intentional process of establishing and maintaining meaningful relational and cultural connections to establish permanency.

QIC-EY Court Training

Around the time the child welfare workforce training and coaching model was implemented, a fully online training was also provided to court personnel in each site's intervention regions. This training provided practical strategies to support youth engagement in child welfare legal processes.

Site-Specific Capacity-Building Activities

Following site-specific systems-level needs assessments, capacity-building activities were developed and led by partners from the University of Lincoln, Nebraska, with support from site implementation teams. These initiatives were implemented to support broader, systems-level improvements in policies and practices related to youth engagement. Below, we briefly highlight the activities of each state pilot site.

Hawai'i. Hawai'i's capacity-building project involved developing a 4-hour training for practitioners to better engage with youth. Training materials include practice-focused exercises, expert narratives, and education on various supervision strategies. Crucially, the training is grounded in Hawaiian culture and values.

Michigan. Michigan's first capacity-building activity included a revision of the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services' (MDHHS) *Rights and Responsibilities for Children and Youth in Foster Care* policy. Additionally, Michigan developed a form, a conversation guide, and a youth-friendly version of the

Rights document for case managers to use when reviewing the Rights with children in foster care. Their second capacity-building activity was to develop a *Handbook for Youth in Foster Care*, an accompanying conversation to support discussions between case managers and youth, and a youth-friendly version of the handbook.

Missouri. Missouri's capacity-building activity consisted of revising the What's It All About (WIAA) Handbook series and activity sheets. The Capacity Building Consultant drafted revised sections, which were subsequently reviewed and edited by the QIC-EY team, SIM, CYEC, site champion, TLE, and Legal Services.

Montana. Montana's capacity-building activity involved developing a sustainability plan to support the Montana Youth Advisory Board (YAB) after QIC-EY support concludes. Montana interviewed YAB administrators in other states and gathered publicly available information to research practices for managing and funding YABs in those states. This research was used to identify a set of core practices that were then discussed by child welfare leaders and TLE. The QIC-EY fiscal consultant and Montana executive consultant met to discuss and identify potential funding sources, including TANF and various foundations.

Rhode Island. Rhode Island's capacity-building project consisted of developing the Placement Option Brochure, the Sibling Bill of Rights, and the Out-of-Home Care Bill of Rights. The Rhode Island site team also developed youth-friendly versions of the three documents.

Site-Specific Youth Engagement Program Models

With support from site implementation teams, pilot sites implemented youth program models targeting various youth engagement needs identified through site-specific environmental scans. Below, we present brief overviews of these program models. More detailed descriptions are available in site-specific youth survey reports.

Hawai'i. Hawaii's site implementation team developed and implemented a youth program model, Pilina Circles, a youth-focused intervention grounded in Hawaiian culture and values. To prepare the workforce to implement the program model, training was administered to staff members at Effective Planning and Innovative Communication (EPIC) 'Ohana, a non-profit organization. EPIC staff received a 4-hour program-facilitation training session led by the consulting group Co-Creative prior to the launch of the Pilina Circle program. Training materials include practice-focused exercises, expert narratives, and education on various supervision strategies. The training emphasized Hawaiian culture and values. Youth who participated in the program worked with a facilitator and a peer support specialist to organize and host a Circle meeting. In these meetings, youth are invited to open the Circle with a poem, song, prayer, or other form of personal expression of their choice; the team develops a case plan to be submitted to the court.

Michigan. The Youth Advocacy Project (YAP), a 6-month intervention designed to empower youth to engage in permanency conversations and self-advocate during court hearings. Youth Champions, professionals with lived experience in foster care, meet one-on-one with the youth to help them develop skills, build knowledge, and prepare for permanency hearings. Child welfare staff were trained in Michigan's youth program model by the Site Implementation Manager (SIM) and the Children and Youth Engagement Coordinator (CYEC). The training sessions consisted of one-hour PowerPoint presentations delivered in person or virtually, covering the program components, the role of Youth Champions, and case manager responsibilities. Training materials were provided during the sessions.

Missouri. Missouri's site implementation team developed and is implementing a youth program model, MO-Engaged Care, that aims to orient youth in care to the permanency planning process, increase understanding of their rights while in foster care, support participation in Family Support Team and other decision-making meetings, and help them understand and participate in court proceedings. MO-Engaged Care includes: (1) a recorded orientation that youth and their caseworkers watch together, and (2) four caseworker-guided sessions using the WIAA handbook series and activity sheets. The five topics of the handbook series are the Introduction, which provides a foundational understanding of various aspects of foster care; Your Rights in Foster Care; What is Permanency All About; Participating in Your Planning Meetings; and Participating in Court Hearings.

Montana. Montana's youth program model consists of a foster care orientation and permanency-focused, youth-centered meetings, which take place over a 7-month period. Youth participate in a virtual orientation, 3 home visits with a caseworker, and 2 youth-centered meetings (YCMs). Throughout the program, youth learn about the foster care process and engage in structured permanency planning conversations guided by a peer-reviewed tool called the Youth Connections Scale. The goal of the program is to reach a Permanency Pact during the second youth-centered meeting.

Rhode Island. The Permanency Through Enhanced Case Planning Program is a 9-month intervention designed to support youth engagement in the permanency planning process. Youth regularly meet with case workers to discuss their cases, goals, and desires. Caseworkers provide youth with resources and education on the permanency process. Youth-driven meetings are held at 90 and 180 days post-admission to reassess and adjust the case plan and to support goal setting and attainment. This program is provided in both the Family Services Unit (FSU) for youth under 18 and the Voluntary Extension of Care (VEC) program for young people 18 and older. The programs are largely the same across the two populations, except that the VEC program focuses on transition planning rather than permanency planning, as they are no longer eligible for legal permanency.

Participant Demographics

Participating child welfare departments were responsible for recruiting study participants. Both supervisors and caseworkers were recruited with the requirement that caseworkers carry at least one ongoing case, including direct work with children and youth in out-of-home care. With the site implementation team's support, child welfare agencies selected counties or regions within their jurisdictions to pilot components of the QIC-EY program. The Pre-Implementation (Time 1) group included supervisors and caseworkers from the pilot sites' intervention regions, who completed the pre-implementation survey between September 2023 and November 2024 prior to the implementation of any QIC-EY intervention components. The Reassessment (Time 3) group included supervisors and caseworkers from the intervention regions of the pilot sites, who were surveyed between January and March 2026.

To be eligible to take the Reassessment survey, workers had to be serving within the QIC-EY intervention region in their current roles—supervisor or case-carrying caseworker—for at least 30 days. They did not have to complete the Pre-Implementation survey to be eligible for the Reassessment; therefore, the Pre-Implementation and Reassessment participants are not necessarily the same, although some overlap may exist. Workers were not required to have directly participated in any of the four QIC-EY components; however, 41.5% (*N* = 115) participants reported receiving the training and coaching model, and 39.4 % (*N* = 109) participants reported having at least one youth on their caseload take part in the youth program model at the time of Reassessment.

Table 3 below presents demographic information for the 728 participants who completed surveys as of March 2026. Among the QIC-EY supervisors, there was a statistically significant difference in average years of service in their current roles, with the Reassessment (T3) group reporting longer tenure. Additionally, the Reassessment (T3) supervisors were slightly older and had worked at the same agency for longer, a difference that approached statistical significance. Among the QIC-EY caseworkers, the Reassessment (T3) group reported working statistically significantly longer in the child welfare field, their current agency, and in their current positions than the Pre-Implementation (T1) group. The T3 caseworkers were also slightly older, and there were differences in educational experiences that approached statistical significance.

Table 3. *QIC-EY Workforce Demographics – Cross-site (N = 728)*

	QIC-EY Supervisors (*n* = 174)			**QIC-EY Caseworkers (*n* = 554)**		
	Pre-Implementation (*n* = 104)	**Reassessment (*n* = 70)**	**Diff.**	**Pre-Implementation (*n* = 352)**	**Reassessment (*n* = 202)**	**Diff.**
State	***N* (%)**	***N* (%)**		***N* (%)**	***N* (%)**	
Michigan	21 (20.2%)	20 (28.6%)		58 (16.5%)	44 (21.8%)	
Missouri	42 (40.4%)	27 (38.6%)		157 (44.6%)	90 (44.6%)	
Montana	26 (25%)	15 (21.4%)		86 (24.4%)	43 (21.3%)	
Rhode Island	11 (10.6%)	5 (7.1%)		33 (9.4%)	19 (9.4%)	
Hawai'i	4 (3.8%)	3 (4.3%)		18 (5.1%)	6 (3%)	
Age (mean years)	43.20	45.57	^	37.34	38.97	^
Sex	***N* (%)**	***N* (%)**		***N* (%)**	***N* (%)**	
Man	14 (13.5%)	7 (10%)	n/s	35 (9.9%)	25 (12.4%)	n/s
Woman	86 (82.7%)	62 (88.6%)		305 (86.6%)	169 (83.7%)	
Prefer not to answer or another response	4 (3.8%)	1 (1.4%)		12 (3.4)	8 (4%)	
Ethnicity	***N* (%)**	***N* (%)**		***N* (%)**	***N* (%)**	
Hispanic or Latino	2 (1.9%)	2 (2.9%)	n/s	20 (5.7%)	7 (3.5%)	n/s
Not Hispanic or Latino	92 (88.5%)	67 (95.7%)		315 (89.5%)	169 (83.7%)	
Prefer not to answer	10 (9.6%)	1 (1.4%)		17 (4.8%)	8 (4.0%)	
Race†	***N* (%)**	***N* (%)**		***N* (%)**	***N* (%)**	
Am. Indian/Alaska Native	0 (0%)	1 (1.4%)	n/s	7 (2.0%)	6 (3.0%)	n/s
Black or African American	7 (6.7%)	3 (4.3%)		31 (8.8%)	20 (9.9%)	
Asian or Asian American	2 (1.9%)	0 (0%)		11 (3.1%)	6 (3.0%)	
White	88 (84.6%)	64 (91.4%)		294 (83.5%)	160 (79.2%)	
Other	2 (1.9%)	0 (0%)		8 (2.3%)	0 (0%)	
Prefer not to answer	8 (7.7%)	2 (2.9%)		18 (5.1%)	15 (7.4%)	
Level of Education	***N* (%)**	***N* (%)**		***N* (%)**	***N* (%)**	
High school graduate	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	n/s	0 (0%)	1 (0.5%)	^
Some college	0 (0%)	0 (0%)		3 (0.9%)	3 (1.5%)	
Associates or vocational	0 (0%)	0 (0%)		0 (0%)	3 (1.5%)	
Bachelor's degree	59 (56.7%)	45 (64.3%)		292 (83.0%)	156 (77.2%)	
Master's degree	44 (42.3%)	23 (32.9%)		56 (15.9%)	39 (19.3%)	
Doctoral degree	1 (1.0%)	2 (2.9%)		1 (0.3%)	0 (0%)	

Table 3. *QIC-EY Workforce Demographics – Cross-site (N = 728)*						
	QIC-EY Supervisors (*n* = 174)			**QIC-EY Caseworkers (*n* = 554)**		
	Pre-Implementation (*n* = 104)	**Reassessment (*n* = 70)**	**Diff.**	**Pre-Implementation (*n* = 352)**	**Reassessment (*n* = 202)**	**Diff.**
Field of Study	***N* (%)**	***N* (%)**		***N* (%)**	***N* (%)**	
Social Work	25 (24.0%)	20 (28.6%)		69 (19.6%)	37 (18.3%)	
Psychology	21 (20.2%)	11 (15.7%)		74 (21.0%)	49 (24.3%)	
Education	9 (8.7%)	5 (7.1%)		34 (9.7%)	18 (8.9%)	
Law	1 (1.0%)	3 (4.3%)		3 (0.9%)	0 (0%)	
Public Health	1 (1.0%)	0 (0%)		4 (1.1%)	3 (1.5%)	
Public Administration	3 (2.9%)	1 (1.4%)	**n/s**	4 (1.1%)	3 (1.5%)	**n/s**
Human Development	4 (3.8%)	1 (1.4%)		17 (4.8%)	15 (7.4%)	
Criminal Justice	16 (15.4%)	12 (17.1%)		56 (15.9%)	26 (12.9%)	
Sociology	9 (8.7%)	4 (5.7%)		22 (6.3%)	12 (5.9%)	
Other	13 (12.5%)	13 (18.6%)		66 (18.8%)	35 (17.3%)	
Missing	2 (1.9%)	0 (0%)		3 (0.9%)	4 (2.0%)	
Participated in the workforce training		35 (50%)			78 (38.6%)	
Worked w/ youth who took part in QIC-EY program model		26 (37.1%)			82 (40.6%)	
Years Worked in the Child Welfare Field (mean)	13.64	14.93	**n/s**	5.39	6.81	*
Years Worked in Current Agency (mean)	11.63	13.57	^	3.67	5.00	**
Years in Current Position (mean)	4.39	6.11	*	3.04	4.17	**

^ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, n/s = no statistically significant difference

† Participants were able to choose more than one racial identity.

Data Collection

This report contains an analysis of the Pre-Implementation (T1) and Reassessment (T3) data from the workforce outcome survey collected from September 2023 to November 2024. Surveys were collected electronically via REDCap's secure online data collection software. At each participating pilot site, the Site Implementation Manager (SIM) provided survey links and requested that intervention region supervisors and caseworkers participate in the survey. These requests were either sent via email, in person during staff meetings and conversations, and/or during time allocated for survey completion at online, synchronous trainings.

Measures

The workforce outcome survey includes measures that assess outcomes included in the logic model (See Appendix B). Table 4 below lists all outcomes assessed in the QIC-EY workforce outcome survey. Due to time constraints in the outcome survey, some measures were shortened to facilitate participant

completion. More detailed information about each measure included in this report can be found in the Findings section.

Table 4. *QIC-EY Workforce Outcome Survey: Outcomes and Corresponding Survey Measures*

QIC-EY Outcome	# of Sub-Outcomes	Constructs	Survey Measure
Short-Term Outcomes			
1. Workforce preparedness/capacity in the engagement of children and youth	8	Confidence to Support Youth in Permanency Planning	**1.1-1.5** Workforce Confidence Items and Total Scale
		Skills in Engaging Youth	**1.6-1.7** Skills in Engaging Youth in Case/ Permanency Planning
		Cultural Competencies, Disability	**1.8** Social Worker's Attitudes Toward Disability Scale, Practice Subscale ^
2. Efficacy & job satisfaction	3	Professional Satisfaction	**2.1** Professional Quality of Life (ProQOL-5), Compassion Satisfaction Subscale
		Professional Efficacy	**2.2** TCU Organizational Readiness for Change (TCU ORC-D4), Efficacy Subscale of Staff Attributes Scale
		Supervisor Support	**2.3** Supervision for Frontline Staff Scale
3. Youth satisfaction with the level of engagement child welfare & courts staff have with them	This is captured in the youth survey.		
4. Children/youth participation in permanency planning	7	Youth Engagement	**4.1-4.6** Agency-Wide Youth Engagement items
		Youth Involvement	**4.7** Involvement and Interaction Rating Scale (IIRS), Youth involvement subscale
5. Children/youth participation in permanency planning hearings and case planning meetings	12	Youth Engagement in Permanency Hearings	**5.1-5.6** Agency-Level Youth Engagement in Permanency Hearings
		Youth Engagement in Case Planning Meetings	**5.7-5.12** Agency-Level Youth Engagement in Case Planning Meetings
6. Philosophy and culture related to engagement of youth by child welfare staff and court personnel	11	Personal- and Agency-Wide Beliefs Regarding Youth Engagement	**6.1-6.2** Case-Level YE Philosophy and Culture, Inform Subscale
			6.3-6.4 Case-Level YE Philosophy and Culture, Elicit Subscale
			6.5-6.6 Case-Level YE Philosophy and Culture, Partner Subscale
			6.7-6.8 Case-Level YE Philosophy and Culture, Permanency Subscale
		Commitment to Youth Engagement	**6.9** Youth Voice Agency Level Assessment (Y-VAL), Overall Vision and Commitment Subscale, Commitment to Meaningful Participation Items
		Culture of Partnership	**6.10** Y-VAL, Overall Vision and Commitment Subscale, Culture of Partnership Items
		Organizational Change	**6.11** Organizational Climate Scale of TCU ORC-D4, Change Subscale

7. Use of EY tools by child welfare & courts	This outcome is measured within the next outcome. Additionally, it is measured with process evaluation.		
Long-Term Outcomes			
8. Implementation of policies & practices that reflect child welfare systems' commitment to EY practices	8	Worker Participation in Youth Engagement Practices	**8.1** Worker Participation Scale
		Youth-Adult Interaction and Involvement in Case/Permanency Planning	**8.2** IIRS, Adult Involvement subscale
			8.3 IIRS, Youth-adult interaction subscale
		Agency-Wide Changes and Support for Youth Engagement	**8.4-8.5** Community Key Informant (CKI) Diffusion Items
		Youth Involvement at the Agency-Level	**8.6** Y-VAL, Empowered Representatives Subscale
			8.7 Y-VAL, Commitment to Facilitation and Support of Youth Participation Item
			8.8 Y-VAL, Participation in Evaluation Subscale
9. Long-term Efficacy & Job Satisfaction	8	Burnout	**9.1** ProQOL-5, Burnout Subscale
		Secondary Traumatic Stress	**9.2** ProQOL-5, Secondary Traumatic Stress Subscale
		Worker Retention	**9.3** Intent to Stay Scale
			9.4-9.8 Intent to Leave Scale
Additional Outcome			
10. Relational Permanence	1	Relational Permanency	**10.1** Relational Permanence Scale

Analyses

The primary goal of data analysis in this report was to assess differences in workforce outcomes for case-carrying workers and supervisors before and after the implementation of the QIC-EY workforce training, court training, youth program model, and capacity-building activity at each site. Differences between pre-implementation (T1) and reassessment (T3) were assessed for statistical significance, and **effect sizes** were calculated to determine whether any differences were small, medium, or large. The analytical approaches used in this report included frequencies, descriptive statistics, t-tests, chi-squared tests, and effect sizes. Statistical comparisons of Pre-Implementation (T1) and Reassessment (T3) scores among intervention group participants were conducted using ANCOVA or logistic regression, controlling for site, level of education, and number of years working in child welfare. Additionally, we assessed differences among the Reassessment (T3) groups based on whether or not they participated in the QIC-EY project components. For the supervisor groups, we assessed differences in each sub-outcome by whether they reported having participated in the QIC-EY workforce training and coaching model. Because the sample sizes were smaller for the supervisor groups, they were not assessed for statistical significance, and differences between groups were determined using **effect size measures only**. For the caseworker groups, we assessed **statistically significant** differences in each sub-outcome by whether they reported (a) having participated in the QIC-EY workforce training and coaching model, and (b) having worked with at least one youth who had taken part in the QIC-EY youth program model in their site. For each scale in which statistical comparisons were conducted, statistically significant findings were reported ($p<0.05$), as well as results that approached but did not reach significance ($p<0.10$). Please see Appendix C for a list of statistical term definitions.

Summary of Findings

The workforce outcome survey assesses the nine outcomes included in the QIC-EY logic model (See Appendix B) and one additional outcome. For each outcome, one or more survey measures (sets of survey questions) are used. For each survey measure, one or more sub-outcomes are assessed to determine how well the QIC-EY program is meeting its intended outcomes.

Findings are separated into supervisor and caseworker subgroups. Differences between Pre-Implementation (T1) and Reassessment (T3) were assessed for statistical significance, and effect sizes were calculated to determine whether any changes were small, medium, or large. Additionally, we assessed differences in outcomes between those who did and did not participate in QIC-EY project components among the Reassessment (T3) group only to better understand the effect of exposure to specific initiatives, above and beyond the system-level influence of working within the intervention region. Our hypothesis is that we will see improvements over time due to the various efforts undertaken in intervention regions over the past several years. Consequently, *observed improvements from Pre-Implementation (T1) to Reassessment (T3) that persist despite supervisors and caseworkers reporting they did not participate in QIC-EY initiatives provide evidence of systemic changes within the intervention site, as the impact of the initiatives trickled down beyond those who experienced the interventions firsthand*.

Note that all findings are based on information reported *by participants* and are, therefore, subject to the participants' perceptions.

Supervisor Overview

From Pre-Implementation (T1) to Reassessment (T3), there were small statistically significant improvements on 16% of sub-outcomes (9 out of 58 total) and medium-to-large statistically significant improvements on 17% of sub-outcomes (10 out of 58 total). There were no statistically significant declines from T1 to T3 across all outcomes.

Supervisor Summary Table

Table 5 presents an overview of changes in QIC-EY outcomes for supervisors from Pre-Implementation (T1) to Reassessment (T3). Specifically, the table shows **(1)** the outcomes, **(2)** the number of sub-outcomes used to assess each outcome, **(3)** the percent of sub-outcomes for each outcome where there were **statistically significant** improvements, and **(4)** the percent of sub-outcomes for each outcome where there were **statistically significant** declines (for the supervisors, there were no statistically significant declines). Please see the ***Findings*** section for more detail, including information on sub-outcomes that did not change.

Table 5. *Supervisor Overall Outcome Changes, N = 174*

Outcome	# of Sub-outcomes	% of Sub-outcomes with Improvement		% of Sub-outcomes with Declines	
		Medium-to-Large Improvements	Small Improvements	Small Declines	Medium-to-Large Declines
Short-Term Outcomes					
(1) Workforce preparedness/capacity in the engagement of children and youth	8	38%	50%	0%	0%
(2) Efficacy & job satisfaction	3	0%	0%	0%	0%
(3) Youth satisfaction with the level of engagement child welfare & courts staff have with them	This is captured in the youth survey.				
(4) Children/youth participation in permanency planning	7	**14%**	0%	0%	0%
(5) Children/youth participating in permanency planning hearings and case planning meetings	12	0%	0%	0%	0%
(6) Philosophy and culture related to engagement of youth by child welfare staff and court personnel	11	**18%**	0%	0%	0%
(7) Use of EY tools by child welfare & courts	This outcome is measured within the next outcome and with process evaluation.				
Long-Term Outcomes					
(8) Implementation of policies & practices that reflect child welfare systems' commitment to EY practices	8	**50%**	38%	0%	0%
(9) Long-term efficacy & job satisfaction	8	0%	25%	0%	0%
Additional Outcome					
Relational Permanence	1	0%	0%	0%	0%

Supervisor Findings in Detail

Pre-Implementation (T1) – Reassessment (T3) Findings

Below, we describe in more detail the outcomes and sub-outcomes that showed **statistically significant improvements** from Pre-Implementation (T1) to Reassessment (T3). There were no statistically significant declines among the supervisor groups. Some of the sub-outcome descriptions are combined for concision. You can follow the hyperlink of each sub-outcome to read more about each finding.

The following sub-outcomes include those with **statistically significant improvements**:

Outcome 1: Workforce preparedness/capacity in the engagement of children and youth

- Moderate improvements in confidence in engaging children and youth in permanency planning that includes relational and cultural permanency, as well as overall confidence across all areas of case/permanency planning.
- Small improvements in confidence in engaging children and youth in case planning and permanency planning that includes legal permanency.
- Small improvements in self-rated skills in engaging youth in case and permanency planning.

Outcome 4: Children/youth participation in permanency planning

- Moderately higher worker-reported youth involvement.

Outcome 6: Philosophy and culture related to engagement of youth by child welfare staff and court personnel

- Moderate increase in commitment to meaningful youth participation in planning processes.
- Moderate increase in commitment to a culture of partnership between the agency and youth in permanency planning.

Outcome 8: Implementation of policies & practices that reflect child welfare systems' commitment to EY practices

- Small improvement in workers' perceptions of their own participation in engaging youth.
- Small improvement in youth-adult interaction in case/permanency planning.
- Moderate improvement in more active and effective supervision.
- Small improvement in the levels of activities in the agency that are geared toward youth engagement.
- Moderate improvements in agency-level youth engagement attitudes and practices, including empowering youth to participate in planning, increased commitment to facilitation and support of youth participation, and support for youth participation in evaluation and in providing feedback about the agency.

Outcome 9: Long-term efficacy & job satisfaction

- A small improvement, a reduction in the number of supervisors considering leaving their jobs.

Reassessment (T3)-Only Comparison by QIC-EY Program Model Participation Findings

Below, we present a comparison of outcomes among the Reassessment (T3) groups. For the supervisor groups, we assessed differences in each sub-outcome by whether they reported having participated in the QIC-EY workforce training and coaching model. Because the sample sizes were smaller for these groups, they were not assessed for statistical significance, and differences between groups were determined using **effect size measures only**. Differences between groups highlight areas where the workforce training and coaching model may have influenced outcomes above and beyond the system-wide effects experienced by workers in the intervention regions.

Among the Reassessment (T3) group, supervisors who reported participating in the QIC-EY training-and-coaching model showed **better outcomes** than the group who did not participate, in the following areas:

Outcome 1: Workforce preparedness/capacity in the engagement of children and youth

- Greater confidence in engaging youth in permanency planning that includes cultural permanency.
- Greater sense of competency in providing resources and support for youth living with disabilities.

Outcome 2: Efficacy & job satisfaction

- A higher sense of compassion in their work with children and youth.

Outcome 4: Children/youth participation in permanency planning.

- A moderately higher level of engagement of youth aged 18 to 20 in permanency planning.

Outcome 5: Children/youth participation in permanency planning hearings and case planning meetings

- Greater engagement of youth in permanency hearings across all age groups, 8 to 20.
- More youth aged 8 to 13 being engaged in, and the roles they play in case planning meetings.

Outcome 8: Implementation of policies & practices that reflect child welfare systems' commitment to EY practices

- Greater levels of activities geared toward youth engagement.
- More commitment to facilitating and supporting youth engagement.
- Higher support for youth participation in evaluation.

Outcome 9: Long-term efficacy & job satisfaction

- Greater intentions to stay in their jobs.
- Less thinking about or acting on thoughts of leaving their jobs among participants who had previously considered leaving.

However, outcomes were **poorer** for the supervisors who reported participating in the workforce training and coaching in the following areas:

Outcome 8: Implementation of policies & practices that reflect child welfare systems' commitment to EY practices

- Less adult involvement in supporting youth participation.
- Less reported youth-adult interaction in case and permanency planning.

Outcome 9: Long-term efficacy & job satisfaction

- Higher reports of looking for other jobs among a subset of participants who had previously considered leaving.

Caseworker Overview

From Pre-Implementation (T1) to Reassessment (T3), there were small statistically significant improvements on 40% of sub-outcomes (23 out of 58 total). There was a small, statistically significant decline in 2% of sub-outcomes (1 out of 58 total).

Caseworker Summary Table

Table 6 presents an overview of changes in QIC-EY outcomes for caseworkers. Specifically, the table shows **(1)** the outcomes, **(2)** the number of sub-outcomes used to assess each outcome, **(3)** the percent of sub-outcomes for each outcome where there were **statistically significant** improvements, and **(4)** the percent of sub-outcomes for each outcome where there were **statistically significant** declines.
Please see the ***Findings*** section for more detail, including information on sub-outcomes that did not change.

Table 6. *Caseworker Overall Outcome Changes, N = 554*

Outcome	# of Sub-outcomes	% of Sub-outcomes with Improvement		% of Sub-outcomes with Declines	
		Medium-to-Large Improvements	Small Improvements	Small Declines	Medium-to-Large Declines
Short-Term Outcomes					
(1) Workforce preparedness/ capacity in the engagement of children and youth	8	0%	50%	13%	0%
(2) Efficacy & job satisfaction	3	0%	33%	0%	0%
(3) Youth satisfaction with the level of engagement child welfare & courts staff have with them	This is captured in the youth survey.				
(4) Children/youth participation in permanency planning	7	0%	43%	0%	0%
(5) Children/youth participating in permanency planning hearings and case planning meetings	12	0%	50%	0%	0%
(6) Philosophy and culture related to engagement of youth by child welfare staff and court personnel	11	0%	27%	0%	0%
(7) Use of EY tools by child welfare & courts	This outcome is measured within the next outcome and with process evaluation.				
Long-Term Outcomes					
(8) Implementation of policies & practices that reflect child welfare systems' commitment to EY practices	8	0%	63%	0%	0%
(9) Long-term efficacy & job satisfaction	8	0%	0%	0%	0%
Additional Outcome					
Relational Permanence	1	0%	100%	0%	0%

Caseworker Findings in Detail

Pre-Implementation (T1) – Reassessment (T3) Findings

Below, we describe in more detail the outcomes and sub-outcomes that showed **statistically significant improvements and declines** from Pre-Implementation (T1) to Reassessment (T3). All the changes among

the caseworker groups were small (based on effect size values). Some of the sub-outcome descriptions are combined for concision. You can follow the hyperlink of each sub-outcome to read more about each finding.

The following sub-outcomes include those with **statistically significant improvements**:

Outcome 1: Workforce preparedness/capacity in the engagement of children and youth

- Improvements in confidence in engaging children and youth in permanency planning that includes relational and cultural permanency, as well as overall confidence across all areas of case/permanency planning.
- Small improvements in self-rated skills in engaging youth in permanency planning.

Outcome 2: Efficacy & job satisfaction

- Increase in perceived supervisor support for frontline staff.

Outcome 4: Children/youth participation in permanency planning

- Improvement in the reported role played by youth aged 14 to 20 in permanency planning.
- Increase in worker-reported youth involvement.

Outcome 5: Children/youth participating in permanency planning hearings and case planning meetings

- Improvement in the roles played by youth aged 14 to 20 in permanency hearings.
- Improvement in the active engagement of and roles played by children aged 14 to 20 in case planning meetings.

Outcome 6: Philosophy and culture related to engagement of youth by child welfare staff and court personnel

- Increase in overall agency beliefs and expectations that children and youth should be kept informed throughout planning processes.
- Increase in commitment to meaningful youth participation in planning processes.
- Increase in commitment to a culture of partnership between the agency and youth in permanency planning.

Outcome 8: Implementation of policies & practices that reflect child welfare systems' commitment to EY practices

- Improvements in youth-adult interaction in case/permanency planning.
- Increase in reports of active and effective supervision.
- Improvements in agency-level youth engagement attitudes and practices, including empowering youth to participate in planning, increased commitment to facilitating and supporting youth participation, and support for youth participation in evaluation and in providing feedback about the agency.

Additional Outcome: Relational Permanence

- Increased commitment to permanency practices that include relational permanence.

There was one sub-outcome with a **statistically significant decline**:

Outcome 1: Workforce preparedness/capacity in the engagement of children and youth

- Decline in practice behaviors that support and advocate for children and youth living with disabilities.

Reassessment (T3)-Only Comparison by QIC-EY Program Model Participation Findings

Below, we present a comparison of outcomes among the Reassessment (T3) groups. For the caseworker groups, we assessed **statistically significant** differences in each sub-outcome by whether they reported (a) having participated in the QIC-EY workforce training and coaching model, and (b) having worked with at least one youth who had taken part in the QIC-EY youth program model in their site. There were no statistically significant differences in sub-outcomes by caseworker participation in workforce training, suggesting that more system-level changes were attributable to exposure to the intervention region. However, there were several areas with statistically significant differences based on having worked with youth who participated in QIC-EY youth program models.

Among the Reassessment (T3) group, caseworkers who reported working with at least one youth who has participated in the youth program model showed **better outcomes** in the following areas:

Outcome 1: Workforce preparedness/capacity in the engagement of children and youth

- Greater confidence across all aspects of case and permanency planning.
- Greater skill in engaging youth in both case planning and permanency planning.

Outcome 8: Implementation of policies & practices that reflect child welfare systems' commitment to EY practices

- Inclusion of more agency-wide activities geared toward youth engagement.

Outcome 9: Long-term efficacy & job satisfaction

- Fewer caseworkers who had considered looking for other work.

Differences between groups highlight areas where the application of youth engagement practices and policies, through their participation in the youth program model, may have influenced outcomes beyond the system-wide effects experienced by workers in the intervention regions.

Conclusion

Participants in the QIC-EY pilot regions were surveyed at the beginning of the project (2023-2024), prior to implementation of youth engagement initiatives, including workforce training and coaching, court training, a site-specific capacity-building project, and a site-specific youth engagement program model. A new, potentially overlapping sample of child welfare supervisors and caseworkers in the pilot region was surveyed again in 2026 to assess long-term, system-wide changes in workforce capacity to meaningfully engage children and youth in case and permanency planning.

Supervisors

Supervisors showed statistically significant improvements from Pre-Implementation to Reassessment across some domains, with no statistically significant declines observed. Workforce preparedness and capacity improved meaningfully. Supervisors reported moderate gains in confidence engaging children and youth in permanency planning—particularly around relational and cultural permanency — as well as moderate increases in overall confidence across all case and permanency planning areas. Small but significant improvements were also found in confidence around legal permanency planning and in self-rated skills for engaging youth in case and permanency planning. Supervisors also demonstrated stronger commitment to youth-centered philosophy and culture. Moderate increases were observed in commitment to meaningful youth participation in planning processes and in commitment to an agency culture of partnership with youth in permanency planning.

Implementation of youth engagement policies and practices improved across several sub-outcomes. Small improvements were found in supervisors' perceptions of their own participation in engaging youth and in youth-adult interaction during case and permanency planning. Moderate improvements were observed in active and effective supervision practices. Small improvements were noted in agency-level activities oriented toward youth engagement. Moderate improvements were observed in broader agency-level youth engagement attitudes and practices, including empowering youth to participate in planning, strengthening commitment to facilitating and supporting youth participation, and increasing support for youth participation in evaluation and feedback processes. Finally, a small but significant reduction was found in the number of supervisors considering leaving their positions, suggesting a modest positive effect on workforce retention.

Comparison by QIC-EY Workforce Training Participation

Among supervisors assessed at Reassessment (T3) by workforce training participation, results were largely consistent with system-level changes attributable to exposure to intervention region activities: 67% of sub-outcomes showed no differences between supervisors who had and had not participated in the QIC-EY training and coaching model (based on effect size measures only due to smaller sample sizes). In the areas where training participants did show stronger outcomes—confidence in cultural permanency planning, competency in supporting youth with disabilities, compassion in practice, engagement of youth across planning processes and meetings, and intentions to remain in their jobs—these gains suggest that workforce training and coaching influenced outcomes beyond system-wide effects in these areas. In the few areas where training participants showed somewhat lower outcomes—adult involvement in supporting youth participation, and youth-adult interaction in case and permanency planning—these differences may be attributable to increased awareness gained through training, which may have prompted more critical and realistic self-assessment rather than reflecting actual declines in practice.

Caseworkers

Caseworkers showed statistically significant improvements across multiple domains from pre- to post-implementation. All statistically significant changes had small effect sizes. One statistically significant decline was also observed. Workforce preparedness and confidence improved. Caseworkers reported increased confidence in engaging youth in permanency planning, including relational and cultural permanency, and overall confidence across case and permanency planning. Small but significant improvements were found in self-rated skills for engaging youth in permanency planning. Caseworkers reported increased perceived supervisor support for frontline staff, a positive indicator for workforce climate and retention. Youth participation in planning processes showed improvement. Caseworkers reported improvements in the role of youth aged 18-20 in permanency planning, in the roles of youth aged 14-20 in permanency hearings, and in the active engagement and roles of youth aged 14-20 in case planning meetings. Agency-level philosophy and culture shifted in a positive direction. Caseworkers reported increases in agency-level beliefs and expectations that youth should be kept informed throughout planning, increases in commitment to meaningful youth participation, and stronger commitment to a culture of partnership with youth in permanency planning.

Implementation of youth engagement policies and practices improved across several sub-outcomes, including greater youth-adult interaction in case and permanency planning, increased reports of active and effective supervision, and improvements in agency-level youth engagement attitudes and practices—including empowering youth to participate in planning, greater commitment to facilitating youth participation, and increased support for youth in evaluation and feedback processes. Further, caseworkers showed increased commitment to relational permanency practices, reflecting broader adoption of permanency-oriented approaches that extend beyond legal permanency outcomes.

The only statistically significant decline was a decrease in workers' perceived competence in working with youth living with disabilities. These results suggest meaningful progress in youth engagement practices, alongside ongoing challenges in workforce preparedness for working with youth living with disabilities.

Comparison by QIC-EY Youth Program Model Participation

Among caseworkers assessed at Reassessment (T3), there were no statistically significant differences in outcomes based on participation in the QIC-EY workforce training and coaching model, and there were no differences between caseworkers who had and had not worked with a QIC-EY-engaged youth across 85% of sub-outcomes, suggesting system-level change among caseworkers regardless of their direct interaction with program-model components. However, caseworkers who had worked with at least one youth in the program model showed greater confidence and skill in engaging children and youth in case/permanency planning, reported more agency-wide activities geared toward youth engagement, and fewer caseworkers considered leaving their jobs. In these areas, direct interaction with program-engaged youth may have influenced worker outcomes beyond system-wide effects.

Implications for Practice

The findings from this evaluation offer several important lessons for child welfare agencies and workforce leaders seeking to advance meaningful youth engagement. Taken together, the data suggest that targeted investment in workforce development, sustained coaching support, and direct youth-worker interaction can yield meaningful shifts in confidence, culture, and practice. Based on the cross-site findings from the QIC-EY pilot sites, several implications for practice could be considered:

(1) Evidence of System-Level Change

Several outcomes suggest that the QIC-EY initiative contributed to meaningful shifts at the system level, not only at the individual worker level. Improvements in agency-level youth engagement attitudes and practices, increased reports of active supervision, stronger commitments to partnership with youth, and broader adoption of relational and cultural permanency frameworks all point to changes in organizational culture and practice environment. These broader shifts are consistent with the theory of change underlying youth engagement programming: that lasting change requires transformation of organizational culture and policy environments, not only worker behavior. To sustain these gains, agencies should embed expectations for youth engagement into policy frameworks, supervision structures, hiring and onboarding processes, and quality assurance systems, ensuring that positive changes outlast the program itself.

(2) Areas Where the QIC-EY Initiative Particularly Advanced System Change

Several findings point to areas where the QIC-EY initiative had a particularly notable influence, including gains in cultural permanency competency, compassion in practice, and supervisory effectiveness. Supervisors who participated showed greater engagement of youth across a wide age range (8–20) in permanency hearings and case planning meetings, with especially notable gains for younger children (ages 8–13) who have historically been more likely to be excluded from planning processes. One of the most striking findings was that caseworkers with direct experience working alongside youth in the youth program model demonstrated significantly stronger outcomes than those who had not—in confidence, skills, agency activities, and retention intentions—suggesting that youth themselves, when meaningfully engaged in structured program models, can serve as catalysts for worker development. Finally, supervisors play a central role in sustaining these gains: moderate improvements in active and effective supervision, combined with stronger intentions to remain in their jobs among training participants, underscore the importance of investing in supervisory capacity for facilitation, modeling, and reflective coaching.

(3) Areas for Continued Improvement

Several findings point to areas where additional attention and investment may be warranted. Declines in caseworkers' perceived competence in advocating for and supporting youth with disabilities, particularly under time constraints, highlight the need for targeted training, accessible resources, and caseload structures that account for the additional demands of inclusive practice. Workforce retention remains a complex picture: while overall intentions to leave declined and caseworkers who worked with program-engaged youth showed better retention indicators, a subset of supervisors who had participated in training and had previously considered leaving reported higher rates of actively seeking other employment. This may signal unmet organizational needs around compensation, workload, or culture that training alone cannot address. Agencies should pair workforce development with complementary strategies to address structural conditions that affect workforce stability.

Appendices

Appendix A. Findings

In the following section, we present detailed findings comparing Pre-Implementation (T1) and Reassessment (T3) outcomes among workers in the QIC-EY intervention regions of the pilot sites. Sections are organized according to the QIC-EY logic model, beginning with short-term outcomes and progressing to long-term outcomes. Within each section, the construct (concept or idea) being measured is listed, along with an explanation of the survey instruments and items used, and a summary of the results.

Effect Sizes

Please note that in each findings table, the **statistically significant differences** between the Pre-Implementation (T1) and Reassessment (T3) scores for participants are highlighted using colors that indicate whether the change is an **improvement** or a **decline** and whether it is **small, medium,** or **large** (also known as the effect size[1]). Any differences that are not statistically significant are not color-coded.

Red = Large Decline	Orange = Medium Decline	Yellow = Small Decline	Grey = Minimal to No Change	Green = Small Improvement	Blue = Medium Improvement	Purple = Large Improvement

Short-term Outcomes

Outcome 1: Workforce preparedness/capacity in the engagement of children and youth

Confidence to Support Youth in Permanency Planning (1.1-1.5)

The Workforce Confidence Scale was developed by the evaluators to assess child welfare workers' confidence in supporting youth in permanency planning. Four items in this measure asked workers to rate their confidence in engaging youth in case and permanency planning, with response options ranging from (0) = *Not at All Confident* to (10) = *Very Confident*. To evaluate the reliability of the total scale, Cronbach's alpha was calculated using data from the cross-site sample at baseline and was within an acceptable range ($\alpha = 0.69$). See Appendix D for the full list of questions.

Table 7 presents the mean scores on the Workforce Confidence Items and the total scale score. Higher scores are associated with greater confidence in engaging with children and youth across various aspects of case and permanency planning.

Supervisors. From T1 to T3, there were statistically significant, small improvements in their confidence in engaging youth in *case planning* (+0.64) and in permanency planning that includes *legal permanency* (+0.82). There were statistically significant, medium improvements in their confidence in engaging youth in permanency planning that includes *relational permanency* (+1.05) and *cultural permanency* (+1.19), as well as *overall confidence* across all areas of case and permanency planning (+0.92). Among the T3 group, supervisors who reported participating in the QIC-EY training and coaching model reported greater

[1] Effect size indicators included Cohen's d and Hedges g (0.2 = small, 0.5 = medium, 0.8 = large), Partial eta squared (0.01 = small, 0.06 = medium, 0.14 = large), Cohen's w (.10 = small, .30 = medium, and .50 = large), and standardized odds ratios (1.68 = small, 3.47 = medium, 6.71 = large)

confidence in engaging youth in planning that includes *cultural permanency* than those who did not, with a small, statistically significant difference between groups.

Caseworkers. From T1 to T3, there were minimal improvements in confidence engaging youth in *case planning* that approached statistical significance (+0.41). There were also minimal, statistically significant improvements in confidence engaging youth in permanency planning that includes *legal permanency* (+0.55). Additionally, there were statistically significant, small improvements in confidence in engaging youth in permanency planning, including *relational* permanency (+0.68) and *cultural permanency* (+0.66), as well as *overall confidence* across all areas of case and permanency planning (+0.85). Among the T3 group, caseworkers who reported having worked with at least one youth who participated in the youth engagement program model showed greater confidence than those who did not, with small, statistically significant differences in confidence in engaging youth in *case planning*, permanency planning that includes *cultural permanency*, and *overall confidence*; they had moderate, statistically significant differences in confidence engaging youth in planning that includes *legal* and *relational permanency*.

Table 7. *Confidence to Support Youth in Permanency Planning*

	QIC-EY Supervisors			QIC-EY Caseworkers		
	N	Mean	Diff.	*N*	Mean	Diff.
1.1 Confidence engaging children and youth in case planning						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	101	8.59	+0.64**	333	7.92	+0.41^
Reassessment (T3)	69	9.23		199	8.33	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				Yes*		
1.2 Confidence engaging children and youth in permanency planning that includes *legal permanency*						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	101	8.37	+0.82**	333	7.56	+0.55*
Reassessment (T3)	69	9.19		197	8.11	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				Yes***		
1.3 Confidence engaging children and youth in permanency planning that includes *relational permanency*						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	101	7.98	+1.05**	333	7.39	+0.68**
Reassessment (T3)	69	9.03		196	8.07	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				Yes***		
1.4 Confidence engaging children and youth in permanency planning that includes *cultural permanency*						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	101	7.60	+1.19***	333	7.00	+0.66*
Reassessment (T3)	69	8.79		196	7.67	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	Yes			No		

Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				Yes*		
1.5 Total Workforce Confidence Scale Scores						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	101	8.13	+0.92***	333	7.47	+0.58**
Reassessment (T3)	69	9.06		197	8.04	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				Yes**		

Note. Possible answer choices ranged from 0 to 10, with higher scores indicated greater confidence
^ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, no symbol = no statistically significant difference

Color coding meanings:

Red = Large Decline	Orange = Medium Decline	Yellow = Small Decline	Grey = Minimal to No Change	Green = Small Improvement	Blue = Medium Improvement	Purple = Large Improvement

Skills in Engaging Youth (1.6-1.7)

The Skills in Engaging Youth item set includes two evaluator-developed measures used to assess child welfare workforce self-perceptions of their skills in engaging youth in case planning (7 items) and permanency planning (4 items). Questions were developed by the evaluation team based on the National Association of Social Workers Standards for Social Work Practice in Child Welfare (2013), Standard 11: Youth Engagement, which states that: "Social workers in child welfare shall actively engage older youths in addressing their needs while in out-of-home care and as they prepare to transition out of foster care" (p. 22).[2] Participants were asked to rate their skill in different areas related to engaging youth in case planning or permanency planning (e.g., "Supporting children and youth in developing decision-making skills, achieving goals, and celebrating successes;" "Co-creating permanency plans with children and youth"). Answer choices ranged from (0) = *I Have No Skill* to (10) = *I Have a High Level of Skill*. To evaluate the reliability of this scale, Cronbach's alpha was calculated based on baseline data from the cross-site sample and demonstrated good reliability for the Case Planning Scale ($\alpha = 0.94$) and for the Permanency Planning Scale ($\alpha = 0.91$). See Appendix D for the full list of questions.

Table 8 below shows the mean scores on the Skills in Engaging Youth Case Planning and Permanency Planning Scales. Higher scores are associated with greater self-rated skill in engaging youth in case and permanency planning.

Supervisors. From T1 to T3, there were small improvements in skill in engaging youth in *case planning* (+0.40) that approached statistical significance, and a small statistically significant improvement in skill in engaging youth in *permanency planning* (+0.71).

Caseworkers. From T1 to T3, there was a statistically significant improvement in skill in engaging youth in *permanency planning* (+0.51). While there were no statistically significant differences in skill in engaging youth in case planning from T1 to T2, among the T3 group, those who had worked with at least one youth who participated in the youth engagement program model scored higher than those who had not, with statistically significant, small differences between groups in both skill in engaging youth in *case planning* and *permanency planning*.

[2] National Association of Social Workers (2013). *NASW Standards for Social Work Practice in Child Welfare*. NASW.

Table 8. *Skills in Engaging Youth*

	QIC-EY Supervisors			QIC-EY Caseworkers		
	N	Mean	Diff.	*N*	Mean	Diff.
1.6 Engaging Youth in Case Planning						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	101	7.70	+0.40^	333	7.57	+0.17
Reassessment (T3)	69	8.09		199	7.74	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				Yes*		
1.7 Engaging Youth in Permanency Planning						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	101	7.25	+0.71**	332	6.94	+0.51**
Reassessment (T3)	69	7.97		199	7.45	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				Yes**		

Note. Possible scale scores ranged from 0 to 10, where higher scores indicate a greater level of skill
^ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, no symbol = no statistically significant difference

Color coding meanings:

Red = Large Decline	Orange = Medium Decline	Yellow = Small Decline	Grey = Minimal to No Change	Green = Small Improvement	Blue = Medium Improvement	Purple = Large Improvement

Cultural Competency, Disability (1.8)

The Social Worker's Attitudes Toward Disability Scale (SWADS) Practice Subscale is a validated measure (α = 0.86) used to assess social workers' cultural competence related to disability. A 2-item subset was used Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree a series of statements, with answer choices ranging from (1) = *Strongly Disagree* to (7) = *Strongly Agree* (e.g., "I advocate for my disabled clients to be included within the community;" "When I am too busy with other clients, I don't want to take time to provide special accommodations for my clients with disabilities").

Table 9 below shows the mean scores on the SWADS Practice Subscale. Higher scores are associated with more practice behaviors that support and advocate for children and youth living with disabilities.

Supervisors. From T1 to T3, there were no statistically significant differences. Among T3 supervisors, those who participated in the QIC-EY workforce training and coaching model showed greater cultural competency related to disability, with a small, statistically significant difference between groups.

Caseworkers. From T1 to T3, there was a small, statistically significant decline in cultural competency related to advocating for and working with youth living with disabilities (-0.42).

Table 9. *Cultural Competency, Disability*

	QIC-EY Supervisors			QIC-EY Caseworkers		
	N	Mean	Diff.	*N*	Mean	Diff.
1.8 SWADS, Practice Subscale items						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	101	6.26	-0.06	331	6.30	-0.42***
Reassessment (T3)	64	6.20		180	5.88	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	Yes			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				No		

Note. Possible scale scores ranged from 1 to 7, higher scores indicate more supportive attitudes
^ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, no symbol = no statistically significant difference

Color coding meanings:

Red = Large Decline	Orange = Medium Decline	Yellow = Small Decline	Grey = Minimal to No Change	Green = Small Improvement	Blue = Medium Improvement	Purple = Large Improvement

Outcome 2: Efficacy & job satisfaction

Professional Satisfaction (2.1)

The Professional Quality of Life (ProQOL-5) Compassion Satisfaction Subscale is an 11-item, validated measure (α = 0.88) assessing workers' professional satisfaction. The language was slightly adapted to be specific to child welfare workers. Researchers added one item to the subscale to assess supervisors' satisfaction with their engagement with staff. Participants were instructed to rate how frequently they experienced each of a series of statements in the last 30 days on a scale ranging from (1) = Never to (5) = Very Often (e.g., "I get satisfaction from being able to help children and youth;" "I feel invigorated after working with children and youth"). See *Appendix D* for the full list of questions.

Table 10 presents the mean scores for the ProQOL-5 Compassion Satisfaction Subscale. Higher mean scores are associated with greater satisfaction in the work with children and youth.

Supervisors. From T1 to T3, there were no statistically significant differences in professional satisfaction. However, the T3 supervisors who reported participating in the QIC-EY training and coaching model had higher compassion satisfaction scores, with a small but statistically significant difference between groups.

Caseworkers. From T1 to T3, there were no statistically significant differences in professional satisfaction.

Table 10. *Professional Satisfaction*

	QIC-EY Supervisors			QIC-EY Caseworkers		
	N	Mean	Diff.	*N*	Mean	Diff.
2.1 ProQOL-5 Compassion Satisfaction Subscale						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	101	4.14	-0.06	331	4.03	-0.07
Reassessment (T3)	65	4.08		184	3.96	

Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…		
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	Yes	No
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?		No

Note. Possible scale scores ranged from 1 to 5, where higher scores indicate greater levels of compassion satisfaction

^ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, no symbol = no statistically significant difference

Color coding meanings:

Red = Large Decline	Orange = Medium Decline	Yellow = Small Decline	Grey = Minimal to No Change	Green = Small Improvement	Blue = Medium Improvement	Purple = Large Improvement

Professional Efficacy (2.2)

The TCU Organizational Readiness for Change (TCU ORC-D4) Efficacy Subscale of the Staff Attributes Scale is a 6-item, validated measure (α = 0.68)[3] that assesses professional efficacy within the workforce. The language was slightly adapted to be specific to child welfare workers. The researchers added an additional question to assess supervisors' perceived efficacy in supporting their staff in child and youth engagement. Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement with a series of statements, with answer choices ranging from (1) = *Disagree Strongly* to (5) = *Agree Strongly* (e.g., "You have the skills needed to conduct effective child welfare work;" "You are effective and confident in doing your job"). See Appendix D for the full list of questions.

Table 11 below shows the mean scores on the TCU ORC-D4, Efficacy Subscale. Higher scores are associated with greater perceived efficacy in their work.

Supervisors. From T1 to T3, there were no statistically significant differences in professional efficacy.

Caseworkers. From T1 to T3, there were no statistically significant differences in professional efficacy.

Table 11. *Professional Efficacy*

	QIC-EY Supervisors			QIC-EY Caseworkers		
	N	Mean	Diff.	*N*	Mean	Diff.
2.2 TCU ORC-D4 Staff Attributes Scale, Efficacy Subscale						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	101	4.18	+0.04	331	3.97	+0.10^
Reassessment (T3)	63	4.22		180	4.07	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				No		

Note. Possible scale scores ranged from 1 to 5, where higher scores indicate greater levels of efficacy

^ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, no symbol = no statistically significant difference

Color coding meanings:

Red = Large Decline	Orange = Medium Decline	Yellow = Small Decline	Grey = Minimal to No Change	Green = Small Improvement	Blue = Medium Improvement	Purple = Large Improvement

[3] Lehman, W. E., Greener, J. M., & Simpson, D. D. (2002). Assessing organizational readiness for change. Journal of substance abuse treatment, 22(4), 197-209.

Supervisor Support (2.3)

The Supervision for Frontline Staff Scale[4] is a 10-item instrument assessing perceived supervisor support among workers. The last two questions, which are specific to supporting child and youth engagement practices, were added by the researchers. Participants were asked to rate a series of statements on a scale that ranged from (1) = *Strongly Disagree* to (4) = *Strongly Agree* (e.g., "My immediate supervisor genuinely cares about me;" "My immediate supervisor supports me in difficult case situations"). To evaluate the reliability of this scale, Cronbach's alpha was calculated using baseline data from the cross-site sample, yielding good reliability (α = 0.94). See Appendix D for the full list of questions.

Table 12 presents the mean scores for the Supervision for Frontline Staff Scale. Higher scores are associated with stronger feelings of support and more effective supervision.

Supervisors. From T1 to T3, there were no statistically significant differences in their experiences with supervision.

Caseworkers. From T1 to T3, there was a statistically significant, small improvement in supervisor support (+0.15).

Table 12. *Supervisor Support*

	QIC-EY Supervisors			QIC-EY Caseworkers		
	N	Mean	Diff.	*N*	Mean	Diff.
2.3 Supervision for Frontline Staff Scale						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	99	3.34	+0.06	313	3.30	+0.15**
Reassessment (T3)	63	3.40		175	3.45	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				No		

Note. Possible scale scores ranged from 1 to 4, where higher numbers indicate greater feelings of support
^ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, no symbol = no statistically significant difference

Color coding meanings:

Red = Large Decline	Orange = Medium Decline	Yellow = Small Decline	Grey = Minimal to No Change	Green = Small Improvement	Blue = Medium Improvement	Purple = Large Improvement

Outcome 3: Youth satisfaction with the level of engagement child welfare & court staff have with them

This outcome is captured within the youth survey rather than in the workforce survey.

Outcome 4: Children/youth participation in permanency planning

[4] Butler Institute for Families (2014). Supervision for Frontline Staff. Unpublished measure. Denver, CO: University of Denver.

Youth Engagement (4.1-4.6)

The 6-item evaluator-developed Agency-Wide Youth Engagement items were used to assess perceptions of agency-level youth engagement practices related to permanency planning. Three items from the scale asked, "Approximately how many children and youth served by your agency would you say are actively engaged in permanency planning?" within each of the age groups (a) ages 8 to 13, (b) ages 14 to 17, and (c) ages 18 to 20. Answer choices ranged from (1) = *Very few (less than 25%)* to (4) = *Most (75-100%)*. The remaining three items asked, "What type of role would you say most children and youth being served by your agency have in their permanency planning?" within each of the age groups: (a) ages 8 to 13, (b) ages 14 to 17, and (c) ages 18 to 20. Answer choices ranged from (1) = *They play no role* to (6) = *They play a primary role in developing ideas and plans as well as decision-making*.

Table 13 presents the mean scores for the Agency-Wide Youth Engagement items. Higher scores are associated with greater youth engagement in permanency planning within their agency.

Supervisors. From T1 to T3, there were no statistically significant differences in the active engagement of children and youth in permanency planning across age groups. Among the T3 group, supervisors who reported participating in the QIC-EY training and coaching model indicated greater active engagement of youth aged 18 to 20 in permanency planning, a medium difference based on effect size measures.

Caseworkers. From T1 to T3, there was a minimal, statistically significant improvement in the active engagement of youth aged 14 to 17 in permanency planning (+0.16).

Table 13. *Youth Engagement*

	QIC-EY Supervisors			QIC-EY Caseworkers		
	N	Mean	Diff.	*N*	Mean	Diff.
4.1-4.3 Agency-Wide Youth Engagement Items						
Approximately how many children and youth served by your agency would you say are actively engaged in permanency planning within each of the age groups below?						
Ages 8 to 13						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	99	1.82	+0.11	309	2.01	+0.04
Reassessment (T3)	63	1.94		177	2.05	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?	[redacted]			No		
Ages 14 to 17						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	100	2.92	+0.22	311	2.80	+0.16*
Reassessment (T3)	64	3.14		178	2.96	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?	[redacted]			No		
Ages 18 to 20						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	85	3.36	+0.13	267	3.10	+0.12

Reassessment (T3)	57	3.49		154	3.21	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	Yes			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				No		

Note. Possible item scores ranged from 1 to 4, where higher numbers indicate greater engagement
^ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, no symbol = no statistically significant difference

Color coding meanings:

Red = Large Decline	Orange = Medium Decline	Yellow = Small Decline	Grey = Minimal to No Change	Green = Small Improvement	Blue = Medium Improvement	Purple = Large Improvement

Table 14 presents the mean scores for the Agency-Wide Youth Engagement items. Higher scores are associated with youth playing a greater role in permanency planning within their agency.

Supervisors. From T1 to T3, there were no statistically significant differences in the roles youth played in permanency planning across age groups.

Caseworkers. From T1 to T3, there was a small statistically significant improvement in the roles played by youth aged 14 to 17 in permanency planning (+0.34) and a small, statistically significant improvement in the roles played by youth aged 18 to 20 in permanency planning (+0.29). Among the T3 group, caseworkers who reported having worked with at least one youth who participated in the youth engagement program model indicated greater roles for youth aged 14 to 17 in permanency planning, a small difference that approached statistical significance.

Table 14. *Youth Engagement*

	QIC-EY Supervisors			QIC-EY Caseworkers		
	N	Mean	Diff.	*N*	Mean	Diff.
4.4-4.6 Agency-Wide Youth Engagement Items						
*What type of **role** would you say most children and youth being served by your agency have in their permanency planning within each of the age groups below?*						
Ages 8 to 13						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	99	3.00	+0.05	309	2.96	+0.01
Reassessment (T3)	65	3.05		185	2.97	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				No		
Ages 14 to 17						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	100	4.36	+0.16	312	4.30	+0.34**
Reassessment (T3)	65	4.52		184	4.65	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				Yes^		
Ages 18 to 20						

Pre-Implementation (T1)	84	5.46	-0.02	268	5.14	+0.29*
Reassessment (T3)	57	5.44		157	5.43	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				No		

Note. Possible item scores ranged 1 to 6 where higher numbers indicate more involved roles
^ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, no symbol = no statistically significant difference

Color coding meanings:

Red = Large Decline	Orange = Medium Decline	Yellow = Small Decline	Grey = Minimal to No Change	Green = Small Improvement	Blue = Medium Improvement	Purple = Large Improvement

Youth Involvement (4.7)

The Involvement and Interaction Rating Scale (IIRS), Youth Involvement subscale, is a 7-item, validated measure (α = 0.83) [5] that assesses the level of youth involvement and participation in case/permanency planning within the agency. One transportation-related item was omitted from this scale because it was not relevant to this study. For each survey question, two statements at opposite extremes were provided, each with a score of 1 or 10. For example, (1) "Children/youth take little initiative in permanency planning" and (10) "Children/youth take lots of initiative in permanency planning." The respondent is then asked to think of their child welfare agency's work as it applies to engaging youth in case planning and/or permanency planning and select the number from 1 (first statement) to 10 (second statement) that best corresponds to their agency, with any number in between also being a valid choice. See Appendix D for the full list of questions.

Table 15 presents mean scores on the IIRS, Youth Involvement subscale. For this sub-outcome, higher scores indicate greater perceived youth involvement in permanency planning.

Supervisors. From T1 to T3, there was a statistically significant, medium improvement in youth involvement in permanency planning (+0.67).

Caseworkers. From T1 to T3, there was a small, statistically significant improvement in youth involvement in permanency planning (+0.32).

Table 15. *Youth Involvement*

	QIC-EY Supervisors			QIC-EY Caseworkers		
	N	Mean	Diff.	*N*	Mean	Diff.
4.7 IIRS Youth Involvement Subscale						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	101	5.68	+0.67**	329	5.79	+0.32**
Reassessment (T3)	65	6.35		183	6.11	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						

[5] Jones, K. R., & Perkins, D. F. (2006). Youth and adult perceptions of their relationships within community-based youth programs. *Youth & Society, 38*(1), 90-109.

Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No	No
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?		No

Note. Possible scale scores ranged from 1 to 10, where higher numbers indicate greater involvement
^ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, no symbol = no statistically significant difference

Color coding meanings:

Red = Large Decline	Orange = Medium Decline	Yellow = Small Decline	Grey = Minimal to No Change	Green = Small Improvement	Blue = Medium Improvement	Purple = Large Improvement

Outcome 5: *Children/youth participation in permanency planning hearings and case planning meetings*

Youth Engagement in Permanency Hearings (5.1-5.6)

The Agency-Level Youth Engagement in Permanency Hearings is a 6-item evaluator-developed assessment of agency-wide youth engagement and roles in permanency hearings. Three items from the scale asked, "Approximately how many children/youth served by your agency would you say are actively engaged in permanency planning hearings?" within each of the age groups: (a) ages 8 to 13, (b) ages 14 to 17, and (c) ages 18 to 20. Answer choices ranged from (1) = *Very few (less than 25%)* to (4) = *Most (75-100%).* The remaining three items asked, "What type of role would you say most children being served by your agency have in their permanency planning hearings?" within each of the age groups: a) ages 8 to 13, (b) ages 14 to 17, and (c) ages 18 to 20. Answer choices ranged from (1) = *They play no role* to (6) = *They play a primary role in developing ideas and plans as well as decision-making*. See Appendix D for the full list of questions.

Table 16 below shows the mean scores for Agency-Level Youth Engagement in Permanency Hearing items. Higher scores are associated with greater active youth engagement in permanency hearings.

Supervisors. From T1 to T3, there were no statistically significant differences in the active engagement of youth in permanency hearings across age groups. However, among the T3 group, supervisors who reported participating in the QIC-EY training and coaching model indicated greater youth engagement in permanency hearings across age groups, with small differences based on effect size measures.

Caseworkers. From T1 to T3, there was a minimal but statistically significant decline in the active engagement of youth aged 8 to 13 in permanency planning hearings (-0.13).

Table 16. *Youth Engagement in Permanency Hearings*

	QIC-EY Supervisors			QIC-EY Caseworkers		
	N	Mean	Diff.	*N*	Mean	Diff.
5.1-5.3 Agency-Level Youth Engagement in Permanency Hearings						
*Approximately how many children/youth served by your agency would you say are actively engaged in permanency planning **hearings** within each of the age groups below?*						
Ages 8 to 13						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	99	1.41	+0.03	305	1.61	-0.13*
Reassessment (T3)	64	1.45		173	1.48	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						

Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	Yes			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				No		
Ages 14 to 17						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	100	2.34	+0.03	306	2.44	+0.07
Reassessment (T3)	64	2.37		174	2.51	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	Yes			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				No		
Ages 18 to 20						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	81	3.13	-0.06	260	3.04	+0.16
Reassessment (T3)	55	3.07		150	3.19	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	Yes			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				No		

Note. Possible item scores questions ranged from 1 to 4, where higher numbers indicate greater engagement
^ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, no symbol = no statistically significant difference

Color coding meanings:

Red = Large Decline	Orange = Medium Decline	Yellow = Small Decline	Grey = Minimal to No Change	Green = Small Improvement	Blue = Medium Improvement	Purple = Large Improvement

Table 17 presents the mean scores for Agency-Level Youth Engagement in Permanency Hearing items. Higher scores are associated with greater youth roles in these hearings within their agencies.

Supervisors. From T1 to T3, there were no statistically significant changes in the roles youth played in permanency planning hearings across age groups.

Caseworkers. From T1 to T3, there were small, statistically significant improvements in the roles played by youth aged 14 to 17 (+0.41) and 18 to 20 (+0.48) in permanency planning hearings.

Table 17. *Youth Engagement in Permanency Hearings*

	QIC-EY Supervisors			QIC-EY Caseworkers		
	N	Mean	Diff.	*N*	Mean	Diff.
5.4-5.6 Agency-Level Youth Engagement in Permanency Hearings						
*What type of role would you say most children being served by your agency have in their permanency planning **hearings** within each of the age groups below?*						
Ages 8 to 13						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	100	2.52	-0.02	306	2.67	-0.12
Reassessment (T3)	64	2.51		177	2.55	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						

Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?	[redacted]			No		
Ages 14 to 17						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	100	3.72	+0.10	308	3.81	+0.41**
Reassessment (T3)	65	3.82		177	4.22	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?	[redacted]			No		
Ages 18 to 20						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	81	4.89	-0.09	262	4.76	+0.48***
Reassessment (T3)	57	4.81		147	5.24	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?	[redacted]			No		

Note. Possible item scores ranged from 1 to 6 where higher numbers indicate more involved roles
^ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, no symbol = no statistically significant difference
Color coding meanings:

Red = Large Decline	Orange = Medium Decline	Yellow = Small Decline	Grey = Minimal to No Change	Green = Small Improvement	Blue = Medium Improvement	Purple = Large Improvement

Youth Engagement in Case Planning Meetings (5.7-5.12)

The Agency-Level Youth Engagement in Case Planning Meetings is a 6-item, evaluator-developed measure assessing agency-wide youth engagement and roles in case-planning meetings. Three items from the scale asked, "Approximately how many children/youth served by your agency would you say are actively engaged in case planning meetings?" within each of the age groups: (a) ages 8 to 13, (b) ages 14 to 17, and (c) ages 18 to 20. Answer choices ranged from (1) = *Very few (less than 25%)* to (4) = *Most (75-100%)*. The remaining three items asked, "What type of role would you say most children and youth being served by your agency have in their case planning meetings?" within each of the age groups: a) ages 8 to 13, (b) ages 14 to 17, and (c) ages 18 to 20. Answer choices ranged from (1) = *They play no role* to (6) = *They play a primary role in developing ideas and plans as well as decision-making*. See Appendix D for the full list of questions.

Table 18 presents the mean scores for the Agency-Level Youth Engagement in Case Planning Meeting items. Higher scores are associated with greater youth engagement in case-planning meetings.

Supervisors. From T1 to T3, there were no statistically significant differences in youth's active engagement in case planning meetings across age groups. Among the T3 group, supervisors who reported participating in the QIC-EY training and coaching model showed greater engagement of youth aged 8 to 13 in case planning meetings.

Caseworkers. From T1 to T3, there were small, statistically significant improvements in the engagement of youth aged 14 to 17 (+0.29) and 18 to 20 (+0.22) in case planning meetings.

Table 18. *Youth Engagement in Case Planning Meetings*

	QIC-EY Supervisors			QIC-EY Caseworkers		
	N	Mean	Diff.	*N*	Mean	Diff.
5.7-5.9 Agency-Level Youth Engagement in Case Planning Meetings						
*Approximately how many children/youth served by your agency would you say are actively engaged in **case planning meetings** within each of the age groups below?*						
Ages 8 to 13						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	99	1.50	+0.14	307	1.64	+0.09
Reassessment (T3)	65	1.64		177	1.73	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	Yes			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				No		
Ages 14 to 17						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	99	2.50	+0.17	310	2.59	+0.29***
Reassessment (T3)	65	2.67		177	2.89	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				No		
Ages 18 to 20						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	83	3.43	-0.10	259	3.31	+0.22*
Reassessment (T3)	57	3.33		151	3.53	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				No		

Note. Possible item scores ranged from 1 to 4, where higher numbers indicate greater engagement
^ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, no symbol = no statistically significant difference

Color coding meanings:

Red = Large Decline	Orange = Medium Decline	Yellow = Small Decline	Grey = Minimal to No Change	Green = Small Improvement	Blue = Medium Improvement	Purple = Large Improvement

Table 19 below presents the mean scores for the Agency-Level Youth Engagement in Case Planning Meeting items. Higher scores are associated with greater youth roles in these meetings.

Supervisors. From T1 to T3, there were no statistically significant changes in the reported roles youth played in case planning meetings across age groups. Among the T3 group, supervisors who reported participating in the QIC-EY training and coaching model indicated that youth aged 8 to 13 played greater

roles in case planning meetings than supervisors who did not participate in the training and coaching model, a moderate difference as indicated by effect size measures.

Caseworkers. From T1 to T3, there were small, statistically significant improvements in the roles played by youth aged 14 to 17 (+0.39) and 18 to 20 (+0.36) in case planning meetings.

Table 19. *Youth Engagement in Case Planning Meetings*

	QIC-EY Supervisors			QIC-EY Caseworkers		
	N	Mean	Diff.	*N*	Mean	Diff.
5.10-5.12 Agency-Level Youth Engagement in Case Planning Meetings						
*What type of **role** would you say most children being served by your agency have in their **case planning meetings** within each of the age groups below?*						
Ages 8 to 13						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	100	2.63	-0.05	309	2.69	+0.03
Reassessment (T3)	66	2.58		181	2.72	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	Yes			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				No		
Ages 14 to 17						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	100	3.93	+0.14	312	3.92	+0.39**
Reassessment (T3)	66	4.07		180	4.30	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				No		
Ages 18 to 20						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	83	5.12	-0.12	261	4.90	+0.36**
Reassessment (T3)	58	5.00		150	5.26	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				No		

Note. Possible item scores ranged from 1 to 6 where higher numbers indicate more involved roles
^ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, no symbol = no statistically significant difference

Color coding meanings:

Red = Large Decline	Orange = Medium Decline	Yellow = Small Decline	Grey = Minimal to No Change	Green = Small Improvement	Blue = Medium Improvement	Purple = Large Improvement

Outcome 6: ***Philosophy and culture related to engagement of youth by child welfare staff and court personnel***

Personal- and Agency-Wide Beliefs Regarding Youth Engagement

Four subscales developed by colleagues at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln from the Case-Level YE Philosophy and Culture Scale were used to measure personal- and agency-wide beliefs related to youth engagement: Inform, Elicit, Partner, and Permanency. The Inform Subscale includes two 3-item measures of the importance of informing children and youth of permanency-related information based on (a) the personal beliefs of the respondent and (b) the beliefs and expectations in the agency overall. Cronbach's alpha was calculated based on baseline data from the cross-site sample and demonstrated somewhat low reliability for the personal beliefs scale ($\alpha = 0.56$) and somewhat higher reliability for the beliefs about the agency scale ($\alpha = 0.68$). The Elicit Subscale includes two 4-item measures of the importance of eliciting children and youths' perspectives on permanency planning. To evaluate the reliability of this scale, Cronbach's alpha was calculated based on baseline data from the cross-site sample and demonstrated adequate reliability for the personal beliefs scale ($\alpha = 0.69$) and somewhat low reliability for beliefs about the agency scale ($\alpha = 0.65$). The Partner Subscale include two 9-item measures of the importance of partnering with children and youth in permanency planning based Cronbach's alpha was calculated based on baseline data from the cross-site sample and demonstrated good reliability for the personal beliefs scale ($\alpha = 0.71$) and beliefs about the agency scale ($\alpha = 0.80$). The Permanency Subscale includes two 1-item measures regarding whether permanency should include legal, relational, and cultural considerations. For each subscale, answer choices ranged from (1) = *Strongly Disagree* to (5) = *Strongly Agree*. See Appendix D for the full list of questions.

Table 20 below shows the mean scores on the Case-Level YE Philosophy and Culture Inform subscale. For this sub-outcome, higher scores indicate greater agreement on centering youth engagement across case planning and permanency planning. Scores are reported for both personal beliefs and agency-wide beliefs.

Supervisors. From T1 to T3, there were no statistically significant changes in personal or agency-wide beliefs regarding keeping youth informed throughout planning processes.

Caseworkers. From T1 to T3, there was a small, statistically significant improvement in agency-wide beliefs that youth should be kept informed (+0.21). Among the T3 group, caseworkers who reported participating in the QIC-EY training and coaching model showed lower scores on the personal belief that youth should be kept informed, a small difference that approached statistical significance.

Table 20. *Personal- and Agency-Wide Beliefs Regarding Youth Engagement*

	QIC-EY Supervisors			QIC-EY Caseworkers		
	N	Mean	Diff.	*N*	Mean	Diff.
6.1-6.2 Inform Subscale						
Personal beliefs						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	101	4.47	-0.13	330	4.27	+0.04
Reassessment (T3)	69	4.34		196	4.31	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			Yes^		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				No		
Beliefs and expectations in the agency overall						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	101	4.22	-0.11	329	3.93	+0.21**
Reassessment (T3)	69	4.11		195	4.14	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						

Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No	No
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?	[redacted]	No

Note. Possible scale scores ranged from 1 to 5, where higher numbers indicate a greater level of agreement
^ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, no symbol = no statistically significant difference

Color coding meanings:

Red = Large Decline	Orange = Medium Decline	Yellow = Small Decline	Grey = Minimal to No Change	Green = Small Improvement	Blue = Medium Improvement	Purple = Large Improvement

Table 21 presents mean scores on the Case-Level YE Philosophy and Culture Elicit subscale. For this sub-outcome, higher scores indicate greater agreement on centering youth engagement across case planning and permanency planning. Scores are reported for both personal beliefs and agency-wide beliefs.

Supervisors. From T1 to T3, there were no statistically significant changes in personal or agency-wide beliefs regarding the elicitation of youths' feedback throughout planning processes.

Caseworkers. From T1 to T3, there was a minimal, statistically significant improvement in agency-wide beliefs that youth feedback should be elicited (+0.13).

Table 21. *Personal- and Agency-Wide Beliefs Regarding Youth Engagement*

	QIC-EY Supervisors			QIC-EY Caseworkers		
	N	Mean	Diff.	*N*	Mean	Diff.
6.3-6.4 Elicit Subscale						
Personal beliefs						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	101	4.47	-0.07	330	4.36	+0.06
Reassessment (T3)	69	4.40		196	4.42	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?	[redacted]			No		
Beliefs and expectations in the agency overall						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	101	4.29	-0.10	330	4.06	+0.13*
Reassessment (T3)	69	4.19		195	4.19	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?	[redacted]			No		

Note. Possible scale scores ranged from 1 to 5, where higher numbers indicate a greater level of agreement
^ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, no symbol = no statistically significant difference

Color coding meanings:

Red = Large Decline	Orange = Medium Decline	Yellow = Small Decline	Grey = Minimal to No Change	Green = Small Improvement	Blue = Medium Improvement	Purple = Large Improvement

Table 22 presents mean scores on the Case-Level YE Philosophy and Culture Partner subscale. For this sub-outcome, higher scores indicate greater agreement on centering youth engagement across case planning and permanency planning. Scores are reported for both personal beliefs and agency-wide beliefs.

Supervisors. From T1 to T3, there were no statistically significant changes in personal or agency-wide beliefs regarding partnering with children and youth.

Caseworkers. From T1 to T3, there was a minimal improvement in beliefs and expectations about the agency's overall approach to partnering with youth throughout planning processes, which approached statistical significance (+0.10).

Table 22. *Personal- and Agency-Wide Beliefs Regarding Youth Engagement*

	QIC-EY Supervisors			QIC-EY Caseworkers		
	N	Mean	Diff.	*N*	Mean	Diff.
6.5-6.6 Partner Subscale						
Personal beliefs						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	101	4.05	+0.04	330	3.97	+0.06
Reassessment (T3)	69	4.09		196	4.03	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				No		
Beliefs and expectations in the agency overall						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	101	3.88	+0.06	330	3.75	+0.10^
Reassessment (T3)	69	3.94		195	3.85	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				No		

Note. Possible scale scores ranged from 1 to 5, where higher numbers indicate a greater level of agreement
^ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, no symbol = no statistically significant difference

Color coding meanings:

Red = Large Decline	Orange = Medium Decline	Yellow = Small Decline	Grey = Minimal to No Change	Green = Small Improvement	Blue = Medium Improvement	Purple = Large Improvement

Table 23 presents mean scores on the Case-Level YE Philosophy and Culture Permanency subscale. For this sub-outcome, higher scores indicate greater agreement on centering youth engagement across case planning and permanency planning. Scores are reported for both personal beliefs and agency-wide beliefs.

Supervisors. From T1 to T3, there were no statistically significant changes in personal or agency-wide beliefs regarding permanency that integrate legal, relational, and cultural aspects.

Caseworkers. From T1 to T3, there were no statistically significant changes in personal or agency-wide beliefs regarding permanency that integrate legal, relational, and cultural aspects.

Table 23. *Personal- and Agency-Wide Beliefs Regarding Youth Engagement*

	QIC-EY Supervisors			QIC-EY Caseworkers		
	N	Mean	Diff.	*N*	Mean	Diff.
6.7-6.8 Permanency Subscale						
Personal beliefs						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	101	4.33	0.00	330	4.27	+0.05
Reassessment (T3)	69	4.33		196	4.32	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?	[redacted]			No		
Beliefs and expectations in the agency overall						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	101	4.15	+0.09	330	4.06	+0.10
Reassessment (T3)	69	4.24		195	4.16	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?	[redacted]			No		

Note. Possible scale scores ranged from 1 to 5, where higher numbers indicate a greater level of agreement
^ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, no symbol = no statistically significant difference

Color coding meanings:

Red = Large Decline	Orange = Medium Decline	Yellow = Small Decline	Grey = Minimal to No Change	Green = Small Improvement	Blue = Medium Improvement	Purple = Large Improvement

Commitment to Youth Engagement (6.9)

The Youth Voice Agency Level Assessment (Y-VAL) [6,7] is a validated scale that measures adult support for authentic youth engagement and participation at the agency level. A 5-item subset of the Y-VAL, Overall vision and commitment subscale, was used to assess agencies' overall vision and commitment to meaningful participation between youth and adults. An additional item was added to the subscale by the evaluators to meet the needs of the current project. Each item describes what fully developed agency support for youth voice looks like in a specific area with participants being asked how their own agencies compare to the descriptions ranging from (1) = *Least developed* to (5) = *Fully developed* (e.g., "The agency has created a formal statement affirming its commitment to promoting child/youth engagement within the agency," "The agency and its leaders clearly communicate this vision to stakeholders - including young people, management and staff"). To evaluate the reliability of this scale, Cronbach's alpha was calculated using baseline data from the cross-site sample, yielding excellent reliability (α = 0.91). See Appendix D for the full list of questions.

[6] Youth MOVE National & Regional Research Institute, Portland State University. (2016). Youth/Young Adult Voice at the Agency Level: A Self-Assessment (YVAL Self-Assessment). Decorah, IA: Youth MOVE National.
[7] Walker, J. S., Masselli, B. M., Blakeslee, J., Baird, C., & Thorp, K. (2018). Development and testing of an assessment of youth/young adult voice in agency-level advising and decision making. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 94, 598-605.

Table 24 below shows the mean scores on the Y-VAL, Overall Vision and Commitment Subscale, Commitment to Meaningful Participation items. Higher scores are associated with more fully developed systems and processes related to meaningful youth participation.

Supervisors. From T1 to T3, there was a moderate, statistically significant improvement in agency-wide commitment to youth engagement (+0.50).

Caseworkers. From T1 to T3, there was a small, statistically significant improvement in agency-wide commitment to youth engagement (+0.29).

Table 24. *Commitment to Youth Engagement*

	QIC-EY Supervisors			QIC-EY Caseworkers		
	N	Mean	Diff.	*N*	Mean	Diff.
6.9 Y-VAL Overall Vision and Commitment Subscale, Commitment to Meaningful Participation Items						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	98	3.55	+0.50***	318	3.70	+0.29***
Reassessment (T3)	69	4.05		189	3.99	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				No		

Note. Possible scale scores ranged from 1 to 5, where higher numbers indicate greater development
^ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, no symbol = no statistically significant difference

Color coding meanings:

Red = Large Decline	Orange = Medium Decline	Yellow = Small Decline	Grey = Minimal to No Change	Green = Small Improvement	Blue = Medium Improvement	Purple = Large Improvement

Culture of Partnership (6.10)

The Y-VAL, Overall Vision and Commitment Subscale, Culture of Partnership items[16] were used to measure the culture of partnership between the agency and youth regarding permanency planning. A 4-item subset from this scale was used, and the evaluators added one additional item. Each item describes what fully developed agency support for youth voice looks like in a specific area with participants being asked how their agencies compare to the descriptions, with answer choices ranging from (1) = *Least developed* to (5) = *Fully developed* (e.g., "Leaders and staff throughout the agency genuinely view children/youth as having valuable experience and ideas that can contribute to improving case/permanency planning outcomes." To evaluate the reliability of this scale, Cronbach's alpha was calculated using baseline data from the cross-site sample, yielding excellent reliability (α = .93). See Appendix D for the full list of questions.

Table 25 presents mean scores on the Y-VAL Culture of Partnership items. Higher scores are associated with a more fully developed agency-wide commitment to a culture of partnership with children and youth.

Supervisors. From T1 to T3, there was a moderate, statistically significant improvement in agency-wide commitment to a culture of partnership with youth (+0.43).

Caseworkers. From T1 to T3, there was a small, statistically significant improvement in commitment to a culture of partnership with youth (+0.22).

Table 25. *Culture of Partnership*

	QIC-EY Supervisors			QIC-EY Caseworkers		
	N	Mean	Diff.	*N*	Mean	Diff.
6.10 Y-VAL Overall Vision and Commitment Subscale, Culture of Partnership Items						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	100	3.58	+0.43***	339	3.70	+0.22**
Reassessment (T3)	64	4.01		177	3.92	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				No		

Note. Possible scale scores ranged from 1 to 5, where higher numbers indicate greater development
^ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, no symbol = no statistically significant difference

Color coding meanings:

Red = Large Decline	Orange = Medium Decline	Yellow = Small Decline	Grey = Minimal to No Change	Green = Small Improvement	Blue = Medium Improvement	Purple = Large Improvement

Organizational Change (6.11)

The Organizational Climate Scale of TCU ORC-D4, Change Subscale[8], is a 6-item, validated measure (α = 0.76)[9] of organizational change related to youth engagement. The evaluators added one question to meet the project's evaluation needs. Participants were asked to rate their level of agreement on a series of statements. Answer choices ranged from (1) = *Disagree Strongly* to (5) = *Agree Strongly* (e.g., "You frequently hear good ideas from other staff for improving child/youth engagement in permanency planning;" "The general attitude in your program is to accept new and changing technology in relation to child/youth engagement (ex. social media)." See Appendix D for the full list of questions.

Table 26 presents mean scores on the Change Subscale. Higher scores indicate that the workforce perceives a greater capacity to enact meaningful organizational changes.

Supervisors. From T1 to T3, there were no statistically significant changes in organizational climate conducive to change related to youth engagement practices.

Caseworkers. From T1 to T3, there were no statistically significant changes in capacity for organizational change.

Table 26. *Organizational Change*

	QIC-EY Supervisors			QIC-EY Caseworkers		
	N	Mean	Diff.	*N*	Mean	Diff.
6.11 TCU ORC-D4 Organizational Climate Scale, Change Subscale						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	101	3.50	+0.12	328	3.45	+0.05
Reassessment (T3)	69	3.62		197	3.50	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						

[8] TCU Institute of Behavioral Research. (2011). *Organizational Readiness for Change.* Texas Christian University. Fort Worth, TX.

[9] Lehman, W. E., Greener, J. M., & Simpson, D. D. (2002). Assessing organizational readiness for change. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 22*(4), 197-209.

Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No	No
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?		No

Note. Possible scale scores ranged from 1 to 5, where higher numbers indicate an organizational climate more conducive to change

^ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, no symbol = no statistically significant difference

Color coding meanings:

Red = Large Decline	Orange = Medium Decline	Yellow = Small Decline	Grey = Minimal to No Change	Green = Small Improvement	Blue = Medium Improvement	Purple = Large Improvement

Outcome 7: Use of EY tools by child welfare & courts

This outcome is measured within the next outcome. It is also measured through process evaluation.

Long-term Outcomes

Outcome 8: Implementation of policies & practices that reflect child welfare systems' commitment to EY practices

Worker Participation in Youth Engagement Practices (8.1)

This 7-item evaluator-developed Worker Participation Scale assesses workers' perceptions of their own participation in engaging youth. Questions were developed based on the National Association of Social Workers Standards for Social Work Practice in Child Welfare (2013), Standard 11: Youth Engagement, which states that "Social workers in child welfare shall actively engage older youths in addressing their needs while in out-of-home care and as they prepare to transition out of foster care" (p. 22).[10] Participants were asked to rate how often they participate in the activities related to engaging youth in case and/or permanency planning on a scale ranging from (0) = *Never* to (10) = *Always* (e.g., "Assessing and recognizing the unique strengths and abilities and specific needs of children and youth with regard to life and personal skills development;" "Developing strong working relationships with children/youth"). To evaluate the reliability of this scale, Cronbach's alpha was calculated from the cross-site baseline sample, yielding a high reliability (α = 0.95). See Appendix D for the full list of questions.

Table 27 presents mean scores on the Worker Participation Scale. Higher scores are associated with greater self-rated participation in engaging youth.

Supervisors. From T1 to T3, there was a small, statistically significant improvement in self-rated participation in engaging youth (+0.44).

Caseworkers. From T1 to T3, there were no statistically significant differences.

[10] National Association of Social Workers (2013). *NASW Standards for Social Work Practice in Child Welfare*. NASW.

Table 27. *Worker Participation in Youth Engagement Practices*

	QIC-EY Supervisors			QIC-EY Caseworkers		
	N	Mean	Diff.	*N*	Mean	Diff.
8.1 Worker Participation Scale						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	100	7.11	+0.44*	326	7.66	+0.20
Reassessment (T3)	65	7.55		183	7.86	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				No		

Note. Possible scale scores ranged from 0 to 10, where higher numbers indicate greater self-rated participation
^ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, no symbol = no statistically significant difference

Color coding meanings:

Red = Large Decline	Orange = Medium Decline	Yellow = Small Decline	Grey = Minimal to No Change	Green = Small Improvement	Blue = Medium Improvement	Purple = Large Improvement

Youth-Adult Interaction and Involvement in Case/Permanency Planning (8.2-8.3)

The IIRS Adult Involvement Subscale is a validated measure (α = 0.84) [11]that assesses adult involvement in engaging youth in case planning and/or permanency planning. The IIRS Youth-Adult Interaction Subscale is a validated measure (α = 0.87) that assesses youth-adult interaction in case and/or permanency planning. The language of both subscales was adapted to ensure relevance to case and/or permanency planning. For each survey question, two statements at opposite extremes were provided, each with a corresponding score of 1 or 10. For example, (1) "Adults display a sense of wanting to control children/youth in relation to case/permanency planning" and (10) "Adults display a willingness to accept and nurture child/youth leadership in relation to case/permanency planning." The respondent is then asked to think of their child welfare agency's work as it applies to engaging youth in case planning and/or permanency planning and select the number from 1 (first statement) to 10 (second statement) that best corresponds to their agency, with any number in between also being a valid choice. See Appendix D for the full list of questions.

Table 28 shows the mean scores on the IIRS Adult Involvement and Youth-Adult Interaction subscales. Higher scores are associated with greater adult involvement and youth-adult interaction in engaging youth in case and/or permanency planning.

Supervisors. From T1 to T3, there was a small improvement in *youth-adult interaction* in case and permanency planning that approached statistical significance (+0.33). Among the T3 group, supervisors who reported participating in the QIC-EY training and coaching model showed less *adult involvement* and *youth-adult interaction* in case/permanency planning, with small differences as indicated by effect size measures.

Caseworkers. From T1 to T3, there was a small, statistically significant improvement in youth-adult interaction in case and permanency planning (+0.30).

[11] Jones, K. R., & Perkins, D. F. (2006). Youth and adult perceptions of their relationships within community-based youth programs. *Youth & Society, 38*(1), 90-109.

Table 28. *Youth-Adult Interaction and Involvement*

	QIC-EY Supervisors			QIC-EY Caseworkers		
	N	Mean	Diff.	*N*	Mean	Diff.
8.2 IIRS, Adult Involvement Subscale						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	101	6.23	+0.03	327	6.06	+0.25^
Reassessment (T3)	65	6.25		182	6.30	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	Yes			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				No		
8.3 IIRS, Youth-Adult Interaction Subscale						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	100	6.12	+0.33^	327	6.06	+0.30**
Reassessment (T3)	65	6.45		181	6.36	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	Yes			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				No		

Note. Possible scale scores ranged from 1 to 10, where higher numbers indicate greater involvement
^ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, no symbol = no statistically significant difference

Color coding meanings:

Red = Large Decline	Orange = Medium Decline	Yellow = Small Decline	Grey = Minimal to No Change	Green = Small Improvement	Blue = Medium Improvement	Purple = Large Improvement

Agency-Wide Change and Support for Youth Engagement (8.4-8.5)

A 2-item subset of the Community Key Informant (CKI) Diffusion Items[12] was used to measure changes in youth engagement over the past year. This measure was also given to participating court staff. The first item for this scale was (1) "Thinking back over the past year, how has the level of activities geared towards engaging children and youth in case/permanency planning changed in your agency?" with answer choices ranging from (1) = *Been cut in half or more than half* to (5) = *Doubled or more than doubled*. The second item on this scale was "Thinking about the last year, has your supervisor been more active and effective in helping you engage children and youth in their case and permanency planning?" with answer choices of yes or no.

Table 29 presents the mean scores or frequencies for the CKI Diffusion Items. For the first sub-outcome, higher scores indicate a greater increase in youth engagement-related activities. For the second sub-outcome, a higher percentage indicates that more participants are reporting more active and effective supervision related to case/permanency planning.

Supervisors. From T1 to T3, there was a small, statistically significant improvement in the level of *activities geared toward youth engagement* (+0.22) and a moderate, statistically significant improvement in *supervision* that is more active and effective (+23.4). Among the T3 group, supervisors who reported

[12] Arthur, M. W., Hawkins, J. D., Catalano, R. F., & Olson, J. J. (2002). Community Key Informant Survey. Seattle, WA: Social Development Research Group, University of Washington.

participating in the QIC-EY training and coaching model indicated greater increases in *activities geared toward youth engagement*, though the difference was small based on effect size measures.

Caseworkers. From T1 to T3, there was a small, statistically significant improvement in active and effective *supervision* (+12.8). Among the T3 group, caseworkers who reported working with at least one youth who participated in the youth engagement program model showed greater increases in *activities geared toward youth engagement*, with a small but statistically significant difference.

Table 29. *Agency-Wide Change and Support for Youth Engagement*

	QIC-EY Supervisors			QIC-EY Caseworkers		
	N	Mean / %	Diff.	*N*	Mean / %	Diff.
8.4-8.5 CKI Diffusion Items						
1-How has the level of activities engaging youth changed? (mean score)						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	99	3.63	+0.22**	284	3.54	+0.07
Reassessment (T3)	65	3.85		183	3.61	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	Yes			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				Yes*		
2- Supervisor more active and effective (% who said *Yes*)						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	102	53.9%	+23.4**	305	56.4%	+12.8**
Reassessment (T3)	66	77.3%		185	69.2%	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				No		

Note: Possible item scores for Q1 ranged from 1 to 5, with higher scores indicating a greater increase in youth engagement activities; answer choices for Q2 were yes or no.
^ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, no symbol = no statistically significant difference
Color coding meanings:

Red = Large Decline	Orange = Medium Decline	Yellow = Small Decline	Grey = Minimal to No Change	Green = Small Improvement	Blue = Medium Improvement	Purple = Large Improvement

Youth Involvement at the Agency-Level (8.6-8.8)

The Youth Voice Agency Level Assessment (Y-VAL) [13,14] is a validated scale that measures adult support for authentic youth engagement and participation at the agency level. A 5-item subset of the Y-VAL Empowered Representative Subscale was used to measure the extent to which an agency is developed to empower youth to meaningfully engage in activities that help meet their needs. Cronbach's alpha was calculated from baseline data from the cross-site sample, which demonstrated good reliability (α = 0.88).

[13] Youth MOVE National & Regional Research Institute, Portland State University. (2016). Youth/Young Adult Voice at the Agency Level: A Self-Assessment (YVAL Self-Assessment). Decorah, IA: Youth MOVE National.
[14] Walker, J. S., Masselli, B. M., Blakeslee, J., Baird, C., & Thorp, K. (2018). Development and testing of an assessment of youth/young adult voice in agency-level advising and decision making. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 94, 598-605.

A single item from the Y-VAL, Commitment to Facilitation and Support of Youth Participation, was used to assess agency efforts to reduce barriers to meaningful youth participation. A 5-item subset of the Y-VAL, Participation in Evaluation Subscale[29] was used to measure agency-level support for youth participation in evaluation. Cronbach's alpha was calculated from baseline data from the cross-site sample and demonstrated excellent reliability ($\alpha = 0.91$). For each scale/item set, the wording of the items was slightly adapted to better align with this study (i.e., case/permanency planning was added). Participants were asked to rate how far their agency has come towards matching this fully developed description, with answer choices ranging from (1) *Least developed, none of the aspects in place/not true for our agency* to (5) = *Fully developed, all aspects in place/completely true for our agency* (e.g., "Case/permanency planning meetings follow an agenda that young people have received and prepared for in advance," "Children and youth that the agency serves are aware of opportunities to participate in case planning/permanency planning"). See Appendix D for the full list of questions.

Table 30 presents mean scores on the three Y-VAL subscales. Higher scores indicate more fully developed agency-wide practices of empowering children and youth in case and permanency planning (8.6), agency-wide commitment to making case planning and permanency planning meetings accessible to children and youth (8.7), and more fully developed agency-wide practices committed to involving children and youth in providing feedback and evaluation (8.8).

Supervisors. From T1 to T3, there were statistically significant, moderate improvements in agency-wide practices of *empowering youth* in case and permanency planning (+0.67), commitment to *facilitating and supporting* planning meetings that are accessible to youth (+0.56), and commitment to *youth involvement* in providing feedback (+0.56). Among the T3 group, supervisors who reported participating in the QIC-EY training and coaching model showed greater commitment to *facilitating and supporting* youth engagement and more fully developed agency-wide practices that commit to *youth involvement* in providing feedback, with small differences between groups based on effect size measures.

Caseworkers. From T1 to T3, there were statistically significant, small improvements in agency-wide practices: *empowering youth* in case and permanency planning (+0.46), *facilitating and supporting* planning meetings that are accessible to youth (+0.28), and *youth involvement* in providing feedback (+0.33). Among the T3 group, caseworkers who reported participating in the QIC-EY training and coaching model showed greater commitment to *facilitating and supporting* youth engagement, with small differences between groups that approached statistical significance; those who reported having worked with at least one youth who participated in the youth engagement program model indicated more fully developed agency-wide practices that commit to *youth involvement* in providing feedback, with a small difference between groups that approached statistical significance.

Table 30. *Youth Involvement at the Agency-Level*

	QIC-EY Supervisors			QIC-EY Caseworkers		
	N	Mean	Diff.	*N*	Mean	Diff.
8.6 Y-VAL Empowered Representatives Subscale						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	99	2.96	+0.67***	302	3.14	+0.46***
Reassessment (T3)	64	3.63		176	3.61	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?	[redacted]			No		

8.7 Y-VAL Commitment to Facilitation and Support of Youth Participation Item						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	100	3.26	+0.56***	312	3.41	+0.28**
Reassessment (T3)	65	3.82		179	3.69	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	Yes			Yes^		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				No		
8.8 Y-VAL Participation in Evaluation Subscale						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	67	3.06	+0.56***	295	3.27	+0.33***
Reassessment (T3)	65	3.61		172	3.60	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	Yes			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				Yes^		

Note. Possible scale scores ranged from 1 to 5, where higher numbers indicate a more fully developed agency
^ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, no symbol = no statistically significant difference

Color coding meanings:

Red = Large Decline	Orange = Medium Decline	Yellow = Small Decline	Grey = Minimal to No Change	Green = Small Improvement	Blue = Medium Improvement	Purple = Large Improvement

Outcome 9: ***Long-term efficacy & job satisfaction***

Burnout (9.1)

The ProQOL-5 Burnout Subscale[15] is a validated measure (α = 0.75)[16] of burnout among workers. The wording was adapted to be relevant to the child welfare setting. Participants were asked to consider themselves in their work over the past 30 days and rate how often they experience each on a scale from (1) = Never to (5) = Very often (e.g., "I feel trapped in my job as a child welfare worker," "I feel worn out because of my work as a child welfare worker"). See ***Appendix D*** for the full list of questions.

Table 31 presents mean scores on the ProQOL-5 Burnout subscale. Higher scores are associated with greater levels of burnout among the workforce.

Supervisors. From T1 to T3, there was no statistically significant difference in burnout.

Caseworkers. From T1 to T3, there was no statistically significant difference in burnout.

Table 31. *Burnout*

	QIC-EY Supervisors			QIC-EY Caseworkers		
	N	Mean	Diff.	*N*	Mean	Diff.
9.1 ProQOL-5 Burnout Subscale						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	100	2.40	-0.05	327	2.50	+0.01
Reassessment (T3)	65	2.35		180	2.51	

[15] Stamm, B.H. (2009). *Professional Quality of Life: Compassion Satisfaction and Fatigue Version 5 (ProQOL).*
[16] Stamm, B.H. (2010). *The concise manual for the professional quality of life scale.*

Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…		
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No	No
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?	[redacted]	No

Note. Possible scale scores ranged from 1 to 5, where higher numbers indicate greater levels of burnout
^ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, no symbol = no statistically significant difference
Color coding meanings:

Red = Large Decline	Orange = Medium Decline	Yellow = Small Decline	Grey = Minimal to No Change	Green = Small Improvement	Blue = Medium Improvement	Purple = Large Improvement

Secondary Traumatic Stress (9.2)

The ProQOL-5, Secondary Traumatic Stress Subscale,[32] is a validated measure (α = 0.81)[33] assessing secondary traumatic stress responses among agency workers. The wording of the original measure was slightly adapted to be relevant to the child welfare setting. Participants were asked to consider questions about themselves and their work situation in the last 30 days and rate how often they experience each on a scale ranging from (1) = *Never* to (5) = *Very often* (e.g., "I am preoccupied with more than one child/youth that I work with," "Because of my child welfare work, I have felt on edge about various things"). See Appendix D for the full list of questions.

Table 32 presents mean scores on the ProQOL-5 Secondary Traumatic Stress Subscale. Higher scores are associated with more symptoms of secondary traumatic stress among the workforce.

Supervisors. From T1 to T3, there was no statistically significant difference in symptoms of secondary traumatic stress.

Caseworkers. From T1 to T3, there was no statistically significant difference in symptoms of secondary traumatic stress.

Table 32. *Secondary Traumatic Stress*

	QIC-EY Supervisors			QIC-EY Caseworkers		
	N	Mean	Diff.	*N*	Mean	Diff.
9.2 ProQOL-5 Secondary Traumatic Stress Subscale						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	100	2.22	+0.02	326	2.42	-0.06
Reassessment (T3)	64	2.24		180	2.36	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?	[redacted]			No		

Note. Possible scale scores ranged from 1 to 5, where higher numbers indicate greater levels of stress
^ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, no symbol = no statistically significant difference
Color coding meanings:

Red = Large Decline	Orange = Medium Decline	Yellow = Small Decline	Grey = Minimal to No Change	Green = Small Improvement	Blue = Medium Improvement	Purple = Large Improvement

Worker Retention (9.3-9.8)

The Intent to Stay[33] Scale was used to measure worker retention and intention to remain within the same agency. Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree with a series of statements, with answer choices ranging from (1) = *Strongly Disagree* to (4) = *Strongly Agree* (e.g., "I have too much time invested at this agency to leave," "I am committed to staying at this agency"). A 9-item subset of the Intent to Leave Scale[17] was used to assess the likelihood that participants are thinking about and taking steps to leave their jobs. Some language has been adapted to be appropriate for the times. Several different sets of answer choices are used across these items. See Appendix D for the full list of questions.

Table 33 presents mean scores on the Intent to Stay Scale. Higher scores indicate a stronger intention to remain in their current place of employment.

Supervisors. From T1 to T3, there was no statistically significant difference in their intention to stay in their current employment. However, among the T3 group, supervisors who reported participating in the QIC-EY training and coaching model showed greater intention to stay, a moderate difference based on effect size measures.

Caseworkers. From T1 to T3, there was a minimal decline in their intention to remain in their current place of employment that approached statistical significance.

Table 33. *Worker Retention: Intent to Stay*

	QIC-EY Supervisors			QIC-EY Caseworkers		
	N	Mean / %	Diff.	*N*	Mean / %	Diff.
9.3 Intent to Stay Scale						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	100	3.13	+0.04	326	2.94	-0.05^
Reassessment (T3)	64	3.18		180	2.89	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	Yes			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				No		

Note. Possible scale scores ranged from 1 to 4, where higher numbers indicate greater intent to stay at current place of employment

^ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, no symbol = no statistically significant difference

Color coding meanings:

Red = Large Decline	Orange = Medium Decline	Yellow = Small Decline	Grey = Minimal to No Change	Green = Small Improvement	Blue = Medium Improvement	Purple = Large Improvement

Table 34 presents mean scores (or frequencies and percentages) on the Intent to Leave Scale. For the Intent to Leave Scale's first sub-outcome (1), higher scores indicate an intent to stay in one's job longer. For the next sub-outcome (2), the percentage of people who have considered looking for a new job is reported, with higher percentages indicating that more participants have considered it. For the three sub-outcomes (3-5) that follow, higher scores are associated with a greater intention to leave their job.

[17] Auerbach, C., Schudrich, W. Z., Lawrence, C. K., Claiborne, N., & McGowan, B. G. (2014). Predicting turnover: Validating the intent to leave child welfare scale. *Research on Social Work Practice*, *24*(3), 349-355.

Supervisors. From T1 to T3, there was a small, statistically significant reduction in the proportion of supervisors who had considered *looking for a new job* (-14.6%). Among a subset of supervisors who had considered looking for new work in the past year, there was a small reduction in *acting* on their thoughts of leaving (-0.33; based on effect size measures only due to a small sample size for this set of questions). Among the T3 group who had considered looking for a new job, supervisors who had participated in the QIC-EY training and coaching model showed moderately lower scores on *thinking* about and *acting* on thoughts of leaving, alongside higher scores in *looking* for other work, a small difference based on effect size measures.

Caseworkers. From T1 to T3, there were no statistically significant differences in caseworkers' length of time they *expect to be working* at their agency, the proportion of workers who have considered *finding new work*, or in *thinking*, *looking,* or *acting* on thoughts of leaving (among the subset who had considered finding new work in the past year). Among the T3 group, caseworkers who reported working with at least one youth who had participated in the youth engagement program model were less likely to have considered *finding a new job*, a small statistically significant difference; among, those who had considered finding new work in the T3 group, those with youth who took part in the program model were also less likely to be *looking* for a new job, a small difference that approached statistical significance.

Table 34. *Worker Retention: Intent to Leave*

	QIC-EY Supervisors			QIC-EY Caseworkers		
	N	Mean / %	Diff.	*N*	Mean / %	Diff.
9.4-9.8 Intent to Leave Scale						
1- How long you expect to be working in your agency						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	100	4.05	+0.20	327	3.59	+0.09
Reassessment (T3)	64	4.25		180	3.68	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				No		
2- Percent that have considered looking for a new job (% Yes)						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	103	51.5%	-14.6*	345	44.1%	+3.2
Reassessment (T3)	65	36.9%		182	47.3%	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				Yes*		
Note: The remaining subscale questions (3-5) were only asked of participants who answered 'Yes' to question 2						
3-Thinking Subscale						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	53	2.34	+0.14	142	2.46	+0.08
Reassessment (T3)	24	2.48		85	2.54	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	Yes			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				No		
4-Looking Subscale						

Pre-Implementation (T1)	53	1.51	-0.09	141	1.39	+0.10
Reassessment (T3)	24	1.42		85	1.48	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	Yes			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				Yes^		
5-Acting Subscale						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	53	0.73	-0.33	142	0.65	-0.05
Reassessment (T3)	24	0.40		85	0.60	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	Yes			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				No		

Note. Possible scale score ranged from 0 to 4, with higher scores indicating greater intent to leave
^ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, no symbol = no statistically significant difference

Color coding meanings:

Red = Large Decline	Orange = Medium Decline	Yellow = Small Decline	Grey = Minimal to No Change	Green = Small Improvement	Blue = Medium Improvement	Purple = Large Improvement

Additional Outcome

Relational permanence is not an outcome identified in the original logic model but was added in over the course of the project.

Relational Permanence

The evaluator-developed Relational Permanence Scale is a 7-item measure of the frequency with which workers engage children/youth in permanency planning to identify a variety of relational needs. Participants were asked to indicate the frequency with which they have engaged children/youth in permanency planning, with answer choices ranging from (1) = *Never* to (7) = *Every time* (e.g., "I have worked with children/youth to identify areas youth might need continued support during transition (emerging adulthood)," "I have worked with children/youth to identify a safety network for the child/youth or work to establish one for them"). To evaluate the reliability of this scale, Cronbach's alpha was calculated using baseline data from the cross-site sample, yielding a high reliability (α = 0.96). See Appendix D for the full list of questions.

Table 35 below shows the mean scores on the Relational Permanence Scale. Higher scores are associated with greater commitment to permanency practices that include relational permanency.

Supervisors. From T1 to T3, there were no statistically significant changes in commitment to permanency practices that include relational.

Caseworkers. From T1 to T3, there was a statistically significant, small improvement in caseworkers' commitment to permanency practices that include relational permanency. Among the T3 group, caseworkers who reported having worked with at least one youth who had participated in the youth

engagement program model scored higher than those who had not, a small difference that approached statistical significance.

Table 35. *Relational Permanence*

	QIC-EY Supervisors			QIC-EY Caseworkers		
	N	Mean	Diff.	*N*	Mean	Diff.
10.1 Relational Permanence Scale						
Pre-Implementation (T1)	99	5.31	+0.04	308	5.30	+0.26*
Reassessment (T3)	67	5.34		189	5.56	
Among T3 participants, were outcomes different for those who…						
Participated in QIC-EY Workforce Training?	No			No		
Worked with Youth who Participated in Youth Program Model?				Yes^		

Note. Possible scale scores ranged from 1 to 7, where higher numbers indicate greater commitment to permanency practices that include relational permanence

^ p<0.10, * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, no symbol = no statistically significant difference

Color coding meanings:

Red = Large Decline	Orange = Medium Decline	Yellow = Small Decline	Grey = Minimal to No Change	Green = Small Improvement	Blue = Medium Improvement	Purple = Large Improvement

Appendix B. Logic Model

Key: EY- engagement of youth

QIC/EY Logic Model 2:

Target Population: Pilot sites' child welfare workforce, particularly those responsible for ensuring permanence

Program Inputs

- Skilled team of 5 partner agencies that have developed national child welfare curricula; experience training and implementing curriculum; workforce development expertise, effectively operated a QIC; worked with multiple states on youth engagement; worked with tribal communities.
- National Youth Engagement Advisory Council
- Relationship established with instructional design expert, curricula writer & cultural & youth engagement specialists
- Partners with lived experience
- 2 partners that have run a QIC for the Children's Bureau

Activities

- Conduct systematic review to identify skill, knowledge and attitude competencies related to EY
- Work with National EY Youth Council to generate competencies for curriculum and provide feedback on developed product
- Develop a construct for training & ongoing coaching
- Develop training competencies
- Write and design a curriculum
- Develop train-the-trainer guide
- Develop a coaching model on EY
- Identify & design evaluation tools
- Conduct fidelity, process, outcome, dissemination, cost and cultural relevance evaluation methodologies
- Develop structured delivery plan & integrate into pilot sites as stand along training & into preservice
- Refine curriculum & coaching model based on feedback from pilot sites
- Develop a learning community among sites
- Disseminate lessons learned among pilot sites & on a national level

Program Outputs

- Identified skill, knowledge & attitude competencies related to EY
- Comprehensive, youth-informed, training that can be used for preservice and in-services training for child welfare workforce
- Adapted training on EY for courts
- Comprehensive coaching model to support EY training in pilot sites
- # of EY tools for child welfare, courts and other stakeholders
- Train-the-trainers/coaches guide
- Pilot sites integrating training/ coaching model into their systems
- # of child welfare and court staff in pilot sites that go through training/coaching model
- Ongoing evaluation reports that help guide project assessment, planning & implementation
- # of lessons learned documents/webinars/podcasts released
- Revised training/coaching model based on feedback & evaluation from pilot sites released nationally

Short-term Outcomes

- Increased workforce preparedness/capacity in the engagement of children and youth
- Increased levels of efficacy & job satisfaction as a result of exposure to workforce training & coaching
- Increased youth satisfaction with the level of engagement child welfare & court staff have with them
- Increased # of children/youth participating in permanency planning
- Increased # of children/youth participating in permanency planning hearings and case planning meetings
- Marked change in philosophy and culture related to engagement of youth by child welfare staff, court personnel
- Increased use of EY tools by child welfare & courts

Long-Term Outcomes

- Increased implementation of policies & practices that reflect child welfare systems commitment to EY practices
- Increased levels of efficacy & job satisfaction as a result of exposure to workforce training & coaching

Goals

Produce one overall training and coaching model for the workforce that is utilized consistently across pilot sites that supports systematic change by shifting mindset, practice and culture of workforce related to EY and is disseminated nationally

Theory of Change

I observe that child welfare workforce and courts, particularly those responsible for ensuring permanence, do not engage youth in making decisions about their lives, which impedes the achievement of permanence and connections to stable and consistent adults for many youth in care, especially those 14 and older. I think it's because child welfare systems do not: Provide consistent training and coaching to the workforce on authentic EY; Emphasize or support relational casework; Allow for children/youth and worker partnership regarding permanency plans including the identification of potential permanent placements and consistent, caring adults that youth wish to maintain connections; Provide workforce with skills for shared decision making; Helping children and youth understand permanency options;Provide workforce with information on child & adolescent development and how this impacts their ability to engage; and Recognize the value and possibility of permanency for older youth.

Through the creation of a QIC that employs authentic youth voice and engagement, I plan to develop a training and coaching model that provides the knowledge, skills, and attitude that will help to transform the culture of the child welfare workforce in authentic engagement of children/youth. This training and coaching model will be infused in the pilot sites, evaluated, revised and then made available to all states, tribes, territories and counties. Which I think will result in: Increased preparedness/capacity to work with and support youth in permanency planning; Increased implementation of policies & practices that reflect child welfare systems commitment to EY practices; and Marked change in philosophy and culture related to engagement of youth by child welfare staff & court personnel.

Appendix C. Defining Terms

Statistical Term	Page Number	Definition
t-test	First appears on p. 4	A statistical test used to compare means of two groups.
Frequencies	First appears on p. 4	A statistical term meaning the number of times a data value occurs. For example, if 100 participants select "Foster Parent" as their role for this study, then the "Foster Parent" role has a frequency of 100.
Descriptive Statistics	First appears on p. 4	A way to summarize the key characteristics of the population in a study. For example, this report has a descriptive statistics table that describes the role of the participants, race, average age, etc.
Chi-square	First appears on p. 4	A statistical test used to compare proportions of two groups.
Cronbach's alpha	First appears on p. 22	A measure of internal consistency, or how closely a set of scale items relate to each other as a group. Higher scores demonstrate a scale is more reliable in measuring the construct as intended.
ANCOVA	First appears on p. 4	A statistical test used to compare means of multiple groups.
Binary logistic regression	First appears on p. 4	A statistical test used to compare the probability of an event occurring.
Mean	First appears on p. 22	A mean is the same thing as an average. For example, if the *mean* age of 100 caseworkers is 35, then their average age is 35.
P-values (e.g., $p<0.10$, $p<0.05$, $p<0.01$, $p<0.001$)	First appears on p. 4	The p-value is the probability that the outcome of a statistical test would have occurred by random chance, assuming there is no difference between the groups being compared. The smaller the p-value, the more likely it is that there is really a difference between the groups being compared.
Statistical significance	First appears on p. 4	If a relationship between two variables is statistically significant, it means that it is very likely that the relationship really exists between the two entities and very unlikely that the relationship found in the current study is an anomaly or due to random chance.
Effect Size	First appears on p. 4	The effect size tells us how strong the effect of the intervention was, or how big of a difference there is between groups (i.e., the QIC-EY Time 1 group vs. the QIC-EY Time 3 group). If there is no effect or the effect size is small, there is not as strong of a relationship between the intervention and the change. A large effect size means there was a strong relationship between the intervention and the change.

Appendix D. QIC-EY Workforce Outcome Survey Items

QIC-EY Outcome	Survey Measure	Question	Answer Choices
Short-Term Outcomes			
1. Increased workforce preparedness/ Capacity in the engagement of the children and youth	Evaluator-Developed Workforce Confidence Items	*How confident do you feel that you can engage children and youth in…*	On a scale from 0 to 10 where: 0 = Not at all (confident) 10 = Very (confident)
		…their case planning	
		…permanency planning that includes legal permanency?	
		…permanency planning that includes relational permanency?	
		…permanency planning that includes cultural permanency?	
	Self-Rated Skills in Engaging Youth in Case/Permanency Planning	*Please rate your skill in the following areas related to engaging youth in case planning.*	0 = I have no skill 1 2 3 4 5 = I have moderate skill 6 7 8 9 10 = I have a high level of skill
		*Engaging youth in **case planning***	
		Assessing and recognizing the unique strengths and abilities and specific needs of children and youth with regard to life and personal skills development	
		Valuing children's and youths' voices	
		Supporting children and youth in developing decision-making skills, achieving goals, and celebrating successes	
		Developing strong working relationships with children and youth	
		Helping children and youth plan for the future through a transition and/or permanency planning process	
		Helping children and youth develop independent living skills	
		Actively engaging young people in developing a transition and/or permanency plan earlier rather than later	
		*Engaging youth in **permanency planning***	0 = I have no skill

		Co-creating permanency plans with children and youth	1 2 3 4 5 = I have moderate skill 6 7 8 9 10 = I have a high level of skill
		Working with children and youth to identify potential permanent placements and consistent caring adults that children and youth wish to maintain connections with	
		Sharing decision-making power with children and youth	
		Understanding adolescent development and how it impacts children's and youth's perspectives on permanency	
	Social Worker's Attitudes Toward Disability Scale (SWADS), Practice subscale items	*Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement.*	1 = Strongly disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Somewhat Disagree 4 = Neither Agree/Disagree 5 = Somewhat Agree 6 = Agree 7 = Strongly Agree
		I advocate for my disabled clients to be included within the community.	
		*When I am too busy with other clients, I don't want to take time to provide special accommodations for my clients with disabilities.	
2. Increased levels of efficacy & job satisfaction	Professional Quality of Life (ProQOL-5), Compassion Satisfaction subscale, Adapted	*Select the number that honestly reflects how frequently you experienced [the statement] in the last 30 days.*	1 = Never 2 = Rarely 3 = Sometimes 4 = Often 5 = Very Often
		I get satisfaction from being able to help children and youth.	
		I feel invigorated after working with children and youth.	
		I like my work as a child welfare worker.	
		I am pleased with how I am able to keep up with child/youth engagement techniques and protocols.	
		My work makes me feel satisfied.	
		I have happy thoughts and feelings about children/youth I work with and how I could help them.	
		I believe I can make a difference through my work.	
		I am proud of what I can do to help children and youth.	
		I have thoughts that I am a "success" as a child welfare worker.	
		I am happy that I chose to do this work.	

		^I believe I can make a difference through the way that I support and engage with my staff.	
	TCU Organizational Readiness for Change (TCU ORC-D4), Efficacy subscale of Staff Attributes Scale, Adapted	You have the skills needed to conduct effective child welfare work.	1 = Disagree Strongly 2 = Disagree 3 = Uncertain 4 = Agree 5 = Agree Strongly
		You are effective and confident in doing your job.	
		You usually accomplish whatever you set your mind on.	
		You have the skills needed to conduct effective child/youth engagement in case planning.	
		You consistently plan ahead and carry out your plans.	
		^You have the ability to help others improve their efforts to engage children and youth incase and permanency planning.	
	Supervision for Frontline Staff Scale	*My immediate supervisor...*	1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Agree 4 = Strongly Agree 0 = Not Applicable or unsure
		Genuinely cares about me.	
		Supports me in difficult case situations.	
		Values my opinion in case decision-making.	
		Works with me to prevent vicarious trauma and burnout.	
		Helps me apply clinical knowledge to cases.	
		Uses supervision to teach me new skills.	
		Facilitates a strong, mutual assessment of the case.	
		Helps me create effective plans for clients.	
		^Coaches me to better engage children and youth.	
		^Asks questions that help me overcome barriers and find solutions to child and youth engagement.	
3. Increased youth satisfaction with the level of engagement child welfare & court staff have with them	This outcome is captured in the youth survey rather than the worker survey.		

4. Increased # of children/youth participating in permanency planning	Agency-Wide Youth Engagement Items	*Approximately how many children and youth served by your agency would you say are actively engaged in permanency planning within each of the age groups below...* • *Ages 8 to 13* • *Ages 14 to17* • *Ages 18 to 20*	1 = very few (less than 25%) 2 = some (25%-49%) 3 = many (50-74%) 4 = most (75%-100%)
		What type of role would you say most children and youth being served by your agency have in their permanency planning within each of the age groups below? • *Ages 8 to 13* • *Ages 14 to 17* • *Ages 18 to 20*	1 = They play no role 2 = They are occasionally consulted to give feedback on adults' ideas or plans 3 = They are frequently consulted to give feedback on adults' ideas or plans 4 = They are involved in developing ideas and plans but have no decision-making power 5 = They are involved in developing ideas and plans and have some decision-making power 6 = They play a primary role in developing ideas and plans as well as decision-making
		Note: If an agency did not work with youth ages 18 to 20, they could select not applicable for that question.	
	Involvement and Interaction Rating Scale, Youth Involvement Subscale	*For the following items, please think of your child welfare agency's work as it applies to engaging youth in case planning and/or permanency planning:* *Please adjust the slider to the sentence you most agree with on a scale of 1-10 with the numbers corresponding to (1) Sentence or (10) Sentence.*	
		1 Children/youth take little initiative in permanency planning	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 — 10 Children/youth take lots of initiative in permanency planning
		1 Children/youth make few decisions for themselves related to permanency planning, often relying on the decisions of adults.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 — 10 Children/youth rely on themselves to make key decisions related to permanency planning.
		1 Children/youth have very little	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 — 10 Children/youth have full access to information that is needed to

		access to information that is needed to make decisions regarding permanency planning.		make decisions regarding permanency planning.
		1 Children/youth rarely share ideas about things that matter to them in relation to permanency planning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	10 Children/youth frequently share ideas about things that matter to them in relation to permanency planning.
		1 Children/youth do not have an equal vote in the permanency planning decision-making process.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	10 Children/youth have an equal vote in the permanency planning decision- making process.
		1 Children/youth do not help one another in developing new skills.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	10 Children/youth help one another in developing new skills.
		1 Children/youth have no interest in being involved in permanency planning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	10 Children/youth are very excited about being involved in permanency planning.
5. Increased # of children/youth participating in permanency planning hearings and case planning meetings	Agency-Level Youth Engagement in Permanency Hearings	*Approximately how many children/youth served by your agency would you say are actively engaged in permanency planning **hearings** within each of the age groups below?* • *Ages 8 to 13* • *Ages 14 to17* • *Ages 18 to 20*	1 = very few (less than 25%) 2 = some (25%-49%) 3 = many (50-74%) 4 = most (75%-100%)	
		*What type of role would you say most children being served by your agency have in their permanency planning **hearings** within each of the age groups below?*	1 = They play no role 2 = They are occasionally consulted to give feedback on adults' ideas or plans	

		• *Ages 8 to 13* • *Ages 14 to 17* • *Ages 18 to 20*	3 = They are frequently consulted to give feedback on adults' ideas or plans 4 = They are involved in developing ideas and plans but have no decision-making power 5 = They are involved in developing ideas and plans and have some decision-making power 6 = They play a primary role in developing ideas and plans as well as decision-making
		Note: If an agency did not work with youth ages 18 to 20, they could select not applicable for that question.	
	Agency-Level Youth Engagement in Case Planning Meetings	*Approximately how many children/youth served by your agency would you say are actively engaged in **case planning meetings** within each of the age groups below?* • *Ages 8 to 13* • *Ages 14 to17* • *Ages 18 to 20*	1 = very few (less than 25%) 2 = some (25%-49%) 3 = many (50-74%) 4 = most (75%-100%)
		*What type of role would you say most children being served by your agency have in their **case planning meetings** within each of the age groups below?* • *Ages 8 to 13* • *Ages 14 to 17* • *Ages 18 to 20*	1 = They play no role 2 = They are occasionally consulted to give feedback on adults' ideas or plans 3 = They are frequently consulted to give feedback on adults' ideas or plans 4 = They are involved in developing ideas and plans but have no decision-making power 5 = They are involved in developing ideas and plans and have some decision-making power 6 = They play a primary role in developing ideas and plans as well as decision-making
		Note: If an agency did not work with youth ages 18 to 20, they could select not applicable for that question.	
6. Marked change in philosophy and culture related to engagement of youth by child welfare staff and court personnel	Case-Level YE Philosophy and Culture, Inform subscale	*Your personal beliefs:*	
		Child welfare professionals should provide children and youth with explanations of the permanency planning process, their permanency options, and the implications of each option.	1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = neutral 4 = agree 5 = strongly agree
		*Children and youth should not be burdened with information about the permanency planning process,	

		their permanency options, and the implications of those options.	
		Child welfare professionals should continually provide children and youth with up-to-date information to support their planning and decision making.	
		Beliefs and expectations in the agency overall:	
		Child welfare professionals should provide children and youth with explanations of the permanency planning process, their permanency options, and the implications of each option.	1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = neutral 4 = agree 5 = strongly agree
		*Children and youth should not be burdened with information about the permanency planning process, their permanency options, and the implications of those options.	
		Child welfare professionals should continually provide children and youth with up-to-date information to support their planning and decision making.	
	Case-Level YE Philosophy and Culture, Elicit subscale	*Your personal beliefs:*	
		Child welfare professionals should make active efforts to elicit children and youth's perspectives and preferences around permanency.	1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = neutral 4 = agree 5 = strongly agree
		Children and youth should be empowered to use their voice and express their preferences related to permanency.	
		To successfully elicit children's and youth's perspectives and preferences, it is important to build authentic, trusting relationships.	
		*Children and youth should not be asked to decide their perspectives and preferences related to permanency.	
		Beliefs and expectations in the agency overall:	
		Child welfare professionals should make active efforts to elicit children and youth's perspectives and preferences around permanency.	1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = neutral

		Children and youth should be empowered to use their voice and express their preferences related to permanency.	4 = agree 5 = strongly agree
		To successfully elicit children's and youth's perspectives and preferences, it is important to build authentic, trusting relationships.	
		Children and youth should not be asked to decide their perspectives and preferences related to permanency.	
	Case-Level YE Philosophy and Culture, Partner subscale	*Your personal beliefs:*	
		Children and youth should be embraced as experts on their own lives, a source of solutions, and as partners in decision-making.	1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = neutral 4 = agree 5 = strongly agree
		*It is not developmentally appropriate to involve children and youth in permanency planning and decision making.	
		*Children and youth lack sufficient knowledge and understanding to be partners in permanency planning and decision making.	
		Engaging children and youth in their own permanency planning expands permanency options and improves permanency and transition-related outcomes.	
		*Children and youth should not bear responsibility for permanency planning and decision making.	
		Child welfare professionals should advocate for children's and youth's permanency preferences when coordinating with other stakeholders.	
		Permanency planning and decision making should involve an equitable partnership between child welfare professionals and children and youth.	
		*Child welfare professionals are the experts on what permanency plans and decisions are best for children and youth.	
		When children's and youth's perspectives and preferences are heard and taken into account, they are more satisfied and accepting of the outcomes.	
		Beliefs and expectations in the agency overall:	

		Children and youth should be embraced as experts on their own lives, a source of solutions, and as partners in decision-making.	1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = neutral 4 = agree 5 = strongly agree
		*It is not developmentally appropriate to involve children and youth in permanency planning and decision making.	
		*Children and youth lack sufficient knowledge and understanding to be partners in permanency planning and decision making.	
		Engaging children and youth in their own permanency planning expands permanency options and improves permanency and transition-related outcomes.	
		*Children and youth should not bear responsibility for permanency planning and decision making.	
		Child welfare professionals should advocate for children's and youth's permanency preferences when coordinating with other stakeholders.	
		Permanency planning and decision making should involve an equitable partnership between child welfare professionals and children and youth.	
		*Child welfare professionals are the experts on what permanency plans and decisions are best for children and youth.	
		When children's and youth's perspectives and preferences are heard and taken into account, they are more satisfied and accepting of the outcomes.	
	Case-Level YE Philosophy and Culture, Permanency items	*Your personal beliefs:*	
		Permanency for children and youth should be legal, relational, and cultural—all three are critical and interconnected.	1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = neutral 4 = agree 5 = strongly agree
		Beliefs and expectations in the agency overall:	

		Permanency for children and youth should be legal, relational, and cultural—all three are critical and interconnected.	1 = strongly disagree 2 = disagree 3 = neutral 4 = agree 5 = strongly agree
	Y-VAL, Overall vision and commitment subscale, commitment to meaningful participation items	The agency has created a formal statement affirming its commitment to promoting child/youth engagement within the agency.	1 = Least Developed 2 3 = Midway 4 5 = Fully Developed
		The agency and its leaders clearly communicate this vision to stakeholders—including young people, management and staff.	
		The agency has completed training or other activities that aim to: -build meaningful partnerships between young people and adults.	
		The agency has completed training or other activities that aim to: -create an understanding of the unique value that young people add to case planning work.	
		The agency has completed training or other activities that aim to: -create a climate where young people are heard, valued and respected.	
		^The agency has created a climate where staff and supervisors work together to find solutions to better engage children and youth.	
	Y-VAL, Overall vision and commitment subscale, Culture of partnership items	Leaders and staff throughout the agency genuinely view children/youth as having valuable experience and ideas that can contribute to improving case/ permanency planning outcomes.	1 = Least Developed 2 3 = Midway 4 5 = Fully Developed
		Children/youth who participate in case/ permanency planning are welcomed as partners, their experience and insights are seen as valuable, and their ideas and contributions are given the same respect and attention as adults'.	
		Children/youth are safe and supported in bringing their own ideas and issues regarding case/ permanency planning forward for consideration.	

		The agency has been responsive to feedback from young people regarding how the agency can be more supportive of child/youth voice and participation in case/ permanency planning.	
		^Supervisors actively work with staff to help them partner with children and youth in their cases and permanency plans.	
	Organizational Climate Scale of TCU ORC-D4, Change subscale, Adapted	You frequently hear good ideas from other staff for improving child/youth engagement in permanency planning.	1 = Disagree Strongly 2 = Disagree 3 = Uncertain 4 = Agree 5 = Agree Strongly
		The general attitude in your program is to accept new and changing technology in relation to child/ youth engagement. (for example, social media).	
		*Novel child/youth engagement ideas by staff are discouraged where you work.	
		It is easy to change procedures related to child/youth engagement at your program to meet new conditions.	
		You feel encouraged to try new and different techniques in relation to child/youth engagement.	
		^You feel encouraged to try new and different solutions to achieving permanency for children and youth.	
7. Increased use of EY tools by child welfare & courts	This outcome is measured within the next outcome. It is also measured with process evaluation, which only applies to the intervention group.		
Long-Term Outcomes			
8. Increased implementation of policies & practices that reflect child welfare systems'	Evaluator-Developed items assessing workers' self-perceptions of their own	*Please rate how often you participate in the following activities related to engaging youth in case planning and/or permanency planning.*	0 = Never 1 2 3 4 5 = About half of the time
		Assessing and recognizing the unique strengths and abilities and specific needs of children and youth with regard to life and personal skills development	

commitment to EY practices	participation in engaging youth	Valuing children's/youths' voices	6 7 8 9 10 = Always
		Supporting youth in developing decision-making skills, achieving goals, and celebrating successes	
		Developing strong working relationships with children/youth	
		Helping children/youth plan for the future through transition and/or permanency planning process	
		Helping children/youth develop independent living skills	
		Actively engaging young people in developing a transition and/or permanency plan earlier rather than later	
	Involvement and Interaction Rating Scale, Adult involvement subscale, Adapted	*For the following items, please think of your child welfare agency's work as it applies to engaging children and youth in case planning and/or permanency planning.* *Please adjust the slider to the sentence you most agree with on a scale of 1-10 with the numbers corresponding to (1) Sentence or (10) Sentence.*	
		1 Adults display a sense of wanting to control children/youth in relation to case/ permanency planning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 — 10 Adults display a willingness to accept and nurture child/youth leadership in relation to case/ permanency planning.
		1 Adults never listen to the suggestions of children/youth regarding case/ permanency planning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 — 10 Adults always listen to the suggestions of children/youth regarding case/ permanency planning.
		1 Adults always take over everything when working on child/youth case/ permanency planning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 — 10 Adults never totally take over everything when working on child/youth case/ permanency planning.

		1 Adults do not learn new skills from one another in relation to child/youth engagement in case/permanency planning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	10 Adults learn new skills from one another in relation to child/youth engagement in case/permanency planning.
		1 Adults never take the ideas of children/youth seriously in relation to case/ permanency planning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	10 Adults always take the ideas of children/youth seriously in relation to case/ permanency planning.
		1 Adults command children/youth to follow the directions of adults in relation to case/ permanency planning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	10 Adults encourage children/youth to come up with their own ideas in relation to case/ permanency planning.
		1 Adults have no interest in being involved in engaging children/youth in case/permanency planning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	10 Adults are very excited about engaging children/youth in case/ permanency planning.
		1 Adults are not very concerned with agency/system change in relation to child/youth engagement in case/ permanency planning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	10 Adults are very concerned with agency/ system change in relation to child/youth engagement in case/ permanency planning.
	Involvement and Interaction Rating Scale, Youth-Adult Interaction subscale, Adapted	*For the following items, please think of your child welfare agency's work as it applies to engaging children and youth in case planning and/or permanency planning.* *Please adjust the slider to the sentence you most agree with on a scale of 1-10 with the numbers corresponding to (1) Sentence or (10) Sentence.*		
		1 There is arguing/tension among children/youth and adults in the context of case/ permanency planning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	10 Children/youth and adults get along well together in the context of case/ permanency planning.
		1 Children/youth appear uneasy and intimidated by adults.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	10 Children/youth seem comfortable working with adults.
		1 Adults appear uneasy and afraid of youth in the context of case/ permanency planning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	10 Adults seem comfortable working with youth on case/ permanency planning.

		1 Adults do not consult with children/youth on case/ permanency planning at all.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	10 Adults actively and consistently consult with children/youth on case/ permanency planning.
		1 Adults provide little or no direction and mentoring for children/youth in relation to case/ permanency planning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	10 Adults provide direction and mentoring for children/youth in relation to case/ permanency planning.
		1 Children/youth and adults rarely agree with one another in relation to case/ permanency planning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	10 Children/youth and adults often agree on most case/ permanency planning decisions.
		1 Children/youth and adults work separately on case/ permanency planning tasks.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	10 Children/youth and adults work together as partners on case/ permanency planning tasks.
		1 Children/youth and adults learn little from one another in the context of case/ permanency planning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	10 Children/youth and adults indicate mutual learning from one another in the context of case/ permanency planning.
		1 Children/youth and adults rarely help one another develop new skills related to case/ permanency planning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	10 Children/youth and adults frequently help one another develop new skills related to case/ permanency planning.
		1 Children/youth and adults never engage in respectful conversations regarding case/ permanency planning.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	10 Children/youth and adults always engage in respectful conversations regarding case/ permanency planning.
	CKI diffusion items	1 - Thinking back over the past year, how has the level of activities geared toward engaging children and youth in case/ permanency planning changed in your agency? Would you say that it has...		1 = Been cut in half or more than half 2 = Decreased somewhat 3 = There has been no change 4 = Increased somewhat 5 = Doubled or more than doubled
		2 - Thinking about the last year, has your supervisor been more active and effective at helping you better engage children and youth in their case and permanency planning?		yes/no

		Note: Question 1 was originally presented as two questions, these were combined for clarity in interpreting the results. Additionally, an item appearing in the survey was not included in the results for clarity.	
	Y-VAL, Empowered Representatives subscale	*Each item provides a description of what fully-developed agency support for youth voice looks like in a specific area. You will be asked to rate how far your agency has come toward matching this "fully developed" description.*	
		Case/permanency planning meetings follow an agenda that young people have received and prepared for in advance.	1 = least developed, none of the aspects in place/not true for our agency 2 3 = Midway 4 5 = Fully Developed, all aspects in place/completely true for our agency
		Expanded or new topics related to case/permanency planning are not introduced without context, and children/youth are not asked to advise on unfamiliar topics or make decisions without adequate information or preparation.	
		The agency has created opportunities for children/youth to develop their individual case/permanency planning participation skills within a community of supportive peers (e.g., youth leadership group, youth advisory board, youth subcommittee, leadership training).	
		Children and youth that the agency serves are aware of opportunities to participate in case/permanency planning.	
	Y-VAL, Commitment to facilitation and support of youth participation item	The agency makes case/permanency planning meetings accessible to children/youth by actively addressing the barriers that prevent meaningful youth participation. Barriers may be related to meeting times, transportation, childcare needs, meeting location, etc.	1 = least developed, none of the aspects in place/not true for our agency 2 3 = Midway 4 5 = Fully Developed, all aspects in place/completely true for our agency
	Y-VAL, Participation in evaluation subscale	The agency regularly gathers confidential feedback from children/youth receiving services to ensure that the case/ permanency planning process is meeting their needs.	1 = least developed, none of the aspects in place/not true for our agency 2 3 = Midway 4 5 = Fully Developed, all aspects in place/completely true for our agency
		Young people do not experience negative consequences as a result of giving honest feedback on the case/ permanency planning process.	

		Feedback that is gathered from children/youth regarding the case/ permanency planning process is considered with equal or greater weight as other stakeholders when making agency decisions.	
		Decision makers report back to children/youth about whether, how, and why specific youth feedback on the case/ permanency planning process was acted upon.	
		Findings from assessments that evaluate how well the agency is serving children/youth in relation to case/permanency planning are shared with children/youth in a timely manner.	
9. Increased levels of efficacy & job satisfaction	ProQOL-5, Burnout subscale	*Consider each of the following questions about you and your current work situation. Select the number that honestly reflects how frequently you experience these things in the last 30 days.*	1 = Never 2 = Rarely 3 = Sometimes 4 = Often 5 = Very Often
		*I am happy.	
		*I feel connected to others.	
		I am not as productive at work because I am losing sleep over traumatic experiences of a youth I work with.	
		I feel trapped by my job as a child welfare worker.	
		*I have beliefs that sustain me.	
		I am the person I always wanted to be.	
		I feel worn out because of my work as a child welfare worker.	

		I feel overwhelmed because my case load/ work load seems endless.	
		I feel "bogged down" by the system.	
		*I am a very caring person.	
	ProQOL-5, Secondary traumatic stress subscale	I am preoccupied with more than one child/youth that I work with.	1 = Never 2 = Rarely 3 = Sometimes 4 = Often 5 = Very Often
		I jump or am startled by unexpected sounds.	
		I find it difficult to separate my personal life from my life as a child welfare worker.	
		I think that I might have been affected by the traumatic stress of a child or youth I work with.	
		Because of my child welfare work, I have felt "on edge" about various things.	
		I feel depressed because of the traumatic experiences of child or youth I work with.	
		I feel as though I am experiencing the trauma of a child or youth I have worked with.	
		I avoid certain activities or situations because they remind me of frightening experiences of a child or youth I work with.	
		As a result of my child welfare work, I have intrusive, frightening thoughts.	

		I can't recall important parts of my work with trauma victims.	
	Intent to Stay	*Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements.*	
		*I plan to leave this agency as soon as possible.	1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Agree 4 = Strongly Agree
		I have too much time invested at this agency to leave.	
		I expect to still be working at this agency in 5 years.	
		I am committed to staying at this agency.	
		I would gain little from switching to another child welfare agency.	
	Intent to Leave Scale items	1- About how many years do you expect to be working in your agency?	1 = Less than 1 year 2 = 1-3 years 3 = 4-6 years 4 = 7-10 years 5 = the rest of my career
		2-Within the past year, have you considered looking for a new job?	yes/no
	3 – **Thinking**: thinking or speaking about leaving current job	In the past year… How often have you thought about leaving?	1 = Almost never 2 = some of the time 3 = often 4 = almost every day
		How often have you spoken with friends, spouses, partners, family members, etc., about leaving?	1 = Almost never 2 = some of the time 3 = often 4 = almost every day
	4 – **Looking:** Searching for or making inquiries about other jobs	How often do you search the internet for jobs?	1 = Never 2 = Every few months 3 = Monthly 4 = Weekly 5 = Daily
		How many phone, email, or social media inquiries have you made about other jobs?	1 = None 2 = 1-2 3 = 3-4

			4 = 5-6 5 = More than 6
	5 – **Acting:** Resumes sent and interviews	How many resumes have you sent out?	1 = None 2 = 1-2 3 = 3-5 4 = 6-10 5 = More than 10
		How many job interviews have you had?	1 = None 2 = 1-2 3 = 3-4 4 = 5-6 5 = More than 6
10. Additional Outcome: Relational Permanence	Evaluator-developed items assessing relational permanence	*I have worked with children/youth to identify...*	
		... areas youth might need continued support during transition (emerging adulthood).	1 = Never 2 = Rarely, in less than 10% of the chances when I could have 3 = Occasionally, in about 30% of the chances when I could have 4 = Sometimes, in about 50% of the chances when I could have 5 = Frequently, in about 70% of the chances when I could have 6 = Usually, in about 90% of the chances I could have. 7 = Every time
		...former important relationships in the child/youth's life that they wish to maintain (family members, coaches, teachers, mentors, church members, and other adults).	
		....an adult(s) that can provide concrete support (cell phone/service, place to do laundry, transportation, babysit, co-sign lease, etc.)	
		... an adult(s) that can provide informational support (help applying to colleges, job searching, supporting youth in civic engagement, etc.)	
		... an adult(s) that can provide emotional support (someone to talk to, supports youth's cultural development, check-in on youth, etc.)	
		... a safety network for the child/youth or work to establish one for them.	
		... people and community spaces that make them feel that they belong.	