A Collaborative Approach to Implementing and Evaluating Family Strengthening and Child Abuse Prevention Strategies:

San Francisco’s Coordinated Family Resource Center Initiative (FRCI)
Three Departments with a Unified Vision

- Funded Jointly by
  - First 5 San Francisco
  - Department of Children, Youth and Families (DCYF)
  - Human Service Agency: Children and Family Services (HSA-CFS)

- Five Goals
  - **Families build their own capacity to improve family functioning** (Early/Intensive Intervention)
  - **Parents have the knowledge, skills, strategies, and support to parent effectively** (Prevention/Intervention)
  - **Children and youth are nurtured, safe, and supported for school success** (Prevention/Intervention)
  - **Families receive adequate services to meet basic needs** (Prevention)
  - **Communities are family-focused and responsive** (Prevention)
Braided and Tiered Funding Model

**Neighborhood FRC: Basic Service Level**
- Community Building
- Access to Resources
- Parenting Education and Support

| 50% DCYF | 50% First 5 |

**Neighborhood FRC: Comprehensive Service Level**
- Basic Service
- Supports for School Readiness and Success
- Case Management
- Linkage with CWS for Coordinated Support

| 25% DCYF | 25% First 5 | 50% HSA |

**Neighborhood FRC: Intensive Service Level**
- Basic Service
- Comprehensive Service
- Intensive Linkage with CWS for Coordinated Support

| 25% DCYF | 25% First 5 | 50% HSA |

**Citywide Special Population FRCs**
Serve families with identifiable need (pregnant/parenting teens, homeless families)

| 16% First 5 | 27% HSA | 57% DCYF |

Service Intensity Increases with Neighborhood Need

$100k - $700k
3 Key Elements of Success

- **Essential Services Framework**
  - Eight required services implemented similarly across FRC programs, also span prevention/ intervention continuum

- **Focus on Quality**
  - Nine Principles of Family Support
  - Five Protective Factors

- **Standardized Evaluation Plan**
Standardized Evaluation Plan

- **Process Measures**
  - Contract Management System Database
  - Participant Assessment of Program Survey

- **Outcome Measures – Each Pairs with an Essential Service**
  - Parenting Scale → Curriculum-based Parent Education
  - **Family Development Matrix** → Case Management
  - Keys to Interactive Parenting Survey → Parent/Child Interactive Activities
  - Child Welfare Services Case Management System → Differential Response and Enhanced Visitation

*Note: Participants also touch many services so this offers an opportunity to look at overlap of service participation and various combinations of outcome measures*
Using Results – All Measures

- **Program Improvement**
  - All FRC programs receive regular presentations and an annual summary of all data submitted
  - Data completion rate increased dramatically from year 1 to year 2; program quality is also increasing notably

- **Sustaining Commitment of Funding Agencies**
  - Data is presented at monthly inter-departmental meetings and quarterly joint funder meetings
  - All three departments have maintained consistent level of funding despite budget challenges

- **Engaging and Informing Community**
  - Annual Initiative Report produced and presented to the community
  - Additional partners are bringing dollars to the table
Using Results - FDM

○ Program Improvement
  • FRC programs share results at regular staff meetings and in staff supervision
  • Staff more effectively identify and plan for families’ needs

○ Sustaining Program Commitment
  • Data shared across funded programs in all-grantee meetings and peer-to-peer networks
  • Number of FRC programs using FDM more than doubled since initial pilot from 6 to 13 (over 50% of all funded FRCs)

○ Engaging and Informing Community
  • Multiple evaluation strategies in place to answer key question: Does case management improve family functioning?
  • Informative data coming to light that allows us to document and quantify the complexity of case management work
Families are improving on several key indicators of overall functioning.

Change Between 1st Assessment and 2nd Assessment: Ten Indicators Most Frequently In Crisis/At Risk (n=338)

- Community Resource Knowledge: 14% to 43%
- Employment: 38% to 41%
- Support System: 19% to 31%
- Budgeting: 20% to 31%
- Child Care: 12% to 27%
- Family Communication Skills: 19% to 26%
- Emotional Well-being: 14% to 24%
- Parenting Skills: 14% to 23%
- Clothing: 14% to 21%
- Risk of Emotional/Sexual Abuse: 9% to 19%
Families are improving on several key indicators of overall functioning.

Six indicators most frequently In Crisis/At Risk also showed the greatest percent change between 1st and 2nd assessment.
DR and Non-DR Families show similar patterns of improvement.

Percent Point Change of Parents/Caregivers in Crisis or At Risk at 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} Assessment: Top Eight Indicators with DR Family Breakout
There is indication that the likelihood of improvement on some key indicators increases with greater service intensity.

Percent of Families Improving on FDM Indicators by Case Management Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FDM Indicators</th>
<th>Case Management</th>
<th>DR Case Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 3x/Month</td>
<td>3x/ Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting Skills</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support System</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Well-Being</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of Emotional/Sexual Abuse</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- When different models of service intensity were tested with statistical analysis we learned:
  - Likelihood of improvement in Parenting Skills Indicator rose 4% for every 10 hours of additional case management; Case Management combined with One-Time Workshops also resulted in greater likelihood of improvement on Parenting Skills Indicator.
  - Families who participated in Case Management combined with Parent/Child Interactive groups were significantly more likely to improve on Support System Indicator.
  - One additional Differential Response Case Management visit per week on average resulted in a 25% increase in the probability that a family improved on the Risk of Abuse Indicator.
Challenges

- Ensuring consistent polices and procedures especially around which families receive the FDM
- Supporting and improving data quality
- Matching and linking data across multiple systems
- Aligning interventions (i.e. service types) and maximizing use of interventions for research purposes
- Explaining and sharing FDM results with others in a meaningful way
Next Steps

- Continue to tighten FDM protocols and procedures

- We will continue to explore how improvement on key indicators is enhanced by greater intensity of case management service and with the addition of other family support services

- Linking FDM results with child welfare outcomes for individual participants with past and/or present child welfare involvement
Contact

- Theresa Zighera, MSW
  Evaluation Program Officer
  First 5 San Francisco Children & Families Commission
  1390 Market St., Suite 318 / San Francisco, CA  94102
  (p)415.934.4873 / (f)415.565.0494 / theresa@first5sf.org

Evaluation Reports are also available at:

www.first5sf.org