

Placement Stability, Time in Care and Permanency options

Targeting the Most Vulnerable Children

Sonia Hélie, Ph.D.

Marie-Andrée Poirier, Ph.D.

Daniel Turcotte, Ph.D.



Context

- ❖ Reform of the Youth Protection Act in 2007
 - Main goal to improve placement stability
 - Obligation to consider kinship care
 - Maximum duration of stay in care
- ❖ Periodic and mandatory monitoring of changes in placement trajectory since the reform

Research team and funding

Grant from the Health & Social Services Ministry (2013-2015)

❖ Quantitative part

- Sonia Hélie
- Marie-Andrée Poirier
- Daniel Turcotte

❖ Qualitative part

- Sylvie Drapeau
- Marie-Christine St-Jacques
- Doris Châteauneuf
- Geneviève Turcotte
- Daniel Turcotte

Method

Cohorts

Cohort	Entry year	Observation period	N
Pre	2003	2003-2007	9620
Post 1	2007	2007-2011	8676
Post 2	2009	2009-2013	8425

- ❖ across all 16 CPS agencies of Québec
- ❖ 3 to 4 years of observation in each cohort



Indicators tracked

- ❖ Placement use (yes/no)
- ❖ Type of setting
- ❖ Stability
 - # of different settings
 - # of placement moves
 - # of non permanent exits
- ❖ Type of permanency attempt (last)
- ❖ Cumulative time in care
- ❖ Sustainability of last permanency attempt

Results

Placement use and type of setting	PRÉ	POST1	POST2
Placement use % placed at least once during the 3-4 years of followup, among those who received protection measures	66	63	60
Among children placed...			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % placed exclusively with kin 	10	17	17
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % placed at least once in a temporary mode 	81	89	91

Results

Stability	PRÉ	POST1	POST2
Number of different settings	2.5 	2.3	2.3
Number of placement moves	1.3	1.2	1.1
Number of non permanent exits	1.1 	1.0	1.0

Method

Cohorts

Cohort	Entry year	Observation period	N
Pre	2003	2003-2007	9620
Post 1	2007	2007-2011	8676
Post 2	2009	2009-2013	8425

- ❖ across all 16 CPS agencies of Québec
- ❖ 3 to 4 years of observation in each cohort

Indicators tracked

- ❖ Placement use (yes/no)
- ❖ Type of setting
- ❖ Stability
 - # of different settings
 - # of placement moves
 - # of non permanent exits
- ❖ Type of the last exit from care
- ❖ Cumulated time in care

Results (Post2 cohort)

Age at first placement	Type of permanency (last) (%)		Cumulative time (months)	Sustainability (%)	
< 2 yrs	Reunification	23	10.1	17	Mostly reunified
	Adoption	35	22.3	--	
	Majority	29	16.5	8	
	No attempt	14	23.2		
2-5 yrs	Reunification	36	8.9	16	Mostly timely reunified
	Adoption	5	25.4		
	Majority	28	19.4	1	
	No attempt	31	19.7		
6-11 yrs	Reunification	44	11.3	23	Mostly reunified but often replaced
	Adoption	0	--	--	
	Majority	30	21.4	9	
	No attempt	26	20.2		
12-17 yrs	Reunification	62	11.6	19	Mostly reunified but often replaced Placement until majority is unstable
	Majority	22	16.9	37	
	Independent living	7	18.7	14	
	No attempt	9	17.0		

Discussion

Major findings

- Placement use decreased
- Kinship care is more likely
- High frequency of temporary placement
- Modest improvement in stability
- Reunification is frequent, rapid, but unstable
- 37% of teenagers placed to majority are moved

Implications for the field

- Formalize family reunification practices
- Enhance collaboration with front-line services
- Support foster families of teenagers placed until majority
- Document temporary placement

Merci!
Thank you !
