

Report Supplementary Material 18: Summary of Rich Process Evaluations - Context Domains

Table of Contents

1.	<i>Table Summarising Rich Process Evaluations.....</i>	2
2.	<i>References</i>	9

1. Table Summarising Rich Process Evaluations

Intervention Type	Intervention	Process Evaluation Participants	Process Evaluation Design	Relevant Context Domains	Linked Outcome Evaluation(s)
Intrapersonal	Computer game UK ¹	Young people in residential care (Age: 12-17 years); social workers delivering the intervention (4 pairs)	Interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Care-experienced children and young people's identities, values and needs • Carer identity, values and needs 	N/A
Intrapersonal	Kundalini Yoga UK ²	Young people (Age:13-17 years); residential care staff (n=total 9 participants)	Interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited system resources and competing demands • Intervention burden • Carer identity, values and needs 	N/A
Intrapersonal; Interpersonal	Trauma Focused Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (TF-CBT) USA ³	Foster carers (n=7); independent group of foster parents (n=5); child welfare case workers (n=5)	Interviews with foster carers. Transcripts reviewed by a second set of independent foster carers. Case workers reviewed joint findings of first two groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carer identity, values and needs 	<p><i>Direct evidence</i></p> <p>Study design: RCT</p> <p>Outcome measurement: Short-term outcomes (post-test; 3-month follow-up):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internalizing problems • Externalizing problems • Post-traumatic stress • Social and emotional functioning

Intervention Type	Intervention	Process Evaluation Participants	Process Evaluation Design	Relevant Context Domains	Linked Outcome Evaluation(s)
					Evidence: No evidence of effect
Intrapersonal; Interpersonal	Supporting Looked After Children and Care Leavers In Decreasing Drugs, and alcohol (SOLID) UK ⁴⁻⁶	Children in care (n = 37); foster and residential carers (n = 30); social workers (n = 27); drug and alcohol practitioners (n = 19); and researchers (n = 3).	Practitioner log and audio files; one-to-one interviews; dyad interviews and focus groups.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited system resources and competing demands • System culture and interprofessional working • Care-experienced children and young people's identities, values and needs • Carer identity, values and needs 	N/A (Outcome measurements for feasibility reporting)
Interpersonal	Family Finding USA ⁷	38 permanency specialists and supervisors from implementation agencies. 22 participated in subsequent interview.	Electronic survey; interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intervention burden • System culture and interprofessional working 	<i>Indirect evidence</i> ⁸ Study design: RCT Outcome measure: Long-term outcomes (12-month follow-up): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internalizing - clinical level • Externalizing - clinical level • Total problems - clinical level • Internalizing - borderline

Intervention Type	Intervention	Process Evaluation Participants	Process Evaluation Design	Relevant Context Domains	Linked Outcome Evaluation(s)
					<p>or clinical level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total problems - borderline or clinical level <p>Evidence: Uncertain effects</p>
Interpersonal	Fostering Connections Ireland ⁹	Foster carers (n=47); intervention facilitators (n=10)	Focus groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited system resources and competing demands Intervention burden System culture and interprofessional working Carer identity, values and needs 	N/A
Interpersonal	Peer mentoring programme UK ¹⁰	Young women in out of home care (Age: 14-18 years) (n=19); mentors (Age: 19-25 years) (n=13).; project co-ordinators	Interviews; mentor diary; focus groups; survey.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited system resources and competing demands Care-experienced children and young people's identities, values and needs 	<p><i>Direct evidence</i></p> <p>Study design: Pilot RCT</p> <p>Outcome measurement: Long-term outcomes (12 months):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emotional health Anxiety / depression Self-harm Suicide attempt <p>Evidence: No evidence of effect.</p>

Intervention Type	Intervention	Process Evaluation Participants	Process Evaluation Design	Relevant Context Domains	Linked Outcome Evaluation(s)
Interpersonal	Parent Management Training (PMT) USA ¹¹	Foster parents (n=38)	Focus groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited system resources and competing demands • Intervention burden • Care-experienced children and young people's identities, values and needs • Carer identity, values and needs 	<p><i>Indirect evidence</i>^{12, 13}</p> <p>Study design: RCT</p> <p>Outcome evaluation: Short-term and long-term outcomes (post-intervention; 12-month follow up):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total problems (carer reported) • Total problems (teacher reported) • Internalizing problems (carer reported) • Internalizing problems (teacher reported) • Externalizing problems (carer reported) • Externalizing problems (teacher reported) <p>Evidence: Uncertain effects</p> <p><i>Indirect evidence</i>^{14, 15}</p> <p>Study design: RCT</p> <p>Outcome evaluation: Short-term outcomes (6 months follow-up; 12 months follow-up):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total problems

Intervention Type	Intervention	Process Evaluation Participants	Process Evaluation Design	Relevant Context Domains	Linked Outcome Evaluation(s)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total (impaired) functioning Evidence: Evidence of effect
Interpersonal	Youth-initiated mentoring relationships (YIM) USA ¹⁶	Young people in foster care (Age: 16-25 years) (n=12); mentors (n=9)	Interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intervention burden Care-experienced children and young people's identities, values and needs 	N/A
Interpersonal; Organisational	Head, Heart, Hands UK ¹⁷	Foster carers (n=76)	Interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intervention burden Carer identity, values and needs 	N/A
Interpersonal; Organisational	Intensive Permanence Services (IPS) USA ¹⁸	Clinical staff delivering the intervention (n=7)	Interviews; review of agency documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Care-experienced children and young people's identities, values and needs Carer identity, values and needs 	N/A
Interpersonal; Organisational; Community	Evolve Behavioural Support Services (EBSS) Australia ¹⁹	Delivery agents (n=21)	Interviews; survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Carer identity, values and needs 	N/A
Interpersonal; Organisational; Community	Multi-dimensional Treatment Foster Care (MTFC) /	Foster carers; children's social workers;	Interviews; survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited system resources and competing 	<i>Direct evidence</i> ²² Study design: RCT

Intervention Type	Intervention	Process Evaluation Participants	Process Evaluation Design	Relevant Context Domains	Linked Outcome Evaluation(s)
	Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care for Adolescents (MTFC-A) UK ^{20, 21}	supervising social workers; individual therapists; birth family therapists; skills workers; social work assistants; programme supervisor; programme manager; members of the management board (n=31) ²⁰ . Young people (Age: 11-16 years) (n=20); MTFC staff and foster carers ²¹		<p>demands</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • System culture and interprofessional working • Carer identity, values and needs 	<p>Outcomes measure: Long-term outcomes (12-month follow-up):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Child global functioning • Child MH symptoms and social/physical functioning <p>Evidence: No evidence of effect</p> <p><i>Indirect evidence</i> ²³ Study design: RCT Outcome measure: Long-term outcomes (12-month follow-up):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Child mental health symptoms and social/physical functioning • Child global functioning <p>Evidence: No evidence of effect</p> <p><i>Indirect evidence</i> ²⁴ Study design: RCT Outcome evaluation: Short-term outcomes (post-intervention):</p>

Intervention Type	Intervention	Process Evaluation Participants	Process Evaluation Design	Relevant Context Domains	Linked Outcome Evaluation(s)
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internalizing problems • Externalizing problems • Total problems Evidence: No evidence of effect
Interpersonal; Organisational; Community	New Orleans Intervention Model in Glasgow (GIFT) / New Orleans Intervention Model in London (LIFT) UK ²⁵⁻²⁷	Professionals; birth parents; foster carers; consultation with children's panel ²⁵ ; Social workers; foster carers; legal decision-makers; intervention team (n=63) ²⁶ ; Delivery agents (n=54) ²⁷	Interviews; focus groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited system resources and competing demands • Intervention burden • System culture and interprofessional working 	N/A
Interpersonal; Organisational; Community	Treatment Foster Care (TFC) / Treatment Foster Care for Older Youth (TFC-OY) / Together Facing the Challenge USA ²⁸⁻³⁰	Foster carers (n=75) ²⁸ ; agency case study ²⁹ ; young people (Age: 16-18 years); foster carers and delivery agents ³⁰	Interviews; focus groups; case study	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intervention burden • System culture and interprofessional working • Care-experienced children and young people's identities, values and needs 	<i>Indirect evidence</i> ³¹ Study design: RCT Outcomes measure: Short-term and long-term outcomes (6 month, 12-month follow-up): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total problem behaviour Evidence: Uncertain effects
Community	Child and	Social services	Focus groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • System culture 	N/A

Intervention Type	Intervention	Process Evaluation Participants	Process Evaluation Design	Relevant Context Domains	Linked Outcome Evaluation(s)
	Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) UK ³²	staff; foster carers; residential social workers (n=58)		and interprofessional working <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Care-experienced children and young people's identities, values and needs 	

2. References

1. Aventin A, Houston S, Macdonald G. Utilising a computer game as a therapeutic intervention for youth in residential care: Some preliminary findings on use and acceptability. *Children and Youth Services Review* 2014;**47**:362-9. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2014.10.012>
2. Vallejos Elvira P, Ball Mark J, Brown P, Crepez-Keay D, Haslam-Jones E, Crawford P. Kundalini yoga as mutual recovery: a feasibility study including children in care and their carers. *Journal of Children's Services* 2016;**11**:261-82. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCS-11-2015-0034>
3. Dorsey S, Conover KL, Revillion C. Improving foster parent engagement: using qualitative methods to guide tailoring of evidence-based engagement strategies. *Journal of clinical child and adolescent psychology : the official journal for the Society of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, American Psychological Association, Division 53* 2014;**43**:877-89. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15374416.2013.876643>
4. Alderson H, Kaner E, Brown R, Howel D, McColl E, Smart D, *et al.* Behaviour change interventions to reduce risky substance use and improve mental health in children in care: the SOLID three-arm feasibility RCT. 2020;**8**:13. <https://doi.org/10.3310/phr08130>
5. Alderson H, Kaner E, McColl E, Howel D, Fouweather T, McGovern R, *et al.* A pilot feasibility randomised controlled trial of two behaviour change interventions compared to usual care to reduce substance misuse in looked after children and care leavers aged 12-20 years: The SOLID study. *PLoS One* 2020;**15**:e0238286. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0238286>
6. Alderson H, McGovern R, Copello A, McColl E, Kaner E, Smart D, *et al.* Implementation Factors for the Delivery of Alcohol and Drug Interventions to Children in Care: Qualitative Findings from the SOLID Feasibility Trial. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2021;**18**. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18073461>
7. Shklarski L. Understanding Individual and Organizational Factors Related to the Implementation Fidelity of the Family Finding Intervention to Support Youth in Foster Care who are Transitioning to Independent Living. *Child Welfare* 2020;**98**:103-36.
8. Vandivere S, Malm KE, Allen TJ, Williams SC, McKlindon A. A Randomized Controlled Trial of Family Finding: a Relative Search and Engagement Intervention for Youth Lingering in Foster Care. *Evaluation review* 2017;**41**:542-67. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193841X17689971>
9. Lotty M, Bantry-White E, Dunn-Galvin A. The experiences of foster carers and facilitators of Fostering Connections: The Trauma-informed Foster Care Program: A process study. *Children and Youth Services Review* 2020;**119**. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.105516>
10. Mezey G, Meyer D, Robinson F, Bonell C, Campbell R, Gillard S, *et al.* Developing and piloting a peer mentoring intervention to reduce teenage pregnancy in looked-after children and care leavers: an exploratory randomised controlled trial. *Health technology assessment* 2015;**19**:1-139. <https://doi.org/10.3310/hta19850>

11. Spielfogel Jill E, Leathers Sonya J, Christian E, McMeel Lorri S. Parent management training, relationships with agency staff, and child mental health: Urban foster parents' perspectives. *Children & Youth Services Review* 2011;**33**:2366-74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2011.08.008>
12. Maaskant Anne M, van R, Floor B, Overbeek Geertjan J, Oort Frans J, Arntz M, *et al.* Effects of PMTO in Foster Families with Children with Behavior Problems: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Journal of child and family studies* 2017;**26**:523-39. <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10826-016-0579-2>
13. Maaskant Anne M, van R, Floor B, Overbeek Geertjan J, Oort Frans J, Hermanns Jo MA. Parent training in foster families with children with behavior problems: Follow-up results from a randomized controlled trial. *Children & Youth Services Review* 2016;**70**:84-94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2016.09.005>
14. Akin BA, Lang K, Yan YQ, McDonald TP. Randomized trial of PMTO in foster care: 12-month child well-being, parenting, and caregiver functioning outcomes. *Children and Youth Services Review* 2018;**95**:49-63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2018.10.018>
15. Akin Becci A, Lang K, McDonald Thomas P, Yan Y, Little T. Randomized Trial of PMTO in Foster Care: Six-Month Child Well-Being Outcomes. *Research on Social Work Practice* 2019;**29**:206-22.
16. Spencer R, Drew Alison L, Gowdy G, Horn John P. "A positive guiding hand": A qualitative examination of youth-initiated mentoring and the promotion of interdependence among foster care youth. *Children & Youth Services Review* 2018;**93**:41-50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2018.06.038>
17. McDermid S, Trivedi H, Holmes L, Boddy J. Foster Carers' Receptiveness to New Innovations and Programmes: An Example from the Introduction of Social Pedagogy to UK Foster Care. *The British Journal of Social Work* 2021.
18. Hall Seventy F, Semanchin J, Annette. Implementation of Intensive Permanence Services: A Trauma-Informed Approach to Preparing Foster Youth for Supportive Relationships. *Child & Adolescent Social Work Journal* 2018;**35**:587-98. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10560-018-0550-8>
19. Ziviani J, Darlington Y, Feeney R, Meredith P, Head B. Children with disabilities in out-of-home care: Perspectives on organisational collaborations. *Children & Youth Services Review* 2013;**35**:797-805. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2013.02.003>
20. Kirton D, Thomas C. A Suitable Case?: Implementing Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care in an English Local Authority. *Adoption & Fostering* 2011;**35**:5-17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030857591103500202>
21. Biehal N, Dixon J, Parry E, Sinclair I, Green J, Roberts C, *et al.* The Care Placements Evaluation (CaPE) Evaluation of Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care for Adolescents (MTFC-A). 2012:8.
22. Biehal N, Dixon J, Parry E, Sinclair I, Green J, Roberts C, *et al.* *The Care Placements Evaluation (CaPE) Evaluation of Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care for Adolescents (MTFC-A)*; 2012.

23. Green JM, Biehal N, Roberts C, Dixon J, Kay C, Parry E, *et al.* Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care for Adolescents in English care: randomised trial and observational cohort evaluation. *British journal of psychiatry* 2014;**204**:214-21. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.113.131466>
24. Jonkman Caroline S, Schuengel C, Oosterman M, Lindeboom R, Boer F, Lindauer Ramon JL. Effects of Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care for Preschoolers (MTFC-P) for Young Foster Children with Severe Behavioral Disturbances. *Journal of child and family studies* 2017;**26**:1491-503. <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10826-017-0661-4>
25. Turner-Halliday F, Watson N, Minnis H. Process evaluation of the New Orleans Intervention Model for infant mental health in Glasgow. *Impact and Evidence Series* 2016:69.
26. Turner-Halliday F, Kainth G, Young-Southward G, Cotmore R, Watson N, McMahon L, *et al.* Clout or doubt? Perspectives on an infant mental health service for young children placed in foster care due to abuse and neglect. *Child abuse & neglect* 2017;**72**:184-95. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2017.07.012>
27. Baginsky M, Moriarty, J., Manthorpe, J., Ougrin, D. and Middleton, K. *Evaluation of the Early Implementation of the New Orleans Intervention Model in a London Borough*
London. London: Department for Education; 2017.
28. Tullberg E, Vaughn W, Muradwij N, Kerker Bonnie D. Unpacking “support”: Understanding the complex needs of therapeutic foster parents. *Children and Youth Services Review* 2019;**105**:104420. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2019.104420>
29. Murray M, Culver T, Farmer E, Jackson Leslie A, Rixon B. From theory to practice: One agency's experience with implementing an evidence-based model. *Journal of Child and Family Studies* 2014;**23**:844-53. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10826-013-9738-x>
30. McMillen JC, Narendorf SC, Robinson D, Havlicek J, Fedoravicius N, Bertram J, *et al.* Development and piloting of a treatment foster care program for older youth with psychiatric problems. *Child and adolescent psychiatry and mental health* 2015;**9**. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13034-015-0057-4>
31. Farmer EMZ, Burns BJ, Wagner HR, Murray M, Southerland DG. Enhancing "usual practice" treatment foster care: Findings from a randomized trial on improving youths' outcomes. *Psychiatric Services* 2010;**61**:555-61. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1176/ps.2010.61.6.555>
32. Callaghan J, Young B, Richards M, Vostanis P. Developing New Mental Health Services for Looked after Children: A Focus Group Study. *Adoption & Fostering* 2003;**27**:51-63. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030857590302700408>