California – Child and Family Services Review Signature Sheet

For submittal of: CSA SIP X Progress Report

County	San Joaquin County
SIP Period Dates	October 2014 – October 2019
Outcome Data Period	October 1, 2012 – September 30, 2013
County Child Welfare Agency Director	
Name	Joseph E. Chelli
Signature*	J E Chelli
Phone Number	(209) 468-1000
Mailing Address	102 S. San Joaquin Street, Stockton, CA 95202
County Chief Probation Officer	
Name	Stephanie James
Signature*	S James
Phone Number	(209) 468-4000
Mailing Address	575 W. Matthews Road, French Camp, CA 95231
Public Agency Administering CAPIT and CBCAP	
Name	Cathy Long
Signature*	Cathy Long
Phone Number	(209) 468-5979
Mailing Address	San Joaquin County Office of Education P.O. Box 213030, Stockton, CA 95213
Board of Supervisors (BOS) Signature	
BOS Approval Date	9/23/14
Name	Robert V. Elliott, Chairman
Signature*	Robert V. Elliott 9/26/2014

Logged and rec'd 10-17-14

RECEIVED OCT - 7 2014

Mail the original Signature Sheet to:	Children's Services Outcomes and Accountability Bureau Attention: Bureau Chief Children and Family Services Division California Department of Social Services 744 P Street, MS 8-12-91 Sacramento, CA 95814
*Signatures must be in blue ink	

HSA
HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY

SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY

JOSEPH E. CHELLI
Director

P.O. Box 201056 102 South San Joaquin Street Stockton, CA 95201-3006

Tel (209) 468-1000
Fax (209) 468-1985

CalWORKs
Head Start
First 5 San Joaquin
Children's Services
Aging and Community Services
Mary Graham Children's Shelter

September 30, 2014

Memorandum

To: Attention: Bureau Chief
Children's Services Outcomes and Accountability Bureau
Children and Family Services Division
California Department of Social Services

From: Joseph E. Chelli,
Human Services Agency

Subject: System Improvement Plan 2014-2019

San Joaquin County Human Services Agency Children's Services and Probation Department have completed the System Improvement Plan for the 2014 – 2019 cycle. The report was reviewed and approved by the San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors on September 23, 2014. Enclosed is an electronic version of the Board Order, the signature pages and the SIP report. The original hard copy signature pages will follow by certified mail.

California – Child and Family Services Review Signature Sheet

For submittal of: CSA SIP X Progress Report

County	San Joaquin County
SIP Period Dates	October 2014 – October 2019
Outcome Data Period	October 1, 2012 – September 30, 2013
County Child Welfare Agency Director	
Name	Joseph E. Chelli
Signature*	JE Chelli
Phone Number	(209) 468-1000
Mailing Address	102 S. San Joaquin Street, Stockton, CA 95202
County Chief Probation Officer	
Name	Stephanie James
Signature*	SJ James
Phone Number	(209) 468-4000
Mailing Address	575 W. Matthews Road, French Camp, CA 95231
Public Agency Administering CAPIT and CBCAP	
Name	Cathy Long
Signature*	Cathy Long
Phone Number	(209) 468-5979
Mailing Address	San Joaquin County Office of Education P.O. Box 213030, Stockton, CA 95213
Board of Supervisors (BOS) Signature	
BOS Approval Date	9/23/14
Name	Robert V. Elliott, Chairman
Signature*	Robert V. Elliott 9/26/2014

Mail the original Signature Sheet to:

Children's Services Outcomes and Accountability Bureau
Attention: Bureau Chief
Children and Family Services Division
California Department of Social Services
744 P Street, MS 8-12-91
Sacramento, CA 95814

*Signatures must be in blue ink

Contact Information		
Child Welfare Agency	Name	John Greco
	Agency	Human Services Agency, Children's Services
	Phone & E-mail	(209) 468-1000; jgreco@sjgov.org
	Mailing Address	102 S. San Joaquin Street, Stockton, CA 95202
Probation Agency	Name	Mark Elliot, Assistant Deputy Chief Probation Officer
	Agency	Juvenile Probation Department
	Phone & E-mail	(209) 468-4000; melliot@sjgov.org
	Mailing Address	575 W. Matthews Road, French Camp, CA 95231
Public Agency Administering CAPIT and CBCAP (if other than Child Welfare)	Name	Cathy Long
	Agency	San Joaquin County Office of Education
	Phone & E-mail	(209) 468-5979; calong@sjcoe.net
	Mailing Address	P.O. Box 213030 Stockton, CA 95213
CAPIT Liaison	Name	Cathy Long
	Agency	San Joaquin County Office of Education
	Phone & E-mail	(209) 468-5979; calong@sjcoe.net
	Mailing Address	P.O. Box 213030 Stockton, CA 95213
CBCAP Liaison	Name	Cathy Long
	Agency	San Joaquin County Office of Education
	Phone & E-mail	(209) 468-5979; calong@sjcoe.net
	Mailing Address	P.O. Box 213030 Stockton, CA 95213
PSSF Liaison	Name	Tasha Dunham
	Agency	Human Services Agency, Children's Services
	Phone & E-mail	(209) 468-1000; tdunham@sjgov.org
	Mailing Address	102 S. San Joaquin Street, Stockton, CA 95202

California - Child and Family Services Review

System Improvement Plan

OCTOBER 2014 – OCTOBER 2019

Table of Contents

Introduction ..... Page 03

SIP Narrative ..... Page 06

Child welfare/Probation Placement Initiatives ..... Page 26

5-Year SIP Chart Outcomes ..... Page 28

5-Year SIP Chart ..... Page 31

Strategies ..... Page 32

CAPIT/CBCAP/PSSF Program and Evaluation Description ..... Page 37

Attachments ..... Page 51

CAPIT/CBCAP/PSSF Expenditure Workbook ..... Attachment A

Letter to the San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors ..... Attachment B

San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors Board Order ..... Attachment C

Introduction

Background – Child and Family Services Review

In 1994, amendments to the Social Security Act (SSA) authorized the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to review state child and family service programs' conformity with the requirements in Titles IV-B and IV-E of the SSA. In response, the Federal Children's Bureau initiated the Child and Family Services Reviews (CFSR) nationwide in 2000. It marked the first time the federal government evaluated state child welfare service programs using performance-based outcome measures in contrast to solely assessing indicators of processes associated with the provision of child welfare services. California was first reviewed by the Federal Health and Human Services Agency in 2002 and began its first round of the CFSRs in the same year. Ultimately, the goal of these reviews is to help states achieve consistent improvement in child welfare service delivery and outcomes essential to the safety, permanency, and well-being of children and their families.

California Child and Family Services Review (C-CFSR)

The California Child and Family Services Review (C-CFSR), an outcomes-based review mandated by the Child Welfare System Improvement and Accountability Act (Assembly Bill 636), was passed by the state legislature in 2001. The goal of the C-CFSR is to establish and subsequently strengthen a system of accountability for child and family outcomes resulting from the array of services offered by California's Child Welfare Services (CWS). As a state-county partnership, this accountability system is an enhanced version of the federal oversight system mandated by Congress to monitor states' performance, and is comprised of multiple elements.

Quarterly Outcome and Accountability Data Reports

The California Department of Social Services (CDSS) issues quarterly data reports which include key safety, permanency and well-being outcomes for each county. These quarterly reports provide summary-level federal and state program measures that serve as the basis for the C-CFSR and are used to track performance over time. These data reports are used to inform and guide both the assessment and planning processes and are used to analyze policies and procedures. This level of evaluation allows for a systematic assessment of program strengths and limitations in order to improve service delivery. Linking program processes or performance with federal and state outcomes helps staff to evaluate their progress and modify the program or practice as appropriate. Information obtained can be used by program managers to make decisions about future program goals, strategies, and options. In addition, this reporting cycle is consistent with the notion that data analysis of this type is best viewed as a continuous process, as opposed to a one-time activity for the purpose of quality improvement.

County Self-Assessment and Peer Review

The County Self-Assessment (CSA) is a comprehensive review of each county's youth in foster care under the supervision of Children's Services (Child Welfare Services) and the Probation Department. The CSA assesses the full array of child welfare and juvenile probation service delivery, from prevention and protection through permanency and aftercare. The CSA is the analytic tool used by counties to determine the effectiveness of current practice and programs across the continuum of child welfare and probation placement services and to conduct a needs assessment to help identify areas for targeted system improvement.

The CSA is developed every five years by the lead agencies (Children's Services and Probation) in coordination with the local community and prevention partners. The process has multiple components including peer review, intensive case worker interviews, and focus groups to gather input from child welfare constituents on the full scope of child welfare and juvenile probation services provided within the County. The CSA also includes quantitative analysis of child welfare data. The Peer Review is intended to provide counties with issue-specific, qualitative information gathered by outside peer experts. Both the CSA and the Peer Review serve as the foundation for the County System Improvement Plan.

In addition, the California Department of Social Services Office Of Child Abuse Prevention is now integrated into the C-CFSR and information is reported in the SIP regarding the use of CAPIT/CBCAP and/or PSSF funds to divert children and families from entering the child welfare system. These funds further support the County in providing a continuum of services for children and families with an emphasis on prevention and early intervention.

System Improvement Plan

Incorporating data collected through the Peer Review and the CSA, the final component of the C-CFSR is the System Improvement Plan (SIP). The SIP serves as the operational agreement between the County and state, outlining how the County will improve its capacity to provide better outcomes for children, youth and families. The SIP includes a coordinated service provision plan for how the county will utilize prevention, early intervention and treatment funds (CAPIT/CBCAP/PSSF) to strengthen and preserve families, and to help children find permanent families when they are unable to return to their families of origin. Quarterly county data reports, quarterly monitoring by CDSS, and annual SIP progress reports are the mechanisms for tracking a county's progress. The SIP is developed every five years by the lead agencies in collaboration with their local community and prevention partners. The SIP includes specific action steps, timeframes, and improvement targets and is approved by the BOS and CDSS. The plan is a commitment to specific measurable improvements in performance outcomes that the county will achieve within a defined timeframe including prevention strategies. Counties, in partnership with the state, utilize quarterly data reports to track progress. The process is a continuous cycle and the county systematically attempts to improve outcomes. The SIP is updated yearly and becomes a mechanism through which counties report on progress toward meeting agreed upon improvement goals.

San Joaquin County had extensive stakeholder input on the development of the SIP throughout the CSA and PR process. There continues to be ongoing data review and program assessment.

SIP Narrative

C-CFSR Planning Team

The San Joaquin County 2013/2014 Child and Family Services Review team included the following individuals:

Focus Area	Name	Organization
Child Welfare	John Greco	Children's Services
Child Welfare	Tasha Dunham	Children's Services
CDSS	Patricia Harper	California Department of Social Services Office of Child Abuse and Prevention
CDSS	Daniel Wilson	California Department of Social Services Outcomes and Accountability Bureau
Probation	Mark Elliot	Juvenile Probation
Probation	Rebekah Graham	Juvenile Probation
Consultant	Lisa Molinar	Shared Vision Consultants

This team met monthly throughout during the calendar year and more frequently in preparation for the Peer Review, CSA and SIP. Management and supervisory staff from Child Welfare Services and Probation also participated some of the planning team meetings.

Core Representatives

In addition to the representatives listed above who participated as core representatives, the CSA and SIP process sought to involve a wide variety of service providers and other community stakeholders in the events leadings up to the CSA and SIP completion. The County has no BIA recognized tribe. The listing of all stakeholders asked to be a part of this process is listed in the section that follows.

Required Participant	Name	Organization
Child Abuse Prevention Council Representative, CAPIT/CBCAP and Children's Trust Fund	Cathy Long	Children's Services Coordinating Commission
County Board of Supervisor	John Greco	Children's Services

designated agency to administer/PSSF Programs		
County Alcohol and Drug Department	Becky Gould	Deputy Director of Substance Abuse Services
County Health Department	Sue Gibson	Public Health Nurse
County Mental Health	Ellen Dunn	Behavioral Health Services
Juvenile Court Representatives	Judge Lucaccini	Juvenile Court Judge
Parents/Consumers	Parents attended a focus group and will remain anonymous. CDSS was in attendance at the focus group.	Parents
Resource Families	Resource families attended a focus group and will remain anonymous. CDSS was in attendance at the focus group.	Resource Families
Youth Representative	Youth attended a focus group and will remain anonymous. CDSS was in attendance at the focus group	Youth

Participation of Core Representatives

The following stakeholders were invited to participate in response to recommendations suggested in the Children's Services Outcomes and Accountability Bureau and the Office of Child Abuse Prevention Bureau C-CFSR Instruction Manual (version 7). All the required stakeholders (see above for specific representatives) participated, including representatives from the Children's Services Coordinating Commission, designated administrator of CAPIT/CBCAP and the Children's Trust Fund, County Alcohol and Drug Department, County Board of Supervisors designated administrator of /PSSF Programs, County Health Department, County Mental Health Department, CDSS Adoptions District Offices, Juvenile Court, PSSF Collaborative, and Foster youth, parents and consumers, resource families and other caregivers.

The Core Representatives participated in the SIP planning process in several ways, focus groups, individual interviews, surveys and discussion at standing meetings. In addition the San Joaquin

County SIP planning committee met on a weekly basis to develop strategies. Each Division Chief within Child welfare was responsible for leading the development of action steps for each strategy. They took the information to supervisors and staff for additional input. Juvenile Probation completed the same process to develop their strategy. The Children's Services Coordinating Commission convened special meetings to discuss the utilization of Office of Child Abuse Prevention monies.

Current Performance towards 2011-2014 SIP Improvement Goals

San Joaquin County Children's Services identified two outcomes to focus on for the 2011-2014 System Improvement Plan. The following is an *abstracted* version of the most recent progress report with outstanding and ongoing action steps identified.

Among the core strategies was implementing a "warm hand-off" system as cases move from one social worker to another. Ninety percent of staff have been trained on this protocol. The remaining 10% are newly employed social workers who will be trained on this protocol by their direct supervisor. Under the current system, receiving social workers are responsible for monitoring their cases when "warm hand-offs" take place. The supervisors of case carrying units collect and review the statistics of their individual social workers. The "Transfer cases" section is being updated in the Agency's Children's Services handbook to reflect these changes

The redesign and implementation of evidence-based Team Decision-Making (TDM) into critical points in a case has been accomplished. A collective decision was made to work towards becoming an "official TDM county" to include gradually implementing the needed changes to the existing model while providing needed training to the facilitators and all child welfare staff.

To reduce re-entry, a system of graduated visits between children and parents was established to identify concerns before reunification including pre-reunification TDM and follow-up case management administered by a Community Based Organization (CBO) before and immediately following reunification. All cases are staffed with social worker supervisors who address the transition process of minors returning home. The overall process includes extended visitation, TDM's, assisting parents in understanding any medical needs of the child, encouraging parental involvement with the child's school, family therapy, wrap-around services (as appropriate), and other services as necessary. Graduated visitation schedules are used to facilitate reunification and stability after reunification in the vast majority of cases (90%).

Another core strategy, i.e., monitoring individual and unit compliance for Structured Decision-Making (SDM) throughout all aspects of the case, will be continued. From Sept 2012 – August 2013, the SDM Safety assessment completion rate was 89.4%; the SDM Family Strength & Needs assessment completion rate was 55.12%.

Supervisors receive their units' *SafeMeasures*™ statistics each month. Staff are educated on the use of *SafeMeasures*™ to assist with identifying case compliance issues & providing remediation prior to performance issues. The supervisors review the statistics with their workers during unit meetings or individual conferences.

The overall implementation and performance on SDM is reviewed at monthly Management Meetings including reviewing the impact on Disproportionality issues.

Over the past years, the Disproportionality Project has continued to expand. Regularly scheduled meetings are held with a focus on forward motion and progress. The Disproportionality committee is currently focusing on engaging fathers in the Child Welfare Process and educating the community on what CPS does ("CPS 101"). Meetings include representatives from Children's Services, CBOs, parent partners and youth. PDSA stands for "Plan Do Study Act" which is a small pilot project created by a small group of social workers to study the effectiveness and make changes before full agency roll out. There are several PDSAs which are in progress, including doing a CPS 101 presentation at local community organizations and Differential Response case managers meeting with fathers to specifically inquire about what they need from CPS. Additionally, there is a connection with "Friends Outside" Community Based Organization to help children re-establish contact with incarcerated parents.

The agency has also developed mechanisms for updating and keeping all relevant data/progress made by the Disproportionality Team. Disproportionality is discussed at quarterly Agency Bureau meetings where staff from all programs are present.

Another core strategy was increasing the availability of relative and Non-Related Extended Family Members (NREFM) placements and placing children in approved homes as soon as possible. The agency has enhanced relative searches by using Lexis/Nexis™ to identify as wide a range of relatives as possible for placements. Relative Assessment staff members have been using Lexis/Nexis to find family members when none have been identified by the family. There has been a slight decrease in the usage due to case carrying social workers providing names to relative assessment social workers, reducing the need for a further Lexis/Nexis search. In addition, TDMs are used when a placement change is needed, including pre-detention, prior to any changes between foster homes, placement change into a relative/NREFM home and prior to a group home placement. Relative/NREFM assessments and placements are routinely discussed at the TDM meetings. A parent partner has been identified to work with the TDM workgroup and be available for consultation and review of documents sent to parents. Social workers are also required to attend Joint Assessment Meetings (JAMS) within two weeks of a child's removal in order to provide updates on the status of the relative/NREFM placement.

Increasing adoption efforts has also been a priority for the agency**.** The Licensing Unit is connected to the community and has increased advertisement at local community events. The Recruitment Coordinator is involved in the Disproportionality Project, so where there are community events, the recruiter attends or makes recruitment literature available for those events. The licensing unit is utilizing public service announcements on TV, local multi-media advertising, billboards, fairs and booths at local community events to raise awareness regarding the need for foster and adoptive parents.

Children's Services has worked to increase the availability and utilization of evidence-based practices; specifically through parenting curriculums and reliable research-based practices. Parenting classes are made an integral part of the case plan in instances where parenting skills

have been deemed sub-standard. Currently the parenting program is offered by Women's Center Youth and Family Services and the program is research based.

Prioritization of Outcome Data Measures/Systemic Factors and Strategy Rationale

The SIP strategies were selected and prioritized based on thorough discussions and analysis of the major conclusions from the CSA compiled by integrating the feedback from stakeholders, data analysis, review of internal processes in both child welfare and probation, candid assessment of the progress towards meeting the goals set by the previous CSA, review of best practices, and an overview of the resources available in San Joaquin County, as well as the unique challenges.

The major conclusions and recommendations from the CSA process are the following:

- Over the past decade, San Joaquin County's population growth rate exceeded the statewide rate with growth occurring in suburban areas. The Hispanic population grew to 40% of the total County population and was the fastest growing population group. The housing boom followed by the 2008 crash in the housing market, impacted the county severely including contributing to the City of Stockton's filing for bankruptcy. The consequences on families and employment were significant and continue to impact family stability and reliance on public resources.
- Participants in the County wide survey ranked the three primary causes of child abuse and neglect as poverty, drug abuse and the lack of services. The survey named crime and substance abuse/behavioral health needs as closely associated factors contributing to child abuse and neglect. Focus groups concurred with these opinions and identified unemployment, the rising poverty rate, shrinking community services, and accessibility to services as the primary obstacles to family stability and reunification.
- Inadequate services for Spanish speaking families were recognized as a serious deficit in the County service array. Recognizing that over one-third of the County population is Hispanic and that a significant percentage of those families considered Spanish as their primary language, one of the biggest challenges continues to be identifying and obtaining access to resources for working with bi-lingual and bi-cultural families. (CSA pp. 6, 86)
- Although progress has been made on many of the goals set in the current System Improvement Plan, the majority of the challenges identified in the previous CSA with effective child abuse prevention, timely reunification and appropriate and stable homes for child and youth persist. (CSA pp. 96 stakeholder survey)

SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT PLAN OUTCOMES FOR 2014(Q3) – 2019

San Joaquin County has selected five outcomes: No Recurrence of Maltreatment (S1.1); Median Time to Reunification (C1.2); Re-entry Following Reunification (C1.4); Placement Stability - At least 24 months in care (C4.3) for Child Welfare Services and Time to Reunification (C1.3) for Probation. (Other outcomes not listed in the SIP will continue to be monitored by both

Children's Services and CDSS. If a concerning situation arises regarding one of these outcomes, a plan will be put in place quickly to address that outcome). The Reunification and Re-entry outcomes were selected as a means to improve County performance in areas highlighted by data analysis during the most recent County Self-Assessment. The paramount concern for the safety of children in San Joaquin County mandates the inclusion of the Maltreatment Outcome (S1.1) in this SIP. Specific strategies for improvement were developed from the data analysis and themes identified through peer review and focus groups. The SIP Stakeholder Team formulated concise goals, strategies, milestones, and timeframes for incremental improvement over the next five years.

San Joaquin County falls below the National standards in other outcome areas, Timeliness to investigations 24 hours and 10 days, Adoption within 12 months, Exits to Permanency (24 months in care) and Long Term Care (in care 3 years or longer). These outcomes were not chosen for this SIP cycle as the agency has already put a plan in place to work on these outcomes. The utilization of Safe Measures on a continuous basis will assist with the timeliness of social worker investigations. In regard to children in care for over three years or longer the agency is working with the Juvenile Court System and other systems to address systemic factors that are contributing to these outcomes. It is believed by stakeholders that improving time to reunification and a decrease in the number of children re-entering the child welfare system after reunification, placement stability especially for those children and youth in care for over 24 months, and no recurrence of maltreatment, will impact all of the outcomes for children, youth and families in San Joaquin County.

Outcomes selected for improvement during the 2014 – 2019 cycle, which are currently below the national standard, are:

(1) No recurrence of maltreatment (S1.1) – Child Welfare Services

By adding new practice models and training for all social workers and supervisors in applying the practice models and with constant attention to this outcome, the performance over the past three years has brought Children's Services very close to the national standard on this outcome (94.5% vs. 94.6%) and now statewide performance has been exceeded (93.2%). With the implementation and training of staff in SOP, it is anticipated that the national standard for this outcome will be met within the next 12 months. The challenge going forward will be to maintain that level of performance.

The lack of adult supervision and behavioral/mental health problems within families were identified by participants in the Community Needs Assessment as the two circumstances most likely to increase future risk of child abuse and neglect. Additionally it was noted that isolation of families with no extended family support systems impacted recurrence of maltreatment. (CSA pp.94)

(2) C1.3 Reunification within 12 Months (Entry Cohort)

In the last SIP cycle there has been a slight increase from 14.3% to 14.7% of children discharged from foster care to reunification in less than 12 months. Current performance is below both the Federal Standard (48.4%) and the statewide performance (47.2%).

The challenges in meeting this outcome for San Joaquin County comes from the impact on reunification of sustained drug and alcohol abuse by parents and the economic challenges faced by the impact of the national recession on employment and housing stability. Public resources have been required to meet the needs of more families under especially stressful circumstances. The growth of the Spanish Speaking population has contributed to special demands on programs and services that they have culturally competent staff who are qualified to present research based programs.

Stakeholders in the CSA process noted the decrease in the number of children entering foster care for the first time and citing more emphasis on in home preventive services and working with parents and children in their homes and communities. A significant consequence is that only children with serious needs from families with limited capacity or willingness to parent are removed and enter foster care. Focus groups involving parents identified unemployment, the rising poverty rate, shrinking community services, and accessibility to services as obstacles to family stability and reunification. Parents working on reunification identified obstacles to reunification such as losing CalWORKs benefits, being incarcerated, and requiring that a parent enter a residential program which could cause loss of housing and transportation. (CSA pp.99)

(3) Median time to reunification (C1.2) - Child Welfare Services

The challenges in meeting this outcome for San Joaquin County comes from the impact on reunification of sustained drug and alcohol abuse by parents and the economic challenges faced by the impact of the national recession on employment and housing stability. Public resources have been required to meet the needs of more families under especially stressful circumstances. The growth of the Spanish Speaking population has contributed to special demands on programs and services that they have culturally competent staff who are qualified to present research based programs.

The national standard for this outcome is 5.4 months; San Joaquin County's baseline performance for Q3 (January 2012-January 2013) was 13.1 months.

(4) Re-entry following reunification (C1.4) - Child Welfare Services

This is an area of critical concern for San Joaquin County. The national standard for this outcome is 9.9% of the children re-entering foster care within 12 months of those reunified within the specified year; San Joaquin County's performance during the prior year was 10.4%.

Over the past three years, child welfare services made significant progress in reducing the rate of re-entry after reunification through diligent work engaging families, better use of assessments, and using TDM's to strengthen natural support systems and identify challenges when reunification occurs. (CSA pp.100) The families that are re-entering the system are the same as families that experience recurrence of maltreatment. Those families also have limited support systems in place and fiscal resources. Relapse into alcohol and drug use is also a contributing factor.

(5) Placement Stability – At least 24 months in care (C4.3) – Child Welfare Services

Maintaining placement stability is a constant challenge for child welfare due to the many factors that contribute to placement stability and disruption including the adjustment of the specific child or children being placed. Largely because of the complexity of this problem and the central importance of stability to child development, the peer review focused on placement stability. In the period, October 1, 2009 to September 30, 2010, the percentage of children in foster care during the year that had been in care for at least 24 months with two or fewer placements settings was 24.1%. In Quarter 3 of 2013, the percentage of children with two or fewer settings increased to 26.5%. Current performance is below the federal standard (41.8%).

Many factors impact placement stability such as sibling group size and the behavior of the child/youth. Another factor that impacts placement stability is when relatives who were not available or eligible for placement during the investigation stage of a case are subsequently located and approved for placement and the child/youth is moved into their care. (CSA pp.108) As was noted in the family reunification section, many of the children that are entering the foster care system have significant behavioral health issues which contribute to multiple moves.

(5) Reunification: Reunification within 12 Months (C1.3) – Probation

Probation had only one youth who reunified out of a total of twenty (20) whom entered foster care during the previous 12 months. The combination of CWS/CMS data entry requirements and the needs of the youth in placement make this and the related reunification outcomes very difficult for juvenile probation departments. As more tools are developed to strengthen the work with parents and families, it is anticipated that successful reunification will be timelier.

Delays in reunification can be attributed to the highly criminally sophisticated, gang entrenched, and violent youth in foster care placement (Carjacking, Attempted Murder, Robbery, Battery with Great Bodily Injury, Serious Sex Offenses including Rape and Child Molestation by Force), youth with significant mental health treatment needs, youth requiring sex offender therapy, sex trafficking victims, lack of participation from parents and lack of appropriate, willing family for youth to return home.

2009 Data from Office of the Attorney General, Department of Justice, and State of California indicates that San Joaquin County has the second highest rate of property and violent offenses, behind Alpine County. FBI data lists Stockton as the 5th most violent city in California when considering per-capita crime rates.

Work is being done to improve the overall nature of the community such as Operation Ceasefire targeting violent criminal gang members. The Probation Department is involved in the Positive Youth Justice Initiative (PYJI) which includes training in Trauma Informed Care, increased and earlier use of Wrap Around services, and more services to crossover youth who are at the highest risk for entering foster care. As more tools are developed to strengthen the work with parents and families, it is anticipated that fewer youth will enter placement and those that do enter foster care will be reunified earlier if their parent or guardian is able to take advantage of increased support and therefore have a more stable home for the youth to return to upon completion of treatment.

Strategies

The outcomes which San Joaquin County has selected to target during the 2014-2019 are integrally connected. The core of the child protection function depends on assessments by trained social workers of the dynamics in a family or circumstances that can either keep a child safe or expose that child to abuse or neglect. Safety Net Services (specifically Differential Response) and Safety Organized Practice are tools which have evolved to help social workers refine their assessments, communicate and design interventions that will enhance the safety of a child or children within their homes or if they have to be removed from their home, help speed up their safe return. The CFSR outcomes advise counties how to measure their child protection systems and how their work compares with other states and counties and research based standards. As a result of decades of research on child protection and child development, systemic outcomes have evolved to further guide child welfare practice.

Probation has elected to focus on reunification (C1.3) which measures the percentage of children reunified within 12 months of removal from their home during the specified year. Although the precise circumstances which lead to removal of the child or youth who comes under the care, youth are committed to the custody and control of the Probation Department as result of a criminal offense rather than being the victim of abuse and/or neglect. Once the child/youth on probation is in placement, the planning for that child/youth to return to his/her community begins and the same assessment of appropriate services and strengthening positive linkages in the community becomes a priority.

Based on analysis of these outcomes as they impact the community, the resources in the community, and the theoretical foundation that these outcomes share, i.e., returning children/youth safely home as soon as possible to live full and healthy lives, San Joaquin County has adopted the following specific strategies and rationales:

Strategy 1: Develop and Expand Safety Net Services – Differential Response, Concrete Support Services for open Child Welfare Cases and After Care Case Management Services

Differential Response has been operating in San Joaquin County for a number of years and has had successful outcomes. The CSA process identified the need to expand the services offered by Community Based Organizations. Currently, Differential Response services (Path 1 and Path 2) are offered to families to prevent entry in to the Child Welfare system and post-reunification services offered to support families that are exiting the system. San Joaquin County is in the process of developing the Safety Net Services Program, which will encompass the Differential Response Program, Concrete Support Services Program and After Care Case Management Program. Safety Net Services referrals come from one of three avenues. The first is Differential Response, which involves calls to Child Protective Services reporting suspected child abuse or neglect that do not rise to the statutory level of an in-person CPS response. In lieu of a response (investigation) by CPS, a referral is made to Differential Response to offer and provide families with resources to address and ameliorate the issue that resulted in the call being made to CPS. The second type of Safety Net Services referral involves the provision of case management or concrete support services. Referrals for case management would typically come from situations where CPS has been involved with the family through an investigation

that revealed low or moderate risk issues. Another example is when the family has an open case with CPS and the case carrying social worker feels that the family could benefit from some short term concrete support services to assist with a specific need that the family has that will lead to the child being returned home. These services could also help preserve the child in the home. The third and final avenue for referrals for Safety Net Services involves children who have returned home from an out of home placement or are transitioning home (i.e. overnight visits) and support is needed to help prevent re-entry into foster care and provide support to the family. In all three situations referrals will come from CPS and will indicate the type of services being requested to assist the family.

Specific services that are offered to families are individualized to meet their needs and are identified in collaboration with the family. All families receive case management services, referrals to resources to meet their needs, for example therapy, transportation, domestic violence counseling, alcohol and drug treatment, and parenting classes.

San Joaquin County selected the development and expansion of the Safety Net Services Program as one of the primary strategies to improve timeliness to reunification and reduce the rate of children re-entering foster care because of the positive responses by Children's Services staff to working with families currently using Differential Response and Post-Reunification Services. This connection to Community Based Organizations allows for a strong link between assessment, engagement and services to serve the ultimate goal of strengthening families. Increased community services to families have been connected to lowered recurrence of abuse. Assessments linking families to services in the community reinforces good parenting. Family satisfaction and engagement increases family participation in decision making. Children's Services social workers report that families were more cooperative and willing to accept services when differential response was available as an alternative to investigation. With emphasis on early intervention and prevention, the Differential Response component of this strategy is likely to have an impact on reducing case loads and reducing the length of time children are in care. This will provide information to the agency about services that will meet the needs of the community. Stakeholders identified the inadequate number of services for Spanish Speaking families as one of the major obstacles to timely reunification. (CSA pp. 33)

The capacity to impact the number of children who must be removed from their families due to their parents' inability to provide a safe home environment directly relates to the capacity of social workers to work intensely and effectively with parents and meet the needs of children particularly during reunification as well as throughout the entire child welfare system. Differential response has been an important tool for preventing child abuse, improving child safety and strengthening families (Differential Response to Reports of Child Abuse and Neglect, Issue Brief, Child Welfare Information Gateway, 2008).

JUSTIFICATION RATIONALE

Although progress has been made on the goals set in the current System Improvement Plan, many of the challenges previously associated with effective child abuse prevention, timely reunification and stable and safe homes for child and youth persist.

Focus groups and participants in the community survey during the recent CSA were in agreement that family instability caused by poverty, fractured family systems, limited education, and multigenerational substance abuse continued to undermine family stability in San Joaquin County. (CSA pp.7) Differential Response has become increasingly accepted by social workers as essential to insuring the safety of children. The goal of the Safety Net Services Program is to replicate that connection to Community-based Organizations throughout the Child Welfare System. Relying on staff's experience with using Differential Response and Post Reunification services, it is anticipated that the implementation of Safety Net Services will be a natural transition. This umbrella program will allow social workers to link families with community services to not only alleviate immediate problems but to help families learn how to access community resources independently.

Differential Response has proven to be a useful tool in linking intervention with resources and enabling social workers to more fully engage parents in overcoming obstacles to family stability. Social workers are fully trained in DR and linked with community resources but believe that continued emphasis on community based services is essential to improving practice as well as outcomes. This strategy takes certain components from a literature review published by the UC Davis Extension: Center for Human Services. The literature review titled, "Factors, Characteristics, and Promising Practices Related to Reunification and Re- Entry" was prepared by Ryan Honomichl, PH.D and Holly Hatton, M.S. and can be read in its entirety by viewing the following link: http://www.childsworld.ca.gov/res/pdf/FactorsCharacteristics.pdf

SYSTEMIC CHANGES IDENTIFIED:

In consultation with the Division Chiefs, Supervisors and Staff, it was decided to form a workgroup to conduct an assessment of the current Differential Response program and make recommendations for the program going forward through the development of a Request for Proposal for Safety Net Services. The workgroup consists of Children's Services social workers, supervisors and Division Chiefs and is tasked with examining the number of people utilizing the services, paying specific attention to how the program impacts timely reunification, placement stability and recurrence of maltreatment. The workgroup is also tasked with developing measures that evaluate whether the strategy was effective, implemented with model fidelity, training was effective, and if the system supported the strategy. It is anticipated that the statewide computer system, Child Welfare Services/Case Management System (CWS/CMS), and SafeMeasures will be utilized to assist in tracking the families using the services and linked to the outcomes being measured.

The Division Chiefs will meet with the workgroup as requested to supply any needed information, assist with reviewing the strengths and challenges of the current program, and assist with the implementation plan. Before the plan is fully implemented, the workgroup will develop internal policies and procedures and continue to meet to monitor program implementation, as well as evaluate how the outcomes have been affected, in accordance to the evaluation matrix developed by the workgroup.

TRAINING IDENTIFIED:

The strategy for the next five years will be to build on the foundation that has been established by training Child Welfare staff, including supervisors, on DR and linking DR evaluation directly to

the contracts with service providers. The type and timeliness of data received from the Community-based Organizations will be established to support evaluation of the services provided.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE NEEDED:

The Office of Child Abuse Prevention and the California Department of Social Services, Outcome and Accountability may be contacted for technical assistance.

STRATEGY 2: IMPLEMENT SAFETY ORGANIZED PRACTICE (SOP)

Safe and stable reunification does not begin or end with the return of children of their parents. Child welfare practice and research reinforce the use of risk tools and comprehensive family assessments. Safety Organized Practice is a solution focused therapy which is based on collaborative team work in child welfare that seeks to build and strengthen partnerships within the family with the central focus being the family and the child. San Joaquin County began the implementation of SOP in 2012 when a few staff, supervisors and a Division Chief attended the three day foundational training at UC Davis. A workgroup was developed in mid-2013 to begin the implementation process within San Joaquin County. Approximately 90% of staff, 100% of supervisors/managers and the Deputy Director have attended the three day foundational SOP training. Currently, staff and supervisors are using coaching to assist with implementation on an individual level and Advanced Classes/Module training is scheduled on a monthly basis to gain a deeper understanding of the SOP tools. The SOP Implementation Team would like to begin to measure the fidelity to the practice and ensure that the staff have the tools needed for standardized agency-wide implementation.

The workgroup or possibly a subcommittee will develop an internal monitoring system to track process indicators. The workgroup will also develop a tracking tool for the process indicators that have been determined to be essential to measure for tracking purposes (e.g. the number of staff trained and adherence to the number of family meetings that are supposed to occur). This will then be compared to the outcomes of the number of children re-entering the system, placement stability and the recurrence of maltreatment.

Safety Organized Practice will assist efforts to improve timeliness to reunification and inform discharge planning and service planning for families after reunification. It is designed to provide tools to assist social workers in assessing safety in the home, creating safety plans, and as an ongoing tool throughout the case to determine readiness to reunify. With the information gathered by using SOP, aftercare planning can be used to insure the safety of the reunified child and the stability of the family reducing the likelihood of re-entry into foster care for either abuse or neglect. With SOP, needs can be identified and matched with community services before reunification occurs. Families experience stress when health, mental health, educational, developmental behavioral and substance abuse issues are not adequately addressed (Madden, MCRoy, Maher & Ward, 2009). SOP is seen as a natural enhancement for social workers applying Differential Response tools and as a linkage for working with families in cases where their child or children cannot safely be maintained in home. SOP is linked to improved assessment of parenting, improving parents' protective capacity and readiness to reunify as well as guiding planning for post-reunification.

Traditional CPS practice is limited by resources and the increasing research showing that standardized practice does not necessarily meet the needs of children and families. (Child Welfare Information Gateway, (www.childwelfare.gov/pubs/issue_briefs/differential_response).

JUSTIFICATION RATIONALE

Safety Organized Practice is a version of collaborative social work that derives from the principle that the child and his/her family are the central focus and that solutions to problems are best found in partnership with the family and the family network. Stakeholders in the community needs assessment agreed that families in San Joaquin County were experiencing increasingly complex problems, such as mental health, drug abuse, criminal involvement, poverty and domestic violence. (CSA pp.94) The mandate to address family problems requires assessment and engagement as well as professional casework. SOP offers tools to help social workers distinguish safety and risk issues and craft individualized safety plans. Focus group participants noted that the workforce faces internal challenges including high caseloads, having multiple responsibilities associated with each assignment, and restrictions on the hours available to work directly with families. Using SOP as a means to assessing and measuring readiness to reunify will be integrated into the case plan tools and report writing to enable children to achieve quickly and safely. (CSA pp.88)

SYSTEMIC CHANGES IDENTIFIED:

This strategy is a continuation of SOP implementation; systemic changes will be implemented as needed during the expansion; none have been identified through the CSA/SIP process as the implementation is so new within San Joaquin County.

TRAINING IDENTIFIED:

The Northern Regional Training Academy, located at UC Davis, has been providing onsite training and technical assistance regarding implementation. A key component of SOP is the ability of Supervisors to coach their staff around the core practice of SOP. UC Davis will also provide technical assistance regarding this component of implementation as well as assisting to ensure that agency procedures are consistent and complementary with SOP principles, as well as combing SOP practices with current practices like SDM.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE NEEDED:

The Northern Training Academy will continue to provide technical assistance regarding the integration of SOP and SDM and identify strategies for internal monitoring of SOP usage.

STRATEGY 3: IMPLEMENT PARENT PARTNERS AND YOUTH ADVOCATES

In an effort to actively engage families, this strategy involves pairing parents who have successfully reunified with their children with parents who are going through the Child Welfare System. A special emphasis of this strategy will be on identifying, connecting with and engaging fathers. Reaching out to this underserved population with tools and resources that are needed by fathers will supplement ongoing case planning and inform reunification planning. Linking intensive engagement with Safety Net Services and SOP offers a recognized method of gathering more information, improving communication, and increasing feedback from parents on their needs so that appropriate services can be provided. Using non-professionals as

partners to work with families recognizes certain basic principles of the child protection system, e.g., the reactions when parents are separated from their children, the necessity of significant evidence of change in parents required by the court before recommendations to reunify can be considered; parental change is assumed to occur as a result of the parent's engagement in services including parenting education, drug and alcohol treatment, mental health counseling, or other supports; and, parental compliance with services is directly related to determinations of readiness to reunify. Parent Partner programs draw upon the strengths of families and engage family and community members in program planning. This program will use nonprofessionals as staff – mothers, fathers, and youth who have experienced child removal, services, and reunification. These individuals will be trained and supported in providing direct services to parents and children working on reunification including mentoring, guiding, and advocating. The principal goal of their work with parents will be to help parents gain awareness of their rights and responsibilities, to improve communication with the agency and providers, and to assist parents toward successful reunification with their children. Because of their unique experience as former clients of the child welfare system, these individuals can offer a perspective that differs from that of social workers and service providers.

Although the research on parent partners (e.g., Contra Costa County Parent Partner Study 2009) relates to adults, there is also a positive impact on both reunification and placement stability when placing youth in a comparable peer to peer role with other youth in the Child Welfare system. Placement stability is the foundation for the emotional stability of the child which is the basis of the stability not just temporarily out of home but as the child returns to his parents and family. Youth advocates offer a parallel 1:1 support and mentor for youth who are removed from their family. The Contra Costa study and related programs using peers to work with parents and youth suggest that this model's operational principles, e.g., partnership, family engagement, joint decision making, and empowerment to change will help agency social workers to engage families, which is consistent with the adoption of Safety Net Services and SOP as strategies to improve reunification, placement stability and reduce the rate of re-entry.

Engagement of families is an essential feature of this evolving practice model. The growing recognition of the importance of family-centered practice and specifically, family engagement rests at the foundation of SDM and SOP. The study of other counties' use of parent partners revealed they have seen improvement in communication between social workers and parents and an increase in parents working through their case plans and preparing for reunification with their child(ren). Expanding the support network of children and youth going through reunification is another means of improving placement stability and creating a context for safe communication with youth in placement.

The recent CSA peer review recognized that social workers were actively working to engage families and provide support and further recognized that TDMs were broadly used as a means of engaging families in problem solving such as sibling placement and locating relatives. (CSA pp.88) Focus groups of social workers identified resistance from young people as a factor causing placement disruption and in some cases, resulting in a plan of long term foster care with emancipation as the permanent plan at any early age. (CSA pp.87) Having a youth advocate participating as part of the team working with the family would facilitate

communication within the family and could help insure that the concerns of youth in placement were being recognized.

JUSTIFICATION RATIONALE:

Using parent partners and youth advocates enhances the capacity of social workers in their one-on-one interactions with families. Including parent partners in TDMs has been acknowledged by other counties using this program as a means of developing a more in-depth understanding of family dynamics, including a shared understanding of how the family became involved with CPS, what needs to change, family strengths, what services the family might want or need and, what resources exist within the extended family and the community.

SYSTEMIC CHANGES IDENTIFIED:

Agency policies and procedures will be reviewed and modified by the work group to clarify the role of para-professionals, specifically parent partners and youth advocates, how referrals will be made, sharing information and maintaining confidentiality, and working with providers. As with all of the strategies, a comprehensive evaluation component will be developed. This is likely to consist of parent and youth surveys, focus groups, tracking via special project codes in CWS/CMS, and feedback from the families that have received parent partners and/or youth advocates and the impact on reunification, placement stability and a decrease in recurrence of maltreatment. Policies and procedures may be modified based upon the outcome of the evaluation.

TRAINING IDENTIFIED:

Training will be designed and conducted for the providers and social workers on the roles of the parent partners and youth advocates, referral procedures and sharing information, etc. It is important to ensure that the appropriate training is provided to staff, youth advocates, parent partners and providers on roles, responsibilities and how to support one another. The training will be ongoing as needs are identified.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE NEEDED:

None identified at this time.

STRATEGY 4: DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT A CONTINUOUS QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CQI)

The Federal Government, the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) and California counties have been in much discussion in the last couple of years regarding how to develop and implement a CQI program for child welfare agencies, which it is anticipated will incorporate statistical and qualitative case reviews, focus groups and surveys. CQI is dependent upon the active inclusion and participation of staff at all levels of the agency/system, children, youth, families, and stakeholders throughout the process. San Joaquin County is committed to making sure that progress is constantly monitored.

CQI is commonly used in both the public and private sector as a means of improving strategic planning, setting goals, and monitoring progress towards those goals. It creates an environment in which those who are closest to the work are also actively engaged in assessing the outcomes of practices, programs, and policies, and are recommending improvements based on those assessments. With experienced staff, this can be particularly useful. CQI is a method for guiding the implementation of the SIP strategies and for other specific projects and tasks

which may be required in response to monitoring the other outcomes not prioritized in this SIP. Stakeholders consistently identified the lack of coordination of mandated services and community resources as an obstacle to reunification and the improvement in those areas as a key to helping more families access services in a timely manner and reunify sooner. (CSA pp. 94) More engagement with foster parents including improving training was named by stakeholder focus groups as a factor directly related to strengthening placements and reducing the frequency of placement disruption. CQI could both facilitate engagement of foster parents as well as formalizing a mechanism for obtaining feedback and sharing information. (CSA pp.107)

Overall in child welfare, CQI has also been used as a means of engaging staff and stakeholders, including families, to regularly assess whether the stated goals of the agency, a strategy, a project, or intervention are being met by the day to day operation of the agency. Data and information include both quantitative and qualitative sources and are gathered both formally and informally for the assessments. With the continued use of Differential Response, the development of Safety Net Services, the implementation of SOP, SDM and other practices, supervisors and managers will be able to look to the CQI process for real time information about the impact of each stage of the implementation on practice with families and for guidance on making necessary adjustments.

JUSTIFICATION RATIONALE:

CQI will be used to improve the case review process through targeting the reunification and re-entry outcomes as the measures of performance. The workgroup will adopt specific goals, tools, and a theory of change will be identified as the workgroup reviews how CQI has been used in other counties and CQI best practices, in conjunction with CDSS. The theory of change describes the organizational (fiscal, policy, etc.) or the practice-based (i.e., effective service models) steps the organization plans to take in order to close the gap. The final step in the CQI process involves monitoring and feedback (University of Chicago, Chapin Hall, CQI Applied to Child Welfare Systems (2008). The initial focus will be on designing and instituting a more specific and intentional case review process. (CSA pp.84) Supervisors and social workers expressed discomfort with relying on file review by supervisors, case plans, and court reports to assess quality of service. The challenge of effectively linking individual assessment to case plan and services was noted in the peer review and during focus groups. Delay between referrals to services, especially mental health was noted by social workers participating in the focus group as a persistent challenge to case management. (CSA pp.89)

SYSTEMIC CHANGES IDENTIFIED:

Strengthening the existing tools (supervisor case review and court reports) may require some reorganization, revisions to policy and procedure, and study of collaborative social work alternatives, e.g., group supervision. SOP has a case review component that will possibly be integrated into the case review tool developed by the workgroup.

TRAINING IDENTIFIED:

A workgroup will be developed to discuss the goals of CQI and review other jurisdiction's implementation strategies. It is envisioned that the workgroup, or sub-committee of the workgroup, will consider specific strategies for implementing CQI according to different child

protection functions, e.g. Court, permanency, family reunification, family maintenance, adoption and supportive transition.

Once policies and procedures are developed for CQI, training, coaching and a feedback loop will be developed. The workgroup will continue to meet to review the impact of policy, procedure and practice changes, making further revisions as necessary.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE NEEDED:

The California Department of Social Services, Outcomes and Accountability may be contacted for technical assistance. The Northern Training Academy may be contacted for specialized training and coaching for supervisors as CQI is implemented.

STRATEGY 5: PROBATION WILL IMPROVE STRENGTHEN ITS WORK WITH YOUTH AND FAMILIES

The San Joaquin County Probation Department has long adopted the principle of reaching out to families of youth under probation services and working with their families as a key to returning the youth home and public safety. "Families have the potential to be the greatest source of positive change and support for youth in the Juvenile Justice System" (The National Center on Education, Disability and Juvenile Justice & the PACER Center, Inc., 2002). "The evidence is consistent, positive, and convincing: families have a major influence on their children's achievement in school and throughout life." More programming aimed at involving families and special efforts to engage them in activities do make a difference (Henderson & Mapp, 2002). Although the challenges in doing so are numerous, Probation Department management believes that focusing on this strategy through the SIP will generate more resources for Probation Officers and increase the number of youth who are reunified in a timely manner. It is important to remember in looking at reunification outcomes, that Probation is limited by state law and the disposition ordered by the Juvenile Court in making decisions about reunification. Although the number of youth under probation supervision who are in placement is a small percentage of the total under supervision, those youth have demonstrated serious behavioral health problems, extensive histories of substance abuse, and/or violent criminal behavior, e.g., sex offenders. In San Joaquin County, with a significant (over 30%) Hispanic community, family engagement involves a continuing recognition that each family has a culture of its own which determines how the family approaches the tasks of daily living, including how the family faces the difficulty of raising a challenging youth. Because families function in various ways, have different resources at their disposal, the action steps in this strategy stress regular and culturally appropriate communication, formal and informal orientation to the Juvenile Justice System for parents in a culturally appropriate manner, frequent 1:1 interaction between the probation officer and the parents and extended family, sharing of information about the youth's progress, facilitating regular contact between the youth and family members through funding and other means, and active and early engagement in the release planning.

Over the past eight years, Probation has implemented Evidence-Based Programming, Evidence-Based Risk Assessments, and Data driven decision making. Youth are assessed when cited or booked by law enforcement using the Positive Achievement Change Tool (PACT). Based on the level of risk and their specific needs, youth are offered evidence based programs including

Functional Family Therapy (FFT), Aggression Replacement Training (ART), Moral Reconation Therapy (MRT) and Girls Moving On (GMO). Probation Officers are trained in Motivational Interviewing (MI) and Effective Practices in Community Supervision (EPICS), both Evidence-Based Practices.

Probation is continuing systemic improvement in how we work with youth, including those at risk for entering foster care. Our most recent efforts include the PYJI (Positive Youth Justice Initiative). The Positive Youth Justice Initiative is an experimental program that focuses on helping "crossover youths" who are stuck in a cycle of going in and out of the juvenile justice system, and have a traumatic background or a history with child welfare services.

As described in a recent Lodi News article dated Thursday, June 12, 2014:

> Chief Probation Officer Stephanie L. James said that the San Joaquin County initiative had already received $75,000 from the Sierra Health Foundation, and would receive an additional $400,000 in the next two years.
>
> Chief James answered these five questions about the Positive Youth Justice Initiative:
>
> **What part do you play in the Positive Youth Justice Initiative?**
>
> As the Chief Probation Officer, I am leading this initiative for San Joaquin County.
>
> **How would you define "crossover youths," if each county has a different definition?**
>
> Our county defined crossover youths as youths who are wards of the court, are being supervised in the community, and have scored high risk or moderate high risk on our validated risk assessment instrument, the Positive Achievement Change Tool.
>
> **How does the Positive Youth Justice Initiative plan to help crossover youths?**
>
> By implementing the PYJI strategies (wraparound services, trauma informed care, reducing ethnic disparities, using data driven decision-making and focusing on positive youth development), we are striving to improve the health and social outcomes for our youths.
>
> **How is San Joaquin leading the way in innovating juvenile justice?**
>
> There are only four counties in the state that are working on this system reform initiative. We are hoping to be a model for other counties throughout the state and the nation.
>
> **It was mentioned earlier that this program was intended for the long haul. How will this program support itself when or if the funding from the Sierra Health Foundation disappears?**
>
> The Executive Steering Committee continually looks for ways to leverage our resources and use other funding streams to sustain the work that is being done through PYJI. Additionally, many of the reforms that will be put in place have one-time costs, which will be paid for through the grant.
>
> Another example is the Probation Department has training dollars available to pay for ongoing training once the grant goes away. Already, the county has leveraged funds through the Probation Department, Behavioral Health Services, Human Services Agency, Victor Community Support Services and (early periodic screening, diagnosis, and treatment) funds to sustain and implement various program components.

We will continue to look for other funding streams to continue our work, and are in the process of applying for a Reducing Ethnic Disparities grant through the Board of State and Community Corrections.

The SIP Strategy and Action steps are only small pieces of overall systemic analysis and improvement. The Probation Department seeks to continue to address and prevent the reasons youth enter foster care in the first place as well as utilize techniques to improve their success when in treatment, including selecting group home programs that offer Evidence Based Practices and use Motivational Interviewing and Effective Practices in Community Supervision techniques when appropriate. The Probation Department does very well in the area of placement stability.

The key area of development in reunification is to improve parent and family support of the youth so the youth will be more open to treatment, improve parent participation with the youth, group home, and Probation Officer to allow for home passes and ultimately timelier reunification.

JUSTIFICATION RATIONALE:

Juvenile Probation has always emphasized that the family is an essential element of the development and socialization of youth and key to reinforcing pro-social behavior. During the next five years, this specific strategy will expand on best practices for working with youthful offenders and their families.

SYSTEMIC CHANGES IDENTIFIED:

Review of policies and procedures to reinforce the importance of engaging families from post adjudication through reunification and planning for ongoing access to community services.

TRAINING IDENTIFIED:

Collaboration will continue with Children's Services on training on family engagement to make arrangements for the Probation Officers to participate as appropriate.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE NEEDED:

None identified as of yet; however the working group may identify specific areas/topics where technical assistance could be provided as focus shifts to working with families to help prepare for the youth's successful return to the home.

Prioritization of Direct Service Needs

San Joaquin County, like many rural counties in California, has significant limitations in the type and breadth of professional and community services that it can access to support child abuse prevention and for improving outcomes for children who enter the child welfare system and probation. The process of generating the current CSA identified some key at-risk populations, e.g., families living at or near the poverty level, Native American and African American children with disproportionate substantiations, families with multi-generational substance abuse, children under one with high allegation rates and linked those at risk populations with types of programs which have proven to have positive results, including parent partners, SOP, and SDM. The challenge for this county is to do as much as possible to secure community services which have bilingual and bicultural staff and offer evidence based programs for the families for whom

Spanish is their primary language. The strategies chosen in the SIP reflect the best match of the needs of the families and the resources available at this time.

Child Welfare/Probation Placement Initiatives

San Joaquin County Children's Services and Probation Department is participating in a number of initiatives including the AB 12/Extended Foster Care and Katie A. /Core Practice Model.

AB 12/Extended Foster Care Program

San Joaquin County began providing Extended Foster Care services in January of 2012. The process began with the identification of key stakeholders and series of implementation meetings to prepare for the program's start. An agreement was made between Children's Services and Probation that each department would manage their own caseload of non-minor dependents. Children's Services provides case supervision to non-minor dependents involved in the child welfare system, while Probation provides case management to non-minor dependents placed through probation.

Currently, San Joaquin County Children's Services has four social workers assigned to eligible youth in this program. As of the writing of this assessment, there are 165 youth participating in Extended Foster Care through Children's Services. San Joaquin County Probation Department has approximately 25 youth participating in the AB 12 program. Their cases are assigned geographically amongst all placement probation officers.

Social workers and Probation officers work closely with the ILP/Aftercare Coordinators to ensure that all youth receiving extended foster care benefits are also accessing available transitional care services. The staff members provide case management services to non-minor dependent youth, which includes monthly face to face contact, assisting the youth in identifying housing options and ensuring that the non-minor dependent meets one of the five participation criteria.

Katie A. /California's Core Practice Model

In 2002, a class action lawsuit was filed against the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), the California Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) and the County of Los Angeles. The basic argument made in this lawsuit centered on the issue of inadequate mental health services for foster youth. The plaintiffs alleged this shortfall was causing children to experience placement instability and result in unnecessary restrictive placement settings. A settlement was reached and a strategic plan has been adopted to rectify the challenges identified in this case.

In preparation for potential program changes as a result of this litigation, San Joaquin County Children's Services and San Joaquin County Behavioral Health Department began meeting regularly with its management staff. These meetings commenced in December of 2012 and have continued to occur a minimum of once per month since that time. A mental health screening tool has been developed to use with foster youth, and both departments have been advised of the processes required to conduct screenings on all children entering care. These

screening tools are completed by the case management social worker and then forwarded to Behavioral Health for review. The Program Supervisor reviews these screenings and determines if a child is in need of ongoing mental health services. A summary of all screenings have been compiled and this information, along with a listing of all children identified as subclass members pursuant to this lawsuit are reviewed monthly by the CWS and BHS leadership team.

San Joaquin County did submit a request to participate in a Statewide Learning Collaborative dedicated to Katie A. implementation. San Joaquin County was selected to participate and this workgroup began in October of 2013. San Joaquin County Program management staff also attended a workshop in which the elements of the proposed California Practice Model were discussed. These elements included the theoretical framework, the values and principles, practice elements and practice behaviors.

The local planning and implementation team is now transitioning its efforts to identify key stakeholders and begin including their input into the planning process. The team is also making efforts to include parent partners into the Katie A. implementation. Currently a unit of Mental Health workers has been co-located with Child Protective Services. This unit is comprised of one program manager, one supervisor and seven mental health clinicians.

5 – Year SIP Chart Outcomes

During the period 2014-2019, San Joaquin County will work on each of the five outcomes below using the strategies and related efforts according to the action steps below for each outcome. Based on review of internal data, including CSA and annual SIP reports, the following improvement benchmarks have been set for each outcome:

Outcome S 1.1: No recurrence of maltreatment

San Joaquin County continues to be very close to the national standard (94.5%) and above state performance. It is highly anticipated that with continued use of DR and implementation of the Safety Net Services with fidelity to the model that the national standard will be met and maintained in this outcome.

National Standard: 94.6%

CSA Baseline Performance: September, 2013 (CSA 94.5%)

Target Improvement Goal: 94.6%

Outcome C 1.3: Reunification within 12 months

Data collected on the County's performance on all reunification outcomes (C1.1, C1.2 and C1.3) over the past three years shows that the County has significantly reduced the number of children entering foster care for the first time from 2008-2013. A significant consequence is that only those children with serious needs from families with limited capacity or willingness to parent are removed and enter foster care.

It is believed that with the simultaneous use of Safety Net Services, SOP and CQI over the next SIP period; San Joaquin County should be able to reduce median time to reunification by 2-3 months in each of the following years.

National Standard: 48.4%

CSA Baseline Performance: September, 2013 (CSA 14.3%)

Target Improvement Goal: 48.4%

Outcome C 1.4: Reentry following reunification

From the baseline of October 1, 2009 to September 30, 2009, there was a decrease in the number of children who exited to reunification within the year and re-entered foster care from 18.4% to 10.4%. From October 2, 2011 to September 30, 2012, the re-entry rate for San Joaquin County was 10.4% which exceeds the performance of other counties in the state, but is slightly below the federal standard (9.9%). This can be attributed to the intensive work with families done by social workers, their experience, the implementation of SDM, and using TDM's

to identify and strengthen natural family support systems and identify challenges when reunification occurs.

It is anticipated that with the implementation of SOP in conjunction with SDM, the national standard will be met within the first few years of the SIP.

National Standard: 9.9%

CSA Baseline Performance: September, 2013 (CSA 10.4%)

Target Improvement Goal: 9.9%

Outcome C 4.3: Placement Stability (At least 24 months in care)

Youth who have not reunified with their parents within 24 months, have not had guardianship established or have not been adopted present a complex set of needs and challenges including their own maturity, sometimes mental health issues, physical disabilities, and often behavioral problems. Regular and frequent visits at the home and school between the social worker and youth are helpful in identifying problems and avoiding disruption and regular efforts to engage relatives is helpful but not sufficient in many cases resulting in placement instability. Limited placement options for older youth in the county also has a negative impact on placement stability and meeting the national standard (41.8%).

It is believed that with the simultaneous use of Safety Net Services, SOP, Placement Stability and CQI over the next SIP period; San Joaquin County should be able to increase placement stability rates for children and youth in care.

National Standard: 41.8%

CSA Baseline Performance: September, 2013 (CSA 27.4%)

Target Improvement Goal: At least 10% improvement in placement stability/year (2014 – 2019)

Outcome C1.3: Reunification within 12 months – Probation

Reunification within 12 months continues to be a challenge for all Probation Departments. Only one of the youth on probation satisfied the requirements of this outcome during the April-September, 2009 reporting period. Despite the numerous strengths which the peer review recognized in the Juvenile Probation Division, the circumstances and needs of youth who can remain under local supervision are much more complex and challenging than five years ago. Youth are often committed for serious offenses that involve sex abuse, gang associations, long histories of substance abuse, and serious behavioral health issues. Matching the needs of the youth with a treatment program generally requires placement in a specialized program out of county and frequently, out of state. The level of placement also impacts reunification time, specifically in the case of sex offenders where 18 -24 months is often required to complete the therapeutic program. In some cases, time in placement is extended due to unavailability of family to reunify with the youth. The commitment to engage parents and family members throughout the placement of the youth and in preparation for the youth's return home, is intended to reduce or eliminate some of the obstacles to successful reunification while

reinforcing linkages between the youth and his/her family while in placement. Contact will be made with other Probation Departments to recommend CWS/CMS data criteria for their reunification outcomes that reflect juvenile probation practice.

National Standard: 48.4%

CSA Baseline Performance: January 2013 (CSA 0.0%). Probation had only one case (1/20) that fit data qualifications for this period

Target Improvement Goal: 48.4%

5 – Year SIP Chart

Priority Outcome Measure or Systemic Factor: No recurrence of maltreatment (S1.1) **National Standard: 94.6%** **CSA Baseline Performance: September, 2013 (CSA 94.5%)** **Target Improvement Goal: 94.6%**
Priority Outcome Measure or Systemic Factor: Reunification within 12 months (C1.3) **National Standard: 48.4%** **CSA Baseline Performance: September 2013 (CSA 14.3%)** **Target Improvement Goal: 48.4%**
Priority Outcome Measure or Systemic Factor: Re-entry following reunification (C1.4) **National Standard: 9.9%** **CSA Baseline Performance: September 2013 (CSA 10.4%)** **Target Improvement Goal: 9.9%**
Priority Outcome Measure or Systemic Factor: Placement Stability (at least 24 months in care) (C4.3) **National Standard: 41.8%** **CSA Baseline Performance: September 2013 (CSA 27.4%)** **Target Improvement Goal: At least 10% improvement in placement stability/year (2015-2019)**
Priority Outcome Measure or Systemic Factor: Reunification within 12 months (C1.3) PROBATION **National Standard: 48.4%** **CSA Baseline Performance: January 2013 (0.0%). Probation had only one case (1/20) that fit data qualifications for this period** **Target Improvement Goal: 48.4%**

Strategy 1: Develop and Expand Safety Net Services – Differential Response, Concrete Services for open Child Welfare cases and After Care Case Management	☐ CAPIT ☐ CBCAP ☒ PSSF ☐ N/A	Applicable Outcome Measures and/or Systemic Factors: Reunification within 12 Months (C1.3): 48.4% (CSA 10.4%) Re-entry following reunification (C1.4): 9.9% (CSA 10.4%) Recurrence of Maltreatment (S1.1): 94.6% (CSA 94.5%)	
Action Steps:	Implementation Date:	Completion Date:	Person Responsible:
A. Workgroup will meet to identify priority areas for development of the Safety Net Services Program; including an assessment of current Differential Response, the development of a Concrete Services program, as well as After Care case management program. Request for Proposals will be developed. Strengths and challenges will be considered.	October 2014	January 2015	Division I Division Chief
B. The workgroup will review data on current use of Differential Response program, expected use of the Concrete Services and After Care programs. Special attention will be paid to identifying the target population for these services, including impact on child welfare practices.	December 2014	January 2015	Division I Division Chief
C. Safety Net Services Program contracts are awarded to the CBO's, the workgroup will develop policies and referral forms for the use of this program for clear delineation of roles and responsibilities.	January 2015	March 2015	Division I Division Chief
D. Workgroup will pay special attention to the number of families utilizing the services, recurrence of maltreatment, training for service providers, and training for CWS staff.	March 2015	March 2016	Division I Division Chief
E. Measures will be developed that evaluate effectiveness, implementation and training needs for service providers and CPS staff. Implementation is reviewed by workgroup and agency administration including CWS/CMS special project code data.	March 2016	August 2017	Division I Division Chief
F. Outcome data will be reviewed for C1.3, C2.4 and S1.1 on an ongoing basis to determine if placement changes have been reduced, families are reunifying faster or there has been a reduction in the reoccurrence of maltreatment.	March 2017	August 2019	Division I Division Chief

Strategy 2: Implement Safety Organized Practice (SOP)	☐ CAPIT ☐ CBCAP ☐ PSSF ☐ N/A	Applicable Outcome Measures and/or Systemic Factors: Re-entry following reunification (C1.4): 9.9% (CSA 10.4%) Placement Stability (C4.3): 41.8% (CSA 27.4%) Recurrence of Maltreatment (S1.1): 94.6% (CSA 94.5%)	
Action Steps:	Implementation Date:	Completion Date:	Person Responsible:
A. Convene workgroup to plan implementation of SOP throughout the agency and track impact on outcomes, including fidelity testing.	October 2014	February 2015	Division II Division Chief
B. Workgroup begins implementation, collaborating with Northern Academy on Advanced training and coaching schedule.	February 2015	August 2015	Division II Division Chief
C. Train supervisors in coaching on SOP with Northern Academy trainers, as necessary.	January 2015	June 2015	Division II Division Chief
D. Revise current policy and procedure to insure consistency with SOP principles and that related policies are complimentary.	September 2015	February 2016	Division II Division Chief
E. Appoint subcommittee from workgroup and selected staff to develop internal monitoring system according to function, e.g., I&A, Court, FM, FR, PP/Treatment and Adoptions	August 2015	August 2019	Division II Division Chief
F. Monitor total training of staff and supervisors.	June 2015	August 2019	Division II Division Chief
G. Outcome data will be reviewed for C1.4, C4.3 and S1.1 on an ongoing basis to determine if re-entries have been reduced, if there has been a reduction in placement changes or there has been a reduction in the reoccurrence of maltreatment.	June 2016	August 2019	Division II Division Chief

Strategy 3: Implement Parent Partners and Youth Advocate Programs	☐ CAPIT ☐ CBCAP ☐ PSSF ☐ N/A	Applicable Outcome Measures and/or Systemic Factors: Reunification within 12 Months (C1.3): 48.4% (CSA 14.3%) Placement Stability (C4.3): 41.8% (CSA 27.4%) Recurrence of Maltreatment (S1.1): 94.6% (CSA 94.5%) ☐ Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project	
Action Steps:	Implementation Date:	Completion Date:	Person Responsible:
A. Form a workgroup with the specific goal of collecting information about Parent Partners and Youth Advocates, as a best practice and as implemented in other counties.	November 2014	January 2015	Division III Division Chief
B. Develop an implementation plan for the program and invite a parents, especially fathers, to participate in serving all populations.	March 2015	July 2015	Division III Division Chief
C. Develop policies and procedures to implement the program including recruitment, screening, training, referral process development, target population, case support and agency support with emphasis on father engagement.	June 2015	January 2016	Division III Division Chief
D. Train staff, youth advocates, parent partners, and providers on their role in supporting the child welfare system.	June 2016	August 2019	Division III Division Chief
D. Review implementation of program including obtaining feedback from parents, parent partners, staff and providers and CWS/CMS special projects code on median time to reunification.	January 2017	August 2019	Division III Division Chief
E. Survey families on impact of program including improving access to services, understanding of court procedure, and family stability.	June 2017	August 2019	Division III Division Chief
F. Workgroup makes necessary modifications & revises policy, procedure, screening, target population, training and program supports as needed. Outcome data will be reviewed for C1.3, C2.4 and S1.1 on an ongoing basis to determine if placement changes have been reduced, reunifying timeframes have been reduced or there has been a reduction in the reoccurrence of maltreatment.	December 2017	August 2019	Division III Division Chief

Strategy 4: Develop and Implement a Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) Program	☐ CAPIT ☐ CBCAP ☐ PSSF ☐ N/A	Applicable Outcome Measures and/or Systemic Factors: Reunification within 12 months (C1.3): 48.4% (CSA 14.3%) Reentry Following Reunification (C1.4): 9.9 % (CSA 10.4%) Placement Stability (C4.3): 41.8% (CSA 27.4%) Recurrence of Maltreatment (S1.1): 94.6% (CSA 94.5%)	
Action Steps:	Implementation Date:	Completion Date:	Person Responsible:
A. Convene a workgroup of managers and social workers to discuss the goals of CQI and review other counties implementation of CQI.	April 2015	October 2015	Projects Supervisor
B. Organize subcommittees from the working group with specific assignments to identify strategies for implementing CQI according to different child protection functions, e.g. in-court, permanency, family reunification, family maintenance, adoption, supportive transition.	October 2015	January 2016	Projects Supervisor
C. Subcommittee drafts policies and procedures for implementation of CQI, including data collection and training.	December 2015	April 2016	Projects Supervisor
D. Workgroup determines plan for implementation including training, coaching and data collection.	January 2016	April 2016	Projects Supervisor
E. Implement policy, procedure, and practice changes.	June 2016	January 2017	Projects Supervisor
F. Reconvene workgroup and review impact of policy, procedure and practice changes and make further revisions as necessary.	December 2017	August 2019	Projects Supervisor

Strategy 5: Improve Probation Department working with families to improve timely reunification by strengthening parental engagement in case planning and preparing for a successful reunification.	☐ CAPIT ☐ CBCAP ☐ PSSF ☐ N/A	Applicable Outcome Measure and/or Systemic Factor: Reunification within 12 months (C1.3): 48.4% (CSA 5.0 %)	
Action Steps:	Implementation Date:	Completion Date:	Person Responsible:
A. Convene a workgroup to identify and assess obstacles to timely reunification focusing on the role of parents.	October 2014	December 2014	Placement Unit Supervisor
B. Train staff and supervisors on improving engagement with families, e.g. case planning and discharge planning.	January 2016	December 2016	Assistant Deputy Chief Probation Officer
C. Modify training, team meetings procedures, placement policy, and case planning as necessary.	January 2016	Ongoing through 2019	Assistant Deputy Chief Probation Officer Placement Unit Supervisor
D. Review all placement policies, including assessment of placements, policies and procedures for the transporting of youth placement and maintaining family connections.	January 2016	June 2016	Assistant Deputy Chief Probation Officer Placement Unit Supervisor
E. Make recommendations regarding uniformity of definition for data entry as relates to CWS/CMS coding for FR by Probation Depts. Review procedures regarding auditing and correction of data entry.	January 2015	June 2015	Placement Unit Supervisor
F. Convene workgroup quarterly to review progress on each project and make necessary modifications, implement and review.	January 2015	August 2019	Assistant Deputy Chief Probation Officer Placement Unit Supervisor

CAPIT/CBCAP/PSSF
Program and Evaluation Description

PROGRAM NAME

Respite/Immediate Short Term Child Care

SERVICE PROVIDER

Child Abuse Prevention Council

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The program will provide immediate short term (3 months or less) and respite child care for families in San Joaquin County that are at risk of abuse or neglect or who may have entered into the Child Welfare System. Care is provided during normal business hours, Monday-Friday. Staff speaks both English and Spanish.

FUNDING SOURCES

SOURCE	LIST FUNDED ACTIVITIES
CAPIT	Respite/Intermediate Short Term Child Care
CBCAP	
PSSF Family Preservation	
PSSF Family Support	
PSSF Time-Limited Family Reunification	
PSSF Adoption Promotion and Support	
OTHER Source(s): (Specify)	

IDENTIFY PRIORITY NEED OUTLINED IN CSA

- High poverty
- The highest rate of substantiations is in the 0 – 5 age range. (CSA, pp.36)
- Domestic violence outreach and services were listed as among the top three services which could reduce child abuse in San Joaquin County. (CSA, pp.94)
- The peer review identified families with domestic violence histories as one of the challenges to successful casework. (CSA, pp.86)
- The Spanish speaking population in San Joaquin County has steadily increased over the last five years to 40% of the total population of the County with continuing growth in the future projected. (CSA, pp.6)

- Stakeholders identified the inadequate number of services for Spanish Speaking families as one of the major obstacles to timely reunification. (CSA pp. 33)
- Family instability caused by poverty, fractured family system, limited education, and multigenerational substance abuse continued to undermine families. (CSA, pp.6)

TARGET POPULATION

- CWS and/or non-CWS families; families with children 0-5; Hispanic families

TARGET GEOGRAPHIC AREA

San Joaquin County

TIMELINE

Services with current provider through December 31, 2014.

Services from January 1, 2015 through the remainder of the SIP-cycle to be determined through RFP process.

EVALUATION

PROGRAM OUTCOME(S) AND MEASUREMENT & QUALITY ASSURANCE (QA) MONITORING

Desired Outcome	Indicator	Source of Measure	Frequency
Improved knowledge of and access to concrete supports in times of need	75% of parents indicated lower stress level	Client survey	Survey administered at conclusion of services

CLIENT SATISFACTION

Method or Tool	Frequency	Utilization	Action
Satisfaction Survey	Completed when services are no longer necessary	Surveys reviewed after each family departs from the program	If a concern arises, discussion will take place immediately to resolve the issue.

Program and Evaluation Description

Program Name

Family Intervention Program

Service Provider

Child Abuse Prevention Council

Program Description

- Family Intervention Program to provide services to families experiencing a high level of stress and/or who may be in need of life enhancing services to keep them from entering the Child Welfare System.
- FIP provides Case management and home visitation services.
- Family strengthening by assisting families in identifying their strengths and needs developing an individualized family plan.
- Increase family awareness and access to affordable community services.

Funding Sources

SOURCE	LIST FUNDED ACTIVITIES
CAPIT	Family Intervention Program case management
CBCAP	
PSSF Family Preservation	
PSSF Family Support	
PSSF Time-Limited Family Reunification	
PSSF Adoption Promotion and Support	
OTHER Source(s): (Specify)	

Identify Priority Need Outlined in CSA

- High poverty
- The highest rate of substantiations is in the 0 – 5 age range. (CSA, pp.36)
- Domestic violence outreach and services were listed as among the top three services which could reduce child abuse in San Joaquin County. (CSA, pp.94)
- The peer review identified families with domestic violence histories as one of the challenges to successful casework. (CSA, pp.86)

- The Spanish speaking population in San Joaquin County has steadily increased over the last five years to 40% of the total population of the County with continuing growth in the future projected. (CSA, pp.6)
- Stakeholders identified the inadequate number of services for Spanish Speaking families as one of the major obstacles to timely reunification. (CSA pp. 33)
- Family instability caused by poverty, fractured family system, limited education, and multigenerational substance abuse continued to undermine families. (CSA, page 6)

TARGET POPULATION

- All children and families living in San Joaquin County who are at risk and are non-CWS families; families with children 0-14; Hispanic families

TARGET GEOGRAPHIC AREA

San Joaquin County

TIMELINE

Services with current provider through December 31, 2014.

Services from January 1, 2015 through the remainder of the SIP to be determined through RFP process.

EVALUATION

PROGRAM OUTCOME(S) AND MEASUREMENT & QUALITY ASSURANCE (QA) MONITORING

Desired Outcome	Indicator	Source of Measure	Frequency
Keeping families out of the Child Welfare System	75% Families have no substantiated referrals	CWS/CMS	Bi-annual and annually

CLIENT SATISFACTION

Method or Tool	Frequency	Utilization	Action
Satisfaction Survey	Completed by all families at entry and exiting the program	Surveys are reviewed after each family exits the program	Agency to address issues identified in survey

Program and Evaluation Description

Program Name

Parenting Program

Service Provider

Women's Center Youth and Family Services (WCYFS)

Program Description

No fee Parenting/life skills services that reduce the risk factors of intimate partner violence and child-abuse utilizing the Nurturing Parent Curriculum. The 8-week Basic Parenting and 12-week Co-Parenting classes are offered in 2-hour sessions, one time per week in various community locations. The courses are offered in English and Spanish; led by trained parent educators and parent leaders. Child care is provided on-site during the sessions.

Funding Sources

SOURCE	LIST FUNDED ACTIVITIES
CAPIT	
CBCAP	Parenting Classes
PSSF Family Preservation	
PSSF Family Support	
PSSF Time-Limited Family Reunification	
PSSF Adoption Promotion and Support	
OTHER Source(s): (Specify) Kids' Plate	Parenting classes

Identify Priority Need Outlined in CSA

- High poverty
- The highest rate of substantiations is in the 0 – 5 age range. (CSA, pp.36)
- Domestic violence outreach and services were listed as among the top three services which could reduce child abuse in San Joaquin County. (CSA, pp.94)
- The peer review identified families with domestic violence histories as one of the challenges to successful casework. (CSA, pp.86)
- The Spanish speaking population in San Joaquin County has steadily increased over the last five years to 40% of the total population of the County with continuing growth in the future projected. (CSA, pp.6)

- Stakeholders identified the inadequate number of services for Spanish Speaking families as one of the major obstacles to timely reunification. (CSA pp. 33)
- Family instability caused by poverty, fractured family system, limited education, and multigenerational substance abuse continued to undermine families. (CSA, pp.6)

TARGET POPULATION

- Families throughout San Joaquin County who are not already a part of the Child Welfare System seeking parenting education and support.
- Services to be provided in the communities where there is a high incidence of
    - CWS referrals;
    - parenting teens;
    - homeless families;
    - Spanish speaking families;
    - Special needs and underserved populations.

TARGET GEOGRAPHIC AREA

San Joaquin County

TIMELINE

Services with current provider through December 31, 2014.

Services from January 1, 2015 through the remainder of the SIP-cycle to be determined through RFP process.

EVALUATION

PROGRAM OUTCOME(S) AND MEASUREMENT & QUALITY ASSURANCE (QA) MONITORING

Desired Outcome	Indicator	Source of Measure	Frequency
Increase parenting and child development knowledge	75% of parents attending classes gain knowledge/skills in parenting children	Pre and post assessment that measures challenges of parenting	Assessment is taken by parents on first night of class and last night of class (8 or 12 weeks depending on which class the parent attends)

CLIENT SATISFACTION

Method or Tool	Frequency	Utilization	Action
Client survey and weekly feedback forms	Post course	Feedback forms to be reviewed at end of each session. Surveys to be reviewed at the end of the class.	If a concern arises, discussion will take place immediately to resolve the issue and/or provide additional resources.

Program and Evaluation Description

PROGRAM NAME

Safety Net Services

SERVICE PROVIDER

To be determined

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

- **Differential Response (DR)** offered in Spanish, English:
  - Path 1 , Community Response
  - Path 2, Community Partner Joint Response with CWS

Calls to Child Protective Services reporting suspected child abuse or neglect that do not rise to the statutory level of an in-person CPS response. In lieu of a response (investigation) by CPS, a referral will be made to Differential Response to offer and provide families with resources to address and ameliorate the issue that resulted in the call being made to CPS in the first place. In Path 1, the Community DR worker will conduct a client intake and needs assessment with families who accept services from the community-based provider. A service plan will be developed with the family to address their presenting needs. Families will be linked to community resources or other services offered by the provider, as appropriate to the presenting needs. Path 2 referrals are evaluated by both the CWS and community provider's DR worker. If the presenting situation merits CWS involvement, the community provider may not remain engaged on the case (unless deemed appropriate). If CWS-involvement is not necessary, the community DR worker will follow intake steps as outlined above for Path 1. Examples of referrals that may be referred to DR include, but not limited to: alleged domestic violence, custody disputes, poor parenting practices, lack of basic needs.

- **Concrete Support Services** involves the provision of case management or concrete support services. Referrals for case management would typically come from situations where CPS has been involved with the family, through an investigation that revealed low or moderate risk issues. Another example is when the family has an open case with CPS and the case carrying social worker feels that the family could benefit from some short term concrete support services to assist with a specific need that the family has that will lead to the child being returned home. These services could also help preserve the child in the home. The component will also provide services to families who are pursuing legal guardianship or adoption and children who have a planned permanent living arrangement.

- **After Care Case Management** involves children who have returned home from an out of home placement or are transitioning home (i.e. overnight visits) and support is needed to

help prevent re-entry into foster care and provide support to the family. Services will include case management, including aftercare service-planning and linkages to community resources or other family support programs offered by the provider.

SOURCE	LIST FUNDED ACTIVITIES
CAPIT	
CBCAP	
PSSF Family Preservation	Differential Response, Concrete Support Services and After- Care Case Management Program
PSSF Family Support	Differential Response, Concrete Support Services and After-Care Case Management Program
PSSF Time-Limited Family Reunification	
PSSF Adoption Promotion and Support	
OTHER Source(s): (Specify) CWSOIP	Differential Response, Concrete Support Services and After- Care Case Management Program

IDENTIFY PRIORITY NEED OUTLINED IN CSA

- High poverty
- High re-entry rates
- Low reunification rates
- The highest rate of substantiations is in the 0 – 5 age range. (CSA, pp.36)
- Domestic violence outreach and services were listed as among the top three services which could reduce child abuse in San Joaquin County. (CSA, pp.94)
- The peer review identified families with domestic violence histories as one of the challenges to successful casework. (CSA, pp.86)
- The Spanish speaking population in San Joaquin County has steadily increased over the last five years to 40% of the total population of the County with continuing growth in the future projected. (CSA, pp.6)
- Stakeholders identified the inadequate number of services for Spanish Speaking families as one of the major obstacles to timely reunification. (CSA pp. 33)
- Family instability caused by poverty, fractured family system, limited education, and multigenerational substance abuse continued to undermine families. (CSA, pp.6)

TARGET POPULATION

- Differential Response: Families report for suspected abuse (e.g. Families evaluated-out from Child Protective Services).
- Concrete Supports: Families with open referrals or open cases with Child Protective Services.

- After Care Case Management: Families who recently had a case closed with Child Protective Services.

TARGET GEOGRAPHIC AREA

San Joaquin County

TIMELINE

Services with current providers for Differential Response (El Concilio, Women's Center Youth and Family Services and Child Abuse Prevention Council) through December 31, 2014.Requests for Proposal are being developed for the Safety Net Services Programs.

Services from January 1, 2015 through the remainder of the SIP to be determined through RFP process.

EVALUATION

Desired Outcome	Indicator	Source of Measure	Frequency
Families have concrete support in times of need	95% of families who accept DR services are linked to resources to address presenting issues	Provider records	Recorded at time of linkage to services
No recurrence of child maltreatment	75% of participating families do not have a re-substantiated case of abuse.	CWS/CMS and SafeMeasures	Quarterly

CLIENT SATISFACTION:

Method or Tool	Frequency	Utilization	Action
Client Satisfaction Survey	Monthly	Surveys will be provided at the close of the case management case.	Surveys will be reviewed by CPS

Program and Evaluation Description

PROGRAM NAME

Adoption and Post-Adoption Services

SERVICE PROVIDER

San Joaquin County Adoption and Post-Adoption Services

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

- The Adoption Post-Adoption program is responsible for processing special needs requests and Adoption Assistance Program contract renewals; providing adoptive parents with information and referrals that support them in making a lifetime commitment to children and assist adoptees with biological family inquiries and determine what, if any, information is authorized to be released about parents, siblings and other relatives. Other services will include: case management, adoptive family recruitment.

FUNDING SOURCES

SOURCE	LIST FUNDED ACTIVITIES
CAPIT	
CBCAP	
PSSF Family Preservation	
PSSF Family Support	
PSSF Time-Limited Family Reunification	
PSSF Adoption Promotion and Support	Adoption and Post-Adoption Services
OTHER Source(s): (Specify) AAP/CWSOIP/Child Welfare Basic	Adoption and Post-Adoption Services

IDENTIFY PRIORITY NEED OUTLINED IN CSA

- San Joaquin County has been able to meet or exceed national and state performance standards for all the adoption outcomes (CSA 100, 101, 102); however, the capacity to recruit and maintain potential adoptive families requires additional support, specifically Spanish speaking families.
- The Spanish speaking population in San Joaquin County has steadily increased over the last five years to 40% of the total population of the County with continuing growth in the future projected. (CSA, pp.6)
- From the baseline period October 1, 2009 to September 30, 2010, there has been a decrease from 17% to 13.1% of children in foster care for 17 continuous months being

discharged to a finalized adoption. One contributing factor identified in the agency focus group was the increase in the number of families who required services who were Spanish speaking. Although the agency has many Spanish-speaking workers, heavy caseloads make working with these families difficult and services in the community are limited. (CSA, pp.102, 103)

TARGET POPULATION

Potential Adoptive families and Adoptive Families

TARGET GEOGRAPHIC AREA

Inside and outside San Joaquin County

TIMELINE

SIP Cycle, October 1, 2014 – October 1, 2019

EVALUATION

Desired Outcome	Indicator	Source of Measure	Frequency
Adoption within 12 months (C2.3)	Recruited more adoptive families	CWS/CMS	Annually

CLIENT SATISFACTION

Method or Tool	Frequency	Utilization	Action
CSW or AAP Specialist communicates with prospective adoptive/adoptive families if an issue arises	As needed, minimally monthly	CSW or AAP Specialist addressed issue to CSW management	Use for program improvement and training

Program and Evaluation Description

PROGRAM NAME

Supervised Visitation Services program

SERVICE PROVIDER

To be determined

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

- The current method of supervised visitation services consists of a detached observation of the family's visitation, usually in the Human Services Agency building or Walter Britten Visitation Center. San Joaquin County is changing the structure of supervised visitation. The primary purpose of visits is to meet the child's rights to maintain connections with people with whom the child has an emotional bond and to meet the child's development and attachment needs. The secondary goal of visitation is to assess the parent's ability to safely parent his/her child; teach parenting skills and determine the final permanency plan.
- The Supervised Visitation Services program is designed to provide supervision and coaching to parents during visitation with their child(ren). The visits will take place throughout San Joaquin County, including but not limited to, the home of the parent, the placement of the child, the general community (i.e. local parks, play zones), the vendor's agency, the Human Services Agency and the Walter Britton Visitation Center located at the Mary Graham Children's Shelter.

FUNDING SOURCES

SOURCE	LIST FUNDED ACTIVITIES
CAPIT	
CBCAP	
PSSF Family Preservation	
PSSF Family Support	
PSSF Time-Limited Family Reunification	Supervised Visitation Services program
PSSF Adoption Promotion and Support	
OTHER Source(s): (Specify)	

IDENTIFY PRIORITY NEED OUTLINED IN CSA

- High poverty
- High re-entry rates
- Low reunification rates

- The highest rate of substantiations is in the 0 – 5 age range. (CSA, pp.36)
- Domestic violence outreach and services were listed as among the top three services which could reduce child abuse in San Joaquin County. (CSA, pp.94)
- The peer review identified families with domestic violence histories as one of the challenges to successful casework. (CSA, pp.86)
- The Spanish speaking population in San Joaquin County has steadily increased over the last five years to 40% of the total population of the County with continuing growth in the future projected. (CSA, pp.6)
- Stakeholders identified the inadequate number of services for Spanish Speaking families as one of the major obstacles to timely reunification. (CSA pp. 33)
- Family instability caused by poverty, fractured family system, limited education, and multigenerational substance abuse continued to undermine families. (CSA, pp.6)

TARGET POPULATION

- Children that are removed from their home and placed in a foster home or a group home.

TARGET GEOGRAPHIC AREA

San Joaquin County

TIMELINE

Services with current providers (Supervised Visitation Services and Child Abuse Prevention Council) through December 31, 2014.

Services from January 1, 2015 through the reminder of the SIP to be determined through RFP process.

EVALUATION

PROGRAM OUTCOME(S) AND MEASUREMENT & QUALITY ASSURANCE (QA) MONITORING

Desired Outcome	Indicator	Source of Measure	Frequency
Timely Reunification	Length of time in foster care shortened by 10%	CWS/CMS	Quarterly

CLIENT SATISFACTION

Method or Tool	Frequency	Utilization	Action
Satisfaction Survey	Completed by all families at exit of the program	Surveys are reviewed after each family exits the program	Agency to address issues identified in survey

CAPIT/CBCAP/PSSF Expenditure Workbook

Attachment A

CAPIT/CBCAP/PSSF Expenditure Workbook
Proposed Expenditures
Worksheet 1

Appendix X

(1) DATE SUBMITTED:
(2) DATES FOR THIS WORKBOOK: 7/1/14 thru 12/31/14
(3) DATE APPROVED BY OCAP: Internal Use Only
(4) COUNTY: San Joaquin
(5) PERIOD OF SIP: 7/1/14 thru 12/31/14
(6) YEARS: 6 months

(7) ALLOCATION (Use the latest Fiscal or All County Information Notice for Allocation): CAPIT: $ 109,204 CBCAP: $26,000 PSSF: $318,506

No.	Program Name	Applies to CBCAP Programs Only	Name of Service Provider	Service Provider is Unknown, Date Revised Workbook to be Submitted to OCAP	CAPIT: Dollar amount to be spent on CAPIT Programs	CAPIT: CAPIT is used for Administration	CBCAP: Dollar amount to be spent on CBCAP Programs	CBCAP: CBCAP is used for Administration	PSSF: Dollar amount to be spent on Family Preservation	PSSF: Dollar amount to be spent on Family Support	PSSF: Dollar amount to be spent on Time-Limited Reunification	PSSF: Dollar amount to be spent on Adoption Promotion & Support	PSSF: Dollar amount of PSSF allocation to be spent on PSSF activities (Sum of columns G1-G4)	PSSF: PSSF is used for Administration	OTHER SOURCES: Dollar amount from other sources	NAME OF OTHER: List the name(s) of the other funding source(s)	TOTAL: Total dollar amount to be spent on this Program (Sum of Columns E, F, G5)
A	B	C	D1	D2	E1	E2	F1	F2	G1	G2	G3	G4	G5	G6	H1	H2	I
1	Respite/Immediate Short Term Child Care		Child Abuse Prevention Council		$43,706		$0		$0	$0	$0	$0	$0		$0		$43,706
2	Family Intervention		Child Abuse Prevention Council		$65,498		$0		$0	$0	$0	$0	$0		$0		$65,498
3	Parenting Classes		Women's Center Youth & Family Services		$0		$25,000		$0	$0	$0	$0	$0		$1,500	Kids' Plate	$26,500
4	Differential Response		Child Abuse Prevention Council		$0		$0		$17,650	$17,650	$0	$0	$35,300		$0		$35,300
5	Differential Response - DV		Women's Center Youth & Family Services		$0		$0		$10,000	$10,000	$0	$0	$20,000		$0		$20,000
6	Differential Response		El Concilio		$0		$0		$17,650	$17,650	$0	$0	$35,300		$0		$35,300
7	Differential Response		Women's Center Youth & Family Services		$0		$0		$35,300	$35,300	$0	$0	$70,600		$0		$70,600
8	FOCUS		Women's Center Youth & Family Services		$0		$0		$14,052	$14,052	$0	$0	$28,104		$50,617	CWSOIP	$78,721
9	Supervised Visitation		CAPC		$0		$0		$0	$0	$31,550	$0	$31,550		$3,450	CWS Basic	$35,000
10	Supervised Visitation		SVS		$0		$0		$0	$0	$31,550	$0	$31,550		$3,450	CWS Basic	$35,000
11	Adoption Promotion and Support		CWS		$0		$0		$0	$0	$0	$63,101	$63,101		$25,749	Adoption	$88,850
12					$0		$0		$0	$0	$0	$0	$0		$0		$0
13					$0		$0		$0	$0	$0	$0	$0		$0		$0
14					$0		$0		$0	$0	$0	$0	$0		$0		$0
15					$0		$0		$0	$0	$0	$0	$0		$0		$0
No.	Program Name	Applies to CBCAP Programs Only	Name of Service Provider	Service Provider is Unknown, Date Revised Workbook to be Submitted to OCAP	CAPIT: Dollar amount to be spent on CAPIT Programs	CAPIT: CAPIT is used for Administration	CBCAP: Dollar amount to be spent on CBCAP Programs	CBCAP: CBCAP is used for Administration	PSSF: Dollar amount to be spent on Family Preservation	PSSF: Dollar amount to be spent on Family Support	PSSF: Dollar amount to be spent on Time-Limited Reunification	PSSF: Dollar amount to be spent on Adoption Promotion & Support	PSSF: Dollar amount of PSSF allocation to be spent on PSSF activities (Sum of columns G1-G4)	PSSF: PSSF is used for Administration	OTHER SOURCES: Dollar amount from other sources	NAME OF OTHER: List the name(s) of the other funding source(s)	TOTAL: Total dollar amount to be spent on this Program (Sum of Columns E, F, G5)
A	B	C	D1	D2	E1	E2	F1	F2	G1	G2	G3	G4	G5	G6	H1	H2	I
	Totals				$109,204		$26,000		$94,652	$94,652	$63,100	$63,101	$318,506		$84,766		$634,475
									30%	30%	20%	20%	100%				

Attachment A

CAPIT/CBCAP/PSSF Expenditure Workbook
CBCAP Programs
Worksheet 2

(1) COUNTY: _____ (2) YEARS: _____

No.	Program Name	Logic Model			EBP/EIP ONLY						Parent Involvement Activities		
					EBP/EIP Level As determined by the EBP/EIP Checklist					EBP/EIP Checklist is on file or N/A			
		Logic Model Not Applicable	Logic Model Exists	Logic Model Will be Developed	Program Lacking support (Level 0)	Emerging & Evidence Informed Programs & Practices (Level 1)	Promising Programs & Practices (Level 2)	Supported (Level 3)	Well Supported (Level 4)		Planning	Implementation	Evaluation
A	B	C1	C2	C3	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	E1	E2	E3

CAPIT/CBCAP/PSSF Expenditure Workbook
Proposed Expenditures
Worksheet 2

Appendix X

(1) DATE SUBMITTED: _____ (2) DATES FOR THIS WORKBOOK 1/1/15 thru 6/30/19

(3) DATE APPROVED BY OCAP _____ Internal Use Only

(4) COUNTY: San Joaquin (5) PERIOD OF SIP: 10/1/14 thru 9/30/19 (6) YEARS: 4.5

(7) ALLOCATION (Use the latest Fiscal or All County Information Notice for Allocation): CAPIT: $ 223,496 CBCAP: $37,627 PSSF: $571,600

No.	Program Name	Applies to CBCAP Programs Only	Name of Service Provider	Service Provider is Unknown, Date Revised Workbook to be Submitted to OCAP	CAPIT: Dollar amount to be spent on CAPIT Programs	CAPIT: CAPIT is used for Administration	CBCAP: Dollar amount to be spent on CBCAP Programs	CBCAP: CBCAP is used for Administration	PSSF: Dollar amount to be spent on Family Preservation	PSSF: Dollar amount to be spent on Family Support	PSSF: Dollar amount to be spent on Time-Limited Reunification	PSSF: Dollar amount to be spent on Adoption Promotion & Support	PSSF: Dollar amount of PSSF allocation to be spent on PSSF activities (Sum of colums G1-G4)	PSSF: PSSF is used for Administration	OTHER SOURCES: Dollar amount from other sources	NAME OF OTHER: List the name(s) of the other funding source(s)	TOTAL: Total dollar amount to be spent on this Program (Sum of Columns E, F, G5)
A	B	C	D1	D2	E1	E2	F1	F2	G1	G2	G3	G4	G5	G6	H1	H2	I
1	Family Intervention		To be determined		$138,000		$0		$0	$0	$0	$0	$0		$0		$138,000
2	Respite/Immediate Short Term Child Care		To be determined		$85,496		$0		$0	$0	$0	$0	$0		$5,504	Kids' Plate	$91,000
3	Parenting Classes		To be determined		$0		$37,627		$0	$0	$0	$0	$0		$22,373	CTF	$60,000
4	Safety Net Services		To be determined		$0		$0		$171,480	$171,480	$0	$0	$342,960		$421,394	CWSOIP	$764,354
5	Supervised visitation		To be determined		$0		$0		$0	$0	$114,320	$0	$114,320		$135,680	CWS Basic	$250,000
6	Adoption Promotion and support		CWS		$0		$0		$0	$0	$0	$114,320	$114,320		$0		$114,320
7	Diff Response Path II		Women's Center		$0		$0		$0	$0	$0	$0	$0		$40,000	CWS Basic	$40,000
8					$0		$0		$0	$0	$0	$0	$0		$0		$0
9					$0		$0		$0	$0	$0	$0	$0		$0		$0
10					$0		$0		$0	$0	$0	$0	$0		$0		$0
11					$0		$0		$0	$0	$0	$0	$0		$0		$0
12					$0		$0		$0	$0	$0	$0	$0		$0		$0
13					$0		$0		$0	$0	$0	$0	$0		$0		$0
14					$0		$0		$0	$0	$0	$0	$0		$0		$0
15					$0		$0		$0	$0	$0	$0	$0		$0		$0
	Totals				$223,496		$37,627		$171,480	$171,480	$114,320	$114,320	$571,600		$624,951		$1,457,674
									30%	30%	20%	20%	100%				

Appendix X

CAPIT/CBCAP/PSSF Expenditure Workbook
CBCAP Programs
Worksheet 2

(1) COUNTY: San Joaquin (2) YEARS: 1/1/15-6/30/19

No.	Program Name	Logic Model			EBP/EIP ONLY						Parent Involvement Activities		
					EBP/EIP Level As determined by the EBP/EIP Checklist								
		Logic Model Not Applicable	Logic Model Exists	Logic Model Will be Developed	Program Lacking support (Level 0)	Emerging & Evidence Informed Programs & Practices (Level 1)	Promising Programs & Practices (Level 2)	Supported (Level 3)	Well Supported (Level 4)	EBP/EIP Checklist is on file or N/A	Planning	Implementation	Evaluation
A	B	C1	C2	C3	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	E1	E2	E3
	Parenting Program			X		X						X	

Attachment B

Intentionally left blank – content to be added at a later date

Attachment C

Intentionally left blank – content to be added at a later date

BEFORE THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

B-14- 559

MOTION: Villapudua/Vogel/5

APPROVAL OF THE SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES REVIEW SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT PLAN FOR THE PERIOD 2014 - 2019

THIS BOARD OF SUPERVISORS DOES HEREBY:

1. Approve the 2014-2019 San Joaquin County Child and Family Services Review System Improvement Plan (SIP) for the period October 1, 2014 – October 1, 2019; and
2. Authorize and direct the Chairman of the Board to sign the SIP Plan.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the above order was passed and adopted on 9/23/2014 **by the following vote of the Board of Supervisors, to wit:**

AYES: Villapudua, Bestolarides, Ruhstaller, Vogel, Elliott

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: None

MIMI DUZENSKI
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
County of San Joaquin
State of California

Mimi Duzenski

SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY CALIFORNIA