

Evaluation of an Intensive Family-Based Service

Australasian Evaluation Society
International Conference
10—12 September 2008

Sue Leahy
Merran Butler
Lucy Tully



NSW Department of Community Services

Overview

1. Context
2. Evidence base for program
3. Program overview
4. Overview of evaluation
5. Results evaluation
6. Economic evaluation
7. Process evaluation

1. Context

- Increase in OOHC each year since 1996
- Negative outcomes for many children in OOHC
- NSW - 30% OOHC Aboriginal
- IFBS implemented according to DoCS strategic framework *Commitment to Aboriginal People* – service comprises Aboriginal managers, caseworkers and clients

2. Evidence base for program

Evidence base – measured by:

- subsequent abuse and neglect
- child placement in OOHC
- child and family functioning
- 1995 – narrative review showed little evidence of impact
- 2004 - WSIPP review –no significant impact on OOHC placements

2. Evidence base for program cont.

- 2006 – meta review identified 4 previous reviews focused on key outcome measures:
 - 2/4 no reduction in OOHC
 - 3/4 significant impact on child/family functioning
- 2006 – WSIPP meta-review – models that subscribed to Homebuilders demonstrated impacts on subsequent reports and OOHC placements
 - At 6 months post, 88% intervention group at home compared with 17% of non-intervention group
 - At 12 months 93% intervention group at home compared with 43% of non-intervention group
- Non-intervention group included foster care – does not provide good comparison group for examining impact of placement



3. Program overview

Service	Location	Year established
Malanee Bulgimah	Casino	1994
Wariwanibuka	Bourke	2004/05
Yallamundi	Redfern	2004/05
Birralee	Dapto	2005/06
Wiritjirbin	Campbelltown	2007/08
Waru Mudyin	Mt Druitt	2007/08
In planning	Hunter	2008

 Outside scope of evaluation



3. Program overview cont.

Program reflects key features of Homebuilders:

- Delivered primarily in the home
- Intensive, with caseworkers available 24/7
- Time-limited (although 12 weeks compared with Homebuilders 4-6)
- Provides mix of concrete and clinical services
- Small service teams with caseloads of 2 families

3. Program overview cont.

Community development role:

- Structured programs e.g. camps, parenting programs
- Support CSC caseworkers e.g. provide cultural advice, attend home visits, help identify lost children
- Support to community members to access welfare systems generally
- Post intervention support to family members

4. Overview of evaluation

To examine the efficiency, effectiveness and appropriateness of the IFBS Program in providing intensive home-based support to eligible client families to achieve the overarching intended result that Aboriginal children and young people return to, or stay in their own homes or within their community.



4. Overview of evaluation cont.

1. Results
2. Economic
3. Process

5. Results evaluation - population

Service	Children receiving an intervention	Children excluded	Final sample
Malanee Bulgimah	113	46	67
Wariwanibuka	20	3	17
Yallamundi	78	20	58
Birralee	71	5	66
Comparison group	90	16	74
Total	372	90	282

5. Results evaluation

No. children within each time period in analysis

Time since intervention finished	Intervention group	Comparison group	Total
Less than 3 months	41	19	60
3 months or more	167	55	222
6 months or more	150	53	203
1 year or more	94	37	131

- Groups cumulative
- Focus of analysis on 6 and 12 months groups
- Comparability of intervention and comparison groups tested within each time period



5. Results Evaluation - method

- No. child protection reports pre-intervention compared to no. reports post-intervention within each time period (e.g. no. 6 months pre compared to no. in the 6 months post)
- OOHC placements pre-intervention compared to whether children experienced a placement post-intervention
- Pre and post intervention analysis undertaken for comparison group
- Pre and post analysis of reported issues
- OOHC placement outcomes analysed according to length of intervention
- Results disaggregated by:
 - prior placements
 - Case plan goal (prevention/restoration)

5. Key Findings – Child Protection Reports

Average no. reports per child 6 months pre and post intervention

	Group	N=	Av. # pre intervention	Av. # post intervention	p-value
All children	Intervention	150	2.0	1.1	<0.001≠ *
	Comparison	53	3.8	2.5	0.065≠
No prior placement	Intervention	93	2.0	0.9	<0.001*
	Comparison	30	2.2	2.7	0.498

* Significant result

≠ Significant difference between groups before intervention



5. Key Findings – Child Protection Reports

Average no. reports per child 12 months pre and post intervention

	Group	N=	Av. # pre intervention	Av. # post intervention	p-value
All children	Intervention	94	4.1	2.7	0.001*
	Comparison	37	5.6	4.7	0.470
No prior placement	Intervention	56	3.8	2.0	0.001*
	Comparison	23	4.1	5.0	0.613

* Significant result



5. Key Findings – Child Protection Reports

Carer drug and/or alcohol - average no. reports per child pre and post intervention

	Group	N=	Av. # pre intervention	Av. # post intervention	p-value
6 months	Intervention	150	0.6	0.3	<0.001*
	Comparison	53	0.9	0.6	0.132
12 months	Intervention	94	1.0	0.5	0.001*
	Comparison	37	0.9	1.1	0.764

* Significant result



5. Key Findings – Child Protection Reports

Carer mental health - average no. reports per child pre and post intervention

	Group	N=	Av. # pre intervention	Av. # post intervention	p-value
6 months	Intervention	150	0.3	0.0	<0.001*
	Comparison	53	0.3	0.2	0.440
12 months	Intervention	94	0.5	0.1	<0.001*
	Comparison	37	0.4	0.5	0.499

* Significant result



5. Key Findings – OOHC placements

% children with a placement in the six months post- intervention

	Intervention group	Comparison group	p-value
Children with placement pre-intervention	58.5%	89.5%	0.019*
Children with case plan goal of prevention	16.4%	36.0%	0.008*

* Significant result



5. Key Findings – OOHC placements

% children with a placement in the 12 months post- intervention

	Intervention group	Comparison group	p-value
Children with placement pre-intervention	66.7%	100%	0.036*
Children with case plan goal of prevention	20.5%	32.4%	0.230

* Significant result

5. Key Findings – Length of intervention

Length of intervention	% children with placement 6 months post-intervention	% children with placement 12 months post-intervention
< 6 weeks	36%	36%
6-12 weeks	32%	39%
12- 16 weeks	12%	19%
< 16 weeks	42%	33%
p-value	0.017*	0.317

* Significant result



6. Economic evaluation

- Unit costs per family derived from total program costs, including accommodation and head office coordination role
- Program benefits includes specific CP and OOHC benefits identified in results analysis, plus long term benefits calculated from previous WSIPP study (cost benefit ratio of 1.6)
- Additional community development role unfunded
- Cost benefit analysis indicates program benefits outweigh costs with a benefit cost ratio of 1.9
- Net benefits per family calculated at \$44,712

7. Process evaluation

Key findings:

- Program highly culturally appropriate
- Referral process could be strengthened
- Post-intervention support should be identified
- Robust measurement of impact on children and family functioning need to be put in place
- Better integration of program within IT business system required
- Enhancements to learning and development
- More formal engagement with community

7. Process evaluation

Strategic directions:

- Enhancements to referral processes
- Strategy to enhance post-intervention support pathways:
 - structured pathway in to early intervention
 - funding for specialist family support services aligned to IFBS locations
- Use of structured decision making tool to:
 - inform case planning pre and post intervention
 - provide a measure of program impact on family functioning

7. Process evaluation

Operational improvements:

- Enhancements to business system
- Additional learning resources to support staff both within and referring to the program
- Strategies to support the retention and development of program staff
- Information kit to support community engagement in the program, particularly in the establishment of new services

Questions

