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Dear Community Member,

On behalf of the Pathways to Safety team, I am pleased to share with you our 6th Annual Program Outcomes Report, covering the 2012-2013 program year. As noted in last year’s report, the development and implementation of our program model has been completed, which means that every call that comes into the Child Abuse and Neglect Hotline is considered for a community based response through Pathways to Safety. While there were not any modifications or changes to the Pathways to Safety program design, there were some notable changes in agency partners. After eight years as a partner with us—starting at the very early stages of development and pilot testing – the Alisal Union School District and its Family Resource Center parted ways with Pathways to Safety. They have been a great partner in this prevention and early intervention effort, and we know they will continue to do great work with their new focus and approach to serving the children and families within their school district. You will see this change reflected in the data you read in this report since Alisal Family Resource Center served Path 1 and Path 2 cases for only part of the year. We continued to serve all families eligible for Pathways to Safety during this transition without disruption so you will see the lower AFRC number offset by expanded service numbers reported for the ACTION Council – which reflects services provided by both the Castro Plaza Family Resource Center (Path 1) and ACTION Council (Path 2) teams.

As you read through this report you should get a feel of the size, scope, and characteristics of the children and families we’ve served. Some of the key program outcomes for the 2012-2013 program year include:

- 1,309 families had the opportunity to participate in family support and case management services through Monterey County’s differential response system, and 86% of these families had a follow-up contact.
- 19% of all families referred to Pathways to Safety (Paths 1, 2 & 3) voluntarily engaged in intensive case management services. Path 3 cases exhibited the highest level of engagement at 52%.
- 47% of families that completed the 90-day program showed measurable improvement on formal assessments. The largest improvements were seen in the parenting capabilities (37%), child well-being (29%) and family interactions (25%) domains.
We must note that this year is the first year we see a distinct difference in Path performance. Path 1, which has the focus of Information and Referral, is demonstrating continued low recurrence. Path 2 has transitioned to almost all of the referrals reported within the time frame. And Path 3 is now an option for the families that are at the highest crisis points. With these factors in place some of our data points will be evolving in their interpretation and we hope to continue development to meet the new definitions of our practice.

In addition, the upcoming program year marks an important transition point in the incubation and development of Pathways to Safety as we focus our attention towards preparing to hand off the case management services from the ACTION Council to another community service provider. All our indicators tell us we’ve reached the point where Pathways to Safety can be successfully handed off to a new partner with fidelity, sustainability, and impact. We have a fully developed program model, six years of experience serving families, and a strong performance management and evaluation system in place. More importantly, our evidence tells us that Monterey County’s approach to differential response is having a positive impact on families and that it represents a cost-effective approach to keeping kids safe and out of the child welfare system.

The work in front of us this year promises to be filled with new changes and challenges. However, thanks to the strong foundation that has been built by all the partners in the Pathways to Safety team over the last six years I’m confident that we will use these changes and challenges as motivation to drive our outcomes to new heights.

Larry Imwalle,
ACTION Council of Monterey County
Pathways to Safety – our way of doing business!

Pathways to Safety is based on two core beliefs – that families can resolve issues more successfully when they voluntarily engage in services, supports and solutions; and that children are safer and families stronger when communities work together.
How it begins….

A referral to Pathways to Safety begins with a call to Family and Children’s Services (Child Welfare). If the legal threshold for abuse and neglect that would allow for an **Immediate Child Welfare Response** is not met, families are “Evaluated Out” or marked as a “10-Day” for follow-up by a social worker.

These families can be referred to Pathways to Safety and offered support and services to address the problems that may have triggered the call to Family and Children’s Services in the first place. Depending on each situation and the level of concern, families are either directly referred to a community-based Family Resource Center (**Evaluated Out, Path 1 -where an Intake Assessment and Case plan are completed**), jointly approached by a Family Resource Specialist and Family and Children’s Services (**10-Day Follow-up, Path 2 – where an Intake Assessment, NC-FASs and Case Plan are completed**) or referred by the social worker after assessment (**Immediate, Path 3 where an Intake Assessment, NC-FASs and Case Plan are completed**).

**Note:** Reasons why a family may not be referred to Pathways to Safety include that Child Welfare cannot locate the family; the family lives outside of Monterey County or on federal land; the incident was an accidental injury; or the child/children may be opened as a case or already represent an open case in the child welfare system.
Overview of Evaluation Methodology

The data presented in this report reflect Pathways to Safety Year 6 program data, covering the period from April 1, 2012 through March 31, 2013. The source data for this report comes from two primary sources of information: CMS/CWS and ETO.

- **CMS/CWS** is the child welfare case management system. It is the source for the information on the number of child abuse referrals, and the demographic characteristics of the child welfare population.

- **ETO** (Efforts to Outcomes) is the Pathways to Safety community case management database that contains the intake and assessment data collection through the community based response. This includes the initial intake, case plans, pre/post family assessments (FAST), and family support funds requests.

In order to produce this report, a matched dataset of ETO and CWS/CMS data was created and this set is the source of all information in this report.

• *It must be noted that as this initiative has developed the amount and quality of data has improved, allowing us to ask more and more questions. In the following pages you will review demographics, summary data and some comparative evaluation data. It is our goal to continue to provide an expanded base of reliable information on program performance.*

- The Evaluation Team-

Members of the Pathways to Safety Evaluation Team: Daniel Bach, Larry Imwalle, Arthur Lomboy, David Dobrowski.
In Program Year 2012-2013, 1994 families representing 2465 children were reviewed for Pathways to Safety.

Chart 1.

- Not referred to Path 1: 187 Families Representing: 202 Children
- Evaluated Out: 589 Families Representing: 664 Children
- Referred to Path 1: 402 Families Representing: 462 Children
- Not referred to Path 2: 90 Families Representing: 14 Children
- 10 Day Referral: 899 Families Representing: 1130 Children
- Referred to Path 2: 809 Families Representing: 1116 Children
- Not referred to Path 3: 421 Families Representing: 570 Children
- Immediate Child Welfare Response: 506 Families Representing: 671 Children
- Referred to Path 3: 85 Families Representing: 101 Children

Pathways to Safety Referrals — Path 1

Pathways to Safety Referrals — Path 2

Pathways to Safety Referrals — Path 3
Demographic Information

Gender
Chart 2 presents the gender breakdown for all children represented in the referrals reported during the program year. The data shows that boys and girls were referred in similar numbers with slightly more girls (864) referred than boys (841).

Age Groups
Chart 3 presents the age group breakdown for all children represented in the referrals reported during the program year, with children 6-10 as the largest reported age group.
**Ethnicity**

*Chart 4* presents the ethnicity breakdown for all children represented in the referrals reported during the program year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EO</th>
<th>10 Day</th>
<th>IMD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/oth.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Referrals by Zip Code

Chart 5.

*Totals above exclude referrals with missing zip code data. (N=783)
Evaluated Out Allegations

Chart 6 presents the Allegations for referrals referred into Path 1 during the program year. General neglect and physical abuse were the most frequent allegation types.

10 Day Allegations

Chart 7 presents the Allegations for referrals referred into Path 2 during the program year. General neglect and physical abuse were the most frequent allegation types.
Immediate Allegations

Chart 8 presents the Allegations for referrals referred into Path 3 during the program year. Physical abuse and general neglect were the most frequent allegation types.
### Pathways to Safety Assignments

**Chart 9.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Path 1</th>
<th>Path 2</th>
<th>Path 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Council</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door to Hope</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCSTART</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alisal</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Start</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsula</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Engagement (Case Management):

Chart 10 presents the percentage of families that participated in case management. *We must note that many families were engaged through a face to face contact (86%), but did not participate in case management.*

Chart 10.1 presents engagement in case management by path.

Chart 11 presents documented reasons why a family did not move into case management.
Chart 12.

**Completed Assessments (Path 1,2 & 3)**

Chart 12 presents the assessments completed for families by partner agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AMC</th>
<th>ACHS</th>
<th>Peninsula</th>
<th>DTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fast Exit</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Plan</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Intake</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Identified Needs

Chart 13 presents the actual number of identified needs (duplicated) by family reported during the program year. The most frequently identified needs continue to be counseling/mental health, parenting education, and housing/shelter.
**Overall Case Plan Goals**

Chart 14 presents the assessments completed for families referred.

**Case Plan Goals by Path**

Chart 15 presents the assessments completed for families referred by Path assignment.
NCFAS-G (FAST) Intake/Exit comparison by Domain

Chart 16 presents the mean scores at intake and exit by domain, for all 197 families with completed intake & exit assessments.
NCFAS-G (FAST) Overall Improvement by Domain

Chart 17 presents the percent of all families with completed intake & exit assessments that showed improvement, by domain. Overall, 47% of families showed improvement on one or more domains.
Support Funds
Chart 18 presents the funds spent by category to support families during the program year.
This chart provides information on the number of referrals that were re-referred within the time frame of greater than 90 days but less than 180 days. Data is broken out by those evaluated out referrals that were not assigned to Pathways and those that were placed in Path 1. From the point of re-entry the chart then shows the new determined response (Evaluated Out, 10-Day, or Immediate) and disposition (Substantiated) of the referrals. The disposition numbers reported are for those referrals that were investigated.
This chart provides information on the number of referrals that were re-referred within the time frame of greater than 90 days but less than 180 days. Data is broken out by those evaluated out referrals that were not assigned to Pathways and those that were placed in Path 2. From the point of re-entry the chart then shows the new determined response (Evaluated Out, 10-Day, or Immediate) and disposition (Substantiated) of the referrals. The disposition numbers reported are for those referrals that were investigated.
This chart provides information on the number of referrals that were re-referred within the time frame of greater than 90 days but less than 180 days. Data is broken out by those evaluated out referrals that were not assigned to Pathways and those that were placed in Path 3. From the point of re-entry the chart then shows the new determined response (Evaluated Out, 10-Day, or Immediate) and disposition (Substantiated) of the referrals. The disposition numbers reported are for those referrals that were investigated.
Recurrence Over Time: Pre-Program Baseline

Chart 22-1.

* In order to maintain the methodology behind recurrence, numbers for the 1 & 2 year re-referral may be adjusted for a period not exceeding 3 years post close of the program year.
Recurrence Over Time: *Pathways to Safety Path 1*

Chart 22-2.
Recurrence Over Time: *Pathways to Safety* Path 2

Chart 22-3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Referrals</th>
<th>Re-referrals</th>
<th>Re-referrals Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>109 96 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>112 113 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>125 122 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>1093</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>93 92 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>75 93 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Re-ferrals: 619  292  326  763  804  787  831
Re-referral: 207  323  323  346  262  218  262

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Substantiated</th>
<th>Re-referrals Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 22-4.

Recurrence Over Time: *Pathways to Safety Path 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Referrals</th>
<th>No Re-ferrals</th>
<th>Re-referral</th>
<th>Re-referrals Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>41  42  56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>47  44  48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>4447</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>41  42  44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>57  69  49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>45  34  27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substantiated</th>
<th>Re-referrals Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exit Surveys with Participating Families

Pathways to Safety quality assurance staff regularly conduct voluntary telephone surveys with families that complete services. Of the 197 families that completed 90-days of services 90 responded to our post-service exit survey. For the program year ending March 31, 2012, families reported the following:

100% ‘strongly agreed’ that their Family Resource Specialist was knowledgeable and provided information that was helpful.
100% ‘strongly agreed’ that their Family Resource Specialist was understanding and respectful our their culture/ethnic background and/or lifestyle.
100% ‘strongly agreed’ that their Family Resource Specialist was effective in assisting the family reach our goals.
96% ‘strongly agreed’ that the services their family received were appropriate to address the goals they set with the Family Resource Specialist
96% ‘strongly agreed’ that they were satisfied with the progress their family made as a result of participating in Pathways to Safety.

While we are pleased with the positive feedback we have been receiving from the families we serve, in the year ahead we will be working on developing a new survey & methodology that will be designed to obtain more constructive feedback from families that successfully complete services, as well as obtaining important insights from families that decided not to engage in Pathways to Safety services.
Glossary of Acronyms

10-Day - Child Welfare Response Code

ACMC - ACTION Council of Monterey County

Allegations - Categories of reported concerns as defined by Welfare and Institutions Code

Assessments - Data collection and performance tracking forms used by Pathways to Safety

Child Welfare Response - Categories of response time as defined by Welfare and Institutions Code

CWS/CMS - Case management system used by child welfare

Disposition - Categories of referral resolution as defined by Welfare and Institutions Code

DR - Differential Response

DSES - Department of Social and Employment Services

Engagement - Those families who received an intake and initial FAST

Enrollments - Those families referred to Pathways to Safety

EO - Child Welfare Response Code - Evaluated out

ETO - Efforts to Outcomes, the case management system for Pathways to Safety

FAST - Nickname for North Carolina Family Assessment Scale, General

FRS - Family Resource Specialist

Goal Domains - 8 areas of focus within the FAST Assessment

P2S - Pathways to Safety

Path 1 - Evaluated out referrals entering Pathways to Safety

Path 2 - 10 day referrals entering Pathways to Safety

Path 3 - 24 hour referrals entering Pathways to Safety

Program Year - Defined as April 1 to March 31

Re-referral - A referral that comes back to CPS

SAS - Statistical Analysis Software
For more Information contact:

Family and Children’s Services
Daniel Bach
(831) 796-3525
bachd@co.monterey.ca.us

The ACTION Council of Monterey County
Larry Imwalle
(831) 783-1276
larry@actioncouncil.org