



Institute for Social and Behavioral Science

UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA

Evaluation of the Children's Home Society of Florida's Enhanced Domestic Violence Services: 6-Month Report

Amy Reckdenwald, Ph.D., Jacquelyn Reiss, Ph.D., and Amy Donley, Ph.D.
UCF Institute for Social and Behavioral Science

January 2024

The University of Central Florida's Institute for Social and Behavioral Science (ISBS) was contracted to evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation of the Children's Home Society of Florida's (CHS) Enhanced Domestic Violence Services that was implemented in the greater Lakeland area, referred to as the Partners for Safe Families Program (P4SF). CHS's Enhanced Domestic Violence Services aimed to more accurately identify and address domestic violence in their child welfare cases. To conduct the evaluation, we utilized a mixed-methods research design comprised of quantitative secondary program data and qualitative interview data.

Methodology

Partners for Safe Families Program (P4SF) Enhanced Domestic Violence Services

As part of the Partners for Safe Families Program (P4SF), cases received enhanced domestic violence services administered by a specially trained CHS clinician, including the Danger Assessment (DA), a tool to help determine the level of danger an abused woman has of being killed by her violent partner, and the HITS (Hurt, Insult, Threaten, Screen), a screening tool for intimate partner violence. P4SF program cases were also offered clinical services that varied depending on the needs of the client.

Secondary Data Analysis

To conduct the secondary data analysis, data was provided by CHS for P4SF program cases that entered the program between 12/1/22 and 5/31/23 (n=8), a group of comparison cases that did not receive enhanced domestic violence services but were admitted into child welfare between 1/1/21 and 6/30/21 and had evidence of household domestic violence (verified or not substantiated household violence that threatens child, intimate partner violence that threatens child, and/or family violence that threatens child (n=14)), and 12-months of aggregate case data in the child welfare system between 9/1/2021 and 9/1/2022, representing cases prior to the implementation of the P4SF program.

P4SF data included information from the Danger Assessment (DA), the HITS (Hurt, Insult, Threaten, Scream), clinician reports, and the Family Functioning Assessment-Ongoing (FFA-O). Comparison case data and the aggregate case data included information from the FFA-O.

Once data were provided, it was cleaned and organized by case. Given the small sample size, descriptive statistics were analyzed for the purposes of this report and are highlighted below. Additionally, as a note, in all the tables below missing data and data points that are not applicable to certain cases are visualized as a dash.

Ethical Concerns

The UCF Institutional Review Board approved this study. To protect the identity of clients, case numbers were de-identified.

Secondary Data Analysis

Presence of Domestic Violence and Intimate Partner Violence

This section highlights the presence of domestic violence and intimate partner violence in the Children’s Home Society (CHS) cases. Table 1 provides a breakdown of the presence of family violence, household violence, and intimate partner violence amongst all cases under CHS’s care prior to the implementation of the P4SF program (between 9/1/2021 and 9/1/2022). Following, Table 2 highlights all domestic violence-related maltreatment allegations for all cases admitted during this same one-year period (9/1/2021 and 9/1/2022).

Table 1. Total Domestic Violence Related Maltreatments Allegations for all Cases

	Family Violence	Household Violence	Intimate Partner Violence	Violence Totals
No Indicator	95 34%	98 16%	9 24.4%	202 21.2%
Some Indicator	15 4.4%	0 0%	0 0%	15 1.6%
Not Substantiated	107 38.4%	283 45%	16 43.2%	406 42.6%
Verified	62 22.2%	255 40%	12 32.4%	329 34.6%
Total	279 29.3%	636 66.8%	37 3.9%	952 100%

Of the data provided by CHS, there were a total of 5,980 maltreatment allegations for all cases under CHS’s care between 9/1/2021 and 9/1/2022. Out of the 5,980 maltreatment allegations, 952, or approximately 16% of all maltreatment allegations, were described as family violence, household violence, or intimate partner violence. Of the 952 maltreatment allegations, 279 (29.3%) were identified as family violence, 636 (66.8%) were described as household violence, and 37 (3.9%) were described as intimate partner violence (shown in Table 1).

While there were a total of 952 maltreatment allegations of family violence, household violence, or intimate partner violence, the largest percentage of maltreatment allegations were not substantiated. Overall, approximately 43% of the 952 maltreatment allegations were not substantiated (see Table 1). Specifically, 107, or 38.4%, of family violence maltreatment allegations were not substantiated, 45% of household violence maltreatment allegations were not substantiated, and 16, or 43.2%, of intimate partner violence maltreatment allegations were not substantiated.

Although the largest percentage of maltreatment allegations overall were not substantiated, Table 1 highlights that approximately one-third of maltreatment allegations, or 34.6%, were verified (n=329). When specifically exploring verified maltreatments by maltreatment type, 62 (22.2%) of those identified as family violence were verified, 255 (40%) of those identified as household violence were verified, and 12 (32.4%) of those identified as intimate partner violence were verified.

Table 2. Domestic Violence Related Maltreatment Allegations for Cases Admitted between 9/1/2021 – 9/1/2022

	Family Violence	Household Violence	Intimate Partner Violence	Violence Totals
No Indicator	0 0%	12 9%	4 50%	16 11.6%
Some Indicator	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
Not Substantiated	0 0%	51 40%	4 50%	55 40.2%
Verified	0 0%	66 51%	0 0%	66 48.2%
Total	0 0%	129 94%	8 6%	137 100%

Table 2 illustrates maltreatment allegations within the 12-month period prior to the implementation of the P4SF program (9/1/2021 – 9/1/2022) for cases admitted during this time. Overall, during this time frame, the data provided included a total of 1,016 maltreatment allegations. Of the 1,016 maltreatment allegations, there were 137 (13.5%) allegations identified as household violence or intimate partner violence. There were no allegations of family violence.

Further, out of the 137 total maltreatment allegations highlighted in Table 2, the largest percentage were verified (48.2%) and all of these verified maltreatments were identified as household violence (n=66). During this time frame, there were no verified intimate partner violence maltreatments.

Demographics

This section provides an overview of the demographic characteristics of parents and children in the P4SF program (shown in Table 3) as well as the demographic characteristics of parents and children in the selected comparison cases (shown in Table 4).

P4SF Program Cases

Table 3. Demographics: P4SF Program Cases

	Parent 1 (n=8)		Parent 2 (n=7)		Child (n =23)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Race						
White	6	75%	4	66.6%	19	86.4%
Black	1	12.5%	1	16.7%	1	4.5%
Asian	1	12.5%	1	16.7%	2	9.1%
Ethnicity						
Hispanic	2	25%	2	28.6%	10	43.5%
Sex						
Male	0	0%	7	100%	9	39%
Female	8	100%	0	0%	14	61%
Age (range)	24 - 52		26 - 53		1-18	
Education						
Elementary	-	-	-	-	9	53%
Middle School	-	-	-	-	3	18%
High School	-	-	-	-	5	29%
Employment Status						
Employed	4	67%	2	50%	-	-
Unemployed	2	33%	1	25%	-	-
Incarcerated	-	-	1	25%	-	-
Marital Status						
Married	3	43%	1	20%	-	-
Single	4	57%	4	80%	-	-

Note: Dashes (-) represent not applicable.

Table 3 highlights demographic information for all P4SF program cases in which demographic data was provided and available. Overall, there were data for 8 cases, which included 8 parents primarily working with CHS (parent 1), 7 secondary parents (parent 2), and 23 children. While those were the total number of parents and children, there was not demographic data available for each case.

Parent 1

More specifically, of the 8 parents identified as ‘parent 1’ in Table 3, 75% were identified as White, 12.5% were identified as Black (n=1), and 12.5% were identified as Asian (n=1). Further, 2 of the 8

total parents identified as Hispanic. The 2 parents who identified as Hispanic also identified as White.

Moreover, amongst parents described as 'parent 1', all were female with ages ranging from 24-52. Most were employed (67%), while 33% were unemployed (n=3). Additionally, most, or 57% of those whose marital status was able to be determined (n=7), identified as single, while 43% identified as married.

Parent 2

Table 3 also highlights all data available for parents identified as 'parent 2' by CHS (n=7). While there were a total of 7 parents who were identified as 'parent 2', there were only 6 parents that CHS was able to determine a racial identity for. Of those 6 parents, the majority identified as White (66.6%). Additionally, of those 6 parents, 2 identified as White and Hispanic.

While parents described as 'parent 1' were all female, those described as 'parent 2' were all male (n=7; 100%) with ages ranging from 26 to 53. Most parents in this category were employed (50%), while 25% were unemployed, and another 25% were listed as incarcerated. Lastly, most, or 80% of, parents identified as 'parent 2' were single, while only 20% were married.

Children

The last set of demographic information provided for P4SF program cases was for all the children in each household (see Table 3). Overall, there were a total of 23 children identified within the program cases. Of the 23 children identified, data on racial identity was provided for 22. Of those 22 cases, a majority were White (86.4%), while 9.1% identified as Asian (n=2), and 4.5% identified as Black (n=1). Of the 23 children within the program, 10, or 43.5% identified as White and Hispanic.

Additionally, of the 23 children in the program, approximately 61% identified as male, while 39% identified as female with ages ranging from 1 to 18. Despite the wide range in age among children in the program, over 50% were in Elementary School, while 29% were in High School, and 18% were in Middle School.

Comparison Cases

Table 4. Demographics: Comparison Cases

	Parent 1 (n=14)		Parent 2 (n = 14)		Child (n=25)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Race						
White	10	71.4%	5	41.7%	15	60%
Black	4	28.6%	6	50%	9	36%
Biracial	-	-	1	8.3%	1	4%
Ethnicity						
Hispanic	1	7.1%	1	7.1%	2	8%
Sex						
Male	0	0%	14	100%	12	48%
Female	14	100%	0	0%	13	52%
Age (range)	23-43		23-47		2-17	
Education						
Elementary	-	-	-	-	9	69.2%
Middle School	-	-	-	-	3	23.1%
High School	-	-	-	-	1	7.7%
Employment Status						
Employed	3	50%	4	80%	-	-
Unemployed	3	50%	1	20%	-	-
Marital Status						
Married	1	9%	1	11%	-	-
Single	10	91%	8	89%	-	-

Note: Dashes (-) represent not applicable.

Next, Table 4 highlights demographic information for all identified comparison cases in which demographic data was provided and available. Overall, there was data for 14 cases, which included 14 parents primarily working with CHS, 14 secondary parents, and 25 children. While those were the total number of parents and children, there was not demographic data available for each case.

Parent 1

Of the 14 parents described as ‘parent 1’ in Table 4, 71.4% identified as White and 28.6% identified as Black (n=4). Further, of the 14 total parents in this category, when asked about ethnicity, 1 identified as Hispanic. For the 1 parent who identified as Hispanic, they identified their race as White.

Additionally, amongst parents identified as ‘parent 1’, 100% were female with ages ranging from 23-43. Moreover, of these 14 parents, employment data was only available for 6 cases. Of those 6 parents, about 50% were employed (n=3), while the other 50% were unemployed. Additionally, most, or 91% of those whose marital status was able to be determined (n=11), identified as single, while only 1 was married.

Parent 2

Table 4 also highlights all data available for parents identified as ‘parent 2’ by CHS (n=14). While there were a total of 14 parents who were identified as ‘parent 2’, there were only 12 parents that CHS was able to determine a racial identity for. Of those 12 parents, the majority identified as Black (50%), while 41.7% identified as White, and 8.3% identified as biracial (n=1). Additionally, of the 14 parents in this group, 1 identified as White and Hispanic.

While parents described as ‘parent 1’ were all female, those described as ‘parent 2’ were all male with ages ranging from 23-47. Most parents in this category that data were available for (n=5) were employed (80%), while 20% were unemployed. Lastly, most, or 89% of, parents described as ‘parent 2’ who also had data on marital status available, were described as single, while only 11% were married.

Children

The last set of demographic information provided for the comparison cases was for all the children in each household (see Table 4). Overall, there were a total of 25 children identified within the comparison cases. Of the 25 children in the comparison cases, a majority were White (60%), while 36% identified as Black (n=9), and 4% identified as biracial (n=1). Of the 25 children within the program, 2, or 8% identified as White and Hispanic.

Additionally, of the 25 children in the comparison cases, approximately 52% identified as female, while 48% identified as male with ages ranging from 2 to 17. Despite the wide range in age among children in the program, approximately 70% were in Elementary School, 23% were in Middle School, and about 7.7% were in High School.

Comparison of P4SF Program Cases and Comparison Cases

This section of the report provides data for all P4SF program cases as well as selected comparison cases. Throughout this section, comparisons are made between P4SF cases that received clinical services and those that did not and between P4SF cases and comparison cases. More specifically, of the 8 total P4SF program cases, 4 were categorized as clinical cases with a determined treatment plan, while the other 4 were categorized as non-clinical with no treatment plan because clients chose not to engage with clinical services after the domestic violence assessments were administered.

First, Table 5 highlights data on the identification of domestic violence including variables for the new domestic violence assessments utilized by clinicians, as well as all verified maltreatments for each case at intake and at the 6-month follow-up. All verified maltreatments listed include maltreatments that were listed as family violence, household violence, and intimate partner violence. All verified maltreatments that were included at intake represent all verified maltreatments in the dataset provided per each case, while all verified maltreatments included at the 6-month follow-up represent verified maltreatments between intake and the 6-month follow-up per each case.

Next, Table 6 provides data on child removals and child permanency for both the P4SF program cases and comparison cases. Variables in Table 6 include whether the children were placed in-home (IH) or out-of-home (OOH) at both intake and the 6-month follow-up and whether the child was reunified with their parent(s) at the time of the 6-month follow-up.

Lastly, Tables 7-9 highlight data on child well-being outcomes for both the P4SF program cases and comparison cases. The child well-being outcomes that are included in the tables are as follows: emotional trauma, behavioral, physical health, developmental, educational, family relationships, peer/adult relationships, cultural identity, substance awareness, and life skills. These tables include both the mean score of each measured outcome as well as scores for each child.

Note: for confidentiality purposes cases have been de-identified.

Identification of Domestic Violence

Table 5. Identification of Domestic Violence

	DA Score	HITS Score	Verified Maltreatments (Intake)	Verified Maltreatments (6mo)
Clinical Cases				
<i>Average Scores</i>	9.75	20.5	1.5	0
Case 1	18	22	2	0
Case 2	12	19	1	0
Case 3	7	-	0	0
Case 4	2	-	3	0
Non-Clinical Cases				
<i>Average Scores</i>	17.5	14.7	2.75	1.25
Case 5	14	10	0	0
Case 6	18	16	5	0
Case 7	19	18	1	0
Case 8	19	-	5	5
Comparison Cases			2.6	0.6
Case 1C	-	-	13	5
Case 2C	-	-	10	0
Case 3C	-	-	1	0
Case 4C	-	-	2	0
Case 5C	-	-	1	0
Case 6C	-	-	4	2
Case 7C	-	-	2	0
Case 8C	-	-	2	0
Case 9C	-	-	1	1
Case 10C	-	-	1	0
Case 11C	-	-	0	0
Case 12C	-	-	0	0
Case 13C	-	-	0	0
Case 14C	-	-	0	0

Note: Dashes (-) represent not applicable.

CHS provided data on the new assessments implemented to identify domestic violence within their child welfare cases. The assessments CHS provided data on include the Danger Assessment (DA) and HITS scores that were determined by CHS clinicians. Higher scores on the DA represent higher

risk of being killed by a violent partner. Specifically, a score less than 8 represents variable danger, a score of 8-13 represents increased risk, a score of 14-17 represents severe danger, and a score of 18 and over represents extreme danger. A HITS score greater than 10 is considered positive for intimate partner violence in the relationship.

Table 5 highlights both the DA and HITS scores for all P4SF program cases as well as all verified maltreatments per each case for both the P4SF cases and comparison cases. Cases are divided between clinical P4SF program cases, non-clinical P4SF program cases, and comparison cases. Although Table 5 includes scores for each individual case, averages for the DA and HITS scores and for verified maltreatments are also included. The P4SF program cases with the highest DA and HITS scores and comparison cases with the highest number of verified maltreatments were bolded and remain bolded throughout the remainder of the report to assess the relationship between higher DA and HITS scores and a higher number of verified maltreatments, and child removal, child permanency, and child well-being outcomes. More specifically, all HITS scores greater than 10 were bolded since all scores greater than 10 indicate the presence of intimate partner violence, and all DA scores above 8 were bolded since that indicates an increased risk of danger for being killed by a violence partner.

Overall, DA scores for P4SF program cases ranged from 2 to 19 and HITS scores ranged from 10 to 22. More specifically, the DA scores for clinical cases ranged from 2 to 18 with an average score of 9.75 and the DA scores for non-clinical cases ranged from 14 to 19 with an average score of 17.5. Alternatively, there were only 2 clinical cases in which the HITS assessment was administered, and they ranged from 19 to 22 with an average of 20.5. While the HITS assessment was only administered for 2 clinical cases, it was administered to 3 non-clinical cases ranging from 10 to 18 with an average of 14.7.

Table 5 also highlights the number of verified maltreatments (family violence, household violence, and/or intimate partner violence) at the time of intake and at the 6-month follow-up. Verified maltreatments were also included in this table to compare whether higher DA and HITS scores were associated with verified domestic violence-related maltreatments.

The number of verified maltreatments at intake for P4SF program clinical cases ranged between 0 and 3 with an average of 1.5, while the number of verified maltreatments at intake for P4SF program non-clinical cases ranged between 0 and 5 with an average of 2.75. At the 6-month follow-up, there were no verified maltreatment allegations for P4SF program clinical cases, while 1 P4SF program non-clinical case had 5 verified maltreatments at the 6-month follow-up. Alternatively, the number of verified maltreatments at intake for comparison cases ranged between 0 and 13 with an average of 2.6 and the number of verified maltreatments at the 6-month follow-up ranged between 0 and 5 with an average of 0.6. Moreover, 2 of the 14 comparison cases had a significantly higher number of verified maltreatments at intake, with 1 of those 2 cases also having a high number of verified maltreatments after 6 months.

Overall, Table 5 shows that P4SF program non-clinical cases had higher DA scores, while P4SF program clinical cases had higher HITS scores. P4SF program non-clinical cases had a higher number of verified domestic-violence maltreatments compared to P4SF program clinical cases. Additionally, aside from one outlier, cases with higher DA and HITS scores were also cases with

verified domestic violence-related maltreatments. Further, comparison cases had higher amounts of verified domestic violence-related maltreatments at intake.

DRAFT

Child Removal and Child Permanency

Table 6. Child Removal and Child Permanency

	IH/OOH (Intake)	IH/OOH (6mo)	Reunification
Clinical Cases			
Case 1	OOH	IH	Yes
Case 2	OOH	OOH	No
Case 3	OOH	OOH	No
Case 3	OOH	OOH	No
Case 3	OOH	OOH	No
Case 3	OOH	OOH	No
Case 3	OOH	OOH	No
Case 3	OOH	OOH	No
Case 4	OOH	OOH	No
Case 4	OOH	OOH	No
Case 4	OOH	OOH	No
Case 4	OOH	OOH	No
Non-Clinical Cases			
Case 5	IH	IH	-
Case 5	IH	IH	-
Case 6	OOH	OOH	No
Case 6	OOH	OOH	No
Case 6	OOH	OOH	No
Case 7	OOH	IH	Yes
Case 8	IH	IH	-
Case 8	IH	IH	-
Case 8	IH	IH	-
Case 8	OOH	IH	Yes
Case 8	OOH	IH	Yes
Comparison Cases			
Case 1C	IH	IH	-
Case 1C	IH	IH	-
Case 1C	IH	IH	-
Case 1C	IH	IH	-

Case 1C	IH	IH	-
Case 2C	OOH	IH	Yes
Case 2C	OOH	IH	Yes
Case 2C	OOH	IH	Yes
Case 2C	OOH	IH	Yes
Case 2C	OOH	IH	Yes
Case 3C	IH	IH	-
Case 4C	IH	IH	-
Case 5C	OOH	IH	Yes
Case 6C	IH	IH	-
Case 6C	OOH	IH	Yes
Case 7C	IH	IH	-
Case 8C	OOH	IH	Yes
Case 8C	OOH	IH	Yes
Case 9C	OOH	IH	Yes
Case 10C	OOH	IH	Yes
Case 11C	IH	IH	-
Case 12C	OOH	IH	Yes
Case 12C	OOH	IH	Yes
Case 13C	IH	IH	-
Case 14 C	OOH	OOH	No

Notes: Dashes (-) represent not applicable.

Table 6 highlights data related to child removals and child permanency amongst the 8 P4SF program cases and the 14 comparison cases. More specifically, Table 6 provides data on whether each child has an in-home (IH) or out-of-home (OOH) placement at intake and the 6-month follow-up and if the child was reunified with their parent(s) at the time of the 6-month follow-up. All P4SF program cases with the highest DA and HITS scores, or identified domestic violence based on their DA and HITS scores are bolded. Similarly, comparison cases with the highest number of verified domestic violence-related maltreatments are bolded.

Of the 4 P4SF program clinical cases, which included 12 children, all children were OOH at intake. Alternatively, of the 4 P4SF program non-clinical cases, which included 11 children, 6 were OOH at intake, while 5 were IH. Moreover, there were 25 children within the 14 comparison cases and of those 25 children, 14 were OOH at the time of intake, while 11 were IH.

At the time of the 6-month follow-up, 1 child (8.3%) of the 12 children in the P4SF program clinical cases was reunified with their parent(s). Alternatively, among the P4SF program non-clinical cases, 3 of the 6 children (50%) in OOH placements were reunited with their parent(s) at the

time of the 6-month follow-up. Lastly, among the 14 children in the comparison cases who were OOH at the time of intake, 13 (93%) were reunified with their parent(s) at the 6-month follow-up.

Overall, there does not appear to be a relationship between DA and HITS scores or the number of verified domestic violence-related maltreatments and whether children were reunified with their parent(s) at the 6-month follow-up.

Additionally, there does not appear to be a relationship between P4SF program participation and reunification at the 6-month follow-up. Overall, 4 out of 18 children (22.2%) in the P4SF program cases (clinical and non-clinical combined) were reunified with their parent(s) compared to 13 out of 14 children (93%) in the comparison cases at the 6-month follow-up.

DRAFT

Case 8	1	1	1	1	1	1
Comparison Cases						
<i>Average Scores</i>	<i>1.95</i>	<i>2.1</i>	<i>1.4</i>	<i>1.8</i>	<i>1.3</i>	<i>1.5</i>
Case 1C	3	3	1	-	1	-
Case 1C	3	3	1	-	1	-
Case 1C	3	3	1	-	1	-
Case 1C	3	1	1	-	1	-
Case 1C	3	1	2	-	2	-
Case 2C	2	-	2	2	1	1
Case 2C	3	-	1	2	3	3
Case 2C	1	1	1	2	2	3
Case 2C	1	2	1	1	1	1
Case 2C	1	3	1	1	1	1
Case 3C	2	1	2	-	2	-
Case 4C	1	2	1	-	1	-
Case 5C	1	2	1	1	1	1
Case 6C	2	2	2	2	1	1
Case 6C	2	3	2	2	1	1
Case 7C	1	1	1	1	1	1
Case 8C	2	2	2	2	2	2
Case 8C	2	2	2	2	2	2
Case 9C	2	2	2	2	2	2
Case 10C	3	3	3	3	2	2
Case 11C	1	1	1	1	1	1
Case 12C	-	2	1	2	1	1
Case 12C	-	3	1	2	1	1
Case 13C	1	-	1	-	1	-
Case 14 C	-	-	1	-	2	-

Notes: Dashes (-) represent missing information.

Table 7 specifically highlights health-related child well-being outcomes, including the following ratings: emotional, behavioral, and physical health. Similar to the tables above the cases are split by clinical P4SF program cases, non-clinical P4SF program cases, and comparison cases. All P4SF program cases with the highest DA and HITS scores, or identified domestic violence based on their DA and HITS scores are bolded. Similarly, comparison cases with the highest number of verified domestic violence-related maltreatments are bolded.

At intake, the emotional rating scores averaged 2.6 for the P4SF program clinical cases (range 1-4), 2 for the P4SF program non-clinical cases (range 1-4), and 1.95 for the comparison cases (range 1-3). At the 6-month follow-up, the emotional rating scores averaged 2.5 for the P4SF program clinical cases (range 1-4), 2.1 for the P4SF program non-clinical cases (range 1-4), and 2.1 for the comparison cases (range 1-3).

Next, at intake, the behavioral rating scores averaged 2 for the P4SF program clinical cases (range 1-4), 1.5 for the P4SF program non-clinical cases (range 1-3), and 1.4 for the comparison cases (range 1-2). At the 6-month follow-up, the behavioral rating scores averaged 2 for the P4SF program clinical cases (range 1-4), 1.5 for the P4SF program non-clinical cases (range 1-2), and 1.8 for the comparison cases (range 1-3).

Finally, at intake, the physical health rating scores averaged 2.4 for the P4SF program clinical cases (range 1-4), 1 for the P4SF program non-clinical cases (range 0), and 1.3 for the comparison cases (range 1-2). At the 6-month follow-up, the physical rating scores averaged 2.2 for the P4SF program clinical cases (range 1-4), 1.3 for the P4SF program non-clinical cases (range 1-2), and 1.5 for the comparison cases (range 1-3).

Overall, clinical P4SF program cases had higher averages for all health-related child-wellbeing outcomes when compared to both non-clinical P4SF program cases and comparison cases at intake and at the 6-month follow-up. However, it is unclear if there is a relationship between DA and HITS scores or the number of verified domestic violence-related maltreatments and health outcomes at the 6-month follow-up.

Table 8. Child Well-Being Outcomes: Family and Adult/Peer Relationship and Cultural Identity

	Family (Intake)	Family (6mo)	Adult/Peer (Intake)	Adult/Peer (6mo)	Cultural Identity (Intake)	Cultural Identity (6mo)
Clinical Cases						
<i>Average Scores</i>	2.5	2.7	2.2	2.5	1.9	1.9
Case 1	3	2	2	2	2	1
Case 2	1	2	1	2	1	1
Case 3	3	3	2	2	2	2
Case 3	3	3	2	4	2	3
Case 3	3	-	2	-	2	-
Case 3	2	3	2	3	2	3
Case 3	4	4	4	4	4	4
Case 3	4	3	4	4	4	3
Case 4	2	3	2	2	1	1
Case 4	1	1	1	1	1	1
Case 4	2	3	2	2	1	1
Case 4	2	3	2	2	1	1
Non-Clinical Cases						
<i>Average Scores</i>	1.5	1.9	1.3	1.6	1.7	1.5
Case 5	1	2	1	1	1	2
Case 5	1	2	1	1	1	2
Case 6	1	2	1	2	4	2
Case 6	1	2	1	2	4	2
Case 6	2	2	2	2	2	2
Case 7	1	2	1	2	1	1
Case 8	3	2	1	2	1	1
Case 8	2	3	2	2	2	2
Case 8	3	2	2	2	1	1
Case 8	1	1	1	1	1	1
Case 8	1	1	1	1	1	1
Comparison Cases						
<i>Average Scores</i>	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.4	1.5
Case 1C	-	-	1	-	1	-
Case 1C	-	-	1	-	1	-

Case 1C	-	-	1	-	1	-
Case 1C	-	-	1	-	1	-
Case 1C	-	-	2	-	2	-
Case 2C	2	2	2	-	2	-
Case 2C	2	2	3	-	2	-
Case 2C	2	2	1	-	1	-
Case 2C	1	1	1	-	1	-
Case 2C	1	1	1	-	1	-
Case 3C	-	-	2	-	2	-
Case 4C	-	-	1	-	1	-
Case 5C	1	1	1	1	1	1
Case 6C	1	1	2	2	2	2
Case 6C	1	1	2	2	2	2
Case 7C	1	1	1	1	1	1
Case 8C	2	2	2	2	2	2
Case 8C	2	2	2	2	2	2
Case 9C	2	-	2	2	2	2
Case 10C	3	3	2	2	2	2
Case 11C	1	-	2	1	1	1
Case 12C	2	-	2	2	1	1
Case 12C	2	-	2	2	1	1
Case 13C	-	-	1	-	1	-
Case 14 C	-	-	1	-	2	-

Notes: Dashes (-) represent missing information.

Table 8 displays the ratings for the following child well-being outcomes: family relationships, peer/adult relationships, and cultural identity. Similar to the tables above the cases are split by clinical P4SF program cases, non-clinical P4SF program cases, and comparison cases. All P4SF program cases with the highest DA and HITS scores, or identified domestic violence based on their DA and HITS scores are bolded. Similarly, comparison cases with the highest number of verified domestic violence-related maltreatments are bolded.

At intake, the family relationship rating scores averaged 2.5 for the P4SF program clinical cases (range 1-4), 1.5 for the P4SF program non-clinical cases (range 1-3), and 1.6 for the comparison cases (range 1-3). At the 6-month follow-up, the family relationship rating scores averaged 2.7 for the P4SF program clinical cases (range 1-4), 1.9 for the P4SF program non-clinical cases (range 1-3), and 1.6 for the comparison cases (range 1-3).

Next, at intake, the adult/peer relationship rating scores averaged 2.2 for the P4SF program clinical cases (range 1-4), 1.3 for the P4SF program non-clinical cases (range 1-2), and 1.6 for the comparison cases (range 1-3). At the 6-month follow-up, the adult/peer relationship rating scores averaged 2.5 for the P4SF program clinical cases (range 1-4), 1.6 for the P4SF program non-clinical cases (range 1-2), and 1.7 for the comparison cases (range 1-2).

Finally, at intake, the cultural identity rating scores averaged 1.9 for the P4SF program clinical cases (range 1-4), 1.7 for the P4SF program non-clinical cases (range 1-4), and 1.4 for the comparison cases (range 1-2). At the 6-month follow-up, the cultural identity rating scores averaged 1.9 for the P4SF program clinical cases (range 1-4), 1.5 for the P4SF program non-clinical cases (range 1-2), and 1.5 for the comparison cases (range 1-2).

In sum, clinical P4SF program cases had higher averages for all child well-being outcomes listed in Table 8 when compared to non-clinical P4SF program and comparison cases. However, when assessing cases at an individual level there does not appear to be as clear of a relationship between cases with higher DA and HITS scores or a higher number of verified maltreatment allegations and child well-being outcomes. Further, there does not appear to be a pattern in whether scores improved between intake and the 6-month follow-up.

Table 9. Child Well-Being Outcomes: Developmental, Educational, Substance Awareness, and Life Skills

	Dev. (I)	Dev. (6mo)	Educ. (I)	Educ. (6mo)	Sub. Aware. (I)	Sub. Aware. (6mo)	Life Skills (I)	Life Skills (6mo)
Clinical Cases								
<i>Average Scores</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2.8</i>	<i>2.7</i>	<i>2.3</i>	<i>2.3</i>	<i>3.5</i>	<i>3.75</i>
Case 1	-	-	2	2	4	2	-	-
Case 2	-	-	-	2	1	2	-	-
Case 3	-	-	4	4	3	3	-	-
Case 3	-	-	3	4	3	3	3	3
Case 3	-	-	3	-	3	-	3	-
Case 3	-	-	3	3	2	3	-	4
Case 3	-	-	4	4	4	4	4	4
Case 3	-	-	4	3	4	4	4	4
Case 4	-	-	1	1	1	1	-	-
Case 4	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	-
Case 4	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	-
Case 4	-	-	1	1	1	1	-	-
Non-Clinical Cases								
<i>Average Scores</i>	<i>1.5</i>	<i>1.8</i>	<i>1.3</i>	<i>1.3</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1.7</i>	-	-
Case 5	-	-	1	1	1	2	-	-
Case 5	-	-	1	1	1	2	-	-
Case 6	3	3	-	-	4	2	-	-
Case 6	1	3	-	-	4	2	-	-
Case 6	2	2	-	-	2	2	-	-
Case 7	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	-
Case 8	-	-	2	2	3	2	-	-
Case 8	-	-	2	2	2	2	-	-
Case 8	-	-	2	2	2	2	-	-
Case 8	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	-
Case 8	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	-
Comparison Cases								
<i>Average Scores</i>	<i>1.7</i>	<i>1.7</i>	<i>1.3</i>	<i>2.25</i>	<i>1.7</i>	<i>1.7</i>	-	-
Case 1C	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-
Case 1C	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-

Case 1C	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-
Case 1C	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-
Case 1C	2	-	1	-	2	-	-	-
Case 2C	2	-	1	2	2	1	-	-
Case 2C	3	-	2	2	2	1	-	-
Case 2C	3	-	-	-	1	1	-	-
Case 2C	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-
Case 2C	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-
Case 3C	2	-	-	-	2	-	-	-
Case 4C	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
Case 5C	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	-
Case 6C	2	2	-	-	2	2	-	-
Case 6C	2	2	-	-	2	3	-	-
Case 7C	1	1	-	-	1	1	-	-
Case 8C	2	2	-	-	2	2	-	-
Case 8C	2	2	-	-	2	2	-	-
Case 9C	2	2	-	-	2	2	-	-
Case 10C	-	-	2	2	3	3	-	-
Case 11C	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-
Case 12C	-	-	2	3	2	2	-	-
Case 12C	-	-	-	-	3	3	-	-
Case 13C	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
Case 14 C	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-

Notes: Dashes (-) represent missing information.

Lastly, Table 9 displays the ratings for the following child well-being outcomes: developmental, educational, substance awareness, and life skills. Similar to the tables above the cases are split by clinical P4SF program cases, non-clinical P4SF program cases, and comparison cases. All P4SF program cases with the highest DA and HITS scores, or identified domestic violence based on their DA and HITS scores are bolded. Similarly, comparison cases with the highest number of verified domestic violence-related maltreatments are bolded.

For the clinical P4SF program cases, developmental ratings at both intake and the 6-month follow-up were only reported for 2 children. Clinicians assessed the developmental ratings for both children as 1 at both intake and the 6-month follow-up. Alternatively, the developmental ratings at intake for the non-clinical P4SF program cases averaged 1.5 (range 1-3), and the developmental ratings for the comparison cases at intake averaged 1.7 (range 1-2). At the 6-month follow-up, developmental ratings averaged 1.8 (range 1-3) for the non-clinical P4SF program cases, and 1.7 (range 1-2) for the comparison cases.

Next, at intake, educational ratings averaged 2.8 (range 1-4) for the clinical P4SF program cases, 1.3 (range 1-2) for the non-clinical P4SF program cases, and 1.3 (range 1-2) for the comparison cases. At the 6-month follow-up, the educational ratings averaged 2.7 (range 1-4) for the clinical P4SF program cases, 1.3 (range 1-2) for the non-clinical P4SF program cases, and 2.25 (range 2-3) for the comparison cases. While the average educational rating scores for comparison cases were high, there were only 4 cases with data reported.

Next, at intake, substance awareness ratings averaged 2.3 (range 1-4) for the clinical P4SF program cases, 2 (range 1-4) for the non-clinical P4SF program cases, and 1.7 (range 1-4) for the comparison cases. At the 6-month follow-up, the educational ratings averaged 2.3 (range 1-4) for the clinical P4SF program cases, 1.7 (range 1-2) for the non-clinical P4SF program cases, and 1.7 (range 1-3) for the comparison cases.

Finally, life skills ratings were only recorded for 4 children in the clinical P4SF program cases. The range of scores for these 4 children were between 3 and 4 at both intake and the 6-month follow-up, however, the average slightly increased from 3.5 at intake and 3.75 at the 6-month follow-up.

Overall, aside from the developmental rating scores, clinical P4SF program cases did have higher averages reported for educational ratings and substance awareness ratings at both intake and the 6-month follow-up when compared to non-clinical P4SF program cases and comparison cases. While it is evident that clinical P4SF program cases did report higher averages overall, there is a lot of missing data for these outcomes. Because of this, it is hard to determine if there is a relationship between these outcomes and case type, DA and HITS scores, or the number of verified domestic violence-related maltreatments.