



# Flipping the Switch:

## Using Data to Illuminate Your CQI Process



# Introductions



**Jennifer Seward**  
Illinois DCFS  
Area Administrator for Central Region



**Dan Phillips**  
Children and Family Research Center  
Web Developer



# Research Finds the Internet



# Sharing Issues

- Data can be presented more from a researcher's point of view.
- Web developers might not be skilled in the field from which the data came.
- Devs look at their own products all day, can become inured to the less user-friendly aspects.
- No expensive focus groups, very little user feedback.



# Break the Cycle?

- A catch-22:
  - Developers need feedback from users in order to make a tool optimal
  - ...but no one wants to use a less-than-optimal tool.
- Hence, portals that SHOULD be connecting data with practice are under-used.
- So please give developers feedback! (Dan's email address is in your packet, for example)



# Workshop Goal(s)

- Hypothetical exercises might not speak directly to you and your CQI process, BUT...
- Doing them will (hopefully):
  - spark thoughts on how this data might be useful to you
  - get you more comfortable with the idea of using web data generally



**Questions?**



# Example Exercise

[cfrc.illinois.edu/outcome-indicator-tables.php](http://cfrc.illinois.edu/outcome-indicator-tables.php)

You are a permanency administrator for the Illinois DCFS, and you've been tasked with creating a baseline for a goal to improve the reunification rates within 12 months across each region. Since the Data Center's most recent complete year of data for this indicator is 2017, you decide to pull the benchmarks from that year. What are those benchmarks?



# Example Exercise

[cfrc.illinois.edu/outcome-indicator-tables.php](http://cfrc.illinois.edu/outcome-indicator-tables.php)

You are a permanency administrator for the Illinois DCFS, and you've been tasked with creating a baseline for a goal to improve the reunification rates within 12 months across each region. Since the Data Center's most recent complete year of data for this indicator is 2017, you decide to pull the benchmarks from that year. What are those benchmarks?

## Solution:

Indicator: Reunification Within 12 Months

In the region table on the Illinois tab for this indicator, we find the following rates for 2017:

Cook:	4.4%
Northern:	16.5%
Central:	15.8%
Southern:	13.2%

Extra credit:

The same data can be found by selecting the Region button then selecting each region individually, looking for the rate in the top table for 2017.



# Exercise #1

[cfrc.illinois.edu/outcome-indicator-tables.php](http://cfrc.illinois.edu/outcome-indicator-tables.php)

You are an administrator for the Cook Region of the IDCFS. You've been directed to determine which of your sub-regions (Cook North, Cook Central, Cook South) experienced the greatest increase in maltreatment among children in intact families between 2016 and 2017. Use the Data Center tables to rank the three sub-regions by percentage change between the two years.



# Exercise #1

[cfrc.illinois.edu/outcome-indicator-tables.php](http://cfrc.illinois.edu/outcome-indicator-tables.php)

You are an administrator for the Cook Region of the IDCFS. You've been directed to determine which of your sub-regions (Cook North, Cook Central, Cook South) experienced the greatest increase in maltreatment among children in intact families between 2016 and 2017. Use the Data Center tables to rank the three sub-regions by percentage change between the two years.

## Solution:

**Indicator: Maltreatment Among Children in Intact Family Cases**

If you click the 'Region' button for this indicator and then click the 'Cook' button, there is a table showing Cook's sub-regions. Their rates from 2016 to 2017 were as follows:

Cook North:	from 9.3% to 11.3% (2% increase)
Cook Central:	from 9.5% to 12.6% (3.1% increase)
Cook South:	from 8.3% to 12.8% (4.5% increase)

The greatest increase in this rate occurred in the Cook South sub-region.



# Exercise #2

[cfrc.illinois.edu/outcome-indicator-tables.php](http://cfrc.illinois.edu/outcome-indicator-tables.php)

You are a member of a task force that focuses on adoptions at a specific child welfare agency in Illinois. Your agency would like to start comparing its rates of children exiting to adoption with those of Illinois as a whole. For the children entering your care in the years 2014, 2015, and 2016, adoption within 24 months was attained by 6.0%, 7.2%, and 8.5% of your clients respectively. Use Data Center tables to determine how your agency compared to the state. Is your agency following a similar trend to what's reflected in the statewide data?



# Exercise #2

[cfrc.illinois.edu/outcome-indicator-tables.php](http://cfrc.illinois.edu/outcome-indicator-tables.php)

You are a member of a task force that focuses on adoptions at a specific child welfare agency in Illinois. Your agency would like to start comparing its rates of children exiting to adoption with those of Illinois as a whole. For the children entering your care in the years 2014, 2015, and 2016, adoption within 24 months was attained by 6.0%, 7.2%, and 8.5% of your clients respectively. Use Data Center tables to determine how your agency compared to the state. Is your agency following a similar trend to what's reflected in the statewide data?

## Solution:

**Indicator: Permanence (Reunification, Adoption, Guardianship) Within 24 Months**

Looking at the Illinois tab for this indicator, the Statewide rates of exiting to adoption within 24 months for the targeted years are as follows:

	State	Agency
2014:	3.7%	6.0%
2015:	4.4%	7.2%
2016:	5.4%	8.5%

The agency has consistently higher percentages than the state, and it is following a similar trend (rates increasing slightly).



# Exercise #3

[cfrc.illinois.edu/outcome-indicator-tables.php](http://cfrc.illinois.edu/outcome-indicator-tables.php)

You are a member of a task force at the IDCFS that focuses on young adults. You've been asked to identify whether there is a significant change in the rates of older youth (ages 12-17) between the years of 2011-2017 running away from substitute care. Use the Data Center tables to find this statistical data.



# Exercise #3

[cfrc.illinois.edu/outcome-indicator-tables.php](http://cfrc.illinois.edu/outcome-indicator-tables.php)

You are a member of a task force at the IDCFS that focuses on young adults. You've been asked to identify whether there is a significant change in the rates of older youth (ages 12-17) between the years of 2011-2017 running away from substitute care. Use the Data Center tables to find this statistical data.

## Solution:

Indicator: Children Who Run Away from Substitute Care

Looking at the Illinois tab for this indicator, we find that the target years list the following rates (for the 12-17 age group):

2011: 23.3%  
2012: 24.1%  
2013: 20.5%  
2014: 22.1%  
2015: 21.7%  
2016: 19.0%  
2016: 18.3%

There has been a 5% decrease in this rate.



# Exercise #4

[cfrc.illinois.edu/outcome-indicator-tables.php](http://cfrc.illinois.edu/outcome-indicator-tables.php)

You are a member of a permanency stability team for the Peoria subregion. Your task is to identify Peoria's rates of re-entry into care for children in care less than a year against those same rates for the state of Illinois as a whole. Compare the two for the years 2014 - 2016.



# Exercise #4

[cfrc.illinois.edu/outcome-indicator-tables.php](http://cfrc.illinois.edu/outcome-indicator-tables.php)

You are a member of a permanency stability team for the Peoria subregion. Your task is to identify Peoria's rates of re-entry into care for children in care less than a year against those same rates for the state of Illinois as a whole. Compare the two for the years 2014 - 2016.

## Solution:

Indicator: Re-Entry to Substitute Care Among Children in Care Less Than 12 Months

Looking at the Illinois tab for this indicator, by scrolling between the top (statewide) table and the "Sub-Region" table you can find the comparative rates for the target years:

	State	Peoria
2014:	8.0%	10.2%
2015:	7.7%	7.4%
2016:	6.9%	4.3%

So since 2014, the state's rates have been dropping steadily from 8%, while Peoria's have been dropping more precipitously and from a higher starting point of 10.2%.



# Thank You

- Dan Phillips - [danzap@illinois.edu](mailto:danzap@illinois.edu)
- Check last page of packet for a short list of free online data resources