

Florida MIECHV Benchmark Report 2014

Comparison Matrix (HRSA Form 2; all site data aggregated into state average)



The Florida Maternal, Infant and Early Child Home Visiting (MIECHV) Initiative is required to report progress on 35 performance measures to HRSA, the federal funding agency. Each performance measure relates to one of six Benchmark areas. Florida MIECHV completed its first report October 30, 2014 and included data on families newly enrolled from the beginning of implementation on April 8, 2013 through September 30, 2014. Families at the Pinellas PAT and Northeast Florida NFP sites who were “carried over” into MIECHV from other funding sources were not included. In the future, this report will be submitted annually by October 30 and include data from October 1 through September 30.

This summary report provides brief information about each benchmark area and performance measure. Please refer to the [Florida Benchmark Plan](#) for more details about each individual performance measure, including the operational definition, rationale for the measure, tool or question used to collect the data, the definition of improvement, and how and when data are collected. The following definitions may be useful in interpreting this report.

Constructs

These constructs were determined by HRSA, but each state could define the parameters of the performance measure that related to the construct.

Description of Measure

This is an abbreviated description of the performance measure, combining the more detailed “Performance Measure”, “Operational Definition”, and “Population” columns from the Florida Benchmark Plan.

From target population, those with complete data

Ideally, the target population includes all families served. Many of the performance measures are set up to measure a process or outcome six, 12, or 18 months after enrollment of the target child. In this column, only families who have stayed enrolled and have reached the measurement point are identified (denominator). Of those, the number who had complete and timely data is also provided (numerator). Essentially, we see how many should have complete data and how many actually do. For example, if you have (26/44) or 59%, then there were 44 individuals who stayed enrolled through the end of the measurement period, but only 26 of them had all necessary data elements completed during the designated timeframe. Generally, a seven-day “grace period” was included on either side of the designated timeframe, extending the actual data collection period allowed from (usually) one month to six weeks. If no Participants reached the end of the measurement period, there is “NA” and (0/0). If there is only “NA”, this indicates that missing data did not exclude anyone from the measure. For example, in 1.5 Maternal Depression, the screen was either recorded or not—that is the performance measure, so there is no need to identify missing data.

State Average

This value is the average of all MIECHV sites combined. For many measures, there may only be five or six sites’ data represented because newer sites did not yet have anyone in the target population who reached the measurement point.

Site Averages

The Site Averages column shows the range of values from the lowest performance to the highest performance from individual sites. Note that where numbers are small, the range can be somewhat meaningless (e.g. 0-100%).

BENCHMARK 1:

Improve Maternal and Newborn Health

Constructs	Description of Performance Measure	From target population, those with complete data	State Average	Site Averages		Analysis/Notes
				Low	High	
1.1 Prenatal Care	Of women enrolled by 20 weeks gestation, % with adequate or better # of prenatal care visits, according to Kotelchuck Index.	89% (57/64)	53% (30/57)	36%	82%	Of 64 women in the target population, 63 were linked to birth certificates; 57 had complete data on prenatal care visits; 30 of those had adequate or better # of visits.
1.2 Maternal Smoking	Of women who smoked at baseline, % who had quit at follow-up.	20% (5/25)	50% (1/2)	0%	100%	Only 5 of 25 women had complete data at both points. Of the 2 who smoked at baseline, 1 had quit smoking by follow-up.
1.3 Pre-conception Care	Of non-pregnant women who take multivitamins less than 4-6 times per week at baseline, % who take them at least 4-6 times per week at follow-up.	0 (0/25)	NA	NA	NA	Unable to report data on this measure due to an omission in data collection process.
1.4 Interbirth Intervals	Of women enrolled before child age 2 months, % with no subsequent pregnancy at child age 12 months.	38% (8/21)	100% (8/8)	100%	100%	Of 21 women in the target population, 8 had complete data. All 8 women reported no subsequent pregnancies.
1.5 Maternal Depression Screening	% women screened for depression.	NA	85% (343/402)	50%	100%	Over 85% of women in the target population were screened for depression on time.
1.6 Breastfeeding	Of women enrolled during pregnancy and who initiated breastfeeding, # weeks of breastfeeding duration at child age 6 months.	59% (26/44)	12.4 (198/16)	6.6	20	Breastfeeding data were complete for 26 of 44 women; 16 of 26 initiated breastfeeding. The average duration for those 16 is 12.4 weeks.
1.7 Well-child visits	Of children enrolled before 2 months old, % with at least 3 of 4 (75%) recommended well child check-ups from 2 to 9 months old.	50% (20/40)	85% (17/20)	83%	100%	Data were complete for 20 of 40 children (all 9 intervals from 2-10 months were complete or enough intervals were complete to show at least 3 well child visits). 85% had 3 or more well child visits.
1.8 Maternal & child health insurance	% women and children with health insurance coverage at 6 months.	54% 163/303	85% (139/163)	60%	100%	Over 85% of the 163 women and children with complete data had health insurance coverage at the measurement point.

BENCHMARK 2:

Child Injuries; Child Abuse, Neglect or Maltreatment; and Reduction of Emergency Department Visits

Constructs/ Performance Measures	Description of Measure	From target population, those with complete data	State Average	Site Averages		Analysis/Notes
				Low	High	
2.1 Children ER Visits	% children with an Emergency Room visit from 6-12 months.	18% (5/28)	20% (1/5)	0%	100%	Data were complete for 5 of 28 children (all 6 intervals from 7-12 months were complete or enough intervals were complete to show at least one ER visit). 20% of children had an ER visit.
2.2 Mothers ER Visits	% mothers with an Emergency Room visit from 6-12 months.	16% (4/25)	25% (1/4)	0%	50%	Data were complete for 4 of 25 mothers (all 6 intervals from 7-12 months were complete or enough intervals were complete to show at least one ER visit). 25% of mothers had an ER visit.
2.3 Discussion of Safety Topics	% families receiving safety training on at least 3 topics during first year of service.	NA	92% (67/73)	74%	100%	Of the 73 families who received at least one year of service, 67 (92%) had documentation of at least 3 safety topics being discussed during that period.
2.4 Child Injuries	% children with injuries that required medical treatment from 6-12 months.	18% (5/28)	20% (1/5)	0%	100%	Data were complete for 5 of 28 children (all 6 intervals from 7-12 months were complete or enough intervals were complete to show at least one incident of an injury requiring medical treatment). 20% of children had such an injury.
2.5 Suspected Maltreatment	% children with a report of maltreatment during first year of service.	100% (51/51)	9.8% (5/51)	0%	23.5%	Fifty-one (51) target children were enrolled for at least one year and 5 had a maltreatment report during that time.
2.6 Substantiated Maltreatment	% children with a substantiated report of maltreatment during first year of service.	100% (51/51)	7.8% (4/51)	0%	17.6%	Of the fifty-one (51) target children who were enrolled for at least one year, 4 had a substantiated maltreatment report.
2.7 First-time Victims of Maltreatment	% children with a substantiated report of maltreatment for the first time ever during first year of service.	100% (51/51)	7.8% (4/51)	0%	17.6%	Of the fifty-one (51) target children who were enrolled for at least one year, 4 had a substantiated maltreatment report. It was the first report ever for all 4 children.

BENCHMARK 3:

Improvements in School Readiness and Achievement

Constructs/ Performance Measures	Description of Measure	From target population, those with complete data	State Average	Site Averages		Analysis/Notes
				Low	High	
3.1 Parent support for children's learning & development	% families whose scores on the Home Environment Subscale (HFPI) or on the Involvement & Learning Materials Scales (HOME) improved from baseline to follow-up.	NA	NA	NA	NA	No participants met target population criteria.
3.2 Parent knowledge of child development	% families with completed HFPI or HOME Inventory at 6 months.	NA	52% (102/198)	30%	80%	Almost 52% of families in the target population had a completed HOME or HFPI at 6 months.
3.3 Parenting behaviors & parent-child relationships	% families whose scores on the Parent/Child Behavior Subscale (HFPI) or on the Responsivity & Acceptance Scales (HOME) improved from baseline to follow-up.	NA	NA	NA	NA	No participants met target population criteria.
3.4 Parenting stress	Decrease mean scores on the Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) from baseline to follow-up.	19% (5/26)	2 (9.8 - 7.8)	+5	-5	Only 5 of 26 participants had complete data at both points. The average score at follow-up (9.8) was 2 points higher than the average score at baseline (7.8). The site with the least improvement had an average score 5 points higher at follow-up; the site with the most improvement had an average score 5 points lower at follow-up.
3.5 Child's communication, language & emergent literacy	Of children who score below cut-off on the ASQ-3 Communications sub-scale, % who received appropriate referral within 30 days.	70% (48/69)	25% (1/4)	25%	NA	For 48 of 69 children (70%) in the target population, an ASQ-3 at the 10- or 12-month interval was recorded. Four children scored below cut-off, but only one was referred for developmental services. There is no high average because all data represent one site.
3.6 Child's general cognitive skills	Of children who score below cut-off on the ASQ-3 Problem Solving sub-scale, % who received appropriate referral within 30 days.	70% (48/69)	0% (0/2)	0%	NA	For 48 of 69 children (70%) in the target population, an ASQ-3 at the 10- or 12-month interval was recorded. Two children scored below cut-off, but none were referred for developmental services. There is no high average because all data represent one site.

BENCHMARK 3: Improvements in School Readiness and Achievement						
Constructs/ Performance Measures	Description of Measure	From target population, those with complete data	State Average	Site Averages		Analysis/Notes
				Low	High	
3.7 Child's positive approach to learning, including attention	Of children who score below cut-off on the ASQ-3 Personal-Social sub-scale, % who received appropriate referral within 30 days.	70% (48/69)	0% (0/2)	0%	NA	For 48 of 69 children (70%) in the target population, an ASQ-3 at the 10- or 12-month interval was recorded. Two children scored below cut-off, but none were referred for developmental services. There is no high average because all data represent one site.
3.8 Child's social-emotional well-being	Of children who score above cut-off on the ASQ:SE, % who received appropriate referral within 30 days.	52% (36/69)	0% (0/2)	0%	0%	For 36 of 69 children (52%) in the target population, an ASQ:SE at the 12-month interval was recorded. Two children scored above cut-off, but none were referred for developmental services.
3.9 Child's physical health & development	Of children who score below cut-off on the ASQ-3 Gross Motor or Fine Motor sub-scales, % who received appropriate referral within 30 days.	70% (48/69)	0% (0/4)	0%	0%	For 48 of 69 children (70%) in the target population, an ASQ-3 at the 10- or 12-month interval was recorded. Four children scored below cut-off, but none were referred for developmental services.

BENCHMARK 4: Domestic Violence						
Constructs/ Performance Measures	Description of Measure	From target population, those with complete data	State Average	Site Averages		Analysis/Notes
				Low	High	
4.1 Domestic Violence (DV) Screening	% women screened within 6 months of enrollment	NA	69% (134/194)	35%	100%	Of women enrolled at least 7 months, 69% were screened for domestic violence by 6 months post-enrollment.
4.2 Domestic Violence (DV) Referrals	Of women who screen positive for DV, % with appropriate referral within 7 days.	100% (134/134)	0% (0/11)	0%	0%	Of 11 women who screened positive for domestic violence risk and who were not already receiving appropriate services, 0 were referred for domestic violence services within 7 days.
4.3 Domestic Violence (DV) Safety Plans	Of women who screen positive for DV, % with safety plan in progress or complete within 30 days.	100% (134/134)	79% (11/14)	0%	100%	Of 14 women who screened positive for domestic violence risk, 11 had safety planning underway or complete by 30 days after the positive screen.

BENCHMARK 5:

Family Economic Self-Sufficiency

Constructs/ Performance Measures	Description of Measure	From target population, those with complete data	State Average	Site Averages		Analysis/Notes
				Low	High	
5.1 Household Income	Difference in mean household income from baseline to follow-up.	22% (4/18)	+\$794 (2652-1858)	-167	+943	Of 18 families in the target population who reached 12-month measurement point, 4 had complete and timely data at both points. The state average income at follow-up was \$2652 per household, which is an increase of \$794 from baseline (\$1858).
5.2 Employment or Education	% primary caregivers who are employed and/or enrolled in educational program	28% (5/18)	50% (2/4)	0%	100%	Of 18 primary caregivers in the target population who reached 12-month measurement point, 5 had complete and timely data at both points. Of the 4 who were not employed or enrolled in school at baseline, 2 had gained employment or enrolled in school by follow-up, a 50% increase.
5.3 Health Insurance Status	% women and children with health insurance coverage.	26% (9/35)	50% (1/2)	0%	100%	Of 35 women and children in the target population who reached 12-month measurement point, 9 had complete and timely data at both points. Of the 2 who had no health insurance coverage at baseline, 1 had gained insurance by follow-up, a 50% increase.

BENCHMARK 6:

Coordination and Referrals for Other Community Resources and Supports

Constructs/ Performance Measures	Description of Measure	From target population, those with complete data	State Average	Site Averages		Analysis/Notes
				Low	High	
6.1 Families identified as needing services	% families with documentation of completed screening	NA	74% (145/195)	0%	100%	Of 195 families who were in services for at least 6 months, 145 (74%) had documentation of a completed screening on the home visit form.
6.2 Families who required services & received referral	Of home visits where a family's need is documented, % who receive referral within 30 days.	NA	61% (192/316)	0%	70%	Among the 195 families who were in services for at least 6 months, 316 home visits were completed where a need was identified. There was at least one matching referral made within 30 days for 192 of those 316 home visits—a rate of 61% of needs receiving referrals.
6.3 Completed Referrals	% referrals that were completed within 6 months.	NA	40% (82/203)	23%	100%	Of the 203 referrals made in response to a need identified on a home visit (see 6.2), 82 (40%) had been partially or fully completed within 6 months.
6.4 MOUs/formal agreements	Average # of MOUs in place with other community agencies.	NA	11 (116/11)	2	21	Among the 11 MIECHV funded programs, there were a total of 116 MOUs in place on 9/30/14, for an average of 11 per program.
6.5 Information sharing: Points of Contact	Average # of community agencies with a clear point of contact for providing services to MIECHV families.	NA	27 (297/11)	6	125	Among the 11 MIECHV funded programs, there were a total of 297 community agencies with identified points of contact providing services to MIECHV families, for an average of 27 per program.