


Stanislaus Collaborative - FDM Data Report
Data as of July 2016
By
Ignacio A. Navarro Ph.D.¹

During the March 2012- July 1st 2016 period the Stanislaus Collaborative completed 5,762 assessments with 4,048 families using the FDM². This report presents the data collected in the FDM on these Families. The first section describes the demographic characteristics and baseline scores for families receiving first assessments in all agencies in the Stanislaus Collaborative. The second section presents the families’ progress on 23 indicators of wellbeing from the first to second and third assessments. The third section presents conclusions at the collaborative level and the fourth section presents the same data disaggregated by agency.

1. Family Characteristics


Between March 1st 2012 and June 2016, 4,048 families received an FDM baseline assessment at an agency in the Stanislaus Collaborative. About 54% of the families that



received a first assessment reported a Hispanic or Latino ethnicity; 34% reported being of White/Caucasian (non Hispanic) descent; 5% identified as African American, 1.4% identified as Asian/Pacific islander, 1% reported being of

Native American descent, and 5% of another or a mix of ethnicities (Figure 1).

As shown in figure 2, about 97% of the families reported having at least one child (0 to 18 years old) at the time of the first assessment; about 20% reported having 4 or more children, 23% reported having 3 children and 54% reported having 1 or 2 children. Figure 2 presents the detailed distribution of number children (0 to 18 years of old) for the 4,048 families receiving a first assessment. Aggregating all the




¹ Ignacio Navarro is an Associate Professor in the Department of Health, Human Services & Public Policy at California State University - Monterey Bay

² Although there were 4,062 first assessments in the data, 14 were not used in the analysis because they were deactivated with the stated reason that they were “duplicates” or added by “mistake”/ “error”.

reported children, the collaborative provided services for 9,794 children under 19 years of age within the 4,048 families it served.

In terms of household type, about 37% of families reported having a two-parent household, 50% identified themselves as single Mothers, 12% reported being a single




father and about 1% reported being from a single grandparent or two grandparent household (figure 3).

Every case that receives an FDM assessment participates in a dialogue with a caseworker to assess the family's strengths and challenges at the time of

the assessment. The Stanislaus Collaborative uses 23 indicators to assess wellbeing. Each indicator is an ordinal measure reflecting a family's situation relative to that dimension of wellbeing. Families can be rated as "in crisis"; "at risk"; "stable"; and "self sufficient" depending on their situation at the time of the assessment. Indicators rated as "stable" or "self-sufficient" are considered strengths that can be leveraged to address the challenge areas on indicators rated as "in crisis" or "at risk." Figure 4 presents the percentage of families that report being "stable" or "self-sufficient" in each of the 23 indicators used by the Stanislaus Collaborative.


As figure 4 shows, only about 37% of the families served by the agencies in the Collaborative have score of "stable" or "self-sufficient" in the indicator of "Adult Education" at the time of the first assessment. Additionally, only about 48% are at the "stable" or "self-sufficient" level in the indicator of "Employment" and 66% on the indicator of "Community Resource Knowledge". Other indicators with relatively lower numbers of families rated as "stable" or "self sufficient" levels are those of "Basic Expenses" (71%); "Clothing" (77%), "Support System" (79%), and "Budgeting" (81%).

Figure 4: Percent of families at stable or self sufficient level on first assessment by indicator



2. Second and third assessments

Out of the 4,048 families that received a first assessment by July 2016, 33% (1,318) received a second assessment and 7% (289) received a third assessment by the date these data were downloaded (July 1st, 2016). As figure 5 presents, of all the families that received a first assessment, 51% did not receive a second assessment and were de-




activated, the other 49% went on to receive a second assessment or are still active in their case management.

The top 3 stated reasons for deactivation of cases were, “Family met goals” or “Completed case management” (35%), and “lack of participation” (34%). The rest


involved various reasons including “clients moving out of the area” or agencies “not being able to contact clients”.

Families that continued in the program and eventually received a second assessment were evaluated on the 23 FDM indicators of wellbeing. Their progress from first to second assessment are presented in figure 6. The results presented in the figure show the percentage of cases at stable or self sufficient level at first and second assessments only for families that had at least 2 assessments.



As figure 6 presents, cases that had at least 2 assessments, as a group, show significant improvements in many indicators between their first and second assessments. The greatest gains in the percentage of cases that scored at stable or self-sufficient on the second assessment when compared to the first assessment were observed in the indicators of “Community Resource Knowledge” “Basic Expenses” and “Employment” (with differences of 27; 15; and 14 percentage points respectively). For the indicators of “Clothing”, “Budgeting” and “Support Systems” the gains were also significant (12; 10; and 9 percentage points respectively). All these differences were statistically significant at the .05 level using a pooled test of difference in proportions³.

Figure 7: Percent of families at "Stable" or "Self Sufficient" level on first through third assessment (for families with 3+ assessments)



³ The star next to the indicator name in figures 6 and 7 shows if the difference between the baseline and last assessment was statistically significant at the .05 level

Figure 7 presents the progress only for families that received at least 3 assessments. As the figure shows, “Community Resource Knowledge”, “Clothing” and “Employment” showed the greatest gains between first and third assessment (with differences of 28; 15; and 14 percentage points respectively). Other indicators showing gains larger than 9 percentage points from first to third assessment are in those of “Support Systems”, “Basic Expenses”, “Budgeting”, “Access to Transportation”, “Appropriate Development” and “Parenting Skills”.

3. Conclusion

In Conclusion, the data in this report shows that by July 2016, The Collaborative served a large group of families facing significant economic challenges and lack of connection to community resources. 4,048 families received a first assessment and 1,318 families received a second assessment. The progress families achieved between first and second assessment was remarkable in several indicators including connection to local community resources and basic economic relief. The progress was even greater for families that continued into a third assessment.

4. Agency level data

The Stanislaus collaborative is comprised by 4 agencies. Table 1 presents all the agencies and the assessments they conducted by July 1st 2016. The client demographic characteristics vary across agencies in terms of race/ethnicity, household type, and number of children, as shown in tables 2, 3 and 4. In addition, the families served in the Collaborative presented varied needs across different agencies. As table 5 presents, the percentage of families that arrived to the agencies at a stable or self-sufficient level varied by indicator across the different agencies. Finally, as table 6 presents, agencies achieved different levels of gains between first and second assessments.

Table 1: Number of Assessments by Agency

Agency	Assessments					Total
	1	2	3	4	5+	
Aspiranet Turlock FRC	201	34	7	1	0	243
Center for Human Services	747	258	48	12	15	1,080
Parent Resource Center	1,478	675	138	30	14	2,335
Sierra Vista Child & Family Services	1,622	351	96	26	9	2,104
Total	4,048	1,318	289	69	38	5,762

Table 2: Distribution of Cases' Race/Ethnicity by agency

Agency	African American	Hispanic/Latino	Asian/Pacific Islander	White	Native American	Mixed/Other	N
Aspiranet Turlock FRC (%)	5.47	50.75	1.49	38.31	1.49	2.49	201
Center for Human Services (%)	2.95	52.74	0.4	39.76	0.54	3.61	747
Parent Resource Center (%)	6.63	53.45	1.83	33.36	1.01	3.72	1,478
Sierra Vista Child & Family (%)	4.01	55.86	1.48	31.38	0.74	6.54	1,622
All	4.84	54.15	1.41	33.99	0.84	4.77	4,048

Table 3: Distribution of Cases' Household Type by Agency

Agency	Household type							N
	Single GrandPa	Single Mother	Two Grandparent	Single Father	Single GrandMa	Two Parent	Other	
Aspiranet Turlock FRC (%)	0	54.73	0.5	7.46	0	37.31	0	201
Center for Human Services (%)	0	58.37	0.67	12.45	0.8	27.71	0	747
Parent Resource Center (%)	0.07	50.81	0.07	13.19	0.34	35.52	0	1,478
Sierra Vista Child & Family (%)	0.06	44.76	0.12	11.28	0.49	43.09	0.18	1,622
All	0.05	49.98	0.22	12.01	0.47	37.2	0.07	4,048

Table 4: distribution of cases' reported number of children by agency

Agency	Number of Children 0-18						N
	0	1	2	3	4	5+	
Aspiranet Turlock FRC (%)	1.99	28.86	30.35	21.39	9.45	7.96	201
Center for Human Services (%)	2.28	24.63	27.58	23.56	15.39	6.56	747
Parent Resource Center (%)	5.89	29.16	26.32	20.57	10.08	7.98	1,478
Sierra Vista Child & Family (%)	1.05	23.92	29.16	25.52	13.32	7.03	1,622
All	3.09	26.21	27.89	23.15	12.33	7.34	4,048

Table 5: Percentage of clients at Stable or Self-Sufficient status at time of first assessment by agency⁴

Indicator	Aspiranet Turlock FRC	Center for Human Services	Parent Resource Center	Sierra Vista Child & Family	All
Access to transportation	88.9	86.9	85.9	93.4	89.2
Adult education	44.6	49.5	27.9	36.2	35.9
Appropriate development	86.0	82.4	94.2	91.8	90.6
Basic expenses	71.0	56.7	73.6	77.5	71.9
Budgeting	76.0	76.2	79.8	83.8	80.6
Child care	75.7	90.5	90.0	86.0	87.7
Child health insurance	89.1	96.1	95.6	95.6	95.4
Clothing	67.7	76.4	77.3	77.4	76.7
Community resources knowledge	62.3	55.0	67.1	70.7	66.1
Emotional well being	77.5	81.7	83.3	87.8	84.5
Employment	40.4	49.5	48.1	47.7	47.8
Family communication skills	77.0	77.0	84.6	87.6	84.1
Health services	91.4	96.0	93.6	95.1	94.5
Home environment	91.5	96.2	95.8	97.2	96.2
Nurturing	90.7	93.5	94.4	95.6	94.5
Nutrition	91.4	93.8	98.3	98.1	97.0
Parenting skills	84.6	89.1	87.7	92.9	90.0
Presence abuse	88.7	92.3	93.6	94.2	93.4
Risk of emotional / sexual abuse	86.0	86.2	90.3	91.7	90.0
School attendance	85.5	93.1	93.6	95.1	93.7
Stability of home shelter	80.9	84.4	82.0	86.9	84.3
Supervision	97.8	98.9	98.8	98.6	98.7
Support system	72.3	77.3	76.3	82.4	78.7
	201	747	1,478	1,622	4,048

⁴ For simplicity, the number of cases reported at the bottom of the table refer to all clients in the agency that received a first assessment. The N in the table and the N used to calculate the percentages may differ for indicators that were used for only some and not all of the families.

Table 6: Percentage of clients at Stable or Self-Sufficient status by assessment and agency⁵

Indicator	Aspiranet Turlock FRC		Center for Human Services		Parent Resource Center		Sierra Vista Child & Family	
	1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st	2nd
Access to transportation	88.2	100	91.1	93.4	84.7	91.4	93.2	95.7
Adult education	42.4	45.5	57.4	63.1	27.0	30.8	30.2	30.7
Appropriate development	93.8	91.2	84.8	92.6	94.6	97.7	90.2	92.7
Basic expenses	78.8	88.2	50.4	81.4	72.3	85.9	79.7	84.0
Budgeting	85.3	97.1	75.6	94.6	80.7	89.6	83.5	90.3
Child care	81.8	96.0	93.4	97.2	89.7	94.3	82.8	90.9
Child health insurance	94.1	100	96.4	99.6	95.7	98.3	95.9	97.7
Clothing	58.8	85.3	74.8	88.0	78.2	91.1	71.8	81.5
Community resources knowledge	58.8	94.1	60.1	93.4	67.3	95.7	70.4	90.3
Emotional well being	67.6	85.3	86.0	92.6	83.0	93.5	87.7	88.3
Employment	28.6	40.0	56.0	68.2	51.4	66.8	45.0	57.6
Family communication skills	79.4	91.2	81.8	89.1	83.7	89.9	88.6	89.7
Health services	94.1	100	98.4	99.2	92.9	97.0	95.4	97.4
Home environment	94.1	97.1	96.5	97.7	96.9	97.6	96.3	98.6
Nurturing	87.5	100	95.9	98.4	94.8	98.9	96.5	96.3
Nutrition	93.9	97.0	93.5	96.3	98.4	99.4	97.1	99.1
Parenting skills	84.8	88.2	90.7	96.3	86.3	98.2	94.4	96.0
Presence abuse	91.2	91.2	95.7	96.1	94.4	96.7	95.2	96.9
Risk of emotional / sexual abuse	81.3	84.4	87.3	94.6	89.7	96.0	92.8	96.0
School attendance	100.0	97.0	93.6	95.2	93.1	97.0	95.1	97.6
Stability of home shelter	88.2	82.4	85.7	94.6	83.9	87.9	88.9	92.3
Supervision	100.0	90.9	99.6	98.8	98.5	99.4	98.8	99.7
Support system	64.7	88.2	84.1	91.5	76.1	87.9	82.1	83.8
N	34		258		675		351	

⁵ For simplicity, the number of cases reported at the bottom of the table refer to all clients in the agency that received a second assessment. The N in the table and the N used to calculate the percentages may differ for indicators that were used with only some and not all of the families.