Comprehensive Family Assessment
Intake Baseline Study

Highlights from the Intake Baseline Case Record Reviews and Focus Groups

This presentation was developed through funding provided by the Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Children’s Bureau, Grant #90CA1753/01, “Using Comprehensive Family Assessments to Improve Child Welfare Outcomes.”
Case Record Review
Safety & Risk Assessment

- Timeliness of investigations
  - 98% face-to-face visits or attempts within timeframe
    - 50% 2005 MNCFSR
- Safety
  - 97% had safety assessment
  - 94% with safety threat had safety plan
  - 33% without safety threat had safety plan
- Services for Safety or to Prevent Placement
  - 84% appropriately matched
    - 95% 2005 MNCFSR
Permanency

• Re-entry into out-of-home placement within 12 months
  ▫ 100% absence of re-entry
    • 87.5% absence 2005 MNCFSR
• Connection to tribes
  ▫ 93% ICWA inquiries
Comprehensive Family Assessment

- 76% of all cases had either partial or full, initial comprehensive assessment of all available family members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial Assessment</th>
<th>Partial Assessment</th>
<th>No Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fathers (n=61)</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers (n=113)</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (n=119)</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings (n=89)</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CFA - Family Involvement

- **Worker Visits**
  - 69% monthly child visits
    - 82% sufficient frequency
    - 71% sufficient quality
  - 75% monthly mother visits
    - 84% sufficient frequency
    - 77% sufficient quality
  - 61% monthly father visits
    - 83% sufficient frequency
    - 70% sufficient quality

- **Safety plans**
  - 50% child involvement
  - 98% mother involvement
  - 100% father involvement
CFA - Family & Community Strengths

- Strengths Assessments (mentioned or complete)
  - Family Strengths 96%
  - Target Child 88%
  - Mother 92%
  - Father 89%
  - Community 78%
CFA - Connecting Services to Needs

- **Identifying Need**
  - 17% of child needs not identified
  - 19% of mothers’ needs not identified
  - 14% of fathers’ needs not identified
  - 23% completed specialized assessments, 28% mentioned

- **Addressing Need with Services**
  - Target child
    - 37% not addressed & 32% unclear if addressed
  - Mothers
    - 37% not addressed
  - Fathers
    - 17% not addressed
CFA - Child Well-Being Services

- **Education**
  - 50% service needs met

- **Physical Health**
  - 100% service needs met

- **Mental Health**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Unclear</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child alcohol abuse addressed (n=4)</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child other drug abuse addressed (n=5)</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child cognitive status addressed (n=4)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child behavioral problem addressed (n=26)</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child mental health addressed (n=21)</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child criminal activities addressed (n=3)</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child witnessing domestic violence addressed (n=8)</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child perpetrating domestic violence addressed (n=4)</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Connecting Needs to Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Provided</th>
<th>For Safety Plan n=39</th>
<th>To Prevent Placement n=15</th>
<th>In Response to Other Assessment n=71</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provided information about services</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made a referral to services</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranged services or contacted provider</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided concrete services</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinated services</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met with other agencies</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiated with landlords</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffed meetings with providers</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged family in services</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Documentation

- Often vague and/or inconsistent
  - connection of safety threats to safety plans
  - details of worker visits with family members
  - specific needs of family members
Cultural Competency

- Environmental, cultural, ethnic, or linguistic contextual strengths & hindrances
  - 17% mentioned strengths but only 7% appeared complete
  - 18% mentioned hindrances but only 8% appeared complete
Worker Focus Groups
Current Assessment Process

- Varies from worker to worker
- Varies from case to case
- Clear shared purpose: assessing risk
- Some prefer structure others prefer flexibility
Fears

• Too standardized
• More pressure given existing timeline
• More documentation
• Won’t be what is needed by workers and families
• Too intrusive
• More work without taking away any work
• Assessing each family member
Recommendations for CFA in Intake

- Clearly and consistently communicated
- Allows for worker expertise and experience
- Realistic given statute timelines
- Clear and shared understanding by supervisors and management
- Allow for time with families in “the field”
Training

- Currently “on-the-job”
- Ramsey-specific training would be helpful
- Online training
- Diversity trainings are available
- Training is inconsistent