As we prepare for the webinar...just a few things to note:

1. Please close all applications on your computer except for Citrix GoToTraining.
2. Please mute your phones to avoid feedback noise.
3. Please reserve the chat box for questions and comments related to the presentation only.
4. If you are having technical difficulties please email Maritza Villagomez at maritza.villagomez@childrenscolorado.org.

Thank you!
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Evaluation Context:
The Illinois Department of Children and Family Services
CPS Screening and Investigation Process

Call of alleged maltreatment comes to DCFS

Calls are screened and either accepted as a report or screened out

Services

Investigation
Illinois Child Protective Services (CPS) caseload volume

Source: Illinois Department of Children and Family Services
Post-investigation service provision

- No Post-Investigation Services
- Intact Family Services
- Substitute Care
# Maltreatment recurrence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>Children with an indicated report</th>
<th># with second indicated report within 6 months</th>
<th>% recurrent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>25,009</td>
<td>2,014</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>25,191</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>24,239</td>
<td>1,884</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>25,822</td>
<td>1,979</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>27,121</td>
<td>2,075</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>26,726</td>
<td>1,923</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>26,185</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>25,286</td>
<td>1,759</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>25,561</td>
<td>1,797</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>27,308</td>
<td>1,748</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Differential Response in Illinois
2008

- CFRC “white paper” on DR
- Identified critical stakeholders/organizations
- Potential legislation drafted

2009

- Casey Family Programs arranges a peer to peer between Minnesota & Illinois
- Initial project steering committee established
- DR Program Act
- Model Developed
- RFP to QIC-DR

2010

- Illinois selected as a R&D site
- Rule, Procedures and Tools
- SACWIS
- Memorandum of Understanding with union
- POS Contracts
- DCFS Worker Selection
- Training
The Differential Response Program Act

• Signed by Governor Quinn on August 25, 2009
• Amends ANCRA and Children and Family Services Act
• “Beginning January 1, 2010, the Department of Children and Family Services may implement a 5-year demonstration of a “differential response program” in accordance with criteria, standards, and procedures described by rule.....”
The Differential Response Program Act

• Also specified: “The Department shall arrange for an independent evaluation of the differential response program....to determine whether it is meeting the goals in accordance with Section 2 of this Act.”

• The demonstration conducted under this subsection shall become a permanent program on January 1, 2015, upon completion of the 5-year demonstration project period.
DR in Illinois

- CPS in Illinois are administered through one state agency, the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS)
- The discretionary demonstration of the Differential Response was implemented statewide on November 1, 2010
- The discretionary demonstration of the Differential Response was discontinued in June 2012 due to high investigative caseloads and overdue investigations stemming from vacant investigator and investigative supervisory positions
- Dual-response system in which screened-in reports of maltreatment could received either:
  - Investigation response (IR)
  - Differential response (DR)
DR Eligibility in Illinois

Screened in reports that met ALL of the following criteria:

• Caretakers were birth or adoptive parents; legal guardians; responsible relatives
• Family had no prior indicated reports of maltreatment; no prior protective custodies
• Current allegations included any combination of: inadequate supervision (children 8 years or older); inadequate food, shelter, or clothing; environmental neglect; medical neglect; emotional abuse; risk of harm

Reports that did not meet all of these criteria were automatically directed to investigation team.
Illinois DCFS Pathways to Strengthening and Supporting Families

1. Report of alleged abuse/neglect to 24-hour hotline
2. Initial Screening for CPS
   - HOTLINE WORKERS
3. Screened Families: meet state and local criteria
4. Eligibility for investigation or Family Assessment Path
   - HOTLINE WORKERS
5. Random Assignment
   - ELECTRONIC DECISION
   - Control Group (investigation)
   - Experimental Group (non-investigation)
6. Mandatory Investigation
7. Eligible for Family Assessment
8. Special DCFS Unit + Private Agency
9. Traditional Investigators
# IR and DR practice in Illinois

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Investigation Response (IR)</th>
<th>Differential Response (DR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staffing</strong></td>
<td>Single public-agency (DCFS) investigator</td>
<td>Paired-worker team: one DCFS employee and one private agency employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed caseloads?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time frame for initial contact</strong></td>
<td>Unannounced in-person contact within 24 hours</td>
<td>Telephone contact within 24 hours; scheduled in-home visit within 3 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety assessment</strong></td>
<td>Yes (CERAP)</td>
<td>Yes (CERAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Possible to reassign cases to other track?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Families can decline further contact after initial visit?</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workers can take PC?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# IR and DR practice in Illinois

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Investigation Response (IR)</th>
<th>Differential Response (DR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maltreatment allegations substantiated?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetrators entered into central registry?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeframe</strong></td>
<td>Investigations completed within 60 days; 30-day extensions possible</td>
<td>Services provided up to 90 days; 3 30-day extensions possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services provided by CPS workers</td>
<td>Services to meet basic needs (&quot;Norman services&quot;); family can be referred to ongoing child welfare services, either intact family services or substitute care</td>
<td>Case management; crisis management; advocacy; service referrals; parent education; transportation; cash assistance up to $400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Illinois Differential Response Evaluation Methodology
DR Evaluation Questions:

- **Child Safety:** Are children whose families receive the family assessment response as *safe* as or safer than children whose families receive the investigation response?

- **Pathway Differences:** How is the family assessment response different from the investigation response in terms of *family engagement, caseworker practice,* and *services provided*?

- **Program Costs:** What are the initial and long-term *costs* (per case) of providing families with an investigation response or a family assessment response?
Research Design and Sample Selection

• Evaluation used a classic experimental design
• DR-eligible families were randomly assigned to either the treatment group (DR) or comparison group (IR)
• Random assignment period: November 1, 2010 – May 22, 2012
Randomization

• All maltreatment referrals are screened at the State Central Register (SCR)
• SCR call-takers collect information from reporters and assign one or more allegations to accepted reports, enter information into SACWIS
• Random assignment program built into SACWIS
Sample

During the evaluation period:

• 101,183 reports were accepted by SCR
• 7,880 reports were randomly assigned
  – 3,240 DR (41%)
  – 4,640 IR (59%)
• Some cases were incorrectly identified as DR-eligible and randomly assigned; these cases excluded from analyses:
  – 139 excluded from DR; final DR sample = 3,101
  – 157 excluded from IR; final IR sample = 4,483
Sample

Families that were randomly assigned to DR could be re-assigned to IR:

• Before initial contact with DR worker (n=278, 9%)

• During initial case, either at DR worker discretion (n=107, 3.5%) or if new report accepted by SCR (n=305, 9.8%)

• In total, 690 families (22.2%) randomly assigned to DR received IR
Sample

Families that were randomly assigned to DR could also refuse additional contact with CPS after initial assessment or withdraw from services at any time after initial acceptance:

- 590 (19.0%) declined DR services
- 322 (10.4%) withdrew before service completion
- 1,389 (44.8%) completed DR services
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (n=7,502)</th>
<th>DR (n=3,019)</th>
<th>IR (n=4,483)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver age (years)</td>
<td>34.1 (9.7)</td>
<td>34.2 (9.9)</td>
<td>34.1 (9.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver = female</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngest child age (years)</td>
<td>6.6 (5.1)</td>
<td>6.8 (5.2)</td>
<td>6.3 (5.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngest child gender (female)</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngest child race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>2.0 (1.2)</td>
<td>1.9 (1.1)</td>
<td>2.1 (1.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Collection

Three primary data sources:

• Illinois SACWIS

• Case Specific Report (CSR): Online form completed by workers at the conclusion of the initial case

• Family Survey (FS): Paper and pencil form distributed by worker to family at last face-to-face meeting
Data Analysis

Report date: DR Case
DR/Investigation case close date OR date transferred to ongoing services
Investigation
Initial case period
Follow-up period
March 31, 2013
Illinois Evaluation Findings: Family Engagement and Satisfaction
Measures

• Parents’ emotional responses following initial visit
• Parents’ rating of their worker’s use of family-centered practices
  ▪ Listening to parents’ concerns
  ▪ Understanding parents’ needs
  ▪ Considering parents’ opinions
  ▪ Recognizing parents’ strengths
• Yatchmentoff’s (2005) measure of parent engagement in CPS
• Workers’ ratings of parents’ level of “engagement”
• Parents’ ratings of satisfaction
Parent emotional responses after the first CPS visit

- Relieved
- Hopeful
- Respected
- Comforted
- Encouraged
- Thankful
- Angry
- Afraid
- Worried
- Disrespected
- Stressed
- Discouraged

DR (n=651) vs IR (n=879)
How carefully did the caseworker listen to what you and your family had to say?

DR (n=642)

IR (n=863)
How well did the caseworker understand you and your family's needs?

![Bar chart showing understanding levels.]

- **DR (n=642)**
  - Very well: 88.2%
  - Somewhat well: 10%
  - Not at all well: 1.9%

- **IR (n=860)**
  - Very well: 78.7%
  - Somewhat well: 17.7%
  - Not at all well: 3.6%
How often did the worker consider your opinions before making decisions that concerned you or your family?

- DR (n=630):
  - Always: 89.4%
  - Sometimes: 7.9%
  - Never: 2.7%

- IR (n=837):
  - Always: 76.7%
  - Sometimes: 16.4%
  - Never: 6.9%
Worker recognition of family strengths and family voice

- Worker recognized family strengths: 96.2% DR (n=641), 89.5% IR (n=860)
- Family voiced important matters: 88.9% DR (n=641), 85.8% IR (n=860)
How easy was it to contact the worker?

DR (n=634):
- Very easy: 85%
- Somewhat easy: 17.9%
- Not at all easy: 2%

IR (n=821):
- Very easy: 70.8%
- Somewhat easy: 23.8%
- Not at all easy: 5.5%
Percentage of parents who were very satisfied with their CPS experience

- Very satisfied with way they were treated:
  - DR (n=632): 90.8%
  - IR (n=860): 82.3%

- Very satisfied with help received:
  - DR (n=632): 85.2%
  - IR (n=860): 76.5%

- Very likely to call worker if needed help:
  - DR (n=632): 76.4%
  - IR (n=860): 61.9%
Illinois Evaluation Findings: Service Provision
Measures

• Initial case duration in days (SACWIS)
• Number of face-to-face contacts (CSR & FS)
• Any service receipt (CSR & FS)
• Number and type of services received (CSR & FS)
• Time to first service (CSR)
• Service effectiveness and match-to-needs (CSR & FS)
• Barriers to effective service provision (CSR)
Families who received at least one service during initial case

- Worker report (n=5,208)
  - DR: 60.1%
  - IR: 26.1%

- Parent report (n=1,530)
  - DR: 61.7%
  - IR: 21%
Timeliness of service provision

- Within one week: 63.8% (DR n=1157), 41.4% (IR n=843)
- Within two weeks: 23.5% (DR), 13.6% (IR)
- Within three weeks: 5.5% (DR), 9.9% (IR)
- Within four or more weeks: 4.6% (DR), 15.7% (IR)
- Uncertain: 2.7% (DR), 19.5% (IR)
Parent reports of number of face-to-face contacts with workers during initial case

- 1 contact: DR (n=636) - 13.1%, IR (n=861) - 46.9%
- 2-5 contacts: DR (n=636) - 38.7%, IR (n=861) - 51.5%
- 6-10 contacts: DR (n=636) - 26.6%, IR (n=861) - 1.5%
- More than 10 contacts: DR (n=636) - 21.7%, IR (n=861) - 0.1%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>DR (n=651)</th>
<th>IR (n=879)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency shelter</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car repair or transportation assistance</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>1.0%***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing assistance</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>2.5%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food or clothing for family</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>3.0%***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money to pay rent</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appliances, furniture, or home repairs</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>1.9%***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help paying utilities</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>1.5%***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare/public assistance services</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>2.7%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical or dental care</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>3.0%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other financial help</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>1.7%***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help for a family member with a disability</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>1.6%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal services</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>1.7%***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance in the home, such as cooking or cleaning</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>.2%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with child care or day care</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help getting mental health services</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>3.1%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respite care</td>
<td>.9%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help getting alcohol or drug treatment</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent support groups</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>.5%***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting classes</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help getting into educational classes</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>.9%***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling services</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>6.4%***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help looking for employment or changing jobs</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>1.3%***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence services</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job or vocational training</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational services</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>2.2%***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01    **p< .001     *** p<.0001
Worker reports of service provision to families

- Services to address material needs: 33.2%
- Substance abuse services: 7.3%
- Health services: 7%
- Mental health services: 9.1%
- Parenting classes: 7.3%
- Domestic violence services: 6.1%
- Educational services: 10.5%
- Social support services: 16.7%

DR (n=1457) vs IR (n=1625)
Involvement of friends and relatives in service provision

- Not at all: DR (n=1880) - 29.2%, IR (n=2887) - 39.6%
- Very little: DR - 21.1%, IR - 14.1%
- Moderately: DR - 33.1%, IR - 26.2%
- Extensively: DR - 16.7%, IR - 20.1%
Community resources used in service provision

- Not at all: 72.2%
- Very little: 21.1%
- Moderately: 27.1%
- Extensively: 5.7%

DR (n=1861) vs IR (n=2881)
Family reports of service effectiveness

- Family needed help that was not received:
  - DR (n=582): 19.9%
  - IR (n=740): 20.9%

- Services were the kind they needed:
  - DR (n=582): 87%
  - IR (n=740): 54.9%

- Services were enough to really help:
  - DR (n=582): 79.3%
  - IR (n=740): 50.9%
Worker-reported barriers to service provision

- **Caseload size**: 9.4%
- **Limited time**: 4.1%
- **Other pressing cases**: 3.9%
- **Family problems beyond CPS scope**: 5.1%
- **Limited funding**: 6.6%

DR (n=1984) | IR (n=3412)
Illinois Evaluation Findings: Safety and Well-Being
Measures

• Cumulative risk of re-report over 18 month follow-up period
• Cumulative risk of substantiated re-report over 18 month follow-up period
• Cumulative risk of child removal over 18 month follow-up
• Parent perceptions of child safety
Cumulative probability of maltreatment re-report within 18 months

- DR (n=3019)
- IR (n=4483)

Months from initial case closure to first re-report
Cumulative probability of maltreatment re-report among DR subgroups

- DR switchers (n=718)
- DR refusers (n=590)
- DR withdrawers (n=322)
- DR completers (n=1389)
- IR (n=4483)
Cumulative probability of substantiated re-report within 18 months

Months from initial case closure to first substantiated re-report

- DR (n=3019)
- IR (n=4483)
Cumulative probability of substantiated re-report among DR subgroups

- DR switchers (n=718)
- DR refusers (n=590)
- DR withdrawers (n=322)
- DR completers (n=1389)
- IR (n=4483)
Cumulative probability of child removal within 18 months

Months from initial case closure to first child removal

- DR (n=3019)
- IR (n=4483)
Cumulative probability of child removal among DR subgroups

- DR switchers (n=718)
- DR refusers (n=590)
- DR withdrawers (n=322)
- DR completers (n=1389)
- IR (n=4483)
Parent reports of improvements in family well-being following CPS experience

- Better able to provide necessities: DR (n=634) 56.1%, IR (n=827) 36.2%
- Better parent: DR (n=634) 68.0%, IR (n=827) 54.4%
- Family is better off: DR (n=634) 60.4%, IR (n=827) 34.1%
For additional information:

Illinois Differential Response reports and presentations available on the CFRC website:
http://www.cfrc.illinois.edu/differentialresponse.php

Contact Tamara Fuller:
t-fuller@illinois.edu