

**New Jersey Task Force on Child Abuse and Neglect
Prevention Committee
Maura Somers Dughi, Esq, Chair
Diana Autin, Esq, Vice-Chair
June 5, 2014
9:30 A.M. – 12:00 P.M.
Minutes**

In Attendance:

Diana Autin	Statewide Parent Advocacy Network (SPAN)
Christine Baker	Metro-RDTC at Newark Beth Israel Medical Center
Maureen Braun-Scalera	Rutgers School of Social Work
Jeanette Collins	Child Assault Prevention
Suzanne Conrad	Consultant
Anthony DiFabio	Robins Nest, Inc.
Diane Dellanno	Advocates for Children of New Jersey (ACNF)
Dawn DeLuca	DCF – Office of Research, Evaluation & Reporting (RER)
Alice Hunnicutt	Department of Labor & Work Force Development
Maura Somers Dughi	Child and Family Advocate
Nancy Gagliano	DCF-Family & Community Partnerships
Antonio Lopez	DCF-Office of Family Support Services
Niurca Louis	Robins Nest
Kerrie Ocasio	Rutgers University
Kathy Roe	Parents Anonymous of NJ
Charmaine Thomas	DCF-Family & Community Partnerships
Michelle Rupe	DCF-Family & Community Partnerships
Rush Russell	Prevent Child Abuse -NJ

Staff

Ifeanyi Pole	DCF-NJTFCAN
--------------	-------------

Introduction and Review of Minutes

Introductions were made. The April 2014 minutes were approved.

Business

Family Success Center (FSC) Research - Kerrie Ocasio

Kerrie provided the Committee with handouts for her PowerPoint research presentation on the Department of Children and Families (DCF's) Family Success Centers (FSC). This presentation was requested by the Prevention Committee. The data collected was included in Kerrie's dissertation. Kerrie thanked DCF for its support throughout the research process. The data includes implementation of the FSC model approach and a study of 115 families that were new to the FSCs. The centers receive about \$240,000 per year which funds 2 ½ to 3 ½ staff. The information received from the 39 FSCs was used to create a survey to evaluate what lead families/individuals visit a FSC. The FSC volunteers are composed of participants who have been with the center for a while and other community members. Sixty-eight percent of the FSC volunteers were not their participants; the FSC non-participant volunteers included high school and college students.

- There was a discussion regarding the FSC engagement process and how it is documented. The FSCs indicated that 80% of families completed some type of intake form and 18 FSCs indicated that they use some form of an electronic database to keep track of utilization of services.
- The plan for each FSC varied to meet the needs of each community as well as the individualized needs of the families they serve. The comments from the FSC directors were reviewed in terms of their process as it related to the percentage of families that were completing the family success plan.
- Primary activities of the FSCs were reviewed along with the percentage of time that was spent on the activities. 22% of the FSC time was spent with “Brief 1-on-1” interaction and less than 30 minutes on Information and Referral (I&R). Some of the other activities that are included in the contract include: community gardens, exercising (i.e. Zumba), health related activities, etc.), nutrient work around the community garden, cooking classes on how to use fresh vegetables, etc.
- Family characteristics were reviewed and some of the FSCs stated the need for case management to assist and follow-up with families.
- Family help behavior seeks to engage people earlier in the problem assessment process. Many of the families that come into the FCS have had problems getting in with other service providers.
- Race and Ethnicity references the percentage of the families served by the FSC based on the families that were interviewed.
- The model discussed was in help seeking behavior, motivation for engaging in services, how it applies to the FSC and understanding the intention to continue the use of services.
- Characteristic of Participants references participants’ intentions; some of these variables will decrease when compared to service involvement.
- There is great variation between the families served by FSCs and the way in which they are served. A FSC can impact the likelihood of participants returning to the FSC. Additional research is needed to understand site level effects. It was discussed that Spanish-speaking families should be included in future research.

The Committee thanked Kerrie for her time and dedication to this research. The Committee stated that because of her presentation, they now have has a better understanding of New Jersey’s FSC investment.

Dawn DeLuca

Dawn provided a handout to the Committee that included data received monthly from each of the FSCs and provided a brief data summary (September 2013 through April 2014):

- The first page of the data indicates the total number of registered community participants. A registered community participant is a family counted as one, so even though it can be three or four people; an individual is counted as one; and this is not

the exact number of people that are served. It also includes the number of centers reporting.

- The core contracted services are reported with four elements: the number of individual sessions, family sessions, group sessions and group attendees. This represents a duplicate number of services not people; it is different for the number of group attendees. Most of the sessions are spent on general information/referral and linkages, family health, life skills, and advocacy. Most of the services are being provided in groups.
- The type of general referrals included the categories of food/clothing, family health and other. There is a difference between general info/referral and linkage. The Committee discussed that this data lacks information on mental health services and substance abuse.
- Expanded services – there is opportunity to write in the expanded services provided. A summary of the expanded services include how many sessions and people served. 66% of the time is spent on individual sessions and 65% of the people are being served in groups.
- Demography information – The three main groups reflected in this data are Caucasian, Hispanic and African American. 72% of the participants spoke English. The Committee asked if the FSC staff are bi-lingual. It was discussed that the focus groups are doing a good job with hiring staff who speak with the language of that particular community. The Committee was informed of the language line and Tony Lopez will make a note of this language line inquiry to share with the FSCs. There was also a discussion about providing sign-language interpreters for the FSC participants. The Committee was informed that a list of qualified sign-language interpreters with national certification can be found with the Division of Deaf and Hard of Hearing (DDHH) within the Department of Human Services (DHS).
- More than half of the FSC participants were adults.
- The Committee discussed the size of the State’s budget for prevention compared to its other budget areas. It was discussed that that the FSC is a great investment for reaching families; it is a place for families to go when they are faced with stress and unmet needs. It was further discussed that perhaps DHS could fund at least 50% of the FSC. It was discussed that there is an opportunity to anchor the FSC more strongly in early child well-being, development and parenting skills. Tony Lopez talked about the stigma that may be attached with accessing services from the FSC when it is in the same area as social services agencies. It was discussed that there is a need for help from other agencies in order to do that what is needed to produce more data.

Kerri discussed her next research steps in working with Robin’s Nest to do a case study on what they are doing, the structure that they have put in place, and how the program is developed, supported and may be replicated to inform the other FSCs. The Committee recommended that a 3-4 person workgroup of the Prevention Committee be identified to further discuss with DCF proposed next steps and recommendations for FSCs. Diana Autin,

Kathy Roe and Diane Dellanno will be a part of this workgroup. This topic will be added to the agenda for a future Committee meeting.

Children's Trust Fund (CTF)

The Committee briefly discussed the CTF: its history and funding status. The CTF will be added to the July Committee meeting agenda for further discussion on how to align future CTF funded projects with the Prevention Plan and Standards.

Workgroups Convened – next meeting July 2, 2014 @ 9:30am – Trenton