



**Rhode Island Family Care Community Partnerships
Semi-annual Report
CY14 3rd and 4th Quarters Data**

**Rhode Island Department of Children, Youth & Families
Data and Evaluation Unit
January 2015**

Rhode Island Family Care Community Partnerships Semi-annual Report CY14 3rd and 4th Quarters


Introduction

The Rhode Island Department of Children Youth & Families presents the Rhode Island Family Care Community Partnership semi-annual report, Calendar Year 2014 3rd and 4th Quarters. The report provides summary data on families opened to the FCCP from July 1 2014 through December 31, 2014.

I. Characteristics of Active Families


The Family Care Community Partnerships (FCCPs) had 1058 families active during the CY14 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 1870. 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 proportion of families in the respective FCCPs with the largest proportion of families in Urban Core.

Figure 1: Percentage of Families Active by FCCP



Data Source: RI Family Information System (RIFIS)


Figure 2: Total Number of Children served by FCCP



Data Source: RIFIS

Figure 3 shows the race of the target child. Twenty seven percent are Caucasian/White followed by 4 percent African American/Black. Over 50 percent of children are identified as “Other”. Of those that were reported as “Other”, 24.1% were of Hispanic origin.


Figure 3: Race of Target Child in FCCP, CY14 3rd and 4th Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS.

Fifteen percent of the active children in CY14 3rd and 4th quarters identified as being of Hispanic origin.


Figure 4: Hispanic Origin of Target Child in FCCP, CY14 3rd and 4th Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS. Eleven percent of the 1058 active families had missing data.

Figure 5 shows the median age of the child. Compared to the previous two years, during this current quarter, the median age of the child dropped to age 7 from age 8.


Figure 5: Median Age of Target Child in FCCP by FCCP, CY14 3rd and 4th Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS.

Figure 6 shows the primary language of target children. Seventy six percent of the children speak English as their first language. The second language spoken by target children is Spanish (10.5 %).

Figure 6: Primary Language of Target Child in FCCP, CY14 3rd and 4th Quarters




Data Source: RIFIS.

III. Eligibility Criteria

There are three FCCP eligibility categories. A family may be eligible due to more than one eligibility criteria. Figure 7 shows the percent of FCCP families by their eligibility criteria during the last 6 quarters. Over three-quarters of the children are at risk of child abuse or neglect.

Figure 7: Percent of FCCP Families by Eligibility Criteria by quarter




Data Source: RIFIS.

Data was taken from FCCP Intake 1A completed in the reported quarters. 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 8 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 8: Percent of FCCP Families by Response Priority, CY14 3rd and 4th Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS.

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 reduced to 7 days from 8 days in the previous two quarters. Figure 9 displays data on the adherence to the FCCP standards for first face-to-face contact with family according to severity-level response category.

Figure 9: Median length of time (hours) to first face to face contact with family by Response Priority, CY14 3rd and 4th Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS

V. Median and Average Length of Time in FCCP

Table 1 displays data on the median and average length of time of families who transitioned from the FCCP during the last 18 months. The median length of time in the third and fourth quarters of CY13 was 4.5 months. The median length of time increased from 3.9 months during the first two quarters of CY14. 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, by quarter

	CY13 3rd and 4th Quarters (N=575)	CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters (N=676)	CY14 3rd and 4th Quarters (N= 478)
Median	81.0	93.0	108.0
Average	124.7	130.3	134.3

Data Source: RIFIS. Data based on number of closed cases during reported quarters. This does not include families whose close reason was “triaged and referred out”, “unable to contact family” and/or “unable to contact family and referred back to DCYF.”

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 and were involved with an agency.

Table 2: Median and Average length of Time in the Agency, by quarter

	CY13 3rd and 4th Quarters (N=478)	CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters (N=420)	CY14 3rd and 4th Quarters (N = 432)
Median	107.5	113.0	94.5
Average	140.4	139.3	126.2

Data Source: RIFIS. Data based on number of closed cases during the reported quarters.

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 to the FCCP, CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters

	CY13 3rd and 4th Quarters (N=1203)	CY14 1st and 2nd Quarters (N=1249)	CY14 3rd and 4th Quarters (N=1058)
DCYF: Indicated Investigation	34.2%	33.3%	35.3 %
DCYF: CPI Request for Services	20.9%	21.1%	18.0 %
DCYF: Intake ISR	5.6%	4.9%	5.4 %

Data Source: RIFIS

Table 4 lists the top 5 referral sources to the FCCP. DCYF referrals make up over half of the referrals followed by self referrals (11.8%) and school (4.8%).

Table 4: Percent of the Top 5 Referral Sources to the FCCP, CY14 3rd and 4th Quarters

	CY14 3rd and 4th Quarters (N= 1058)
DCYF: Indicated Investigation	35.3%
DCYF: CPI Request for Services	18.0%
Self Referral	11.8%
DCYF: Intake ISR	5.4%
School System or Education Agency	4.8%

Data Source: RIFIS

IX. Number of Team Meeting Occurrences by Quarter

Table 5 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 5: Number of FCCP Team Meetings, by FCCP region, CY14 3rd and 4th Quarters

	East Bay	Northern RI	Urban Core	West Bay	State
Number of Team Meetings	360	179	291	186	1016
Child/Youth open to FCCP 30 days or greater*	104	159	364	142	770

Data Source: RIFIS Consumer Assessment Responses by Program. * 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. This also does not include families whose close reason was “triaged and referred out”, “unable to contact family” and/or “unable to contact family and referred back to DCYF.”

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

Table 6 presents data on the FCCP close/transition reasons. The percent of families whose closed/transitioned reason was Wrap completed and goals achieved increased from 44.4% during CY14 1st and 2nd quarters to 45.8% in the last two quarters of CY14. Closed/transition reasons of “Team agrees wrap goals were not met”, “Triaged and referred out”, and “Transfer target child to another FCCP” increased during the last six months of CY14 from the first two quarters of the same year.

Table 6: Percent of the Top 10 FCCP close reasons, by quarter

FCCP Close Reason	CY13 3 rd and 4 th Quarters (N=575)	CY14 1 st and 2 nd Quarters (N=676)	CY14 3 rd and 4 th Quarters (N=584)
Team agrees wrap goals have been met*	44.8%	44.4%	45.5 %
Unable to contact family	13.7%	10.8%	10.1%
Team agrees wrap goals were not met **	7.8%	7.9%	9.8%
Family declined service	10.6%	10.9%	9.2%
Triaged and Referred Out	3.7%	3.1%	7.0%
Other	5.6%	4.0%	3.9%
Family moved out of area	3.1%	4.1%	3.4%
Transfer target child to another FCCP	1.7%	2.7%	2.9%
Target child opened to DCYF and removed from home	2.6%	3.3%	2.6%
Target child opened to DCYF and remained in home	2.8%	3.4%	2.2%

Data Source: RIFIS. * 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. Data based on the number of closed cases during reported quarters.

Families can complete Wrap at any of the 4 stages. Table 7 shows, among those families closed during this quarter, that over twenty percent of the families that met their Wrap goals did so during the “transition” phase of Wrap. Three percent completed partial goals/needs and 18.2% met most/all goals/needs.

Table 7: Among families who closed to the FCCP during CY14, 3rd and 4th Quarters by Wrap phase at time of closure

Phase of Wrap	No/little goals/needs met	Partial goals/needs met	Most/all goals/needs met
Engagement	7.9%	2.7%	3.1%
Planning	1.0%	2.4%	1.4%
Implementation	0.9%	8.9%	5.7%
Transition	0.0%	3.1%	18.2%

Data Source: RIFIS. Data based on the number of closed cases during July 1 to December 31, 2014.

Table 8 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 8: Percent of FCCP Top 5 close reasons by 5 referral source categories, CY14 3rd and 4th Quarters

FCCP Close Reason	Referral Source				
	DCYF	YDC (DCYF)	Self-Referral	School	Other
(N= 476)					
Team agrees Wrap goals have been met*	55.7%	50.0%	51.0%	72.2%	55.1%
Unable to contact family	13.1%	16.7%	12.2%	0.0%	12.4%
Team agrees Wrap goals were not met **	9.9%	16.7%	12.2%	16.7%	14.6%
Family declined service	10.8%	16.7%	12.2%	11.1%	15.7%
Triaged and Referred Out	10.5%	0.0%	12.2%	0.0%	2.2%

Data Source: RIFIS. Data based on the number of closed cases during July 1 to December 31, 2014.

Table 9 presents data on FCCP top close reasons by 4 Referral Sources. All 4 referral sources 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 9: Percent of FCCP Top 5 close reasons by 4 Referral Sources, CY14 3rd and 4th Quarters

(N=315)	DCYF: Indicated Investigation	DCYF: CPI Request for Services	DCYF: Intake ISR	Self-Referral
Team agrees Wrap goals have been met*	56.3%	54.4%	53.8%	51.0%
Unable to contact family	13.2%	13.6%	7.7%	12.2%
Team agrees Wrap goals were not met **	8.6%	14.6%	15.4%	12.2%
Family declined service	9.1%	11.7%	7.7%	12.2%
Other	12.7%	5.8%	15.4%	12.2%

Data source: RIFIS.

Table 10 presents data on cases 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 10: Percent of FCCP families with Close Reason reported as “Opened to DCYF”

	CY13 3 rd and 4 th Quarters	CY14 1 st and 2 nd Quarters	CY14 3 rd and 4 th Quarters
Child opened to DCYF	6.2%	7.1%	6.3%


Data Source: RIFIS. Data based on the number of closed cases during reported quarters. 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.

The last two quarters of CY14, 66.3% of children who were opened more than 45 days to an agency had a NCFAS baseline completed. This is slightly up from the last two quarters, (62.6%). Thirty four percent of the children who closed/transitioned between July 1 to December 31, 2014 and were open for greater than 45 days to an agency had a baseline and transition NCFAS, a decrease from the previous two quarters of CY14, (66%).

Figure 10: Percent of FCCP families that completed NCFAS, at intake and transition



Data Source: RIFIS. Data based on the number of closed cases that were open for greater than 45 days to an agency.

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 age 5 and under, 9.0% had a baseline ASQ. This is a reduction from the previous two quarters in CY2013, (28.3 %). Ten percent of children who were open for greater than 45 days to an agency and were between the ages of 6-18 had a baseline Ohio Scales Parent Rating. This percentage also decreased from the first two quarters of CY14 (21.0%). Table 11 shows the number of completed assessments.

Table 11: Percentage of Completed Assessments for Families Open to an Agency for more than 45 days, CY14 3rd and 4th Quarters

	CY14 3 rd and 4 th Quarters
Ages and Stages Baseline	9.0%
Ohio Scales Baseline - Parent	10.0%

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

Table 12 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 12: Average Number of days for NCFAS completion, CY14 3rd and 4th Quarters

	CY14 3 rd and 4 th Quarters
Average number of days to complete NCFAS baseline	19.5

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

NCFAS Outcomes, CY14 3rd and 4th Quarters

A 6 point scale is used to rate families ranging from “serious problem (-3)” to “clear strength (+2)”. Table 13 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 13: Percent of ratings in each NCFAS domain at intake and discharge (N=210)

	Serious Problem (-3)	Moderate Problem (-2)	Mild Problem (-1)	Baseline/Adequate (0)	Mild Strength (+1)	Clear Strength (+2)
Environment						
<i>Intake</i>	5.7	14.3	15.2	38.1	13.3	12.4
<i>Transition</i>	2.4	6.7	10.0	44.8	20.0	16.2
Parental Capabilities						
<i>Intake</i>	2.9	14.3	18.6	39.0	11.4	13.3
<i>Transition</i>	2.9	8.1	12.4	41.9	18.1	16.7
Family Interactions						
<i>Intake</i>	6.2	14.3	26.7	31.0	14.3	6.7
<i>Transition</i>	5.7	6.7	16.2	35.7	24.8	10.0
Family Safety						
<i>Intake</i>	5.7	14.3	19.0	39.0	8.6	11.4
<i>Transition</i>	4.3	4.8	8.1	51.4	15.2	15.2
Child Well-Being						
<i>Intake</i>	6.7	17.1	21.0	32.4	11.9	9.0
<i>Transition</i>	4.3	8.1	15.2	39.5	20.0	11.9
Social/Community Life						
<i>Intake</i>	1.4	7.6	21.0	45.7	15.2	8.1
<i>Transition</i>	1.9	5.7	12.4	47.1	21.0	11.0
Self-Sufficiency						
<i>Intake</i>	8.6	16.7	19.5	31.9	13.3	9.5
<i>Transition</i>	7.1	9.5	15.7	38.1	19.0	9.5
Family Health						
<i>Intake</i>	7.1	19.0	21.4	28.6	14.8	8.1
<i>Transition</i>	4.3	10.0	18.6	37.1	20.0	9.5

Data Source: RIFIS.

Figure 11 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 63.4% to 76.2%. Significant positive changes were found in all domains, ranging from 20.4% to 32.2%. A small number of families experienced negative changes in each of the domain areas, ranging from 3.4% to 7.7%.

Figure 11: Percent of Families Showing Change in NCFAS Ratings, (N=205)




Data Source: RIFIS.

XII. FCCP Intake Data: Additional Child and Family Characteristics

The following figures show information taken from intakes conducted on the 1058 families who are reported on in this report and were open to the FCCP during CY14 3rd and 4th quarters.

Figure 12 shows the family structure of the target child. Fifty percent of the households are headed by single females.


Figure 12: Family Structure of Target Child in FCCP, CY14 3rd and 4th Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS Summary of FCCP Intake Report.

Figure 13 shows the presenting concerns of the target child. Forty five percent of the children indicated mental/behavioral health as a concern, followed closely by stressful life events (43.4 %).


Figure 13: Percent of Presenting Concerns of Target Child in FCCP, CY14 3rd and 4th Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS Summary of FCCP Intake Report. The numbers are not mutually exclusive because the end user can indicate up to five presenting concerns.

Figure 14 shows the caregiver/family concerns presented at intake. Forty three percent had mental health concerns followed by 43 percent who had stressful life events.

Figure 14: Percent of Caregiver/Family Presenting Concerns in FCCP, CY14 3rd and 4th Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS Summary of FCCP Intake Report. The numbers are not mutually exclusive because the end user can indicate up to five presenting concerns.

Table 14 shows the top 10 activities completed during the first two quarters of CY14. The data reflects the activities of the FSCC, not services children/families received.

Table 14: Top 10 FCCP Activities, CY14 3rd and 4th Quarters

Activities	CY14 3 rd and 4 th Quarters (N=1296)
<i>1013 Families were open 45 more days to an agency during the reporting period.</i>	
FCCP Intake	6.8%
Supplies	6.7%
Food/Groceries	5.5%
Clothing	3.9%
Implementation	3.8%
Recreation (cost) - Identified Child	3.8%
Furnishings/Appliances	3.4%
Housing	3.3%
Case Management Services - Identified Child	3.2%
Supervisor Approval Date-Family Service Plan (FSP)	3.2%


Data Source: RIFIS FCCP Activities Report. The percentage is calculated from the total number of activities recorded during CY14 3rd and 4th quarters.

XIII. Families who re-enter the FCCP

Of the 1058 families that were active from July 1 to December 31, 2014, 17.4% of the families had previously received services from a FCCP. The following figures provide a snapshot of who these families are.

Figure 15 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 first two quarters of CY14.

Figure 15: Median and Mean Age of Target Child Who Re-entered FCCP, CY14 3rd and 4th Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS.

Table 15 shows the top 5 referral sources for families who re-entered the FCCP. Almost 50% of the families were referred by DCYF (Indication investigation or CPI request for services).

Table 15: Top 5 Referral Sources of Families Who Re-entered FCCP, CY14 3rd and 4th Quarters

Referral Source	
DCYF: Indicated Investigation	25.8%
Self-Referral	20.1%
DCYF: CPI Request for Services Self Referral	15.5%
Social Service Agency	7.2%
Other FCCP Organization	6.2%

Data Source: RIFIS.

Table 16 shows the close reasons of families previously served by a FCCP. Over fifty percent of families transitioned from a FCCP with a positive reason of completing Wrap. Eleven percent of families did not meet their Wrap goals and six percent declined services.

Table 16: Top 10 Close Reasons of Families Who Re-entered FCCP, CY14 3rd and 4th Quarters

FCCP Close Reasons	(N=103)
Team agrees Wrap completed	53.5%
Team agrees Wrap goals were not met	11.7%
Family declined service	5.8%
Other	4.9%
Family moved out of area	4.9%
Target child opened to DCYF & removed from home	3.9%
Unable to reach family	3.9%
Target child opened to DCYF & remained in home	3.9%
Triaged & referred out	2.9%
Transfer target child to another FCCP	1.9%

Data Source: RIFIS.

Table 17 shows the NCFAS ratings from baseline to transition for families previously served by a FCCP. The overall scores indicate an improvement over time.


Table 17: Percent of ratings of Families Who Re-entered FCCP in each NCFAS domain at intake and discharge (N=33)

	Serious Problem (-3)	Moderate Problem (-2)	Mild Problem (-1)	Baseline/Adequate (0)	Mild Strength (+1)	Clear Strength (+2)
Environment						
<i>Intake</i>	9.1	12.1	15.2	36.4	18.2	9.1
<i>Transition</i>	6.1	0.0	12.1	48.5	21.2	12.1
Parental Capabilities						
<i>Intake</i>	0.0	12.1	24.2	39.4	12.1	12.1
<i>Transition</i>	0.0	6.1	9.1	57.6	15.2	12.1
Family Interactions						
<i>Intake</i>	3.1	15.6	40.6	21.9	9.4	9.4
<i>Transition</i>	3.1	9.4	25.0	28.1	21.9	12.5
Family Safety						
<i>Intake</i>	6.1	18.2	18.2	42.4	6.1	9.1
<i>Transition</i>	9.1	0.0	3.0	66.7	12.1	9.1
Child Well-Being						
<i>Intake</i>	6.3	18.8	21.9	40.6	9.4	3.1
<i>Transition</i>	6.1	9.1	12.1	48.5	21.2	3.0
Social/Community Life						
<i>Intake</i>	0.0	18.2	27.3	33.3	15.2	6.1
<i>Transition</i>	0.0	9.1	15.2	42.4	27.3	6.1
Self-Sufficiency						
<i>Intake</i>	9.1	9.1	24.2	30.3	18.2	9.1
<i>Transition</i>	9.1	6.1	21.2	33.3	24.2	6.1
Family Health						
<i>Intake</i>	6.1	24.2	21.2	36.4	9.1	3.0
<i>Transition</i>	6.1	12.1	18.2	45.5	12.1	6.1

Data Source: RIFIS.

Figure 16 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 18.2% to 39.4%. A small number of families experienced negative changes in each of the domain areas, ranging from 3.0% to 12.5%.

Figure 16: Percent of Families Who Re-entered FCCP Showing Change in NCFAS Ratings, (N=33)




Data Source: RIFIS.

XIV. Family Support Partners

During the last two quarters of 2014, 26.2% of the active children had a Family Support Partner (FSP). This is an increase from the previous two quarters of CY14, 17.4%. The following figures/tables compare families with and without a FSP.

Figure 17 shows response priority by FSP. There is little difference in the response categories.


Figure 17: Response Priority by FSP, CY14 3rd and 4th Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS.

Figure 18 shows the FCCP eligibility by FSP and there is little difference between the categories.

Figure 18: FCCP Eligibility by FSP, CY14 3rd and 4th Quarters



Data Source: RIFIS.

Table 18 shows the average and median length of time a child/family served by a FCCP. Children who did not work with a FSP spent more time in the FCCP then children who had a FSP.

Table 18: Median and Average Length of Time in FCCP by FSP

	FSP (N=169)	No FSP (N=409)
Median	64.0	89.0
Average	100.4	121.8

Data Source: RIFIS. Data based on families closed to FCCP during July 1 to December 31, 2014. . This does not include families whose close reason was “triaged and referred out”, “unable to contact family” and/or “unable to contact family and referred back to DCYF.”

Table 19 shows the close reasons for families with and without a FSP. Thirty seven percent of families who worked with a FSP transitioned from a FCCP with a positive reason of completing Wrap compared to 45.2% of families who did not have a FSP. Ten percent of families without a FSP could not be contacted and 9.9% declined to be served.

Table 19: Top 10 FCCP close reasons by FSP, CY14 3rd and 4th Quarters

FCCP Close Reason	FSP (N=171)	No FSP (N=413)
Team agrees Wrap goals were met	37.3%	45.2%
Team agrees Wrap goals were not met	11.1%	9.2%
Triaged and Referred Out	11.1%	5.3%
Unable to contact family	10.5%	9.9%
Family declined service	9.9%	9.0%
Other	4.7%	3.6%
Target child opened to DCYF and remained in home	4.7%	3.6%
Family moved out of area	3.5%	3.4%
Target child opened to DCYF and removed in home	1.2%	3.1%
Change in target child	0.7%	1.2%

Data Source: RIFIS. Data based on families closed to FCCP during July 1 to December 31, 2014.