



Rhode Island Department of Children, Youth & Families

**Rhode Island Family Care Community Partnerships
Semi-annual Report
CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters Data
July 1 to December 31, 2012
East Bay**

**Rhode Island Department of Children, Youth & Families
January 2013**

**Rhode Island Family Care Community Partnerships Semi-annual Report
CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters
East Bay**


Introduction

The Rhode Island Department of Children Youth & Families presents the Rhode Island Family Care Community Partnership semi-annual report, Calendar Year 2012 3rd and 4th Quarters. The report provides summary data on east bay (EB) families opened to the FCCP from July 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012.

I. Characteristics of Active Families

The EB Family Care Community Partnerships (FCCP) had 164 families active during the CY12 3rd and 4th quarters (active defined as opened at least 1 day or greater during the quarter). The total number of children served by the FCCP during these 2 quarters was 184. A “target” child is identified within a family to allow for a single family record. A family may have more than one child receiving supports and/or services in the FCCP. Figure 1 shows that the families by FCCP disposition.


Figure 1: Percentage of EB Families by FCCP Disposition, CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters



Data Source: RI Family Information System (RIFIS): FCCP Open/Close page.

Figure 2 shows the race of the target child. Forty two percent are Caucasian/White followed by 10 percent African American/Black. Twenty two percent of children are identified as “Other”. Fifty seven percent of the children identified as “Other” are of Hispanic origin.


Figure 2: Race of Target Child in EB FCCP, CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS Demographics page.

Four percent of the active children in CY12 3rd and 4th quarters identified as being of Hispanic origin.


Figure 3: Hispanic Origin of Target Child in EB FCCP, CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS Demographics page. Thirteen percent of the 164 active families had missing data.

Figure 4 shows the average and median age of the child. The median age of the child has remained consistent at age 7.


Figure 4: Average and Median Age of Target Child in EB FCCP, CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS Demographics page.

Figure 5 shows the primary language of target children. Eight four percent of the children speak English as their first language. The second language spoken by target children is Spanish (3.0%).

Figure 5: Primary Language of Target Child in EB FCCP, CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS Demographics page.

III. Eligibility Criteria

There are three FCCP eligibility categories. A family may be eligible due to more than one eligibility criteria. Figure 6 shows the percent of FCCP families by their eligibility criteria. Over three-quarters of the children are at risk of child abuse or neglect.

Figure 6: Percent of EB FCCP Families by Eligibility Criteria, CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters




Data Source: RIFIS Assessments/Forms Tab>Intake 1A.

FCCP Intake 1A was completed during July 1 to December 31, 2012. The numbers are not mutually exclusive because the end user can check all that apply.

IV. Response Priority: Response severity among families and face-to-face contact time by Quarter

Figure 7 shows the percentage of families broken down by their respective response priority/category at the time of intake. The greatest proportion of active families was classified as “routine” rather than emergency or urgent within response priority (response severity). This trend has been consistent across quarters since the FCCP inception.


Figure 7: Percent of EB FCCP Families by Response Priority, CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS FCCP Open/Close page.

Each of the 3 DCYF severity-level response categories (Emergency, Urgent, and Routine) has a corresponding first face-to-face contact response time as defined in the FCCP Practice Standards. The largest proportion of CPS referrals is classified as routine. The median length of time to make a face-to-face visit with a family identified as routine was 10 days. Figure 8 displays data on the adherence to the FCCP standards for first face-to-face contact with family according to severity-level response category.

Figure 8: Average & median length of time (hours) to first face to face contact with family by Response Priority, CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS FCCP Open/Close page.

V. Median and Average Length of Time in FCCP

Table 1 displays data on the median and average length of time families who transitioned from the FCCP during the two quarters. The median length of time in the third and fourth quarters of CY12 was 6.1 months. The data is based on date opened to the FCCP to FCCP close/transition.

Table 1: Median and Average Length of Time in the FCCP

	CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters (N=92)
Median:	183.0
Average:	201.5

Data Source: RIFIS. Data based on number of families closed to a FCCP during July 1 to December 31, 2012.

Table 2 shows the median and average length of time a family spends with an agency. This table only includes families that have transitioned from the FCCP.

Table 2: Median and Average Length of Time in the Agency

	CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters (N=70)
Median:	212.0
Average:	228.3

Data Source: RIFIS. Data based on number of families closed to a FCCP during July 1 to December 31, 2012.

VII. FCCP Referral Source

Table 3 displays the percent of DCYF Child Protective and Intake referrals made to the FCCPs. Consistent with previous quarters, DCYF indicated investigation remains the greatest proportion of referral source among these three referral categories.

Table 3: Percent of DCYF Referral Sources, CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters

	CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters (N=164)
DCYF: Indicated Investigation	32.3%
DCYF: CPI Request for Services	11.0%
DCYF: Intake ISR	1.25

Data Source: RIFIS FCCP Open/Close page.

IX. Number of Team Meeting Occurrences by Quarter

Table 4 presents the number of team meeting occurrences. The table includes children/youth that were open to the FCCP for 30 days or greater as a mechanism to potentially reduce the number of children/youth who would be closed to the FCCP and have insufficient time to have a family team meeting occur.

Table 4: Number of FCCP Team Meetings, by FCCP region, CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters

	East Bay	Northern RI	Urban Core	West Bay	State
Number of Team Meetings	177	67	257	59	560
Child/Youth open to FCCP 30 days or greater*	151	249	582	233	1215

Data Source: RIFIS Consumer Assessment Responses by Program Report which is pulling data from the Assessments/Forms tab > Team Meeting form. * Child/Youth are those that were open to FCCP for more than 30 days. Some of the children/youth included in these numbers may have closed prior to the time a team meeting occurring. Further analysis will be conducted.

X . Outcomes**FCCP Close Reason – Differences by the Close Reason**

Table 5 presents data on the FCCP close/transition reasons. Forty nine percent of the families who closed during the last two quarters of CY12 completed their Wrap goals.

Table 5: Top 10 FCCP close reasons, CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters

FCCP Close Reason	CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters (N=92)
Team agrees Wrap goals have been met*	48.9%
Family declined service	18.5%
Unable to contact family	9.8%
Triaged and referred Out	9.8%
Family withdrew without notice	3.3%
Team agrees Wrap goals were not met **	2.2%
Target child opened to DCYF and removed in home	2.2%
Target child opened to DCYF and remained in home	1.1%
Transfer child to another FCCP	1.1%
Change in target child	1.1%

Data Source: RIFIS FCCP Open/Close page. * The family met partial/most/all goals in any of the 4 phases of Wrap. **The goals were not met in any of the 4 phases of Wrap.

Table 6 presents data on the top close reasons by referral source categories. Amongst the 5 referral sources, the percent of families in the FCCP with a “positive” close reason of “team agrees the Wrap goals met” comprise the largest proportion of close reasons in the 3rd and 4th quarters.

Table 6: Percent of FCCP Top 5 close reasons by 5 referral source categories, CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters

FCCP Close Reason (N=83)	Referral Source				
	DCYF	YDC (DCYF)	Self-Referral	School	Other
Team agrees Wrap goals met	30.1%	2.4%	13.3%	1.2%	8.4%
Family declined service	8.4%	1.2%	2.5%	1.2%	7.2%
Unable to contact family	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.0%
Triaged and referred out	4.8%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	4.8%
Family withdrew without notice	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	2.5%

Data Source: RIFIS FCCP Open/Close page. Data based on number of families closed to a FCCP during July 1 to December 31, 2012. “Other” is a combination of 16 referral source categories.

Table 7 presents data on FCCP top close reasons by 4 Referral Sources. DCYF: Two referral sources, DCYF: Indicated Investigation and Self-Referral had the largest proportion of “positive” close reason of “Team agrees wrap goals met”. DCYF: CPI Request for Services had the highest proportion of “unable to reach family”.

Table 7: Percent of FCCP Top 5 close reasons by 4 Referral Sources, CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters

	DCYF: Indicated Investigation	DCYF: CPI Request for Services	DCYF: Intake ISR	Self-Referral
Team agrees Wrap goals met	25.3%	3.6%	1.2%	13.3%
Family declined service	1.2%	7.2%	0.0%	2.4%
Unable to contact family	3.6%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Triaged and referred out	4.8%	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%
Family withdrew without notice	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%

Data source: RIFIS FCCP Open/Close page. Data based on number of families closed to a FCCP during July 1 to December 31, 2012.

Table 8 presents data on families with a close reason reportedly as “opened to DCYF”. Child opened to DCYF refers to opening to DCYF Family Service Unit or DCYF juvenile probation.

Table 8: Percent of FCCP families with Close Reason reported as “Opened to DCYF”, CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters

	CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters
Child opened to DCYF	5.4%

Data Source: RIFIS FCCP Open/Close page. Data based on number of families closed to a FCCP during July 1 to December 31, 2012. Open to DCYF defined as to DCYF FSU or DCYF probation assigned or YDC.

XI. Functional Assessments

In addition to reasons for the family transition or closing as an outcome measure, functional assessments such as the North Carolina Family Assessment, among others, inform as to whether the family has made family functional improvement as it relates to the Wrap model approach.

Since the inception of the FCCP’s, the completion of the NCFAS has been low. The last two quarters of CY2012, however, indicates that 80.6% of children who were opened more than 45 days to an agency having a NCFAS baseline completed. Eighty six percent of the children who closed/transitioned between July 1 to December 31, 2012 and were open for greater than 45 days to an agency had a baseline and transition NCFAS.

Ages & Stages and Ohio Scales

In addition to the NCFAS, the Ages and Stages Questionnaire and the Ohio Scales are two age dependent assessments whose completion rates remains low. Of those children who were open for greater than 45 days to an agency and were under the age of 5, only 6.7% had a baseline ASQ. Three percent of children who were open for greater than 45 days to an agency and were older than 5 had a baseline Ohio Scales Parent Rating.

Table 9 provides data on the average number of days to complete the NCFAS from family opening to an agency. The FCCP standards for completing a baseline NCFAS is 45 days.

Table 9: Average Number of days for NCFAS completion, CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters

	CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters
Average number of days to complete NCFAS baseline	17.0

Data Source: RIFIS. Calculation is determined from the agency intake start date.

NCFAS Outcomes, CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters

A 6 point scale is used to rate families ranging from “serious problem (-3)” to “clear strength (+2)”. Table 10 shows the percent of ratings in each NCFAS domain at intake and transition. Families appear to be improving in each of the domain areas.


Table 10: Percent of ratings in each NCFAS domain at intake and discharge (N=55)

	Serious Problem (-3)	Moderate Problem (-2)	Mild Problem (-1)	Baseline/Adequate (0)	Mild Strength (+1)	Clear Strength (+2)
Environment						
<i>Intake</i>	0.0	7.3	9.1	45.5	20.0	18.2
<i>Transition</i>	0.0	3.6	3.6	43.6	25.5	23.6
Parental Capabilities						
<i>Intake</i>	0.0	0.0	19.2	28.8	30.8	21.2
<i>Transition</i>	0.0	1.9	11.1	24.1	37.0	25.9
Family Interactions						
<i>Intake</i>	1.9	7.4	13.0	35.2	29.6	13.0
<i>Transition</i>	1.8	3.6	7.3	40.0	30.9	16.4
Family Safety						
<i>Intake</i>	0.0	3.8	18.9	41.5	20.8	15.1
<i>Transition</i>	0.0	0.0	7.3	41.8	30.9	20.0
Child Well-Being						
<i>Intake</i>	1.8	5.5	14.5	45.5	21.8	10.9
<i>Transition</i>	0.0	1.8	7.3	43.6	34.5	12.7
Social/Community Life						
<i>Intake</i>	0.0	1.9	5.7	62.3	15.1	15.1
<i>Transition</i>	0.0	1.9	3.7	51.9	22.2	20.4
Self-Sufficiency						
<i>Intake</i>	1.8	1.8	9.1	41.8	27.3	18.2
<i>Transition</i>	1.8	1.8	3.6	49.1	21.8	21.8
Family Health						
<i>Intake</i>	0.0	11.1	14.8	37.0	18.5	18.5
<i>Transition</i>	0.0	9.3	7.4	42.6	22.2	18.5

Data Source: RIFIS Child and Family Functional Assessments – 01 NCFAS report.

Figure 9 shows the amount of change a family experiences from intake to transition in each of the NCFAS domains. For example, a family received a “-2” rating in the Environment domain at intake and at transition they received a “-1” rating. This change shows up as a positive change in the figure below. While a majority of the families did not experience any change from intake to transition, over two thirds of the families maintained positive scores from baseline to transition, ranging from 63.3% to 74.5%. Significant positive changes were found in all domains, ranging from 18.9 to 29.8%. A small number of families experienced negative changes in each of the domain areas, ranging from 3.7% to 6.9%.

Figure 9: Percent of Families Showing Change in NCFAS Ratings, (N=55)




Data Source: RIFIS

XII. FCCP Intake Data: Intake Data during July 1 to December 31, 2012. Additional Child and Family Characteristics

The following figures show information taken from intakes conducted during July 1 to December 31, 2012. There were 74 intakes completed during these two quarters. The 164 families who are reported on in this report and were open to the FCCP during CY12 1st and 2nd quarters may have had their intake to the FCCP prior to July 1, 2012 and would not be reflected in the following figures.

Figure 10 shows the family structure of the target child. Over 50 percent of the households are headed by single females.


Figure 10: Family Structure of Target Child in FCCP, CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS Summary of FCCP Intake Report. This is not representative of the 164 families presented in this report because some intakes were completed prior to CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters.

Figure 11 shows the presenting concerns of the target child. Over fifty percent of the children indicated mental/behavioral health as a concern (52.7%), followed closely by stressful life events (43.2%).

Figure 11: Percent of Presenting Concerns of Target Child in FCCP, CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters




Data Source: RIFIS Assessments/Forms tab > Intake 1A.

FCCP Intake 1A was completed during July 1, to December 31, 2012. The numbers are not mutually exclusive because the end user can indicate up to five presenting concerns.

Figure 12 shows the caregiver/family concerns presented at intake. Fifty five percent had mental health concerns, followed by 46 percent who had stressful life events.

Figure 12: Percent of Caregiver/Family Presenting Concerns in FCCP, CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS Assessments/Forms tab > Intake 1A.


FCCP Intake 1A was completed during July 1, to December 31, 2012. The numbers are not mutually exclusive because the end user can indicate up to five presenting concerns.

XIII. Families who re-enter the FCCP

Of the 164 families that were active from July 1 to December 31, 2012, 20.8% of the families had previously received services from a FCCP. The following figures provide a snapshot of who these families are.

Figure 13 shows the average and median age of the target child. The median age of families previously served by a FCCP is slightly higher than the median age of the active population of the last two quarters of CY12.


Figure 13: Median and Average Age of Target Child, CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters (N=27)



Data Source: RIFIS Demographics page.

Figure 14 shows the top 5 referral sources for families who re-entered the FCCP. Thirty seven percent of the families were a DCYF indication investigation referral and 26 percent were self referred.

Figure 14: Top 3 Referral Sources, CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters (N=27)



Data Source: RIFIS FCCP Open/Close page.

Table 11 shows the close reasons of families previously served by a FCCP. These close reasons represent the Fifty percent of families transitioned from a FCCP with a positive reason of completing Wrap.

Table 11: FCCP Close Reasons

FCCP Close Reasons	(N=6)
Team agrees Wrap completed	50.0%
FCCP declined to serve family	16.7%
Team agrees Wrap Goals were not met	16.7%
Target child opened to DCYF FSU and/or probation	16.7%

Data Source: RIFIS FCCP Open/Close page.

Table 12 shows the NCFAS ratings from baseline to transition for families previously served by a FCCP.


Table 12: Percent of Ratings in Each NCFAS Domain at Intake and Discharge (N=18)

	Serious Problem (-3)	Moderate Problem (-2)	Mild Problem (-1)	Baseline/Adequate (0)	Mild Strength (+1)	Clear Strength (+2)
Environment						
<i>Intake</i>	11.1	0.0	11.1	66.7	11.1	0.0
<i>Transition</i>	22.2	0.0	0.0	22.2	55.6	0.0
Parental Capabilities						
<i>Intake</i>	16.7	16.7	16.7	44.4	5.6	0.0
<i>Transition</i>	33.3	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0
Family Interactions						
<i>Intake</i>	5.6	16.7	33.3	33.3	11.1	0.0
<i>Transition</i>	0.0	33.3	22.2	11.1	33.3	0.0
Family Safety						
<i>Intake</i>	18.8	12.5	25.0	43.8	0.0	0.0
<i>Transition</i>	22.2	0.0	22.2	33.3	22.2	0.0
Child Well-Being						
<i>Intake</i>	5.6	11.1	44.4	22.2	11.1	5.6
<i>Transition</i>	11.1	0.0	44.4	33.3	11.1	0.0
Social/Community Life						
<i>Intake</i>	0.0	5.9	29.4	47.1	17.6	0.0
<i>Transition</i>	11.1	11.1	11.1	44.4	22.2	0.0
Self-Sufficiency						
<i>Intake</i>	16.7	22.2	27.8	27.8	5.6	0.0
<i>Transition</i>	11.1	11.1	11.1	55.6	11.1	0.0
Family Health						
<i>Intake</i>	0.0	16.7	38.9	27.8	16.7	0.0
<i>Transition</i>	0.0	0.0	33.3	44.4	11.1	11.1

Data Source: RIFIS Child and Family Functional Assessments -01 NCFAS Report.

Figure 15 shows the amount of change a family experiences from intake to transition in each of the NCFAS domains. While a majority of the families did not experience any change from intake to transition, significant positive changes were found in all domains, ranging from 14.3% to 71.4%. A small number of families experienced negative changes in each of the domain areas, ranging from 0.0% to 28.6%.

Figure 15: Percent of Families Showing Change in NCFAS Ratings, (N= 7)




Data Source: RIFIS

XIV. Family Support Partners

During the first two quarters of 2012, 39 (17.3 %) of the active children had a Family Support Partner (FSP). . The following figures/tables compare families with and without a FSP.


Figure 16 shows response priority by FSP. There is little difference in the response categories.

Figure 16: Response Priority by FSP, CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS FCCP Open/Close page.

Figure 17: FCCP Eligibility by FSP, CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS Assessments and Forms tab > Intake 1A.

Table 13 shows the average and median length of time a child/family served by a FCCP. Children who worked with a FSP spent more time in the FCCP then children who did not have a FSP.

Table 13: Median and Average Length of Time in FCCP

	FSP (N=39)	No FSP (N=125)
Median	154.0	146.0
Average	174.8	162.1

Data Source: RIFIS

Table 14 shows the close reasons for families with and without a FSP. Forty four percent of families who worked with a FSP transitioned from a FCCP with a positive reason of completing Wrap compared to 29.4% of families who did not have a FSP. Seventeen percent of families without a FSP could not be contacted and 10.5% declined to be served.

Table 14: Top 5 FCCP Close Reasons, CY12 3rd and 4th Quarters

FCCP Close Reason	FSP (N=14)	No FSP (N=78)
Team agrees Wrap goals were met	57.1%	47.4%
Unable to contact family	14.3%	9.0%
Family declined service	7.1%	20.5%
Target child opened to DCYF and remained in home	7.1%	0.0%
Triaged and referred out	0.0%	11.5%

Data Source: RIFIS FCCP Open/Close page.