


**Rhode Island Family Care Community Partnerships
CY10 4th Quarter and CY11 1st Quarter Data
Urban Core Partnership Meeting**

I. Characteristics of Active Families


The Family Care Community Partnerships (FCCPs) had 1315 families active during the CY11 1st quarter (active defined as opened at least 1 day or greater during the quarter). Of those, Urban Core (UC) served 658 families. All data displayed reflects CY10 4th quarter and CY11 1st quarter, unless noted.

Figure 1: Percentage of Families in UC FCCP by FCCP Disposition, CY10 4th Quarter & CY11 1st Quarter




Data Source: RI Family Information System (RIFIS). In CY11 1st quarter, there was one case that was not eligible.

Figure 2: Race of Target Child in UC FCCP, CY10 4th Quarter & CY11 1st Quarter



Data Source: RIFIS

Figure 3: Median Age of Target Child in UC FCCP, CY10 4th Quarter & CY11 1st Quarter




Data Source: RIFIS

II. Wrap versus Non Wrap Practice Model: Percentage of Families in Wrap by Quarter

The number of Urban Core families in a Wrap Practice Model increased from 28.4% to 34.2%. The largest proportion of active families statewide experienced Non Wrap Practice model vs. Wrap Practice Model. However, the proportion of families in a Wrap Practice Model has increased since the inception of the FCCPs.

Figure 4: Percent of UC FCCP Families by Practice Model, CY10 4th Quarter & CY11 1st Quarter




Data Source: RIFIS

¹ PEP: Positive Educational Partnership

III. Eligibility Criteria by Practice Model by Quarter

Figure 5 shows percentage of eligibility criteria by practice model. Statewide, the largest percentage of children entering the FCCP is at risk for child abuse and neglect. Proportionally, Urban Core FCCP witnessed a decrease in families experiencing Wrap whose eligibility criteria was reportedly at risk for child abuse/neglect from CY10 4th Qtr. to CY11 1st Qtr. and an increase in families with an eligibility of the Youth Development Center (RITS). The proportion of families in Non Wrap with eligibility criteria of risk for child abuse/neglect decreased alongside a corresponding increase in families with an eligibility of serious emotional disturbance (SED). Statewide, the proportion of risk for child abuse and neglect in Non Wrap increased from CY10 4th Qtr to CY 1st Qtr.

Figure 5: Percent of Eligibility Criteria by Practice Model Among UC FCCP Families, CY10 4th Quarter & CY11 1st Quarter



Data Source: RIFIS


FCCP Intake 1A was completed during the quarter specified. 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

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 6 shows the percentage of families broken down by their respective response priority/category at the time of intake.

Figure 6: Percent of UC FCCP Families by Response Priority, CY10 4th Quarter & CY11 1st Quarter




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.

Figure 7 displays data on the adherence to the FCCP standards for FCCP response time to make face-to-face with the family given their respective response priority is outlined below. The median response time for the first face-to-face contact decreased in CY11 1st Qtr for families with a response DCYF CPS routine response priority.

Figure 7: Average & median length of time (days) to first face to face contact with family in UC FCCP by response priority, CY10 4th Quarter & CY11 1st Quarter



Data Source: RIFIS

V. Median and Average Length of Time in FCCP, by State and UC FCCP

Table 1 displays the median and average length of time among families who exited/transitioned out of the UC FCCPs during CY11 1st Qtr. FCCPs (based on date opened to the FCCP to FCCP close/transition).

Table 1: Median and Average Length of Time in the FCCP CY11 1st Quarter


	UC (N=277)
Median:	122.0
Average:	157.4

Data Source: RIFIS. Based on number of closed cases during CY11 1st Quarter. The median length of time in this table is lower than the median length of time in figure 8 because children whose practice model was set to “pending” are included.

VI. Length of Time in Practice Model by Quarter

Figure 8 displays data comparing the length of time a family is in their respective Practice Model (among closed families). The median length of time has decreased among Wrap families from 200 to 175 days. The median length of time increased among Non Wrap families from 167 to 150 days.

Figure 8: Median Length of Time in Practice Model (in days) in UC FCCP, CY10 4th Quarter & CY11 1st Quarter



Data Source: RIFIS

Based on number of closed cases during CY10 4th Quarter CY11 1st Quarter and does not include children whose practice model was set to “pending.”

VII. FCCP Referral Source and Wrap Vs Non Wrap Practice Model by Quarter


The following data informs whether families referred by DCYF to the FCCP experience different practice model approaches compared to those families not directly referred by DCYF. In UC FCCP, the gap remained relatively small between Wrap and Non Wrap for those referred through DCYF Indicated Investigations over the two quarters. This relatively small gap between these two groups diverges from the aggregate state level data.

Table 2: Percent of Top 5 UC Referral Sources by Practice Model, CY10 4th Quarter & CY11 1st Quarter

	CY10 4 th Quarter		CY11 1 st Quarter	
	Wrap	Non Wrap	Wrap	Non Wrap
DCYF: Indicated Investigation	25.4%	26.1%	27.5%	26.4%
DCYF: CPI Request for Services	17.2%	14.6%	14.6%	17.2%
DCYF: Intake ISR	10.7%	18.5%	6.4%	12.4%
School	20.1%	15.3%	20.2%	21.2%
Self Referral	7.7%	10.8%	7.3%	9.2%

Data Source: RIFIS

**Figure 9: Percent of UC FCCP Referral Sources Referral Source by Practice Model
CY10 4th Quarter & CY11 1st Quarter**




Data Source; RIFIS

³ All other: the remaining 19 referral sources combined as each of these 19 sources have very low percentages. These categories are collected separately and combined for this table only.

VIII. Families in Wrap vs. Non Wrap and their corresponding response priority by Quarter

The data is to help inform whether families with different response priorities receive different Practice Models (Wrap Practice vs. Non Wrap). The data below illustrate a higher proportion of families who are “routine” and not directly referred by DCYF are in Wrap compared to “routine CPS (DCYF)”.

**Figure 10: Percent of Response Priority by Practice Model
CY10 4th Quarter & CY11 1st Quarter Among UC FCCP Families**




Data Source: RIFIS

*Total will not equal 100% (excluded “pending” “blank”)

IX. Number of Wrap team meeting occurrences by Quarter

Figure 11 shows the number of Wrap Team Meetings among Wrap families in UC FCCP. Although Wrap team meeting occurrences continue to be reportedly low, the number of Wrap meetings in UC increased over the two quarters as did the number of families in Wrap.

**Figure 11: Number of UC FCCP Wrap Team Meetings among Wrap Families
CY10 4th Quarter & CY11 1st Quarter**



Data Source: RIFIS

X . Outcomes

FCCP Close Reason – Differences by the Close Reason

Tables 3-5 is to inform the exit reason outcomes among WB FCCP families with close/transition reasons based on referral source type. (Urban Core: N= 277)

Table 3: Top 10 UC FCCP close reasons, CY11 1st Quarter

FCCP Close Reason	UC (N = 277)
FCCP Non Wrap completed	26.4%
Family withdrew without notice	18.1%
Team agrees Wrap completed	12.6%
Family declined service	10.5%
Unable to contact family	6.9%
Other	4.3%
Target child opened to DCYF and removed from home	4.0%
Family moved out of area	3.6%
Family withdrew with notice	2.2%
Target child opened to DCYF and remained in home	1.1%

Data Source: RIFIS. Based on the number of closed cases during CY11 1st Quarter

Table 4 presents data on the top close reasons by referral source categories for CY11 1st Quarter. Amongst families referred by DCYF, excluding the Youth Development Center (YDC), the percent of families where the team agrees the Wrap or non Wrap was completed was 14.7% and 41.3% respectively while 23.9% withdrew without notice, 11.0% unable to reach and 9.2% family declined service.

Table 4: Percent of UC FCCP Top 5 close reasons by 4 referral source categories, CY 11 1st Quarter

FCCP Close Reason	DCYF	YDC (DCYF)	Self-Referral	School	Other
Family declined service	9.2%	15.0%	27.0%	0.0%	16.2%
Family withdrew w/o notice	23.9%	20.0%	27.0%	50.0%	24.3%
FCCP Non Wrap completed	41.3%	45.0%	29.7%	50.0%	18.9%
Team agrees Wrap completed	14.7%	10.0%	13.5%	0.0%	29.7%
Unable to reach family	11.0%	10.0%	2.7%	0.0%	10.8%

Data Source: RIFIS. Based on the number of closed cases during CY11 1st Quarter


Table 5 presents data on UC FCCP families with a close reason reportedly as “opened to DCYF”. The percent slightly increased in CY11 1st Qtr from CY10 4th Qtr.

Table 5: Percent of UC FCCP families with Close Reason reported as “Opened to DCYF”, CY10 4th Quarter & CY11 1st Quarter

	DCYF Referred to FCCP	
	CY10 4 th Quarter	CY11 1 st Quarter
Child opened to DCYF	4.0%	5.1%

Data Source: RIFIS. Based on the number of closed cases during CY10 4th Quarter and CY11 1st Quarter

Figure 12: Percent of UC FCCP Top 5 close reasons by practice model, CY10 4th Quarter and CY11 1st Quarter



Data Source: RIFIS “Unable to Contact Family” was added as a response choice in CY11 1st quarter.

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 practice model approach.

The completion of the NCFAS is low and is consistent with the trends observed since the inception of the FCCPs. Approximately 30% of the 352 children who closed/transitioned in CY11 1st quarter and were open for greater than 30 days had a baseline and transition NCFAS. The low numbers create barriers for analysis.

The FCCP standards provide 30 days for the NCFAS baseline completion.

Table 5: Average Number of days for NCFAS completion by UC FCCP, CY10 4th and CY11 1st Quarters

	CY10 4th & CY11 1st Qtrs
Average number of days to complete NCFAS baseline	37.6

Data Source: RIFIS