

**California Department of Social Services
Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project**

Annual Progress Report for July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011

This fourth annual progress report covers the reporting period from July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011, for the California Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project (CAP). This report fulfills the requirement in Section 5.4 of the federal Waiver Terms and Conditions and provides updates for project oversight and monitoring activities, county implementation of funded waiver strategies, and the CAP state evaluation efforts.

I. OVERVIEW

On March 31, 2006, the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) received approval from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) for the CAP. The five-year demonstration project allows counties flexibility to use federal and state foster care maintenance and administrative funds for the provision of direct services to children and their families and supports child welfare practice, program, and system improvements for early intervention, reunification efforts, and reduction in out-of-home placements. The target population is Title IV-E and non-Title IV-E eligible children ages zero through nineteen currently in out-of-home –placement, or who are at risk of entering or re-entering foster care. Any foster care savings that occur as a result of the waiver demonstration must be reinvested by the participating counties in child welfare services program improvements. Alameda County and Los Angeles County are the two participating counties. The demonstration project was implemented on July 1, 2007.

II. CDSS PROJECT ACTIVITIES

During Project Year Four, the CDSS CAP Project Team has focused on ongoing payment activities; evaluation contract monitoring and contract extension activities; fiscal technical assistance for probation departments; negotiations with the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) to finalize the group home rate increase request, county site visits; and waiver extension planning and development. In addition, quarterly federal reporting, issuing of allocation letters, and executed Terms and Conditions (T&Cs) for extension of the temporary increase in the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) were completed for the CAP Counties.

The Financial Services Bureau (FSB) continued to perform tasks supporting the claiming and payment operations for the CAP. The FSB provided monthly advances/offsets and quarterly payments/offsets to the counties; collections and reporting of monthly and quarterly claim/payment data to the counties and other CDSS units; analysis of actual expenditures versus budgeted allocations to determine advance methodology and advance amounts to the counties; review of actual expenditures

reported to ensure proper waiver/non-waiver ratios and overmatch are applied to each payment; and staff participation in CAP Project Team meetings.

In addition, the FSB assists counties with fiscal questions and issues on a monthly basis. Specific technical assistance was provided to Los Angeles County related to: reconciliation of waiver expenditures, development of a ledger tool to track waiver costs, direction on the use of waiver pin codes, and the county request for a funding shift between federal and state to maximize its funding allocation.

Over the reporting period, the Estimates Branch, Fiscal Policy staff, provided technical assistance to the counties to address Probation claiming processes and procedures and including conference calls, answering questions, and providing written claim instructions. Site visit preparation and scheduling was also undertaken to review how the county departments are organized, the claiming systems in place to track and control county CAP expenditures, and to provide on-site technical assistance.

In June 2010, staff began working with ACF to submit an initial request to add additional federal Title IV-E funds to California's capped allocation due to a court decision that granted group home providers a 32 percent rate increase retroactive to December 14, 2009. Several revised estimates were submitted in response to requests by ACF and a final revised estimate was submitted on February 22, 2011. As of June 2011, this request and the most current estimate are currently being reviewed by Office of Management and Budget and the DHHS Secretary. In addition, staff also served as resource to the CAP evaluator in providing data and answering fiscal related questions for the CAP Fiscal Study that is expected by October 2011.

The Research Services Branch worked with internal and external stakeholders to extend the CAP evaluation contract that expired in June 2011. The contract has been extended through June 30, 2013, which will coincide with the end of California's new project extension date that was approved by ACF in February 2011. This process included revising the scope of work to include updated deliverables and due dates, obtaining, reviewing, and approving a new contract budget from the evaluator, and obtaining the required contract approvals. Staff has also provided technical assistance for the evaluation, review and approval of evaluation contract invoices, and participation in monthly evaluation conference calls.

The Federal Foster Care Title IV-E 1 Reports were submitted via electronic submission. The December March 2010 quarter was submitted on July 2, 2010; the June 2010 quarter was submitted on January 3, 2011; the September 2010 quarter was submitted on September 29, 2011; the December 2010 quarter was submitted on April 15, 2011; and the March 2011 quarter was submitted on July 22, 2011.

Staff within the Child Protection and Family Support Branch (CPFBSB) continued to perform program support and monitoring activities for the CAP including project management tasks, coordinating the CAP Project Team, monthly conference call with the evaluator, negotiations with ACF, federal progress reporting, and provision of county

technical assistance. In addition, the CPFBSB provided support and coordination for a stakeholder meeting and Webinar held on September 22, 2010, that presented the CAP Interim Evaluation Report findings.

In collaboration with the Outcomes and Accountability Bureau (O&AB) and the Office of Child Abuse Prevention (OCAP), county site visit planning and development of a monitoring protocol was undertaken during November and December 2010. Program site visits were conducted in Alameda County on March 14 and 15, 2011 and in Los Angeles County on June 14, 15, and 16, 2011. Findings of the site visits will be reported in the next semi-annual progress report.

Over the reporting period ongoing collaboration efforts have continued between CPFBSB waiver project staff and the O&A Bureau staff in tracking the county System Improvement Plan (SIP) and performance on key outcomes under the CAP. As of the writing of this report, Los Angeles County has just submitted a three year SIP draft for CDSS approval.

In addition, staff has been coordinating with OCAP staff in monitoring the prevention and early intervention activities and services in the CAP counties. The OCAP provides oversight of the Child Abuse Prevention, Intervention and Treatment (CAPIT), Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP) and Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF) programs including monitoring the county OCAP (CAPIT/CBCAP/PSSF) three year plans. The OCAP has also been working closely with Los Angeles County and O&A to help integrate their prevention plan with their SIP.

Both counties continue to experience significant reductions in their foster care caseload (Alameda 33.2 percent and Los Angeles 23.8 percent) since implementation of the CAP in 2007. Foster care entries and exits have decreased significantly in Alameda County with 34.2 percent for entries and 23.2 percent for exits. Los Angeles County has a more moderate reduction in entry rates of 10.4 percent; however, they have experienced a 15.7 percent increase in their exits which has increased since the last reporting period. A table with statewide in care rate trend data for counties with foster care caseloads of 1,000 or greater is provided in Appendix D.

As reported previously, the state legislation, Assembly Bill (AB) 12 to implement Public Law (PL) 110-351, Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008, was signed by the Governor on September 30, 2010. Over the current reporting period CDSS has developed a state level workgroup with stakeholder to begin the implementation planning for AB 12. The two CAP counties are currently reviewing the impact AB 12 may have on their foster care case loads.

The California federal T&Cs were revised on November 19, 2010, to reflect the funding adjustment for the extension of the temporary increase in FMAP authorized under PL 111-226. California also received federal approval on August 6, 2010, for an initial short-term waiver extension. Over the reporting period CDSS has been engaged in internal development to plan a phased completion and submission of a five-year waiver

proposal to ACF by January 2012. Over the last quarter of 2010, the focus was to initiate the contract extension for the CAP evaluator. During the first two quarters of 2011, internal CDSS workgroups have been convened to begin the development of an extension proposal. On July 21, 2011, CDSS hosted an initial waiver extension workgroup with both CAP counties. Additional meetings and webinars will be conducted over the next project year.

The CDSS continues to address ongoing fiscal challenges due to historic budget shortfalls and structural deficits in California. The Budget for 2011-12 was approved on June 30, 2011. As part of this budget, many activities including the waiver project were realigned to the local county level. The full impact cannot be determined at this time; however, discussions are occurring with the CDSS, Department of Finance and the CAP counties.

STATUS OF THE DEMONSTRATION - COUNTY SECTIONS

Alameda County

A. COUNTY IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES

Alameda Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS)

This section will discuss the status of each waiver-funded strategy and will include direct service utilization data, where appropriate. It should be noted that the Alameda County Social Services Agency Research and Evaluation Team is currently conducting a comprehensive evaluation of each individual Waiver strategy listed in this report. The approximate completion date of these evaluations is June 2012.

Updated Activities for July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011

Goal One: Increase number of children who can remain safely in their home, thus reducing first entries into care.

Another Road to Safety (ARS) Fiscal Year (FY), (FY 2010-11 Projected Expenditures - \$1,423,421)

The ARS is an alternative response program that serves families who can be diverted from the Child Abuse Hotline to community-based, intensive family support service delivery programs. Path II referrals (no further Child Protective Services intervention, referral closed, family diverted to ARS) continue to be made on a regular basis with engagement/enrollment.

The communication loop with referring Child Welfare Workers (CWWs) has been closed. The Child Welfare Supervisor is able to receive feedback regarding a family's level of cooperation with ARS on a redesigned referral form. This ensures completion of services and encourages a collaborative approach between Community Based Organizations (CBOs) and DCFS.

The DCFS continues to contract with three CBOs; Family Support Services of the Bay Area (FSSBA), Prescott Joseph Center (PJC), and La Familia. Staff turnover in the CBOs has been an issue, but each CBO is now fully staffed and it appears that retention may be better. The CBO staff has continued to expand their service geographic capacity and staff has completed an intensive Life Skills Progression tool training.

Due to leadership issues in the CBOs, there has been model drift and challenges in keeping line staff focused on their roles, boundaries, and expectations. Clinical supervisors and at times directors have not played an active and/or assertive role with their staff. The DCFS has supported and developed on-going training for all to keep effective leadership in place. The DCFS has continued to monitor program compliance by embedding management staff within each CBO's operations meetings and by

conducting quarterly site visits, quarterly oversight meetings, and monthly collaborative meetings.

| July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011 ARS | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|--|-------------------|--|
| Agency | Families Referred | Breakout of Total Referrals by Number of Child/Youth in Each Age Group | Families Enrolled | Families Completed |
| FSSBA | 157 | 0-5 = 56 6-17 = 125 | 52 | 16 (includes 2 FY 09-10 families that closed in FY 10-11) |
| PJC | 111 | 0-5 = 24 6-17 = 63 | 13 | 8 |
| La Familia | 112 | 0-5 = 29 6-17 = 46 | 41 | 33 (includes 30 FY 09-10 families that closed in FY 10-11) |
| Total | 380 | 0-5 = 296 6-17 = 592 | 106 | 57 |

Voluntary Diversion Program (FY 10-11 Projected Expenditures - \$30,412)

This strategy was established to serve a small number of cases in which a child is being cared for by a relative or Non Related Extended Family Member (NREFM). The goal of these cases is for the relative/NREFM to obtain legal guardianship of the child through Probate Court.

The DCFS contracts with Legal Assistance for Seniors to help facilitate the process of establishing legal guardianship in Probate Court. Twenty four families have been served since July 2007; sixteen obtained permanent legal guardianship of child through Probate Court, five cases still pending.

Children’s Hospital Contract (FY 10-11 Projected Expenditures - \$232,382)

Clinical consultants from Children’s Hospital and Research Center – Oakland provide consultation, training, and technical assistance designed to strengthen the services provided to families in the Paths to Success (P2S) and Another Road to Safety (ARS) programs.

During this reporting period, the clinical consultants provided DCFS with feedback regarding the leadership and programmatic issues experienced by each CBO in the P2S and ARS programs. A DCFS program manager regularly meets with the consultants to: 1) review services they provide, 2) obtain feedback on unmet training needs, 3) review utilization, and 4) collaboratively develop training and leadership strategies to support each respective CBO.

Goal Two: Increase number of children and youth in least restrictive settings.

Faith Initiative (FY 10-11 Projected Expenditures - \$251,106)

The Faith Initiative has continued its recruitment and retention efforts of County-licensed foster homes, ongoing support groups for foster parents, and providing community outreach. Faith Initiative sponsors three monthly foster parent support groups and two additional support groups are planned in the fall of 2011.

Since the end of FY 2009-10, DCFS has been able to increase the number of County-licensed foster homes by fifty homes. It is believed that the Faith Initiative has played an integral part in recruiting and retaining foster homes.

Enhanced Kinship Support (FY 10-11 Projected Expenditures - \$525,822)

Since the writing of the last report, DCFS no longer has three providers for this strategy and maintains contracts with FSSBA and Lincoln Child Center (PJC subcontracts with Lincoln Child Center) to provide support services to relative caregivers with the goal of maintaining the youth in their homes with or without DCFS intervention. These programs are referred to as Kinship Support Services Program (KSSP).

| Provider | Time Period | Caregivers Served | Children Served |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Family Support Services of the Bay Area | July 1, 2010 – March 31, 2011 | 86 | 13 |
| Lincoln Child Center | July 1, 2010 – March 31, 2011 | 302 | 113 |

Family Finding and Engagement Search Clerks (FY 2010-11 Projected Expenditures - \$171,004)

Six search clerks search for absent parents and relatives for children who are placed in a foster placement using the web-based search tool Accurint. It is believed that the 42 percent increase in the number of children whose first placement is a relative/NREFM placement is partially due to this Waiver strategy.

The table below provides the number of searches, by search type, that have been completed during this reporting period.

| Search Activity | |
|--|------|
| CWW requested - searches for absent parent and/or relative search ¹ | 547 |
| CWW requested - relative search only | 407 |
| Registration requested - searches for absent parent and/or relative search ^{1*} | 780 |
| Total Requested Searches (the number of searches completed may be slightly different) | 1734 |

¹ Totals may include either search type, or both, counted as one request

*Decrease in Registration requested is due to recently-performed searches are not automatically assigned unless the CWW requests it. This change has allowed the search unit to keep up with the increases in the other two areas, without overtaxing current staff.

Child Care for County-Licensed Foster Homes, Relatives, Fictive Kin Caregivers, and Dependent Teen Parents (FY 10-11 Expenditures –\$334,238)

The goal of this strategy is: 1) to promote placement stability by providing childcare so that caregivers can work outside the home, 2) to ensure that more children can be placed in their neighborhoods, 3) more relatives will become caregivers, and 4) that more teen foster youth could continue in school and participate in the Independent Living Skills Program (ILSP).

During this reporting period, eighty-four children received child care services while placed with a County-licensed foster parent, approved relative, or approved fictive kin caregiver at an approximate cost of \$334,000 for July 2010 to June 2011. The average number of placements for these eighty-four children from the time they began receiving child care services is 1.1.¹ While there may be other factors that contribute to placement stability, this number signifies that the child care strategy has been a to cost-effective waiver investment.

Only four dependent teen foster parents have received child care services since this strategy was implemented. It is believed that this number remains low given the placement instability of the dependent teen parent, which causes logistical difficulties in maintaining the non-dependent child in the same child care.

The DCFS is looking at expanding the eligibility criteria in FY 2011-12 in order to serve more children and families while examining its effects on delays in permanency.

Goal Three: Increase number of children who safely and permanently reunify with their families within 12 months.

Paths to Success (P2S) (FY 10-11 Projected Expenditure - \$1,471,344)

In collaboration with Casey Family Programs, a comprehensive program evaluation has been completed (see Appendix A:vii.). Community-based organizations: FSSBA, PJC, and La Familia are fully staffed.

Alameda DCFS and the three CBOs continue collaborative efforts in coordinating home visits and crisis management of families in need. The CWWs and CBO advocates specify each respective service delivery for the family, support for the case plan, and problem solving. The CBO staff completed intensive training on the Life Skills Progression Tool.

¹ CWS/CMS extract, 6/17/11

| July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011 – P2S | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Agency | Families Referred | Breakout of Total Referrals by Number of Child/Youth from Case Plan in Each Age Group | Families Actively Enrolled | Families Completed |
| FSSBA | 54 | 0-5 = 31 6-17 = 60 | 13 | 28 |
| PJC | 21 | 0-5 = 15 6-17 = 19 | 5 | 13 |
| La Familia | 35 | 0-5 = 23 6-17 = 39 | 16 | 13 |
| Total | 110 | 0-5 = 69 6-17 = 118 | 34 | 54 |

Project Permanence Wraparound (FY 10-11 Projected Expenditures – \$194,692)

Project Permanence Wraparound Program Services (a partnership between DCFS, Alameda County Behavioral Health, and Lincoln Child Center) is designed to provide supportive services to youth transitioning from a group home to a family home from a period of six to twelve months.

Fifty-one foster youth had new cases opened with Project Permanence during this reporting period. For more information, please refer to the Project Permanence Outcome Summary (Appendix A:iv.).

*The Gathering Place (formerly known as the Visitation Center)
(FY 2010-11 Projected Expenditures – \$352,498)*

The goal of the Gathering Place is to increase visitation frequency and reduce the amount of therapeutic intervention and structure as quickly and safely as possible with the intent of being able to improve the timeliness of reunifications and to reduce recidivism.

Since April 2011 (first client referral), fifty-five families have received services from the Gathering Place. These services include supervised visitation, therapeutic visitation, and observed visitation. Limited transportation is also available.

Goal Four: Increase percent of timely guardianships and adoptions.

Services to Enhance Early Development (SEED) (FY 2010-11 Projected Expenditures - \$89,861)

Two public health nurses were added to the units in order to expand this integrated case management model for all children ages zero to three. The public health nurses will:

- Perform initial developmental screening of child, as requested, and re-screen, as appropriate;
- Maintain ongoing medical/dental/mental health information on child;
- Assist in getting the child seen by medical/dental/mental health providers within the Child Health and Disability Prevention Program (CHDP) periodicity guidelines for foster care children;
- Explain medical/dental findings to CWW and SEED team; provides nursing consultation to CWW, the courts, and/or medical providers;
- Attend Team Decision Meetings to contribute medical expertise.

As with all of the Waiver-funded strategies, the Research and Evaluation team will be conducting a comprehensive program evaluation of this strategy

Goal Five: Increase and develop supports for all foster care exits

Parent Advocate Expansion (FY 2010-11 Projected Expenditures - \$274,779)

As previously reported, the plan for this strategy was to increase the program to include 17 Parent Advocates (PAs); however, at this time only two additional advocates have been hired for a total of eight. The eight PAs perform a variety of duties, one of which is being the “consumer voice” at Team Decision Making meetings (TDMs). The contract with a Better Way Foster Family Agency to oversee the PA Program has been developed and now allows for a maximum of 12 PAs who will be hired from the Parent Leadership Program. The full potential of this program has not yet been realized, but the county has identified a variety of challenges. Some of the identified challenges include a delay in executing a contract with a Better Way. The time it takes to train a PA is 12 months and with only eight PAs on board, much of their work was focused mainly on front-end programs such as Emergency Response and Dependency Investigations. In the future, PAs will begin to focus on critical case-development programs within Family Reunification and Permanent Placement. It is hoped that the new contract will move the expansion forward.

| Parent Advocate Activities for July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011 | Total |
|--|--------------|
| Enrollment of new families | 63 |
| Closed Cases (reunification, case transfer, time limits reached, parent did not follow through, parent could not be located) | 55 |
| TDM meetings attended | 160 |
| Parent Orientations attended | 121 |
| Parent Leadership meetings attended | 48 |

Goal Six: Enhance the safety net for transitional age and emancipating youth.

*Youth Fellows Board (formerly known as Youth Advocate Panel-YAP)
(FY 2010-11 Projected Expenditures – (\$274,223 Coordinator, Liaison & Stipend Costs)
(\$699,552 (Contracted Services)*

In December 2010, DCFS entered into a partnership with WestCoast Children's Clinic to oversee the Youth Fellows Board. The Youth Fellows are now salaried employees of WestCoast and also receive a benefits package. The contract with WestCoast allows a maximum of twelve Youth Fellows.

There are six Youth Fellows who have a variety of job functions, one of which is participating in TDMs and Transitional Living Conferences (TLCs). The TLCs were formerly called Emancipation Conferences, and the Youth Fellows recommended that the name be changed to Transitional Living Conferences. Having more Youth Fellows on board will allow for more participation in TDMs and TLCs, which has been a highly successful strategy as reported by child welfare staff, community partners, and most notably, the foster youth themselves.

The Youth Fellows will help prepare training for child welfare staff on the implementation of AB 12 (California Fostering Connections to Success Act).

Services for ILSP Youth (FY 2010-11 Projected Expenditures - \$809,912)

The DCFS expanded its partnership with the Alameda County Office of Education/Foster Youth Services in hiring an additional three education mentors to help improve outcomes for foster youth in school.

Project 1959 (a partnership with WestCoast Children's Clinic) continues to serve foster youth who have multiple placement changes. An absent without leave (AWOL) program with WestCoast is in the process of being developed, and should be implemented in the next reporting period.

Agency Staffing and Administrative Investment

Research and Evaluation Consultants (FY 2010 -11 Projected Expenditures - \$213,649)

Three fulltime equivalent (FTE) Management Analyst positions have been filled during this reporting period in the Finance Department. The purpose of this strategy is to expand the existing waiver research efforts and make evaluation-informed decisions on which waiver investments to maintain, increase, reduce, or eliminate. For more information, please refer to Appendix A:i.

Medi-cal Consultant (FY 2010-11 Projected Expenditures - \$91,605)

The consultant continues to play an integral part in resolving Medi-Cal issues for foster youth. The consultant collaborates with the Department of Social Services, Department of Mental Health and the Department of Health Care Services to try and overcome similar obstacles statewide.

Additional Child Welfare Staff (FY 2010-11 Projected Expenditures - \$3,515,000)

The following table lists staffing levels before the Waiver and as of June 2011, the last month of this reporting period.

| Staffing Levels | Pre-Waiver | As of June 2011 | Difference |
|---------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| Child Welfare Workers | 275 | 285 | 10 |
| Child Welfare Supervisors | 57 | 70 | 13 |
| Search clerks | 2 | 6 | 4 |
| Totals | 334 | 359 | 27 |

The DCFS has not been able to increase staff levels to improve caseload levels. Despite not reaching the original staffing goals (of adding 50 CWWs), it is still believed that the net increase of 27 staff positions has had a positive effect in reducing caseload size; thus, allowing for better outcomes for foster youth, improved worker engagement, and increased worker morale.

Additions to County Counsel (FY 2010-11 Projected Expenditures - \$1,444,618)

The original goals of this strategy were to increase the amount of representation for dependent court cases, provide non-court legal oversight of jurisdictional petition writing, and provide additional writ and appeals support. County Counsel provides legal support for DCFS' Online Practice Guide (OPG-the County Department's policies, procedures, and practices manual on the web), redesigns the search and seizure warrants, and ensures that the Title IV-E recommendations for court reports are current. Additions to County Counsel in fiscal year 2009-10 have allowed for more legal training for CWWs in the areas of preparing court reports, trial preparation, testifying in court, and educational rights.

During this reporting period, County Counsel participated in: 1) the creation of a County-wide protocol regarding access to information needed to provide mental health services to dependents and information crucial for the court, 2) advocacy on behalf of DCFS regarding pending legislation and/or promulgation of rules regarding implementation of legislation, such as AB 12, and 3) developing a protocol with DCFS, Probate Court, and Family Court on information sharing of emergency response investigation information.

In the future, efforts will be designed to evaluate the effectiveness of having additional staff attorneys, especially as it relates to permanency outcomes for foster youth.

Behavioral Health Services

Mobile Response Team (MRT) (FY 2010-11 Projected Expenditures - \$85,000)

The DCFS continues to partnership with Alameda County Behavioral Health and Seneca Center to provide crisis intervention services (including mental health services and non-mental health services) to children placed in non-group home settings with the goal of supporting these children in their placements and reducing the risk of placement disruption.

Challenges of this strategy are: 1) meeting the needs of the large Spanish-speaking population (MRT employs two full-time MRT bilingual Spanish clinicians), 2) covering crisis in such a large service area, and 3) maintaining adequate staffing through both the busy and slow days and seasons.

During this reporting period, 135 youth and families were served (58 unduplicated clients and 77 duplicated clients).

Screening, Stabilization, and Transition Services (STAT) Provided to Non-Medi-Cal Eligible Clients (FY 2010-11 Projected Expenditures – 0)

In a partnership (with Alameda County Behavioral Health and WestCoast Children's Clinic), DCFS provides funding for WestCoast to conduct mental health assessments at the DCFS Assessment Center and short-term stabilization services to children who may be ineligible (123 children during this reporting period) for Medi-Cal and who were recently placed in a foster home.

Discretionary Fund (FY 2010-11 Projected Expenditures – about \$60,000)

The Discretionary Fund was rolled out in May 2011 and has essentially replaced the existing funds: family preservation, kinship emergency, front-end, family finding and engagement, and ILSP. Since inception to the end of this reporting period, the funding was used help support 70 families.

Other Identified Investments

High End Group Homes

Alameda DCFS has continued to fund supplemental payments to Rate Classification Level (RCL) 14 Group Homes under the CAP. The budgeted amount for the current year is \$1,076,712.

Emergency Home Group Home Placement for Youth – REFUSE

In CAP Year Four, the fiscal reporting identified the use of waiver funding to provide four emergency group home placement beds at RCL level 12. The budgeted amount for FY 2010-11 is \$380,016.

Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) Program Coordinator

Over CAP year Four, Alameda DCFS plans to use waiver funding to provide financial support to the CASA program. This funding will support a CASA coordinator and program infrastructure to increase the recruitment, training, and retention of CASA volunteers. The budgeted amount is \$260,000.

Alameda Probation – Project Status

The Probation Department has continued to implement and fulfill the major strategies of the Department's goal to reduce the number of out-of-home placements.

Screening for Out-of-Home Services (SOS)

The SOS is composed of medical, mental health, education, social services and probation experts. Their goal is to reduce the number of out-of-home placements that are being recommended to the Court. The SOS is educating Department Probation Officers (DPOs) on the additional potential resources for local services for youth remaining in the home.

Collaborative Court

Collaborative Court manages court cases of youth that have mental health challenges. The DPOs refer youth to clinicians, case managers, family advocates and services are secured for youth and families. Collaborative Court's goal is to provide an alternative to out-of-home placements for youth with mental health issues. The behavior of juveniles is being stabilized and the families are being assisted with resources.

Family Preservation Unit (FPU)

The FPU (composed of DPOs and unit supervisor) provides direct court-ordered supervision services and referrals for Multi-System Therapy Services to reduce out-of-home placements. Probation is reviewing the possibility of expanding this strategy.

Transition Center

One full-time DPO was added that now functions as part of the Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT). The MDT is comprised of School District Coordinator, medical experts, juvenile hall, school educators, guidance clinic mental health professionals, and assigned case managers. The goal is to prevent and reduce out-of-home placements.

Collection of Data on out-of-home placement recommendations

The county recommends developing a new placement database and new tracking system for SOS team.

Dialogue with Bench Officers, Probation staff and Community Partners

The goal is to treat minors in the least restrictive environment while providing Wraparound Services. Activity has been made more difficult at times by the rotation schedule of Bench Officers and also new Bench Officers have been introduced. The dialogue has been a contributing factor to incur a slight increase in out-of-home placements.

Transition Center at Juvenile Justice Center

The Center develops transitional case plans for youth who reside in Oakland and are in custody in Juvenile Hall. The center is composed of teachers, nurses, guidance clinic psychologists, Probation Department Juvenile Institutional Officers and nine case managers. The goal is to stabilize the juvenile by securing an appropriate community re-entry environment. The Center is planning on developing MDTs at school sites and adding a Probation Unit Supervisor at the Transition Center, and providing training in probation practices and juvenile justice for the case managers.

Youth Level of Service-Case Management Inventory

The Youth Level of Service Case Management Inventory is developing greater insight about juveniles to help identify criminogenic risks that impact recidivism. This in turn will allow them to provide more effective and appropriate levels of supervision and services, as well as separating the youth by low, medium, and high risk of recidivism. Motivational interviewing, assessment tools, cognitive behavioral interventions, family-focused services, substance abuse/mental health counseling, multi-disciplinary team approaches are embraced throughout the County.

B. IMPACTS, OUTCOMES, AND TRENDS

Alameda DCFS: Impacts, Outcomes and Trends

Understanding the impacts and efficacy of specific strategies implemented by DCFS under the CAP is a priority of current evaluation efforts. Measuring the outcomes resulting from practice shifts and programmatic innovations implemented both pre- and post-waiver represent multi-faceted, complex, and challenging evaluation questions. In addition, measuring the impact of newly implemented practices in a child welfare context often requires tracking a cohort of participants for twelve to twenty-four months, meaning that the earliest data for this first cohort of participants is not available until two to three years after a practice or program's implementation. This is further complicated by the fact that for newly implemented programs, data from this earliest cohort can be affected by issues related to program start-up, including adjustments to the program

model in the early months, and insufficient sample sizes for analysis. Given these limitations, it has not yet been possible to attribute the successful outcomes or cost savings of DCFS to individual strategies.

As many new strategies were implemented in Project Year 2 and 3, we are just now approaching the time when it will become possible to pull early data for a first cohort year of clients with a full twelve months afterwards to track outcomes. As such, evaluation activities in Project Year 4 of the waiver has been focused on 1) monitoring and tracking data trends at the county level; and, 2) increasing evaluation planning activities in preparation for program specific evaluations.

The DCFS has been using a visual data dashboard tool developed to assist the management team in monitoring progress for the overall direction of caseload trends and placement numbers (see Appendix A:iii.).

Current data trends related to these outcome goals and cost-savings are as follows:

Youth placed in out-of-home care

The DCFS has been successful in its efforts to reduce the total population of youth in out-of-home placement and the number of youth in group home placement.

YOUTH PLACED IN OUT-OF-HOME CARE

Between the baseline period (July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007) and Waiver Year 4 (July 1, 2010 – May 31, 2011) (Appendix A:vi.)

| Youth Placed in Out-of-Home Care | Decrease | Increase | Represents a |
|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Total out-of-home care population (excluding non-relative legal guardianships) | 32.9% (from 2,073 to 1,390 youth) | | Reduction of total population of youth in out-of-home placement and the number of youth in group home placement |
| Number of youth placed in group homes | 60.3% (from 340 to 135 youth) | | 40.8 percent decrease in the percentage of youth placed in group homes |
| Number of youth placed in county foster homes | | 11.3% (from 106 to 118 youth) | 66.0 percent increase in the percentage of youth placed in county foster homes |
| Number of youth placed in a relative/NREFM | 28.2% (from 878 to 630 youth) | | 7.0 percent increase in the percentage of youth placed with relatives |
| Number of youth placed in foster family agency homes | 31.5% (from 707 to 484 youth) | | 2.1 percent increase in the percentage of youth placed in a foster family agency home |

CASELOAD AND SERVICE COMPONENT

Between the baseline period (July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007) and Waiver Year 4 (using the 12-month period of October 1, 2010 – May 31, 2011) (Appendix A:vi.)

| Caseload and Service Component | Decrease | Increase | Represents |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Number of youth with Family Maintenance cases | 14.2% (from 702 to 602 youth) | | 20.7% increase in the percentage of youth served in-home with Family Maintenance services |
| Number of youth with Permanent Placement cases | 35.5% (from 2,093 to 1,351 youth) | | 9.1% decrease in the percentage of youth with a Permanent Placement case |

ENTRIES

Between the baseline period July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007) and Waiver Year 4 (using the 12-month period of May 1, 2010 – April 30, 2011) (Appendix A:vi.)

| Entries | Decrease | Represents |
|--|---|--|
| Total number of entries into out-of-home care (placement episodes of 8 or more days) | 34.8% (from 810 to 528 youth (see template)) | Reduction in the number of youth entering out-of-home care |
| Total number of first entries into out-of-home care | 35.6% (from 627 to 404 youth) (see Dashboard) | |

FIRST PLACEMENT TYPE

Between the baseline period (July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007) and Waiver Year 4 (using the 12-month period of May 1, 2010 – April 30, 2011) (Appendix A:vi.)

| First Placement Type | Decrease | Increase | Represents |
|---|-----------------|--|--|
| Number of children placed with a relative as a first placement (placement episodes of 8 or more days) | | 46.3% (from 123 to 180 youth) | Reduction in number of youth entering out-of-home care |
| Proportion of all new entries, first placements with a relative | | 124.5% (from 15.2% of all first placements to 34.1% of all first placements) | |

EXITS

Between the baseline period (July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007) and Waiver Year 4 (using the 12-month period of May 1, 2010 – April 30, 2011) the percentage of youth exit care (exit cohort) to permanency, through reunification, adoption or guardianship, increased by 4.2 percent. (Appendix A:vi.)

| Exits | Decrease | Increase |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Percentage of youth in the exit cohort exiting to reunification | 18.2% (from 41.6% to 34.0%) | |
| Percentage of youth in the exit cohort exiting to adoption | 0.4% (from 17.02% to 16.95%) | |
| Percentage of youth in the exit cohort exiting to KinGAP | | 249.7% (from 4.1% to 14.3%) |
| Percentage of youth in the exit cohort exiting to other guardianship | | 5.9% (from 6.8% to 7.2%) |

TIMELINESS OF PERMANENCE THROUGH ADOPTION OR GUARDIANSHIP

Between the baseline period (7/1/06/-6/30/07) and Waiver Year 4, Quarter 2 (January 1, 2010 – December 31, 2010), the percentage of youth in the exit cohort exiting to timely permanence is as follows (Progress Report on Outcome Goals: Year 4, Quarter 2 Revised) (Appendix A:viii.)

| Timeliness of Permanence through Adoption or Guardianship: | Decrease | Increase |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Percentage of youth in the exit cohort exiting to adoption within 24 months | By 7.9% (from 33.9% to 31.2%) | |
| Percentage of youth in the exit cohort exiting to guardianship (all types) within 24 months | | By 9.2% (from 48.2% to 52.6%) |

Timely Reunification

The waiver goal adopted for timely reunification was revised on June 28, 2011 at the monthly Waiver Executive Team meeting. The new reunification goal is patterned after the federal entry cohort reunification measure C1.3; however, while the federal measure reports on a six-month entry cohort, we have opted to track based on a 12-month cohort to: 1) reduce some of the variation that is seen between six-month periods, 2) to be consistent with how we track successful reunification (12-month cohorts), and 3) to enable us to track performance for each of the remaining years of the waiver. The new goal is based on data available on the UCB website, using the December 2010 Quarter 4 extract.

After reviewing the data trend since the baseline year prior to the implementation of the waiver, which shows a decline in reunifications within 12 months for youth entering care for the first time (from 45.1 percent to 33.2 percent), the most recent 12-month cohort was selected as the baseline in order to determine a meaningful and feasible goal for the remainder of the Waiver period.

- Baseline: Of youth who entered Alameda County foster care for the first time in 2009, 33.2 percent exited to reunification within 12 months.
- New goal: The revised reunification goal based on this 2009 entry cohort is 38 percent.

This new goal is now reflected in the Progress Report on Outcome Goals: Year 4, Quarter 2 Revised (see Appendix A:viii.). Data beyond the newly selected baseline period of 2009 is not currently available as we are working to develop a query of county Child Welfare Services/Case Management System (CWS/CMS) data that replicates the methodology used by UCB for Measure C1.3, including the trial home visit adjustment.

Successful Reunification

Between the baseline period (July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007) and the 12-month period ending March 31, 2010 (Waiver Year 3, Q3), the percentage of youth reentering foster care within 12 months of reunification following a placement episode of eight or more days decreased from 21.4 percent to 14.6 percent (CWS/CMS 6/15/11 extract, as reported on Safe Measures) (Appendix D).

Alameda Probation: Impacts, Outcomes, and Trends

For the reporting period of project year four, Alameda Probation provided the following caseload and dispositional data:

| Probation Department | July 1, 2010 through November 30, 2010 (December 2010 data was not available) |
|--|--|
| Unduplicated Youth Entering Placement | 121 |
| Average length of Stay for Exiting Youth | 161 days |
| Out-of-Home Placements | 41 percent decrease (231 to 136) |

| Probation Department | January 1, 2011 through June 30, 2011 |
|--|--|
| Unduplicated Youth Entering Placement | 193 |
| Average length of Stay for Exiting Youth | 148 days |
| Out-of-Home Placements | 1 % increase (199 to 221) |

Alameda Probation data from the SOS showed successful results of shared information from the SOS reviews, which have actually reduced the number of out-of-home placements. Data from July 1 through November 30, 2010 (December data was not available) and January 1 through June 30, 2011, showed the following results of youth screened:

| Pre-SOS – Initial Recommendation by Deputy Probation Officer | July 1, 2010 through November 30, 2010 (172 youth screened) | January 1, 2011 through July 1, 2011 (200 youth screened) |
|---|--|--|
| Out-of-Home Placement | 59 (34 %) | 60 (30 %) |
| In-County Camp Program | 40 (23 %) | 39 (19.5 %) |
| FPU (remaining in the community) | 30 (17 %) | 34 (17 %) |
| Field Supervision in the Community | 10 (6 %) | 21 (10.5 %) |
| Undecided | 23 (14 %) | 19 (9.5 %) |
| Other (Detention Alternatives-electronic monitoring and global positioning satellite) | 32 (19 %) | 17 (8.5 %) |
| State Division of Juvenile Justice | 10 (6 %) | 5 (2.5 %) |
| Probation without wardship | 0 | 3 (1.5 %) |
| Continue Present Order | 0 | 1 (0.5 %) |
| Dismissal from Probation | 0 | 1 (0.5 %) |

| Post-SOS – Actual Recommendation by Deputy Probation Officer | July 1, 2010 through November 30, 2010 (172 youth screened) | January 1, 2011 through July 1, 2011 (200 youth screened) |
|---|--|--|
| Out-of-Home Placement | 59 (34 %) | 72 (30 %) |
| In-County Camp Program | 40 (23 %) | 39 (19.5 %) |
| FPU (remaining in the community) | 30 (17 %) | 34 (17 %) |
| Field Supervision in the Community | 10 (6 %) | 21 (10.5 %) |
| Undecided | 23 (14 %) | 19 (9.5 %) |
| Other (Detention Alternatives-electronic monitoring and global positioning satellite) | 32 (19 %) | 17 (8.5 %) |
| State Division of Juvenile Justice | 10 (6 %) | 5 (2.5 %) |
| Probation without wardship | 4 (2 %) | 3 (1.5 %) |
| Continue Present Order | 0 | 1 (0.5 %) |
| Dismissal from Probation | 2 (1 %) | 1 (0.5 %) |

Local Evaluation Efforts

Alameda County DCFS – Local Evaluation Efforts

In November 2010, Alameda County expanded the capacity of its Program Evaluation and Research (PER) unit by three FTE Management Analysts to conduct evaluation planning, outcome analysis and cost benefit analysis of Waiver strategies implemented under the CAP. Although extensive program evaluation activities had been completed on a targeted basis to date, staff in the Program Evaluation and Research unit has been broadening its evaluation planning activities to include all Waiver strategies that have been implemented as well as those that are still in development/program planning stages.

Overview Evaluation Plan for CFS and the CAP (Waiver) Strategies

The basic goal of the evaluation plan for the initiatives implemented as a result of the waiver is to test whether new policies, programs, and practices make a difference in outcomes or other measures for families served by Children and Family Services. This evaluation plan will clearly identify the change strategies being implemented as part of the Waiver and other practice or process changes that have been expanded or enhanced since the Waiver began.

For each identified strategy, a description or theory of expected change will be presented. The measures of data used to assess these changes will be specified. Where feasible, a comparison group will be developed to assess the effects of new strategies. Issues of cost, scale, and effectiveness will be explored in every analysis.

- How many children/families have been served? So far and projected?
- How much has been spent on new or expanded services? In-house or contracted?
- How were the additional staffing, services, and resources deployed?
- How much is being spent on the various Waiver strategies by category, for example, Prevention and Early Intervention services? Or, alternately, how have the funding mechanisms and policy/program goals been aligned in the CAP?

In addition, an overall meta-analysis of changes in outcomes since the implementation of the Waiver in July 2007 will be conducted in order to assess the relative contribution of individual strategies to any improved outcomes or reduction in costs. Evaluation approaches will include quantitative methods, qualitative methods, and more extensive cost analysis of specific strategies.

As DCFS and its partners approach the fifth year of the CAP, the Program Evaluation and Research Team will be conducting an in-depth evaluation of each Waiver-funded strategy. This evaluation will assist the Waiver Executive Team in deciding which strategies to maintain, modify, or terminate if an extension of the CAP is granted.

The DCFS and Probation will be exploring how the Research Team can also evaluate the effectiveness of Probation Waiver strategies. The Probation Department is in the final stages of hiring staff for a Data and Research Unit. This Unit will be comprised of a Senior Management Analyst and four Management Analysts as well as various support staff. This newly formed unit will assist the Department in taking a closer look at our waiver efforts to date and assist in the development of concrete strategies moving forward.

Status of Evaluation Efforts for Specific Waiver Strategies (Appendix A:ii.)

*For all Outcome Evaluations in Progress and *Upcoming Evaluations (Appendix A:ii.)*

Alameda County Probation – Local Evaluation Efforts

The ability to develop the needed infrastructure to collect and analyze data to determine the effectiveness of our interventions continues to be challenging. As we previously reported, the Probation Department replaced its case management system in October 2010. While the move to our new Probation Reporting and Information Management System (PRISM) marks a significant upgrade in our ability to track juvenile probation referrals and Court outcomes, continued improvements are necessary to fully benefit from this technology. The PRISM and the Placement Database both need evaluation components and reporting function development.

C. CHALLENGES AND BARRIERS

As reported in the last progress report dated December 2010, DCFS went through some leadership changes, and has incurred even more leadership changes since that report. The former DCFS Division Director of the Title IV-E Waiver who was promoted to the Assistant Agency Director of the Economic Benefits Department, Lori Jones, has since been appointed by the Board of Supervisors to the Director of the Alameda County Social Services Agency effective July 3, 2011. The new interim DCFS Assistant Agency Director, Michelle Love, formerly a DCFS Division Director, has assumed the roles and responsibilities of the Title IV-E Waiver Coordinator.

There do not appear to have been any significant challenges given the change in leadership since Ms. Love has been a member of the DCFS Waiver Executive Team since its inception in 2007. Ms. Jones will continue to be a member of the Waiver Executive Team, which will assist in providing continuity of information flow. To put it simply, it is business as usual in Alameda County.

The Probation Department has continued to implement and fulfill the major strategies from the Department's goal to reduce the number of out-of-home placements. In February 2011, Chief David Muhammad was appointed by the Alameda County Board of Supervisors as the new Chief of Probation in Alameda County, and under his leadership thus far, the Department is experiencing a renewed commitment to the waiver goals as well as the creation of new innovative practices. This commitment is even further enhanced by our ever expanding relationship with our Social Services

Agency partners. Title IV-E Waiver dollars fund staff who implement and support the Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project (CAP) goals and strategies.

Despite an increased number of juveniles with more serious offenses and mental health issues during the country's worst economic crisis in decades, the Department has been successful in maintaining the Waiver goals. This is demonstrated by implementing MDTs at critical decision points; implementing a validated risk/needs assessment tool (YLS-CMI); improving the Department's connection to community-based services that can stabilize at-risk juveniles and their families and strengthen the non-custody supervision aimed at reducing recidivism; designing the Collaborative Court for buy-in to reduced out-of-home placements; coordinating "Measure Y" funded Case Managers and Oakland School personnel; extending funding for community service providers to counsel/provide rehabilitation referral opportunities for DPOs' caseloads; and increased successes of MST for the youth served by FPU.

Fiscal Management/Reinvestment Planning (Please refer to Appendix A:i.)

D. PLANNED ACTIVITIES FOR THE NEXT REPORTING PERIOD

The future of the Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project (CAP) within Alameda County is very bright. This is particularly true with the Probation Department. Our productive and positive relationship with the Social Services Agency has created an environment that is conducive to the creation of new strategies that support the CAP Waiver goals. It remains a priority of the Probation Department to retain the staffing levels assigned to the SOS, Collaborative Court, FPU, Transition Center, and the Placement Unit. However, during the next reporting period, we hope to expand our efforts in these areas to include new programming that enhances these service areas to further align them with the goals of the waiver. This is particularly the case in the FPU. This service area has received very positive feedback for its efforts. Strengthening FPU will be a major focus during the next reporting years.

The following strategies for DCFS have been approved by the Waiver Executive Team, and are expected to be implemented in the next reporting period:

- Mentor Program
- CASA Program
- Young Parent Opportunities (YPO)-this program will replace CAL-Learn
- Summer Youth Employment Project (SYEP)
- Family Finding and Engagement Training
- Enhanced TDM Services with the Bay Area Collaborative of American Indian Resources
- Post-Dependency Services Package
- Beyond Emancipation-Employment Specialist
- Employment RFP for ILSP youth
- Foster Parent Recruiter Request of Proposal (RFP)

Upcoming data and evaluation reports

In the next reporting period, completed evaluation plans will be available for all of the strategies that have been implemented to date. In addition, initial process or data reports are tentatively planned for the following programs:

- Voluntary Diversion
- Project Permanence
- County Counsel Expansion
- Kinship Support Services Program

Los Angeles County

A. COUNTY IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES

During CAP Year Four (July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011), DCFS continued its focus on multiple core strategies, including the Point of Engagement (POE) approach to strength-based practice and community partnering, Structured Decision Making, Team Decision Making (TDM), Concurrent Planning and the Permanency Partners Program (P3) :

Updated Activities for July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011

Los Angeles County DCFS

Expansion of Family Team Decision Making (TDM) Conferences

Permanency Planning Conferences (PPCs) continue to be held for youth ages 12 and older in group home care or in foster care two years or longer with no identified permanency resources. When the population of youth 0-12 years of age in group homes began to increase over the past year, PPCs were also scheduled to target this population of younger youth.

| Placement Plan Recommendations (373 youth) (June 1, 2010 – April 30, 2011) | Number of Youth | Percentage of Youth |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Transition to a family-based setting, including home of parent, relative placement, placement with a non-relative extended family member, legal guardianship or adoption | 175 | 46.9% |
| Transition to a lower level of care, including lower Rate Classification Level (RCL) group home setting, Foster Family Home, Foster Family Agency (FFA), Intensive Treatment Foster Care (ITFC) or D-Rate Foster Home | 56 | 15.0% |
| Maintenance in a current level of care | 32 | 8.6% |
| Termination of jurisdiction or emancipation | 105 | 28.2% |
| Transition to a Regional Center placement | 4 | 1.1% |
| Transition to a higher level of care | 1 | 0.2% |

As previously reported, DCFS increased staffing to allow TDM conferences to be held for families investigated by the Emergency Response Command Post (ERCP). Between December 2010 and May 2011, just seven TDMs were conducted at the ERCP. It should be noted that in our last progress report the county indicated that the dramatic decrease was attributed to a change in departmental policy in October 2010, which shortened the timelines for Children's Social Workers to file detention reports from 48 hours to 24 hours to adhere to legal mandates. The timeframe changed was actually from 72 hours to 48 hours. As a strategy to off-set the challenges with these changes, TDM Facilitators that were assigned to conduct TDMs at the ERCP, instead, conducted TDMs and PPCs in the regional offices and consideration is being given to

reassigning them to the offices with the highest need to conduct removal, replacement and reunification TDMs.

| TDMs Held at the ERCP | July 1, 2010 – May 31, 2011 |
|---|--|
| Total Families served by the ERCP | 48 |
| Families with children at risk of detention | 33 (3 resulted in detention) |
| Children that have already been detained | 15 (2 resulted in recommendation that children be released to parent prior to detention hearing) |

Focused Family Finding and Engagement through Specialized Permanency Units at Three Regional Offices

Youth Permanency (YP) Units continue to operate in three DCFS regional offices. These units serve the most challenging youth identified as high-need, who may have the following characteristics: no or limited family connections, multiple recent replacements, heavy substance abuse, recent psychiatric hospitalization, and repeat runaways. The YP Unit social workers continue to receive training and support that assist in connecting or reconnecting youth to siblings, parents, extended family members and adult mentors. Focused efforts also foster stability and permanency for these youth. Between July 1, 2010 and June 31, 2011, the three YP Units served 287 youth.

It should be noted that, as designed, social workers in the YP Units carry reduced caseloads of 15 youth; however, as reported in our January 2011 progress report, due to reassignments throughout the Los Angeles County Department, their caseloads had risen to 24 cases over the past year. The YP Unit supervisors report that, over the past six months, caseloads have started to decrease to between 15–19 cases per worker. Without these reductions, YP Unit social workers are unable to optimally meet the permanency needs of these youth and test the effectiveness of this CAP strategy.

Up-Front Assessments on High-Risk Cases for Domestic Violence, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Issues

To reduce unnecessary entries and reentries into foster care and to assist in timelier reunification, DCFS contracts with 40 Family Preservation (FP) providers to provide up-front assessments (UFA) of high risk referrals involving mental health, substance abuse and/or domestic violence. During this reporting period, an additional domestic violence assessment was integrated into the UFA tool and has proven useful, per agency staff that conduct UFAs.

| Up-Front Assessments on High-Risk Cases for Domestic Violence, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Issues | July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011 |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| Families receiving UFAs during referral investigations | 5,420 (11,068 children) |
| Referred for ARS | 14.2% |
| Referred for FP services | 14.1% |
| Other (not reported) | 71.7% |

Prevention Initiative Demonstration Project (PIDP)

The PIDP continues to provide preventative services to primary, secondary, and tertiary populations through innovative and diverse strategies. Each lead contracted agency is expected to meet contract deliverables by addressing three over-arching goal areas: increasing economic opportunities, decreasing social isolation, and increasing access to community-based resources.

In FYs 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, CAP funding continued to be utilized to support the program. With a fourth and potentially final year planned for FY 2011-2012, PIDP agencies and DCFS managers have begun transitional planning while continuing to explore sustainability strategies. As part of its CAP reinvestment planning, the Department's Executive Team is currently assessing the amount of CAP reinvestment funding to be allocated to PIDP during Cap Year Five and the one-year bridge period in FY 2012-2013.

| Prevention Initiative Demonstration Project (PIDP) | First 10 months of CAP Year Four |
|---|---|
| Clients served by PIDP network agencies | 11,549 |
| <i>Referred by DCFS</i> | 2,810 |
| <i>Non-DCFS community residents</i> | 8,739 |

Youth Development Services

During CAP Year Four, the DCFS Youth Development Services (YDS) Division began providing cash assistance (educational and vocational expenses) to Independent Living Program (ILP) -eligible youth due to the suspension of the Emancipated Foster Youth Stipend (EYS).

Additional Strategies

In addition to these specific CAP initiatives, DCFS has continued to utilize additional strategies to improve outcomes for children and families during CAP Year Four. These include:

Child Safety Enhancements

As detailed in recent progress reports, DCFS furthered its efforts to enhance and strengthen its focus on child safety through several widespread efforts. These efforts included updating computer systems, improving computerized management oversight, and enhancing Emergency Response (ER) training. Efforts also included working with the state for authority to extend the closure of referrals from 30 to 60 days and reallocating staff resources, safely reducing ER referrals open past this period between July 2010 and June 2011. Staff reallocation involved redeployment of non-case carrying staff and temporary reassignment of program staff to ER line operations, and hiring temporary ER social workers. All current efforts for these enhancements are being overseen by the Regional Administrators.

As a part of on-going evaluation of child safety enhancements, DCFS monitors key ER activities and benchmarks such as timely disposition of allegation, conclusion of referrals and timely social work visits. Per the University of California at Berkeley (UCB) Center for Social Services Research on June 29, 2010, between the Baseline Period (July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007) and Q4 2010, the rate of timely social work visits increased by 5.2 percent from 89.8 percent to 95.5 percent. In addition, between Q2 2007 and Q4 2010, the timely response for Immediate Response Investigations increased 1 percent from 97.3 percent to 98.3 percent.

Intensive Treatment Foster Care (ITFC)

The DCFS continues to achieve success with its ITFC Program, which provides intensive in-home services for children and youth ages 6-17 with serious emotional and behavioral problems. The ITFC is a trauma-informed program using Trauma Focused-Cognitive Behavioral Therapy as the preferred treatment intervention overseen by the Department of Mental Health (DMH) and California Institute for Mental Health (CIMH). A second option offered under the ITFC Program is Multi-Dimensional Treatment Foster Care (MTFC), an evidence-based program also overseen by DMH and CIMH. MTFC is available for DCFS youth ages 12-17 who are in a group home, or children ages 6-11 who meet the eligibility requirements for an RCL 9 facility or higher, and who have an identified caregiver who would provide a permanent home were it not for the child's severe problem behaviors.

The ITFC Program in continues to experience steady growth. The DCFS has executed ITFC program contracts with 12 Foster Family Agencies (FFAs), four of which also offer the MTFC model.

| Placement Type | July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011 |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| ITFC Certified Homes | 49 |
| MTFC Certified Homes | 36 |

Since the ITFC Program was instituted in Los Angeles County in May 2008, 128 youth have entered and received intensive services with 31 youth entering in the last six months. The majority of youth entering ITFC have had an average of nine prior failed placements and come to ITFC from group home settings. Of the youth exiting ITFC, 36 (28.1 %) have transitioned to a lower level of care; of those transferring to a lower level of care, half were reunified with parents or legal guardians. At the end of June 2011, 56 youth were stably placed in an ITFC home.

As some prospective ITFC foster parents have objected to participating in the adoption home study process, DCFS executive management recently agreed to waive the Los Angeles County requirement that ITFC foster parents be dually certified as foster parents and adoptive parents. This new policy awaits expected final approval by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors and will remove one identified barrier to ITFC foster parent certification.

In addition to the challenges of ITFC foster family recruitment, the development of ITFC treatment teams at each of the provider agencies is a time-consuming process. Nine of the 12 ITFC providers received their contract in the last 12 months and are still becoming accustomed to the program and working on implementation issues that arise. The DCFS and Department of Mental Health (DMH) Treatment Foster Care staff has been working closely to provide technical assistance to support this process.

With the removal of the dual preparation mandate and increase in ITFC provider experience, the ITFC Program remains optimistic that DCFS will reach its goal of 300 beds (220 ITFC and 80 MTFC) by December 2012 in fulfillment of the obligations of the Katie A. Settlement Agreement.

To further strengthen the social work practice in Los Angeles, DCFS continues to participate in Quality Service Reviews (QSR) as part of their Katie A. Settlement Agreement. This process provides a mechanism for the county to share practices that they have implemented to improve areas of need identified in the QSR.

Residentially Based Services (RBS) Demonstration Project

As part of California’s group home reform effort under the authority of AB 1453, the state has developed a demonstration pilot project that infuses residential care with Wraparound principles. There are currently four RBS pilot projects within the state. On December 2, 2010, the RBS contract was approved by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, and the three identified pilot program service providers, Hathaway-Sycamores, Five Acres and Hillside, were sent “Start Work” notices. Fifty-three children were initially enrolled in the Project by the end of December 2010.

The DCFS and DMH have allocated resources to support RBS and have demonstrated a strong collaboration and desire to see RBS succeed. Together, they have developed a strong RBS administration that works closely with the three RBS providers and the regional DCFS offices to ensure the smooth operation of RBS. An RBS Roundtable and Advisory Group were established to focus on practice and implementation issues, and sustainability and expansion, respectively.

| RBS Total Children Enrolled | Age | Male/ Female | African American | Hispanic | White | Asian |
|--|----------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|
| 52 in residential care, 5 transitioned to community care, 1 transitioned to foster-adoptive home and successfully graduated | 6 to18 Age Range, Average age 12 | 85%/ 15% | 22 (42%) | 16 (30%) | 14 (26%) | 1 (2%) |

Los Angeles County Probation

Waiver Funded Strategies/Initiatives – Probation Department

Enhanced Cross-Systems Case Assessment and Case Planning (CSA)

Probation created CSA, in consultation with DMH and input from the group home provider community. The CSA is a comprehensive and collaborative method of assessing all youth with a new Suitable Placement order, with the goal of ensuring targeted treatment while the youth is in care based on the identified risk and needs of CSA. This strategy was also designed to reduce replacements to congregate care by ensuring that minors are appropriately matched with the level of care and service provider. A total of 686 CSAs were completed during this reporting period.

As previously reported, the CSA program has undergone extensive changes recommended by several pilot programs. These changes identified that these assessments would be more effective if implemented in the Placement Assessment Centers (PACs). The PACs offer a more comprehensive, 30-day psycho-social assessment of the risk and protective factors of the youth and their families, including education, mental health, substance abuse and gang affiliation. At the start of the CAP, Probation contracted with two group home providers to house the PACs and they have plans of adding two additional PACs. The PACs have assessed 366 youth during this reporting period.

Expansion of Functional Family Therapy (FFT), Functional Family Probation (FFP) and Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST)

Under the CAP, Probation has built internal and external capacity to provide FFT and MST, two evidenced-based programs designed to treat youth and families. In order to build this capacity the Probation Department converted fifteen of their Deputy Probation Officers (DPO) that were part of their larger Residential Based Services (RBS) operation that oversees youth in care. The RBS DPOs were trained as FFT interventionists to provide FFT services to youth and families. Based on the growing need for additional capacity, Probation has requested an increase in the external capacity through DMH in FY 2011-2012 based upon their contracting processes and usage of Early and Periodic Screening and Diagnostic Treatment services.

| FY 2010 – 2011 FFT, FFP, MST | FFT | FFP | MST |
|---|------------|------------|---------------------------|
| Capacity | 291 | 460 | 50 (82 youth referred) |
| Slots available in Spanish (of the 291) | 110 | 160 | |
| Families currently receiving services | 271 | 296 | 36 |
| Families Completed | 122 | 62 | 6 |

As previously reported, the partnership between Probation and the California Institute of Mental Health (CiMH) trained a unit of operation consisting of 14 staff in Functional Family Probation/Parole (FFPP), an evidenced-based supervision model grounded in

FFT principles. Based on the continued success of these programs that resulted in RBS caseload reductions, the Department was able to convert an additional nine Residentially Based Services DPOs to FFP in November 2010, enabling the Department to focus on “front end” cases (youth at imminent risk of entering foster care) in order to prevent entry into foster care. Internal capacity for FFT is 136 cases in which eligibility is not predicated on full scope Medi-Cal. Los Angeles DMH has contracted with providers Starview and Shields for Families for an additional 15.5 FFT therapists with an external capacity of 155 cases.

As previously stated, at the inception of the CAP, Probation focused efforts on youth transitioning home from group home care. The expansion of FFT, FFP and MST has allowed Probation to expand its focus on youth who are at-risk of entering out-of-home care, and to provide additional aftercare supervision to support successful reunification and reintegration into the community.

Prospective Authorization and Utilization Review (PAUR) Unit

Probation has established the PAUR Unit to improve consistency in service utilization, as referrals to services are pre-approved based on whether a youth and family meet the specified focus of service. The PAUR was staffed in December 2009 and initially began working specifically with Family Preservation services for the entire Department.

On August 1, 2010, the PAUR Unit assumed referral and utilization responsibilities for FFT/FFP and MST. The PAUR processes referrals for youth who are considered at-risk of entering out-of-home care as well as referrals for those youth transitioning from placement back to the community to ensure that these programs are operating at full capacity. Each case is systematically reviewed to determine if the service provided addresses the youth’s risks and needs as identified through assessments, the Probation Case Management System (PCMS), Court orders and Conditions of Probation. The PAUR has received and processed 1,880 referrals during this reporting period.

Expenditure Listing

Appendix B:iv., Listing of County Waiver Investments for Project Year 4, provides the budgeted amounts for FY 2010-2011 strategies/initiatives as well as actual expenditures for the first three quarters of FY 2010-2011 for Los Angeles DCFS and Probation.

B. IMPACTS, OUTCOMES, AND TRENDS

Los Angeles County: Impacts, Outcomes, and Trends

The county departments view their successful outcomes as the result of combined systemic efforts that interweave strategies undertaken under the CAP with previous ongoing efforts. Flexible funding has allowed the departments to provide a more responsive and comprehensive array of services and supports, including preventive services that reach families before abuse or neglect has occurred.

DCFS

LA DCFS has been successful in its efforts to reduce the temporary out-of-home care population and the number of youth in high cost residential care during the CAP.

| Out-of-Home Care Population Between July 1, 2006 – June 30, 2007 (Baseline Period) and May 31, 2011 | Decrease |
|--|--------------------------|
| DCFS Temporary out-of-home placement population | 24.1% (20,302 to 15,410) |
| Group Home Placements | 26.3% (1,440 to 1,062) |
| In Group Home Care for 24 months or more | 8.2% |

Efforts to reduce the out-of-home care population have focused on strategies that safely reduce entries into care and increase timely exits from care to permanency, as follows:

Safely Reducing Entries into Care

During the eleven-month period (July 1, 2010–May 31, 2011), there were 9,485 entries into care (See Appendix B:v.). If it is assumed that entries will continue at a similar rate during the remaining month of CAP Year Four, the county projects there will be 10,347 entries into care during CAP Year 4. This reflects a 7.8 percent decrease from the Baseline Period (11,219 to 10,347) and a 4.8 percent decrease from CAP Year Three (10,869 to 10,347). However, using this same method of extrapolation, while entries into relative/NREFM care, foster homes, FFAs, and guardianship will decrease, it is projected that from Baseline to CAP Year Four there will be a 23.6 percent *increase* in the number of entries into group home care (335 to 414) and a 12.9 percent increase in FFA entries from Baseline to CAP Year Four (5,461 to 6,165). The increase in the group home population in the last CAP year is primarily due to the increased number of children 0 -12 years placed in group homes. As previously mentioned, to address this increase, PPCs previously dedicated to older youth in group home care have been expanded to address this younger population.

While entries into care have continued to decline, reentries into care within 12 months of reunification have increased. This is a trend DCFS continues to closely monitor, with an understanding that such an increase is not unusual when there is system change involving a movement towards taking only children with families with the most challenging needs into care. Increased reentries may also be associated with an increased number of reunifications and shortened timelines to reunification as has occurred over the CAP. The County Department’s Executive Team and Family Reunification Workgroup continue to focus on strategies to reduce reentry, and reducing reentries has been established as a managerial goal for FY 2011-2012. Strategies to reduce reentry may include better assessment of “reunification readiness” through improved safety and risk assessments and family strengths and needs assessments prior to reunification and expanded reunification TDM meetings focused on family support needs. Strategies to address reentry may also involve effective and ongoing formal and informal family supports through transition and aftercare.

Individual strategies designed to reduce entries and reentries include additional TDM at the ERCP, UFAs with expanded Family Preservation, ARS and PIDP.

UFA

(Between July 1, 2010 – June 30, 2011) 5,420 families with 11,068 children received UFAs during referral investigations

| Total number of referrals promoted to a case and receiving the following services | 4,099 | 37.0% |
|--|--------------|--------------|
| Voluntary Family Maintenance | 2,286 | 55.8% |
| Family Maintenance | 1,053 | 25.7% |
| Voluntary Family Reunification | 137 | 3.3% |
| Family Reunification | 623 | 15.2% |

It should be noted that while preparing the UFA data for this progress report, it was determined that DCFS provided erroneous UFA data in past progress reports. While the correct number of families who received UFAs and the correct number of their children were reported, the reported number of children whose families received UFAs and promoted to a case has been incorrect. Instead of counting all children in the family who were promoted to a case, the UFA tracking system only counted one child per family. While this did not have a large effect on the percent of children whose family received a UFA and went on to receive Family Preservation or Alternative Response Services, it inaccurately reported a lower number and percent of children who were reported to have been promoted to a case. This higher number (4,099) and percent (37%) continue to demonstrate that UFAs have mitigated the need for case openings and detentions. The tracking system has been corrected and the Department is now able to provide accurate information.

PIDP

While there was no formal evaluation of PIDP during its third year as there was in its second year, PIDP agencies continue to submit monthly reports and attended bi-monthly stakeholder meetings. They believe their efforts and outcomes are as successful or more successful as those demonstrated in the second year evaluation; they assert that they are enhancing child safety, reducing the number of families that require formal DCFS intervention, and raising overall safety in the communities they serve. As the momentum for PIDP has steadily increased, agencies indicate that community capacity has increased. They are confident that they are providing child abuse prevention services that impact family stability, such as improving community economic opportunities, filling local gaps in services, increasing access to services that do exist and forming neighborhood actions counsels that meet to address the complex challenges of families needing support.

Safely Increasing Timely Exits from Care

During the eleven-month period (July 1, 2010–May 31, 2011), there were 9,655 exits from care (See Appendix B:v.). Assuming that exits will continue at a similar rate during the remaining month of CAP Year Four, the county projects that there will be 10,533 exits from care during CAP Year Four. This reflects a 15.7 percent decrease from the Baseline Period (12,493 to 10,533) and a 12.7 percent decrease from CAP Year Three (12,069 to 10,533). While this is a trend DCFS will continue to watch, as previously

stated, the number of youth in Family Reunification (FR) in out-of-home care “available” to exit care has decreased significantly from the Baseline Period to May 31, 2011.

The DCFS continues its focus on the safe reduction of the temporary out-of-home care population with an emphasis on finding permanency for youth, especially those in Planned Permanent Living Arrangement (PPLA) caseloads. There have been promising outcomes for youth in long term care, including those most likely to age out of care without permanency. Between the Baseline Period and May 31, 2011, the PPLA caseload decreased by 27.5 percent (14,667 to 10,639) (See Appendix B.v.).

The following efforts focus on those youth most at-risk of exiting care without permanency.

TDM PPCs – Of the 373 PPCs held from July, 2010 to April 30, 2011, the following outcomes were achieved for youth in congregate care or foster care without identified permanency resources:

| Family Based Setting | Number of Youth |
|--|------------------------|
| <i>Home of Parent</i> | 7 |
| <i>Relative Placement</i> | 8 |
| <i>Legal Guardianship</i> | 7 |
| <i>Foster Family Home</i> | 2 |
| <i>MTFC/ITFC Placement</i> | 4 |
| Group Home Setting | |
| <i>Lower Level of Care</i> | 9 |
| <i>Same Level of Care</i> | 18 |
| Other | |
| Emancipation/Termination of Jurisdiction | 11 |
| No Change in Status | 307 |

YP Units - During CAP Year Four, the YP units served 287 high-need youth, with the following outcomes:

| YP Units Outcomes | Number of Youth |
|---|------------------------|
| Home of Parent | 16 |
| Moving towards Adoption | 15 |
| Legal Guardianship | 25 |
| Moving towards Legal Guardianship | 20 |
| Replacement from high-level residential group home care to a reduced level of care | 57 |
| Emancipation with connections | 26 |
| Increased connectedness with new or increased contact with extended family members, siblings for other committed adults | 35 |
| No change in status – continue to receive specialized services in YP unit | 93 |

In reviewing the outcomes achieved by the YP Units, it is important to understand that youth served in these units are those identified as having the highest needs, those for whom finding connections and permanency is the most challenging. Although achieving connections without legal permanency is not the ideal, YP Unit social workers report

seeing vast improvements in the emotional and behavioral health of these youth after they become connected to family or other important individuals.

Probation

Probation continues to experience a steady reduction in the number of youth in care and length of stay in congregate care since CAP implementation. Probation believes their CAP initiatives have been instrumental in realizing caseload reductions. The total number of youth placed out-of-home has dropped significantly since the beginning of the CAP, from 1,684 in July 2007 to 975. During the reporting period the number dropped to 975 (See Appendix B:ii.). Average length of stay in congregate care has decreased from approximately 12 months at the beginning of the CAP to approximately 9.6 months. Data from the Child Welfare Services/Case Management System (CWS/CMS) is based on a specific moment in time which does not always reflect the actual population in care due to a lag in processing time which is attributed to the transfer of information from Probation to DCFS for data entry.

Probation has targeted those youth transitioning home from congregate care or at risk of entering out-of-home care. While it is not possible at this time to determine direct causation between Probation CAP initiatives and the rapid rate of decline in the total number of youth in congregate care or the decline in average length of stay, it is clear that Probation has made great strides in these areas. For example, through the use of FFT and FFP the average length of stay in group home care is now six to nine months while those youth who did not receive services prior to the implementation of the initiatives stayed in out-of-home care an average of 12 months. Also, with the implementation of the PAUR Unit, DPOs are able to match youth and families with intensive community-based alternatives in lieu of out-of-home care. Anecdotally, the paradigm shift to implement evidence-based practices has assisted in the cultural shift of the Placement Services Bureau, in that services are family-focused and strength-based.

Probation has utilized flexible funds to create these new initiatives under the CAP. CSA and PACs allow Probation to assess youth prior to placement and assist the DPOs in gathering information on the youth and family for case planning purposes. Once the youth is prepared to transition back to the community, he or she is referred for services through the PAUR Unit and matched with the most appropriate community-based service. This continuum of care did not exist for Probation youth prior to the CAP.

The Departments view their outcomes as the result of combined systemic efforts that interweave the individual strategies detailed above with previous ongoing efforts. Therefore, in addition to tracking the outcomes listed above for individual strategies (i.e., entries, exits, length of stay, etc.), the Departments track overall progress under the CAP by monitoring the outcome measures identified through the UCB Center for Social Services Research. These include outcomes related to recurrence of maltreatment, timeliness of reunification, reentry, timeliness of adoption, exits to permanency, and placement stability (See Appendix B:iii.).

Local Evaluation Efforts

As previously stated, both departments evaluate CAP implementation through comparison of Baseline and current data related to exits, entries, placements, etc. as well as data provided through the UCB Center for Social Services Research. In order to evaluate the impact of specific Waiver activities on targeted outcomes, DCFS monitors CAP activities in relation to the overall goals of the CAP. For example, decreasing the number of youth in out-of-home care and congregate care reduces DCFS assistance costs, allowing DCFS to utilize these funds to reinvest in more program improvements.

As previously detailed, during FY 2009-2010 an independent PIDP evaluation was completed involving the PIDP agencies; DCFS regional, Bureau of Information Services, and Community-based Support Division staff; and the PIDP Evaluation Team. These efforts culminated in a second year evaluation report and profile of the Service Planning Area SPA-based networks. The evaluation was presented at a December 1, 2010 meeting of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors Children's Deputies who were highly impressed with PIDP efforts. A copy of the presentation with goals, overall evaluation design, findings and lessons learned, as well as the Executive Summary report, were provided with the January 12, 2011 CAP Progress report.

As part of a larger effort to integrate the ongoing use of outcome data into child welfare practice, the DCFS has developed a Data Partnership effort with staff throughout the Department, Casey Family Programs and consultants from the Western Pacific Implementation Center (WPIC) and the National Resource Center on Data and Technology. The Data Partnership will allow staff and managers in each of the Department's offices, as well as centralized program staff, to assess and provide root cause analyses on a regular basis.

The Probation Department plans to conduct an outcome study of the FFT and FFP programs once the desired level of fidelity is achieved and the programs have been operationalized for a minimum of three years, a period which research indicates is strongly correlated to fidelity.

C. CHALLENGES AND BARRIERS

Although DCFS and Probation have seen success through the CAP, there have been challenges as well, including: 1) those around fiscal claiming and reporting mandates, and 2) methodology for the apportionment of reinvestment funds. The departments are moving forward to fully resolve remaining fiscal and allocation issues.

During CAP Year Four, a substantial challenge for the departments has been planning for the use of additional reinvestment funds. It has been a challenge to plan third sequence activities and move forward with additional innovative strategies due to the uncertain fiscal environment. As previously reported, the largest use of projected reinvestment funding for DCFS was the Emergency Response (ER) caseload reduction costs at 13.2 million per year. However, they have not sought Board of Supervisors' (BOS) approval for a third sequence initiatives or further reinvestment spending due to a

variety of budget concerns. The impact of the group home rate increase retroactive to December 14, 2009 impeded the county's effort. Both DCFS and Probation have had to use reinvestment funds to cover this significant increase in group home costs. The county reports both DCFS and Probation have chosen to be prudent, but there are plans to pursue a reinvestment package and spend additional reinvestment funds.

While the departments continued to invest in their second sequence activities in CAP Year Four, receipt of the State planning augmentation on June 24, 2011 in the amount of \$14.2 million provides vital funding and will allow the planning and utilization of reinvestment funds to move forward. However, it should be noted that challenges to reinvest funds into a third CAP sequence may continue due to ongoing concerns with the countywide budget as well as existing contracting and hiring requirements. The Departments will move forward as diligently and quickly as possible to obtain Board of Supervisors' approval of third sequence activities and expenditures.

Los Angeles County DCFS

An additional challenge for DCFS over CAP Year Four has involved departmental leadership changes; three individuals oversaw the Department as Director, Interim Director and Acting Director during this twelve-month period of time. In addition, the Senior Deputy Director who oversaw many CAP fiscal matters during the first three years of the CAP retired shortly before the commencement of CAP Year Four, and the Deputy Director who served as the Department's CAP lead resigned and was replaced with a new Deputy Director in March 2011. While transitions related to the CAP have been relatively smooth, by their nature, transitions require educating and updating new participants and integrating their perspectives into planning.

As previously reported, the media coverage of child death fatalities related to Senate Bill 39 continues to impact on DCFS. While entries into care have decreased in CAP year four, staff has expressed heightened anxiety and risk aversion with regard to leaving children in homes during child abuse investigations. This may further explain the decrease in the number of children exiting the system through reunification.

Los Angeles County Probation

Probation is experiencing challenges with the caseload increase for foster care youth as they are under the federal/state mandates for the collection of National Youth in Transition Database data. This additional collection of data has required dual entry for Probation Officers. Currently, Probation is only receiving access to Title IV-E Administrative funds. Probation is working to identify how the benefits from the funds allocated to the county welfare office can further support Probation with similar activities. Probation will continue to work with the Chief Probation Officers of California to obtain funding for these mandated services.

As previously mentioned, Los Angeles Probation began piloting the use of CWS/CMS beginning October 1, 2010. Probation began entering the following data elements into CWS/CMS:

- Adoptions and Foster Care Analysis Report (AFCARS)
- The National Data Archive on Child Abuse and Neglect Data System (NCANDS)
- The Children and the Family Service Review (CFSR)/Outcome Measures
- The National Youth in Transition Database (NYTD)

Prior to Probation's access of CWS/CMS, Probation created a Probation Case Management System (PCMS) which requires that all DPOs utilize this system for case management. The addition of Probation access to CWS/CMS increases the workload of Placement Probation Officers because the State is requiring that Probation enter case management information into CWS/CMS as well. Furthermore, Probation access to CWS/CMS is mandated by the state without any additional funding allocated to this effort. As a result, Probation has been forced to roll out implementation, training and technical support using existing resources. Due to this strain on resources, full utilization of CWS/CMS as a case management system for Probation has been slowed.

Probation reports additional challenges with the final placement decisions that are made by the courts. The Probation Department screens for the appropriateness of a foster care placement and makes recommendations to the courts; however, a judge can disagree with the recommendation and order a youth to be suitably placed.

Due to budgetary issues and declining juvenile camp orders, the Probation Department decided to close five out of the 19 existing Residential Treatment and Services Facilities (camps), losing approximately 25 percent capacity. As a result, the Department's camp capacity is quickly being maximized, offering fewer alternatives to community supervision. Due to the decrease in camp capacity, the court is left with fewer options to service Probation youth and are more often turning to foster care to provide the appropriate services for eligible youth.

Since the inception of the CAP, the Department has mitigated some barriers by increasing our community-based interventions such as FFT, FFP and MST; however, if Probation foster care numbers do not decrease exponentially then the Department cannot realize CAP savings and cannot invest or expand its evidenced-based alternatives to foster care and detention.

Fiscal Management/Reinvestment Planning

As reported in January, during the beginning of CAP Year Four, DCFS benefited from technical assistance around fiscal issues provided by CDSS staff. Technical assistance involved: reconciliation of CAP expenditures; development of a CAP ledger for DCFS to use as a tool to track and monitor CAP costs against the CAP allocation; understanding the funding shift between Federal and State to allow DCFS to maximize its funding allocation; providing direction on the appropriate use of CAP pin codes; and helping

DCFS resolve numerous fiscal related issues, including FMAP rate increases, group home increases and CAP reporting requirements as mandated by the Federal government. Probation has also benefited from CDSS technical assistance around claiming issues

Any DCFS expenditures lower than the budgeted amounts are primarily attributable to delays in hiring and contract negotiations. All unexpended funds were rolled over to the following fiscal years and became part of the available unspent reinvestment funds.

Probation's Administration expenditures have exceeded the budgeted allocation since inception of the CAP. This is attributed to the Department's ability to provide and claim for activities to prevent youth from going into foster care that were not eligible for reimbursement prior to the CAP.

Attached are the listings of actual services and expenditure amounts that have been claimed to Program Codes 701 (DCFS) and 702 (Probation) during the rating period (See Appendix B:iv.). Also attached are the allocation expenditures for Probation (Appendix B:iv.) and DCFS (Appendix B:iv.). The use of reinvestment savings for both Departments during the current project year is provided in Attachment I previously referenced in the Project Status Section.

Los Angeles County DCFS

It is important to note that the costs claimed to Program Code 701 reflect only a small fraction of the use of reinvestment funds. The activities claimed to Program Code 701 reflect specific activities that were separately approved by the Board of Supervisors after the approval of the initial CAP Plan Budget. The initial CAP Plan Budget included a total shift of \$106 million in assistance funds included in the CAP capped allocation to the administrative budget over the five years of the CAP. These funds were shifted based on projected reductions in assistance costs that have materialized. An additional \$10.2 million in FY 2009-2010 and an additional \$6.5 million in FY 2010-2011 were shifted from the assistance budget to the administrative budget based on further actual assistance cost reductions. This makes a total of \$122.7 million in CAP funds that have been redirected from assistance costs to child welfare services costs. This has enabled DCFS to maintain and enhance pre-CAP services consistent with the goals of the CAP.

As a significant portion of DCFS reinvestment dollars have been budgeted and expended on UFAs through contracted Family Preservation (FP) agencies, DCFS, in conjunction with Casey Family Programs, is evaluating DCFS FP services, including UFAs. The evaluation team will initially examine FP Family Maintenance (placement prevention) and FP Reunification Services. Thereafter, Subsequently, UFA and Alternative Response Services (ARS) will be examined. The evaluation will seek to answer five overarching questions: (1) Who is being served by different kinds of FP Services?; (2) What kinds of services are being provided by which agencies and in which DCFS offices?; (3) What does it cost to provide these services?; (4) What kinds

of family outcomes are being achieved?; and, (5) What refinements need to be made in services and performance measurement?

Los Angeles County Probation

Since the CAP progress report submitted in July 2010, CDSS has provided technical assistance to Probation in the area of Fiscal Management. Probation claims entered throughout the life of the CAP did not reflect the expenditures for activities related to the CAP initiatives. Probation continued to claim staff converted to provide activities through the CAP initiatives to various Program Codes, rather than Program Code 702. For example, Probation originally converted a total of 29 DPOs to serve as FFP and FFT DPOs. These DPOs were not claimed through Program Code 702. Instead, they were claimed through the previous mechanism for Title IV-E. Fiscally, this does not reflect the massive effort that Probation has undertaken to provide these new interventions for our youth and families under the CAP.

Due to the fact the Title IV-E funds were an entitlement in the past, Probation has had to research and learn how to track and claim expenditures previously reported solely through DCFS. Based on the Probation Department's lack of prior experience, Probation has faced challenges in claiming and fiscal reporting. Appendix B:iv. reflects an accounting of all flexible funding strategies going back to the beginning of the CAP.

Successes

Both departments continue to demonstrate success under the CAP. Some of this success is reflected in the Baseline to CAP Year Four outcome data provided above with regard to DCFS entries and exits into care, and Probation's reduction in numbers of youth and length of stay in out-of-home care. In addition to these quantitative departmental outcomes, CSWs and Deputy Probation Officers share stories of successes with individual youth and families.

The DCFS staff who conduct PPCs and manage YP Unit caseloads relate success in connecting and reconnecting youth with family and finding permanency for youth who have lived in group home care or congregate care for extended periods of time. Staff managing the UFA program confirms the ability to more quickly and accurately identify and obtain services for families with substance abuse, domestic violence and mental health issues; it is believed that this expedited assessment and connection to services has allowed an increased number of parents to reunify more quickly with their children. Finally, as described above and in our previous progress report, the Year Two PIDP evaluation found that prevention strategies for DCFS families were highly effective and families involved with PIDP expressed "significant improvement in quality of life indicators."

For Probation, implementation of the CAP initiatives has caused a marked improvement in the availability of services for youth and families. Innovations such as the PAUR Unit have also greatly improved service delivery. Due to the increased availability of

interventions created under the CAP for at-risk youth, Probation has started to experience an organizational shift by becoming more treatment focused in the way that it intervenes in the lives of the youth and families that it serves.

Planned Activities for the Next Reporting Period (July 1, 2011 – December 31, 2011)

Los Angeles County DCFS

During the last reporting period, the DCFS Executive Team inventoried the programs and initiatives utilized by the Department and reviewed associated outcomes in order to plan for the use of reinvestment funds during CAP Year Five and bridge year, FY 2012–2013. As a part of this process, a comprehensive PowerPoint presentation was developed in conjunction with the Probation Department detailing the CAP background, fiscal status, initiatives, key outcomes, potential investments and next steps. (See Appendix D)

With a focus on outcomes, during the next six-month period of the CAP, DCFS will continue to utilize strategies designed to:

- Enhance child safety
- Reduce timelines to permanency
- Reduce reliance on out-of-home care
- Enhance child well-being

Planning for the CAP third sequence has included an assessment of the effectiveness of the following second sequence strategies:

- YP Units
- PPCs for youth in extended care and group home care
- UFAs across the County
- PIDP to determine possible revision or expansion

Due to concerns with DCFS's increasing reentry rate, their Executive Team is looking closely at strategies utilized during and after family reunification. This may include TDMs when recommendations to send children home are considered and better assessment of reunification "readiness." It may also include strategies that provide necessary support and services to families' post-reunification, possibly contracting with current PIDP providers and/or providing funding for the County's community-based secondary prevention initiative, Partnership for Families (PFF). Other initiatives under consideration include expanding services provided under the PIDP, including expanding the successful Parents in Partnership (PIP) Program, which utilizes parents who have successfully reunified with their children as parent advocates; further development of visitation centers, kinship support strategies, and supportive services to improve self-sufficiency for youth.

As previously stated, DCFS and Probation did not pursue an additional reinvestment package during the past rating period due to fiscal uncertainties. However, the County Department will soon present an investment strategy package to the Board of Supervisors for its approval. At this time, the County Department is devising two separate third sequence plans based on potential receipt of funding: one plan assuming receipt of revenue from the state foster home rate increase, but without receipt of the federal reimbursement for the group home and foster care rate increases; and a second plan assuming receipt of the state foster home rate increase and federal shares of the group home and foster care rate increases. As much of the proposed third sequence funding is anticipated to involve contracting with community-based agencies.

Expansion of Placement Assessment Centers (PAC)

Throughout implementation of the CSA, Probation has closely monitored the process to determine the efficacy of the assessment in adequately assisting the Placement DPO and group home provider in case planning. Due to a strong need to keep all Probation youth from languishing in Juvenile Hall, the Probation Department enacted several policies to expedite transition from Juvenile Hall to Placement, Camp or back to the community. As a result, the time needed to administer a comprehensive assessment while a youth is detained in Juvenile Hall began to challenge these Department policies. During the progressive evaluations and quality assurance reviews of both CSA and PAC, it was determined that the PAC assessment provided more detailed information regarding the risk and needs of the minor. Therefore, the Department has decided to increase the number of PACs.

The Probation Department, in consensus with the group home providers, assigned the on-site RBS DPOs as participating members of the assessment team. The RBS DPOs use the assessments to write the Foster Care Case Plan and determine the most appropriate placement for the youth following the 30-day assessment. The benefit of adding an on-site DPO has been anecdotally related to an increase in youth and family engagement as well as a reduction in AWOLs reported in number by both group homes.

Probation will add a Program Analyst to oversee the quality assurance of the new PAC expansion to ensure that assessments are being completed and submitted in a timely manner. The funding that was dedicated to paying for three DMH staff as part of the CSA will be re-allocated to expanding existing Mental Health contracts and expanding the capacity for Probation's evidence-based practices, FFT, FFP and MST.

Probation aims to: 1) expand PACs to ensure that between 75-80 percent of all Placement youth, new and replacement, receive this quality assessment, 2) ensure that beds become available for female placement youth, 3) conduct a comprehensive assessment, and 4) with the expansion of PACs will assist Probation in realizing the goals of increased child safety, increased and timelier exits to permanency, and increased placement stability.

Multi-Disciplinary Team Decision-Making

Probation began a Multi-Disciplinary Team Decision-Making (MDT) pilot at Rancho San Antonio Group Home in January 2010, with the focus on youth leaving placement. MDT brings Probation staff, group home staff, Educational Liaisons, service providers, the youth and family together to discuss the risks and needs of the youth and family.

Probation is in the midst of expanding this pilot program to all group homes where Probation youth are placed. The expansion will consist of an initial MDT meeting to determine a course of treatment for the youth during his or her placement stay as well as a transition MDT meeting to assist in the transition back to the community.

Probation is implementing the expansion of PACs, MDT meetings and existing contracts for evidence-based practices to provide a better continuum of care for placement youth. Probation aims to ensure that every youth entering placement will receive a quality assessment through PACs or the CSA. Once assessed, those youth will participate in an initial MDT at the group home and will be provided with a clear treatment plan while placed. When the youth is transitioning from group home back to the community, he or she will participate in a transition MDT. These youth will be referred for transition services through the PAUR Unit and matched with the most appropriate evidence-based practice. Probation believes these efforts will continue to achieve the goals of increased child safety, increased and timelier exits to permanency, and increased placement stability for its youth.

EVALUATION STATUS

Overview

The CDSS has contracted with the San Jose State University Research Foundation to conduct an independent, third party evaluation consisting of a process study, a fiscal study, and an outcome study for the Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project (CAP). The primary purpose of the CAP evaluation is to determine whether and how changes in the funding structure for foster care (i.e., eliminating eligibility restrictions, and capping the dollar amount in exchange for spending flexibility) will impact the functioning of county child welfare systems and relevant probation systems. The secondary purpose of the evaluation is to assess outcomes for dependent and delinquent children and their families before and during implementation of the CAP. The evaluation uses an interrupted-time series design to assess for change over time.

This section describes activities for the period between July 1, 2010 and June 30, 2011. The evaluation activities over this period were focused on the continuation of data collection and data analyses.

Activities Completed

PROCESS STUDY

Site visits to the Departments of Children and Family Services (DCFS) in both counties were conducted during the reporting period, in addition to a site visit to CDSS. A site visit to one of the Probation Departments was also conducted during the reporting period. Evaluators visited Alameda County DCFS in September/October 2010, Los Angeles County DCFS in August 2010 and May 2011, Los Angeles County Probation in June 2011, and CDSS in October 2010.

In Alameda County, focus groups with child welfare workers, supervisors, and program managers from DCFS were completed in September 2010. In Los Angeles County, focus groups with child welfare workers, supervisors, program managers, and fiscal department representatives from DCFS were completed in August 2010. The CDSS focus groups were conducted in October 2010. Conducted focus groups during the site visits met for approximately two hours. The protocol used to guide these focus groups is contained in Appendix C. Table 1 displays the types of focus groups and number of participants for each organization.

Table 1: Number of Focus Group Participants by Department

| Department | Site Visit Date | Focus Group | Number of Participants |
|-------------------------|-----------------|---|------------------------|
| Alameda County DCFS | September 2010 | Child Welfare Workers (2 groups) | 19 |
| | | Supervising Child Welfare Workers (2 groups) | 18 |
| | | Program Managers (1 group) | 8 |
| Los Angeles County DCFS | August 2010 | Children's Social Worker (2 groups) | 11 |
| | | Supervising Children's Social Worker (2 groups) | 16 |
| | | Program Managers (1 group) | 9 |
| | | Fiscal Representatives (1 group) | 5 |
| CDSS | October 2010 | CAP Team | 7 |
| | | Fiscal Representatives | 7 |
| | | Operations Team | 3 |

Key informant interviews were conducted during each of the site visits previously noted. These were conducted with executive-level county DCFS and Probation Department administrators in both counties, and with executive-level staff at CDSS. Key informant interviews took approximately sixty minutes to complete. The protocol used to guide the key informant interviews is contained in Appendix C. Table 2 displays the number of interview participants by county and departments for each site visit.

Table 2: Number of Interview Participants by Department

| Department | Site Visit Date | Conducted With: | Key Informant Interviews (approx 60 minutes to complete) |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| Alameda County DCFS | September 2010 | Executive-level County DCFS & Probation Department Administrators | 2 |
| Los Angeles County DCFS | August 2010 May 2011 June 2011 | Executive-level County DCFS & Probation Department Administrators | 5 4 3 |
| CDSS | October 2010 | Executive-level Staff | 1 |

During this reporting period, the evaluation staff also began conducting a series of sub-studies to be included as part of the Process Study. The purpose of the sub-studies is to provide a more in-depth description of a single intervention in each of the four county departments. The interventions that are the focus of the sub-studies were identified by the CDSS, in consultation with the evaluation staff: Alameda County DCFS - Family Finding and Engagement, Alameda County Probation Department – Family Preservation Unit, Los Angeles County DCFS – Up Front Assessments, and Los Angeles County Probation Department – Functional Family Therapy. The county departments have identified their respective intervention as a key service component being implemented under the CAP. The description of the interventions will be included in the Final Evaluation Report.

The evaluation staff developed a protocol to guide the data collection for the sub-studies (Appendix C). Data collection began during the site visit with the Los Angeles County DCFS in May 2011 and continued with the site visit with Los Angeles County Probation in June 2011. Table 3 displays the types of focus groups and number of participants for each organization. Table 4 displays the number of interview participants by county and department for each site visit. Data collection for the remaining two sub-studies will be completed during the next reporting period.

Table 3: Number of Sub-Study Focus Group Participants by Department

| Department | Intervention | Site Visit Date | Focus Group | Number of Participants |
|---|---------------------------|-----------------|---|------------------------|
| Los Angeles County DCFS | Up Front Assessments | May 2011 | Child Welfare Workers and Supervisors | 8 |
| | | | Contracted Agency Staff | 14 |
| Los Angeles County Probation Department | Functional Family Therapy | June 2011 | Deputy Probation Officers and Supervisors | 6 |
| | | | Contracted Agency Staff | 15 |

Table 4: Number of Sub-Study Interview Participants by Department

| Department | Intervention | Site Visit Date | Key Informant Interviews |
|---|---------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Los Angeles County DCFS | Up Front Assessments | May 2011 | 3 |
| Los Angeles County Probation Department | Functional Family Therapy | June 2011 | 3 |

In addition to data collection, process study activities during this reporting period included data analysis. Coding and analysis of data collected during the various site visits was ongoing. Cross-walks of the information provided by the county departments in the annual progress reports were also conducted.

FISCAL STUDY

The focus of work in the Fiscal Study was on extracting and interpreting data in preparation for the Interim Fiscal Study Report. Specific efforts were undertaken to obtain administrative expenditure data, secure fiscal data for the comparison period, and requesting fiscal data directly from the counties. After discussions between the evaluation staff, representatives from the CDSS, and the evaluation fiscal consultant, it was determined that the best accessible source of administrative expenditure data for the years of the CAP would be the Title IV-E Waiver database spreadsheets instead of from database spreadsheet reports made the extraction process more efficient. Expenditure reports for State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2007/08, 2008/09, and 2009/10 were requested from CDSS just before the start of this reporting period and were received at the end of July 2010.

The evaluation staff and fiscal consultant initiated a discussion with CDSS just before the start of this reporting period regarding the best source of data for the years of fiscal data to be used as the comparison period. Those conversations continued into the fall when, in October 2010, it was determined that the Generic Reporting Information System database reports produced by CDSS would be the best source of information. Data for comparison years SFY 2004/05, 2005/06, and 2006/07 were received on November 22, 2010.

The evaluation staff made requests for other data necessary for the fiscal study directly to DCFS in each of the counties. First, the evaluation staff asked county staff to provide the number of paid placement days and number of group home paid placement days for SFY 2005/06, 2006/07, 08/09, and 2009/10. The data for SFY 2007/08 had been received from Alameda County DCFS in response to request during the previous reporting period. Another request for data for SFY 2007/08 from Los Angeles County DCFS was made along with the larger request for data. The necessary information from both counties was received approximately four months after the initial request, in October 2010. The DCFS in each of the counties was also able to provide the same information for the

Probation Departments. The initial request was made in February 2011 and completed by Alameda County DCFS in May 2011 and by Los Angeles County DCFS at the end of June 2011.

The evaluation staff also asked the DCFS in both counties to provide assistance expenditure data, broken out by DCFS and the Probation Department assistance expenditures, after determining that CDSS does not breakout the assistance expenditures separately. The initial request to both county departments was made at the beginning of November 2010 and included SFY 2005/06, 2006/07, 2007/08, 2008/09, and 2009/10. Data was received from Alameda County DCFS within one day of the request. A portion of the data from SFY 05/06 were not available in Alameda County as they predate the implementation of the county's current management information system so could not be extracted.

Representatives from Los Angeles County DCFS reported to the evaluator that the department does not separate assistance expenditure data by DCFS and Probation Department as a matter of regular operations and to do so would create an extensive workload. After evaluation staff conferred with CDSS, a representative from CDSS began discussions with administrators from DCFS in mid-November 2010, to identify and resolve the issue. The CDSS staff confirmed in early December 2010, that the data had been produced by Los Angeles DCFS; it was received by the evaluator in January 2011.

The extraction of data from the various data sources, along with data preparation, has continued through the reporting period. A summary of Los Angeles County DCFS and Probation fiscal data was completed by the end of the reporting period and is ready for analysis. The summary for Alameda County DCFS and Probation will be completed during the next reporting period along with the analyses for both counties. The evaluation staff had originally projected that the interim fiscal study report would be completed by the spring of 2011. However, due to data availability issues, it is now anticipated that the report will be completed over the fall of 2011.

OUTCOME STUDY

Outcome Study activities over this project year are focused on finalizing the best available source of Probation data for the study. Over the first six months of the reporting period, relevant evaluation staff familiarized themselves with the Probation sections of the Child Welfare Dynamic Report System at the University of California, Berkeley (UCB), Center for Social Services Research. During the second six months of the reporting period, evaluation staff accessed the relevant Probation information available from the system and, in consultation with CDSS representatives and the county Probation Departments, began discussion regarding its viability as data for use in the departments' direct access to the CWS/CMS system began in October 2010, its implementation process in the CAP counties is unlikely to have a significant impact on data availability for the Outcome Study.

Both county Probation Departments have continued working on their internal data and management information systems. However, after undertaking discussions with Probation Department representatives during the reporting period, evaluation staff determined that these sources of data do not appear to be viable for use in the Outcome Study. This is due to the status of their development processes and the timelines of the evaluation, as well as, the county workload that would be required to organize and aggregate the data into a format that meets the needs of the evaluation and complies with its human subject's protocol.

Additional Evaluation Activities

As part of the implementation of the CAP evaluation, evaluation staff has participated in meetings and conference calls with CDSS representatives and representatives from the county departments to discuss various aspects of the evaluation and CAP at large. Meetings have been ongoing or scheduled ad hoc to address a specific issue and have resulted in weekly contact between evaluation staff and CDSS representatives over the course of the reporting period.

Discussions with CDSS regarding the extension of the evaluation contract began in May 2010. CDSS representatives informed the evaluation staff on December 8, 2010, that the contract would be extended for 24 months. On December 17, 2010, the evaluation staff received a request from CDSS for a new budget and Scope of Work/Deliverables to be submitted to start the contract extension approval process. The materials were submitted to the CDSS on January 27, 2011. The contract was fully executed on July 5, 2011.

Dissemination of the Interim Evaluation Report was a key activity during this reporting period. In conjunction with CDSS, the evaluation staff and San Jose State University's School of Social Work hosted a meeting and Webinar for CAP evaluation stakeholders on September 22, 2010. The evaluation staff presented the findings from the Interim Evaluation Report and held a discussion with over 100 participants on-site, and via Webinar and teleconference. In October 2010, evaluation staff were invited to present the findings to the Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, Center for Families, Children, and the Courts.

Findings from the Interim Evaluation Report were also disseminated through several media outlets. An article discussing child deaths in Los Angeles County that included references to the CAP and to the CAP evaluation was published in the Los Angeles Times on October 19, 2010. This article prompted contacts with the evaluator from two deputies representing two of the Supervisors from the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors (BOS). In addition a directive from the Los Angeles County BOS was made to DCFS Director Trish Ploehn requesting a letter from the CAP Evaluation Principal Investigator (PI) clarifying items referenced by the Los Angeles Times reporter. A letter was requested on October 21, 2010, and a draft was then submitted to DCFS on October 25, 2010.

Discussions of the CAP and the evaluation also appeared in the Huffington Post on November 16, 2010, and at witnessLA.com on November 22, 2010, after the PI was contacted by journalists seeking information about the waiver project. The evaluator was also interviewed by the National Center for Youth Law in May 2011.

Evaluation staff also completed a number of other activities. In September 2010, evaluation staff participated in a Webinar sponsored by the Children's Bureau entitled: "Introduction to Cost Analysis in Child Welfare." In October 2010, evaluation staff also participated in a phone conference with an evaluation team from Casey Family Programs to discuss their evaluation of the Another Road to Safety program in Alameda County. It should be noted that in October 2010, the Interim Evaluation report was amended to correct an error in the narrative portion of the report concerning the number of months used in a child safety indicator.

At the end of June 2011, the evaluator participated in the 14th Annual Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Project Grantees Conference in Washington, DC.

EVALUATION CHALLENGES

The implementation of the evaluation continued during this reporting period without major issues or disruptions in data collection. However, there were several challenges worth noting. As was previously discussed, evaluation staff anticipated completing an interim fiscal report by December 31, 2010. Receiving the necessary data from the various sources took longer than was anticipated, delaying the extraction and analysis. At this time the task of identifying the viable sources of fiscal data has been completed.

Securing reliable and valid data for the Probation portion of the Outcome Study continued to be a challenge for the evaluation. Progress on the issue has been made, however. The evaluator hopes to determine by the end of the next reporting period whether or not the Child Welfare Dynamic Report System can serve as the data source. If the system cannot be used, the previously cited source in the evaluation plan, the Probation Foster Care Placement Monthly Caseload Statistical Report (FC 23), will be used to create outcomes and indicators for the Outcome Study.

Finally, a number of changes have occurred in the counties with each department experiencing turnover of key executive-level staff during this reporting period. The CAP Coordinators who also serve as the evaluation liaisons in both Probation Departments moved to other positions and were replaced by new individuals. The same kind of turnover occurred in Alameda County DCFS. In Alameda County, the Alameda County Social Services Director retired along with the Alameda County DCFS Director. The new Social Services Director started at the end of the June 2011. In addition, in Los Angeles County, the DCFS Director was replaced with an Interim Director by the County Board of Supervisors. The Interim Director resigned in April 2011 and was replaced by an Acting Director. During this period of fluctuation the impact of these changes on the evaluation is yet to be fully determined.

Interim Findings

As referenced in the last progress report, the CAP Interim Evaluation Report was submitted on April 12, 2010. No further findings are available at this time.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Alameda County Documents

- i. Total County Waiver Investments for Project Year 4
 - County Welfare Charges to Waiver Code 701 for Project Year 4
 - Probation Charges to Waiver Code 702 for Project Year 4
 - Title IV-E Waiver Probation Capped Allocation Expenditures
 - Title IV-E Waiver Capped Allocation Expenditures
- ii. Alameda Evaluation Timelines in Progress and Upcoming
- iii. Alameda County Title IV-E Waiver Dashboard
- iv. Project Permanence
- v. Probation Placement Data
- vi. CWS Caseload by Service Component
 - CWS out of Home Placement Type
 - Group Home Placements by Time in Care
 - CWS Out of Home Entry by First Placement
 - CWS Out of Home Exits by Type
- vii. Paths to Success (P2S) Evaluation
- viii. Progress Report on Outcome Goals Year 4, Quarter 2 Revised

Appendix B: Los Angeles County Documents

- i. Reentry into Foster Care Within 12 Months from Reunification
- ii. Probation Placement Data
- iii. Outcomes – Overview
- iv. Total County Waiver Investments for Project Year 4
 - County Welfare Charges to Waiver Code 701 for Project Year 4
 - Probation Charges to Waiver Code 702 for Project Year 4
 - Title IV-E Waiver Probation Capped Allocation Expenditures
 - Title IV-E Waiver Capped Allocation Expenditures
- v. Group Home Placements Time in Care LA County DCFS
 - CWS Caseload by Service Component LA County DCFS
 - CWS Out of Home Placements for LA County DCFS
 - CWS Out of Home Entry for LA County DCFS
 - CWS Out of Home Exits for LA County DCFS

Appendix C: CAP Evaluation Data Collection Protocols

Appendix D: Key Outcomes Presentation for CAP Counties (CWS/CMS Quarter 2, 2010 Data Extract)