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ARLINGTON IN THE DC METRO AREA

Arlington County Map
• 26 square miles located directly across the Potomac River from Washington DC.

• Estimated population of 220,400.

• Students speak 104 languages and hail from 116 countries.

• 72% of residents over 25 have college degree.
Family Partnership Meeting Model

- Facilitator/Coordinator
- Agenda
- Plan
How We Got Started

- Executive Champion
- Training by subject-matter consultant
- Piloted with volunteers
Performance Measures
DHS PERFORMANCE PLAN FRAMEWORK

**Quantity**

**Effort**

PM 1

How much did we do?

- # Staff & Functions
- # Customers & Units of Service

**Quality**

PM 2

How well did we do it?

- Standards
- Satisfaction
- Efficiency

**Is anyone better off?**

PM 3

Change in...

- Behavior/Circumstance
- Skills/Knowledge
- Attitude/Opinion
How Well vs Better Off Measures
Example

How well:
Standard: walkway visible
Satisfaction: parents happy
Efficiency: cleared before school start time

Better off:
Number of children who arrive on time
Number of children who arrive safely
• Focuses on outcomes
• Provides quick visual of data
• Blends story and data
• Promotes continuous improvement
ASKING THE TOUGH QUESTIONS
WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE PROGRAM?
What is your purpose?
WHAT SHOULD BE MEASURED?
What would you measure?
HOW WILL DATA BE COLLECTED?
WHO WILL DO THE WORK AND WHAT DO THEY NEED TO BE SUCCESSFUL?
HOW WILL THE AGENCY CULTURE IMPACT IMPLEMENTATION?
Arlington FPM Program Purpose

Prevent foster care placement for children at risk of removal and reduce time in care for children who enter foster care.
How Much Did We Do?

**FY 2015 FPM PMP**

### PM1: How much did we do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>1.3 FTEs including:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2 FTE Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5 FTE FPM Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.6 FTE Case Managers (5% of 12 Staff)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customers</th>
<th>Units of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total FPMs / Children Served</td>
<td>FY 2014 / 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk FPMs / Children Served</td>
<td>24 / 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal FPMs / Children Served</td>
<td>18 / 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement Change FPMs / Children Served</td>
<td>53 / 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Living Plan FPMs / Children Served (included in Placement Change total above)</td>
<td>39 / 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Change FPMs / Children Served</td>
<td>1 / 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only Risk and Removal FPMs are measured in this plan.
How Well Are We Doing?

- Meetings held within 14 days of risk referrals
- Meetings held before first court hearing for removal referrals
- Providers and family members will be satisfied with the meeting experience
Timeliness of Risk Meetings

The Story Behind the Curve: FY 2013 implementation of staff member with reduced caseload to coordinate FPMs
The Story Behind the Curve: Choosing the right measure – within 5 days vs before court hearing; timeliness of referrals
Satisfaction Survey

• I felt prepared for the meeting

• I was included in making decisions

• The main safety concerns were addressed in the meeting

• Overall, I was satisfied with the Family Partnership Meeting
The Story Behind the Curve: Measuring satisfaction, versus measuring engagement

Average Satisfaction Score with FPMs for Service Providers and Family Members (scale: 1-4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are Youth Better Off?
“It’s a serious decision if you’re going to pull a cub,” said Mindy Babitz, a sloth bear expert at the zoo. “We want cubs to be raised by their mom. That’s an ideal situation. We’re doing everything we can to be a surrogate mom to her. But we’re not bears.”
Percent of Youth at Risk of Removal Who Remained in the Home at least 90 Days After FPM
Youth Remain In Home

Percent of Youth At Risk of Removal Who Remained in the Home at least 90 Days After FPM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Percent of Youth Remaining in Home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Story Behind the Curve: Continuous improvement in processes for identifying at-risk youth and early referral for FPM
Anyone Better Off Measure #2

Children with Removal FPM Exiting Care within 12 Months
Youth Exit Care within 12 Months

Children with Removal FPM Exiting Care within 12 Months

The Story Behind the Curve: Complexity of capturing this measure
Keys to Success

• Committed leadership

• Clarity around process

• Ongoing guidance and support

• Internal experts / champions / ambassadors at all levels
• Honest examination of what’s working and what’s not

• Coming up with thoughtful recommendations

• Involving the whole team in generating ideas