

Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project
Annual Progress Report
Reporting Period July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013

This annual progress report provides updated information for the California Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project (CAP) covering the period from July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013. This report fulfills the requirement in Section 5.4 of the federal Waiver Terms and Conditions and highlights state departmental support and oversight activities, county level implementation, and evaluation efforts.

I. OVERVIEW

On March 31, 2006, the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) received approval from the United States Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) for the CAP. The five-year waiver demonstration allows participating counties flexible use of foster care funds for the provision of direct services to children and their families and to expand and strengthen child welfare practice, programs, and system improvements. The target population is Title IV-E and non-Title IV-E eligible children ages zero through 19 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 and Los Angeles counties are the two participating counties. The original five-year project began on July 1, 2007 and ended on June 30, 2012. Point in time outcome data covering the CAP five-year project period is in Appendix C-IV.

The CDSS is operating the CAP in both counties under an approved bridge extension through June 30, 2014, or until a five-year waiver extension is approved by DHHS. A five-year extension proposal was submitted to the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) on March 28, 2013, that detailed modifications to the existing project, a proposed fiscal model, programmatic focus for the counties and third-party evaluation, and inclusion of up to 18 new counties beyond the two current participating counties. The proposed project period for the extension is July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2019.

California's waiver demonstration, which has been called the "Capped Allocation Project" or CAP, will be re-named "Cal-Kids" for the waiver extension. Under Cal-Kids, the state proposes to implement and expand child welfare and probation practices in up to 20 counties statewide, impacting key outcomes and promoting child and family well-being. The Cal-Kids project implementation will focus on prevention, family engagement and family centered practice, after care services, and evidence-based interventions. The specific goals of Cal-Kids are to:

- Improve the array of services for children and families and engage families through a more individualized approach that emphasizes family involvement;
- Increase child safety without an over-reliance on out-of-home care.
- Improve permanency outcomes and timelines; and
- Improve child and family well-being.

II. CDSS PROJECT ACTIVITIES

During the period of July 1, 2012 to June 30, 2013, the CDSS cross-division project implementation team has continued to perform project management, county oversight monitoring, CDSS fiscal system activities, and support for the evaluation for the current project. These activities included ongoing claiming and payment operations; federal reporting, evaluation contract monitoring and completion and submission of the CAP Final Evaluation Report.

The Integrated Services Unit (ISU) of the Child Protection and Family Support Branch continued as lead providing program support for implementing and monitoring the CAP. Activities for the ISU staff included monthly project team meetings, monthly calls with the participating counties, correspondence and negotiations with ACF, the review of county progress reporting and outcome performance data, addressing waiver related program/policy issues within CDSS, and provision of county technical assistance.

The Fiscal Systems and Accounting Branch (FSAB) continued to perform ongoing procedures and tasks to support the claiming and payment operations for the CAP. These included monthly advances/offsets and quarterly payment/offsets to the participating counties; collection and reporting of monthly and quarterly claim/payment data to the counties and other CDSS units; response to county payment inquiries; analysis of actual expenditures versus budgeted allocations to determine advance methodology and advance amounts to the counties; and review of actual expenditures reported to ensure proper waiver/non-waiver ratios and overmatch are applied to each payment. The FSAB staff attends the monthly project team meetings; provides fiscal and expenditure updates; and completes required federal reporting.

The FSAB submitted the Foster Care IV-E 1 Reports as follows: The September 2012 quarter was submitted December 30, 2012; the December 2012 quarter was submitted March 30, 2013; the March 2013 quarter was submitted June 30, 2013; and the June 2013 quarter was submitted September 30, 2013.

The Financial Analysis Bureau issued County Fiscal Letters (CFL) with allocation information for the participating counties as follows:

The CFL 12/13-19 Fiscal Year 2012/13 Federal Planning Allocation for Child Welfare Services and Foster Care Assistance Programs was issued on October 16, 2012.
http://www.dss.cahwnet.gov/lettersnotices/entres/getinfo/cfl/2012-13/12-13_19.pdf

The CFL 12/13-45 Fiscal Year 2012/13 Final Federal Allocation for Child Welfare Services and Foster Care Assistance Programs was issued on July 26, 2013.
http://www.dss.cahwnet.gov/lettersnotices/EntRes/getinfo/cfl/2012-13/12-13_45.pdf

The Research Services Branch (RSB) staff has continued to monitor the evaluation activities for the CAP evaluation contract including processing evaluator invoices, conducting payment activities, and monthly conference calls with the evaluator and CDSS program staff. The RSB provided support for the completion of the Final

Evaluation Report and the Addendum to the Final Report. In addition, CDSS fiscal staff reviewed the final Fiscal Study including checking calculations for accuracy and verified that the expenditures listed were consistent with CDSS expenditures. As required, the CAP Final Evaluation Report was submitted to ACF on December 28, 2012. The evaluator submitted the draft Addendum to CDSS on June 26, 2013. This draft report is currently under review and will be submitted upon finalization in early September 2013. The RSB staff also facilitated the presentation of a Title IV-E Waiver Webinar on the CAP Final Evaluation Report held in Sacramento on April 15, 2013.

In addition, CDSS also directed resources to develop the multi-year extension proposal, which included fiscal analysis and data to develop the proposed fiscal methodology, county program and fiscal orientation webinars, a two-day convening in collaboration with Casey Family Programs (CFP) for intent counties, quarterly project calls, one-on-one county technical assistance, and evaluation consultation and planning. The intent counties used fiscal templates based on the proposed fiscal methodology to determine the feasibility of their participation in the waiver extension. Currently, there are 20 counties including Alameda and Los Angeles that submitted a waiver Letter of Intent. The CDSS cross-divisional project team coordinates resources and support needed for the extension negotiations with ACF, CDSS implementation, and evaluation activities. Both CDSS and representatives from Alameda and Los Angeles counties attended the 15th Annual Child Welfare Demonstration Protects Meeting held on April 3-5, 2013, in Arlington, Virginia and met with Children's Bureau staff on the submitted proposal.

As part of the fiscal methodology development process, the Estimates Bureau (EB) provided a fiscal template for the intent counties to pull their expenditures and provide input back to CDSS on factors that would impact their participation in the extension. Based on the information provided from the intent counties from the two-day convening, a fiscal methodology was developed. The EB provided county specific expenditures of the proposed fiscal methodology and hosted fiscal webinars to discuss the calculations included in the proposal and provided follow-up technical assistance. The technical assistance included investigating expenditure adjustments to provide detailed backup of the assistance and administration expenditures and additional calls to further discuss how the numbers were developed and what counties could pursue fiscally under the waiver extension.

After submission of the extension proposal to ACF, the EB responded to questions and provided additional information through a webinar. In addition, EB staff has provided fiscal and caseload analysis to respond to questions and participate in conference calls with ACF regarding the proposed fiscal methodology.

As part of finalizing modifications for the evaluation and initial planning efforts, RSB staff has conferred with CDSS program staff and child welfare data consultants to consider research methods and approaches for the extension evaluation. These methods will facilitate a greater level of robustness by inclusion of specific sub-studies for the outcome study and ensuring that available individual data are collected before and after county program interventions.

The RSB is exploring the feasibility of using matched comparisons within and outside of the participating counties. This quasi-experimental research methodology may enable waiver counties to obtain more robust outcomes findings. The CDSS is focusing on incorporating the use of validated assessment instruments and county case-level data for implemented program interventions that could be captured at each interval of the interrupted time-series design to be continued under the waiver extension evaluation.

STATUS OF THE DEMONSTRATION – COUNTY SECTIONS

Alameda County

A. Administrative and Implementation Activities

Over the CAP, one major success identified by Alameda County has been the nearly 40 percent reductions in the number of youth placed in a foster care setting. Alameda County activities conducted during the Bridge Year One reporting period (July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013) are described below, including their efforts to understand the impacts of strategies implemented by Alameda County Department of Children and Family Services (Alameda DCFS) in previous project years.

In Alameda County, the current Waiver Executive Team (WET) is comprised of representatives from Alameda DCFS, Alameda County Probation Department (Alameda Probation), Alameda County Social Services Agency (ACSSA) Finance Department, ACSSA Program Evaluation and Research, Behavioral Health Care Services, and Casey Family Programs (CFP). The WET meets monthly to discuss new and existing CAP strategies, strategy evaluations and outcomes, progress of CAP goals and objectives, and planning for the waiver extension.

In addition to continuing to operate strategies implemented during project years two and three, Alameda DCFS invested in the following programs with one-time project funding during this period: Youth Radio, Empowering Parents, and Alameda County's Home Visiting Program. Over the year, the WET examined what CAP strategies to sustain, modify, or eliminate, based on the following criteria: 1) Impact on CAP goals/objectives; 2) synergy with future priorities; 3) concrete benefits to families; 4) impact on practice improvement; 5) blending funding being used or available to pay for program; and 6) cost of services and numbers served.

Based on the above criteria, three programs have been terminated, one program has been modified, and the contract amount has been reduced for another. The eliminated programs are as follows: The Faith Initiative, which assisted with recruitment efforts for county-licensed foster homes, as well as community outreach; Youth Radio, which provided supportive services, media skills training, workforce development programming, and in-house employment opportunities, and Paths to Success (P2S), providing intensive supports and advocacy for families with court ordered Family Maintenance. The Subsidized Child Care program was modified to provide eligible

families a preset child care allocation for a limited time period, instead of the market rate for child care, thus allowing more families to access child care services. Finally, the contract amount for the Mentoring Program was reduced to the actual amount being reimbursed for the program instead of the original budgeted amount.

The Alameda Probation strategies to reduce the number of out-of-home placements have remained in effect over Bridge Year One and are being expanded. The CAP funding is being used to enhance services through staffing, collaborative partnerships, and operational development. Key programs include Screening for Out-of-Home Services, the Collaborative Court, Family Preservation Unit (FPU), and The Transition Center.

B. Outcomes and Evaluation Activities

ALAMEDA DCFS

Alameda County reports significant efforts have been underway during this reporting period to understand the impacts and efficacy of strategies implemented by Alameda DCFS under the CAP. As many strategies were implemented in project years two and three, the county is 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 of interest.

The Program Evaluation and Research Unit (PERU) continue to provide the monthly Waiver Dashboard reports (Appendix A-I) and quarterly Progress Reports to Alameda DCFS management on aggregate data trends that detail Alameda County's performance on its five-year outcome goals (Appendix A-II). In addition, PERU is in the process of completing evaluations of individual waiver strategies and provided Alameda DCFS management with status timeline for all evaluation projects (Appendix A-III). Further, during this reporting period, PERU staff provided Alameda DCFS management with reports on: Child Care Program, Faith Initiative, Summer Youth Employment Program, and Youth Advocate Program (Appendix A-IV, A-V, A-VI, and A-VII).

The following county provided data trends are based on data extracted from the Child Welfare Services/Case Management System (CWS/CMS) Dynamic Report System – Key Outcomes Presentation Tool, based on the CWS/CMS 2013 Extract¹ for 2007 – 2013 (April 1, 2007 to April 1, 2013 for point-in-time data) as contained in Appendix C-I, except as noted. As the current Key Outcomes Presentation Tool now provides data for youth ages zero to 20 to include non-minor dependents, the county provided additional data based upon the same measures reported in the Key Outcomes Presentation Tool as reported in CWS/CMS Dynamic Report System CWS/CMS 2013 Q1 Extract for youth zero to 17 in the tab Alameda County Key Outcomes zero to 17 (Appendix C-II).

¹ Needell, B., Webster, D., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Dawson, W., Magruder, J., Exel, M., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Putnam-Hornstein, E., Williams, D., Simon, V., Hamilton, D., Lou, C., Peng, C., Moore, M., King, B., Henry, C., & Nuttbrock, A. (2012). *Child Welfare Services Reports for California*. Retrieved 6/25/2012, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research website. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/ucb_childwelfare>

Youth placed in out-of-home care

Alameda DCFS reports success in its efforts to reduce the total population of youth in out-of-home placement and the number of youth in group home placement. Between the baseline period (4/1/2007) and the most recent reporting period (4/1/2013), there was a 39.1 percent reduction in the number of youth ages zero to 20 in child welfare supervised foster care, from 2,552 to 1,555 children and for youth ages zero to 17 in child welfare supervised foster care there was a 39.1 percent reduction, from 2,430 to 1,230 children.

Placement in least restrictive settings

Alameda DCFS reports success in its efforts to increase the percentage of children/youth placed in least restrictive settings. Between the baseline period (4/1/07) and the most recent reporting period (4/1/2013) there was a 36.3 percent decrease in the percentage of youth ages zero to 20 placed in congregate care, from 13.5 percent to 8.6 percent and for youth ages zero to 17 placed in congregated care there was a 32.5 percent decrease in the percentage, from 13.4 percent to 9.1percent.

For relative placements, including all child welfare supervised youth, including non-minor dependents, the percentage of youth in relative placements held relatively steady, from 33.5 percent to 33.4 percent. However, the age range for this measure changed to include child welfare supervised youth ages zero to 20 in the most recent reporting period, the decline in the proportion of youth in relative placements is likely due to shifts in placement type for non-minor dependent youth. Among youth ages zero to 17, there was a 13 percent increase in the percentage of youth placed with relatives, from 33.7 percent to 38.0 percent (Appendix C-II).

Caseload and service component

Alameda DCFS reports success in its efforts to increase the percentage of youth served in-home between the baseline period (4/1/07) and the most recent reporting period (4/1/13) (Appendix C-II). They report while there has been an overall 35.3 percent decline in the number of children served in-home via Family Maintenance services, as a percentage of the total number of children served in-home and in child welfare supervised foster care, excluding non-minor dependent youth, there has been a 19.8 percent increase in the percentage of children being served in Family Maintenance overall between 4/1/2007 and 4/1/2013 (23.5 percent to 28.2 percent).

Entries

Alameda DCFS reports success in its efforts to reduce the number of youth entering out-of-care overall. Between the baseline period (4/1/06 to 3/31/07) and the most recent reporting period (4/1/12 to 3/31/13), there was a 41.6 percent decline in the number of children who entered foster care for 8 or more days, from 853 to 498 youth.

In addition, Alameda DCFS reports success in its efforts to reduce the number of youth entering out-of-care for the first time. Between the baseline period (7/1/06 to 6/30/07) and the most recent reporting period (using the 12-month period of 1/1/12 to 12/31/12), there was a 40.1 percent decline in the number of children who entered foster care for the first time for eight or more days, from 627 to 371 youth (Appendix A-II).

First placement type

Alameda DCFS reports success in its efforts to increase the number of children placed in relative homes as a first placement (placement episodes of eight or more days). Between the baseline period (7/1/06 to 6/30/07) and the 12-month period 1/1/2012 to 12/31/2012, the number of children placed with a relative as a first placement increased by 55.3 percent, from 123 youth to 191 youth (Appendix A-II). Further, as a proportion of all entries, first placements with a relative have increased by 165.8 percent, from 15.2 percent of all first placements to 40.4 percent of all first placements (Appendix A-I).

Successful reunification

Alameda DCFS reports success in its efforts to decrease the percentage of children who reenter foster care within 12 months of reunification. Between the baseline period (4/1/06 to 3/31/07) and the most recent reporting period (4/1/11 to 3/31/12) the percentage of youth reentering foster care within 12 months of reunification following a placement episode of 8 or more days decreased by 10.9 percent from 18.4 percent to 16.4 percent.

Timeliness of Permanence through Adoption or Guardianship

Between the baseline period (7/1/06 to 6/30/07) and the current reporting period (using the 12-month period of 1/1/12 to 12/31/12) (Appendix A-II) the percentage of youth in the exit cohort exiting to adoption within 24 months increased by 8.3 percent, from 33.9 percent to 36.7 percent. The percentage of youth in the exit cohort exiting to guardianship (all types) within 24 months decreased by 6.0 percent, from 48.2 percent to 45.3 percent.

Timely Reunification

Alameda DCFS identified that their CAP goal adopted for timely reunification was revised on June 28, 2011, at their monthly WET meeting. The revised reunification goal is patterned after the federal entry cohort reunification measure (C1.3), however, while the federal measure reports on a 6-month entry cohort, the county elected to track based on a 12-month cohort in order to: 1) reduce some of the variation that is seen between 6-month periods, 2) to be consistent with how they track successful reunification (12-month cohorts), and 3) enable the county to track performance for each of the latter years of the waiver. The new goal was based data available on the CWS/CMS Dynamic Report System, using the June 2012 Quarter 1 extract, with data

available through 2009, which was thus selected as baseline period for the revised goal. Between the 12-month baseline period ending 12/31/2009 and the 2-month period ending 12/31/2011, there was an 18.4 percent increase in the percentage of children exiting foster care to reunification within 12 months of first entry, from 33.2 percent to 39.3 percent (Appendix A-II).

ALAMEDA PROBATION

Alameda County has been committed to expanding activities that better support at-risk youth and their families to achieve the following goals under the CAP: 1) to reduce the number of youth out-of-home placements, 2) to provide the least restrictive level of placement, when out-of-home placement is necessary, and 3) to promote family preservation and family reunification.

For Fiscal Year (FY) 2012-13, Alameda Probation reported probation placement data showed a decrease (3 percent) in youth placed out-of-home and a significant decrease (26 percent) in youth placed in group homes as compared to last FY data. The average length of stay showed an increase by 40 percent from the last FY (Appendix A-VIII).

The three year trends were: average length of stay for youth in June 2013 showed a 40 percent increase from 2012, yet a two percent increase from 2011; youth placed in out-of-home for June 2013 showed a three percent decrease from 2012 and a six percent decrease from 2011; and youth placed in group homes for June 2013 showed a 26 percent decrease from 2012 and a 24 percent decrease from 2011 (Appendix A-VIII).

Alameda Probation advised that this reported placement data included some duplication of youth entering multiple placements; only reflects the number of new youth who began placement assignment during the quarter; and does not represent a total count of youth in placement at the end of each quarter.

The number of out-of-home placement recommendations made by Alameda Probation has consistently decreased. In the current reporting period, there is a decrease of recommendations in three core areas: out-of-home placement by 15.5 percent; in-county camp program by 25.9 percent; and State Division of Juvenile Justice by 14.3 percent (see Table 1).

These decreases demonstrate significant progress in the efforts to decrease placements and explore least-restrictive placement options for youth. To better assess results, Alameda Probation reported enhancing their placement database to track court decisions and the Screening for Out-of-Home Services (SOS) Committee will work to capture, track and assess the final placement order by the court.

Table 1
Alameda Probation

	<i>Pre SOS (Initial) Recommendation by Probation Officer</i>	<i>Post SOS(Actual) Recommendation by SOS Committee</i>	<i>Outcome</i>
Goal: To Reduce Out-of-Home Placement whenever possible as well as placement in the least restrictive environment when possible.			
<i>Out-of-Home Placement</i>	129	109	<i>Decrease (15.5%)</i>
<i>In-County Camp Program</i>	58	43	<i>Decrease (25.9%)</i>
<i>State Division of Juvenile Justice</i>	14	12	<i>Decrease (14.3%)</i>
Family Preservation			
<i>Family Preservation</i>	91	61	
<i>Field Supervision in the Community</i>	15	55	
<i>Probation without Wardship</i>	3	5	
<i>Undecided/Data Unavailable</i>	23	50	
<i>Other</i>	2	0	
<i>Total:</i>	335	335	

The FPU has continued to provide services to maintain the youth in the home by providing Multi-Systemic Therapy (MST) Services. During this reporting period, 57 percent of the families served have successfully completed the MST program and graduated. This represents 36 youth served by MST who, with their families, have avoided placement by providing family focused services in their home, avoiding a more restrictive setting such as residential facilities and detention.

During this reporting period, Justice Works served 55 youth supervised by FPU with comprehensive case management and post-program services. Their Violation Initiative Program utilizes Short-term Therapeutic Outreach to prevent removal from the home. The program has demonstrated a reduction in number of placements and a reduced length of stay for those in placement. Alameda Probation's contract with Justice Works has concluded, and procurement efforts are in effect to secure a replacement service provider.

Alameda Probation has also initiated the implementation of several strategies to address data and information management needs including the following: 1) Safe Measures has been contracted to review and analyze CWS/CMS records to identify reporting gaps, 2) an external audit was recently conducted to identify challenge areas, 3) an evaluation of data collection activities is currently being drafted and will be used to prepare a strategy for ensuring data quality assurance, and 4) data entry training has been conducted and will continue as a strategy for improvements as implemented.

C. Fiscal Reporting and Funded Waiver Initiatives

Included in Appendix A-IX and A-X are project allocation expenditure summary sheets for Alameda DCFS and Alameda Probation with project-to-date yearly data and project listings for both departments containing detailed information for each waiver initiative covering the Bridge Year One reporting period.

In the expenditure summary worksheets the county provided explanatory notes for the Probation allocation. They identified that while under spending from the FY 2012 allocated amount of \$12 million did not roll into FY 2013, a new \$12 million was allocated to the Probation Department for FY 2013 to cover strategies implemented in FY 2012, in addition to new strategies to be implemented in FY 2013. The FY 2012-13 base allocation was budgeted at the same FY 2011-12 amount. Alameda Probation continued to have access to an additional amount of \$12 million beyond the base for waiver investments and was projected to spend \$8.17 million of the available amount.

D. Waiver Extension Planning

Alameda DCFS is continuing to plan for the waiver extension. In addition to the evaluation of current waiver strategies, Alameda DCFS and the WET are assessing what evidence-based practices to implement during the next waiver phase. The county reported one of the target populations Alameda DCFS and Alameda Probation would like to focus on during the waiver extension is “cross-over youth”, youth who have been touched by both child welfare and probation systems. Evidence based practices around serving cross-over youth are being explored.

In addition, Alameda Probation reported that in the second Bridge Year they intend to implement planned procurement of services such as those previously provided by Justice Works with an emphasis on transitional support and placement stability care for youth and improved support for their families.

Los Angeles County

A. Administrative and Implementation Activities

The Los Angeles Department of Children and Family Services (LA DCFS) and the Los Angeles County Probation Department (LA Probation) CAP Management Teams are responsible for ensuring that all initiatives and programs implemented with reinvestment funds are aligned toward improving outcomes for youth and their families that they serve and the monitoring of these outcomes. In addition, the Management Teams provide progress reports to their respective departments, the Board of Supervisors, and the CDSS and works with its community partners.

The LA Probation’s CAP team is also responsible for ensuring that contracts with community-based service providers meet county requirements, and that all parties are operating within the scope of work outlined in the contract.

During the Bridge Year One reporting period of July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013, both Los Angeles County Departments continued to utilize the funding flexibility for implementation and expansion of a wide array of programs and services to provide individualized services and strategies that are strength-based, family centered, child focused and community based.

In Bridge Year One, LA DCFS underwent a department-wide reorganization. The primary goals of the reorganization were to consolidate line, support and administrative staff functions, improve its investigative capacity and to identify any efficiency which will allow more staff to support Regional Office operations. In addition to the reorganization, LA DCFS appointed a Chief Deputy Director, Senior Deputy Director, two Deputy Directors and four new Regional Administrators. The county reported that while transitions related to the CAP have been relatively smooth, by nature, transitions require educating and updating new DCFS staff and integrating their perspectives into planning.

Although the implementation of California Fostering to Connections to Success Act (Assembly Bill 12) has not had a statistically significant impact on the number of youth in out-of-home care, it has increased the number of children 18 to 20 years who continue to receive LA DCFS services. Although placement funding for these youth is outside of the CAP, the task of monitoring AB12 youth directly impacts workload and services for the zero to 17 year old population. To address this, LA DCFS will implement specialized units in the new fiscal year to monitor and provide services to the AB 12 population.

The LA DCFS reported that they continue to receive intense media coverage, especially surrounding child fatalities in Los Angeles County. The county identified that while the number of entries into foster care continues to decrease since the start of the CAP, DCFS staff continue to express heightened anxiety and risk aversion with regard to leaving children in homes during child abuse investigations.

In Bridge Year One, LA Probation also underwent a department-wide reorganization. A new Chief Probation Officer was named. The new Chief realigned the existing management structure with an emphasis on increasing accountability and improving communication across the Department. The Chief appointed two new Assistant Chief Probation Officers, appointed two new Deputy Chief Probation Officers, appointed three new Bureau Chiefs, realigned the Bureau Chief oversight responsibilities within existing Supervisorial Districts, strengthened the human resources component and enhanced the budget and fiscal management sections. The county reported that while transitions related to the CAP have been relatively smooth, by nature, transitions require educating and updating new participants and integrating their perspectives into planning.

For LA Probation, implementation of AB 12 has had an impact on the number of youth in out-of-home care. As with LA DCFS, the task of monitoring AB 12 youth directly impacts workload and services for the 12 to 17 year old Probation population. The Probation Department has initiated a realignment of services within the Placement Bureau to facilitate servicing these youth. Concurrently, LA Probation has initiated efforts to identify these youth as early as possible after they reach age 17 to improve the transitional outcomes for these youth.

The LA Probation reported facing various challenges as it implemented Functional Family Therapy (FFT) and Functional Family Probation (FFP). These included changes in management, staffing shortages and inconsistencies relating to the referral

processes. In addition, they identified apparent shortcomings related to the data and its management, as it does not appear to be capturing enough data on model fidelity and implementation quality. The Department is addressing these issues.

Due to county contracting processes, LA Probation was not able to fully implement all identified services for their youth and families. During Bridge Year One, LA Probation has continued to consistently implement services, and will continue moving forward and expanding these strategies during the next Bridge period.

B. Outcomes and Evaluation Activities

Due to the number and complexity of individual strategies utilized by both departments, neither LA DCFS nor LA Probation can assign direct causality to individual strategies. Rather, the departments view their outcomes as the result of combined systemic efforts that interweave strategies undertaken under the CAP with previous ongoing efforts. On October 23, 2012, the county submitted a CAP County Evaluation Report to their Board of Supervisors (BOS) that presented county evaluation and fiscal data for the five-year CAP. The BOS report is contained in Appendix B-IV.

The CAP has allowed LA DCFS the flexibility to provide a broader array of services to increase safety for children. The county reports the impact of their implemented child safety enhancements is evidenced by the improvement in the quantity of innovative initiatives that allowed children to remain safely in their own homes while receiving preventative services. In FY 2011-12, the number of children who were able to remain safely in their own homes decreased 2.9 percent (from 15,506 to 15,053). Of this decrease, there was a .64 percent decrease in children who received Pre-placement Family Maintenance (FM) Services and an 8.8 percent (from 4,335 to 3,954) decrease in the number of children who received FM services after receiving out-of-home care services (Appendix C-III). For the most recent reporting period, available data showed decreases for Pre-placement, Post-placement, and total FM services (Appendix C-I).

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 referenced earlier as a result of the implementation of AB 12, LA DCFS has experienced a .69 percent (from 18,627 to 18,518) decrease in the number of children/youth in out-of-home care comparing point-in-time data from July 1, 2011 to July 1, 2012, of which 1,475 youth in out-of-home care were ages 18 to 20 years and the number of emancipations decreased 16.8 percent (from 1,279 to 1,064) over this period (Appendix C-III).

In addition, LA DCFS continued to decrease the number of youth in congregate care. From July 1, 2011 to July 1, 2012 year one, the number of youth in congregate care has decreased 1.8 percent (from 996 to 978) (Appendix C-III). For the most recent reporting period, available data showed an increase children/youth in the out-of-home care, a continued decrease in the number of emancipations, and no change in the number of youth in congregate care (Appendix C-I).

From October 1, 2009 to March 31, 2010, for children exiting placement to permanency, there were 3,545 children in out-of-home care with LA DCFS for the first time. For this cohort of 3,545 children, 47.6 percent reunified with their parents within 12 months, 65.1 percent reunified within 24 months, and 67.6 percent within 36 months (Appendix C-III).

In addition, for FY 2011-12, entries into foster care decreased 6.4 percent (from 9,512 to 8,900) and exits decreased 8.3 percent (from 9,845 to 9,028) (Appendix C-III). For the most recent reporting period, available data showed an increase in entries and a continued decrease in exits (Appendix C-I). The county stated that since LA DCFS is removing fewer children from the home of their parents and more children are being provided in-home service, parents of the children who are detained often have greater issues and for the safety of the child, out-of-home care is still needed.

For reentries into care within 12 months of reunification, an increase of 14.0 percent (from 10.7 to 12.2 percent) was seen over the period of July 1, 2007 to July 1, 2011 (Appendix C-IV). For the most recent reporting period, available data showed a continued increase into FY 2012-13 (Appendix C-I). The county reported LA DCFS is assessing these trends.

The LA DCFS evaluates CAP implementation through comparison of baseline and current data related to exits, entries and placements, well as data provided through the University of California, Berkeley Center for Social Services Research. In order to evaluate the impact of specific CAP activities on targeted outcomes, LA DCFS monitors 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 program improvements and prevention services.

As part of a larger effort to integrate the ongoing use of outcome data into child welfare practice, LA DCFS has developed a Data Partnership effort with staff throughout the department, CFP, consultants from the Western Pacific Implementation Center and the National Resource Center on Data and Technology. DCFS Stat, implemented in November 2011, allows staff and managers in each of the department's offices, as well as centralized program staff, to assess key departmental measures by providing root cause analyses, exploring key underlying factors, and defining strengths and needs on a regular basis. A case review was added to DCFS Stat in April 2013 and "Data Champions" have been identified in each Regional Office.

A significant portion of LA DCFS reinvestment dollars have been budgeted and expended on Up-front Assessments (UFA) through contracted Family Preservation (FP) agencies. The LA DCFS, in conjunction with CFP, is evaluating DCFS FP services, including UFAs. Currently, the FP evaluation Executive Summary and tables are being reviewed by the research team and have not been finalized.

Since the initiation of the CAP on July 1, 2007, LA Probation has decreased the number of youth in out-of-home care by 43 percent (1,684 to 956). The average length of stay in

LA Probation's foster care has also decreased by 100 days or 28 percent (361 to 261) (Appendix B-I).

With the assistance of CFP, LA Probation recently completed an evaluation of FFT and FFP, which encompassed youth who received services from 2007 to 2011. The evaluation showed that while there were favorable outcomes, the absence of a consistent pattern of findings across the intervention spectrum prevents LA Probation from drawing strong conclusions regarding its effectiveness. Despite these challenges, the evaluation affirms that a significant effort is being made to assess the impact of FFT and FFP during the early stages of implementation by LA Probation. The CFP will continue to provide technical assistance to ensure that LA Probation is gathering and properly managing data with an enhanced focus on implementation quality and fidelity.

C. Fiscal Reporting and Funded Waiver Initiatives

Included in Appendix B-II and B-III are allocation expenditure summary sheets with project-to-date yearly data showing totals for Los Angeles County, LA DCFS, and LA Probation and project listings for both departments containing detailed information for each waiver initiative covering the Bridge Year One reporting period.

In relation to the project listing, the county identified 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 their BOS after the approval of the initial CAP Plan Budget. The LA DCFS provided \$12,722,000 in CAP reinvestment funds to the Wraparound Program. They identified this as a one-time usage of the reinvestment funds for a State-mandated mental health service and is rolled into the base allocation.

D. Waiver Extension Planning

Los Angeles County reports that while noteworthy progress has been made, the benefit of the CAP for the county cannot be completely achieved in five years. By extending California's waiver, Los Angeles County will be in a position to apply lessons learned during the initial waiver period to the extension, and focus future flexible funding benefits on increasing the capacity, utilization, and effectiveness of family engagement, family-centered practice and interventions, improving social-emotional well-being and expanding child welfare practice, program and systems improvement.

The LA DCFS reports that they have begun planning for the CAP extension, which is in conjunction with their Strategic Planning efforts, through the use of Objective Teams. The Objective Teams, which include external partners, are responsible for developing implementation plans for their Strategic Plan initiatives and are aligned with possible new CAP initiatives. The DCFS Executive Team will select probable CAP initiatives based on available resources and then convene a community-based forum to discuss the possible implementation of these initiatives.

Two hurdles identified by the county that greatly impact both departments' implementation readiness is that since the extension is still in the review process and has not been approved; the baseline and growth factor are unknown. The departments are unable to present any plan to the Los Angeles County BOS without an accurate CAP allocation. In addition, both departments had to absorb the additional cost for the increase in group home costs and have analyzed CAP fiscal and outcome data to determine the efficacy of the current CAP initiatives. The county has identified that no matter how positive the fiscal and the outcome data are for individual initiatives, LA DCFS is unable to fund all strategies and is exploring alternative funding sources for some of their CAP initiatives and other ways to maximize CAP funding, while creating linkage to align to their new departmental strategies and Strategic Plan objectives.

Two examples of LA DCFS securing alternative funding sources for current CAP initiatives are locating other funding sources, such as Metropolitan Transit Authority funds, to supplement the budgeted amount that was previously allocated to enhance the Youth Development Services contracts. The UFA is another current CAP initiative that will not be funded as a CAP initiative. The LA DCFS is undergoing a Promoting Safe and Stable Family/Child Abuse Prevention, Intervention and Treatment Redesign and funding for UFA will be included in this redesign.

The LA DCFS is looking at the possibility of amending its contracting process for new CAP initiatives, so that the implementation of new CAP contracts is timely. LA DCFS is exploring the use of the Request for Information process to begin the contracting process prior to the CAP extension approval so that if the CAP extension is approved, the contracts can be submitted to the BOS along with the implementation plan for approval.

The LA Probation has also begun planning for the waiver extension. The county reports that while it is difficult to plan without knowing the specific terms and conditions of the pending extension, LA Probation has developed a list of initiatives and strategies that will serve as a catalyst toward maintaining and building upon the improved outcomes achieved during the first project period for youth in out-of-home placement. During the first CAP period, LA Probation focused its resources on youth transitioning back to the community from out-of-home placement. The LA Probation plans to implement front-end interventions to enhance preventative services and reduce the number of youth requiring out-of-home placement. During the CAP extension, LA Probation also plans to better evaluate existing strategies to ensure that accurate and appropriate data is being gathered. This data will be utilized to measure the efficacy of CAP strategies and will require LA Probation to become more data-driven in its decision-making.

For the first five-year CAP period, LA Probation utilized the federal Children and Family Services Review (CFSR) outcome measures of child safety, permanency and well-being to evaluate the efficacy of the CAP strategies. The CFSR measures were created specifically for youth involved with the child welfare system. While several of these measures have been used to determine outcomes for probation youth requiring out-of-home placement, the department is seeking to make some changes to the outcome measures, which will ensure the inclusion of delinquency risk and needs components.

III. EVALUATION STATUS

The CDSS has contracted with San Jose State University Research Foundation to conduct an independent, third party evaluation for the Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration. 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 CAP evaluation consists of a process study, fiscal study, and an outcome study and uses an interrupted time-series design to assess for change over time.

This section describes activities for the period between July 1, 2012 and June 30, 2013. The evaluation activities over this period were focused on data analyses and the completion of the CAP Final Evaluation Report and its Addendum. Completion of the CAP Final Evaluation Report took place between July 1, 2012 and December 31, 2012. Completion of the Addendum to the CAP Final Evaluation Report took place between January 1, 2013 and June 30, 2013.

Activities Completed

PROCESS STUDY

Coding and analysis of data collected during the various site visits, including the previously conducted intervention sub-study site visits, were completed during this reporting period in preparation for the final report. Cross-walks of the information provided by the county departments in the annual progress reports were also performed. The evaluation team worked with department liaisons to secure information about the initiatives and investments implemented by the departments during the CAP. The collected information was also included in the process study. The findings from the process study analysis conducted for each of the departments formed Chapter Two of the CAP Final Evaluation Report.

FISCAL STUDY

Additional fiscal data were secured from the county departments as well as from the CDSS during this reporting period. The data were from the fourth fiscal year of the CAP. These data were added to the first three years of data that were in the Interim Fiscal Study Report (submitted on June 22, 2012). The analyses were performed using the four years of data and the findings formed Chapter Three of the CAP Final Evaluation Report. The process was repeated again in the spring of 2013 and the fifth year of fiscal data was secured from the county departments as well as from the CDSS. The analyses were performed again using the five years of data of the CAP. The updated findings were included in the Addendum to the CAP Final Evaluation Report.

OUTCOME STUDY

The data necessary for the outcome study portion of the CAP Final Evaluation Report were downloaded during this reporting period from Child Welfare Dynamic Report System at the University of California, Berkeley, Center for Social Services Research. Analyses of the data were conducted during this reporting period and the findings formed Chapter 4 of the CAP Final Evaluation Report. The process was repeated again in the spring of 2013 and the fifth year of outcome data were downloaded from the Child Welfare Dynamic Report System. The analyses were performed again using the five years of data of the CAP. The updated findings were included in the Addendum to the CAP Final Evaluation Report.

CAP Final Evaluation Report Addendum to the CAP Final Evaluation Report

All aspects of the Final Evaluation Report and Addendum were completed during this reporting period. The implementation of the evaluation continued during this reporting period without major issues or disruptions in data collection.

Additional Evaluation Activities

As part of the implementation of the CAP evaluation, evaluation staff participated in meetings and conference calls with CDSS and representatives from the county departments to discuss various aspects of the evaluation and CAP. Meetings were ongoing or scheduled as needed to address specific issues and have resulted in monthly contact between evaluation staff and CDSS representatives over the course of the reporting period.

Evaluation staff attended the 15th Annual Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Projects Meeting held in Washington, DC, in April 2013. Evaluation staff prepared a Webinar and in-person presentation drawn from the CAP Final Evaluation Report. The Webinar and presentation, sponsored by the CDSS, was held on April 15, 2013.

Final Findings

The CAP Final Evaluation Report was submitted to the CDSS on December 12, 2012, and then by the CDSS to the Administration for Children and Families, Children's Bureau on December 28, 2012. The Addendum to the CAP Final Evaluation Report was submitted to the CDSS on June 26, 2013.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Alameda County Documents

- A-I Alameda Waiver Dashboard Report, February 2013
- A-II Alameda Waiver Progress Report, Year 6, Quarter 2
- A-III Alameda PERU Evaluation Projects April 2013 Status Report
- A-IV Alameda PERU Evaluation Report – Child Care Program
- A-V Alameda PERU Evaluation Report – Faith Initiative
- A-VI Alameda PERU Evaluation Report – Youth Employment Program
- A-VII Alameda PERU Evaluation Report – Youth Advocate Program
- A-VIII Alameda Probation Placement Data
- A-IX Alameda DCFS and Alameda Probation Expenditure Summary
- A-X Project Listing for Alameda DCFS and Alameda Probation

Appendix B: Los Angeles County Documents

- B-I Los Angeles Probation Placement Data
- B-II Los Angeles DCFS and Los Angeles Probation Expenditure Summary
- B-III Project Listing for Los Angeles DCFS and Los Angeles Probation
- B-IV BOS Submitted County Evaluation Report Dated October 23, 2012

Appendix C: CWS/CMS Outcome Data

- C-I CWS/CMS Dynamic Report System Key Outcomes Presentation Tool for Point in Time 2007-2013 for Bridge Year Reporting Period FY 2012-13
- C-II Alameda DCFS 0-17 Data for Measures Reported in CWS/CMS Dynamic Report System Key Outcomes Presentation Tool, 2013 Q 1
- C-III Los Angeles DCFS CWS/CMS Dynamic Report System Key Outcomes Presentation Tool for Point in Time 2007-2013 for FY 2011-12
- C-IV CWS/CMS Dynamic Report System Key Outcomes Presentation Tool for Point in Time 2007-2013 for Five-Year CAP Project Period July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2012