



Rhode Island Department of Children, Youth & Families

**Rhode Island Family Care Community Partnerships  
Semi-annual Report  
CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarters Data**

**Rhode Island Department of Children, Youth & Families  
July 2012**

**Rhode Island Family Care Community Partnerships Semi-annual Report  
CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarters**


**Introduction**

The Rhode Island Department of Children Youth & Families presents the Rhode Island Family Care Community Partnership semi-annual report, Calendar Year 2012 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarters. The report provides summary data on families opened to the FCCP from January 1, 2012 through June 30, 2012. This report has changed in two main ways from previous RI FCCP reports. This report combines data from a 6 month time period whereas previous reports presented data on a quarterly basis. Consistent with the change in August 2011 moving to a WRAP practice model for all families in the FCCP, this report reflects data on all families that receive WRAP, except in a few graphs / tables where required.

**I. Characteristics of Active Families**

The Family Care Community Partnerships (FCCPs) had 1533 families active during the CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 2544. 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, CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarters**



Data Source: RI Family Information System (RIFIS)

Figure 2 shows the race of the target child. Twenty four percent are Caucasian/White followed by 5 percent African American/Black. Over 50 percent of children are identified as “Other”.


**Figure 2: Race of Target Child in FCCP, CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarters**



Data Source: RIFIS.

Twenty two percent of the active children in CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> quarters identified as being of Hispanic origin.


**Figure 3: Hispanic Origin of Target Child in FCCP, CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarters**



Data Source: RIFIS.

Figure 4 shows the median age of the child. The median age of the child has remained consistent at age 8.


**Figure 4: Median Age of Target Child in FCCP by FCCP, CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarters**



Data Source: RIFIS

Figure 5 shows the primary language of target children. Seventy three percent of the children speak English as their first language. The second language spoken by target children is Spanish (13.6%).

**Figure 5: Primary Language of Target Child in FCCP, CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 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 FCCP Families by Eligibility Criteria, CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarters**




Data Source: RIFIS

FCCP Intake 1A was completed during January 1 to June 30, 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 FCCP Families by Response Priority, CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 has decreased to 7 days from the previous two quarters. 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 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 families who transitioned from the FCCP during over the two quarters. The median length of time in the first and second quarters of CY12 was 6

months. The median length of time has decreased from the previous two quarters of CY 2011. During the last quarters of CY 2011, the median length of time was 7 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**

	<b>CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarters (N= 1016)</b>
Median:	192
Average:	165

Data Source: RIFIS. Data based on number of closed cases during January 1 to June 30, 2012.

**VII. FCCP Referral Source**

Table 2 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 2: Percent of DCYF Referral Sources, CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarters**

	<b>CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarters (N=1533)</b>
<b>DCYF: Indicated Investigation</b>	31.9
<b>DCYF: CPI Request for Services</b>	17.5
<b>DCYF: Intake ISR</b>	3.6

Data Source: RIFIS

**IX. Number of Team Meeting Occurrences by Quarter**

Table 3 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 3: Number of FCCP Team Meetings, by FCCP region, CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarters**

	<b>East Bay</b>	<b>Northern RI</b>	<b>Urban Core</b>	<b>West Bay</b>	<b>State</b>
<b>Number of Team Meetings</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>591</b>
<b>Child/Youth open to FCCP 30 days or greater*</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>663</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>1395</b>

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. Further analysis will be conducted.

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

Table 4 presents data on the FCCP close/transition reasons. The percent of families whose closed/transitioned reason was Practice Model completed and goals achieved (Wrap and Non Wrap) stayed the same in CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarters as compared to the last two quarters of CY11.

Closed/transition reasons of "Family withdrew with notice", "Triaged and Referred Out", "Target child opened to DCYF and remained in home" and "Target child opened to DCYF and removed from home" increased during the first 2 quarters of CY12 from the last two quarters of the previous calendar year.

**Table 4: Top 10 FCCP close reasons, CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarters**

<b>FCCP Close Reason</b>	<b>CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarters (N=1016)</b>
<b>Team agrees Wrap completed</b>	26.2
<b>Unable to contact family</b>	16.0
<b>Family withdrew without notice</b>	12.0
<b>FCCP Non Wrap completed</b>	9.2
<b>Family declined service</b>	7.2
<b>Triaged and Referred Out</b>	5.6
<b>Family withdrew with notice</b>	5.6
<b>Other</b>	4.1
<b>Target child opened to DCYF and remained in home</b>	3.5
<b>Family moved out of area</b>	3.3
<b>Target child opened to DCYF and removed in home</b>	2.4

Data Source: RIFIS.

Table 5 presents data on the top close reasons by referral source categories. Amongst the 5 referral sources, all families referred, excluding the Self Referral", the combined percent of families in the FCCP with "positive" close reasons of "team agrees the Wrap was completed" and "Non Wrap completed" comprise the largest proportion of close reasons in the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> quarters.

**Table 5: Percent of FCCP Top 5 close reasons by 5 referral source categories, CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarters**

<b>FCCP Close Reason</b>	<b>Referral Source</b>				
	<b>DCYF</b>	<b>YDC (DCYF)</b>	<b>Self-Referral</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>Other</b>
(N=1016)					
<b>Family declined service</b>	6.5%	7.9%	10.8%	6.1%	7.2%
<b>Family withdrew w/o notice</b>	11.8%	10.5%	13.3%	15.2%	10.6%
<b>FCCP Non Wrap completed</b>	12.7%	0.0%	11.7%	2.0%	3.4%
<b>Team agrees Wrap completed</b>	24.1%	31.8%	2.5%	34.3%	28.0%
<b>Unable to reach family</b>	12.9%	18.4%	15.0%	19.2%	23.2%

Data Source: RIFIS. Data based on the number of closed cases during January 1 to June 30, 2012.

Table 6 presents data on FCCP top close reasons by 4 Referral Sources. All 3 CPS referral sources had the largest proportion of "close reasons" was the combination of "FCCP Non Wrap completed" and "Team agrees Wrap Completed". DCYF: CPI Request for Services had the highest proportion of "unable to reach family".

**Table 6: Percent of FCCP Top 5 close reasons by 4 Referral Sources, CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarters**

	DCYF: Indicated Investigation	DCYF: CPI Request for Services	DCYF: Intake ISR	Self-Referral
Family declined service	5.4%	6.6%	15.8%	10.8%
Family withdrew w/o notice	11.4%	13.2%	7.9%	13.3%
FCCP Non Wrap completed	15.2%	8.1%	15.8%	11.7%
Team agrees Wrap completed	28.8%	18.7%	13.2%	2.5%
Unable to reach family	7.9%	22.8%	2.6%	15.0%

Data source: RIFIS

Table 7 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 7: Percent of FCCP families with Close Reason reported as “Opened to DCYF”, CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarters**

	CY12 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarters
Child opened to DCYF	6.8

Data Source: RIFIS. Data based on the number of closed cases during CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 completion of the NCFAS is low and is consistent with the trends observed since the inception of the FCCP’s. Slightly more than half of the children (56.9%) who were opened more than 30 days to an agency had a NCFAS baseline completed. Thirty eight percent of the children who closed/transitioned between January and June, 2012 and were open for greater than 30 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 30 days to an agency and were under the age of 5, only 16.4% had a baseline ASQ. Twenty percent of children who were open for greater than 30 days to an agency and were older than 5 had a baseline Ohio Scales Parent Rating.

Table 8 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 8: Average Number of days for NCFAS completion, CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarters**

	CY12 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarters
Average number of days to complete NCFAS baseline	21.3

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

## NCFAS Outcomes, CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarters

A 6 point scale is used to rate families ranging from “serious problem (-3)” to “clear strength (+2)”. Table 9 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 9: Percent of ratings in each NCFAS domain at intake and discharge (N=367)**

	Serious Problem (-3)	Moderate Problem (-2)	Mild Problem (-1)	Baseline/ Adequate (0)	Mild Strength (+1)	Clear Strength (+2)	Unknown	Not Applicable
<b>Environment</b>								
<i>Intake</i>	4.9	9.3	14.2	40.1	21.0	7.1	1.1	0.0
<i>Transition</i>	2.7	6.5	10.9	43.1	22.3	11.2	1.1	0.0
<b>Parental Capabilities</b>								
<i>Intake</i>	4.9	8.7	19.3	35.7	20.7	5.7	0.8	1.6
<i>Transition</i>	3.5	6.8	10.9	41.4	25.3	8.2	0.8	0.8
<b>Family Interactions</b>								
<i>Intake</i>	4.9	10.1	25.1	33.0	19.9	3.0	0.5	0.0
<i>Transition</i>	3.3	7.1	19.3	34.9	26.7	5.4	0.8	0.0
<b>Family Safety</b>								
<i>Intake</i>	5.2	12.5	18.3	37.9	14.4	6.8	0.3	1.6
<i>Transition</i>	3.8	5.7	13.6	44.1	19.6	8.2	0.8	1.6
<b>Child Well-Being</b>								
<i>Intake</i>	3.5	18.3	19.3	36.0	14.7	3.0	0.8	1.4
<i>Transition</i>	2.2	11.7	15.5	37.9	24.5	4.1	0.3	1.1
<b>Social/Community Life</b>								
<i>Intake</i>	2.2	6.0	13.4	51.8	15.8	3.8	3.5	0.0
<i>Transition</i>	1.9	2.5	11.7	51.0	23.2	3.5	2.5	0.0
<b>Self-Sufficiency</b>								
<i>Intake</i>	6.3	11.4	22.3	36.2	13.6	7.1	0.0	0.5
<i>Transition</i>	3.3	9.8	13.4	44.1	18.5	7.4	0.0	0.5
<b>Family Health</b>								
<i>Intake</i>	2.5	14.2	24.5	35.7	14.2	5.4	0.0	0.0
<i>Transition</i>	1.4	8.4	23.2	39.2	17.4	6.8	0.0	0.0

Data Source: RIFIS

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 67.4% to 84.9%. Significant positive changes were found in all domains, ranging from 19.4 to 27.8%. A small number of families experienced negative changes in each of the domain areas, ranging from 4.4% to 7.9%.

**Figure 9: Percent of Families Showing Change in NCFAS Ratings, (N=357)**




Data Source: RIFIS

**XII. FCCP Intake Data: Intake Data during January 1 through June 30, 2012. Additional Child and Family Characteristics**

The following figures show information taken from intakes conducted during January 1 to June 30, 2012. There were 659 intakes completed during these two quarters. The 1533 families who are reported on in this report and were open to the FCCP during CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> quarters may have had their intake to the FCCP prior to January 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 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarters**




Data Source: RIFIS

FCCP Intake 1A was completed during January 1 to June 30, 2012. This is not representative of the 1533 families presented in this report because some intakes were completed prior to CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarters.

Figure 11 shows the presenting concerns of the target child. Over fifty percent of the children indicated mental/behavioral health as a concern (52.2%), followed closely by stressful life events (48.0%).

**Figure 11: Percent of Presenting Concerns of Target Child in FCCP, CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarters**




Data Source: RIFIS

FCCP Intake 1A was completed during January 1, to June 30, 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 four percent had stressful life events, followed by 48 percent who had mental health concerns.

**Figure 12: Percent of Caregiver/Family Presenting Concerns in FCCP, CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarters**



Data Source: RIFIS


FCCP Intake 1A was completed during January 1, to June 30, 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 1533 families that were active from January 1 to June 30, 2012, 15.6% 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 first two quarters of CY12.


**Figure 13: Median and Mean Age of Target Child, CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarters**



Data Source: RIFIS

Figure 14 shows the top 5 referral sources for families who re-entered the FCCP. Almost 50% of the families were referred by DCYF (Indication investigation, CPI request for services or YDC).

**Figure 14: Top 5 Referral Sources, CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarters**



Data Source: RIFIS

Table 10 shows the close reasons of families previously served by a FCCP. Thirty eight percent of families transitioned from a FCCP with a positive reason of either completing Wrap on Non wrap. Fourteen percent of families withdrew without notice followed by 8% who the FCCP could not contact.

**Table10: Top 10 Close Reasons**

FCCP Close Reasons	(N=229)
Team Agrees Wrap Completed	20.1%
FCCP Non Wrap Completed	17.5%
Family Withdrew Without Notice	13.6%
Unable to Reach Family	8.4%
Family Withdrew With Notice	5.2%
Other	4.5%
Family Moved Out of Area	3.2%
Family Declined Service	3.2%
Target Child Opened to DCYF & removed from home	2.6%
Triaged & Referred Out	2.6%

Data Source: RIFIS

Table 11 shows the NCFAS ratings from baseline to transition for families previously served by a FCCP. The overall scores indicate an improvement over time.


**Table 11: Percent of ratings in each NCFAS domain at intake and discharge (N=58)**

	<b>Serious Problem (-3)</b>	<b>Moderate Problem (-2)</b>	<b>Mild Problem (-1)</b>	<b>Baseline/Adequate (0)</b>	<b>Mild Strength (+1)</b>	<b>Clear Strength (+2)</b>	<b>Unknown</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<b>Environment</b>								
<i>Intake</i>	3.4	10.3	17.2	27.6	20.7	8.6	0.0	0.0
<i>Transition</i>	1.7	8.6	12.1	36.2	17.2	15.5	0.0	0.0
<b>Parental Capabilities</b>								
<i>Intake</i>	5.2	3.4	17.2	27.6	25.9	3.4	1.7	1.7
<i>Transition</i>	3.4	6.9	17.2	24.1	31.0	5.2	1.7	1.7
<b>Family Interactions</b>								
<i>Intake</i>	3.4	10.3	20.7	34.5	17.2	1.7	0.0	0.0
<i>Transition</i>	3.4	8.6	20.7	31.0	25.9	1.7	0.0	0.0
<b>Family Safety</b>								
<i>Intake</i>	3.4	8.6	15.5	31.0	19.0	10.3	0.0	0.0
<i>Transition</i>	1.7	3.4	17.2	22.4	31.0	10.3	0.0	0.0
<b>Child Well-Being</b>								
<i>Intake</i>	3.4	15.5	22.4	29.3	13.8	3.4	0.0	0.0
<i>Transition</i>	1.7	8.6	19.0	31.0	24.1	3.4	1.7	0.0
<b>Social/Community Life</b>								
<i>Intake</i>	0.0	8.6	20.7	37.9	13.8	3.4	3.4	0.0
<i>Transition</i>	0.0	3.4	19.4	41.4	20.7	1.7	3.4	0.0
<b>Self-Sufficiency</b>								
<i>Intake</i>	6.9	19.0	8.6	31.0	17.2	5.2	0.0	0.0
<i>Transition</i>	3.4	15.5	5.2	39.7	22.4	3.4	0.0	0.0
<b>Family Health</b>								
<i>Intake</i>	0.0	22.4	22.4	24.1	13.8	5.2	0.0	0.0
<i>Transition</i>	0.0	13.8	17.2	36.2	19.0	3.4	0.0	0.0

Data Source: RIFIS

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 18.9% to 29.4%. A small number of families experienced negative changes in each of the domain areas, ranging from 5.7% to 10.0%.

**Figure 15: Percent of Families Showing Change in NCFAS Ratings, (N=53)**




Data Source: RIFIS

**XIV. Family Support Partners**

During the first two quarters of 2012, 12.1% 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 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarters**



Data Source: RIFIS

**Figure 17: FCCP Eligibility by FSP, CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarters**



Data Source: RIFIS

Table 12 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 12: Median and Average Length of Time in FCCP**

	<b>FSP (N=185)</b>	<b>No FSP (N=1348)</b>
<b>Median</b>	198.0	141.0
<b>Average</b>	218.9	172.2

Data Source: RIFIS

Table 13 shows the close reasons for families with and without a FSP. Forty five percent of families who worked with a FSP transitioned from a FCCP with a positive reason of either completing Wrap on Non wrap compared to 34.1% of families who did not have a FSP. Sixteen percent of families with a FSP withdrew without notice followed by 11.0% who the FCCP could not contact. Twelve percent of families without a FSP withdrew without notice followed by 16.7% who could not be contacted.

**Table 13: Top 10 FCCP close reasons, CY12 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarters**

<b>FCCP Close Reason</b>	<b>FSP (N=118)</b>	<b>No FSP (N=898)</b>
<b>Team agrees Wrap completed</b>	42.3%	24.1%
<b>Family withdrew without notice</b>	16.1%	11.5%
<b>Unable to contact family</b>	11.0%	16.7%
<b>Family moved out of area</b>	5.9%	3.0%
<b>Target child opened to DCYF and removed in home</b>	4.2%	2.1%
<b>Family withdrew with notice</b>	3.4%	5.9%
<b>Family declined service</b>	3.4%	7.7%
<b>FCCP Non Wrap completed</b>	2.5%	10.0%
<b>Other</b>	2.5%	4.3%
<b>Target child opened to DCYF and remained in home</b>	2.5%	3.7%

Data Source: RIFIS