

Regional Partnership Grants National Cross-Site Evaluation (RPG-2)

NDACAN Dataset Number 218 USER'S GUIDE



**National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect
Bronfenbrenner Center for Translational Research
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York 14850
607-255-7799
ndacan@cornell.edu**

<https://www.ndacan.acf.hhs.gov/>

INITIAL RELEASE 02/19/2019

REGIONAL PARTNERSHIP GRANTS NATIONAL CROSS-SITE EVALUATION (RPG-2)

Data Collected by

Debra Strong
Mathematica Policy Research Princeton, NJ

Sarah Avellar
Mathematica Policy Research Washington, D.C

Russell Cole
Mathematica Policy Research Princeton, NJ

Angela D'Angelo
Mathematica Policy Research Chicago, IL

Funded by

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families,
Administration on Children, Youth and Families, Children's Bureau

Distributed by

National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect

User's Guide and Codebook Written by

Holly M. Larrabee, MSHP
National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect
in collaboration with
Russell Cole and Michael Kerachsky
Mathematica Policy Research Princeton, NJ

© 2019 National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect

Table of Contents

Regional Partnership Grants National Cross-Site Evaluation (RPG-2)	1
Preface.....	6
Acknowledgement of Source.....	6
Publication Submission Requirement.....	7
ABSTRACT.....	8
STUDY OVERVIEW.....	9
Study Identification.....	9
Purpose of the Study.....	9
Study Design.....	10
Date(s) of Data Collection.....	10
Geographic Area.....	10
Unit of Observation.....	10
Sample.....	11
Data Collection Procedures.....	11
Response Rates.....	12
Sources of Information.....	12
Type of Data Collected.....	12
Measures.....	12
Related Publications & Reports.....	17
Analytic Considerations.....	18
Confidentiality Protection.....	20
Extent of Collection.....	20
Extent of Processing.....	23
DATA FILE INFORMATION.....	24

File Specifications.....	24
Data File Notes	24

Preface

The data for *Regional Partnership Grants National Cross-Site Evaluation (RPG-2)* have been given to the National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect (NDACAN) for public distribution by Russell Cole. Funding for the project was provided by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Administration on Children, Youth and Families, Children's Bureau (Award Number: HHSP233201250024A).

Acknowledgement of Source

Authors should acknowledge the National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect (NDACAN) and the original collector of the data when they publish manuscripts that use data provided by the Archive. Users of these data are urged to follow some adaptation of the statement below:

The data used in this publication were made available by the National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, and have been used with permission. Data from *Regional Partnership Grants National Cross-Site Evaluation (RPG-2)* were originally collected by Debra Strong, Sarah Avellar, Russell Cole, and Angela D'Angelo. Funding for the project was provided by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Administration on Children, Youth and Families, Children's Bureau (Award Number: HHSP233201250024A). The collector of the original data, the funder, NDACAN, Cornell University and their agents or employees bear no responsibility for the analyses or interpretations presented here.

The bibliographic citation for this data collection is:

Strong, D., Avellar, S., Cole, R., & D'Angelo, A. (2019). *Regional Partnership Grants National Cross-Site Evaluation (RPG-2)* [Dataset]. Available from National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect website, <https://www.ndacan.acf.hhs.gov/>.

Publication Submission Requirement

In accordance with the terms of the Data License for this dataset, users of these data are required to notify the National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect of any published work or report based wholly or in part on these data. A copy of any completed manuscript, thesis abstract, or reprint should be emailed to NDACANsupport@cornell.edu. Such copies will be used to provide our funding agency with essential information about the use of NDACAN resources and to facilitate the exchange of information about research activities among data users and contributors.

ABSTRACT

To address the far-reaching consequences of adult substance use disorders on families and children, Congress in 2006 authorized, and in 2011 reauthorized, competitive grants to support partnerships among child welfare, substance use disorder treatment, and related organizations. The Children's Bureau (CB) within the Administration for Children and Families, Administration on Children, Youth and Families at the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services established the Regional Partnership Grant (RPG) program, and in 2017 awarded grants to 17 second-cohort (RPG-2) partnerships to implement evidence-based programs (EBPs) to meet the needs of this target population.

CB funded Mathematica Policy Research, along with its subcontractor Walter R. MacDonald & Associates (WRMA), to conduct a five-year cross-site evaluation of the grantees' RPG projects. Mathematica and WRMA designed a cross-site evaluation to address the following 7 research questions:

1. Who was involved in each RPG project and how did the partners work together? To what extent were the grantees and their partners prepared to sustain their projects by the end of the grant period?
2. Who were the target populations of the RPG projects? Did RPG projects reach their intended target populations?
3. Which EBPs did the RPG projects select? How well did they align with RPG projects' target populations and goals?
4. What procedures, infrastructure, and supports were in place to facilitate implementation of the EBPs?
5. How were the EBPs implemented? What services were provided? What were the characteristics of enrolled participants?
6. To what extent were the RPG projects prepared to sustain their EBPs at the end of the grant period?
7. What were the well-being, permanency, and safety outcomes of children, and the recovery outcomes of adults, who received services from the RPG projects?

The cross site evaluation had three main components used to answer these research questions: (1) an implementation study, (2) a partnership study, and (3) an outcomes study.

STUDY OVERVIEW

Study Identification

Regional Partnership Grants National Cross-Site Evaluation (RPG-2)

Investigator(s):

Debra Strong, Mathematica Policy Research Princeton, NJ

Sarah Avellar, Mathematica Policy Research Washington, D.C.

Russell Cole, Mathematica Policy Research Princeton, NJ

Angela D'Angelo, Mathematica Policy Research Chicago, IL

Funding Agencies:

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families,
Administration on Children, Youth and Families, Children's Bureau

Award Numbers: HHSP233201250024A

Purpose of the Study

In order to address the far-reaching consequences of adult substance use disorders on families and children, Congress in 2006 authorized, and in 2011 reauthorized, competitive grants to support partnerships among child welfare, substance use disorder treatment, and related organizations. The Children's Bureau funded Mathematica Policy Research, along with its subcontractor WRMA, Inc., to conduct a five-year cross-site evaluation of the grantees' RPG projects. Mathematica and WRMA designed a cross-site evaluation to address the following 7 research questions:

- Who was involved in each RPG project and how did the partners work together? To what extent were the grantees and their partners prepared to sustain their projects by the end of the grant period?
- Who were the target populations of the RPG projects? Did RPG projects reach their intended target populations?
- Which EBPs did the RPG projects select? How well did they align with RPG projects' target populations and goals?
- What procedures, infrastructure, and supports were in place to facilitate implementation of the EBPs?
- How were the EBPs implemented? What services were provided? What were the characteristics of enrolled participants?
- To what extent were the RPG projects prepared to sustain their EBPs at the end of the grant period?
- What were the well-being, permanency, and safety outcomes of children, and the recovery outcomes of adults, who received services from the RPG projects?

Study Design

The cross site evaluation had three main components used to answer these research questions: (1) an implementation study; (2) a partnership study; and (3) an outcomes study.

The implementation study examined the implementation of the 17 RPG projects, focusing on factors shown in the research literature to be associated with quality implementation (research questions 2 through 6). The implementation study examined activities conducted at different stages of implementation and implementation progress over time, as well as the extent to which structural supports for implementation are in place. This study included data collected from the Staff Survey, as well as the participant Enrollment and Service Log (ESL) web-based reporting system. The Staff Survey was completed by frontline staff and supervisors, identified by the grantee, implementing the 10 focal EBPs. The ESL provided information on implementation outputs. Grantee staff used this system to record individual-level data, including demographic information about RPG case members at enrollment, enrollment and exit dates for each case that enrolled in the RPG project, enrollment and exit dates for all EBPs that were offered as part of the RPG project, and information on each service delivery contact for any of the 10 focal EBPs implemented by the grantee.

The partnership study provided a description of partnerships formed among each of the 17 RPG grantees (research question 1). Each grantee developed a roster of partner organizations and a web-based Partner Survey was administered to each organization. The individual within the organization who was most knowledgeable about RPG served as the respondent. The survey collected data about each grantee's partnership and asked questions about organizational characteristics, how partners communicated and collaborated, goals of the partnership, and the types of roles within the partnership. The survey contained "network data" prompts that allow respondents to describe how each of the organizations in the partnership interacted with each other.

The outcomes study described the characteristics of, and changes over time, in children, adults, and families who participated in the RPG programs (research question 7). The study reported participant outcomes in five domains of interest to Congress and the Children's Bureau: child well-being; permanency; safety; adult recovery; and family functioning/stability. To assess change over time, standardized assessments were administered to participants at program entry and program exit. In addition, for each participant, grantees collected administrative data from state and local agencies for the 1-year period prior to RPG enrollment and for the 1-year period following RPG enrollment.

Date(s) of Data Collection

Data collection started on June 12th, 2014 and concluded on August 31st, 2017.

Geographic Area

United States

Unit of Observation

There were three components to the RPG-2 cross-site evaluation: (1) an implementation study; (2) a partnership study; and (3) an outcomes study. The data associated with each component are described separately. The unit of observation varied across the three components: case records (multiple per

grantee); individual records (multiple per case); evidence-based programs (multiple per case); and service logs (multiple per evidence-based program).

Sample

The RPG cross-site evaluation was comprised of three main studies that utilized data collected and submitted from all grantees: (1) implementation; (2) partnership; and (3) outcomes. Each study drew its sample from 17 grantees. However, the data sources differ across studies.

The implementation study included data from the Enrollment and Service Log (ESL) web-based reporting system, as well as the Staff Survey.

The ESL portion of the implementation study collected demographic data on all individuals enrolling in RPG, as well as information on the services they received. Specifically, the enrollment data included background demographics on all children and adults in a case. The services data included basic information on all 51 evidence-based programs (EBPs) offered to individuals enrolling in RPG. These data included the EBP name, date on which the case was enrolled in the EBP, case members participating in the EBP, and date when the case exited the EBP. In addition, more detailed implementation data were collected on a subset of 10 EBPs. Specifically, separate service log entries were collected on each session provided to the case members. Service logs provided more detailed information on each contact with a case.

The Staff Survey was administered to all frontline staff and their supervisors who were involved in implementing the 10 focal EBPs and providing direct services to children, adults, and families. The purpose of the Staff Survey was to collect information about staff background, training, and experiences on RPG.

The partnership study included data from the Partner Survey, which was administered to all 17 grantees and their primary partner organizations; that is, the organizations who participated in the RPG project and played a crucial role in planning and coordinating services for families across service-delivery systems. The purpose of the Partner Survey was to collect information on the characteristics and relationships among the partner organizations.

The outcomes study included information on the changes that occurred in children, adults, and families enrolled in RPG. The broad RPG target population is families with a child in, or at-risk of, out of home placement due to an adult with a substance-use problem. Each grantee defined a more specific, local target population for enrollment into RPG. The outcomes examined were drawn from five domains of interest to Congress and the Children's Bureau: child well-being; permanency; safety; adult recovery; and family functioning/stability. Standardized instruments were administered by grantees to operationalize outcomes in several domains – specifically family functioning, child well-being, and two outcomes in the recovery domain. These data were obtained at program entry and program exit. Administrative data from child welfare agencies and state-funded substance abuse treatment agencies were used to operationalize data from other domains – specifically safety, permanency, and one aspect of adult recovery. To assess change over time, these administrative data were used to operationalize events occurring in the one year period prior to RPG enrollment and the one year period post RPG enrollment.

Data Collection Procedures

The implementation study used data which grantees entered into the Enrollment and Service Log (ESL) web-based reporting system. Staff surveys were administered to frontline staff and supervisors via WebServ, a web-based questionnaire software.

The partnership study used Partner Surveys, which were administered to grantees and partner organizations via WebServ.

The outcome study included administrative data (covering the adult recovery, child safety, and child permanency outcome domains), as well as standardized instrument data (covering the family functioning, child well-being, and adult recovery domains). Grantees and their local evaluators obtained administrative data from state child welfare agencies and Single State Agencies for Substance Abuse Services. Grantees and collected standardized instrument from adults (who also reported about the focal child in their care) at program entry and program exit. Grantees then uploaded all outcome data (standardized instrument and administrative data) to the web-based Outcome and Impact Study Information System (OASIS) reporting system.

Response Rates

The implementation study's Staff Survey had a response rate of 87 percent. The ESL enrollment data required demographic information about case members at enrollment – therefore, there is a response rate of 100 percent for this set of information, as it is the full population for cases and individuals in the cross-site evaluation. However, there may have been non-response for the services data – grantees may not have entered complete data. Unfortunately, the cross-site evaluation cannot determine the extent of non-response for the services data.

The Partner Survey had a response rate of 75 percent.

The outcome study had standardized instrument response rates that ranged from 16 percent to 45 percent across outcomes, where respondents are considered as individuals with valid data at both baseline and follow-up assessments, relative to the population of individuals who were eligible to respond at both time points. The administrative data response rates were 100 percent among eligible sample members.

Sources of Information

Data were collected from administrative sources, surveys/standardized instruments, and enrollment and service logs.

Type of Data Collected

The types of data collected were survey, administrative, enrollment and service logs, and standardized instruments.

Measures

Only copies of project created survey instruments/measures were archived with this dataset, the RPG-Partner-Survey and RPG-Staff-Survey. All other measures are subject to legal protections under copyright law and will need to be sourced by secondary analysts.

Addiction Severity Index (ASI)- Self Report Form

McLellan, A. T., Kushner, H., Metzger, D., Peters, R., Smith, I., Grissom, G., Pettinati, H., & Argeriou, M. (1992). The fifth edition of the Addiction Severity Index. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 9(3), 199-213. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0740-5472\(92\)90062-S](https://doi.org/10.1016/0740-5472(92)90062-S).

Carise, D., McLellan, A. T., Gifford, L. S., & Kleber, H. D. (1999). Developing a national addiction treatment information system: An introduction to the drug evaluation network system. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 17(1-2), 67-77. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0740-5472\(98\)00047-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0740-5472(98)00047-6).

Leonhard, C., Mulvey, K., Gastfriend, D. R., & Schwartz, M. (2000). The Addiction Severity Index: A field study of internal consistency and validity. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 18(2), 129-135. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0740-5472\(99\)00025-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0740-5472(99)00025-2).

Luo, W., Wu, Z., & Wei, X. (2010). Reliability and validity of the Chinese version of the Addiction Severity Index. *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*, 53, S121-S125. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1097/QAI.0b013e3181c7dfca>.

Mäkelä, K. (2004). Studies of the reliability and validity of the Addiction Severity Index. *Addiction*, 99(4), 398-410. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.2003.00665.x>.

McLellan, A., Luborsky, L., Woody, G., & O'Brien, C. (1980). An improved diagnostic evaluation instrument for substance abuse patients: The Addiction Severity Index. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 168(1), 26-33. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1097/00005053-198001000-00006>

Adult-Adolescent Parenting Inventory 2 (AAPI-2)

Bavolek, S. J., & Keene, R. G. (1999). *Adult-Adolescent Parenting Inventory – AAPI-2: Administration and developmental handbook*. Park City, UT: Family Development Resources, Inc. Retrieved from: <https://www.assessingparenting.com/assessment/aapi>

Conners, N., Whiteside-Mansell, L., Deere, D., Ledet, T., & Edwards, M. (2006). Measuring the potential for child maltreatment: The reliability and validity of the Adult Adolescent Parenting Inventory-2. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 30(1), 39-53. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2005.08.011>.

Behavior Rating Inventory of Executive Functioning (BRIEF)

Gioia, G. A., Isquith, P. K., Guy, S. C., & Kenworthy, L. (2000). Test review behavior rating inventory of executive function. *Child Neuropsychology*, 6(3), 235-238. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1076/chin.6.3.235.3152>.

Behavioral Rating Inventory of Executive Function - Preschool Version (BRIEF-P)

Gioia, G. A., Isquith, P. K., Guy, S. C., & Kenworthy, L. (2000). Test review behavior rating inventory of executive function. *Child Neuropsychology*, 6(3), 235-238. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1076/chin.6.3.235.3152>.

Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) 1 ½ - 5 years

Achenbach, T. M. & Rescorla, L. (2000). *Manual for the ASEBA preschool forms & profiles*. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Dept. of Psychiatry. Available from: <http://www.aseba.org/preschool.html>.

Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) 6-18 years

Achenbach, T. M., & Rescorla, L. A. (2001). *Manual for the ASEBA school-age forms & profiles*. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Research Center for Children, Youth, & Families. Available from: <http://www.aseba.org/schoolage.html>.

Center for Epidemiologic Studies-Depression Scale (CES-D)- 12-Item Short Form

Radloff, L. S. (1977). The CES-D Scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 1(3), 385-401. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/014662167700100306>.

Infant-Toddler Sensory Profile (ITSP)

Dunn, W. (2002). *The infant/toddler sensory profile manual*. San Antonio, TX: Pearson Education, Inc. Available from: <https://www.pearsonclinical.com/therapy/products/100000389/infanttoddler-sensory-profile.html>.

Dunn, W. & Daniels, D.B. (2002). Initial development of the infant/toddler sensory profile. *Journal of Early Intervention*, 25(1), 27-41. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/105381510202500104>.

Parenting Stress Index

Abidin, R. A. (1995). *Parenting stress index short form (PSI-SF)*. Lutz, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources. Retrieved from: <http://www4.parinc.com/Products/Product.aspx?ProductID=PSI-SF>.

Reitman, D., Currier, R. O., & Stickle, T. R. (2002). A critical evaluation of the parenting stress index-short form (PSI-SF) in a head start population. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 31(3), 384-392. Retrieved from: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=7232503&site=ehost-live>.

RPG-2 Enrollment and Service Log (ESL)

The Enrollment and Service Log (ESL) was used by the grantees to collect data related to the enrollment of cases and implementation of RPG services. The information collected in ESL includes: (1)

demographic data for each RPG case at enrollment, including enrollment date for the RPG case, as well as demographic information; (2) evidence-based program (EBP) enrollment data for each EBP in which any case members are ever enrolled as part of receiving RPG services; (3) information about case closure; and (4) data related to service delivery for case members enrolled in focal EBPs, including topics covered and the engagement of clients in programming.

The ESL data is represented by five separate data files:

- RPG_ESL_EBP_Level
- RPG_ESL_CaseEBP_Level
- RPG_ESL_Case_Level
- RPG_ESL_Person_Level
- RPG_ESL_Session_Level

Strong, D., Avellar, S., Cole, R., & D'Angelo, A. (2014). *RPG-2 enrollment and service log (ESL)* [Instrument]. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research.

RPG-2 Partner Survey

This survey collected information about the organization, relationships with the grantee and other collaborating organizations, and program implementation. Representatives of partner organizations working with RPG grantees were the respondents.

Strong, D., Avellar, S., Cole, R., & D'Angelo, A. (2014). *RPG-2 partner survey* [Instrument]. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research.

RPG-2 Permanency Data

Permanency data, information about where children reside following removal from the home, is one type of administrative data requested from grantees. Grantees requested information on permanency of children directly from state child welfare agencies. Grantees provided child welfare agencies a list of children that they had enrolled in RPG, and asked the organization to provide permanency information on this subset of children. This data returned to grantees contained information on dates of removal, dates of placement into different settings, and whether removals ultimately ended in permanency.

Using this data, the cross-site evaluation team created person-level indicator variables for whether a given incident, removal and placement, occurred in a particular period. Periods of interest were one year prior to RPG enrollment, and the one year period following RPG enrollment for a given child.

Strong, D., Avellar, S., Cole, R., & D'Angelo, A. (2014). *RPG-2 permanency data* [Instrument]. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research.

RPG-2 Recovery Data

Recovery data, information about whether an adult had participated in a state-funded use disorder treatment program, is one type of administrative data requested from grantees. Grantees requested information on recovery of adults enrolled in RPG from state substance abuse departments. Grantees

provided state substance abuse departments a list of adults that they had enrolled in RPG, and asked the organization to provide recovery information on this subset of adults. This data returned to grantees contained information on dates of substance use treatment enrollment and program completion (if applicable).

Using this data, the cross-site evaluation team created person-level indicator variables for whether a given incident, treatment enrollment and completion, occurred in a particular period. Periods of interest were one year prior to RPG enrollment, and the one year period following RPG enrollment for a given adult.

Strong, D., Avellar, S., Cole, R., & D'Angelo, A. (2014). *RPG-2 recovery data* [Instrument]. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research.

RPG-2 Safety Data

Safety data, information about the maltreatment of children, is one type of administrative data requested from grantees. Grantees requested information on maltreatment of children (instances of abuse, neglect, and other maltreatment) directly from state child welfare agencies. Grantees provided child welfare agencies a list of children that they had enrolled in RPG, and asked the organization to provide maltreatment information on this subset of children. This data returned to grantees contained information on the dates of maltreatment investigations, the type of maltreatment, and whether it was substantiated or not.

Using this data, the cross-site evaluation team created person-level indicator variables for whether a given incident of maltreatment occurred in a particular period. Periods of interest were one year prior to RPG enrollment, and the one year period following RPG enrollment for a given child.

Strong, D., Avellar, S., Cole, R., & D'Angelo, A. (2014). *RPG-2 safety data* [Instrument]. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research.

RPG-2 Staff Survey

The Staff Survey was administered to front-line staff and collected information about the characteristics of the staff and organizations implementing RPG-funded programs.

Strong, D., Avellar, S., Cole, R., & D'Angelo, A. (2014). *RPG-staff survey* [Instrument]. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research.

Trauma Symptom Checklist (TSC-40)

Briere, J., & Runtz, M. (1989). The Trauma Symptom Checklist (TSC-33): Early data on a new scale. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 4, 151-163. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/088626089004002002>.

Elliott, D., & Briere, J. (1992). Sexual abuse trauma among professional women: Validating the trauma symptom checklist-40 (TSC-40). *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 16, 391-398. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0145-2134\(92\)90048-V](https://doi.org/10.1016/0145-2134(92)90048-V)

Zlotnick, C., Shea, M. T., Begin, A., Pearlstein, T., Simpson, E., Costello, E. (1996). The validation of the trauma symptom checklist-40 (TSC-40) in a sample of inpatients. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 20(6), 503–510. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0145-2134\(96\)00032-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0145-2134(96)00032-4)

Trauma Symptoms Checklist for Young Children (TSCYC)

Briere, J., Johnson, K., Bissada, A., Damon, L., Crouch, J., Gil, E., Hanson, R., & Ernst, V. (2001). The Trauma Symptom Checklist for Young Children (TSCYC): Reliability and association with abuse exposure in a multi-site study. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 25(8), 1001-1014. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0145-2134\(01\)00253-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0145-2134(01)00253-8)

Lanktree, C., Gilbert, A., Briere, J., Taylor, N., Chen, K., Maida, C., & Saltzman, W. (2008). Multi-informant assessment of maltreated children: convergent and discriminant validity of the TSCC and TSCYC. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 32(6), 621–625. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2007.10.003>

Wherry, J. N., Graves, L. E., & Rhodes King, H. M. (2008). The convergent validity of the trauma symptom checklist for young children for a sample of sexually abused outpatients. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, 17(1), 38–50. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10538710701884441>

Vineland-II, Socialization Subscale Vineland Adaptive Behavioral Scales

Sparrow, S. S., Cicchetti, D. V. & Balla, D. A. (2005). *Vineland-II Adaptive Behavior Scales: Survey forms manual*. Pearson Education, Inc. Available from: <https://www.pearsonclinical.com/psychology/products/100000668/vineland-adaptive-behavior-scales-second-edition-vineland-ii-vineland-ii.html>

Related Publications & Reports

Users are strongly encouraged to review these references before doing analyses. To view a complete list of publications visit our online citations collection called “canDL” at: <http://www.ndacan.acf.hhs.gov/publications/publications.cfm>. Once on the webpage, navigate to the DS# 218 folder to view all publication citations relevant to this dataset.

Strong, D. A., Paulsell, D., Cole, R., Avellar, S. A., D’Angelo, A. V., Henke, J., & Keith, R. E. (2014). Regional Partnership Grant Program cross-site evaluation design report. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research. Available from: <https://www.mathematica-mpr.com/our-publications-and-findings/publications/regional-partnership-grant-program-cross-site-evaluation-design-report>.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2012). *Targeted grants to increase the well-being of, and to improve the permanency outcomes for, children affected by methamphetamine or other*

substance abuse: First annual report to congress. Washington, DC: Administration for Children and Families, Administration on Children, Youth and Families, Children’s Bureau. Available from: <https://www.mathematica-mpr.com/our-publications-and-findings/publications/report-1-2012-regional-partnership-grants-to-increase-the-wellbeing-of-and-to-improve-the-permanency>

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2013). *Targeted grants to increase the well-being of, and to improve the permanency outcomes for, children affected by methamphetamine or other substance abuse: Second annual report to congress.* Washington, DC: Administration for Children and Families, Administration on Children, Youth and Families, Children’s Bureau. Available from: <https://www.mathematica-mpr.com/our-publications-and-findings/publications/report-2-2012-regional-partnership-grants-to-increase-the-wellbeing-of-and-to-improve-the-permanency>.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2014). *Targeted grants to increase the well-being of, and to improve the permanency outcomes for, children affected by methamphetamine or other substance abuse: Third annual report to congress.* Washington, DC: Administration for Children and Families, Administration on Children, Youth and Families, Children’s Bureau. Available from: <https://www.mathematica-mpr.com/our-publications-and-findings/publications/third-annual-report-to-congress-2012-and-2014-regional-partnership-grants-to-increase-the-well-being>.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2019). *2012 and 2014 Regional Partnership Grants to Increase the Well-Being of and to Improve the Permanency Outcomes for Children Affected by Substance Abuse: Fourth Annual Report to Congress.* Washington, DC: Administration for Children and Families, Administration on Children, Youth and Families, Children’s Bureau. Available from: <https://www.mathematica-mpr.com/our-publications-and-findings/publications/2012-and-2014-regional-partnership-grants-to-increase-the-well-being-of-and-to-improve>.

Analytic Considerations

Missing data is coded as such on a variable by variable basis within the value labels field. Some missing data are coded as system missing. In variables that are designated as being “string” or “character”, system missing data may appear as blank values.

The following user-defined missing value codes were used throughout the dataset:

“L” or “.L” = Logical Skip

“M” or “.M” = Item Non-Response

The user defined missing value of “M” or “.M” should be treated the same as a system missing value.

Blank data points, contained within string variables, should be treated as missing.

Each of the standardized instruments contains a weighting variable (ends in “_WGT”). The weight is used to adjust for non-response, for a given instrument, for the pre-post analysis.

Prior to replicating any statistics from published reports, please review the document with the filename

“Report-to-Congress-Replication-Instructions” regarding guidelines for reproducing summary statistics.

The data files are each oriented differently. Some are one-record-per-id and others are multiple-records-per-id. Data users will need to explore each file prior to merging. Secondary analysts can merge/join data files using record identifier variables common to the files they wish to merge (see Table 1 below).

Table 1. Listing of data files and variables available for use in a merge/join function.

Data File Name	Variables Available for Merging Data Files
RPG_esl_ebp_level	EBPName
RPG_esl_caseEBP_level	Grantee_ID, Case_ID, Case_EBP_ID, EBPName
RPG_esl_case_level	Grantee_ID, Case_ID
RPG_esl_session_level	Grantee_ID, Case_ID, Case_EBP_ID, EBPName
RPG_esl_person_level	Grantee_ID, Case_ID, Ind_ID
RPG_aapi2	Grantee_ID, Case_ID, Ind_ID
RPG_asi	Grantee_ID, Case_ID, Ind_ID
RPG_brief	Grantee_ID, Case_ID, Ind_ID
RPG_cbcl	Grantee_ID, Case_ID, Ind_ID
RPG_cesd	Grantee_ID, Case_ID, Ind_ID
RPG_itsp	Grantee_ID, Case_ID, Ind_ID
RPG_psi	Grantee_ID, Case_ID, Ind_ID
RPG_tsc_40	Grantee_ID, Case_ID, Ind_ID

Data File Name	Variables Available for Merging Data Files
RPG_tscyc	Grantee_ID, Case_ID, Ind_ID
RPG_vinelandii	Grantee_ID, Case_ID, Ind_ID
RPG_safety	Grantee_ID, Case_ID, Ind_ID
RPG_recovery	Grantee_ID, Case_ID, Ind_ID
RPG_permanency	Grantee_ID, Case_ID, Ind_ID
RPG_common	Grantee_ID, Case_ID, Ind_ID
RPG_staff_survey	Grantee_ID
RPG_partner_survey	Grantee_ID

Confidentiality Protection

The dataset underwent a confidentiality review by NDACAN and it was determined that no recodes were necessary. There are no primary or secondary identifiers in the dataset.

Extent of Collection

This collection consists of the User’s Guide, Data Dictionaries and Codebooks, supplemental documentation, 21 data files with import program files for SAS, SPSS, and Stata, text and tab-delimited data files, and files native to SPSS, Stata, and SAS (see Table 2 below).

Table 2. List of documents included in dataset, in addition to the User’s Guide.

Document File Name	Brief description	Data File(s) to which the document is relevant
Report-to-Congress-Replication-Instructions	Provides guidance to secondary analysts interested in replicating findings from the reports to Congress.	All

Document File Name	Brief description	Data File(s) to which the document is relevant
OAISIS-DataDictionary-Administrative-Indicators	Describes the administrative data elements, including how summary indicator variables were derived.	RPG_Permanency, RPG_Recovery, RPG_Safety
Partner-Survey-DataDictionary-SNA-Variables	This document is design to further an analyst's understanding of how to interpret the data from the Partner Survey, Social Networking section of variables.	RPG_Partner_Survey
ESL-DataDocumentation	Describes the layout of the Enrollment and Service Log (ESL) data files. Also includes a description of how key variables were constructed and how some analyses were conducted as a part of the cross-site evaluation.	rpg_esl_case_level, rpg_esl_caseebp_level, rpg_esl_ebp_level, rpg_esl_person_level, rpg_esl_session_level
OAISIS-Standardized-Instrument-Data-Dictionary	Describes the variables from the data files that make-up the standardized instrument portion of the Outcome and Impact Study Information System (OAISIS). Scored and indicator variable derivations are described.	rpg_aapi2, rpg_asi, rpg_brief, rpg_cbcl, rpg_cesd, rpg_itsp, rpg_psi, rpg_tsc_40, rpg_tscyc, rpg_vinelandii
RPG-ESL-CaseEBP-Level-Codebook	Contains the variable name, variable label, and value label(s) information for the data file. The file contains variables on each case's distinct enrollment into a focal EBP. Information on the number of sessions and duration is reported.	rpg_esl_CaseEBP-Level
RPG-ESL-Case-Level-Codebook	Contains the variable name, variable label, and value label(s) information for the data file. The data collected represents a single RPG case and provides information on the type, number, and duration of the case's enrollments into specific evidence-based programs (EBP's).	rpg_esl_case_level
RPG-ESL-EBP-Level-Codebook	Contains the variable name, variable label, and value label(s) information for the data file. The data file serves as a crosswalk between specific Evidence Based Programs and broad categorizations of EBP's offered by grantees.	rpg_esl_ebp_level
RPG-ESL-Person-Level-Codebook	Contains the variable name, variable label, and value label(s) information for the data file. Also contains information about the individuals who enrolled in RPG, including demographic, background, economic activity, and relationship to the index/focal child.	rpg_esl_person_level

Document File Name	Brief description	Data File(s) to which the document is relevant
Partner-Survey-Codebook	Contains the variable name, variable label, and value label(s) information for the data file. The data originate from the Partner Survey, which was collected from representatives of a partner organization working with an RPG grantee.	rpg_partner_survey
RPG-Partner-Survey-Revised-10-10-2018	This document is the actual survey instrument as administered during the study. The document contains mark-ups of the coded response options found in the data file, as well as any skip logic.	rpg_partner_survey
RPG-Staff-Survey-Revised-10-10-2018	This document is the actual survey instrument as administered during the study. The document contains mark-ups of the coded response options found in the data file, as well as any skip logic.	rpg_staff_survey
Staff-Survey-Codebook	Contains the variable name, variable label, and value label(s) information for the data file. The data originates from the Staff Survey, which was completed by front-line members who work directly with RPG participants.	rpg_staff_survey
RPG-aapi2-data-codebook	Contains the variable name, variable label, and value label(s) information for the data file. The data originates from the Adult-Adolescent Parenting Inventory-2 (AAPI-2).	rpg_aapi2
RPG-asi-data-codebook	Contains the variable name, variable label, and value label(s) information for the data file. The data originates from the Addiction Severity Index (ASI).	rpg_asi
RPG-brief-data-codebook	Contains the variable name, variable label, and value label(s) information for the data file. The data originates from the Behavior Rating of Executive Function (BRIEF).	rpg_brief
RPG-cbcl-data-codebook	Contains the variable name, variable label, and value label(s) information for the data file. The data originates from the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL)-School Age.	rpg_cbcl
RPG-cesd-data-codebook	Contains the variable name, variable label, and value label(s) information for the data file. The data originates from the Center for Epidemiologic Studies-Depression Scale (CES-D).	rpg_cesd

Document File Name	Brief description	Data File(s) to which the document is relevant
RPG-itsp-data-codebook	Contains the variable name, variable label, and value label(s) information for the data file. The data originates from the Infant-Toddler Sensory Profile (ITSP) 1 to 36 months.	rpg_itsp
RPG-psi-data-codebook	Contains the variable name, variable label, and value label(s) information for the data file. The data originates from the Parenting Stress Index (PSI)-Short Form	rpg_psi
RPG-tsc-40-data-codebook	Contains the variable name, variable label, and value label(s) information for the data file. The data originates from the Trauma Symptom Checklist-40 (TSC-40).	rpg_tsc_40
RPG-tscyc-data-codebook	Contains the variable name, variable label, and value label(s) information for the data file. The data originates from the Trauma Symptom Checklist for Young Children (TSCYC).	rpg_tscyc
RPG-vinelandii-data-codebook	Contains the variable name, variable label, and value label(s) information for the data file. The data originates from the Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales-Socialization Subscale, Second Edition (Vineland II).	rpg_vinelandii
RPG-safety-data-codebook	Contains the variable name, variable label, and value label(s) information for the data file. The data consists of summary/indicator variables from the safety domain.	rpg_safety
RPG-recovery-data-codebook	Contains the variable name, variable label, and value label(s) information for the data file. The data consists of summary/indicator variables from the recovery domain.	rpg_recovery
RPG-permanency-data-codebook	Contains the variable name, variable label, and value label(s) information for the data file. The data consists of summary/indicator variables from the permanency domain.	rpg_permanency
RPG-common-data-codebook	Contains the variable name, variable label, and value label(s) information for the data file. The data consists of variables from the “Common” data file.	rpg_common

Extent of Processing

NDACAN produced the User’s Guide, 508 Compliant versions of the Codebooks, the SPSS, Stata, and SAS native and program import files, and text data files.

DATA FILE INFORMATION

File Specifications

There are 21 data files pertaining to each of the surveys and assessments administered during the course of the study.

Data File Notes

The data collectors used characters to represent user-define missing values. This means that variables, where the values of “M” and “L” were used, are consider string/character variables even though all other values are numeric. SPSS allows for the assignment of value labels in string variables, however, Stata does not. In other words, whenever a variable is defined as “string,” Stata will not allow for there to be value labels, and so, none can be applied nor displayed. The result is that many variables in the Stata data files will be absent value labels. These are limitations with the version of Stata (Stata/SE 14.2) used to test these data and are not within the scope of NDACAN to resolve. However, this limitation could be resolved in future releases of the software. Data users should leverage the codebook documentation to assist them in understanding what each value represents within a specific variable.

Commonly used abbreviations in the study documentation and data files:

AAPI-2: Adult-Adolescent Parenting Inventory 2

ASI: Addiction Severity Index

BRIEF: Behavior Rating of Executive Function

CBCL: Child Behavior Checklist

CES-D: Center for Epidemiologic Studies-Depression Scale

EBP: Evidence Based Programs

ESL: Enrollment and Service Log

FC: Focal child

FFA: Family Functioning Adult

ITSP: Infant –Toddler Sensory Profile

PSI-SF: Parenting Stress Index, Short Form

OASIS: Outcome and Impact Study Information System

RDA: Recovery Domain Adult

RPG: Regional Partnership Grants

SUB: Substantiated

TSCYC: Trauma Symptom Checklist for Young Children

UNSUB: Unsubstantiated

Technical support for this dataset is provided by NDACAN.

Please send your inquiries to

NDACANsupport@cornell.edu

**Check the User Support page of the NDACAN website for help documents related
this dataset (<https://www.ndacan.cornell.edu/user-support/user-support.cfm>).**