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NPLH: Project Goals and Objectives

To improve the safety, permanency and well-being of children through implementation, program enhancement, and evaluation of FGDM.

1. Test the effectiveness of FGDM models in preventing children from re-referral and entering or re-entering foster care
2. Determine the costs for FGDM implementation
3. Analyze implementation of multiple FGDM models to provide knowledge on fit, flow, fidelity and sustainability
4. Disseminate implementation, cost and outcome findings and products
Evaluation Overview – Sites, Time & Process

• Three child welfare agencies
  ◦ Region 3 (Dallas and Tarrant Counties), Texas
  ◦ Larimer County, CO
  ◦ Rapid City, SD

• Three year project (starting 10/2011) and 18-month data collection period (10/2012- 4/2014)

• Training, technical assistance, coaching provided
Evaluation Overview – Data Sources

• Five surveys
  1. Staff Survey
  2. Caregiver (Pretest) Survey
  3. Fidelity Survey (2 versions: Participant and Facilitator/Coordinator)
  4. Case-Specific Questionnaire
  5. Caregiver and Participant Fidelity Posttest Surveys (Texas only)

• Administrative SACWIS data extracts (services, outcomes)
NPLH Evaluation Successes and Challenges

Successes
• Cross-site n
• Response rates; some exceeded targets of 60% or more
• Rich process data

Challenges
• Low referral rates
• Low response rates for surveys (25% or less)
• QA issues
What is model fidelity?

• Extent to which practice stays true to the model’s essential features

• Model Fidelity ≠ Participant Satisfaction
  ◦ Participant Satisfaction: I was satisfied with who was at the family meeting. (a service output)
  ◦ Model Fidelity: The right people were at the family meeting. (an immediate outcome)
NPLH Fidelity Tool

Addressed gaps in understanding:
• Family, service provider and facilitator perspectives on preparation and their roles pre-meeting
• Transparency of information sharing and the planning process
• Inclusivity and role in plan development
## From Facilitators: A Portrait of Family Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Larimer FUMs (n=121)</th>
<th>Larimer FGCs (n=17)</th>
<th>Texas FGCs (n= 150)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of meetings per facilitator</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of those facilitators, they organized between</td>
<td>1-32 FUMs</td>
<td>1-6 FGCs</td>
<td>2-16 FGCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of meetings per facilitator</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median number of participants in attendance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median length of meeting</td>
<td>1 hour, 50 minutes</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:1 ratio of family members to professionals in attendance</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Who Attends Family Meetings (% meetings in attendance)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Type</th>
<th>Larimer FUMs (n=121)</th>
<th>Larimer FGCs (n=17)</th>
<th>Texas FGCs (n=150)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mom</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dad</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal family (other than Mom)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal family (other than Dad)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Like-family”</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals (other than social worker)</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Profile of Participant Fidelity Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Larimer</th>
<th>Texas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Family/Like-Family</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Maternal Kin</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Paternal Kin</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Professionals</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Different Looks at the Fidelity Data

1. Fidelity Index (FI) - The FI summarizes how well practices consistent with FGDM model fidelity are implemented
   • FI values range from 0.00 to 1.00
   • Values close to 1 represent ideal practice implementation (high/strong fidelity)

2. Four fidelity domains compose the index—To support practice understanding and continuous quality improvement
   • Preparedness
   • Inclusion and Respect
   • Family Leadership
   • Transparent Planning
Fidelity Index Scores

Larimer County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>FUM</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>FGC</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Texas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>FGC</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preparedness Domain Scores

Larimer County

Family: 0.76
Professional: 0.89
Facilitator: 0.86
Family: 0.90
Professional: 0.96
Facilitator: 0.93

Texas

Family: 0.82
Professional: 0.92
Facilitator: 0.98
Inclusion/Respect Domain Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Larimer County</th>
<th></th>
<th>Texas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Distribution of FUM and FGC Fidelity Index Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>FUMs with Index Values &gt;0.75</th>
<th>FGCs with Index Values &gt;0.75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **LARIMER COUNTY** | • 89% - facilitators  
• 86% - professionals  
• 63% - family/like-family participants | • 89% - facilitators  
• 86% - professionals  
• 63% - family/like-family participants |
| **TEXAS** | • 97% - facilitators  
• 80% professionals  
• 73% family/like-family participants | • 97% - facilitators  
• 80% professionals  
• 73% family/like-family participants |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full sample  ((n = 652))</th>
<th>Control ((n = 185))</th>
<th>Treatment ((n = 467))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n) of families</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% male children</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% age (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11+</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hispanic</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of PSM

Are positive outcomes due to treatment, or selection characteristics into the intervention vs. control group?
Creating a matched sample based on propensity scores

“Treatment group” = at least one FGC or FUM held

$n = 467$ children

Match on the basis of propensity scores to identify *selected non-FGDM cases* who are close in characteristics and probability of experiencing FGDM meetings to those cases that actually experiences FGDM meetings.
Which variables were used to generate propensity scores?

Individual-level covariates:
- Gender
- Age
- Abuse/neglect allegations

Family-level covariates
- Caregiver history of child maltreatment
- Domestic violence
- Caregiver substance abuse
- Reporter type
- Prior involvement with CPS
Standardized n differences before and after matching

Testing the Propensity Score Match
Texas Outcome Analysis Overview

• 542 cases (272 from Tarrant, 270 from Dallas)
• 270 treatment group, 272 comparison group
• Avg. time from meeting log referral to FGC: 41 days
• (Known) race/ethnicity of persons listed on a case: Hispanic – 23.6%, Black – 29.5%, White – 24.0%, Multiple race categories – 21.2%

Did a re-referral or removal occur after an FGC was held or more than 41 days after the meeting log referral date (if no FGC was held or family was in the control group)?
Texas Outcomes Analysis: Screened In Re-Referrals

Screened-In Re-Referral Occurrence among Families*

- **Treatment Group:**
  - Re-Referral: 53 (19.6%)
  - No Re-Referral: 217 (80.3%)

- **Control Group:**
  - Re-Referral: 37 (13.6%)
  - No Re-Referral: 235 (86.0%)

*No statistically significant difference
Texas Outcomes Analysis: Child Removals

Removal occurrence among families*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Removal Group</th>
<th>No Removal Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Group</td>
<td>255 (94.4%)</td>
<td>15 (5.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>253 (93.0%)</td>
<td>19 (7.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No statistically significant difference
Other Findings

• Orientation toward child safety versus family preservation depended on job type, years of experience, and shared vision.

• Caseworkers noted significantly higher degree of improvement in social supports for families that received a family meeting than families in the treatment group.
Other Findings

- The majority of family member respondents expressed positivity about their experiences with CPS.
- Higher ratings of FGC effectiveness depended on worker type, perceptions of local services, and belief in families’ ability to construct plans to address issues.
Future Analyses for Consideration

• Examining duration of out-of-home placement and placement type as outcomes
• Examining only *substantiated* re-referrals as an outcome
• Examining source of re-referral (e.g., high risk assessment or Family Assessment Response)
• Examining differences in outcomes by race/ethnicity
• Conducting multivariate analysis with linked information across datasets
Major Takeaways

• Fidelity index indicates overall favorable response from both family and professionals

• No statistically significant differences between treatment and control groups in screened-in re-referrals and removals

• Worker attitudes matter
Limitations

• Low survey response rates
• Fewer FGCs held than expected
• Data quality issues
• Statistical power to detect small effects
Explanations for Non-Significant Findings

• Low frequency events pose a challenge to finding effects
• FSRTs may produce some of the same results as FUMs and FGCs for this stage of service
• Intermediate effects like more comprehensive, family-centric plans and increases in social support may take longer to be reflected in other outcomes
• Other unmeasured benefits may be present, social supports, positive impacts on agency culture, consistency with agency values, and family engagement over time
Value of the Study

• Rigorous research in CW rare; funding for it lags behind other fields
• Showcases use of administrative data for evaluation purposes
• Peer-reviewed publications contributes to the knowledge base
• Commonly used practice; agencies and families need to know what difference it makes
• Non-significant findings equally important to understand
• Reflects Larimer and Texas as a learning agencies
• Commitment to family-centered practice
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