BEYOND PERMANENCY PLANNING

With permanency planning taking the spotlight increasingly in the field of foster care, it becomes urgent to examine the definition of permanency, the effect on practice, and the implications for service delivery.

ANTHONY N. MALUCCIO – EDITH FEIN – JANE HAMILTON – JO LYNN KLIER – DARRYL WARD

Reprinted by special permission of the Child Welfare League of America from CHILD WELFARE, Volume LIX, No.9 1980, pp. 515-530.

Permanency planning for children involved with the foster care system has created considerable excitement recently in the field of child welfare. Fanshel and Shinn (8) have suggested that the movement toward permanency planning may represent a revolution in child welfare comparable to the closing down of mass congregate institutions. The adequacy of an agency's performance is increasingly being assessed on the basis of its success in assuring permanence in living arrangements and continuity of relationships for children in its care (8).

Whether or not a revolution is taking place, there is no doubt that permanency planning is much talked about among administrators, planners, social workers and others in child welfare agencies throughout the country. It is timely, therefore to examine this concept critically. This paper places permanency planning in historical perspective, considers its meaning and reviews related research, so as to clarify what is known and what the issues are in this important area of child welfare. The impact of permanency planning on service delivery is examined, and ways of enhancing its significance for practice are identified. The ultimate purpose is to build on the accomplishments of permanency planning by stimulating further analysis of it as a concept and a movement.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Foster care in the United States was grounded historically in the spirit of rescueing potentially "good" children from "bad" parents, and rearing the children to become productive citizens. The more modern concept of foster care as care predominantly by a substitute family on a temporary basis evolved gradually and unevenly over time.

Although foster care has a long history, permanency planning as such appears to have been first mentioned in the literature by Epstein and Heymann in an article on adoption planning for older children (6). The article describes a private child welfare agency's efforts to prevent long-term foster home placement by confronting the parents early with the need to make a permanent plan either through adoption or return to the child's own home.

Anthony N. Maluccio, D.S.W., is Professor, University of Connecticut School of Social Work, West Hartford. Edith Fein, M.A., Jane Hamilton, Ph.D., is Associate Director, United Social and Mental Health Services, Willimantic, CT. This article is supported by Grant No. 90-C-1794, "Outcomes of Permanency Planning in Foster Care," from the Children's Bureau, Administration of Children, Youth and Families, HHS. The authors thank Michael Dunn, Arlene Jackson, Martha Jones, Janet Lahti, Kathleen Olmstead, Carl Schoenberg and Marie Sutton for criticisms of an early draft.

More recently, permanency planning has been substantially promoted through the activities of the landmark Oregon Project, which have included research, demonstration of service delivery, and national dissemination through extensive training and technical assistance to child welfare agencies interested in building permanency planning into their programs (5:19:20:30).

Interest in permanency planning has also grown in response to continuing dissatisfaction with the service delivery system, especially as research has raised questions about the effectiveness of foster care programs in meeting the needs of children. For instance, various researchers have pointed to the damage resulting from the tenuous status in which many foster children find themselves – a status that makes it difficult for the child to develop an identity, to achieve a sense of belonging, to establish meaningful relationships with people, and to deal successfully with developmental tasks (1). The phrase "children adrift in foster care" has been used to describe the instability, uncertainty and length of the child's experience within a program that is supposed to be temporary and remedial (32).

In general, evaluative research has demonstrated that the foster care system has not fulfilled its ultimate mission of reuniting children with their parents or providing them with another permanent family following a temporary placement. Almost two decades ago, in a nationwide study, Maas and Engler (21) reached some startling conclusions: many of the children in foster care had at least one parent living, but the parents rarely visited them and generally had no plans to assume responsibility for their care; almost two-thirds of the children were unlikely to return to their own homes; for most of the children in foster care, plans were indefinite and there was little sense of permanency.

Maas and Engler's findings have been supported by many subsequent studies (17;8;12;36). As Gruber observed in his analysis of the foster care program in Massachusetts, these studies in general show that" despite the temporary purpose of foster care, it is more often than not a permanent status for the child". Gruber's findings exemplify the status of most foster care programs throughout the country:

> About 68% of the children have been in foster home care between 4 and 8 years. The average length of time spent in foster home care is more than 5 years, yet 83% of the children have never been returned to their parents, not even for trial periods. (12).

Furthermore, little effort appears to be made to prevent placement or keep the family together. In one study it was found that almost one-third of the biological parents did not have any contact with the social worker from the child-placing agency, while more than half had not seen a social worker for at least 6 months (12). Other investigators reported that there is minimal casework with parents (14).

These research findings, along with other factors such as concern for children's rights, and writings on the "best interests of the child" (10;11) have led to dissatisfaction with the impact of the foster care system on children and families. As a result of these mounting concerns, the value of permanency planning for each child has been asserted with renewed conviction. This conviction was concisely expressed by Fanshel and Shinn upon conclusion of their longtitudinal foster care study:

> We emerge from our research with the view that all children should be afforded permanency in their living arrangements if at all possible (8).

Others would have also underscored the critical importance of permanence and the child's need for continuity of parental relationships. Stressing the con-

cept of "psychological parenting," Goldstein, Freud and Solnit have advocated legislation to provide each child with a permanent relationship to those adults who have functioned psychologically as his or her parents (10). They also urged substitution of the "least detrimental alternative" for the "best interests of the child" as a guide in child care decisions. Scheafer further highlighted the child's need for consistent care, recommending the use of permanent, "professional" parents whenever possible (31). In short, the goal of permanency for each child has begun to shape the overall philosophy of many foster care programs. It is also reflected in the commitment of the federal government to support related programs and in federal legislation mandating permanency planning and periodic case review.

THE MEANING OF PERMANENCY PLANNING

Although much has been written about it, the concept of permanency planning is broad and ambiguous. On the basis of their extensive work with the Oregon Project, Pike et al. describe it as follows:

> Permanency planning means clarifying the intent of the placement, and, during temporary care, keeping alive a plan for permanency. When a temporary placement is prolonged, foster care may have the appearance of permanency, but it lacks the element of intent that is critical to permanence. (28).

Emlen et al, explain that the quality of permanence includes the following features: 1) the home is not guaranteed to last forever, but is "intended to last indefinitely;" 2) "permanence means commitment and continuity in the child's relationships"; 3) the family is one in which the child has a real sense of belonging and "definite legal status"; and 4) the child has "a respected social status", in contrast to the second-class status typical of temporary foster care (5).

Most writers on this subject agree with Emlen et al. and Pike et al. that permanence implies intent. But a review of the literature indicates that the term "permanency planning" has been applied to many different things, including: philosophical commitment to the vital role of the family in a child's development; continuity of care; adoption; a case management method; systematic case review; a program to reduce the number of children in temporary care; a set of attitudes about the needs of children and ways of meeting these needs; "good" or active casework; techniques such as decision making or contracting; a one-time event; an ongoing process; mobilization of support services to aid parents; need for aftercare services; and legal status of a child.

At present a clear consensus on definition of permanency planning does not exist. Rather, what is available is a set of practice guidelines useful in arranging stable placements for children. These guidelines usually include: 1) early intervention and early consideration of long-term plans for each child; 2) examination of different alternatives to move the child out of temporary foster care; 3) delineation of a time-limited casework plan to achieve an appropriate permanent placement or to determine the most appropriate placement (e.g. arrange regular visits with parents, offer time-limited rehabilitation services to parents); 4) organization of legal evidence for a plan, if necessary (e.g. termination of parental rights); and 5) periodic case review (internal, external, or a combination).

In essence, permanency planning refers to the idea of removing the child as soon as possible out of temporary substitute care and returning him or her to the family as the preferred alternative or to an adoption home as the second priority, or, if necessary, to another permanent alternative such as a family with legal guardianship.

RESEARCH ON PERMANENCY PLANNING

Due to the ambiguity and breadth of permanency planning, most research in foster care can be viewed as having implications for this concept. The research literature in this area ranges from studies documenting the drift of children in foster care (7;15;21) to a longtiduinal assessment of the effects of foster care on children (8), to studies analyzing how different variables are related to duration of foster care (15;27;34). In addition, evaluations of services to parents (16;35) as well as assessment of case review procedures (3) suggest techniques to accomplish permanency planning.

From a narrower viewpoint, there is a growing body of research where authors specifically identify their studies as dealing with the issues involved in achieving a permanent home. Some of these investigations provide experimental comparisons of intensive services designed to minimize the drift of children in unplanned long-term foster placements. The results are varied.

Jones, Neuman, and Shyne studied a demonstration project involving a sample of 549 families in which it had been determined by a social agency that there was at least one child at risk of placement in foster care (16). The purpose of the project, which involved a range of public and private child welfare agencies, was "to test the effectiveness of intensive family casework services to prevent the occurrence or recurrence of foster care placements" (16). Effectiveness was measured by means of outcome criteria such as number of children placed in foster care, duration of placement, return to own home, and child's problems and functioning. These researchers concluded that the demonstration project was successful in preventing or shortening placement and in helping children and parents:

> The effectiveness of the intensive service provided in the demonstration units as compared with the regular program was strongly supported by the consistently more favourable outcomes for experimental than control cases.

In another study of 413 children placed through a public child welfare agency, Sherman, Neuman, and Shyne examined the relative effectiveness of these alternative service approaches: 1) regular services; 2) administrative case monitoring; and 3) administrative case monitoring plus special workers to provide services to parents. They concluded that "it could not be demonstrated to a statistically significant degree that the special interventive strategies worked better than regular practice" (32). However, the authors recognized that the design of their research was not truly experimental, since it was not possible to assign cases randomly to experimental and control groups; the effect of antecedent variables therefore could not be controlled.

OTHER STUDIES

Studies conducted in public agencies in California (34;35) and Iowa (13) have demonstrated the effectivenss of using service contracts and case planning to move children out of temporary care more rapidly. Similarly, the Oregon Project (19;20) found that a higher percentage of project children were in permanent homes than in the comparison groups characterized by customary casework activity. The project's casework techniques emphasized decision-making guidelines for devising appropriate plans and court procedures for terminating parental rights. The important characteristic that distinguished this project from previously mentioned studies was its focus on children considered adoptable and not likely to return home. In fact, it was the higher number of completed adoptions, as

compared with the number of children returned to their parents, that accounted for the differences between the experimental and compairson caseloads (19).

These investigations lead to questions about the stability of the children's placements: Are they truly "permanent"? The 18-month followup of the Oregon Project revealed that 90% of the children remained in the same placement, with the adoptive homes being the most stable and return-to-parent the least, although this difference was not statistically significant (19). On the other hand, Fein, Davies and Knight found that only 66% of the children discharged from a time-limited foster care program remained in their permanent placement (9); however, this program served primarily emotionally disturbed children, which may account for the discrepancy. These researchers found no difference in stability of placement between discharges to adoptive and biological parents.

RESEARCH ON ADJUSTMENT

Looking beyond the mere fact of permanence, several studies have also examined whether there were any differences in adjustment between those children in permanent homes and those remaining in temporary foster care. Two investigations found no difference between these types of placement (13;16). It should be noted that this is consistent with Fanshel and Shinn's longitudinal evaluation of the effects of foster care(8). Fanshel and Shinn suggested some of the difficulties involved in this type of evaluative research and the inconclusive nature of the findings:

> We are not completely sure that continued tenure in foster care over extended periods of time is not in itself harmful to children. On the level at which we are able to measure the adjustment of the children we could find no negative effect. However, we feel that our measures of adjustment are not without problems, and we are not sure that our procedures have captured the potential feelings of pain and impaired self-image that can be created by impermanent status in foster care.

In the followup study of the Oregon project it was found that there was no difference in adjustment between the children in temporary foster care and those in permanent placements. Moreover, these investigators noted that the child's and the parents' or caretakers' sense of permanence, rather than the legal status of the placement, seemed to be most closely related to the child's well-being:

> Whether the child was in a legally permanent placement, adoption or returned home, or was in legally temporary foster care made very little difference in his level of adjustment and health at the time of the interview. Perception of permanence was the key. (19).

These findings raise questions about the definition of permanence or permanent placement. For example, should it rest solely on legal indicators? Is it really a state of mind? This issue also suggests the need to investigate what options should be accepted as permanent placement. In addition to reunification with the own parents and traditional adoption, the alternatives include foster parent adoption, subsidized adoption, long-term foster care, and various forms of legal guardianship. These options should be carefully examined to determine their characteristics and effects on the children.

The studies reviewed earlier are limited in applicability, due to their reliance on demonstration projects or special intensive services and the lack of naturalistic research methods; how permanency planning operates in the more typical context of a large public social service system should be explored.* Additionally, these investigations do not differentiate children in foster care, and do not supply information that could help determine how permanency planning needs differ among different types of children.

In short, research findings on permanency planning are at present limited and inconclusive. More extensive and rigorous research should be undertaken. There is a need to define the components of permanency planning and determine which elements are useful in different types of situations. The Oregon Project's analysis of abrriers to permanent planning (30) should be replicated in other systems to identify critical barriers and ways of overcoming them. Research relting to the importance of the sense of permanence should be extended. There should also be investigation into such areas as the appropriateness of different types of permanent plans for different types of children; criteria for termination of parental rights; the role of foster parents in permanecy planning; identification of high risk populations and services needed to avert placement out of the home; and followup evaluation of permanent placements and their outcome.

IMPACT ON SERVICE DELIVERY

There is no systematic empirical evidence documenting the impact of permanency planning on service delivery in the field as a whole, not only because little related research has been carried out, but because of the ambiguities inherent in the concept itself. For instance, some agencies or some workers may be "doing" permanency planning without labelling it as such. There is no question, however, that the concept of permanency planning has been influencing service delivery, beginning by "raising consciousness" about the needs of children in substitute care and leading to changes in the programs of particular agencies (8;17;33).

Even without definitive evidence of its effectiveness, permanency planning as a goal is beingnincreasingly adopted in the field. Some agencies have successfully restructured their services to counter the drift of children in their care and to promote permanency (33). Others have found that "a modest investment of time, staff and money" can be productive in increasing workers' skills and making stable placement plans for children (17). The Oregon Project (19) and other demonstration programs (16) have shown that a permanency planning approach succeeds in getting children out of temporary foster care and into "permanent" homes. Foster care caseloads have been substantially reduced.

One of the most concrete changes in service delivery resulting in part from the emphasis on permanency planning has been the creation in many agencies of case review procedures, including citizen, judicial, and/or internal case review systems (3). This is a major policy change or structural device that is intended to control the recurrent problems exemplified in the phenomenon of foster care drift. Although its impact nationally is unclear (3;22), it is widely believed that "mandatory periodic review of cases of children in foster care is a promising method of preventing children from languishing in limbo" (18). There is some evidence that the case review system results in moving children out of temporary foster care (29), but its relative effectiveness remains to be evaluated through further experience.

In short, there are indications that the thrust toward permanency planning is leading toward significant change in child welfare programs and methods, including: 1) more emphasis on carefully evaluating a child's needs in the context of the family situation; 2) careful planning of the child's placement to achieve continuity of care and help assure stability in his or her life; 3) more explicit attention and intensive help to the parents; and 4) greater awareness of the importance of aftercare services.

FORM VERSUS SUBSTANCE

On the negative side, however, viewing permanency planning as a panacea risks its being used as a program label or as a cosmetic device, as a means of legitimating existing programs without making real changes in service delivery. In this respect, the emphasis on permanency planning may reflect concern with form more than substance – something that has been typical of child welfare throughout its history (26). Now, as in the past, there seems to be more concern with the structure of services, rather than with their content or substance; greater attention has been given to the type of substitute care that should be preferred than to the components and knowledge necessary to make various types effective and responsive to the needs of different children (23).

A danger in all of this is the potential illusion that substantial structural change is accomplished simply by instituting a special project or training current line staff in an agency. In reality, many systemic barriers to permanency planning continue to exist, particularly in respect to the legal systems, overloaded public agencies, lack of societal supports to families, and inadequate aftercare services (2;30). How can an overloaded system weak in resources help the large numbers of children remaining in foster care?

Another danger is that the burden of permanency planning will increasingly be placed on line staff, as reflected in the growing emphasis on training of workers. It should be noted that the importance of educating planners, administrators, legislators, judges and attorneys, school of social work faculty members, and others. These institutes were designed to help participants examine child welfare policies and programs in their states and identify barriers to permanency planning for foster children.**

In general, however, the emphasis in training programs has been on "changing" the line staff, on providing staff members with greater knowledge and skills is a necessary but not sufficient condition in efforts to enhance the effectiveness of services. Often practitioners are expected to achieve permanent plans in complex family situations with little agency support. Increased expectations in the face of limited resources place a further burden on workers, resulting in frustration and dissatisfaction on their part and perhaps contributing to growing "burnout" and worker attrition in child welfare agencies. On the other hand, when adequate supports are available to them, workers can gain satisfaction and enhance their competence as they are better able to help children and parents achieve meaningful goals.

DIFFICULT DECISIONS

Along with systemic barriers and inadequate supports, practitioners are confronted with the need to make difficult decisions in their efforts to achieve permanent plans (18). Practice experiences as well as research findings have shown how crucial it is that decisions about children be made in a planned, timely fashion. Workers are aware that allowing a child to continue in a placement that is inappropriate can be destructive and unfair.

Yet in many client situations it is difficult to evaluate a parent's adequacy or functioning, to assess the quality of parent-child relationships, to estimate the parents' future capacity, and ultimately to determine the best way of meeting a child's needs. These difficulties are compounded by the fact that people's needs and qualities change over the course of their development. For example, parents may change in their ability to care for a child as life experiences provide further opportunities for them to enhance their competence and coping capacities (24). How can workers make these assessments and decisions in light of so much that is uncertain? How can they predict what might happen years from now, especially since they usually meet parents at a point of crisis?

It has been noted that workers sometimes cope with these issues by avoiding decision making, resulting in children being left in foster care unnecessarily. But there is another potential danger – – that of giving up too quickly on parents or on efforts to reunite the child with his or her family in the rush to effect a permanent plan. There is already some indication that permanency planning is becoming synonymous with adoption planning and that insufficient efforts are made to involve and help biological parents. For example, manuals and resource books being developed for child welfare workers through demonstration projects on permanency planning emphasize such aspects as termination of parental rights and planning for adoption, while paying limited or no attention to methods of helping biological parents (4).

Another issue that should be clarified is one alluded to earlier, namely, the definition of permanent planning. What constitutes a permanent placement? In general, the answer to this question has emphasized legal permanence (28). However, as previously indicated, research findings suggest that the degree of "permanence" of any given placement is dependent in part on the caretakers' and the child's concept of the placement, not only on its legal status or objective reality. In research as in practice, more attention should therefore be given to ways of enhancing the child's and caretaker's sense of permanence. There should be appreciation of the distinction between making and maintaining a permanent placement that is responsive to the child's needs and characteristics; more attention should be paid to the quality of each placement and the services or ingredients necessary to make it as satisfying as possible for the child and the parents. Everyone agrees that simply placing a child back in his or her family or in an adoption home is not enough.

It may also be that different types of placement have different meaning for different children. For example, long-term foster homes (which are currently frowned upon) may be an appropriate means, perhaps the best means, of providing some children with the sense of permanence. As already noted in the section on research, it is necessary to delineate further the concept of permanence, and to develop practice guidelines useful to workers in their efforts to achieve different types of "permanent" plans for different children at different points in their life cycles.

CONCLUSION

Despite growing emphasis on permanency planning, the goal of a permanent plan for each child is still far from being realized. There continues to be a wide gap between the promise and performance in the child placement system. In a recent nationwide survey of public policy and services on behalf of children in out-of-home care, it was concluded that children and families don't count: placement programs reflect a pervasive antifamily bias; services are fragmented or nonexistent; children in placement seem to be abandoned by the public systems responsible for them (2).

The permanency planning movement on the other hand, holds considerable promise for improving service delivery and reflects the conviction that children and families do indeed count. But much more needs to be done to fulfill this potential and translate this conviction into the reality of practice. In addition to dealing with the issues identified in this paper, there is a need to build on the many positive aspects of permanency planning. These include, in particular, its future orientation; its emphasis on careful planning and timely decision making based on consideration of all possible alternatives in a child's situation; its focus on case reviews and on following through the implementation strategies and avoiding the tendency to "lose" children in the system; and its pattern of systematic planning rather than acting in response to a crisis or emergency.

To fulfill the promise of permanency planning, we must also improve the substance of services so that they can become more responsive to the needs and qualities of children and parents. Among other aspects, this means sytematic changes in service delivery (e.g. appropriate allocation of staff time and caseload responsibility) to enable workers to implement permanency planning; a more explicit focus on the family as the unit of service; provision of adequate resources and supports to parents and other caretakers (25); delineation of the ingredients necessary to give children a feeling of permanence and stability; sophisticated consideration of what each child should have at each state of development, as his or her needs and qualities change; and greater emphasis on aftercare services needed to sustain a permanent placement.

Above all, we reiterate the importance of providing adequate supports to parents so as to promote their own competence in caring for their children. Planning is onenof the initial and essential steps toward alleviating the problems of drift and impermanence; however, it remains only a first step if it is not followed by careful implementation and adequate supports and resources. Ultimately, a truly effective network of home-based services may be the best means of going beyond permanency planning by preventing removal of children from their own homes in the first place. Permanency planning cannot substitute for preventive services and for increased investment in our children.

*The authors are engaged in one such study, a longtitudinal investigation of the outcome of permanency planning in a statewide public child welfare agency.

**Communication from Janet Lahti, Director of Permanent Planning Project, Regional Research Institute for Human Services, dated April 18, 1980.

REFERENCES

1. Bryce, Marvin E., and Ehlert, Roger C., "144 Foster Children" Child Welfare L, 9 (November 1971), pp. 499-503.
2. Children's Defense Fund. Children Without Homes, Washington, D.C.: Children's Defence Fund, 1978.
3. Claburn, W. Eugene; Magura, Stephen; and Resnick, William, "Periodic Review of Foster Care: A Brief National Assessment, "Child Welfare LV, 6 (June 1976), pp. 395 - 405.
4. Eastern Oregon State College. Permanent Planning for Children in Foster Care. LaGrande, OR: Eastern Oregon State College, 1979.
5. Emlen, Arthur, et al. Overcoming Barriers to Planning for Children in Foster Care. Porland, OR: Regional Research Institute for Human Services, 1977, pp. 10,11.
6. Epstein, Laura, and Heymann, Irmgard, "Some Decisive Processes in Adoption Planning for Older Children," Child Welfare XLVI, 1 (January 1967): pp. 5-9 and 46.
7. Fanshel, David, "The Exit of Children from Foster Care: An Interim Research Report," Child Welfare L, 2 (February 1971), pp. 65 - 81.
8. Fanshel, David, and Shinn, Eugene B. Children in Foster Care, New York: Columbia University Press, 1978, pp. 478, 479.
9. Fein, Edith; Davies, Linda; and Knight, Gerrie. "Placement Stability in Foster Care." Social Work XXIV, 2 (March 1979) pp. 156-157.
10. Goldstein, J.: Freud, A.: and Solnit, A.J. Beyond the Best Interests of the Child. New York: Free Press, 1973.
11. Before the Best Interests of the Child. New York: Free Press, 1979.
12. Gruber, A.R. Children in Foster Care. New York: Human Sciiences Press, 1978, pp. 176, 184.
13. Iowa Department of Social Services, Foster Care Research Project. Increasing the Effectivenss of Foster Care Through the Use of the Service Contract with Children, Natural Parents, Foster Parents and Workers. Des Moines, IA: Oowa Department of Social Services, Division of Community Services, August 1977, mimeographed.
14. Jameson, Barbara, and Sugg, Michael. The Monitoring and Evaluation System to Assure Permanent Plans for Children in Foster Care: An Assessment, Midlothian VA, Social Research Associates, 1979, mimeographed, p. 108;
15. Jenkins, Shirley. "Duration of Foster Care —— Some Relevant Antecedent Variables." Child Welfare XLVI, 8 (October 1967), pp. 450=456.
16. Jones, Mary Ann; Neuman, Renee; and Shyne, Ann. A Second Chance for Families, New York; Child Welfare League of America, 1976, p. 118.
17. Jones, Martha L. "Developing Training Resources for Permanency Planning," Children Today IX, 2 (March-April 1980) pp. 25-26.
18. Krymow, Virginia L. "Obstacles Encountered in Permanent Planning for Foster Children," Child Welfare LVIII, 2 (February 1979), pp. 97-104.
19. Lahti, Janet, et al. A Follow-up Study of the Oregon Project, Portland, OR: Regional Research Institute for Human Services, August 1978, p. 9, 3.
20. Lahti, Janet, and Dvorak, Jacqueline. "Coming Home from Foster Care," in The Challenge of Partnership: Working with Parents of Children in Foster Care, Anthony N. Maluccio and Paula Armbruster Sinanoglu, editors. New York: Child Welfare League of America, in press.
21. Maas, Henry S., and Engler, Richard E. Children in Need of Parents, New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.
22. Magura, Stephen, and Claburn, Eugene W. "Foster Care Review· A Critique of Concept and Method," Journal of Social Welfare V, 2 (Summer 1978) pp.25-34.
23. Maluccio, Anthony N. "Foster Family Care Revisited: Problems and Prospects", Public Welfare XXXI, 2 (Spring 1973), p.13.
24. "Promoting Competence Through Life Experiences," in Social Work Practice: People and Environments, Carel B. Germain, editor. New York: Columbia University Press, 1979, pp. 282-302.
25. Maluccio, Anthony N., and Sinanoglu, Paula Armbruster, editors. The Challenge of Parntership: Working with Parents of Children in Foster Care, New York: Child Welfare League of America, in press.
26. Meisels, Joseph F., and Loeb, Martin B. "Unanswered Questions About Foster Care," Social Service Review XXX, 3 (September 1956), pp. 239-246.
27. Murphy, H.B.M., "Predicting Duration of Foster Care," Child Welfare XLVII, 2 (February 1968), pp. 76-84.
28. Pike, Victor, et al. Permanent Planning for Children in Foster Care: A Handbook for Social Workers. Washington, DC: US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1977. Publication No. (OHDS) 78-30124, p.1.
29. Poertner, John, and Rapp, Charles A. "Information System Design in Foster Care," Social Work XXV, 2 (March 1980), pp. 114-119.
30. Regional Research Institute for Human Services. Barriers to Planning for Children in Foster Care, Portland, OR: Regional Research Institute for Human Services, 1976.
31. Schaefer, C.E., "The Need for 'Psychological Parents' by Children in Residential Treatment," Child Care Quarterly VI, 4 (Winter 1977), pp. 288-299.
32. Shermann, E.A., Neuman, R.; and Shyne, A. Children Adrift in Foster Care. New York: Child Welfare League of America, 1973, pp.98.
33. Sisto, Grace W. "An Agency Design for Permanency Planning in Foster Care," Child Welfare LIX, 2 (February 1980), pp. 103-111.
34. Stein, Theodore J., and Gambrill, Eileen D. "Facilitating Decision-Making in Foster Care: The Alameda Project, " Social Service Review LI, 3 (September 1977), pp. 503-513.
35. Stein, Theodore, J.; Gambrill, Eileen D.; and Wiltse, Kermit T. Children in Foster Homes —— Achieving Continuity of Care. New York: Praeger, 1978.
36. Eiltse, K.T., and Gambrill, Eileen D. "Foster Care, 1973: A Reappraisal, "Public Welfare XXXII, 1 (Winter 1974) pp 7 - 14.