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This Report

• A review of what we have learned in the past 3 years.
• FDM Growth over time
• FDM clients’ strengths and challenges
• Agencies’ strengths and challenges
• Engagement
• Future steps
change over time
(2009-2013)
Collaboratives (2009-2013)

*Year assigned when more than 30 first assessments were entered
**Sacramento collaborative left in 2011
Collaboratives by Size

First assessments (Feb 2013)
Assessments by Year

Number of First Assessments 2009-2013

- 2009: 454
- 2010: 4,651
- 2011: 7,393
- 2012: 11,516
- 2013: 13,110

* 2013 year only has cases up to March

Number of Second Assessments 2009-2013

- 2009: 36
- 2010: 2,590
- 2011: 4,590
- 2012: 6,437
- 2013: 6,930

* Funded by the Office of Child Abuse Prevention*
Follow-up Pattern

Follow up visits as percent of first assessments

- Second: 55%
- Third: 14%
- Fourth: 4%
Distribution of Client’s DR Path by Year

- Path 1
- Path 2
- Path 3
- Non DR

- 2009: 50.9%
- 2010: 71%
- 2011: 60%
- 2012: 60%
- All years: 64%

Funded by the Office of Child Abuse Prevention
Distribution of Clients’ Ethnicity by Year

- **Mixed/Other**
- **Native American**
- **Asian/Pacific Islander**
- **African American**
- **White**
- **Latino/Hispanic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mixed/Other</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Asian/Pacific Islander</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Latino/Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>59.68</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>55.73</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>58.05</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>60.95</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All years</td>
<td>58.29</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clients’ strengths and challenges
A look at the 20 core indicators
Next Evaluation Questions

• Linking FDM to CPS data.
• How do FDM families look like on the CPS (data) side?
• How many FDM families come back to the system?
• Can FDM indicators predict re-referrals?
Overall strengths:

Percent of clients at “stable” or “self sufficient” level by indicator

- Supervision n= 11,028
- Nutrition n= 11,323
- HomeEnvironment n= 12,111
- PresenceAbuse n= 12,104
- Nurturing n= 11,368
- AccessToTransportation n= 12,120
- Appropriatedevelopment n= 10,978
- HealthServices n= 12,113
- ChildHealthInsurance n= 11,224
- ParentingSkills n= 11,427
- RiskOfEmotionalOrSexualAbuse n= 10,828
- StabilityHomeShelter n= 12,108
- EmoWellbeingLifeValue n= 12,111
- FamilyCommunicationSkills n= 12,112
- ChildCare n= 8,512
- Clothing n= 12,113
- SupportSystem n= 12,106
- Budgeting n= 12,111
- CommunityResourcesKnowledge n= 12,122
- Employment n= 9,531
Outcomes Measurement

Outcomes are an important element in family-centered practice; they raise expectations for goal achievement.

An outcome answers the question “What difference did the services delivered to the family make?”
Distributions of Overall Scores by Assessments

*Only clients with 20 indicators are considered*
Change:

Percent of clients at “stable” or “self sufficient” level by indicator
Change:

Percent of clients at “stable” or “self sufficient” level that started “at Risk” or “in crisis” in the first assessment
Client engagement
Our theory of change

Intervention

Family
- Family 1: Participation
- Family 2: Follow empowerment plan
- Family 3: Barriers
- Family 4: Level of support

Worker

Pathway Intervention

Case management activity
Follow Through

- Full participation by family
- Uneven follow through
- No action taken by family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>ALL years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.47</td>
<td>58.61</td>
<td>59.12</td>
<td>64.63</td>
<td>61.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funded by the Office of Child Abuse Prevention
Barriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Family used strategies to overcome barriers</th>
<th>Family identified barriers</th>
<th>Family did not experience any barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>58.82</td>
<td>60.11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>60.11</td>
<td>61.87</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>61.87</td>
<td>58.13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>58.13</td>
<td>59.36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL years</td>
<td>59.36</td>
<td>58.13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Increased all supports
Increased some supports
Same level of support
Less support

Funded by the Office of Child Abuse Prevention
Change by Engagement Level

- SupportSystem n= 732
- Supervision n= 85
- StabilityHomeShelter n= 425
- RiskOfEmotionalOrSexualAbuses n= 571
- PresenceAbuse n= 226
- ParentingSkills n= 398
- Nutrition n= 114
- Nurturing n= 251
- HomeEnvironment n= 204
- HealthServices n= 330
- FamilyCommunicationSkills n= 361
- Employment n= 944
- EmoWellbeingLifeValue n= 571
- CommunityResourcesKnowledge n= 251
- Clothing n= 675
- ChildHealthInsurance n= 361
- ChildCare n= 408
- Budgeting n= 772
- AppropriateDevelopment n= 226
- AccessToTransportation n= 281

- Full participation by family
- Uneven follow through
- No action taken by family
# Engagement Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unsupportive environment</th>
<th>Supportive environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low receptivity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low “buy-in”</td>
<td>Rejecting</td>
<td>Rejecting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High “buy-in”</td>
<td>Evading</td>
<td>Evading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High receptivity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low “buy-in”</td>
<td>Hopeless</td>
<td>Weakly Motivated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High “buy-in”</td>
<td>Defiant</td>
<td>Highly Motivated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Evaluation Questions

• Linking FDM to CPS data.
• How do FDM families look like on the CPS (data) side?
• How many FDM families come back to the system?
• Can FDM indicators predict re-referrals?