Evaluation of Differential Response in Ohio:

Challenges in Implementing a Randomized Control Trial.

Linda Newton-Curtis
Mady Kimmich
Laying the Foundation

Screening

Screened In as Abuse or Neglect

Screened Out or Family in Need of Services

Pathway Assignment Tool

Eligible for DR

Ineligible for Alternative Response

*legislatively mandated
*family characteristics

Regular Investigation

Differential Response (DR)

(Traditional) Investigative Response (IR)

Close

Subset of Families
Caseworker Case Report
Family Exit Survey

Caseworker Case Report
Family Exit Survey

Close
Laying the Foundation

• Data Collection
  – Family Survey, Caseworker Survey
  – Training

• Data has to be collect for experimental side and control

“I thought this was voluntary!!!”

• Communication
  – Directors, supervisor, caseworkers
Randomization

• Random really does mean random
  • AR caseworker start-up
  • Stocks and flows
    – Workload
      » IR/AR friction
      » AR envy
  • County Solutions
    – Request a change in ratio
    – Workers given non-AR cases
    – Bypass the randomizer? Nooooooooo!
• Overwhelmed by cases
Technology

- Technology
  - Electronic Randomizer
  - SACWIS
  - SOARDS
Lessons Learned

• Buy in
  – Child Protective Services
    • Trainings
    • Shared Vision
      – We’re doing this *with* you, not to you
    • Open communication
      – conference calls 2x monthly, individual phone calls, visits, 
      – Quarterly face-to-face visits, E-mail,
Lessons Learned

- Pilot Period for Current Study
  - Training
  - Counties not using randomizer
  - Track switch
  - Response rate
  - General hiccups
  - Monitoring data