<div align="center">

Project Report
DR cases in the Family Development Matrix
Aug 2008- Feb 2013
By
Ignacio A. Navarro Ph.D.
June 12th 2013

</div>

Introduction:

This report presents an analysis of cases that were identified as Differential Response (DR) referrals in the FDM database in the August 2008 – February 2013 period. The report gives special emphasis on a comparison of outcomes between clients classified as DR referrals and clients not classified as DR referrals by the family resource centers providing services to these clients.

The report is organized as follows. The first section presents an overview of the total number of cases and their demographic characteristics. The second section presents a comparison and overview of outcomes for DR and non DR cases on the 20 core FDM indicators; the third section presents an analysis of family engagement for DR cases, while the fourth section concludes.

Highlights:

I. DR referrals in the FDM

Between August 2008 and February 2013, 12,050 first assessments were entered in the FDM database. Out of this total number of cases, 4,302 (36%) were classified as DR referrals in all DR paths. (See table 1)

The distribution of DR referrals by collaboratives shows a wide variation on how collaborative utilize the FDM for DR cases. In collaboratives like Venture, Fresno, Mendocino, Madera, more than 80% of their cases in the FDM are classified as DR. On the other hand, in collaboratives like Santa Barbara, Los Angeles, San Joaquin, less than 20 % of their cases are classified as DR. (See table 1)

Out of the 4,302 DR cases in the FDM the majority were path 2 (67%) followed by path 1 (20%) and path 3 (13%). (See table 2).

The distribution of number of children for Non-DR and DR cases are fairly similar, with Non-DR cases being slightly more likely to be from families with no children at the time of the first assessment. (A member of the FDM panel of experts offered an explanation for this difference stating that it may be caused by families expecting their first child who are referred to family resource centers through First 5 and therefore are not DR). (See table 3)

The distribution of DR referrals varies by ethnicity. As table 4 shows, Hispanic families represent 52% of DR cases, and 63% of non-DR cases. On the other hand, White families represented 14% of non-DR cases, and 23 % of DR cases. (See table 4)

II. Family Outcomes: DR vs. non-DR

Table 5 shows a comparison of families rated as "safe" or "self-sufficient" in each of the 20 core indicators for Non-DR and DR families. As the table shows, DR families tend to be (slightly) more likely to be "safe" or "self-sufficient" in the indicators of Child health insurance, Budgeting and Nutrition; but they are less likely to be rated as "safe" or "self-sufficient" in 14 of the other 20 indicators. The largest differences are in the indicators of Risk of emotional or sexual abuse, Family communication skills, Parenting skills, and Presence of (substance) abuse. (See table 5)

Table 6 shows differences in the percentage of families rated as "safe" or "self-sufficient" in each of the 20 core indicators between Non-DR and DR cases for families that have at least 3 assessments in the FDM. DR families tend to have lower percentages of cases starting at "safe" or "self-sufficient" levels, in the majority of the 20 core indicators than non-DR families. However, by the third assessment these differences are reduced in all indicators (with the exception of employment) and become non-statistically significant in all but 8 indicators. For the indicators that showed the biggest difference at the first assessment, (Risk of sexual or emotional abuse) the difference remains in the third assessment, but is greatly reduced (from about 13 percentage points to 5). (See table 6)

With the exception of employment, all the differences in scores between DR and non-DR cases are reduced from 1st to 3rd assessment, suggesting that DR cases improve at a higher rate than non-DR cases. (See table 6)

III. Family engagement: DR vs. non-DR

The FDM collects data on family engagement as perceived by the case manager in the FRC using an ordinal measure of how much the family followed the steps it agreed to follow in the first assessment during the empowerment plan.

DR Families were less likely to be perceived as "participating fully" (non-DR=66%; DR=54%) and more likely to be perceived as having an "uneven follow through" or "not participating" in the process than non-DR families. This difference remained unaltered regardless of family scores in the 20 core indicators[1]. (See table 7)

DR families were (slightly) less likely to return to a second assessment than non-DR families (non-DR=68%; DR=62%). However, when comparing non-DR families to DR families with similar scores in the 20 indicators, this difference was not statistically significant[1]. This suggests that the difference between the probabilities of having a second assessment between DR and non-DR cases is explained by family baseline scores in the 20 indicators. (See table 8)

---

[1] This result was assessed using a propensity score matching algorithm.

Tables

Table 1: Distribution of First assessment by DR referrals and collaborative (2009-March 2013)

Collaborative *	Non DR (%)	DR (%)	Total Number of First Assessments
Alpine	85.71	14.29	7
Butte	23.3	76.7	176
Del Norte	91.89	8.11	37
Fresno	19.01	80.99	584
Humboldt	64.1	35.9	39
Lake	31.25	68.75	256
Los Angeles	98.57	1.43	906
Madera	11.36	88.64	44
Mendocino	13.04	86.96	23
Orange	58.48	41.52	1,698
Sacramento	83.07	16.93	1,618
San Joaquin	93.71	6.29	1,002
Santa Barbara	77.29	22.71	1,889
Santa Clara	0	100	13
San Francisco	58.56	41.44	1,163
San Luis Obispo	93.33	6.67	165
Smith River	85.71	14.29	14
Stanislaus	41.11	58.89	1,102
Siskiyou	12.7	87.3	126
Tehama	95.51	4.49	245
Tulare	64.43	35.57	149
Ventura	9.72	90.28	648
Yolo	68.52	31.48	108
Yurok	81.58	18.42	38
Total	64.29	35.71	12,050

Table 2: Differential Response clients by path

DR path	Families	%
Path 1	862	20.04
Path 2	2,877	66.88
Path 3	563	13.09
Total	4,302	100

Table 3: Number of children by DR referral

Number of Children	Non DR (%)	DR (%)	ALL (%)
No children	8.21	1.51	5.82
1	28.3	27.75	28.11
2	29.4	30.17	29.68
3	20.16	21.04	20.47
4	8.66	11.13	9.54
5 or more	5.27	8.39	6.38
Total First Assessments	7,748	4,302	12,050

Table 4: Ethnicity by DR referral

Race/Ethnicity	Non DR (%)	DR (%)	ALL (%)
African American	12.67	16.66	14.09
Latino/Hispanic	62.97	51.74	58.96
Asian/Pacific Islander	4.82	3.68	4.42
White	14.26	23.46	17.54
Native American	1.47	1.56	1.5
Mixed/Other	3.8	2.91	3.48
Total First Assessments	7,734	4,293	12,027

Table 5: Percentage of clients that score at "safe" or "self-sufficient" level in the first assessment by indicator and DR referral (all first assessments)

Indicator	Non DR (%)	DR (%)	Difference (DR-Non DR)	
Child health insurance	85.94	89.53	3.59	*
Budgeting	71.24	73.32	2.08	*
Nutrition	94.17	96.24	2.07	*
Employment	48.74	50.57	1.83	
Health services	87.33	87.67	0.34	
Childcare	79.33	78.97	-0.36	
Supervision	97.29	96.28	-1.01	*
Access to transportation	89.66	88.33	-1.33	*
Clothing	78.35	75.31	-3.04	*
Home environment	93.37	90.17	-3.20	*
Stability of home shelter	85.86	82.53	-3.33	*
Support system	76.43	73.06	-3.37	*
Community resources knowledge	64.71	60.52	-4.19	*
Appropriate development	89.63	84.67	-4.96	*
Nurturing	92.9	87.37	-5.53	*
Emotional wellbeing/sense life value	82.39	76.38	-6.01	*
Presence of (substance) abuse	93.26	86.78	-6.48	*
Parenting skills	88.76	80.41	-8.35	*
Family communication skills	83.35	74.09	-9.26	*
Risk of emotional or sexual abuse	89.64	77	-12.64	*

* Difference is statistically significant at the .05 level

Table 6: Percentage of clients that score at "safe" or "self-sufficient" level in first and third assessment by indicator and DR referral (clients with at least 3 assessments)

	1st Assessment			3rd Assessment		
	NON DR	DR	Difference	NON DR	DR	Difference
Risk of emotional or sex abuse	87.65	74.46	-13.20*	96.26	91.38	-4.88*
Family communication skills	81.37	68.61	-12.76*	91.1	84.79	-6.31*
Support system	75.19	65.39	-9.79*	90.52	84.75	-5.77*
Comm. resources knowledge	63.03	54.04	-8.99*	94.63	94.41	-0.23
Nurturing	92.06	83.33	-8.72*	96.77	94.56	-2.21
Emotio. wellbeing/sense life val.	80.4	71.69	-8.71*	91.43	87.67	-3.76*
Appropriate development	87.68	79.05	-8.63*	94.29	88.45	-5.84*
Presence of (substance) abuse	94.04	86.07	-7.98*	95.96	92.15	-3.80*
Childcare	80.55	73.48	-7.06*	91.31	90.31	-1
Clothing	76.34	69.28	-7.06*	90.43	89.04	-1.39
Parenting skills	86.29	79.45	-6.84*	93.47	90.45	-3.02
Stability of home shelter	85.1	78.43	-6.67	92.33	86.55	-5.78*
Home environment	93.05	87.16	-5.89*	96.37	95.28	-1.09
Health services	89.25	84.08	-5.17*	94.8	94.85	0.06
Employment	57.88	53.61	-4.27	70.7	61.16	-9.54*
Supervision	97.18	94.48	-2.69*	99.04	97.68	-1.36
Budgeting	70.74	68.09	-2.65	88.05	87.02	-1.02
Access to transportation	90.32	89.44	-0.88	96.45	95.07	-1.38
Nutrition	95.55	95.86	0.31	98.45	98.41	-0.05
Child health insurance	83.61	88.61	5	94.22	96.15	1.92

* Difference is statistically significant at the .05 level

Table 7: Worker assessment on family engagement (follow-through with empowerment plan) by DR referral

Level of Follow Through	Non DR (%)	DR (%)	ALL (%)
No action taken by family	6.73	11.9	8.61
Uneven follow through	27.18	34.01	29.67
Full participation by family	66.09	54.09	61.71
First assessments with engagement evaluation	4,727	2,714	7,441

Table 8: Percentage of clients receiving a second assessment by DR referral*

Family has a second assessment	Non DR (%)	DR (%)	ALL (%)
No	32.33	37.96	34.42
Yes	67.67	62.04	65.58
Clients with a first assessment more than six months ago	5,876	3,454	9,330

*When controlling for initial scores (using propensity score matching) the difference disappears