Exhibit A1

Data Availability by Outcome

Outcome	Last available date
Arrest	January 2017
Homelessness	January 2017
Employment	Fourth quarter, 2017
High school graduation	2015-2016 school year
Teen birth	May 2017
Mental health inpatient treatment	March 2016
Substance use disorder inpatient treatment	March 2016

Subsamples

Some outcomes—receipt of TANF and food stamps, employment, earnings, homelessness—were only relevant for youth who had turned 18. When we created a subsample of youth meeting these criteria from our Phase 2 match, we found the HHM and comparison samples were no longer balanced on some variables that predicted outcomes. Thus, for these analyses, we created a new sample using the entire HHM sample (who had reached age 18) and matching to the comparison pool of youth meeting the same criteria we used in our Phase 2 match. Because this group was heavily weighted to King County (about 95% of youth were in King County) we completed only one matching protocol, controlling for King County. HHM and comparison youth were then well matched.

To evaluate the effect of HHM experience on high school graduation by age 19 it was again necessary to create a subsample, since not all youth would have been able to graduate by June 2016 (the last year for which we had data). When the sample was reduced to include only those youth who would have been expected to graduate (18 or older by June 15, 2016, and not still enrolled in school), the HHM sample and the comparison group were unbalanced on several measures. For this analysis, we matched HHM youth who were 18 or older by June 15, 2016 and not still enrolled in schoo with youth from the comparison pool. We excluded from the HHM sample and potential comparison pool all youth who had a school exit code indicating that they had transferred out of Washington State or were deceased,.

A. II. Matching Procedures

In an ideal research design, both caregivers and youth would be randomly assigned to either the HHM or traditional foster care model. With a successfully implemented random assignment, any observed differences in outcomes could be attributed to the effect of the HHM. Unfortunately, as is the case in many real world settings, random assignment was not possible for this evaluation.

Instead, we used observational data and relied on a quasi-experimental research design. To infer causality from this quasi-experimental study, selection bias must be minimized. To do so, we implemented a variety of research design methods and statistical techniques that provided the ability to test the sensitivity of our findings. In this section of the Appendix, we describe the study groups and statistical methods we used to arrive at estimates of the effects of the HHM.

Propensity Score Matching

Propensity score matching allowed us to match HHM youth with similar youth to obtain balance on observed covariates. This method has many benefits over standard regression analysis, which is often used to control for differences between treated and comparison groups.

First, the match is based on characteristics before the treatment occurs. That is, the outcome plays no part in matching the treated and comparison groups. This emulates an experimental design by separating the research design stage—where we test various matching procedures to obtain a sufficiently matched sample—from the analysis stage—where we estimate the effect of the treatment using our matched sample. Second, matching can limit the importance of functional form in regression analysis.[26] Finally, by conducting a logistic regression on the matched sample using the covariates from the matching model, we further reduced any residual bias that may remain after matching and account for any correlation between matched pairs.

Information on our initial two phase matching protocol is detailed in the Appendix of our previous report.[27] Here, we present results of matching protocols for the two new matched subsamples used for outcome analyses in this supplemental report. Exhibit A2 reports the results from the coefficients for subsample matching.

The table also provides the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC) for each model. AUC is a measure of how well the model predicts the outcome—in this case, whether youth would be in the HHM group. Values of AUC can range from 0.05 to 1, with 1 indicating perfect prediction. AUCs of 0.7 or greater are considered good predictive models.

[26] Ho, D.E., Imai, K., King, G., & Stuart, E.A. (2007). Matching as nonparametric preprocessing for reducing model dependence in parametric causal inference. *Political analysis, 15*(3), 199-236.
[27] Goodvin & Miller (2017).

Exhibit A2

Subsample Logit Models Estimating the Likelihood of HHM Participation
Those over 18 January 1, 2017 and Those Meeting Criteria for Graduation by Age 19

	18 and over sample			High school grad sample		
Covariate	**Coefficient**	**p-value**	**SE**	**Coefficient**	**p-value**	**SE**
Age (reference group 5 to 10 years old)						
11-14 years old	-0.552		0.394	-0.392		0.460
over 15 years old	-0.670		0.431	-0.407		0.507
Male[a]	-0.294		0.231	-0.392		0.249
Race (reference group is White/undetermined)						
Black	0.026		0.274	-0.407		0.287
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.359		0.525	0.366		0.541
Native American	0.022		0.412	-0.320		0.457
Hispanic	0.664		0.410	0.656		0.428
Child placing agency	1.229	***	0.261	1.185	***	0.273
Exceptional rate payment[a]				0.241		0.266
No. of removal episodes to date	0.017		0.098	0.035		0.098
No. of prior placement events in removal	-0.022		0.015	0.001		0.013
No. of prior CPS reports	-0.017		0.031			
Year of index placement (reference group is 2009-2011)						
2003-2005	-0.099		0.371	0.003		0.417
2006-2008	-0.451		0.314	-0.386		0.336
2012-2014	0.319		0.344	0.866	*	0.372
2015-2017	0.557		0.509	0.754		0.588
Any prior arrests	1.390	***	0.373	-0.651	^	0.336
Any prior runaway event	0.980	*	0.427			
Prior mental health treatment need	0.651	^	0.332	0.678	^	0.359
Prior SUD treatment need	-0.580	^	0.323	-0.345		0.332
King County	1.214	*	0.546	1.014		0.578
N	528			433		
AUC	0.748			0.693		

Notes:
^ p < 0.10, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, and *** p < 0.001.

In Exhibits A3 and A4 we present descriptive statistics on all matching variables for HHM and comparison youth. We used various diagnostics to determine the extent to which the propensity score matching improved balance between the treated and comparison groups. A common measure of balance is the standardized difference (or bias) calculated as the difference in the mean/proportion for the treated and comparison groups, divided by the pooled standard deviation for each covariate prior to matching. This measure is preferred to traditional t-tests as the standardized difference is not influenced by the study's sample size. Additionally, t-tests are used for making inferences about a population based on a sample; balance, on the other hand, is an in-sample property. Standardized bias values greater than 0.10 usually

indicate moderate imbalance while greater than 0.25 indicates severe imbalance.[28] Exhibits A3 and A4 also display the percent standardized bias for each covariate in the propensity score model before and after matching as well as the p-value as a reference. After matching using Austin's criteria,[29] in the sample of all youth over 18 by January 1, 2017 we found moderate imbalance in one characteristic—the percent of youth who were ages 5 to 10 at the beginning of the index event. In the sample of those eligible for high school graduation by June 15, 2016, we observed two characteristics with moderate imbalance after the match—the percent of youth who were Native American and average number of prior reports to CPS. Finally we used logistic regression, controlling for the same variables used in the propensity score match. This last step is used to "clean up" residual covariate imbalance between groups.[30]

[28] Austin, P.C. (2009). Balance diagnostics for comparing the distribution of baseline covariates between treatment groups in propensity-score matched samples. *Statistics in Medicine, 28*(25), 3,083–3,107 and Stuart, E.A. (2010). Matching methods for causal inference: A review and a look forward. *Statistical Science: A Review Journal of the Institute of Mathematical Statistics*, *25*(1), 1–21.
[29] Austin (2009).
[30] Stuart (2010).

Exhibit A3

Subsample of Youth 18 and Older Characteristics Before and After Matching

Variable	Means and proportions after matching		p-value	Absolute standardized difference (d)	
	HHM youth (n = 128)	Comparison youth (n = 128)		Before matching	After matching
Percent age 5-10	14%	9%	0.243	0.12#	0.12#
Percent age 11-14	38%	38%	1.000	0.03	0.00
Percent over 15	48%	53%	0.452	0.00	0.05
Percent male	41%	42%	0.795	0.04	0.02
Percent White/undetermined	27%	34%	0.273	0.04	0.08
Percent Black	46%	39%	0.257	0.01	0.08
Percent Asian/Pacific Islander	6%	6%	1.000	0.09	0.00
Percent Native American	9%	7%	0.490	0.08	0.08
Percent Hispanic	11%	14%	0.439	0.12#	0.08
Percent child placing agency	36%	41%	0.366	0.23#	0.06
Percent with exceptional rate payment	50%	45%	0.452	0.04	0.05
No. of removal episodes to date	1.75	1.83	0.668	0.02	0.05
No. of prior placement events in removal	7.44	7.38	0.957	0.03	0.00
No. of prior reports	4.93	4.77	0.757	0.00	0.04
Percent before 2009	43%	42%	0.900	0.01	0.01
Percent 2009-2011	28%	30%	0.673	0.06	0.03
Percent 2012-2014	19%	20%	0.754	0.07	0.03
Percent 2015-2017	8%	9%	0.648	0.03	0.05
Any prior arrests	22%	18%	0.438	0.34^	0.06
Any prior runaways	17%	13%	0.290	0.30^	0.10
Prior mental health treatment need	85%	84%	0.859	0.10	0.02
Prior SUD treatment need	19%	16%	0.621	0.08	0.04

Notes:

# Indicates moderate imbalance, |d| > 0.1.

^ Indicates severe imbalance, |d| > 0.25.

Exhibit A4

Youth in the High School Graduation Subsample Characteristics Before and After Matching

Variable	Means and proportions after matching			Absolute standardized difference (d)	
	HHM youth (n = 111)	Comparison youth (n = 111)	p-value	Before matching	After matching
Percent age 5-10	9%	12%	0.511	0.08	0.08
Percent age 11-14	41%	39%	0.667	0.00	0.03
Percent over 15	50%	50%	1.000	0.03	0.00
Percent male	41%	38%	0.579	0.06	0.04
Percent White/undetermined	25%	26%	0.878	0.04	0.01
Percent Black	44%	47%	0.686	0.00	0.03
Percent Asian/Pacific Islander	5%	6%	0.771	0.08	0.04
Percent Native American	13%	8%	0.271	0.13#	0.13#
Percent Hispanic	13%	12%	0.835	0.14#	0.02
Percent child placing agency	36%	37%	0.902	0.24#	0.01
Percent with exceptional rate payment	48%	48%	1.000	0.04	0.00
No. of removal episodes to date	1.84	1.77	0.707	0.00	0.05
No. of prior placement events in removal	7.24	7.51	0.833	0.48^	0.03
No. of prior reports	5.12	4.59	0.300	0.37^	0.14#
Before 2009	50%	50%	0.766	0.04	0.01
Percent 2009-2011	32%	32%	1.000	0.06	0.00
Percent 2012-2014	19%	18%	0.861	0.14#	0.02
Percent 2015-2017	7%	5%	0.581	0.04	0.08
Any prior arrests	18%	20%	0.732	0.15#	0.03
Any prior runaways	22%	19%	0.617	0.13#	0.04
Prior mental health treatment need	80%	85%	0.368	0.05	0.08
Prior SUD treatment need	17%	19%	0.730	0.11#	0.03

Notes:

# Indicates moderate imbalance, |d| > 0.1.

^ Indicates severe imbalance, |d| > 0.25.

A. III. Methods to Estimate HHM Effects

Dichotomous (Yes/No) Outcomes

For outcomes of interest defined as dichotomous (high school graduation, arrests, employment, TANF receipt, food stamp receipt, homelessness, and behavioral health treatment), we conducted logistic regression analysis. Because the vast majority of youth in the samples of youth over 18 or graduated from school were from King County, we used a fixed effect for whether a youth was in King County.

Continuous Outcomes

For outcomes of interest defined as continuous (earnings) we conducted a two-part model, again using a fixed effect for King County youth.

Outcome Analysis: Logistic Regression on Matched Samples

Our preferred analysis used logistic regression on the matched samples to estimate the effect of the HHM on youth outcomes. Our outcome models used most of the same covariates included in the matching model. Covariates used in the various models were not all the same. In some cases, small cell sizes resulted in multi-collinearity or quasi-complete separation. A group of variables provided various measures of a youth's behaviors and conditions. These included exceptional foster care payments, history of arrest and runaway, and the DSHS-identified need for mental health and substance abuse treatment. In some cases these were so highly correlated that we eliminated one or more of these indicators from the analysis. When we controlled for the years in which events began some subsets had so few children that we substituted "before 2009" for the years 2003-2005 and 2006-2008.

Calculating Earnings

Fewer than 40% of youth in our age 18 and older sample had any recorded earnings. For that reason we used a two-part model to calculate the average quarterly earnings per youth. The first part of the model used logistic regression to estimate the likelihood that a youth had any earnings. The second part calculated earnings given the likelihood that youth had any earnings. We used the Stata program, twopm, with a fixed effect for King County youth. We used the same covariates in the analysis that we used in the propensity score matching. Results of the analysis are summarized in Exhibit A5 below.

Exhibit A5

Average Quarterly Earnings

	N	Mean	SE
HHM	128	$299.52	$110.21
Comparison	128	$195.98	$64.61

A. IV. Results of Outcome Analyses Estimating HHM Effects

Results of the logistic regression analysis of high school graduation by age 19 are reported in Exhibit A6.

Exhibit A6

Logistic Regression Estimating Effects of the HHM on High School Graduation by Age 19

	High school graduation		
Covariate	**Coefficient**	**p-value**	**SE**
HHM	0.178		0.314
Age at event (reference group 0-10)			
11-14	-1.277	*	0.583
Over 15	-0.664		0.672
Male	-0.574		0.352
Race (reference group is White/undetermined)			
Black	-0.236		0.415
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.024		0.707
Native American	0.035		0.612
Hispanic	0.440		0.553
Child placing agency	0.646	^	0.368
Exceptional child payment	-0.073		0.361
No. of removal episodes to date	0.000		0.133
No. of prior reports	-0.013		0.048
No. of prior placement events in removal	-0.008		0.023
Before 2009	-0.642		0.435
King county	0.038		0.715
Any prior arrests	-0.707		0.518
Prior mental health treatment need	-0.377		0.429
Prior SUD treatment need	-1.897	**	0.612
N	222		
AUC	0.738		

Note:
^ $p < 0.10$, * $p < 0.05$, and ** $p < 0.01$.

Results of the logistic regression analysis of having been arrested any time after the start of the index event, for youth age eight and older at the start of the index event, are reported in Exhibit A7.

Exhibit A7

Logistic Regression Estimating Effects of the HHM on Arrests for Youth Age Eight and Older

	Arrests		
Covariate	**Coefficient**	**p-value**	**SE**
HHM	-0.090		0.109
Age at event (reference group is 0-10)			
11-14	1.639	***	0.128
Over 15	1.858	***	0.100
Male	0.090		0.103
Race (reference group is White/undetermined)			
Black	0.381	***	0.112
Asian/Pacific Islander	-0.309		0.355
Native American	-0.343	^	0.188
Hispanic	-0.023		0.191
Child placing agency	0.034		0.093
Exceptional child payment	1.330	***	0.184
No. of removal episodes to date	0.151	***	0.018
No. of prior placement events in removal	0.016	^	0.009
Year of index placement (reference group is 2009-2011)			
Before 2009	0.157		0.102
2012-2014	-0.251	**	0.080
2015-2017	-0.270		0.223
Any prior arrests	1.526	***	0.089
Any prior runaways	1.137	**	0.350
Prior mental health treatment need	-0.119		0.114
Prior SUD treatment need	1.195	***	0.334
Months at risk (months since 18)	0.023	***	0.003
N	1,074		
AUC	0.908		

Note:
^ p < 0.10, * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, and *** p < 0.001.

Results of the logistic regression analysis on receiving inpatient mental health treatment at any time after the start of the index event are reported in Exhibit A8.

Exhibit A8

Logistic Regression Estimating Effects of the HHM on Inpatient Mental Health Treatment

	Mental health treatment		
Covariate	**Coefficient**	**p-value**	**SE**
HHM	-0.362		0.292
Age at event (reference group is 5-10)			
Under 5	-1.407	*	0.597
11-14	0.220		0.365
Over 15	0.719		0.467
Male	-0.035		0.297
Race (reference group is White/undetermined)			
Black	-0.020		0.367
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.071	^	0.610
Native American	0.652		0.430
Hispanic	0.017		0.551
Child placing agency	-0.851	*	0.417
Exceptional child payment	1.279	***	0.319
No. of removal episodes to date	0.092		0.119
No. of prior placement events in removal	-0.048	^	0.027
Year of index placement (reference group is 2009-2011)			
Before 2009	2.508	***	0.515
2012-2014	1.108	*	0.491
2015-2017	0.647		0.541
Prior mental health treatment need	0.477		0.407
Prior SUD treatment need	0.523		0.451
N	1,580		
AUC	0.863		

Note:
^ $p < 0.10$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, and *** $p < 0.001$.

Results of the logistic regression analysis of having been in paid employment any time starting at age 18, for our sample of youth age 18 and older, are reported in Exhibit A9.

Exhibit A9

Logistic Regression Estimating Effects of the HHM on Paid Employment for Youth Age 18 and Older

	Employment		
Covariate	**Coefficient**	**p-value**	**SE**
HHM	-0.342		0.280
Age at event (reference group is Before 11)			
11-14	-0.325		0.468
Over 15	-0.396		0.520
Male	-0.353		0.305
Race (reference group is White/undetermined)			
Black	0.166		0.351
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.459		0.605
Native American	0.615		0.552
Hispanic	0.794	^	0.462
Child placing agency	-0.170		0.322
Exceptional child payment	-0.660	*	0.305
No. of removal episodes to date	-0.058		0.107
No. of prior placement events in removal	-0.020		0.019
Year of index placement (reference group is 2009-2011)			
Before 2009	0.195		0.377
2012-2014	-0.039		0.438
2015-2017	-0.628		0.670
King County	-0.083		0.663
N	256		
AUC	0.696		

Note:
^ $p < 0.10$ and * $p < 0.05$.

Results of the logistic regression analyses for receiving food stamps or TANF and for homelessness at any time starting at age 18 and discharge from care, for our sample of youth age 18 and older, are reported in Exhibit A10.

Exhibit A10

Logistic Regression Estimating Effects of the HHM on Food Stamp Receipt, TANF Receipt, and Homelessness after Age 18 and Discharge from Care

	Food stamps			TANF			Homelessness		
Covariate	**Coefficient**	**p-value**	**SE**	**Coefficient**	**p-value**	**SE**	**Coefficient**	**p-value**	**SE**
HHM	0.111		0.36	-0.488		0.33	0.227		0.30
Male	-1.008	*	0.39	-1.506	***	0.39	0.555	^	0.32
Race (reference group White/undetermined)									
Black	-0.664		0.47	0.320		0.41	-0.009		0.36
Asian/Pacific Islander	-2.109	*	0.71	-0.229		0.71	0.210		0.64
Native American	-1.715		0.69	0.812		0.63	-0.096		0.60
Hispanic	-0.925		0.61	0.432		0.56	0.871		0.55
Exceptional child payment	0.327		0.40	0.220		0.37	-0.258		0.33
No. of removal episodes to date	-0.011		0.14	-0.073		0.13	-0.016		0.10
No. of prior placement events in removal	0.072	*	0.03	0.005		0.02	-0.034	^	0.02
Year of index placement (reference group is 2009-2011)									
Before 2009	0.350		0.46	-0.262		0.43	-0.016		0.38
2012-2014	0.105		0.55	-0.591		0.56	0.260		0.47
2015-2017	-0.171		0.79	1.166		0.79	0.323		0.77
King County	0.256		0.72	0.840		0.86	0.194		0.71
Months at risk (months since 18)	0.026	**	0.01	0.019	**	0.01	-0.025	***	0.01
N	233			233			233		
AUC	0.806			0.755			0.762		

Note:
^ p<0.1 * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, and *** p < 0.001.

A. V. Benefit-Cost Analysis

Exhibit A13 shows all effects entered into the benefit-cost analysis for our primary model, using the full analytic sample with a minimum two-year follow-up period from the start of the index event to examine new reports to CPS and new out-of-home placements. Exhibit A14 shows all effects entered into the benefit-cost analysis for our alternative model, using the sample who exited the child welfare system, with a minimum two-year follow-up period after exit, to examine new reports to CPS and new out-of-home placements.

Exhibit A13

Effects Entered in the Primary Benefit-Cost Analysis

Outcome	Effect size	SE	Tx N	p-value
New reports to CPS	0.134	0.126	563	0.286
New out-of-home placements	-0.007	0.166	563	0.965
High school graduation by age 19	0.108	0.170	111	0.528
Arrests	-0.059	0.100	548	0.554
Inpatient mental health treatment	-0.220	0.169	790	0.195
Food stamp receipt	0.067	0.192	115	0.728
TANF receipt	-0.295	0.184	115	0.109

Exhibit A14

Effects Entered in the Alternative Benefit-Cost Analysis

Outcome	Effect size	SE	N	p-value
New reports to CPS	0.090	0.120	265	0.450
New out-of-home placements	0.191	0.170	260	0.261
High school graduation by age 19	0.108	0.170	111	0.528
Arrests	-0.059	0.100	548	0.554
Inpatient mental health treatment	-0.220	0.169	790	0.195
Food stamp receipt	0.067	0.192	115	0.728
TANF receipt	-0.295	0.184	115	0.109

In our standard approach to benefit-cost analysis,[31] WSIPP estimates what the effects and monetary consequences of a program would be in Washington, given what we know about the characteristics of people in Washington. For the analysis described in this report, we look at the observed outcomes for a very specific population of youth who lived for at least some time in HHM foster homes in comparison to a similar group of youth who lived in traditional foster homes. Rather than use what we know about the Washington population at large, we instead used information specific to our study population.

For example, the foster youth in our study were much less likely to graduate from high school than the average Washington youth. While we would normally set our expected outcomes to match the average Washington youth, for the purposes of this study we adjusted expected educational achievement levels, the percent of people receiving inpatient mental health treatment, and the likelihood of child abuse and

[31] See WSIPP's Technical Documentation.

neglect and out-of-home placement to reflect outcomes observed for youth in our study population. These adjustments are described in the paragraphs below.

High School Graduation

Previous work by WSIPP on the foster care population[32] indicated youth in the foster care system are substantially less likely to graduate from high school. For our benefit-cost analysis of the HHM, we made an adjustment to the expected rate of high school graduation. Rather than relying on the graduation rate for all Washington students, we used information from our comparison group of foster youth. This reduced the expected high school graduation rate of 78% to the 33% graduation rate observed in our comparison sample.[33]

Postsecondary Education

Foster youth can be considered to face a different set of barriers than non-foster youth in attaining higher education. We adjusted our percent of students who pursue higher education[34] using information from an analysis of foster youth outcomes in Washington.[35] We proportionally reduce the likelihood of continuing beyond high school (by attaining some college education or completing college) by the ratio (47%) of enrolling in higher education for foster youth as compared to the overall population.

Inpatient Mental Health Treatment

We used the rate of acceptance into inpatient mental health treatment in the comparison group (4.1%) instead of the general Washington base rate for psychiatric hospitalization (8.3%).[36]

Subsequent Reports of Child Abuse and Neglect

WSIPP's Technical Document displays the population assumptions for the cumulative likelihood of subsequent recurrent substantiation by follow-up year for an indicated population.[37] We adjust our estimates for the overall rate of subsequent Child Protective Services interaction by multiplying the rate in each year by the ratio of comparison group subsequent interaction (8.7%) to that in the overall population (32.7%), measured at two years of follow-up. In our alternative benefit-cost scenario, we used the ratio of subsequent interaction following permanency (22.4%) to that in the overall population up (32.7%), measured at two years of follow-up.

Out-of-Home Placement

WSIPP's Technical Document displays the population assumptions for the likelihood of subsequent out-of-home placement after a subsequent child protective services event.[38] We used our estimates for the "indicated" population but adjust them for the overall rate of subsequent out-of-home placement given a subsequent Child Protective Services interaction. We multiply the expected rate in each year by the ratio of subsequent placement in the comparison group (5.2%) to that in the overall population (1.0%) measured at age ten. In our alternative benefit-cost scenario, we used the ratio of out-of-home placement following permanency given a subsequent child protective services interaction in our comparison group (8.9%) to that in the overall population (1.1%) measured at age ten.

---

[32] Burley, M. (2013). Educational outcomes of foster youth—updated benchmarks (Document Number 13-06-3901). Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.
[33] For more detail see Exhibit 4.7.1 of WSIPP's Technical Document.
[34] Ibid, Exhibit 4.7.5.
[35] Sharkova, I., Luckenko, B., & Felver, B.E.M. (2015). Transition to adulthood: Foster youth at 19: An analysis of the 2013 National Youth in Transition Database Survey for Washington State. DSHS RDA Report 7.107.
[36] For more detail see Exhibit 4.9.10 in WSIPP's Technical Document.
[37] Ibid, Exhibit 4.3.1.
[38] Ibid, Exhibit 4.3.4.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank staff at The Mockingbird Society for providing program background information and records needed to conduct this evaluation. We are particularly grateful to Degale Cooper for considerable effort in clarifying historical and current program information. Additionally, we thank staff at Catholic Community Services and Olive Crest, especially Blaire Lessor, for providing information relevant to HHM implementation at child placing agencies. We also thank Lisa Barber at the Children's Administration for her assistance in identifying HHM providers in licensing records. We are thankful for the assistance of Barbara Lucenko and staff at Research and Data Analysis and staff at Education Research Data Center for their help in the design of this study. Finally, we appreciate the contributions of Jim Theofilis, former director of The Mockingbird Society, in sharing historical HHM program information.

For further information, contact:
Rebecca Goodvin at 360.664.9077, rebecca.goodvin@wsipp.wa.gov

Document No. 18-01-3901