



Rhode Island Department of Children, Youth & Families



Picture Source: KVC Health Systems <http://www.kvc.org/>

Community Based Services

July 1, 2012 – June 30, 2014

(July 1, 2012 – June 30, 2013 for out-of-home population

July 1, 2013 – June 30, 2014 for in-home population)

Data and Evaluation

June 2015

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Children, youth and caregivers receiving selected RI DCYF funded community based services	2
Community based services: Placement types and population characteristics	4
Selected outcomes of children and youth who started a community based service in-home during FY14	6
Disproportionality and selected outcomes	8
Most frequently used services	9
Enhanced Family Support Services (EFSS)	9
Preserving Family Networks (PFN)	10
Multisystemic Therapy (MST).....	11
Outreach and Tracking (O&T).....	12
Family Preservation (FP)	13
Community Based Services – Visitation Center (July 1, 2012 – June 31, 2013).....	14
Appendix	16
Table 1. Number and percent of youth and caregivers who started at least one type of community based services through RI DCYF in FY14, by service type and age	16
Table 2. Six month follow-up of youth who started a community based service from in-home in FY14, by service type, age and selected outcomes	17
Table 3. Median length of time (Days) from the start of a community based service to the selected outcomes for youth who started a community based service from in-home in FY14, by service type and age	18

Acknowledgment

This report, Community Based Services (July 1, 2012 – June 30, 2014), was produced by the Rhode Island Department of Children, Youth and Families' Data and Evaluation Unit. It represents a collaborative effort of many individuals.

Colleen Caron, RI DCYF
Leanne Lasher, RI DCYF
Kyeonghee Kim, RI DCYF
Maria Leone, RI DCYF
Susan Anderson, RI DCYF
Brian Renzi, RI DCYF
Mark Giansanti, RI DCYF
Leon Saunders, RI DCYF
Dave Allenson, RI DCYF
Christopher Strnad, RI DCYF

If you have questions or require additional information about this report, please contact Colleen Caron, RI DCYF Data and Evaluation Unit Director and Epidemiologist, at Colleen.Caron@dcyf.ri.gov, or Kyeonghee Kim, RI DCYF epidemiologist, at Kyeonghee.Kim@dcyf.ri.gov.

RI Department of Children, Youth and Families (RI DCYF)
Community Based Services
July 1, 2013 – June 31, 2014

Introduction

The Rhode Island Department of Children, Youth and Families (RI DCYF) in collaboration with community providers offer various community based services as part of early efforts to preserve families caring for their children and youth as well as to promote their overall well-being. The primary purpose of this report is to provide a preliminary surveillance on the profile of children, youth and families receiving *RI DCYF funded community based services* during July 1, 2013 through June 31, 2014, 1 year post the implementation of the System of Care (SOC) Family Care Networks (FCN). Children and youth may have received additional services paid through other funding sources (i.e. managed Medicaid, Medicaid, private insurance) not captured in this report during this same time period. This information can assist RI's Child Welfare System of Care in service array planning to meet the needs of children and families. Most of the community based services funded by RI DCYF were administered in collaboration with and as part of their SOC FCN implemented in State Fiscal Year 2013 (FY13). The data presented in this report are limited to DCYF funded services only. Children and caregivers who may have received other services funded through alternate means are not included in this report.

In FY14, 1038 youth and 286 caregivers (a duplicated count by service type) entered at least one type of 19 different DCYF funded community based services (FCN and non-network). Entry into one of the community based programs is defined as no previous enrollment in that particular program for at least 3 months or greater. This parameter was selected due to the nature in which the data is collected, fiscal data submission processes and could potentially yield limitations in the entry definition. As the primary purpose of this preliminary surveillance report is for community based service array utilization in FY14, 1 year post SOC FCN implementation, and initial data on selected outcomes, this report does not include dosage analysis on outcomes.

Children and youth in-home – selected outcomes

This report mainly focuses on 647 entry cohort of children and youth between ages 0 and 21 who are involved with DCYF's child welfare, behavioral health and/or juvenile justice and started at least one type of DCYF funded community based services from an in-home placement in FY14. From a surveillance (descriptive) framework, these youth were then followed for 12 months from the start of their services to see if they experienced any of these selected outcomes consistent with the program objectives within the given period: 1) removals from home, 2) Child Protective Services (CPS) investigation, 3) indication of maltreatment, 4) stay at Rhode Island Training School (RITS) and/or 5) adjudication in the juvenile justice system.

Children and youth out-of-home – selected outcomes

The report also includes an analysis on 58 entry cohort of children who started Visitation Center service in FY13. This service is analyzed separately as it specifically serves younger children already in out-of-home placements to support successful reunification with their parents. Children in Visitation Center service were followed from the service start date to see if they reunified with their parents after receiving the service. Then, those who reunified were followed for 6 months from the date they returned home to see if they experienced any of these selected outcomes within the given period: 1) subsequent removals from home, 2) Child Protective Services (CPS) investigation, 3) indication of maltreatment, 4) stay at Rhode Island Training School (RITS) and/or 5) adjudication.

Ongoing data collection with new community based services paid for by RI DCYF

The DCYF is continuing its efforts to expand its service array to better support well-being of children and families. In FY15, DCYF started funding for new services including Family Centered Treatment (FCT), Trauma Systems Therapy (TST) and Positive Parenting Program (Triple P). As of April 2015, 24 youth and/or caregivers received FCT, 99 received TST and 39 received Triple P. These new programs are being tracked by DCYF evaluation team and will be included in the next round of service evaluation.

Children, youth and caregivers receiving selected RI DCYF funded community based services

During FY14 there was a total of 1,324 children, youth and caregivers who received RI DCYF funded community based services through RI DCYF community providers and partners. The aim of these services is to preserve families, maintain safety and promote overall family well-being. The largest proportion of those receiving services were with youth age 18 and younger, 1,009 youth, followed by caregivers age 18 and older, 286 caregivers, and then youth age 18-21, 29 youth (See Table 1).

Table 1. Number of youth and caregivers who started at least one type of community based services through RI DCYF in FY14*.

	Youth (under 18)	Youth (18 – 21)	Caregiver (18 and older)	Total
Number of youth and caregivers who received at least one type of community based service paid for by DCYF (duplicated)	1,009	29	286	1,324

NOTES:

- A youth may be counted in more than one category if age at the start of each community based service differs.
- Duplicated by service type. If a youth received multiple services in FY14, a youth is counted once for each service. If a youth received a same service with more than 90 days gap between the sessions, it is considered separate service episodes and a youth is counted more than once.



Picture Source: Child & Family <http://childandfamilyri.com/>

Among the DCYF funded community based services, the majority of children and youth in FY14 (excludes caregivers) were primarily serviced by 4 RI DCYF funded services, Enhanced Family Support Services (EFSS), Preserving Family Networks (PFN), Multisystemic Therapy (MST) and Outreach and Tracking (see Figure 1). As services are often tailored to different age groups, the utilization of services is stratified by age revealing different utilization patterns. Figure 2 shows the percent of youth among age categories and their most frequently used service type. Among youth age 0-10, the largest proportion, 30.5% of youth received EFSS followed by 24.5% of youth who received Visitation Center services followed by 19.6% receiving Respite. Among youth age 11-17, the largest proportion, 35.8% of youth received EFSS, followed by 21.6% of youth who received MST, followed by PFN, 21.1%. Among youth age 18-21, the largest proportion, 55.1% of youth received EFSS followed by 17.2% of youth who received Education Program followed by Respite, 10.3%. The largest proportion, 53.5% of caregivers age 18 and older received mental health counseling, 22.7% received substance abuse counseling and 13.9% received Parent Aide/Education.

Figure 1. Number of youth and caregiver who started at least one type of community based services through RI DCYF in FY14, by service type and age. (N=1,324) (Please refer to Appendix for detailed table on number and percent for all services)





Figure 2. Percent of youth and caregiver who started at least one type of community based services through RI DCYF in FY14, by most frequently used service type and age. (N=1,324) (Please refer to Appendix for detailed table on number and percent for all services)



NOTE: Other may include any of the services listed in Figure 1 that are not chosen as the three most frequently used services for each age group.

Community based services: Placement types and population characteristics

Table 2 provides data on children and youth and whether they resided in-home or in an out-of-home placement when they started the community based services. As the purpose of this surveillance report focuses on children and youth in their homes receiving community based services, the majority of children and youth were in home when they began the community based service (see Table 2). This purpose of focusing on in-home holds true except for the additional focus on the Visitation program primarily aimed at young children who are primarily in a foster family setting receiving visitation support with their primary caregivers.

Table 2. Number and percent of youth who started at least one type of community based service in FY14, by placement type at the start of service and age. (N=1,038)

Placement	Age						Total	
	0 – 10		11 – 17		18 – 21			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Started service in-home	100	35.1%	533	73.6%	14	48.3%	647	62.3%
Started service out-of-home	185	64.9%	191	26.4%	15	51.7%	391	37.7%
Total	285	100.0%	724	100.0%	29	100.0%	1038	100.0%

NOTES:

- In-home placements defined in this report include living arrangement of stay with friend, guardian, married parents, relatives, separated couple, single female parent, single male parent, subsidized adoption, and unmarried couple. This is not exclusively child welfare placement.
- Out-of-home placements defined in this report include AWOL, group home, independent living (funded or unfunded), relative foster home, relative foster home – pending license, non-relative foster home, private agency foster care, pre-adoptive home, psychiatric hospital, RITS, residential facility, respite care, shelter care, substance abuse facility, and other. This is not exclusively child welfare placement.

The following sections within this report present data on the children and youth who were in-home when they started receiving their community based services. A subsequent section in this report provides data on the children in out-of-home placement receiving the Visitation Program.

Among the 647 children and youth who started a community based service in FY14 while in-home, 60% were male, 85% were between the age of 11 and 21, and 50% were White, 11% were Black, 7% were Other/Multiracial and 31% were Hispanic (any race) (see Figure 3). Figure 4 presents data on the demographics of the caregiver with 61% female, 86% parent, and 64% White, 15% Black, 5% Other/Multiracial and 15% Hispanic (any race).

Figure 3. Demographics of youth who started community based services from in-home in FY14. (N=647)





Figure 4. Demographics of caregivers who received community based services in FY14. (N=286)




Note: Parent group includes adoptive parent, biological parent and step parent. Other includes foster parent, legal guardian, maternal grandparent, non-relative, other relative, parent's paramour, paternal aunt, sibling's father and step sibling grandparent

Selected outcomes of children and youth who started a community based service IN-HOME during FY14

Figure 5 provides data on children and youth who started a DCYF funded community based service from in-home in FY14 and experienced at least one of the 5 selected outcomes within 12 months of starting a service. Depending on the length of time a youth received a service, a youth may or may not have been receiving the service at the time of experiencing the outcome. This information can serve as an initial starting point for each respective service to assess these selected outcomes over time and should not be viewed as a comparison across these programs due to differences in populations served by the respective services (i.e. differences in age groups, family and presenting concerns, severity of presenting concerns etc.)

The most frequent outcome amongst all community based services totaled (all 19 services listed on Appendix Table2) presented in Figure 5 was “Removals” followed by “CPS investigations”, “Stay at Rhode Island Training School (RITS)”, “Indication of maltreatment” and “Adjudication”. For each of the individual 5 services, “Removals” was the most frequently experienced outcome followed by “CPS investigation for 4 out of the 5 services.

Figure 5. Selected outcomes of youth who started a community based service from in-home in FY14, by most frequently used service type. (Please refer to Appendix for number and percent of selected outcomes for all services)



* Total reflects outcomes of all services (19 services total) listed on appendix table 2.


NOTES:

- A youth may be counted in more than one outcome category, if a youth experienced multiple outcomes within the 12 month period.
- In-home placements defined in this report include living arrangement of stay with friend, guardian, married parents, relatives, separated couple, single female parent, single male parent, subsidized adoption, and unmarried couple. This is not exclusively child welfare placement.
- Depending on the length of time a youth received the service, a youth may or may not have been receiving the service at the time of experiencing an outcome. Youth may have ended the service any time before or after experiencing a selected outcome.

Selected outcomes of children and youth who started a community based service IN-HOME during FY14

Figure 6 provides data on the median length of time from the start of a service until a youth experienced one of the 5 selected outcomes within 12 months of starting a service. For all services totaled (all 19 services listed on Appendix Table3), the median length of time for the 5 selected outcomes to occur was less than 4 months from the start of the service.

Figure 6. Median length of time (Days) from the start of the community based service to the selected outcomes for youth who started a community based service from in-home in FY14, by most frequently used service type. (Please refer to Appendix for median length of time to selected outcomes for all services)



* Total reflects median length of time for all services (19 services total) listed on appendix table 3.


NOTES:

- A youth may be counted in more than one outcome category, if a youth experienced multiple outcomes within the 12 month period.
- In-home placements defined in this report include living arrangement of stay with friend, guardian, married parents, relatives, separated couple, single female parent, single male parent, subsidized adoption, and unmarried couple. This is not exclusively child welfare placement.
- Depending on the length of time a youth received the service, a youth may or may not have been receiving the service at the time of experiencing an outcome. Youth may have ended the service any time before or after experiencing a selected outcome.

Disproportionality and selected outcomes of children and youth who started a community based service IN-HOME during FY14

Among all youth in this sample, similar percentages across the racial and ethnic categories experienced at least one of the selected 5 outcomes. The data suggests an absence of disproportionality by race or ethnicity in experiencing at least one of the 5 selected outcomes (see Figure 7). There may be disproportionality for any of the 5 individual outcomes; however, due to small numbers, this analysis was unable to be conducted at this time. A future report will combine multiple years that would increase the sample to provide analysis on individual outcomes across racial and ethnic groups. Some of the racial groups were combined due to small numbers.


Figure 7. Selected outcomes of youth who started a community based service from in-home in FY14, by race and ethnicity.



■ Any one of selected outcomes (Removal, CPS investigation, maltreatment, Stay at RITS, and/or Adjudication)

NOTE: In-home placements defined in this report include living arrangement of stay with friend, guardian, married parents, relatives, separated couple, single female parent, single male parent, subsidized adoption, and unmarried couple. This is not exclusively child welfare placement.

Figure 8. Among EFSS, PFN, MST, Outreach & Tracking combined, 69% percent of children remained in home within in 1 year from beginning the start of their in-home program, FY14 entry cohort




A Kaplan Meir survival analysis was conducted to identify time to outcome for all outcomes in this report with right censor of the data. A log rank test was used to test for statistical significance between programs outcomes. Please note that case characteristics (case severity) are unadjusted which can impact outcomes across the programs.

Figure 8 shows among the 4 most prevalent in-home services combined, EFSS, PFN, MST, Outreach & Tracking the time to removal among children and youth receiving these services. As can be seen, at 1 year from the start of receiving

one of these in-home services, 68% of the children and youth were still in their homes and had not been placed in foster care (out-of-home placement). Further, there was no statistical significant difference among these four programs in removal from home. As the sample size is relatively small, future analysis will include larger samples that may result in significant findings.

Figure 9. Among children and youth in EFSS and FP (in-home programs with 20% or more of children age 11 and under), approximately 77% of children did not have a CPS investigation within 1 year from the start of their programs, FY14 entry cohort



EFSS: blue FP:red

Figure 9 shows among EFSS and FP combined, 77% of children did not have a substantiated maltreatment within 1 year of the start of the community based program. For the outcome of CPS investigation, these two programs were selected as their aim is to reduce maltreatment and 20% or greater of their population served was between the ages of 0 and 11 years old; an age group that is correlated with maltreatment. There were no statistically significant differences in outcomes between the two programs. The small sample size may in part reduce the ability to detect a statistical difference. A future analysis will combine multiple years of data that will provide a larger sample size.

Figure 10. Among EFSS, and FP combined, on average, 91% percent of children did not have an indicated maltreatment within in 1 year from beginning their in-home program, FY14 entry cohort




Figure 10 shows among EFSS and FP combined, 91% of children did not have an indicated maltreatment within 1 year from the start of the community based program. For the outcome of indicated maltreatment, these two programs were selected as their aim is to reduce maltreatment and 20% or greater of their population served was between the ages of 0 and 11 years old; an age group that is correlated with maltreatment. There were no statistically significant differences in outcomes among the programs. The small sample size may in part reduce the ability to detect a statistical difference. A future analysis will combine multiple years of data

that will provide a larger sample size.

Figure 11. Among EFSS, PFN, MST, Outreach & Tracking combined, on average, 86% percent of children did not have a RITS stay within in 1 year from beginning their in-home program, FY14 entry cohort




Figure 11 shows among the 4 community based programs – EFSS, PFN, Outreach & Tracking and MST – 86% of youth did not have a RITS stay within 1 year from the start of the community based program. There were no statistically significant differences in outcomes among the programs. The small sample size may in part reduce the ability to detect a statistical difference. A future analysis for FY15 will combine multiple years of data that will provide a larger sample size.

Enhanced Family Support Services (EFSS)

Table 1. Number and percent of youth and caregivers who started EFSS in FY14, by age.

Age group	N	%
Youth	362	99.4%
0 – 10	87	23.9%
11 – 17	259	71.1%
18 – 21	16	4.4%
Caregiver (18+)	2	0.6%
Total	364	100.0%

Table 2. Number and percent of youth who started EFSS in FY14, by placement type at the start of EFSS.

Placement*	N	%
Started EFSS in-home	253	69.9%
Started EFSS out-of-home	109	30.1%
Total	362	100.0%

Figure 1. Demographics of youth who started EFSS from in-home in FY14. (N=253)




Table 3. Twelve month follow-up of youth who started EFSS from in-home in FY14, by age and selected outcomes. (N=253)

Age group	Total number of youth	Removal from home			CPS investigation			Indication of maltreatment			Stay at RITS			Adjudication		
		N	% (row)	Median Days*	N	% (row)	Median Days*	N	% (row)	Median Days*	N	% (row)	Median Days*	N	% (row)	Median Days*
0 – 10	56	15	26.8%	116.0	21	37.5%	127.0	9	16.1%	109.0	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%	-
11 – 17	187	55	29.4%	114.0	36	19.3%	124.5	14	7.5%	107.0	29	15.5%	167.0	11	5.9%	246.0
18 – 21	10	2	20.0%	112.5	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%	-	1	10.0%	99.0	1	10.0%	120.0
Total	253	72	28.5%	115.5	57	22.5%	127.0	23	9.1%	109.0	30	11.9%	166.5	12	4.7%	219.0

*Median length of time (in days) between the start of EFSS and the selected outcome.

NOTES:

- A youth may be counted in more than one outcome category, if a youth experienced multiple outcomes within the 12 month period.

- Depending on the length of time a youth received the service, a youth may or may not have been receiving the service at the time of experiencing an outcome. Youth may have ended the service any time before or after experiencing a selected outcome.

Preserving Family Networks (PFN)

Table 1. Number and percent of youth and caregivers who started PFN in FY14, by age.

Age group	N	%
Youth	159	99.4%
0 – 10	6	3.8%
11 – 17	153	95.6%
18 – 21	0	0.0%
Caregiver (18+)	1	0.6%
Total	160	100.0%

Table 2. Number and percent of youth who started PFN in FY14, by placement type at the start of PFN.

Placement*	N	%
Started PFN in-home	121	76.1%
Started PFN out-of-home	38	23.9%
Total	159	100.0%

Figure 1. Demographics of youth who started PFN from in-home in FY14. (N=121)




Table 3. Twelve month follow-up of youth who started PFN from in-home in FY14, by age and selected outcomes. (N=121)

Age group	Total number of youth	Removal from home			CPS investigation			Indication of maltreatment			Stay at RITS			Adjudication		
		N	% (row)	Median Days*	N	% (row)	Median Days*	N	% (row)	Median Days*	N	% (row)	Median Days*	N	% (row)	Median Days*
0 – 10	3	0	0.0%	-	2	66.7%	55.0	1	33.3%	34.0	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%	-
11 – 17	118	35	29.7%	80.0	22	18.6%	101.0	6	5.1%	48.0	16	13.6%	86.0	6	5.1%	103.5
18 – 21	0	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%	-
Total	121	35	28.9%	80.0	24	19.8%	87.0	7	5.8%	41.0	16	13.2%	86.0	6	5.0%	103.5

*Median length of time (in days) between the start of PFN and the selected outcome.

NOTES:

- A youth may be counted in more than one outcome category, if a youth experienced multiple outcomes within the 12 month period.

- Depending on the length of time a youth received the service, a youth may or may not have been receiving the service at the time of experiencing an outcome. Youth may have ended the service any time before or after experiencing a selected outcome.

Multisystemic Therapy (MST)

Table 1. Number and percent of youth and caregivers who started MST in FY14, by age.

Age group	N	%
Youth	156	100.0%
0 – 10	0	0.0%
11 – 17	156	100.0%
18 – 21	0	0.0%
Caregiver (18+)	0	0.0%
Total	156	100.0%

Table 2. Number and percent of youth who started MST in FY14, by placement type at the start of MST.

Placement*	N	%
Started MST in-home	117	75.0%
Started MST out-of-home	39	25.0%
Total	156	100.0%

Figure 1. Demographics of youth who started MST from in-home in FY14. (N=117)




Table 3. Twelve month follow-up of youth who started MST from in-home in FY14, by age and selected outcomes. (N=117)

Age group	Total number of youth	Removal from home			CPS investigation			Indication of maltreatment			Stay at RITS			Adjudication		
		N	% (row)	Median Days*	N	% (row)	Median Days*	N	% (row)	Median Days*	N	% (row)	Median Days*	N	% (row)	Median Days*
0 – 10	0	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%	-
11 – 17	117	44	37.6%	109.0	12	10.3%	274.0	5	4.3%	115.0	22	18.8%	164.5	6	5.1%	252.0
18 – 21	0	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%	-
Total	117	44	37.6%	109.0	12	10.3%	274.0	5	4.3%	115.0	22	18.8%	164.5	6	5.1%	252.0

*Median length of time (in days) between the start of MST and the selected outcome.

NOTES:

- A youth may be counted in more than one outcome category, if a youth experienced multiple outcomes within the 12 month period.

- Depending on the length of time a youth received the service, a youth may or may not have been receiving the service at the time of experiencing an outcome. Youth may have ended the service any time before or after experiencing a selected outcome.

Outreach and Tracking (O/T)

Table 1. Number and percent of youth and caregivers who started O/T in FY14, by age.

Age group	N	%
Youth	91	98.9%
0 – 10	6	6.5%
11 – 17	85	92.4%
18 – 21	0	0.0%
Caregiver (18+)	1	1.1%
Total	92	100.0%

Table 2. Number and percent of youth who started O/T in FY14, by placement type at the start of O/T.

Placement*	N	%
Started O/T in-home	71	78.0%
Started O/T out-of-home	20	22.0%
Total	91	100.0%

Figure 1. Demographics of youth who started O/T from in-home in FY14. (N=71)




Table 3. Twelve month follow-up of youth who started O/T from in-home in FY14, by age and selected outcomes. (N=71)

Age group	Total number of youth	Removal from home			CPS investigation			Indication of maltreatment			Stay at RITS			Adjudication		
		N	% (row)	Median Days*	N	% (row)	Median Days*	N	% (row)	Median Days*	N	% (row)	Median Days*	N	% (row)	Median Days*
0 – 10	1	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%	-
11 – 17	70	24	34.3%	137.5	12	17.1%	149.5	2	2.9%	144.5	11	15.7%	139.0	5	7.1%	276.0
18 – 21	0	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%	-
Total	71	24	33.8%	137.5	12	16.9%	149.5	2	2.8%	144.5	11	15.5%	139.0	5	7.0%	276.0

*Median length of time (in days) between the start of O/T and the selected outcome.

NOTES:

- A youth may be counted in more than one outcome category, if a youth experienced multiple outcomes within the 12 month period.
- Depending on the length of time a youth received the service, a youth may or may not have been receiving the service at the time of experiencing an outcome. Youth may have ended the service any time before or after experiencing a selected outcome.

Family Preservation (FP)

Table 1. Number and percent of youth and caregivers who started FP in FY14, by age.

Age group	N	%
Youth	35	100.0%
0 – 10	35	74.5%
11 – 17	12	25.5%
18 – 21	0	0.0%
Caregiver (18+)	0	0.0%
Total	47	100.0%

Table 2. Number and percent of youth who started FP in FY14, by placement type at the start of FP.

Placement*	N	%
Started FP in-home	30	63.8%
Started FP out-of-home	17	36.2%
Total	47	100.0%

Figure 1. Demographics of youth who started FP from in-home in FY14. (N=30)




Table 3. Twelve month follow-up of youth who started FP from in-home in FY14, by age and selected outcomes. (N=30)

Age group	Total number of youth	Removal from home			CPS investigation			Indication of maltreatment			Stay at RITS			Adjudication		
		N	% (row)	Median Days*	N	% (row)	Median Days*	N	% (row)	Median Days*	N	% (row)	Median Days*	N	% (row)	Median Days*
0 – 10	21	4	19.1%	62.0	5	23.8%	82.0	2	9.5%	62.0	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%	-
11 – 17	9	2	22.2%	86.0	3	33.3%	171.0	0	0.0%	-	1	11.1%	353.0	0	0.0%	-
18 – 21	0	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%	-	0	0.0%	-
Total	30	6	20.0%	62.0	8	26.7%	126.5	2	6.7%	62.0	1	3.3%	353.0	0	0.0%	-

*Median length of time (in days) between the start of FP and the selected outcome.

NOTES:

- A youth may be counted in more than one outcome category, if a youth experienced multiple outcomes within the 12 month period.

- Depending on the length of time a youth received the service, a youth may or may not have been receiving the service at the time of experiencing an outcome. Youth may have ended the service any time before or after experiencing a selected outcome.

RI Department of Children, Youth and Families (RI DCYF)
Community Based Services – Visitation Center
July 1, 2012 – June 31, 2013 (FY13 Entry Cohort)

This section reflects youth who started Visitation Center (VC) in FY13*. The youth who started Visitation Center from an out-of-home placement during FY13 were followed from the service start date to see if they reunified with parents and returned home after receiving the service. Then, those who returned home were followed for six months from the date of their reunification to see if they experienced any of these selected outcomes after returning home: 1) subsequent removal from home, 2) CPS investigation, 3) indication of maltreatment, 4) stay at RITS and/or 5) adjudication.

* Visitation services analyzed in previous sections of this report reflect FY14 entry cohort whereas this section presents deeper analysis on FY13 entry cohort. Therefore, the numbers presented in this section may be different from the previous sections.

Table 1. Number and percent of youth who started Visitation Center through RI DCYF in FY13, by placement type at the start of Visitation Center and age. (N=58)

Placement	Age						Total	
	0 – 10		11 – 17		18 – 21			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Started service in-home	5	9.8%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	8.6%
Started service out-of-home	46	90.2%	7	100.0%	0	0.0%	53	91.4%
Total	51	100.0%	7	100.0%	0	0.0%	58	100.0%

NOTES:

- In-home placements defined in this report include living arrangement of stay with friend, guardian, married parents, relatives, separated couple, single female parent, single male parent, subsidized adoption, and unmarried couple. This is not exclusively child welfare placement.
- Out-of-home placements defined in this report include AWOL, group home, independent living (funded or unfunded), relative foster home, relative foster home – pending license, non-relative foster home, private agency foster care, pre-adoptive home, psychiatric hospital, RITS, residential facility, respite care, shelter care, substance abuse facility, and other. This is not exclusively child welfare placement.

Table 2. Number and percent of youth who started Visitation Center from an out-of-home placement, by discharge and age. (N=53)

Discharge	Age						Total	
	0 – 10		11 – 17		18 – 21			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Discharged after starting VC	38	82.6%	6	85.7%	0	0.0%	44	83.0%
No Discharge after starting VC	8	17.4%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%	9	17.0%
Total	46	100.0%	7	100.0%	0	0.0%	53	100.0%

Table 3. Number and percent of youth who started Visitation Center from an out-of-home placement and discharged from all out-of-home placements after starting the service and median length of time from start of the service to discharge, by age and discharge reason. (N=44)

	N	%	Median length of time from service start to discharge* (Days)
Age			
0 – 10	38	86.4%	325.5
11 – 17	6	13.6%	50.5
18 – 21	0	0.0%	-
Discharge Reason			
Reunification with parents	31	70.4%	152.0
Guardianship	1	2.3%	342.0
TPR	12	27.3%	524.0
Total	44	100.0%	278.5

NOTE: Depending on the length of time a youth received the service, a youth may or may not have been receiving the service at the time of discharge.

Visitation Center (VC)

Figure 1. Demographics of youth who reunified with parents after starting Visitation Center. (N=31)




Table 4. Six month follow-up of youth who reunified with parents after starting Visitation Center, by age and selected outcomes. (N=31)

Age	Total number of youth	Removal from home		CPS investigation		Indication of maltreatment		Stay at RITS		Adjudication	
		N	% (row)	N	% (row)	N	% (row)	N	% (row)	N	% (row)
0 – 10	25	6	24.0%	2	8.0%	1	4.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
11 – 17	6	0	0.0%	2	33.3%	2	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
18 – 21	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	31	6	19.4%	4	12.9%	3	6.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%

NOTES:

- A youth may be counted in more than one outcome category, if a youth experienced multiple outcomes within the six month period.
- Depending on the length of time a youth received the service, a youth may or may not have been receiving the service at the time of experiencing an outcome.

Table 5. Median length of time (Days) between discharge from all out-of-home placements and the selected outcomes for youth who reunified with parents after starting Visitation Center, by age and selected outcomes. (N=31)

Age	Total number of youth	Removal from home		CPS investigation		Indication of maltreatment		Stay at RITS		Adjudication	
		N	Days	N	Days	N	Days	N	Days	N	Days
0 – 10	25	6	118.0	2	146.5	1	132.0	0	-	0	-
11 – 17	6	0	-	2	114.0	2	114.0	0	-	0	-
18 – 21	0	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Total	31	6	118.0	4	123.0	3	114.0	0	-	0	-

NOTES:

- A youth may be counted in more than one outcome category, if a youth experienced multiple outcomes within the six month period.
- Depending on the length of time a youth received the service, a youth may or may not have been receiving the service at the time of experiencing an outcome.

Appendix

Table 1. Number and percent of youth and caregivers who started at least one type of community based services through RI DCYF in FY14, by service type and age. (N=1,324)

Service type	Age								Total	
	Youth (0 – 10)		Youth (11 – 17)		Youth (18 – 21)		Caregiver (18 +)			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Alt for Family – CBT	1	0.4%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	0.2%
Counseling – Mental Health (Group/Individual)	6	2.1%	6	0.8%	2	6.9%	153	53.5%	167	12.6%
Counseling – Sexual Abuse (Group/Individual &Family)	4	1.4%	9	1.2%	0	0.0%	6	2.1%	19	1.4%
Counseling – Substance Abuse (Group/Individual)	0	0.0%	4	0.6%	1	3.5%	65	22.7%	70	5.3%
Education Programs	2	0.7%	16	2.2%	5	17.2%	2	0.7%	25	1.9%
Enhanced Family Support Services	87	30.5%	259	35.8%	16	55.1%	2	0.7%	364	27.5%
Enrichment Programs	1	0.4%	3	0.4%	1	3.5%	0	0.0%	5	0.4%
Family Therapy	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	6	2.1%	7	0.5%
Family Preservation	35	12.3%	12	1.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	47	3.5%
Home Based Treatment	1	0.4%	2	0.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	0.2%
Medical Management	2	0.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	3.1%	11	0.8%
Multisystemic Therapy	0	0.0%	156	21.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	156	11.8%
Outreach and Tracking	6	2.1%	85	11.8%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%	92	7.0%
Parent Aide/Education	7	2.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	40	13.9%	47	3.5%
Preserving Family Networks	6	2.1%	153	21.1%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%	160	12.1%
Respite	56	19.6%	11	1.5%	3	10.3%	1	0.4%	71	5.4%
Teen Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (Teen ACT)	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%
Trauma Focus – CBT	1	0.4%	2	0.3%	1	3.5%	0	0.0%	4	0.3%
Visitation Center	70	24.5%	3	0.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	73	5.5%
Total	285	100.0%	724	100.0%	29	100.0%	286	100.0%	1324	100.0%

NOTE: Highlighted are the number and percent of most frequently used service types, by age.

Appendix

Table 2. Twelve month follow-up of youth who started a community based service from in-home in FY14, by service type, age and selected outcomes. (N=647)

	Total number of youth	Removal from home		CPS investigation		Indication of maltreatment		Stay at RITS		Adjudication	
		N	% (row)	N	% (row)	N	% (row)	N	% (row)	N	% (row)
Service type											
Alt for Family – CBT	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Counseling – Mental Health (Group/Individual)	10	0	0.0%	4	40.0%	3	30.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Counseling – Sexual Abuse (Group/Individual & Family)	11	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	9.1%	1	9.1%
Counseling – Substance Abuse (Group/Individual)	5	2	40.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%	4	80.0%	3	60.0%
Education Programs	7	5	71.4%	5	71.4%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Enhanced Family Support Services	253	72	28.5%	57	22.5%	23	9.1%	30	11.9%	12	4.7%
Enrichment Programs	2	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Family Therapy	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Family Preservation	30	6	20.0%	8	26.7%	2	6.7%	1	3.3%	0	0.0%
Home Based Treatment	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Medical Management	2	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Multisystemic Therapy	117	44	37.6%	12	10.3%	5	4.3%	22	18.8%	6	5.1%
Outreach and Tracking	71	24	33.8%	12	16.9%	2	2.8%	11	15.5%	5	7.0%
Parent Aide/Education	2	1	50.0%	2	100.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Preserving Family Networks	121	35	28.9%	24	19.8%	7	5.8%	16	13.2%	6	5.0%
Respite	10	2	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Teen Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (Teen ACT)	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Trauma Focus – CBT	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Visitation Center	0	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Age group											
0 – 10	100	24	24.0%	36	36.0%	17	17.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
11 – 17	533	168	31.5%	91	17.1%	28	5.3%	84	15.8%	31	5.8%
18 – 21	14	3	21.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	14.3%	2	14.3%
Total	647	195	30.1%	127	19.6%	45	6.7%	86	13.3%	33	5.1%

NOTES:

- Highlighted are the most frequently used service types for youth who started a community based service from in-home in FY14.

- A youth may be counted in more than one outcome category, if a youth experienced multiple outcomes within the 12 month period.

- In-home placements defined in this report include living arrangement of stay with friend, guardian, married parents, relatives, separated couple, single female parent, single male parent, subsidized adoption, and unmarried couple. This is not exclusively child welfare placement.

Appendix

Table 3. Median length of time (Days) from the start of a community based service to the selected outcomes for youth who started a community based service from in-home in FY14, by service type and age. (N=647)

	Removal from home		CPS investigation		Indication of maltreatment		Stay at RITS		Adjudication	
	N	Days	N	Days	N	Days	N	Days	N	Days
Service type										
Alt for Family – CBT	1	29.0	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Counseling – Mental Health (Group/Individual)	0	-	4	137.0	3	86.0	0	-	0	-
Counseling – Sexual Abuse (Group/Individual&Family)	1	126.0	0	-	0	-	1	119.0	1	119.0
Counseling – Substance Abuse (Group/Individual)	2	174.5	1	76.0	0	-	4	143.5	3	139.0
Education Programs	5	69.0	5	173.0	2	14.5	0	-	0	-
Enhanced Family Support Services	72	115.5	57	127.0	23	109.0	30	166.5	12	219.0
Enrichment Programs	0	-	1	100.0	0	-	0	-	0	-
Family Therapy	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Family Preservation	6	62.0	8	126.5	2	62.0	1	353.0	0	-
Home Based Treatment	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Medical Management	1	85.0	1	7.0	0	-	0	-	0	-
Multisystemic Therapy	44	109.0	12	274.0	5	115.0	22	164.5	6	252.0
Outreach and Tracking	24	137.5	12	149.5	2	144.5	11	139.0	5	276.0
Parent Aide/Education	1	217.0	2	128.0	1	101.0	0	-	0	-
Preserving Family Networks	35	80.0	24	87.0	7	41.0	16	86.0	6	103.5
Respite	2	184.5	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Teen Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (Teen ACT)	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Trauma Focus – CBT	1	22.0	0	-	0	-	1	106.0	0	-
Visitation Center	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-
Age group										
0 – 10	24	106.5	36	114.5	17	82.0	0	-	0	-
11 – 17	168	103.5	91	144.0	28	102.0	84	149.5	31	246.0
18 – 21	3	73.0	0	-	0	-	2	95.0	2	116.0
Total	195	103.0	127	127.0	45	88.0	86	146.5	33	230.0

NOTES:

- A youth may be counted in more than one outcome category, if a youth experienced multiple outcomes within the 12 month period.
- Depending on the length of time a youth received the service, a youth may or may not have been receiving the service at the time of experiencing an outcome.
- In-home placements defined in this report include living arrangement of stay with friend, guardian, married parents, relatives, separated couple, single female parent, single male parent, subsidized adoption, and unmarried couple. This is not exclusively child welfare placement.