

# CHAPTER 9: PLACEMENT OUTCOMES ANALYSIS

## 9.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes the second of two major analyses of child outcomes, examining the effects of the second waiver on counties' use of foster care placements, focusing on first placements<sup>1</sup> and estimating waiver effects on type of exit and length of stay.<sup>2</sup> The Placement Outcomes Analysis (POA) estimated separate waiver effects for select demographic groups and for each of the original demonstration counties.<sup>3</sup> The study team used statistical techniques similar to those used in Year 5 of the first waiver evaluation (HSRI, 2003), incorporating counterfactual imputations that estimated what would have happened in the absence of the waiver.

The methodology used in the POA is more fully explained in Appendix F. In brief, the counterfactual model estimated what would have happened in each waiver county in the absence of the second waiver, based on what actually happened in the comparison counties. This involved examining change over time in the demonstration counties and comparing it to change over time in the comparison counties for similar children (i.e., controlling for as many confounding factors as possible). The study team then estimated what the demonstration counties' outcomes would have been under pre-waiver and first-waiver conditions.<sup>4</sup> The result is an estimate of the effects of the second waiver on exit types and median placement durations for each demonstration county, relative to conditions prior to the first waiver and to conditions under the first waiver.

To remove selection bias, the evaluation team controlled for differences over time and across county groups on characteristics of the children and placement types. Thus, any possible effects of the waiver on initial placement type (foster home, group home, institution, etc.) could not be detected in the analysis. But this was necessary in order to avoid false causal conclusions – i.e., concluding that the waiver lengthened placements when longer placements actually were because more difficult families were being served.<sup>5</sup>

The major findings reported in this chapter are listed below. Throughout the chapter, whenever an effect is characterized as significant, it is statistically significant at  $p \leq 0.05$  even if the effect is small (as many of them are). All findings reported in the following bullets are statistically significant.

---

<sup>1</sup> The study team analyzed first placements because they are the majority of placements and their outcomes are not complicated by previous placement history.

<sup>2</sup> These estimates should not be used for projecting waiver effects statewide. The experience of implementing a waiver in only 14 counties is not sufficient for extrapolating beyond the 14 counties.

<sup>3</sup> Although additional Ohio counties joined the second waiver, the POA was based on the original 14 demonstration counties and 14 comparison counties studied during the first waiver period.

<sup>4</sup> The bridge period (October 1, 2002 through June 30, 2004) is excluded from the analysis because it differed from both waiver periods in contractual requirements and strategies used.

<sup>5</sup> The initial placement type was the best available information in the data that could indicate the severity of needs of the child. It is at best a very indirect proxy, so there could still be some selection bias in the estimates.

- In the Year 5 report on the first waiver (HSRI, 2003), the study team showed that the waiver led to a significant decline in reunifications among the demonstration counties as a group. Under the second waiver, the team again found a significant decline in reunifications when estimating second-waiver outcomes relative to *pre-waiver conditions*. However, the estimation of second-waiver outcomes relative to *first-waiver conditions* showed a slight but significant increase in reunifications, rather than a decrease. Thus more of the decline in reunifications happened during the first waiver, and the trend slowed and then reversed somewhat after the second waiver began.
- Across both comparisons (pre-waiver and first-waiver), the second waiver led to steady increases in exits to custody to kin and third party<sup>6</sup> and to runaways. This continued and was consistent with the effects of the first waiver.
- Compared with the pre-waiver period, the second waiver increased exits to adoption. But that effect was not found in the first-waiver comparison and the evaluation of the first waiver had found no impact on adoption. This suggests that perhaps exits to adoption increased very slowly, so that only the comparison covering the longest time span (pre-waiver to second waiver) was able to detect a significant change.
- In contrast to the first waiver, which significantly shortened median duration of placements by four months, the second waiver had no overall impact on placement duration in either the pre-waiver or the first-waiver comparison. At the county level, four counties experienced significant decreases in overall duration of placements and two counties experienced significant increases relative to first-waiver conditions.
- In the pre-waiver comparison as well as the first-waiver comparison, the second waiver increasingly reduced the median duration of placements ending in adoption, indicating that the momentum to reduce the wait for adoption increased during the second waiver. This contrasted with the first waiver, which had no effect on duration of placements ending in adoption.

Chapter 9 also contains results of an expanded analysis of re-entry into foster care, using first waiver data. In 2008, the study team broadened the analysis reported in the Final Comprehensive Report (HSRI, 2003) to look at children’s re-entry into foster care after they exited their first foster care placements to the custody of either their parents or kin. As discussed below, the expanded analysis found that re-entry remained at the same level as it would have been absent the waiver. Thus, children's safety was not compromised by a focus on reducing placement days.

This chapter is organized as follows. Section 9.2 summarizes the raw numbers on first placements and types of exit, by county, over the entire pre-, first-, and second-waiver periods (all cases included in the POA). The chapter then presents estimates for second-waiver effects compared to pre-waiver

---

<sup>6</sup> In the evaluation of the first waiver, this exit category included only custody to relatives.

conditions (Section 9.3) and compared to first-waiver conditions (Section 9.4).<sup>7</sup> Within Sections 9.3 and 9.4, overall estimates are discussed first; then the sections present estimates by age (less than 1 year old, ages 1 through 12, and ages 13 and older) and race (black children, and white and other children). Section 9.5 presents county-level tables showing the second-waiver effects compared to first-waiver conditions.<sup>8</sup> Finally, Section 9.6 examines children’s safety in terms of re-entry to care after exiting to parents, kin, or third party during the first waiver.<sup>9</sup> All tables in this chapter use asterisks to indicate significant findings ( $p \leq 0.05$ ) regarding second-waiver effects.

## 9.2 FIRST PLACEMENTS IN DEMONSTRATION COUNTIES

Table 9.1 shows the numbers of first placements and types of exit, by demonstration county and then comparison county, over the three study periods. The POA analyses presented in the remainder of this chapter are based on these placements. The placements began at some point during the study periods January 1, 1991 through September 30, 2009 (the date of censoring<sup>10</sup>), excluding the bridge period. Since these data reflect 18 years of events, most placements have been completed, with children exiting to reunification, custody to kin or third party, adoption, runaway, or other exit. The 6,258 cases not completed are counted as censored, with imputations for placements that had not yet ended as of the date of censoring. Overall almost 123,300 children started their first placements during the study periods, with reunification the most common exit type.

---

<sup>7</sup> The study team found bias in the imputations and removed the bias by simulating actual outcomes and comparing them to simulated counterfactual outcomes. Thus the second-waiver outcomes presented in Sections 9.3 and 9.4 are simulated in order to make the estimates more accurate. The actual outcomes under the second waiver are presented in Appendix G. However, the county-level estimates in Section 9.5 are based on actual outcomes under the second waiver rather than simulated outcomes in order to better reflect local initiatives and conditions. The reason for presenting county-level effects differently from overall effects is that simulated actual outcomes reflect average effects across counties for each subgroup with a differential effect, so county-level simulated actual outcomes would tend to be the same in each county – in other words, county-level differences would be averaged out.

<sup>8</sup> County-level comparisons to pre-waiver conditions are not included because that time period is so long ago it would not be helpful or informative for policy decisions at the county level.

<sup>9</sup> This analysis was not repeated for the second waiver.

<sup>10</sup> Some children were still in placement at the end of the study period and it was unknown how long these children would stay in their placements. To use the information from these “censored” cases, the study team imputed the outcomes (exit type and date) using information from survival analysis modeling that took into account child and case factors that could influence the length of placement and placement outcomes.

**Table 9.1: Number of First Placements, by County and Exit Type, Across the Three Study Periods**

County	First Placements Ending With:						
	Reunification	Custody to Kin or Third Party	Adoption	Runaway	Other*	Censored	Total**
Ashtabula	1,126	527	218	4	171	102	2,148
Belmont	589	222	117	4	114	56	1,102
Clark	1,516	624	329	80	301	174	3,024
Crawford	535	232	67	1	238	40	1,113
Fairfield	859	342	192	11	186	187	1,777
Franklin	20,838	7,594	2,286	628	2,799	1,383	35,528
Greene	923	520	152	7	202	117	1,921
Hamilton	4,726	3,196	1,146	252	4,770	1,016	15,106
Lorain	1,538	948	418	10	332	79	3,325
Medina	536	145	87	7	123	28	926
Muskingum	674	534	170	1	132	49	1,560
Portage	856	889	212	22	286	138	2,403
Richland	1,243	491	268	20	308	45	2,375
Stark	3,189	1,944	1,031	72	1,111	397	7,744
<b>Demonstration</b>	<b>39,148</b>	<b>18,208</b>	<b>6,693</b>	<b>1,119</b>	<b>11,073</b>	<b>3,811</b>	<b>80,052</b>

**Table 9.1 (continued): Number of First Placements  
by County and Exit Type, Across the Three Study Periods**

County	First Placements Ending With:						
	Reunification	Custody to Kin or Third Party	Adoption	Runaway	Other*	Censored	Total**
Allen	942	458	145	12	164	96	1817
Butler	2,624	1,752	579	58	492	308	5,813
Clermont	1,498	617	356	8	270	266	3,015
Columbiana	491	317	120	2	130	105	1,165
Hancock	216	173	91	2	42	47	571
Hocking	324	266	53	1	53	31	728
Mahoning	1,446	701	160	20	162	174	2,663
Miami	510	214	147	8	187	47	1,113
Montgomery	3,065	2,997	947	60	704	610	8,383
Scioto	1,044	222	54	22	100	57	1,499
Summit	7,744	2,701	861	307	887	520	13,020
Trumbull	800	460	344	6	114	99	1,823
Warren	404	194	106	1	119	40	864
Wood	363	159	78	5	114	47	766
<b>Comparison</b>	21,471	11,231	4,041	512	3,538	2,447	43,240
<b>Total**</b>	60,619	29,439	10,734	1,631	14,611	6,258	123,292

\*"Other" includes unknown/unclassified/conflicting exits (56.7%) and those ending in emancipation (39.7%); transfer to correctional institution, hospital, or other agency (2.1%); or death while in county custody (1.5%). Note that in the Year 5 report this category included "guardianship" exits, but those exits are now counted in the "custody to kin or third party" exits.

\*\*County figures may not sum exactly to the totals due to rounding.

Table 9.2 shows the numbers of children by the age and race subgroups whose outcomes were examined in this chapter: ages up to 1 year, 1-12 years, 13 and older, black children, and white and other children. These subgroups are not shown by demonstration/comparison status because the analysis of outcomes controlled for age and race, and thus the demonstration/comparison break-outs are not relevant here.

<b>Table 9.2: Number of Children by Subgroups, Across the Three Study Periods</b>	
<b>Subgroup</b>	<b>Number of Children</b>
Age:	
Up to 1 Year	21,821
1-12	61,195
13 and Older	40,276
Total	123,292
Race:	
Black	51,140
White and Other	72,152
Total	123,292

### **9.3 WAIVER EFFECTS ACROSS DEMONSTRATION COUNTIES BASED ON PRE-WAIVER CONDITIONS**

Pre-waiver conditions represent the absence of any treatment effect. This period extended from January 1, 1991 through September 30, 1997.<sup>11</sup>

#### **9.3.1 Overall Effects on Exit Type and Median Placement Duration**

Table 9.3 summarizes the estimates of the effects of the second waiver on exit types by comparing exits under the second waiver with what they would have been if the pre-waiver conditions had continued – i.e., no waiver had been implemented. It shows that:

- Under the second waiver, 51.03% of exits were reunifications, while the percentage under pre-waiver conditions would have been 55.31%. This effect is a significant -4.27 percentage points.
- Relative to pre-waiver conditions, the second waiver significantly increased custody to kin by 2.43 percentage points. This could indicate that the second-waiver kinship strategy, as well as

<sup>11</sup> The ending date for the pre-waiver data in this POA analysis – September 30, 1997 – is different from the ending date used in the POA analysis of the first waiver – December 31, 1997. This slight difference does not influence the results.

the overall increased attention paid by demonstration counties to finding kin caregivers (see Chapter 5), had an effect.

- Also the second waiver slightly but significantly increased adoptions and runaways relative to pre-waiver conditions.
- Except for adoptions, these findings were generally consistent with, but smaller than, the significant first-waiver effects that were presented in the Year 5 report (HSRI, 2003): the first waiver decreased reunification by 11.40 percentage points and increased custody to relative by 3.66 percentage points. Those trends continued in the second waiver, but with somewhat smaller effects.

<b>Table 9.3: Effects of the Second Waiver on Exit Types from First Placements in the Original Demonstration Counties Relative to Conditions Prevailing Prior to First Waiver</b>				
<b>First Placements Ending with:</b>	<b>Percentage of Cases</b>		<b>Second Waiver Effect Relative to Pre-waiver</b>	
	<b>During Second Waiver Period</b>	<b>Counterfactual Projection to Pre-waiver Conditions</b>		
Reunification	51.03	55.31	-4.27	*
Custody to Kin or Third Party	23.13	20.71	2.43	*
Adoption	12.61	11.87	0.74	*
Runaway	2.12	1.00	1.12	*
Other	11.11	11.12	-0.02	
Total	100	100	N/A	

Table 9.4 shows that, although there was no impact on placement duration for all exits considered together, the second waiver decreased duration for placements ending in adoption and in the “other” category relative to pre-waiver conditions. Children were adopted faster, and “other” types of exits (unknown/unclassified/conflicting exits as well as placements ending in emancipation; transfer to correctional institution, hospital, or other agency; or death while in county custody) happened more quickly as well. This differed from first-waiver effects, where the only significant finding was that median duration for any type of exit declined by 0.40 months.

<b>Table 9.4: Effects of the Second Waiver on Duration of First Placements in the Original Demonstration Counties Relative to Conditions Prevailing Prior to First Waiver</b>				
<b>First Placements Ending with:</b>	<b>Median Placement Duration in Months</b>		<b>Second Waiver Effect Relative to Pre-waiver</b>	
	<b>During Second Waiver Period</b>	<b>Counterfactual Projection to Pre-waiver Conditions</b>		
Reunification	3.74	3.54	0.20	
Custody to Kin or Third Party	5.41	5.70	-0.29	
Adoption	30.83	32.59	-1.77	*
Runaway	10.43	10.44	-0.01	
Other	14.81	21.45	-6.65	*
Any Type of Exit	7.09	7.05	0.04	

### 9.3.2 Effects by Age Group on Exit Type and Median Placement Duration

#### 9.3.2.1 Age Less than 1

As Table 9.5 shows, for infants under 1 year of age the second waiver slightly but significantly decreased reunifications and increased custody to kin or third party and other types of exits, compared to the pre-waiver period.

<b>Age at placement less than 1 year old</b>				
<b>Table 9.5: Effects of the Second Waiver on Exit Types from First Placements in the Original Demonstration Counties Relative to Conditions Prevailing Prior to First Waiver</b>				
<b>First Placements Ending with:</b>	<b>Percentage of Cases</b>		<b>Second Waiver Effect Relative to Pre-waiver</b>	
	<b>During Second Waiver Period</b>	<b>Counterfactual Projection to Pre-waiver Conditions</b>		
Reunification	36.92	41.80	-4.88	*
Custody to Kin or Third Party	25.93	23.68	2.25	*
Adoption	31.44	30.54	0.91	
Runaway	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Other	5.71	3.98	1.73	*
Total	100	100	N/A	

Relative to pre-waiver conditions, the second waiver had no significant effect on placement duration for infants (Table 9.6). Note that, in all tables presenting placement duration by age group (Tables 9.6, 9.8, and 9.10 in this section, and Tables 9.18, 9.20, and 9.22 in Section 9.4.2), exits for “other” category have been suppressed from the age group tables. Emancipations are an important component of “other” exits, but can take considerable time to occur. For placements in the early 1990s, emancipation took about 8 years; for children placed in 2005 and later, not enough time had gone by to observe emancipation patterns. In fact, only two were reported in all of the 28 study counties for those children.



Age at placement less than 1 year old				
Table 9.6: Effects of the Second Waiver on Duration of First Placements in the Original Demonstration Counties Relative to Conditions Prevailing Prior to First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Median Placement Duration in Months		Second Waiver Effect Relative to Pre-waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to Pre-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	4.62	4.53	0.09	
Custody to Kin or Third Party	5.77	6.18	-0.41	
Adoption	25.29	26.49	-1.20	
Runaway	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Other	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Any Type of Exit	11.00	11.17	-0.16	

### 9.3.2.2 Age 1 through 12

The second waiver had a relatively large impact on reunifications in this age group compared to the effects on the other age groups. Table 9.7 shows that, under the second waiver relative to the pre-waiver period, reunifications declined by 7.11 percentage points. The second waiver also had small but significant effect on custody to kin or third party, adoption, and other exits, significantly increasing the proportion of those exits compared to pre-waiver conditions.

Age at placement after 1 <sup>st</sup> birthday but before 13 <sup>th</sup> birthday				
Table 9.7: Effects of the Second Waiver on Exit Types from First Placements in the Original Demonstration Counties Relative to Conditions Prevailing Prior to First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Percentage of Cases		Second Waiver Effect Relative to Pre-waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to Pre-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	53.88	60.99	-7.11	*
Custody to Kin or Third Party	26.80	22.63	4.17	*
Adoption	12.03	10.92	1.11	*
Runaway	0.43	0.11	0.32	
Other	6.85	5.34	1.51	*
Total	100	100	N/A	

Table 9.8 shows that the second waiver significantly reduced median durations of cases ending in adoption for children ages 1-12, relative to the pre-waiver period.

Age at placement after 1 <sup>st</sup> birthday but before 13 <sup>th</sup> birthday				
Table 9.8: Effects of the Second Waiver on Duration of First Placements in the Original Demonstration Counties Relative to Conditions Prevailing Prior to First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Median Placement Duration in Months		Second Waiver Effect Relative to Pre-waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to Pre-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	4.01	3.82	0.19	
Custody to Kin or Third Party	5.74	5.91	-0.16	
Adoption	37.78	40.49	-2.71	*
Runaway	60.91	60.02	0.89	
Other	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Any Type of Exit	6.76	6.61	0.15	

### 9.3.2.3 Age Thirteen and Older

The second waiver slightly but significantly increased the percentage of teenagers who ran away, compared to pre-waiver conditions, and decreased the percentage in the “other” category of exits (Table 9.9). Unlike for the younger children, there was no impact on reunifications.

Teenager at time of placement				
Table 9.9: Effects of the Second Waiver on Exit Types from First Placements in the Original Demonstration Counties Relative to Conditions Prevailing Prior to First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Percentage of Cases		Second Waiver Effect Relative to Pre-waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to Pre-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	56.38	55.38	1.00	
Custody to Kin or Third Party	14.87	15.29	-0.42	
Adoption	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Runaway	6.52	3.23	3.29	*
Other	22.24	26.11	-3.87	*
Total	100	100	N/A	

The second waiver had no statistically significant effect on placement duration for teenagers, relative to the pre-waiver period (Table 9.10).

Teenager at time of placement				
Table 9.10: Effects of the Second Waiver on Duration of First Placements in the Original Demonstration Counties Relative to Conditions Prevailing Prior to First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Median Placement Duration in Months		Second Waiver Effect Relative to Pre-waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to Pre-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	3.14	2.95	0.19	
Custody to Kin or Third Party	3.98	4.96	-0.98	
Adoption	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Runaway	9.57	9.81	-0.24	
Other	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Any Type of Exit	5.41	5.39	0.01	

### 9.3.3 Effects by Race Group on Exit Type and Median Placement Duration

#### 9.3.3.1 Black Children

Black children were less likely to exit to reunification as a result of the second waiver, compared to black children under pre-waiver conditions (Table 9.11). They were more likely to exit to custody to kin or third party, be adopted, or run away.

Black children				
Table 9.11: Effects of the Second Waiver on Exit Types from First Placements in the Original Demonstration Counties Relative to Conditions Prevailing Prior to First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Percentage of Cases		Second Waiver Effect Relative to Pre-waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to Pre-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	55.02	58.85	-3.83	*
Custody to Kin or Third Party	20.04	18.61	1.43	*
Adoption	11.07	10.15	0.92	*
Runaway	2.54	1.23	1.32	*
Other	11.33	11.16	0.17	
Total	100	100	N/A	

In comparing the second waiver to pre-waiver conditions, the only effect on black children’s placement duration that was statistically significant was in the “other” category, which was shorter by 6.6 months (Table 9.12).

Black children				
Table 9.12: Effects of the Second Waiver on Duration of First Placements in the Original Demonstration Counties Relative to Conditions Prevailing Prior to First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Median Placement Duration in Months		Second Waiver Effect Relative to Pre-waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to Pre-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	3.73	3.49	0.24	
Custody to Kin or Third Party	5.64	5.69	-0.05	
Adoption	34.68	33.65	1.04	
Runaway	10.97	10.33	0.64	
Other	16.01	22.61	-6.60	*
Any Type of Exit	6.89	6.56	0.33	

### 9.3.3.2 White and Other Children

The second waiver had a similar pattern of exit-type effects on the white and other children as was found for black children, except that it did not have an effect on their adoptions. Similarly for the black children, it decreased reunification and increased exits to custody to kin or third party and running away, relative to pre-waiver conditions for white and other children.

White and other children				
Table 9.13: Effects of the Second Waiver on Exit Types from First Placements in the Original Demonstration Counties Relative to Conditions Prevailing Prior to First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Percentage of Cases		Second Waiver Effect Relative to Pre-waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to Pre-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	48.19	52.78	-4.59	*
Custody to Kin or Third Party	25.34	22.20	3.14	*
Adoption	13.71	13.09	0.62	
Runaway	1.81	0.83	0.98	*
Other	10.95	11.10	-0.15	
Total	100	100	N/A	

Relative to the pre-waiver period, the second waiver shortened placement durations among white and other children who were adopted (by 3.1 months) and those who exited placement in the “other” category (by 6.7 months) (Table 9.14).

White and other children				
Table 9.14: Effects of the Second Waiver on Duration of First Placements in the Original Demonstration Counties Relative to Conditions Prevailing Prior to First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Median Placement Duration in Months		Second Waiver Effect Relative to Pre-waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to Pre-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	3.73	3.58	0.16	
Custody to Kin or Third Party	5.31	5.71	-0.39	
Adoption	28.97	32.07	-3.10	*
Runaway	10.27	11.37	-1.09	
Other	13.95	20.67	-6.72	*
Any Type of Exit	7.23	7.45	-0.21	

## 9.4 WAIVER EFFECTS ACROSS DEMONSTRATION COUNTIES BASED ON FIRST-WAIVER CONDITIONS

The first waiver period lasted from October 1, 1997 through September 30, 2002. It provided counties opportunities to explore innovative approaches to meeting the needs of children and families in their communities. However, demonstration counties did not implement specific strategies under the first waiver as they did under the second waiver; rather, they received flexible funding that was not based on placement days but could be used to provide in-home services to prevent or shorten placement. The second waiver tested the impact of the implementation of planned strategies (in addition to the flexible funding) around family team meetings, supervised visitation, kinship caregiving, and mental health/substance abuse treatment. It explored whether the provision of these focused strategies had a different impact from simply providing flexible funding as with the first waiver. When this change occurred, it was unknown whether outcomes would be better or worse under focused strategies compared to generally-available flexible funding without the strategies. The following analysis casts some important light on this question.

### 9.4.1 Overall Effects on Exit Type and Median Placement Duration

As shown in Table 9.15, relative to conditions under the first waiver:

- The second waiver led to small but statistically significant increases in exits to reunification, custody to kin or third party, and runaway, and a decrease in the “other” category. The finding on reunification was different from the finding relative to *pre-waiver* conditions, when there was a significant decrease in reunifications (Table 9.3).
- There was no second-waiver impact on the proportion of exits to adoption. Exits to adoption were higher relative to the pre-waiver period (Table 9.3) but were not higher relative to the first-waiver period. And the evaluation of the first waiver had found no impact on the proportion of exits to adoption either (HSRI, 2003). This suggests that perhaps the proportion of

exits to adoption increased very slowly, so that only the comparison covering the longest time span (pre-waiver to second waiver) was able to detect a significant effect.

<b>Table 9.15: Effects of the Second Waiver on Exit Types from First Placements in the Original Demonstration Counties Relative to the First Waiver</b>				
<b>First Placements Ending with:</b>	<b>Percentage of Cases</b>		<b>Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver</b>	
	<b>During Second Waiver Period</b>	<b>Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions</b>		
Reunification	51.03	50.52	0.51	*
Custody to Kin or Third Party	23.13	22.33	0.81	*
Adoption	12.61	12.24	0.37	
Runaway	2.12	1.45	0.66	*
Other	11.11	13.46	-2.35	*
Total	100	100	N/A	

Examining exit types across both comparisons (pre-waiver in Table 9.3 and first-waiver in Table 9.15) shows that the second waiver steadily increased exits to custody to kin and third party, as well as runaways. This trend continued and was consistent with the effects of the first waiver as reported in the Year 5 report (HSRI, 2003).<sup>12</sup>

Although there was no impact on the proportion of exits that were to adoption, there was a significant decline of 2.06 months in how long it took for children to be adopted (Table 9.16). That was the only statistically significant effect on placement duration. And the effect (-2.06 months) was larger than the effect relative to the pre-waiver period (-1.77 months), indicating that the momentum to reduce the wait for adoption increased during the second waiver.

<sup>12</sup> In the first waiver, the exit category was custody to relatives only, not to third party.

Table 9.16: Effects of the Second Waiver on Duration of First Placements in the Original Demonstration Counties Relative to the First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Median Placement Duration in Months		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	3.74	3.79	-0.05	
Custody to Kin or Third Party	5.41	5.48	-0.07	
Adoption	30.83	32.89	-2.06	*
Runaway	10.43	10.23	0.20	
Other	14.81	14.17	0.63	
Any Type of Exit	7.09	7.17	-0.08	

## 9.4.2 Effects by Age Group on Exit Type and Median Placement Duration

### 9.4.2.1 Age Less than One

Relative to the first waiver, infants' reunifications declined and exits to custody to kin or third party and to adoption increased under the second waiver (Table 9.17).

Age at placement less than 1 year old				
Table 9.17: Effects of the Second Waiver on Exit Types from First Placements in the Original Demonstration Counties Relative to the First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Percentage of Cases		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	36.92	41.07	-4.15	*
Custody to Kin or Third Party	25.93	24.13	1.80	*
Adoption	31.44	29.27	2.17	*
Runaway	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Other	5.71	5.52	0.18	
Total	100	100	N/A	

The second waiver had no significant impact on placement duration of infants, relative to first-waiver conditions (Table 9.18).

Age at placement less than 1 year old				
Table 9.18: Effects of the Second Waiver on Duration of First Placements in the Original Wave of Demonstration Counties Relative to the First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Median Placement Duration in Months		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	4.62	4.48	0.14	
Custody to Kin or Third party	5.77	5.84	-0.07	
Adoption	25.29	25.99	-0.70	
Runaway	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Other	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Any Type of Exit	11.00	10.82	0.18	

#### 9.4.2.2 Age 1 through 12

The second waiver significantly decreased exits to reunification and increased exits to custody to kin or third party among children ages 1 through 12, relative to the first waiver (Table 9.19). The effect on reunification was quite a bit smaller than in the comparison to the pre-waiver period shown in Table 9.7 (-7.11 percentage points compared to -2.20).

Age at placement after 1 <sup>st</sup> birthday but before 13 <sup>th</sup> birthday				
Table 9.19: Effects of the Second Waiver on Exit Types from First Placements in the Original Demonstration Counties Relative to the First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Percentage of Cases		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	53.88	56.08	-2.20	*
Custody to Kin or Third Party	26.80	24.55	2.25	*
Adoption	12.03	12.20	-0.17	
Runaway	0.43	0.40	0.03	
Other	6.85	6.77	0.09	
Total	100	100	N/A	

For children ages 1-12, the second waiver significantly shortened placement duration for all exits by 0.6 months and shortened children's waits for adoption by about 3 months, relative to the first waiver (Table 9.20). The impact on placements ending in adoption, relative to the first waiver, was even greater than the impact relative to the pre-waiver period, which was -2.7 months (Table 9.8).



Age at placement after 1 <sup>st</sup> birthday but before 13 <sup>th</sup> birthday				
Table 9.20: Effects of the Second Waiver on Duration of First Placements in the Original Demonstration Counties Relative to the First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Median Placement Duration in Months		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	4.01	4.19	-0.19	
Custody to Kin or Third Party	5.74	5.69	0.06	
Adoption	37.78	40.83	-3.05	*
Runaway	60.91	64.59	-3.68	
Other	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Any Type of Exit	6.76	7.34	-0.59	*

#### 9.4.2.3 Age Thirteen and Older

Among teenagers, the second waiver significantly increased exits to reunification and running away and decreased custody to kin or third party and “other” types of exits, relative to the first waiver (Table 9.21). The reunification finding was in contrast to the other age groups, where the second waiver led to fewer reunifications relative to the first waiver.

Teenager at time of placement				
Table 9.21: Effects of the Second Waiver on Exit Types from First Placements in the Original Demonstration Counties Relative to the First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Percentage of Cases		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	56.38	47.90	8.48	*
Custody to Kin or Third Party	14.87	17.24	-2.37	*
Adoption	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Runaway	6.52	4.29	2.22	*
Other	22.24	30.57	-8.33	*
Total	100	100	N/A	

For teenagers, the second waiver increased placement duration for all cases overall by 0.42 months relative to the first waiver (Table 9.22). In contrast, teenagers’ placement duration was not impacted by the second waiver relative to *pre-waiver* conditions (Table 9.10).

Teenager at time of placement				
Table 9.22: Effects of the Second Waiver on Duration of First Placements in the Original Demonstration Counties Relative to the First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Median Placement Duration in Months		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	3.14	2.99	0.15	
Custody to Kin or Third Party	3.98	4.69	-0.71	
Adoption	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Runaway	9.57	8.46	1.11	
Other	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Any Type of Exit	5.41	4.99	0.42	*

### 9.4.3 Effects by Race Group on Exit Type and Median Placement Duration

#### 9.4.3.1 Black Children

Black children were significantly more likely to be reunified and to run away, and less likely to have an “other” type of exit, relative to black children in the first waiver (Table 9.23). This is in contrast to the pre-waiver comparison, where black children were *less* likely to be reunified.

Black children				
Table 9.23: Effects of the Second Waiver on Exit Types from First Placements in the Original Demonstration Counties Relative to the First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Percentage of Cases		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	55.02	52.39	2.63	*
Custody to Kin or Third Party	20.04	20.34	-0.30	
Adoption	11.07	10.49	0.58	
Runaway	2.54	1.71	0.83	*
Other	11.33	15.08	-3.75	*
Total	100	100	N/A	

The second waiver’s effect on placement duration, relative to the first waiver, was to increase by about 3 months the length of stay for black children who had an “other” type of exit (Table 9.24).

Black children				
Table 9.24: Effects of the Second Waiver on Duration of First Placements in the Original Demonstration Counties Relative to the First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Median Placement Duration in Months		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	3.73	3.77	-0.04	
Custody to Kin or Third Party	5.64	5.67	-0.03	
Adoption	34.68	36.27	-1.59	
Runaway	10.97	10.44	0.53	
Other	16.01	12.91	3.10	*
Any Type of Exit	6.89	6.83	0.06	

#### 9.4.3.2 White and Other Children

White and other children experienced a decrease in reunification and “other” exits and an increase in custody to kin or third party and runaway, relative to white and other children in the first waiver (Table 9.25).

White and other children				
Table 9.25: Effects of the Second Waiver on Exit Types from First Placements in the Original Demonstration Counties Relative to the First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Percentage of Cases		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	48.19	49.19	-1.00	*
Custody to Kin or Third Party	25.34	23.74	1.60	*
Adoption	13.71	13.49	0.22	
Runaway	1.81	1.27	0.54	*
Other	10.95	12.30	-1.36	*
Total	100	100	N/A	

Among white and other children, the second waiver shortened the wait for adoption by 2.3 months, compared to white and other children in the first waiver (Table 9.26).

**White and other children**

**Table 9.26: Effects of the Second Waiver on Duration of First Placements in the Original Demonstration Counties Relative to the First Waiver**

First Placements Ending with:	Median Placement Duration in Months		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	3.73	3.80	-0.07	
Custody to Kin or Third Party	5.31	5.35	-0.04	
Adoption	28.97	31.31	-2.34	*
Runaway	10.27	10.03	0.24	
Other	13.95	15.27	-1.32	
Any Type of Exit	7.23	7.40	-0.16	

**9.5 COUNTY-LEVEL WAIVER EFFECTS BASED ON FIRST-WAIVER CONDITIONS**

Table 9.27 summarizes significant second-waiver effects on exit type by county, relative to first-waiver conditions. The table shows that for reunification, effects at the county level were quite mixed, which would have contributed to the overall significant but small effect of the second waiver relative to first-waiver conditions. The overall significant increase in custody to kin or third party, and the significant increase in five counties, reflects the second waiver’s kinship strategy and the overall increased attention paid by demonstration counties to finding kin caregivers. The significant increase in runaways overall was not found at the county level, probably due to runaways being such a very small percentage of exit types for any one county.

<b>Table 9.27: Significant County-Level Waiver Effects on Exit Types from First Placements, Compared to First-Waiver Conditions</b>					
<b>County</b>	<b>Exit Type</b>				
	<b>Reunification</b>	<b>Custody to Kin or Third Party</b>	<b>Adoption</b>	<b>Runaway</b>	<b>Other*</b>
Ashtabula	-	-	-	-	-
Belmont	-	-	-	-	-
Clark	↑	-	-	-	↓
Crawford	↓	↑	-	-	-
Fairfield	-	-	-	-	-
Franklin	↑	↓	-	-	↓
Greene	-	-	-	-	-
Hamilton	↓	↑	↑	-	-
Lorain	-	-	-	-	-
Medina	↑	-	-	-	-
Muskingum	↓	↑	-	-	-
Portage	-	↑	-	-	-
Richland	-	-	-	-	-
Stark	↓	↑	-	-	-
Overall	↑	↑	-	↑	↓

*\*Includes placements ending in emancipation, transfer to another institution, or death, or those with missing, unclear, or conflicting information on exit type.*

Table 9.28 summarizes significant second-waiver effects on placement duration by county, relative to first-waiver conditions. The finding for all types of exits considered together was not significant overall, but was significant for six counties: the second waiver increased placement duration for two counties and decreased it for four. The significant reduction in the wait for adoption overall also was found at the county level for three counties.

<b>Table 9.28: Significant County-Level Waiver Effects on Median Duration of First Placements, Compared to First-Waiver Conditions</b>						
<b>County</b>	<b>Exit Type</b>					
	<b>Reunification</b>	<b>Custody to Kin or Third Party</b>	<b>Adoption</b>	<b>Runaway</b>	<b>Other*</b>	<b>Any</b>
Ashtabula	-	-	-	-	-	-
Belmont	-	-	-	-	-	-
Clark	-	-	-	-	-	↓
Crawford	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fairfield	↑	↑	-	-	-	↑
Franklin	-	-	-	-	↑	↓
Greene	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hamilton	↑	↑	-	-	↑	↑
Lorain	-	-	↓	-	-	↓
Medina	-	-	-	-	-	-
Muskingum	-	-	↓	-	-	-
Portage	-	-	-	-	-	-
Richland	-	-	-	-	-	↓
Stark	↑	↓	↓	-	-	-
Overall	-	-	↓	-	-	-

*\*Includes placements ending in emancipation, transfer to another institution, or death, or those with missing, unclear, or conflicting information on exit type.*

Table 9.29 begins the detailed presentation of county-specific effects. The county-level effects should be interpreted cautiously, as there is some amount of bias in the estimates; see Appendix F on the POA methodology for a discussion of the bias.

Table 9.29 shows the effects in Ashtabula County on exit types, based on first-waiver conditions. None of the effects on exit types was statistically significant in Ashtabula County. In addition, there were no significant effects on placement duration in Ashtabula County (Table 9.30).

Ashtabula				
Table 9.29: Effects of the Second Waiver on Exit Types from First Placements in Ashtabula County Relative to the First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Percentage of Cases		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	54.63	47.60	7.03	
Custody to Kin or Third Party	22.66	28.41	-5.75	
Adoption	13.06	12.92	0.14	
Runaway	0.38	0.38	0.00	
Other	9.26	10.69	-1.43	
Total	100	100	N/A	

Ashtabula				
Table 9.30: Effects of the Second Waiver on Median Duration of First Placements in Ashtabula County Relative to the First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Median Placement Duration in Months		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	2.81	3.60	-0.78	
Custody to Kin or Third Party	5.49	5.34	0.15	
Adoption	30.45	33.82	-3.37	
Runaway	22.03	26.82	-4.79	
Other	12.04	16.95	-4.91	
Any Type of Exit	5.83	7.39	-1.56	

As shown in Tables 9.31 and 9.32, there were no significant second-waiver effects in Belmont County either.

<b>Belmont</b>				
<b>Table 9.31: Effects of the Second Waiver on Exit Types from First Placements in Belmont County Relative to the First Waiver</b>				
<b>First Placements Ending with:</b>	<b>Percentage of Cases</b>		<b>Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver</b>	
	<b>During Second Waiver Period</b>	<b>Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions</b>		
Reunification	49.24	48.30	0.94	
Custody to Kin or Third Party	21.52	24.80	-3.27	
Adoption	18.71	12.63	6.08	
Runaway	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Other	10.53	13.10	-2.57	
Total	100	100	N/A	

<b>Belmont</b>				
<b>Table 9.32: Effects of the Second Waiver on Duration of First Placements in Belmont County Relative to the First Waiver</b>				
<b>First Placements Ending with:</b>	<b>Median Placement Duration in Months</b>		<b>Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver</b>	
	<b>During Second Waiver Period</b>	<b>Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions</b>		
Reunification	4.47	3.72	0.76	
Custody to Kin or Third Party	7.56	4.71	2.85	
Adoption	28.76	29.54	-0.78	
Runaway	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Other	25.37	11.26	14.11	
Any Type of Exit	9.90	6.48	3.42	



Clark County experienced an increase in reunifications and a decrease in “other” exits (Table 9.33). And there was a shortening of placement durations by 2.5 months for all exits considered together (Table 9.34).

Clark				
Table 9.33: Effects of the Second Waiver on Exit Types from First Placements in Clark County Relative to the First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Percentage of Cases		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	53.16	44.31	8.86	*
Custody to Kin or Third Party	17.07	18.86	-1.78	
Adoption	17.44	16.80	0.64	
Runaway	1.78	1.45	0.34	
Other	10.54	18.59	-8.05	*
Total	100	100	N/A	

Clark				
Table 9.34: Effects of the Second Waiver on Duration of First Placements in Clark County Relative to the First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Median Placement Duration in Months		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	5.10	5.68	-0.58	
Custody to Kin or Third Party	5.98	7.02	-1.03	
Adoption	27.32	35.09	-7.77	
Runaway	10.84	31.70	-20.85	
Other	23.45	25.14	-1.70	
Any Type of Exit	9.42	11.94	-2.52	*

Crawford County experienced a decrease in reunifications and an increase in exits to kin or third party (Table 9.35). There was no effect on placement duration (Table 9.36).

<b>Crawford</b>				
<b>Table 9.35: Effects of the Second Waiver on Exit Types from First Placements in Crawford County Relative to the First Waiver</b>				
<b>First Placements Ending with:</b>	<b>Percentage of Cases</b>		<b>Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver</b>	
	<b>During Second Waiver Period</b>	<b>Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions</b>		
Reunification	38.34	52.90	-14.56	*
Custody to Kin or Third Party	31.61	17.88	13.73	*
Adoption	14.29	16.68	-2.40	
Runaway	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Other	15.30	12.07	3.23	
Total	100	100	N/A	

<b>Crawford</b>				
<b>Table 9.36: Effects of the Second Waiver on Duration of First Placements in Crawford County Relative to the First Waiver</b>				
<b>First Placements Ending with:</b>	<b>Median Placement Duration in Months</b>		<b>Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver</b>	
	<b>During Second Waiver Period</b>	<b>Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions</b>		
Reunification	3.03	4.63	-1.60	
Custody to Kin or Third Party	1.77	5.50	-3.73	
Adoption	28.16	36.67	-8.51	
Runaway	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Other	9.01	25.87	-16.87	
Any Type of Exit	5.21	8.95	-3.74	

In Fairfield County, the second waiver had no significant effect on exit types (Table 9.37). However, it lengthened the duration of placements overall by nearly 3 months, placements ending in reunification by 4 months, and placements ending in custody to kin or third party by 4.3 months (Table 9.38).

Fairfield				
Table 9.37: Effects of the Second Waiver on Exit Types from First Placements in Fairfield County Relative to the First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Percentage of Cases		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	41.62	46.28	-4.66	
Custody to Kin or Third Party	29.64	29.37	0.28	
Adoption	15.22	13.64	1.58	
Runaway	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Other	12.81	10.43	2.37	
Total	100	100	N/A	

Fairfield				
Table 9.38: Effects of the Second Waiver on Duration of First Placements in Fairfield County Relative to the First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Median Placement Duration in Months		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	8.70	4.65	4.04	*
Custody to Kin or Third Party	10.74	6.46	4.28	*
Adoption	34.94	30.22	4.72	
Runaway	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Other	9.67	23.11	-13.44	
Any Type of Exit	11.58	8.64	2.93	*

Franklin County experienced a significant increase in reunifications and a decrease in placements ending in custody to kin or third party, as well as “other” types of exits (Table 9.39). Franklin County also had a significant reduction of 0.6 months in median length of placement for all exits, as well as an increase of 3.2 months in median length of placements ending in “other” exits (Table 9.40).

Franklin				
Table 9.39: Effects of the Second Waiver on Exit Types from First Placements in Franklin County Relative to the First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Percentage of Cases		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	62.61	53.31	9.30	*
Custody to Kin or Third Party	16.31	19.90	-3.59	*
Adoption	8.49	10.04	-1.54	
Runaway	2.49	1.94	0.55	
Other	10.10	14.82	-4.72	*
Total	100	100	N/A	

Franklin				
Table 9.40: Effects of the Second Waiver on Duration of First Placements in the Original Wave of Demonstration Counties Relative to the First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Median Placement Duration in Months		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	2.82	3.27	-0.45	
Custody to Kin or Third Party	5.05	5.09	-0.04	
Adoption	31.39	32.80	-1.41	
Runaway	8.89	9.78	-0.89	
Other	13.47	10.29	3.18	*
Any Type of Exit	5.27	5.87	-0.61	*

Greene County experienced no significant second-waiver impacts on either exit types or placement durations (Tables 9.41 and 9.42).

<b>Greene</b>				
<b>Table 9.41: Effects of the Second Waiver on Exit Types from First Placements in Greene County Relative to the First Waiver</b>				
<b>First Placements Ending with:</b>	<b>Percentage of Cases</b>		<b>Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver</b>	
	<b>During Second Waiver Period</b>	<b>Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions</b>		
Reunification	45.32	44.32	1.01	
Custody to Kin or Third Party	28.39	23.55	4.84	
Adoption	13.76	17.75	-3.98	
Runaway	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Other	11.99	12.90	-0.91	
Total	100	100	N/A	

<b>Greene</b>				
<b>Table 9.42: Effects of the Second Waiver on Duration of First Placements in Greene County Relative to the First Waiver</b>				
<b>First Placements Ending with:</b>	<b>Median Placement Duration in Months</b>		<b>Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver</b>	
	<b>During Second Waiver Period</b>	<b>Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions</b>		
Reunification	6.04	4.25	1.79	
Custody to Kin or Third Party	4.26	6.84	-2.57	
Adoption	36.84	34.34	2.50	
Runaway	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Other	16.11	14.45	1.66	
Any Type of Exit	8.57	9.61	-1.03	

In Hamilton County, reunifications declined significantly and exits to custody of kin or third party and adoptions both increased significantly (Table 9.43). Placement durations increased overall for any exit (5.8 months) and exits to reunification (6.5 months), custody to kin and third party (4 months), and “other” exits (20.8 months) (Table 9.44).

Hamilton				
Table 9.43: Effects of the Second Waiver on Exit Types from First Placements in Hamilton County Relative to the First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Percentage of Cases		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	43.55	54.08	-10.53	*
Custody to Kin or Third Party	27.97	22.28	5.69	*
Adoption	16.25	11.73	4.53	*
Runaway	1.51	1.09	0.42	
Other	10.72	10.82	-0.10	
Total	100	100	N/A	

Hamilton				
Table 9.44: Effects of the Second Waiver on Duration of First Placements in Hamilton County Relative to the First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Median Placement Duration in Months		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	10.35	3.84	6.52	*
Custody to Kin or Third Party	9.32	5.28	4.04	*
Adoption	33.35	34.19	-0.84	
Runaway	12.01	11.15	0.85	
Other	34.46	13.63	20.82	*
Any Type of Exit	12.50	6.71	5.79	*

Lorain County had no significant effects on exit types (Table 9.45), but experienced significant decreases in placement durations for all exits (2.3 months) as well as children who were adopted (8.5 months) (Table 9.46).

Lorain			
Table 9.45: Effects of the Second Waiver on Exit Types from First Placements in Lorain County Relative to the First Waiver			
First Placements Ending with:	Percentage of Cases		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions	
Reunification	42.00	43.61	-1.60
Custody to Kin or Third Party	29.31	25.12	4.19
Adoption	14.88	15.99	-1.11
Runaway	0.53	2.27	-1.74
Other	13.27	13.01	0.27
Total	100	100	N/A

Lorain			
Table 9.46: Effects of the Second Waiver on Duration of First Placements in Lorain County Relative to the First Waiver			
First Placements Ending with:	Median Placement Duration in Months		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions	
Reunification	3.98	3.92	0.06
Custody to Kin or Third Party	6.34	6.61	-0.27
Adoption	22.80	31.28	-8.47
Runaway	29.51	6.07	23.44
Other	6.97	22.43	-15.46
Any Type of Exit	6.82	9.11	-2.28

Medina County experienced an increase in reunifications (Table 9.47) and no effects on placement durations (Table 9.48).

<b>Medina</b>				
<b>Table 9.47: Effects of the Second Waiver on Exit Types from First Placements in Medina County Relative to the First Waiver</b>				
<b>First Placements Ending with:</b>	<b>Percentage of Cases</b>		<b>Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver</b>	
	<b>During Second Waiver Period</b>	<b>Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions</b>		
Reunification	66.30	50.11	16.20	*
Custody to Kin or Third Party	14.89	23.26	-8.37	
Adoption	8.80	13.26	-4.46	
Runaway	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Other	9.78	13.15	-3.37	
Total	100	100	N/A	

<b>Medina</b>				
<b>Table 9.48: Effects of the Second Waiver on Duration of First Placements in Medina County Relative to the First Waiver</b>				
<b>First Placements Ending with:</b>	<b>Median Placement Duration in Months</b>		<b>Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver</b>	
	<b>During Second Waiver Period</b>	<b>Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions</b>		
Reunification	2.55	5.25	-2.69	
Custody to Kin or Third Party	9.46	6.55	2.91	
Adoption	23.14	34.96	-11.82	
Runaway	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Other	15.84	18.89	-3.06	
Any Type of Exit	6.03	8.82	-2.80	



Muskingum County saw a significant decrease in reunifications and increase in custody to kin or third party (Table 9.49). Muskingum also experienced a large and significant decrease of nearly 15 months in placement duration for adoptions (Table 9.50).

Muskingum				
Table 9.49: Effects of the Second Waiver on Exit Types from First Placements in Muskingum County Relative to the First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Percentage of Cases		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	33.56	49.40	-15.84	*
Custody to Kin or Third Party	43.38	23.90	19.48	*
Adoption	16.52	15.79	0.73	
Runaway	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Other	6.39	10.44	-4.05	
Total	100	100	N/A	

Muskingum				
Table 9.50: Effects of the Second Waiver on Duration of First Placements in Muskingum County Relative to the First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Median Placement Duration in Months		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	5.99	4.37	1.63	
Custody to Kin or Third Party	2.76	5.91	-3.15	
Adoption	16.46	31.35	-14.88	*
Runaway	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Other	7.20	19.81	-12.61	
Any Type of Exit	5.82	8.93	-3.12	

In Portage County, there was a significant increase in exits to the custody of kin or third party (Table 9.51). There was no impact on placement durations (Table 9.52).

Portage				
Table 9.51: Effects of the Second Waiver on Exit Types from First Placements in Portage County Relative to the First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Percentage of Cases		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	44.58	46.41	-1.83	
Custody to Kin or Third Party	30.99	23.12	7.87	*
Adoption	12.74	15.46	-2.72	
Runaway	1.22	1.22	0.00	
Other	10.47	13.79	-3.33	
Total	100	100	N/A	

Portage				
Table 9.52: Effects of the Second Waiver on Duration of First Placements in Portage County Relative to the First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Median Placement Duration in Months		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	6.58	5.33	1.25	
Custody to Kin or Third Party	8.57	5.48	3.09	
Adoption	32.97	33.52	-0.55	
Runaway	12.97	14.34	-1.38	
Other	18.01	22.13	-4.12	
Any Type of Exit	9.87	10.27	-0.40	

There was no effect on exit types in Richland County (Table 9.53). However, there was a reduction of 6.4 months in placement duration for any type of exit (Table 9.54).

Richland				
Table 9.53: Effects of the Second Waiver on Exit Types from First Placements in Richland County Relative to the First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Percentage of Cases		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	45.55	45.18	0.36	
Custody to Kin or Third Party	27.74	20.15	7.59	
Adoption	13.07	16.57	-3.50	
Runaway	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Other	12.77	16.57	-3.80	
Total	100	100	N/A	

Richland				
Table 9.54: Effects of the Second Waiver on Duration of First Placements in Richland County Relative to the First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Median Placement Duration in Months		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	1.91	4.66	-2.75	
Custody to Kin or Third Party	1.88	6.33	-4.45	
Adoption	20.98	30.61	-9.64	
Runaway	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Other	11.85	19.70	-7.85	
Any Type of Exit	4.01	10.45	-6.44	*

In Stark County, there was a decrease in reunifications and an increase in exits to kin or third party (Table 9.55). Durations of placements ending in reunification increased, while durations decreased for placements ending in custody to kin or third party and for adoptions (Table 9.56).

Stark				
Table 9.55: Effects of the Second Waiver on Exit Types from First Placements in Stark County Relative to the First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Percentage of Cases		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	29.12	41.36	-12.24	*
Custody to Kin or Third Party	39.93	30.89	9.04	*
Adoption	16.40	15.38	1.02	
Runaway	1.30	0.76	0.54	
Other	13.24	11.60	1.64	
Total	100	100	N/A	

Stark				
Table 9.56: Effects of the Second Waiver on Duration of First Placements in Stark County Relative to the First Waiver				
First Placements Ending with:	Median Placement Duration in Months		Second Waiver Effect Relative to First Waiver	
	During Second Waiver Period	Counterfactual Projection to First-waiver Conditions		
Reunification	6.88	4.74	2.14	*
Custody to Kin or Third Party	2.47	5.64	-3.17	*
Adoption	26.83	31.93	-5.10	*
Runaway	5.40	18.78	-13.38	
Other	12.37	20.32	-7.95	
Any Type of Exit	8.09	9.16	-1.08	

## 9.6 PLACEMENT RE-ENTRY IN THE FIRST WAIVER

Maintaining children’s safety is a major objective of the ProtectOhio Waiver. Exiting foster care is a positive outcome only if children are able to successfully remain in their discharge settings. The analysis summarized in this section updates and broadens the analysis from the first ProtectOhio evaluation, which found that the first waiver did not lead to an increase in children’s re-entry after reunification.<sup>13</sup> In response to increased interest in kinship caregiving, the study team broadened the analysis (still using cases from the first waiver period) and analyzed children’s re-entry into foster care after they exited their first foster care placements to the custody of either their parents or kin.<sup>14</sup> As discussed below, the expanded analysis found no evidence (as measured by the re-entry rate) that the first waiver harmed these children. Re-entry was maintained at the same level as it would have been without the first waiver, thus helping to alleviate the concern that a focus on reducing placement usage might lead to children being discharged too soon and needing to re-enter foster care. This analysis was not repeated for the second waiver. Appendix H contains the full report of the re-entry study.

### 9.6.1 METHODOLOGY

The analysis used Ohio administrative data from the statewide FACSIS. The evaluation team examined re-entry within three windows of time (6 months, 1 year, and 3 years after discharge from first placement) or by the child’s 18th birthday, whichever came first. The team defined *eligible children* as those who exited first placements to reunification or to the custody of kin from January 1, 1991 through September 30, 2002, and examined re-entries through September 30, 2005. Eligible children were divided into a treatment group and three comparison groups.

- The treatment group consisted of children who exited placements in demonstration counties<sup>15</sup> during the first waiver period.<sup>16</sup>
- The comparison groups consisted of children who exited placements in (1) demonstration counties before the first waiver period, (2) comparison counties before the first waiver period, and (3) comparison counties during the first waiver period.

### 9.6.2 Major Findings

The analysis covered 53,611 eligible children (62.7% in demonstration counties and 37.3% in comparison counties). Among these cases:

- About two thirds (67.7%) exited first placements to the custody of their parents, 28.4% to relatives, and 3.9% to guardianship/third party; and

---

<sup>13</sup> The findings were presented in the ProtectOhio Fourth Annual Report (HSRI, 2002) and Final Comprehensive Report (HSRI, 2003).

<sup>14</sup> In FACSIS, exits to kin included exits to the custody of relatives or guardianship/third party, which in practice was exit to the custody of family friends.

<sup>15</sup> The 14 demonstration counties included in this analysis are Ashtabula, Belmont, Clark, Crawford, Fairfield, Franklin, Greene, Hamilton, Lorain, Medina, Muskingum, Portage, Richland, and Stark Counties. The 14 comparison counties are Allen, Butler, Clermont, Columbiana, Hancock, Hocking, Mahoning, Miami, Montgomery, Scioto, Summit, Trumbull, Warren, and Wood Counties.

<sup>16</sup> The first waiver period in this analysis was 1998 through 2005. The pre-waiver period was 1991 through 1997.

- Nearly a quarter (23.9%) re-entered foster care within 3 years,<sup>17</sup> while 15.6% re-entered within 1 year and 10.5% re-entered within 6 months.

The evaluation team addressed the following three questions.

1. *During the first waiver period, were children in demonstration counties more likely than children in comparison counties to re-enter foster care?* The team estimated the difference between demonstration and comparison counties during the first waiver period and found no statistically significant differences in the likelihood of re-entry at any of the time windows.
2. *From the pre-waiver period through the first waiver period, did the likelihood of re-entry change in the demonstration counties?* The team estimated the changes from the pre-waiver period through the first waiver period in demonstration counties, ignoring change in the comparison counties. This analysis showed that in demonstration counties, the likelihood of re-entry during the waiver period was not significantly different from the likelihood prior to the waiver using any of the three time windows.
3. *From the pre-waiver period through the first waiver period, did the likelihood of re-entry in demonstration counties show a different change from the likelihood of re-entry in the comparison counties?* The team attached the greatest weight to this analysis, which estimated the differential changes over time between the demonstration and comparison counties. The results showed that there was no statistically significant change in either the demonstration or the comparison county group, and there was no evidence of differential change over time. The team concluded that the waiver did not appear to have had any ill effects on post-discharge child safety.

Table 9.57 addresses these questions by comparing likelihoods of re-entry for three contrasts. The likelihoods are based on estimated odds ratios.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Note that this proportion also includes re-entry within 1 year and within 6 months.

<sup>18</sup> The odds of a phenomenon like re-entry is the ratio of the number of times it is observed or predicted to occur to the number of times it is observed or predicted not to occur. The odds of re-entry for demonstration counties during the waiver can be compared to the odds of re-entry for comparison counties during the waiver, and the ratio of these two is called the odds ratio. An odds ratio above 1 implies that the demonstration counties have greater likelihood of re-entry.

<b>Table 9.57: Risk-Adjusted<sup>19</sup> Log Odds Ratios of Re-Entry Within Three Time Periods</b>					
<b>Contrast</b>	<b>Re-Entry Window</b>	<b>Estimate</b>	<b>Standard Error</b>	<b>P Value</b>	<b>Odds Ratio</b>
(1) Demonstration vs. comparison counties during the waiver	6 months	0.153	0.127	0.229	1.166
	1 year	0.109	0.115	0.343	1.115
	3 years	0.117	0.107	0.273	1.124
(2) Change from pre-Waiver through Waiver within demonstration counties	6 months	-0.017	0.090	0.853	0.984
	1 year	-0.060	0.073	0.410	0.941
	3 years	-0.114	0.061	0.063	0.893
(3) Differential change over time between demonstration and comparison counties	6 months	0.047	0.063	0.456	1.048
	1 year	0.024	0.053	0.650	1.024
	3 years	0.000	0.045	0.992	1.000

Table 9.57 reveals similar findings across the three time windows for each of the contrasts, and none of the three contrasts showed statistically significant differences. The results for contrast (1) in Table 9.57 show that there were no significant differences in the odds of re-entry between demonstration counties and comparison counties during the waiver period. For contrast (2), the results show that the odds of re-entry during the waiver period were not significantly different from the odds of re-entry prior to the Waiver.

Estimates for contrast (3) are the most essential results. For these rows, the numbers in the odds-ratio column are actually ratios of odds ratios. The lack of statistical significance indicates that changes in re-entry odds over time in demonstration counties were similar to those in comparison counties. In other words, the odds of re-entry within all three time windows decreased from the pre-waiver period to the waiver period for both demonstration counties and comparison counties. The changes for both groups of counties were at a similar pace, and the odds of re-entry for both groups reached similar levels in the waiver period.

The team also examined the effects of the first waiver in terms of counterfactual projections, which estimate the probability of a child re-entering foster care in the absence of the waiver (Table 9.58). None of the differences were statistically significant. This provides further support that the waiver did not increase children’s re-entry rates.

<sup>19</sup> Estimates were adjusted for child-specific risk factors such as age, sex, race, abuse history, disabilities, length of placement, and type of living arrangements.

<b>Table 9.58. Predicted Probability of Re-Entry in Demonstration Counties<sup>20</sup></b>		
<b>Re-Entry Window</b>	<b>Under the Waiver</b>	<b>In the Absence of the Waiver</b>
6 months	11.1%	10.7%
1 year	16.5%	16.2%
3 years	25.1%	25.1%

Thus the overall conclusion is that the waiver did not appear to have had any ill effects on post-discharge child safety, and that conclusion was supported by every analysis the team conducted. However, two caveats should be kept in mind. First, although the team controlled for as many child-specific risk factors as were available in FACSIS, some potentially important information was not available – such as the specific nature of the maltreatment and whether the abusers were in the homes that the children were discharged to. Consequently, findings could be influenced by uncontrolled differences in the case mix. Second, the number of demonstration counties in the analysis is small (only 14), which can lead to false findings even though the team included random county effects in the model. Nonetheless, despite these caveats, the re-entry analysis provides solid evidence that child safety was not jeopardized by the waiver, in terms of re-entry to foster care after exits to reunification or custody of kin.

---

<sup>20</sup> The analysis is based on the 13,896 children in demonstration counties during the first waiver period.