

CALIFORNIA'S
TITLE IV-B
CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES PLAN
ANNUAL PROGRESS AND SERVICES REPORT
FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR 2007
JUNE 30, 2007



California Department of Social Services
Children and Families Services Division
744 P Street, MS 11-87
Sacramento, CA 95814

**APSR
FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR (FFY) 2007
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Executive Summary.....3

California’s Child Welfare Services System Overview.....7

PIP Outcome: Safety.....12

PIP Outcome: Permanence..... 22

PIP Outcome: Well-Being.....38

PIP Outcome: Systemic Factors.....52

Training and Staff Development Plan.....60

Evaluation and Technical Assistance.....107

Promoting Safe and Stable Families110

Title IV-E Waiver Demonstration Project.....121

Indian Child Welfare Act..... 124

Foster Care/Adoption Recruitment Plan131

Adoptions Program..... 157

Cross-Jurisdictional Plan and Probation Data.....160

Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act Report.....163

Sixth Report of the California Citizen Review Panels... ..210

Appendix A: Statewide Citizen Review Panel List.223

Chafee Foster Care Independence Program and Education and
Training Vouchers Program Report.....226

Annual Budget Request and Summary..... 241

Disaster Plan..... 245

California’s Collaboration with the Courts 248

Request for Training and Technical Assistance..... 254

Glossary 263

Executive Summary

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

While significant progress has been made to reach our goals, we realize that continued efforts to improve practice and outcomes for children and families are essential in order to meet California's vision for child welfare practice. The state's efforts to examine and improve the child welfare services (CWS) system, as well as respond to the federal review with a Program Improvement Plan (PIP), created a new urgency for developing a system that can provide a public accounting of outcomes for children and families. This report highlights progress made since the June 30, 2006 Annual Progress and Services Report (APSR) in implementing the changes needed to make this a reality. The report is the third APSR to the state's 5-year Child and Family Services (Title IV-B) Plan, approved September 17, 2004, for federal fiscal years 2005 through 2009.

June 30, 2005, marked the end of California's PIP. However, some of the activities contained in the PIP are continuing and therefore will be updated in our annual APSRs. As such, specific goals and objectives initially included as part of the state's PIP have been incorporated in the current APSR. The measurement methods for these goals and objectives are contained in California's PIP, which is available on the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) web site and located at: <http://www.dss.cahwnet.gov/cfsr/default.htm>.

While California is committed to improving outcomes for children and their families, it is clear that critical to the success of our improvement efforts will be both adequate and flexible funding and resources, but also the active participation and collaboration with other stakeholders at the state, county, community and neighborhood levels.

California will continue, through its CWS System Improvements, to make enhancements to promote the safety of children, to promote their right to a stable permanent home and enhance their well-being. California again made a significant financial commitment to child welfare services, as \$98.3 million was included in this year's budget, for state fiscal year (SFY) 2006-07, for CWS System Improvements. These funds were allocated to counties to finance activities identified in the counties' self improvement plans. An additional \$11.2 million was included to support additional administrative responsibilities associated with the planning and coordination of the periodic county self-assessments and the annual county self improvement plans. Funding was also included to assist counties in the peer quality case review process, to assist in caseloads, and in meeting additional costs associated with new data requirements. In addition to these funds, all counties were also invited to apply for an additional \$10.6 million to fund outcome and system improvements identified through peer quality case reviews, self assessments and self improvement plans.

The County Welfare Directors Association conducted a survey of the twelve largest counties to determine how the 2006-07 funds were spent. The majority of the funds were reported by these counties as being used to hire more social workers to reduce caseloads. Additional activities being funded include the implementation or expansion of differential response, prevention services for at-risk children, services to emancipated youth and youth in out-of-home care and family preservation and wraparound services. Finally, approximately \$29.1 million (\$13.1 million State General Fund) was provided for county social worker training and to hire additional adoption caseworkers.

This year's major accomplishments in the implementation of the CWS System Improvements include the continuation of the launching or expansion of Differential Response in targeted communities; the implementation of quality case planning strategies such as Team Decision Making (TDM), Permanency and Youth Transitional Protocols; and the implementation of the Standardized Safety Assessment System. Provided in this year's budget was a separate allocation to fund the implementation of the Standardized Safety Assessment System for the more than one dozen counties who had not yet implemented it. By June 30, 2007, all 58 counties will have implemented the Standardized Safety Assessment System county-wide. The System utilizes screening and assessment tools to be used throughout the life of a case. The use of these tools will contribute to fair and equitable decision-making with a consistent, statewide system to the assessment of safety, risk and protective capacity.

This year the State Interagency (Children's) Team (SIT) continued to increase the number of agencies participating and also continued work on a variety of issues that impact children and families. The SIT is chaired by the CDSS, and is comprised of representatives overseeing programs effecting children from departments within the California Health and Human Services Agency (CHHS), such as the California Department of Health Services, the California Department of Mental Health, the California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs and the California Department of Developmental Services. In addition to those agencies, the California Department of Education, the California Employment Development Department, the California First 5 Commission, the California Workforce Investment Board, the California Department of Justice, the Judicial Council/Administrative Office of the Courts, and the Foundation Consortium also participated. A recent addition to the team is a representative from the Office of the Chancellor for California Community Colleges.

The SIT priority work plan objectives for calendar years 2006-07 are to: (1) Increase statewide utilization of mental health services, including prevention and early intervention, to children of all ages; (2) Decrease racial disproportionality and disparities in outcomes across systems with a focus on CWS; (3) Ensure that needed mental health, health and educational services are provided to children placed out of county; (4) Improve access to high wage, high growth training for young adults and family members; (5) Strengthen services to children, youth and families where there is a nexus between the use of alcohol and other drugs and child safety, education and workforce readiness/success; maternal/child health and mental health; (6) Analyze and make recommendations regarding the potential for using outcomes data from systems other than CWS for accountability reporting required by the California Outcomes and Accountability System with a focus on outcomes and of indicators of child and family well being; and (7) Overcome real and perceived legal barriers to sharing "confidential" client information in order to strengthen services. Several work groups have been created to achieve some of these goals, which are described in more detail in the Safety section of this document.

Counties have implemented, or are in the process of implementing, Team Decision Making (TDM) for targeted areas or groups. Team Decision Making is one of the four core strategies of the Family to Family initiative. We now have 25 counties that are implementing Family to Family. These counties include all of the 11 pilot counties, which were part of an evaluation again this year. The 11 Pilot counties are: Contra Costa, Glenn, Humboldt, Los Angeles, Placer, Sacramento, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Stanislaus, Tehama and Trinity. In 6 of the 11 pilot counties TDMs were used at the initial placement decision making stage. In just those 6 counties, which includes Los Angeles County, the TDMs allowed more than 11,000

children to remain in their homes who would otherwise have been removed. Counties have been receiving positive feedback from parents who have participated in the TDM process. In addition to those counties who have implemented TDMs as a part of the Family to Family initiative, many others have implemented Family Group Conferencing, Family Group Decision Making and other similar models that positively increases family voice and choice in case planning and other child welfare activities.

The Blue Ribbon Commission on Children in Foster Care continued to meet this year. The Commission began meeting in 2006 to begin a study of one of the most critical issues facing the justice system – the need to quickly secure safe and permanent homes for California’s children. Appointed by Chief Justice Ronald M. George, the representative Commission, chaired by California Supreme Court Justice Carlos R. Moreno, is made up of judges (including a tribal judge), legislators, attorneys, representatives from CDSS, county social services and probation representatives, former foster youth, community leaders and others. They are exploring the causes and consequences of court-based delays and are in the process of making some recommendations on how to improve the ability of courts to move children quickly out of foster care and into permanency. An update of their activities this year is contained in the Permanency section.

The Interim Director of the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) joined leaders of the Karuk Tribe of California in the tribe’s ancestral territory town of Happy Camp on March 14, 2007, to announce the signing of an agreement which will provide funding to the tribe for eligible child welfare services involving Karuk children and families under the jurisdiction of the Children’s Division of the Karuk Tribal Court.

This agreement, the first of its kind in California, will allow the Karuk Tribe to independently provide funding for services including foster care, independent living and adoption assistance payments. These services traditionally are provided by individual counties with the use of federal Title IV-E funding.

Governor Schwarzenegger’s proposed budget supports the agreement with the Karuk through provisions which would allocate state funding to the tribe to finance child welfare services. The state funding will ensure that child welfare services allocations in counties affected by the agreement will not change in the coming fiscal year.

The Karuk Tribe established its court in November 2003 and has since focused primarily on hearing child welfare cases involving tribal families. Arch Super, Chairman of the Karuk Tribe of California, noted that it is a major accomplishment to finally be able to access the same funding that counties receive in order to support the Karuk Tribe’s child welfare program and foster families.

The Karuk Tribe, the second largest Indian tribe in the state by population, is located in Northwestern California. Traditional lands lie just south of the Oregon border and extend generally west from Interstate 5. Currently, tribal lands encompass approximately 1,100 acres in both Siskiyou and Humboldt counties.

California's Child Welfare Services System: Overview

California's Child Welfare Services System: Overview

California's state-supervised child welfare system is administered at the local level by 58 counties, each governed by a county board of supervisors. While there are challenges inherent in the complexity of this type of system, its central strength lies in the flexibility afforded each county to determine how best to meet the needs of its own children and families. As the most populous state in the country, California's rich culture and ethnic diversity includes 224 languages and 109 federally recognized Indian tribes (and an estimated 40-50 non-federally recognized tribes). The state's counties differ widely by population; economic base; mix of urban, rural and suburban settings; and topographies that span desert, forest, mountain, coastal and inland valley formations. Within a single statutory and regulatory framework, these counties are charged with providing the full array of services necessary to meet the needs of at-risk children and families.

The California Department of Social Services (CDSS), via its Children and Family Services Division (CFSD), is the agency authorized by statute to promulgate regulations, policies and procedures necessary to implement the state's child welfare services (CWS) system and to ensure safety, permanency and well-being for California's children. The CDSS is responsible for the supervision and coordination of programs in California funded under federal Titles IV-B, IV-E, and XX of the Social Security Act. Furthermore, the CDSS is responsible for developing the state's Child and Family Services Plan. These efforts are all achieved within a framework of collaboration with child welfare stakeholders. Due to its complexity and this high degree of collaboration, California's child welfare system is ever-changing as it seeks to improve its ability to meet the needs of the state's children and families.

The Children and Family Services Division (CFSD) of the CDSS plays a vital role in the development of policies and programs that implement the goals of CDSS' mission. Oversight of the state's CWS system is the responsibility of the CFSD. In developing policies and programs, the Division collaborates with other state and local agencies, tribal representatives, foster/kinship caregivers, foster youth, foster care service providers, community-based organizations, the Judicial Council, researchers, child advocates, the Legislature and private foundations to maximize families' opportunities for success.

Child Welfare Services (CWS) System

The CWS system is the primary intervention resource for child abuse and neglect in California. Existing law provides for child welfare services which are directed toward the accomplishment of the following purposes: protecting and promoting the welfare of all children, including handicapped, homeless and dependent children; preventing, remedying or assisting in the resolution of problems that contribute to the exploitation or delinquency of children; preventing the unnecessary separation of children from their families where the removal of the child(ren) can be prevented by identifying family needs; assisting families in resolving those issues that lead to child abuse and neglect; reunifying families whose children have been removed, whenever possible by providing necessary services to the children and their families; maintaining family connections, when removal cannot be prevented by identifying children for whom tribal placement and relative placement are preferred and most appropriate and, finally, assuring permanence for dependent children, who cannot be

returned home, by promoting the timely adoption, guardianship or alternative permanent placement for these children.

Oversight of California's CWS system is provided by the various branches of the CDSS Division:

- The Child Protection and Family Support Branch (CPFSB) has primary responsibility for the emergency response; pre-placement and in-home services policy components, including child abuse prevention and the Title IV-E Waiver Demonstration projects. The CPFS Branch is also responsible for statewide training and staff development activities of public child welfare service workers. The CPFSB includes oversight of statewide child abuse prevention and family support services. This component of the service delivery system is administered by the Office of Child Abuse Prevention (OCAP) within the CPFSB, and consists of a wide range of community-based services, including child abuse prevention, intervention and treatment services that promote the safety and well-being of children and families. These services are designed to increase family strengths and capacity to provide children with a stable and supportive family environment, and to also enhance child development. OCAP serves as a statewide center for public and private child abuse prevention, intervention and treatment programs and also administers programs funded under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA), Community Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP), Child Abuse Prevention, Intervention & Treatment (CAPIT) and the Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF) Act.
- The Children Services Operations and Evaluation Branch is responsible for maintaining the integrity of child and family services by monitoring the uniform implementation of laws and regulations governing the provision of child welfare services by the 58 California counties. In addition, this branch has primary responsibility for the implementation of the CWS System Improvements; the C-CFSR; operating State Adoption District Offices and reviewing, maintaining, managing and ensuring the confidentiality of all California adoption records and providing post-adoption services.
- The Child and Youth Permanency (CYP) Branch supervises the delivery of services to children removed from their homes and placed into foster, kinship, adoptive or guardian families. The CYP Branch responsibilities include program management through regulation development and policy directives related to out-of-home care and permanency for dependent children; Independent Living Program; the implementation of the Family to Family Program; and foster parent training and recruitment.
- The Case Management System (CMS) Support Branch is responsible for providing support and oversight of the Child Welfare Services/Case Management System (CWS/CMS). The CWS/CMS is a personal computer (PC)-based Windows™ application that supports the case management business needs of all of California's child welfare social workers. As the CDSS' primary point of contact for CWS/CMS, the CMS Support Branch is responsible for facilitating the development of CWS programmatic changes and improvements to the system, pursuant to state and federal policy and regulation. The CMS Support Branch also works closely with the counties

to assure programmatic consistency, clarity and to respond to collective county questions regarding system policy.

- The Foster Care Audits and Rates Branch is responsible for ensuring that children placed into foster care in group homes and by foster family agencies are receiving the services for which providers are being paid; that provider payment levels are established appropriately; that overpayments are minimized and that federal, state and county payment and funding systems are appropriately administered.

The following major components comprise the CWS system:

Prevention: service delivery and family engagement processes designed to mitigate the circumstances leading to child maltreatment before it occurs.

Emergency Response: a response system designed to provide in-person 24-hours-a-day response to reports of abuse, neglect or exploitation for the purpose of investigation; to determine the necessity for providing initial intake services and crisis intervention to maintain the child safely in his/her own home or to protect the safety of the child through emergency removal and foster care placement.

Family Maintenance: time-limited services that are designed to provide in-home protective services to prevent or remedy neglect, abuse or exploitation for the purpose of preventing the separation of children from their families.

Family Preservation: intensive services for families whose children, without such services, would be subject to risk of out-of-home placement; would remain in existing out-of-home placements for longer periods of time or would be placed in a more restrictive out-of-home placement.

Family Reunification: time-limited services to children in out-of-home care to prevent or remedy neglect, abuse or exploitation when the child cannot remain safely at home and needs temporary foster care while services are provided to reunite the family.

Foster Care: services designed to serve and protect those children who cannot remain in their homes. Current placement options include family homes (relative or foster family homes), certified homes of foster family agencies and group homes. Foster care maintenance also includes payments to cover the cost of providing food, clothing, shelter, daily supervision, school supplies, a child's personal incidentals and reasonable travel, including travel to the child's home for visitation.

Permanent Placement: alternative family structures for children who, because of abuse, neglect or exploitation cannot remain safely at home and/or who are unlikely ever to return home. These services are provided when there has been a judicial determination of a permanent plan for adoption, legal guardianship (including the Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment [KinGAP] Program), an independent living arrangement for adolescent children or other alternative permanent placement.

When adoption is the permanent plan for a child, the potential adoptive family is home studied, approved and the child is placed with the family. Services include recruitment of potential adoptive parents; financial assistance to adoptive parents to aid in the support of special needs children; direct relinquishment and independent adoption.

Independent Living: education and services for foster youth based on an assessment of needs and designed to help youth transition successfully from foster care to living independently. Services are provided to enhance necessary basic living skills, as well as career development skills.

**PIP Outcome:
Safety**

Safety

Safety for children is an important part of the state's vision for children and families and a measurable outcome of the state's child welfare services (CWS) system. California strives to ensure that children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect and that they are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.

Child Safety Outcomes

Over the last two decades, California has experienced high numbers of child abuse reports that have grown increasingly complex and challenging to the CWS system's capacity to effectively respond. The complexity of the issues facing child welfare families reaches beyond the CWS system's ability to handle alone and requires participation by other partners who have responsibility in these same areas. Thus the emphasis of the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) herein is on system reform and collaborative action.

For the purposes of this Annual Progress Service Report (APSR), the program improvement goals from the prior year report have been identified as objectives and cover the period from July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007.

OBJECTIVE 1: The State's objective is to reach the target of 8.9% in the rate of repeat maltreatment of children. (Safety Outcome 1, Item 2A.)

California met the improvement goal of 8.9% as reported in the previous APSR of Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2005. The CDSS remains committed to further improvements in this objective and continues to measure progress in this area. As of the September 2006 quarter, this measure is 7.6 %, which continues to decrease.

Some of the 11 counties piloting the Child Welfare System Improvements were able to provide some data about the implementation of Differential Response and the impact on repeat maltreatment. Although Differential Response has been implemented only in certain areas or for certain populations, counties have already been able to see positive results. For example, many counties found that a number of the families served through Differential Response had never before received community or county services. As a result of the implementation of Differential Response in the 11 counties, more than 8,800 families have received services that would not have been offered were it not for the pilots.

In the 11 Pilot Counties, the rate of recurrence of maltreatment within 3 and 6 months decreased by 1.6 percentage points, and within 12 months the rate decreased by 1.9 percentage points. In one county, a program called The Incredible Years offers training in parenting skills. Among children whose parents have completed the program, the rate of recurrence of maltreatment is 5.7%, which is 2-6 percentage points lower than the rate for parents from other areas who didn't participate in the program.

OBJECTIVE 2: The State's objective is to decrease two percentage points in the rate of recurrence of abuse or neglect in cases where children are not removed from the home. (Safety Outcome 2, Items 3 & 4.)

This benchmark has been met. The CDSS and Region IX agreed to a revised target for this measure. The state data review team completed an extensive review of the methodology and data sources that comprise the performance measure. Based on corrections made to this measure, we recalculated the performance measure back to the beginning of the PIP, which resulted in a dramatic change to the performance indicator. The new baseline data was 12.4% for calendar year 2002, and the original 2 percentage point level of improvement originally agreed upon was used to recompute the PIP target. As confirmed in the January 29, 2007, letter from Region IX, the state has passed this measure. We believe the implementation of the Standardized Safety Assessment System and Differential Response among other improvements have helped to impact this outcome.

OBJECTIVE 3: The State's objective is to reach the target of 0.53% in the data indicator for child abuse or neglect in foster care based on the existing data indicator. (Safety Outcome 1, Item 2B.)

This benchmark has been met. CDSS and Region IX agreed to a revised target of .57% for this measure, which is the national standard.

The CDSS identified an error in the way this measure was being computed. Similar to the correction for the Recurrence of Maltreatment measure that Region IX approved in 2005, CDSS determined that some factors were also inappropriately included in the computations for this measure. As part of this correction, CDSS applied the same methodology back to the 2000 base year in order to consistently track improvement over the course of the PIP. Region IX approved the revised method/baseline data.

The CDSS analyzed this recomputed performance data going back to the baseline and the change lowered the rate of abuse in out-of-home care. Of particular importance, however, is that California met the target as of the December 2004 quarter. According to the recomputed data and Region IX staff's verbal instructions, California's new baseline as of September 2003 is .58%. For the December 2004 quarter, the recomputed rate was .56%. Therefore, the state has passed this measure. Final approval from Region IX was received on March 20, 2006.

This particular measure is no longer being produced by University of California at Berkeley, as changes to the CWS/CMS system now allow the state to properly capture the data. For the last federal fiscal year, October 2005 through September 2006, the rate of abuse or neglect in foster care for the state was .19%.

The development of a tool to assess the needs of substitute care providers, which will aid counties in assessing what services and supports a resource family might need in order to meet the needs of a specific child, has been completed. A field test was begun in August 2006, and has been completed. It resulted in some modification of the tools, which were developed by the Children's Research Center in conjunction with CDSS and the counties. The counties who participated in the field test are pleased with the tools, and the statewide implementation of the tools is under discussion.

In addition, the Children's Research Center, in conjunction with counties, developed a substitute care provider safety assessment in 2006. The safety assessment tool is to be used to assess safety when there is an allegation of abuse by a substitute care provider. This tool is available to all counties who have implemented Structured Decision Making. Further, for counties that have implemented the Comprehensive Assessment Tool (CAT), the Placement Assessment Tool is designed to record information about the substitute care provider's ability and willingness to provide the child in their care with support to assist in meeting the child's permanency needs. This tool assists in making better decisions in regards to placements.

Benchmarks:

By June 30, 2006, CDSS will, based on the experience of the 11 counties, make recommendations to the Administration and Legislature via the State budget process regarding phasing in additional counties to begin implementation of the Standardized Safety Assessment System.

This benchmark has been met. The CDSS recommended to both the Administration and the Legislature that additional counties begin implementation of the Standardized Safety Assessment System.

By June 30, 2006, CDSS will report, in the Annual Progress and Services Report (APSR), its findings and plans for the appropriate next steps regarding the phasing in of additional counties to begin implementation of the Standardized Safety Assessment System or the elimination of this strategy to achieve the objectives for this goal.

This benchmark has been met. As of last fiscal year there were only a few counties that were not using one of the two state-approved models to record assessment information (SDM and CAT). The CDSS requested funding from the Legislature to be able to expand these tools to the remaining counties in SFY 2006-07. Funding was included in the Governor's budget for SFY 2006-07 for the continued implementation of the Standardized Safety Assessment System so that all counties could implement the System by June 30, 2007. All 58 counties will have implemented the Standardized Safety Assessment System countywide by June 30, 2007.

By June 30, 2006, CDSS will, based on the experience of the total participating counties, and the approval of the Administration and Legislature via the State budget process, begin phasing in 15 additional counties to begin implementation of the Standardized Safety Assessment System.

This benchmark has been met. See above.

By June 30, 2007, CDSS will, based on the experience of the total participating counties, and the approval of the administration and legislature via the State budget process, begin phasing in 16 additional counties to begin implementation of the Standardized Safety Assessment System.

This benchmark has been met. See above.

By June 30, 2008, CDSS will, based on the experience of the total participating counties, and the approval of the administration and legislature via the State budget process, begin phasing in 16 additional counties to begin implementation of the Standardized Safety Assessment System.

This benchmark has been met. See above.

By June 30, 2009, barring any unforeseen barriers to full implementation, the new Standardized Safety Assessment System will be utilized in all counties in California.

This benchmark has been met. See above.

By June 30, 2005, a minimum of 11 counties will have implemented and begun validation of a consistent approach to the assessment of safety, risk, protective capacity and family strengths.

This benchmark has been met. The 11 pilot counties implemented the Safety Assessment System on June 30, 2005. The pilot counties are Contra Costa, Glenn, Humboldt, Los Angeles, Placer, Sacramento, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Stanislaus, Tehama, and Trinity. Two models are being utilized to record the assessment information. Seven of the pilot counties worked with the Children's Research Center to modify the existing Structured Decision Making (SDM) tools to ensure that all elements were captured. These revised tools were rolled out to all counties using SDM in March 2006. The remaining four pilot counties worked with the Sphere Institute and developed the Comprehensive Assessment Tools (CAT), which were implemented June 30, 2005. Both sets of tools include the response paths for Differential Response.

The CDSS, in collaboration with the County Welfare Directors Association (CWDA), determined that the most cost-effective approach to evaluation of the CWS system improvements would be to establish a single evaluation process for the entire pilot. A preliminary evaluation and report was issued in June 2006. A full evaluation will be completed by Fall 2007.

By June 30, 2005, the CDSS will have established a uniform screening system that utilizes the safety, risk and family protective capacity assessment process, and establishes criteria for each Differential Response path.

This benchmark has been met. Counties in the 11 county pilot implemented the new Safety Assessment System on June 30, 2005. Child safety is being addressed throughout the time that a child is involved with the child welfare system. The Child and Family Policy Institute of California conducted a survey to collect preliminary information from the 11 pilot counties about their experiences of developing, planning, testing and implementing the new Safety Assessment System as part of the 11 county pilot evaluation. The counties reported that "the new Safety Assessment System allowed them to make better and more consistent decisions regarding the safety of children. It also allowed ready and easy access to the information on each case that was necessary for making decisions about the effective delivery of services to children and families. In addition, they reported the new process has had a positive impact resulting in improving relationships with community partners and families."

By June 30, 2005, each of the 11 counties will have developed the community resource capacity to respond to service referrals in targeted communities.

This benchmark has been met. The 11 counties developed community resource capacity to be able to implement Differential Response in targeted areas. The CDSS, in collaboration with CWDA, is continuing to work to support network expansion and resource development statewide, particularly in rural areas. Counties have noted that many families need substance abuse, mental health, financial, educational and vocational services. It is important that all the county systems that serve these families work together to provide the services needed. Counties also observed that the state needs to continue to work to secure additional funding for more prevention and pre-placement services in order to sustain Differential Response services and activities, including those provided by community based organizations.

By June 30, 2005, a minimum of 11 counties will have begun the implementation and validation of the Differential Response Intake Structure in specific, targeted communities.

This benchmark has been met. The 11 pilot counties met their June 30, 2005, target date for implementation of Differential Response in targeted communities and/or identified populations. In the 11 pilot counties, child welfare is engaging families, community members and other organizations. The public perception of child welfare is changing from that of an organization that comes to take children from their parents to one that helps ensure the safety of children and the well-being of families. Counties report that families, teachers, etc. support this preventive, strength-based approach. One county conducts a service satisfaction survey with parents on a regular basis, and positive ratings have increased by 25%.

The counties reported that the new Differential Response system allowed them to engage families in a meaningful way and families were more responsive to their interventions. Relationships with community partners were developed in the implementation of this new system and, as a result, resources for families have been maximized. Two pilot counties report that they have fully integrated services from public health, mental health, education, probation, community partners and tribes; staff work side-by-side and meet regularly to coordinate services.

Families who participate in Differential Response often engage voluntarily in services that help improve their situation prior to child welfare involvement. One county reports that preliminary findings indicate that 8-12% of families would be re-referred and formally enter the child welfare system if Differential Response was not available, but only 1% of the families referred for Differential Response services have subsequently entered the system.

By January 30, 2006, CDSS will, based on the experience of the 11 counties, have determined and evaluated the factors (cost, statutory and/or regulatory changes, practice changes, resources: staffing/funding/community support, etc.) necessary to implement the Differential Response Intake Structure in additional counties.

This benchmark has been met. The CDSS recommended to the Administration and Legislature that additional counties begin implementation of the Differential Response Intake Structure.

By June 30, 2006, CDSS will, based on the evaluation of implementation experience of the 11 counties, make recommendations to the administration and legislature via the State budget process, regarding phasing in additional counties to begin implementation of the Differential Response Intake Structure.

This benchmark has been met. The CDSS recommended to the Administration and Legislature that additional counties begin implementation of the Differential Response Intake Structure.

By June 30, 2006, CDSS will report, in the Annual Progress and Services Report, its findings and plans for the appropriate next steps regarding the phasing in of additional counties to begin implementation of the Differential Response Intake Structure or the elimination of this strategy to achieve the objectives for this goal.

This benchmark has been met. In addition to the 11 pilot counties who implemented Differential Response by June 30, 2005, 16 counties in SFY 2005-06 requested and received funding through CWS Outcome Improvement funds to implement or expand existing Differential Response programs.

By June 30, 2006, if implementation is identified as appropriate and doable, and budgeted in the State Budget, CDSS will begin phasing in an additional 15 counties to implement the Differential Response Intake Structure.

This benchmark has been met. See above.

By June 30, 2007, if implementation is identified as appropriate and doable, and budgeted in the State Budget, CDSS will begin phasing in an additional 16 counties to implement the Differential Response Intake Structure.

This benchmark has been met. The CDSS requested funding from the Legislature to be able to expand the Differential Response Intake Structure to additional counties in SFY 2006-07. Funding was included in the Governor's budget for SFY 2006-07 for the continued implementation of the Differential Response Intake Structure to additional sites. In SFY 2006-07, 3 additional counties requested to implement Differential Response programs using CWS Outcome Improvement funds. Another 12 requested and received funding through CWS Outcome Improvement funds to expand existing Differential Response programs. Other counties have implemented Differential Response using other funding sources (such as PSSF and grants) but future expansion will depend on available funding.

By June 30, 2008, if implementation is identified as appropriate and doable, CDSS will begin phasing in an additional 16 counties to implement the Differential Response Intake Structure.

By June 30, 2009, barring any unforeseen barriers to implementation; and if budgeted in the State Budget, CDSS will have implemented the Differential Response Intake Structure in all 58 counties

Other Efforts

The State Interagency Team (SIT)

The State Interagency Team (SIT) is chaired by the CDSS CFSD Deputy Director, and is comprised of representatives overseeing programs effecting children from departments within the California Health and Human Services Agency (CHHS), such as the California Department of Health Services, the California Department of Mental Health, the California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs and the California Department of Developmental Services. In addition to those agencies, the California Department of Education, the California Employment Development Department, the California First 5 Commission, the California Workforce Investment Board, the California Department of Justice, the Judicial Council/Administrative Office of the Courts, and the Foundation Consortium also participated.

The purpose of the SIT is to provide leadership and guidance to facilitate implementation of improved systems that benefit the common population of children, youth and families served by SIT agencies. The SIT promotes shared responsibility and accountability for the welfare of children, youth and families by promoting the alignment of planning, funding and policy across state departments and philanthropy. The seven SIT priority work plan objectives for calendar years 2006-07 are described in the Executive Summary.

The SIT has created work groups to achieve several of its 2006-07 objectives, which include the following:

The Alcohol and Other Drug (AOD) Workgroup is comprised of representatives from the Departments of Alcohol and Drug Programs, Health Services, Mental Health, CDSS, Education, Developmental Services, Judicial Council and California's First 5 Commission. In 2006, the Work Group results included improving the collection of data on substance abuse by families in the child welfare, health and education systems; and assisting counties in estimating substance abuse treatment needs for child welfare families. They also developed a county survey of AOD screening protocols and tools to determine promising practices and recommendations for improving screening and referral. This survey is underway and recommendations are due to the SIT in June 2007.

The Work Group to Eliminate Disparities is comprised of representatives from the Departments of Alcohol and Drug Program, Health Services, Mental Health, CDSS, Education, Developmental Services, Judicial Council and the Annie E. Casey Foundation. Their focus for 2007 is addressing racial disproportionality in CWS through their participation as the state level team in the California Disproportionality Project, which is co-sponsored by the CDSS, the Annie E. Casey Foundation and Casey Family Programs through the California Co-Investment Partnership. The goal is to launch this initiative in Summer 2007,

which, in addition to the state level team, will include approximately up to 14 county CWS agencies and involve their community and interagency partners. As the state level team, the Work Group will develop recommendations to the SIT for policy, practice and cross system changes to reduce the disproportionate representation of children of color in the CWS, as well as to improve outcomes for children and families of color across the state of California.

The Core Indicator Workgroup has been charged with developing a state enriched core set of indicators of child and family well-being for the California Outcomes and Accountability System. This includes recommendations for the potential use of outcome data from systems other than child welfare, such as health, education, substance abuse treatment, etc. The CDSS is leading the workgroup, and the Departments of Health Services, Mental Health, Education, Developmental Services, and Alcohol and Drug Programs and the Judicial Council are participating.

Cross agency indicators will encourage shared accountability for improved outcomes for shared populations. Since various data systems have not been designed to produce outcomes data or to transfer data easily across systems this is a long-term effort, which presents both opportunities and challenges. In 2006 the CDSS, through their contract with the University of California, Davis, completed an analysis of relevant SIT member agencies' key outcomes, indicator and data systems. With the assistance of appropriate staff from those agencies, the potential for using the data for the Outcomes and Accountability System was discussed, and recommendations were identified, developed and prioritized recommendations to the SIT and will be pursued during 2007.

Consolidated Home Study

In July 2003, as part of California's PIP, the CDSS convened a workgroup to develop a proposal for a consolidated home study. This consolidated home study would replace the existing separate processes and requirements for foster care licensing, relative and non-related extended family members' approval and adoption home studies all into a single process, using a single standard for approval. The workgroup included representatives from the CWDA, various counties and CDSS Divisions including Legal Affairs, Community Care Licensing and Children and Family Services.

In May 2004, the workgroup presented a detailed framework for a proposed consolidated home study to CWDA and CDSS. After consideration, both organizations agreed to further develop the proposal and to address some of the more difficult aspects: costs, staffing qualifications, conflict of interest, treatment of existing licensees, due process, etc. The joint CWDA/CDSS workgroup convened in May 2005 to discuss proceeding with a legislative proposal for authority to pilot a consolidated home study process.

In June 2005, CDSS renegotiated this PIP Action Step timetable and desired results with federal representatives and agreed to continue working with CWDA to forward a legislative proposal to implement a consolidated home study pilot. CDSS also reviewed existing county efforts to integrate the existing separate licensing/approval processes and requirements.

In 2006, AB 2161 was introduced in the Legislature. This bill requires CDSS, in consultation with stakeholders and other interested parties, to develop and implement a pilot program in up to five counties to establish a resource family approval process that would replace the

existing separate and duplicative processes for licensing foster family homes, approving relatives and non-related extended family members, and approving adoptive families. The bill passed through the policy committees with a long list of supporters and no opposition. The bill died in the Appropriations Committee. In 2007, AB 340 has been introduced. It contains language consistent with the previous bill.

During much of 2006, the joint CDSS/CWDA workgroup met monthly to develop in greater detail the requirements of the proposed pilot program.

Public Education and Awareness Campaign to Prevent Child Abuse

“It Only Takes a Minute” is a public education and awareness campaign that was designed to protect California’s children while ensuring their health and safety. This campaign will play an integral part in raising the public’s awareness on:

- How to reduce unintentional injuries to children
- Reducing intentional harm inflicted upon children
- Decreasing the number of children who experience emotional trauma

The statewide effort is based upon research commissioned by Prevent Child Abuse America through the Frame Works Institute. Partners in this project include Prevent Child Abuse California (PCA-CA), County Welfare Directors Association, and the California Family Resource Association. The project will be launched statewide over a period of three years. CDSS’ contract with PCA-CA during year one of the project will support the development, printing, and distribution of materials. Materials developed for the campaign include bookmarks, magnets, buttons, pledge cards, posters, banners wristbands and lapel pins. Twenty-four counties have placed orders for the materials for a total of 624,761 items.

This statewide effort is directed at parents, community members and professionals, and will be conducted in various community settings throughout California. The initial plan is to establish a relationship with major retail stores to disseminate materials and “It Only Takes a Minute” information.

Bookmarks, magnets, buttons and posters were developed and used for April 2007, which was Child Abuse Prevention Month. Established networks of prevention field contacts will be used to build peer-to-peer communication and outreach for the campaign. This project will conduct regional education site visits to promote the use of campaign materials, public service announcements, radio/TV/print ads, and an interactive website including a “train the trainers” opportunity.

**PIP Outcome:
Permanence**

Permanence

Permanence for children is one of California's primary goals; specifically, permanence in a home in which the child is safe and can grow into a healthy stable adult. The state of California and the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) are committed to ensuring that children have permanence and stability in their living situations, continuity of family relationships and on-going connections to family, friends, community and racial heritage. Further, the CDSS is dedicated to ensuring that, for children who cannot remain safely in their homes, reunification, adoption, guardianship, alternative permanent placement or transition from foster care to independent living occurs in a timely manner.

Objective 1: By June 30, 2005, the State's objective is to reach the Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) target of decreasing the rate of children re-entering foster care within 12 months of reunification to 9.4%. (PIP Permanency Outcome 1, Item 5.)

By June 30, 2009, the State will achieve a minimum statewide improvement over June 2004 data of 3.43 percentage points or better, in the rate of children re-entering foster care within 12 months of reunification.

Re-entry into Foster Care within 12 months of a previous placement episode is an area that has shown little movement over the course of the PIP despite practice and resource improvements. The state data review team analyzed this area and determined that several factors have contributed to the lack of improvement in this performance measure. The team has determined that the Child Welfare Services/Case Management System is reporting cases where the child exited and re-entered the system within 24 hours, which we have determined to be system input errors, such as the closing of a case from Dependency and the reopening as a Probation case on the same day. This has resulted in an overstatement of 10.82% in the state Foster Care re-entry rate which, when corrected, we believe results in the state surpassing the PIP target of 9.4 percent.

We have had several discussions with our Regional Office about making the appropriate adjustments to the methodology for this measure. In order to officially recognize improvement for purposes of the PIP, the re-entry rate must be reported from the Federal Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS). Therefore, the State has requested approval from our Regional Office for this methodology and to change our November AFCARS submission to accurately report California's data. We have received questions from both our Regional Office and the Central Office about the last file submitted, and are in the process of correcting and resubmitting the file.

Objective 2: By June 30, 2005, the State's objective is to reach the PIP target to increase the percentage of children who have two or fewer foster care placements in the first year of their latest removal by 3.8 percentage points. (PIP Permanency Outcome 1, Item 6.) By June 30, 2009, the State will achieve a minimum statewide improvement over June 2004 data of 3.73 percentage points or better, in the percentage of children who have two or fewer foster care placements in the first year of their latest removal.

The state has performed extensive analysis of this data element which eventually resulted in more accurate data; however, it also resulted in a federal recalculation of the base. Based on this recalculation, the new target is 86.7%, which is also the current national standard. The same issues identified as problems in reporting the state re-entry rate needed to be corrected for the stability performance indicator. Given the inter-relationship between the two measures, the state asserts that we have successfully reduced the rate of children re-entering the foster care system, but we await confirmation from our Regional Office.

In order to officially recognize this improvement for purposes of the PIP, this must be verified by the corrected November AFCARS report. Therefore, the state has requested approval from our Regional Office for this methodology and to change our November AFCARS submission to accurately report California's data. We have received questions from both our Regional Office and the Central Office about the last file submitted, and are in the process of correcting and resubmitting the file.

Objective 3: The State's objective is to reach the PIP target to improve the timely establishment of appropriate permanency goals from 70.4%. (PIP Permanency Outcome 1, Item 7.)

California met the improvement goal of 70.4% as reported in the APSR of FFY 2005. The most recent data for the quarter ending September 2006 indicates that we are at 78.7%, which demonstrates steady improvement in the measure. The CDSS remains committed to further improvements in this objective and will continue to measure progress in this area.

Objective 4: By June 30, 2009, the State's objective is to achieve a minimum statewide improvement over June 2004 data of 2.88 percentage points or better, in the proportion of children who exited to reunification and did so within 12 months of the latest removal. (PIP Permanency Outcome 1, Item 8.)

California met the PIP objective in this area on December 2003. The most recent data for the quarter ending September 2006 indicates that we are currently at 68.9%, which indicates steady improvement in the measure.

Objective 5: By June 30, 2009, the State has set an overall objective of a minimum statewide improvement over June 2004 data of 1.34 percentage points or better, in proportion of children who exited to adoption and did so within 24 months. (PIP Permanency Outcome 1, Item 9.)

California met the PIP objective in this area on December 2003. The most recent data for the quarter ending September 2006 indicates that we are at 30.3%, which indicates steady improvement in the measure.

Objective 6: By June 30, 2005, the State's objective is to reach the PIP target to reduce the proportion of children with a goal of long-term foster care at two years after entry to 31.3%. (PIP Permanency Outcome 1, Item 10.)

California met the improvement goal of 31.3% as reported in the APSR of FFY 2005. The most recent data for the quarter ending September 2006 indicates that we are at 29.3%, which indicates continued improvement in this measure.

Objective 7: By June 30, 2005, the State's objective is to reach the PIP target to increase from the baseline survey by three percentage points, the percentage of children whose primary connections are preserved. (PIP Permanency Outcome 2, Item 14.)

California has met the improvement goal for this systemic factor. The CDSS used a statewide statistically valid survey that established a baseline performance level for Permanency Outcome 1, Item 14. Progress is assessed using subsequent surveys to compare to the baseline performance.

Objective 8: By June 30, 2005, the State's objective is to reach the PIP target that Family to Family (see glossary) will be available in those counties whose caseload combined represents 60% of the CWS caseload statewide. (PIP Systemic Factor 2, Item 25.)

Family to Family is a national initiative that is supported by the Annie E. Casey Foundation, the Stuart Foundation and the Walter S. Johnson Foundation. The state of California is in partnership with these foundations to improve California's Child Welfare System and to meet federal outcomes. Counties are implementing changes to their child welfare systems to make improvements primarily using state and county dollars. There are currently 25 counties participating in the Family to Family initiative, with Santa Cruz the most recent county beginning in 2007. California, in partnership with philanthropies, continues to provide training and technical assistance to Family to Family counties with the long term goal of having all of California's counties participate in the Family to Family initiative.

California met the improvement goal for this systemic factor. The CDSS remains committed to further improvements in this area and will continue to measure progress.

Objective 9: By June 30, 2005, the State's objective is to reach the PIP target to decrease the proportion of children in care for 17 of the most recent 22 months without a Termination of Parental Rights (TPR), by 2%. (PIP Systemic Factor 2, Item 28.)

California met the improvement goal for this systemic factor. The target for Item 28 was 87.5%. As of the 4th quarter of 2005 and the 1st quarter of 2006, the trend for this measure was a continuation of the decrease, with the 1st quarter of 2006 at 84.9%. However, for the 2nd and 3rd quarters of 2006 the measure increased (to 90.3 for the 3rd quarter of 2006.) We are concerned about this more recent trend and will analyze the data as well as continue to monitor the measure.

Benchmarks

By June 30, 2005, the CDSS will have developed and implemented quality case planning and service delivery protocols that include team-based approaches to promote family engagement, such as team decision-making, family conferencing, etc., for targeted cases in each of the 11 pilot counties.

By June 30, 2005, the CDSS, in partnership with the 11 pilot counties, will have developed and implemented protocols to include children and youth in case and transition planning.

These benchmarks have been met. The 11 pilot counties are integrating the individualized, inclusive, team-based case planning process for supporting family restoration and transitional youth planning. Counties have developed county implementation plans for each strategy, trained staff in family engagement, and engaged community partners, families and youth in planning and implementation.

Counties have implemented Team Decision Making (TDM) for targeted areas or groups, as all of the 11 pilot counties are also counties that are implementing Family to Family. To highlight TDM activity in California, as of December 2006, 24 of 25 counties have rolled out TDMs. This is an incredible accomplishment given three years earlier, in 2003, only four counties had rolled out TDMs. As of June 2006, 26,338 total reported recommendations were made in TDM meetings. The majority of TDM recommendations were conducted for reasons for imminent risk of placement, the next largest group was for emergency placement and placement move.

As the number of California counties rolling out TDM increased in 2006, there has been an increased demand for trained TDM Facilitators. In collaboration with UC Davis, there were six 5-day TDM Facilitator Trainings offered in 2006. In order to assist and prepare counties, important site assessment work needs to be accomplished before, during, and after TDM launch.

For most counties, this required site visits, strategic planning meetings, developing TDM workgroups and review of county SIP reports and TDM protocols. The lead Technical Assistant at the Annie E. Casey Foundation for the TDM Facilitators in California, observed and provided feedback for TDM facilitators in Alameda, Fresno, Humboldt, Los Angeles, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Francisco, San Luis Obispo, and Riverside Counties in 2006. Additionally, the lead Technical Assistant coordinated and planned the TDM convening in November 2006 for all 25 California Family to Family counties (200 in attendance). A planning committee met via telephone conferences, gathered input from all 25 counties via email survey, and developed an agenda tailored to the requested needs of the counties. The convening included half-day skill enhancement training for TDM Facilitators and their supervisors, attended by 100 people.

While TDMs were used at the initial placement decision-making stage in 6 of the 11 pilot counties, these TDMs allowed more than 11,000 children to remain in their homes who would otherwise have been removed. This is especially significant in that TDMs have been used in target areas and/or for target populations. One parent commented: "This is the second time we've been through family reunification. It's so different. The first time, we didn't have choices

or help. This time, with the TDM we know what resources are available and that we're not alone."

In addition, many counties have implemented parent partner programs. In the parent partner program, successfully reunified parents mentor families newly involved in the child welfare system. They help the parents navigate the system, learn how to advocate for themselves and help them work on their case plan. In one county, preliminary analysis shows that for the initial cases in which there are parent partners involved, 14.7% of the youth have reunified within 3 months of being removed, compared to 9.6% for a matched historical sample. None of the reunified youth who had parent partner involvement have returned to foster care.

By June 30, 2006, CDSS will, based on the experience of the total participating counties, begin phasing in an additional 15 counties to implement the quality case planning and service delivery protocols.

This benchmark has been met. The CDSS requested funding from the Legislature to be able to expand the quality case planning and service delivery protocols to additional counties in SFY 2006-07. Funding was included in the Governor's budget for SFY 2006-07 for continued implementation of the protocols to additional sites. In addition to the 11 pilot counties who implemented Differential Response by June 30, 2005, 41 counties in SFY 2005-06 requested and received funding through CWS Outcome Improvement funds to implement or expand permanency improvements.

By June 30, 2007, CDSS will, based on the experience of the total participating counties, add an additional 16 counties to begin implementation of the quality case planning and service delivery protocols.

See above. Since 2004, three new counties have joined California's Family to Family Initiative: Kern, Solano and Santa Cruz counties. Currently, 25 out of the 58 California counties now participate in Family to Family. One of the strategies of Family to Family is the Team Decision Making component which engages not just the foster parent and caseworkers, but also birth families and community members in all placement decisions to ensure a network of support for children and their families.

Counties have used funding from the CWS Outcome Improvement fund to implement some of these case planning improvements. Four additional counties are developing projects to work with families such as family team meetings, family participation in safety planning or expanded family engagement.

By June 30, 2008, CDSS will, based on the experience of the total participating counties, add an additional 16 counties to begin implementation of the quality case planning and service delivery protocols that include team-based approaches to promote family engagement, such as team decision-making, family conferencing, etc.

By June 30, 2009, CDSS will have implemented the quality case planning and service delivery protocols in all 58 counties.

Other Efforts

National Governor's Association (NGA) Policy Academy

California was chosen to participate in the National Governor's Association (NGA) Policy Academy on Youth Transitioning Out of Foster Care. The Academy, which runs from June 2006 through December 2007, provides a unique opportunity for six state teams to work together, with the assistance of national and state experts, to improve outcomes for youth transitioning from foster care to adulthood.

California has approximately 26,000 foster children 16 years and older. Once emancipated from the system, research has shown that many foster youth drop out of high school, many become homeless, more than half are unemployed, and too many leave the system without any connection to an adult, a family or their community.

In recent years, California's public and private agencies have made great strides in improving services and outcomes for our transitioning foster youth. An impressive collection of innovative and promising approaches has emerged at both state and county levels indicating California's readiness to help foster youth successfully transition. Yet many of these initiatives currently reach only a small number of transition-aged foster youth, and challenges remain to integration and statewide implementation, such as the inability to track youth across systems.

The team is under the leadership of California Department of Social Services' Deputy Director Mary Ault. It is comprised of county and state leaders from multiple public systems such as child welfare, mental health, employment, education, and corrections, as well as private providers, philanthropy, youth and advocates. The team has identified three key goals:

Permanence - Every youth will have lifelong connections with family and supportive adults.

Education - Every youth will have a quality education, a high school diploma and support in pursuing post-secondary opportunities.

Employment - Every youth will have work experience and training opportunities that will prepare them for and place them in living wage employment and careers.

To achieve these goals, California's NGA Policy Academy Team is assessing the lessons offered from existing efforts and taking action to implement, spread more widely and sustain effective approaches so that all of California's transitioning youth have the full array of supports they need to thrive. This project is made possible through the support of the Jim Casey Youth Opportunities Initiative, the Freddie Mac Foundation, the Eckerd Family Foundation and the Walter S. Johnson Foundation.

The Family to Family Initiative

The Family to Family Initiative is in various phases of implementation throughout California. Partners under the California initiative include the Annie E. Casey Foundation, the Stuart Foundation, Casey Family Programs, the Walter S. Johnson Foundation and the CDSS. Support of all families including birth families and resource families and partnerships with all segments of the community are key strategies. Families are supported by this initiative by improving safety of the placements when removal is necessary and by having families, including the child when appropriate, participate in these decisions about their lives. Parents and youths who have experienced the foster care system are encouraged to be involved as mentors for new families and youth and also to participate in all aspects of system improvements.

The California Family to Family website can be found at www.f2f.ca.gov and serves as an informational resource for any person interested in gaining knowledge about the Family to Family program. The website hosts the Family to Family principals, goals, strategies and tools to help state and local child welfare agencies achieve better outcomes for children and families. As well, the website contains county specific information, a variety of topics related to child welfare issues, latest research findings throughout the United States, contact information, and Family to Family convening dates. The information disseminated in the website is provided to support the various phases of Family to Family implementation and to give web viewers throughout the world information pertinent to improving child welfare.

The website also hosts a map of all the Family to Family counties to detail the four regional groups in California, which include the Northern cluster, Bay Area cluster, Central/Coastal cluster, and Southern cluster. Los Angeles County is divided into three regional groups based on their Service Planning Areas and is also part of the Southern Region. The foundations and the CDSS provide grants and technical assistance to counties with their Family to Family implementation through expert consultants. The four strategies of the Family to Family Model are: Recruiting, Training and Supporting Resource Families; Building Community Partnerships; Team Decision-Making and Self Evaluation.

There are 25 counties participating in the initiative, representing 85% of the foster children in care in the state. As of December 31, 2006, 24 of the 25 Family to Family counties have successfully implemented Team Decision Making meetings. Data for Family to Family sites can be accessed on the Center for Social Services Research of U.C. Berkeley website. The outcomes of Family to Family are integrated in the AB 636 outcomes of the state.

The California Family to Family initiative has an additional strategy involving improving systems for older youth called Connected by 25. There are currently five counties participating in this initiative. It is anticipated that three more counties will be added in 2007. More information about this initiative can also be found later in this section.

The California Family to Family initiative partners with the California Permanency for Youth Project, and in 2007 will begin to develop strategic ways to integrate their mutual efforts. This initiative supports the goal that no youth leaves the foster care system without a lifelong connection to a caring adult.

As part of the California System Improvement Plan (SIP), TDM has been adopted as the approach to implementation of the youth transitions/permanence component. As of June 2006, there were 26,338 reported recommendations made in TDM meetings.

The majority of TDM recommendations were conducted for imminent risk of placement, the next largest group was for emergency placement and placement move. San Luis Obispo County's quarterly data reflect ongoing improvement directly attributed to TDMs. Trinity County reports one of the major advantages of using the TDM is that the placement process is slowed down, which allows the best decision to be made and placements to be saved. Stanislaus County reports the most important change in the agency as a result of implementing TDM has been the reduction in removals: the number of children entering foster care has decreased and the number of families served in voluntary services has increased. Contra Costa County reports the most important change in Contra Costa's child welfare practice as a result of holding TDMs is providing Exit TDMs for youth as they transition into adulthood. Having birth parents take part in the decision-making process and identifying relative or near kin as placement options at the TDM are two of the most significant practice changes reported by Monterey County. San Mateo County reports that TDMs are utilized in cases transitioning from Family Reunification status to Family Maintenance status with the attempt to improve re-entry rates by maintaining services and case management to families that are not showing stability after 3 months of placement.

Judicial Review and Technical Assistance (JRTA)

Technical assistance for judges, as well as dependency and delinquency court stakeholder groups was provided under the provisions of the Judicial Review and Technical Assistance (JRTA) contract, during this past fiscal year. A half-time JRTA staff attorney coordinated and staffed court/county collaborative workshops in California's largest counties. The agenda for each workshop was developed through feedback from the dependency court judicial officers regarding obstacles and challenges to permanency, in their respective counties. Each agenda included promising practices in permanency issues, such as: finding life-long connections for youth, engaging youth in dependency process, concurrent planning, prioritizing permanency for youth, ADR methods, Family to Family models, termination of parental rights and adoption. Each court/county collaborative was able to identify and share key county programs in which they either sought to strengthen or initiate.

The JRTA attorney will continue to provide technical assistance and training related to permanency through continued research, development of curriculum and maintaining relationships with local, state and national experts. Future technical assistance and training will focus on working collaboratively with dependency and delinquency court judges and county agencies in the areas of ILP, transitional housing and finding connections. In addition to expanding these services to delinquency court system stakeholders, they will be made available statewide as resources permit.

The Judicial Council of California's Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) Initiative

Effective December 2005, the CDSS entered into an interagency agreement with the Judicial Council of California to create the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) Initiative. While the agreement's end date is June 2007, the agreement is expected to be renewed for three years through June 2010. The initiative was created because Indian children continue to be

removed from their families and tribal communities and placed with non-Indian caregivers. While juvenile court judges and placing agency staff have received some training on ICWA, this initiative presents an opportunity to provide targeted training and technical assistance in order to increase knowledge of ICWA by making available a range of facilitation and training services through cross-disciplinary regional and locally targeted trainings for judicial officers, clerks, attorneys, social workers and probation officers. Services are tailored to the needs of the local court system or region. As part of this initiative, educational materials addressing the federal requirements under the Indian Child Welfare Act have been developed. These materials include charts, agency checklists on notice procedures and case planning, a judicial handbook, descriptions of available services to Indian children and families and a qualified ICWA expert witness list. Educational workshops have been provided by a broad-based group of subject matter experts on a statewide, regional and local basis. This initiative continues to impact, not only the preservation of connections for Indian children, but also achieving permanency, as defined by the Indian community.

The start of the fiscal year began with the last and fourth in a series of regional trainings across the state. Held in Redding on August 7, 2006, the Northern California Symposium on the Indian Child Welfare Act focused on the nuts-and-bolts of applying ICWA in dependency and delinquency cases. There were approximately 65 attendees, including numerous tribal representatives, judicial officers, child welfare and probation staff and attorneys. The evaluations received were very positive.

One of the key speakers at the symposium was Justice William Thorne, Utah Court of Appeals. He is recognized as a foremost authority on ICWA, and is requested to speak at numerous conferences/symposia/gatherings nationwide. A video has been made of his presentation, "A Historical and Cultural Perspective on ICWA," and is available for use by any interested party.

As with each of the regional trainings, a resource binder was created for participants and has been made available on CD and posted on the Judicial Council's Web site located at: <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/cfcc/programs/description/jrta-ICWAResourceBinder.htm>.

As this was the last of the four regional trainings, a video bringing together all of the symposia presentations was made, and is available upon request. In addition, all Native American resources compiled for each regional symposium, which will soon be posted to the Judicial Council's Web site.

The initiative staff conducted two workshops at the annual Beyond the Bench Conference, entitled "The Nuts and Bolts of the Indian Child Welfare Act" and "Tribal Courts and Jurisdiction." This conference is the largest statewide conference for courts, state agencies, county child welfare and probation agencies, attorneys and children's advocates. The workshops were well received with 57 and 46 persons in attendance, respectively.

In addition to the Beyond the Bench statewide conference, the following educational offerings were made at statewide conferences: (1) the U.C. Davis Child Abuse and Neglect Conference in Sacramento, held on September 12, 2006; (2) the Tribal State Jurisdiction Symposium in Pala, held on September 20, 2006; (3) the 11th Annual Los Angeles Partnership Conference: A New Beginning," held on October 5, 2006; (4) the Spirit of the Law

Conference in Lemoore, held on October 19 and 20, 2006 — the Administrative Office of the Courts co-sponsored the conference by contributing \$3,000 toward conference expenses, offering continuing legal education credit to attorney attendees, and assisting in facilitating focus group discussions. It is anticipated that the initiative staff will be on the planning committee for next year's conference and assist with workshop content and outreach to the judiciary; and (5) the "The Tribal and State Justice Summit" in San Francisco, held on November 13 through 15, 2006.

In the 2006 Legislative Session, the California Legislature passed and the Governor signed Senate Bill (SB) 678 (Ducheny) Chapter 838, Statutes of 2006, effective January 1, 2007. SB 678 is a comprehensive act affecting Indian children that revises existing provisions of state law governing child custody, adoption, guardianship, conservatorship and juvenile proceedings, including termination of parental rights and the voluntary relinquishment of a child by a parent. Initiative staff prepared training materials on the new legislation and conducted a workshop for all court clerks statewide, which was held on November 8, 2006, in San Francisco.

During the second half of the fiscal year, the initiative's focus shifted from statewide educational efforts to local court/county educational meetings and efforts to implement SB 678. The first, entitled "Collaborative Meeting on the Indian Child Welfare Act," was held in Orange County at the Orange County Superior Court on March 10, 2007. The series of collaborative meetings has continued in Sacramento County scheduled for April 30, 2007 and Glenn County scheduled for June 18, 2007. The location of the fourth has yet to be determined, but it will likely be in Alameda County.

In addition to these numerous training events, staff has updated training materials in light of SB 678 and worked with the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and the Probate and Mental Health Committee to propose new rules and forms relating to ICWA to implement SB 678. The proposal will be circulated for public comment from April 20, 2007 through June 15, 2007.

Kinship Support Services Program (KSSP)

Funding augmentation of \$2.5 million was included in the budget for SFY 2006-07 for the Kinship Support Services Program (KSSP). This program provides services to caregivers who provide for their relative children within their familiar family settings to ensure safe, stable and permanent placements for dependent children or children who are at risk of dependency. This funding was allocated on a competitive basis to counties so that 21 counties are now planning, starting-up or operating a Kinship Support Services Program. The original program was limited to 11 counties until legislation enacted in FY 2006-07 changed participation requirements to expand county participation.

Funds to Hire Additional Adoption Caseworkers

In order to further improve adoption outcomes, included in the FY 2006-07 budget was funding to augment adoption funding in order to improve permanency outcomes for children via adoption and increased foster care exits. The budget approved \$12.2 million to hire additional state and county adoptions caseworkers. The hiring of additional adoption caseworkers is expected to produce an additional 1,000 adoption finalizations; this increase in adoptions will represent a 15.5% increase over the number of actual adoptions finalized during FY 2003-04. Because of adoptions process timelines and data reporting timeframes,

the state does not anticipate that the increased number of additional completed adoptions annually will be reflected in statewide statistics until at least March of 2008. Additionally, funding has also been made available for a three-year project to achieve increased adoptions of children who are age nine and older and not placed with a relative. The bill specified Los Angeles and San Francisco Counties, a state Adoptions District Office (serving multiple counties) and two counties to be selected by CDSS. Alameda and Kern counties have been selected.

The California Blue Ribbon Commission on Children in Foster Care

The California Blue Ribbon Commission on Children in Foster Care was established by the Judicial Council as a high level, multidisciplinary body to provide leadership and recommendations on how courts and their partners can improve safety, permanency, well-being and fairness outcomes. The Blue Ribbon Commission seeks to improve court performance and accountability, to improve collaboration between courts and child welfare agencies, and to address the need for adequate and flexible funding. Appointed by Chief Justice Ronald M. George, the Commission is chaired by California Supreme Court Justice Carlos R. Moreno. The representative Commission includes trial, appellate, supreme court, and tribal judges and justices, as well as legislators, attorneys, foster youth, community leaders and representatives from CDSS, county social services, education, substance abuse and mental health. The Commission has had a busy year examining the causes and consequences of, and the solutions for, court-based delays, the lack of transitional plans or services for children aging out of the dependency system and obstacles to flexible funding and information sharing.

Among other challenges, in the year to come the Commission will be examining the education of children in foster care, and court management and collaboration models and their effects on timely reunification and other permanency options. The Commission has met quarterly since March 2006, and has held meetings and briefings with foster youth, parents, caregivers, social workers, educational representatives and the California Legislature. Recently the Commission worked closely with representatives from CDSS and the Center for Social Services Research to draft quantitative performance measures for the juvenile court. The final report and recommendations of the Commission will be launched in March 2008. Christopher Wu, of the Administrative Office of the Courts, Judicial Council, is the Executive Director of the Commission.

The Youth Transition Action Team Initiative (YTAT)

The Youth Transition Action Team Initiative (YTAT) focuses on bringing together the resources of the workforce, education and child welfare systems to better prepare adolescents who are current or former foster youth to achieve economic, educational and employment success as they transition into the adult world.

Transition Act Teams are made up of leaders from the child welfare, education, philanthropy, workforce development and other local systems working together to improve transition outcomes for youth touched by the child welfare system. Each team is also charged with assisting its respective county in achieving their child welfare system enhancement goals, particularly in the area of youth permanency.

Teams from across the state are bringing together and leveraging the approaches, strategies and resources of multiple efforts concerned with the issue of successful youth transition. YTAT impacts will be measured by success in improving outcomes for youth aging out of the foster care system in educational achievement and aspiration; workforce readiness and employment and also support networks.

The project is funded by several philanthropic groups. Counties that are currently participating in the initiative are Glenn, Humboldt, Los Angeles, Orange, Placer, Sacramento, San Diego, San Francisco, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Tehama, Tulare, and Ventura. More information may be found at the following web sites: <http://www.newwaystowork.org/documents/ytatdocuments/YouthTransitionActionTeamFactsheet.pdf> and at <http://www.nww.org/initiatives/ytat.html>

In the Fall of 2006, with the generous support of Casey Family Programs, New Ways to Work through YTAT partnered with the Child and Family Policy Institute of California to create cross-system awareness and improve local collaboration between county child welfare agencies and local workforce investment areas. The intent of the forums was to better connect these two systems and to highlight and promote cross-agency approaches to better serve foster youth throughout California. The Foster Youth Employment Forums provided an opportunity for participants to learn about quality local programs, to develop a working knowledge of both the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) workforce and child welfare systems and to meet potential new partners and colleagues to collaborate with in the future. Four-hundred-thirty-five representatives of child welfare, workforce development and education, and 50 youth participated in the forums.

As a result of the forums, the YTAT initiative will be expanding the network to additional counties in 2007 and continuing a concerted focus on better preparing foster youth for education and employment opportunities and creating better system connections between education, workforce development and child welfare services.

California Connected by 25 Initiative

In California, the Connected by 25 Initiative (CC25I) supports a group of California counties in building a comprehensive continuum of services that support foster youth who are transitioning to adulthood, ages 14-24 years. The CC25I is a fifth strategy under the California Family to Family Initiative.

The CC25I aims to accomplish the following objectives: 1) provide financial, technical and administrative assistance to several counties to provide supports and services for transitioning foster care youth; 2) develop effective strategies and tools for counties to conduct ongoing evaluation of the impacts that services and programs developed for transitional youth are having on the desired client-level outcomes (high school graduation, employment, secure housing, etc) and 3) document the county systems changes that take place over the course of the Initiative's implementation.

The CC25I is supported by the Annie. E. Casey Foundation, the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the Charles M. Schwab Foundation, the Stuart Foundation and the Walter S. Johnson Foundation. Counties currently participating include Alameda, Fresno, San

Francisco, Santa Clara and Stanislaus. Each county plan contains a set of locally designed core strategies for building and expanding key partnerships, effecting systems change or integration, and implementing new and improved services in key focus areas: K-12 Education; Post-secondary Education and Training; Housing; Employment and Career; Financial Literacy and Competency, Personal/Social Asset Development and Permanence. In addition, counties are helping to develop the framework for a California Family to Family foster youth transitions strategy with guiding principles, values, key elements, tools and technical assistance. The goal is to develop a framework that can be utilized in the future by other California counties interested in expanding their Family to Family work to youth who have transitioned out of foster care. Key benchmarks and systems change indicators important to this work include:

- Partnerships with schools, families and the community to improve educational advocacy, resources and outcomes for foster youth.
- Partnerships with local workforce investment boards, businesses, institutions of higher education and community partners to create sector specific training and career pathways that link older foster youth with jobs in growing industries.
- Partnerships with foster youth, resource families, communities and public and private housing providers to expand supportive housing options for foster youth.
- Partnerships, services and systems that promote financial literacy skills, financial competency and youth savings and asset accumulation.
- Partnerships, services and systems that promote the physical, psychological, emotional and social development of youth, building personal and social assets and resiliency.
- Identifying, developing and maintaining lifelong committed relationships for foster youth with significant adults who fulfill a role as a positive mentor, parent or emotional supporter of the youth.
- Partnerships, services and systems that empower families, youth, foster parents, group homes, foster family agencies, kinship families, guardians and agency staff to meet the needs of emancipating foster youth.
- Independent Living Program (ILP) services that are accessible to all foster youth and that are integrated within all levels of the child welfare agency.

More information may be found at:

http://ccyp.berkeley.edu/activities/research/california_connected.html

California Permanency for Youth Project (CPYP)

California Permanency for Youth Project (CPYP) is a project of the Public Health Institute, started in January 2003 as a result of a five-year grant awarded by the Stuart Foundation. This grant has since been extended through 2009. CPYP's vision is that every youth who enters foster care in California will return home safely or find an alternative lifelong family. CPYP's objectives are:

- To increase awareness among the child welfare agencies and staff, legislators and judicial officers in the state of the urgent need that older children and youth have for permanency.

- To influence public policy and administrative practices so that they promote permanency.
- To assist fourteen specific counties and the private agencies with which they work to implement new practices to achieve permanency for older children and youth.

The project initially worked with four counties: San Mateo, Alameda, Stanislaus and Monterey to develop programs to achieve permanency for more youth. The project provided these counties with technical assistance over two-and-a-half years to help them develop youth permanency practice in their counties. Each county is now working on the challenge of bringing the youth permanency work to scale so that all county youth have this service available. Each county has developed a youth permanence plan that includes the following target areas: administrative practices, permanency practice, identification of the project target group, staff development, partnerships and involvement of youth in finding their own permanency and integration with other initiatives.

Now CPYP has begun assisting ten more counties: Contra Costa, Fresno, Humboldt, Kern, Los Angeles (metro north region), Orange, Sacramento, San Francisco, San Luis Obispo and Sonoma. This work started in the Spring of 2005 and will continue through March 2008.

In conjunction with the California Youth Connection (CYC) and the Bay Area Academy, the project supported the development of "Digital Stories" on permanency by current and former foster youth. These DVDs are available from CPYP and can be used in training.

As a part of the development of CPYP, a national convening was held in April 2002 to explore the issues of permanency for youth. Subsequently, national convenings have been held in 2003, 2004 and 2005. In 2006, Casey Family Services took over the national convenings, thus allowing CPYP to focus its resources specifically on the work in California. Reports of the convenings are available on the CPYP website <http://www.cypyp.org/index.html>

To measure results, CPYP is gathering data over time from workers in each county on the young people being targeted for youth permanency services. In addition, the project is doing a formative evaluation of each county's implementation process that will inform the child welfare field of strategies for future implementation and change.

Emancipated Youth Connections Project (EYCP)

In 2005, funding was obtained from the Stuart and Zellerbach Family Foundations to develop a model program to seek and sustain permanent lifelong connections for older youth who have already emancipated from foster care without a permanent connection to a caring adult. Service is being provided to twenty young adults who have emancipated from the child welfare system and who have been instrumental in promoting the idea that permanence for foster youth is critical. This project is using lessons learned from other U.S. programs that have been successful in establishing permanency connections for youth *before* they left the child welfare system. EYCP is adapting these lessons in order to develop a model of service to young adults who have now *left* the child welfare system. As expected, EYCP is making significant changes to existing models in order to address the current developmental stage of this young adult population. This process will lead to the creation of a new model which will

be made available to "After Care" programs and to others who are interested in providing service to this population group.

Dependency Drug Courts

Dependency Drug Courts (DDC) monitor families who are involved with the child welfare system and for whom substance abuse is a significant issue. These courts oversee compliance with the law, protection and permanency planning for children and therapeutic interventions for individuals with substance abuse problems. In California and in other states, dependency drug courts have been determined to have important positive effects on child welfare case outcomes. In 2006, under contract to the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) UCLA completed an analysis of dependency drug courts in three California counties, which assessed case outcomes and cost avoidance.

Since 2004, the CDSS has provided technical assistance and staff support to the Judicial Council's Collaborative Justice Advisory Committee and to local efforts to test and disseminate these practices. With the Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs, the CDSS is planning the next phases of DDC expansion and evaluation of prospective data. Approximately 20 additional counties will be funded under the expansion.

The state's budget included funding for Dependency Drug Courts to expand the program to additional counties. For FY 2006-07, \$1.8 million of dependency drug court funds was allocated for the original 9 counties: El Dorado, Modoc, Merced, Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, San Luis Obispo, Santa Clara, and Santa Cruz. An additional \$3 million was awarded to 8 additional counties via a competitive bid process: Butte, Lake, Los Angeles, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Francisco, San Joaquin and Tehama counties.

**PIP Outcome:
Well-Being**

Promote the Well-Being of Children and Families

California is committed to the well-being of children and families. To measure progress towards well-being, the following specific outcomes have been established:

- Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.
- Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.
- Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.

The California Department of Social Services (CDSS) used a statewide statistically valid survey that established a baseline performance level for the well-being measures. Three subsequent surveys are being used to measure change from the baseline performance.

Objective 1: By June 30, 2005, the State's objective is to reach the PIP target to increase by three percentage points, the percentage of children, parents and caregivers whose needs were assessed and who received services to meet those needs. (PIP Well-Being Outcome 1, Item 17.)

For this objective, there are two measures that need to be met before the objective is considered achieved: 1) the percentage of children, parents and caregivers whose needs were assessed; and 2) the percentage of children, parents and caregivers who received services to meet those needs. California met the first of the two measures and has improved in the second.

This objective has been met. In the first measure for this item, the goal of an increase in the percentage of children, parents and caregivers whose needs were assessed has been met. The goal was an increase of three percentage points from the baseline of 55.7%. This goal was achieved in the second set of surveys.

In the second measure for this item, the goal of an increase in the percentage of children, parents and caregivers who received services to meet those needs has been met. The goal was an increase of three percentage points from the baseline of 66.4%. This goal was achieved in the third set of surveys.

Objective 2: By June 30, 2005, the State's objective is to reach the PIP target to increase by three percentage points, the percent of children, parents and caregivers involved in case planning. (PIP Well-Being Outcome 1, Item 18.)

By June 30, 2009, the State's objective is to achieve a minimum statewide improvement over June 2004 data of 0.81 percentage points or better, the percentage of children, parents, and caregivers involved in case planning.

For this objective, all three measures need to be met before it is considered achieved. The improvement goal for the first measure was an increase in the percentage of children, parents and caregivers involved in case planning from the baseline of 90.9%.

The second measure has two parts. It measures the percentage the case plan is discussed with: (a) interviewee and (b) interviewee and case child. The improvement goal for the first

part was an increase in the percentage the case plan is discussed with the interviewee (parent or caregiver) from a baseline of 89.6%. The improvement goal for the second part was an increase in the percentage the case plan is discussed with the interviewee and case child from a baseline of 50.7%.

California has met the objective for this measure as all three measures have been met.

Objective 3: By June 30, 2005, the State's objective is to reach the PIP target to increase by three percentage points the percentage of compliance by workers with planned parent visit schedules; the percentage of parents whose ability to meet their case plan goals was promoted/assisted by social worker visits; and the percentage of parents whose ability to safely parent the in-home child was promoted/assisted by social worker visits. (PIP Well-Being Outcome 1, Item 20.)

The second statewide survey indicated the State obtained our improvement goal for measures two and three for Item 20, (measures worker visits with parents). The survey also indicated improved performance in the first measure (worker compliance with planned parent visit schedules) for this item, although we had not yet quite met the improvement goal.

In the second measure for this item, the goal had been met by the percentage of parents in whose ability to safely parent children in the home was promoted/assisted by social worker visits. In the third measure for this item, the goal had been met for the percentage of parents in whose ability to meet their case plan goals was promoted and/or assisted by social worker visits. In order to achieve the goal for this measure, all three measures needed to be met. The state requested to be allowed to use an alternative data source to measure progress in this item, and Region IX granted approval. The alternative data source provided sufficient evidence that the necessary improvement had been made in the measure. In a letter dated June 7, 2007, Region IX informed the state that the measure had been passed.

Caseworker Visits for Children in Foster Care

The state must describe:

How the state will use the additional funds under Title IV-B to support monthly caseworker visits with children in foster care:

California is currently developing a plan to achieve monthly visitation. The state will use the funding to fund increased visiting and the additional data entry workload that is not currently required. The method of allocating the funds to counties is currently under discussion.

The procedures developed to track and report caseworker visit data:

California currently uses the state's SACWIS system, the Child Welfare Services/Case Management System (CWS/CMS) to capture data on social worker visits. CWS/CMS captures the location of the visit and it is a required field when a contact is entered. The state will continue to use this system for federal reporting on this issue. In addition, because Foster Family Agencies, with whom counties have placement agreements, do

not have access to input data to CWS/CMS, an alternate method of collecting/reporting the data is being explored.

California is currently working with public and private agency stakeholders to implement the new federal requirements: These changes will involve at least these key areas:

- Clarifying social worker and visitation requirements including the purpose of the visits and documentation.
- Reducing the circumstances in which a visitation exception may be granted.
- Identifying alternate data collection processes.
- Clarifying reporting requirements for contract agencies.

The state standards for content and frequency of caseworker visits which assure children are visited on a monthly basis:

California currently has a monthly social worker visit standard for children in foster care, however exceptions may be granted under specified circumstances. An exception may be granted if the child is routinely visited by other child welfare agency representatives and there is a written agreement for those contacts to be reported. No exceptions may be granted when a child is placed in a group home.

The most common circumstances for a visit exception is when a child is placed by the county having care and supervision of the child with a Foster Family Agency (FFA). The county signs a placement agreement with the FFA for each child placed. The FFA has responsibility for developing a needs and services plan for the child and for visiting the child and the caregiver. The FFA makes quarterly reports to the county agency documenting the visits with the child and caregiver. Currently, the FFA visits are not required to be entered into CWS/CMS by the county worker.

This placement agreement is currently under revision to align it with federal requirements.

Caseworkers (Social Workers) visit and care for children in accordance with Manual of Policy and Procedures (MPP) Division 31 Section 31-320 (Social Worker Contacts with the Child). The MPP Division 31, Section 31-206.24 requires the social worker to establish a case plan that includes a schedule of "planned social work contacts and visits with the child". The contacts must take place in accordance with Section 31-320 (social worker/probation officer contacts with the child). MPP Section 31-320.11 emphasizes the social worker visit objectives to ensure the child's safety, permanency and well-being by focusing on the following achievements in conjunction with the child's case plan: verifying the location of the child, monitoring the safety of the child, assessing the child's well-being, and assisting the child in preserving and maintaining religious and ethnic identity; gathering information to assess the effectiveness of services provided to meet the child's needs, to monitor the child's progress, and to meet identified goals; establishing and maintaining a helping relationship between social worker and child to provide continuity and stability point for the child; and soliciting the child's input on his/her future, informing the child as to current and future placement plans and progress, and discussing these plans and progress with the child.

The child's caseworker is a social worker as defined by Title 22, Division 6, Chapter 1, General Licensing Requirements: "Social Worker" means a person who has a graduate degree from an accredited school of social work."

California meets the requirements of the Safe and Timely Interstate Placement Act of 2006, which increased the "frequency of required caseworker visits from every 12 months to every 6 months for children in out-of-State foster care placements..." Senate Bill 933, Chapter 311, Statutes of 1998, required that children placed in group homes out-of-state are visited once a month and this requirement is captured in the Manual of Policies and Procedures 31-320.414. Additionally, the Manual of Policies and Procedures 31-510 Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC), 31-510.3 requires California comply with Family Code sections 7900 through 7909 when sending foster children out-of-state. Family Code section 7906 requires California enter into an agreement with the receiving state to meet requirements for visitation, inspection, or supervision of children, homes, institutions, or other agencies in the receiving state.

Currently, the Manual of Policies and Procedures Division 31, sections 31-320.4 and 31-320.412 provide for less than monthly visit exceptions if certain conditions are present. Visit exceptions are primarily based upon the stability of the child in their current foster care setting and the effectiveness of the services provided to meet the child's needs. A visit exception is to be granted if the conditions set forth in Division 31 are met and is only applicable to the placement home in which the child is placed at the time the exception is approved. Therefore, if a child's placement changes, the exception is no longer valid and the requirement for social worker visits with the child becomes monthly until a new visit exception is approved. Exceptions are allowed for: court supervised cases--court approval of a specific visitation plan and for voluntary cases--county deputy director approval of a specific visitation plan.

As required by the Child and Family Services Improvement Act of 2006, the state of California will provide by June 30, 2008, "an outline of the steps it will take to ensure that 90 percent of children in foster care are visited by their workers on a monthly basis, and that the majority of the visits occur in the residence of the child by October 1, 2011." These exceptions will be eliminated within the timeframe allowed by federal law. CDSS is currently reviewing data to determine the extent of the use of visit exceptions in various circumstances and placement types. The specific plan is being developed and will be submitted as required in June 2008.

Objective 4: By June 30, 2005, the State's objective is to reach the PIP target to increase by three percentage points, the percent of all children in the home, or in out-of-home placement, who were assessed and received services for educational needs. (PIP Well-Being Outcome 2, Item 21.)

The second statewide survey indicated the goal was met for one of the two measures for Item 21 (percentage of children receiving in-home services or who are in out-of-home care who were assessed and received services for educational needs). The first measure is the percentage of cases in which the educational needs of the children were assessed. In the second measure, which is the percentage of children with educational needs who received services, the third survey for this measure indicated a decrease, so we have still not met the

goal for this measure. Therefore, California has not yet achieved the goal for this measure because both measures need to be met. However, the CDSS has been working with the California Department of Education to improve the provision of services to children, including through the State Interagency Team (SIT).

Through the SIT, a report was prepared by CDSS under contract with the UC Davis Center for Public Policy Research. The report focuses on the development of state child welfare services well-being indicators, and provides some conclusions and recommendations. One of the recommendations was to establish memorandums of understanding (MOU) between CDSS and the Departments of Education and Health Services to improve locating and tracking systems for shared populations. An MOU has recently been signed with the Department of Mental Health to be able to share data. While CDSS is pursuing the MOUs, we are also searching for more expedient methods to obtain the data.

Objective 5: By June 30, 2005, the State's objective is to reach the PIP target to increase by three percentage points, the percent of all children in the home, or in out-of-home placement, who were assessed and received services for mental health needs. (PIP Well-Being Outcome 3, Item 23.)

The second statewide survey indicated improved performance in one of the two improvement goals for Item 23 which is the percentage of children receiving in-home services or who are in out-of-home care that were assessed and received services for mental health needs. The first measure is the percentage of cases in which mental health needs were assessed. The second measure which is the percentage of children with mental health needs who received services also indicated improvement. California has met the objective for this measure as both measures have been met.

Benchmarks

By June 30, 2005, CDSS will have developed and implemented quality case planning and service delivery protocols in each of the 11 pilot counties for targeted cases in each county.

By June 30, 2005, CDSS, in partnership with the 11 pilot counties, will have developed and implemented protocols to enhance family participation in case planning.

By June 30, 2005, CDSS, in partnership with the 11 pilot counties, will have developed and implemented protocols to include children and youth in case and transition planning.

These benchmarks have all been met. Please see the section on Permanency for more information.

By June 30, 2006, the 11 counties will develop strategies for community resource development to better serve children and families in targeted cases.

This benchmark has been met. As reported previously, as part of the implementation of Differential Response, resources in the community were developed in order to serve the families being referred by CWS.

By June 30, 2006, CDSS will, based on the experience of the total participating counties, begin phasing in an additional 15 counties to implement the quality case planning and service delivery protocols; the protocols to enhance family participation in case planning; the protocols to include children and youth in case and transition planning; and develop strategies for community resource development to better serve children and families.

This benchmark has been met. As previously discussed in the Permanency section, CDSS requested and received funding in the budget from the Legislature to be able to expand the quality case planning and service delivery protocols to additional counties in SFY 2006-07. Future expansion will depend on available funding.

By June 30, 2007, CDSS will, based on the experience of the total participating counties, begin phasing in an additional 16 counties to implement the quality case planning and service delivery protocols; the protocols to enhance family participation in case planning; the protocols to include children and youth in case and transition planning; and develop strategies for community resource development to better serve children and families.

This benchmark has been met, and was previously discussed in the Permanency section.

By June 30, 2008, CDSS will, based on the experience of the total participating counties, begin phasing in an additional 16 counties to implement the quality case planning and service delivery protocols; the protocols to enhance family participation in case planning; the protocols to include children and youth in case and transition planning; and develop strategies for community resource development to better serve children and families.

By June 30, 2009, CDSS will have implemented the quality case planning and service delivery protocols; the protocols to enhance family participation in case planning; the protocols to include children and youth in case and transition planning; and develop strategies for community resource development to better serve children and families in all 58 counties.

Assessment of Health Needs by Medical Professionals

Under the Health Care Program for Children in Foster Care, funded through and managed by the California Departments of Social Services (CDSS) and Health Services, public health nurses play a crucial role in assessing and meeting the health care needs of children in foster care. Housed within county child welfare services agencies, these nurses provide administrative case management, which includes examining health records and case files and determining the need for health-related evaluations and services. When a nurse overseeing a child's medical care identifies unmet healthcare needs, she arranges for and follows up on the provision of services from primary and specialty care physicians and associated health care providers. Using the recommended periodicity schedule of the American Academy of Pediatrics and the individual health needs of each child, each public health nurse determines the need for periodic and interperiodic health assessments that conform to the standards established by the California Department of Health Services. These

health assessments are conducted by or under the direct supervision of physicians who have met that Department's standards, and the public health nurses make the necessary referrals and arrangements for transportation. The CDSS actively participates in the administration of this program by providing program consultation to county social services and public health nursing staff and by conferring on a regular, scheduled basis with regional nursing staff and statewide program executives.

The CDSS confers, on a quarterly basis, with a subcommittee of the County Mental Health Director's Association to discuss and work to improve program and placement options to meet the needs of foster youth with high level mental health needs.

As judicial approval is mandated by California law prior to the administration of psychotropic medications to foster youth, the CDSS collaborates with the judiciary and child psychiatrists to ensure that the necessary processes and protections are in place and current.

Other Efforts

The Foster Youth Services Program

The Foster Youth Services (FYS) Program was created by the California Legislature in 1981, and is administered by the California Department of Education (CDE). The FYS Program is designed to: (1) help obtain health and school records to determine appropriate school placements and coordinate instruction; (2) provide direct service and/or referrals for counseling, tutoring, mentoring, vocational training, emancipation services and training for independent living and (3) facilitate educational advocacy, training and collaboration among partner agencies and systems. The CDE has expanded the countywide FYS Program to include 57 county offices of education. It is projected to serve approximately 35,000 students in 2007.

The FYS Program has demonstrated substantial progress in building collaborative relationships between various local agencies and systems that interface with the lives of foster youth. Interagency agreements and memoranda of understanding have been used with increasing frequency to formalize and document agreements between partner agencies. The collaborative relationships developed by the FYS Countywide Program have resulted in comprehensive services being provided to foster youth. The goal of the FYS Program is to ultimately expand to serve children and youth in all of the counties.

Building California Construction Careers

Building California Construction Careers (BC3) is a program of the State Building and Construction Trades Council of California. The purpose of the statewide program is to educate high school students, teachers and guidance counselors about opportunities for high-paying jobs in the construction industry. The program is funded by a grant from the California Department of Education with Workforce Investment Act funds. BC3's outreach coordinators make presentations at high school classes, assemblies and career fairs. The outreach coordinators have all worked in the building trades and are African American or Latino. The presentations explain why it is important to graduate from high school and complete courses that lead to a career in the construction trades. Topics include job opportunities in construction, the skills necessary for success and how apprenticeship programs work.

In 2004, BC3 received a grant aimed at helping to educate foster youth about career opportunities in the construction industry and link them to job training, pre-apprenticeship and state-approved apprenticeship programs. BC3 also provided training and materials for staff who manage services for foster care youth.

Over the course of the grant, which was extended and ended in March 2007, BC3 worked to assure that the excellent careers in the building and construction trades are not overlooked by foster youth. They also worked to see that the foster youth were successfully assisted by the program. For many of these young men and women the chance to become an apprentice, to learn a skilled craft, to become self-sufficient and to form lifelong connections as part of a family of tradespeople is life-changing. BC3 is seeking new funding to continue its outreach efforts.

Education Coordinating Council

In addition to statewide efforts, many counties have devoted considerable resources to the area of educational needs of their children. One example of this is the Los Angeles County Education Coordinating Council (ECC). The ECC was created by the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors in November 2004, and was charged with raising the educational achievement of foster and probation youth throughout the county. More than 200 educators, child welfare and probation experts, advocates, community leaders, youth and caregivers developed a set of recommendations. The establishment of a coordinating body that would provide oversight and accountability for raising the educational attainment of these youth was recommended.

The ECC brings together the major stakeholders responsible for the educational performance of foster and probation youth. Its 23 members include the leadership of school districts with significant numbers of system youth, county departments, the juvenile court, city and county children's commissions, advocacy and planning groups, community agencies, and youth and their caregivers. Its purpose is to coordinate efforts across organizations and jurisdictions, encouraging networks of people to collaborate to expand best practices and fill the gaps in communities where little help or support for families is available so that none of the Los Angeles County's children are left behind.

During its initial year, the ECC reached out to hundreds of organizations, agencies, constituent groups and communities in Los Angeles working to overcome the existing barriers to effectively working together and building solid relationships with those who share responsibility for or have an interest in the education of system youth. The ECC developed a comprehensive blueprint for raising the educational achievement of Department of Children and Family Services and probation youth. The ECC is now addressing how to implement the recommendations and actions suggested in the blueprint.

The accomplishments by the ECC in 2006 include:

- Raising awareness of the Blueprint and its recommendations through publications, presentations to organizations, participation in conferences and juvenile court training sessions;

- Developing tools and supports such as the ECC website, legislation and budget allocations to help foster and probation youth, data matches to gather information about those youth and additional funding and consultant team members for the ECC;
- Major strides in the focus areas of early childhood education, youth development, data and information-sharing and school-based supports;
- Enhancing accountability among caregivers, caseworkers, service providers, schools and others regarding the educational needs of system youth and
- A meeting to strengthen relationships and identify roles was held between school superintendents, county departments and the juvenile court – a second meeting is already planned.

Meetings have been held on a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to share system youth's education information with representatives from the Department of Children and Family Services, the Probation Department, the Los Angeles Unified School District, the Los Angeles County Office of Education, the public defender's office, County Counsel, CASA (court-appointed special advocates), the Children's Law Center and the ECC. Participants agreed on a process for sharing education records and other student information among county caseworkers, school personnel, children's attorneys and CASAs. Following approval by the ECC, the agreement will be signed by the heads of the agencies and organizations involved in the process, and then shared with all school districts within Los Angeles County.

The EEC performed data matches between school districts and DCFS, in which active DCFS caseloads were matched against the districts' enrollment files. The purposes of the data matches are to identify the number of children in the CWS system, and to gather information on ethnicity, enrollment in specific programs (e.g., special education, gifted and talented), attendance records, suspension data, etc. With the data, they will know where foster and probation youth are, be able to focus services in those areas and be better able to serve them. It also helps to avoid duplication of services.

The Tutor Connection Program

The Tutor Connection Program, which is a collaboration with San Diego Child Welfare (Health and Human Services Agency); California State University, San Marcos, College of Education; the San Diego County Office of Education, Foster Youth Services (SDCOE, FYS); and Casey Family Programs. This program teaches pre-teachers about the unique educational needs of foster youth (including basic information about child welfare, foster care and the educational impacts of trauma abuse and neglect), then has them provide one-on-one tutoring to a youth in foster care. The program is administered by the Foster Youth Services Program. California State University at San Marcos (CSUSM) students perform Community Service Learning hours which apply to their minimum required student contact hours for entry into the teacher credential program at the University.

The Foster Youth Student Information System (FY-SIS) is a web-based database and is administrated by San Diego County of Education, Foster Youth Services (SDCOE, FYS). This database displays, in a secure and filtered manner, specific educational information on all students in foster care in San Diego County. Downloaded information is received from San Diego County Child Welfare, their school district and REGIS. REGIS is a data management system used by San Diego County Juvenile Court. There are several different user groups

and each user groups such as Child Welfare, Juvenile Court, Public Defenders, CASA and school district personnel have a unique screen set that only contains certain information. This database exists through collaboration between San Diego Health and Human Services Agency, San Diego County Probation, San Diego County Juvenile Court and San Diego County school districts. There is an interagency agreement and a Memorandum of Agreement allowing for this data exchange.

The Mental Health Services Act - Wraparound Services

The California Department of Social Services' role in the Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) relates to the requirement that counties provide children with services such as Wraparound Services, pursuant to California Welfare and Institutions Code, section 18250, commonly referred to as SB 163 Wraparound. The Child Protection and Family Support Branch in CDSS has administrative authority for the SB 163 Wraparound Programs, and is also responsible for meeting the Department's obligations under the MHSA. Four positions established specifically to support CDSS's role in the MHSA provide essential leadership, oversight and expertise to social services and mental health partners at both state and local levels in order to ensure that counties meet requirements of the MHSA and Welfare and Institutions Code section 18250.

In fiscal year 2005-06, CDSS approved 6 additional Wraparound Implementation Plans, as a result of the MHSA requirement, bringing the total number of counties with Wraparound to 35. Wraparound is available in the following 35 counties: Alameda, Butte, Contra Costa, Del Norte, El Dorado, Fresno, Humboldt, Kern, Los Angeles, Mendocino, Merced, Mono, Monterey, Napa, Orange, Placer, Plumas, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San Joaquin, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Shasta, Siskiyou, Solano, Sutter, Tehama, Tulare, and Ventura.

The following six counties are actively planning to develop and implement California Wraparound: Colusa, Glenn, Inyo, Nevada, Tuolumne, and Yolo.

Activities in fiscal year 2006-07 included continuing support and expansion of the availability of the Wraparound services as a way to coordinate and deliver effective services in California:

- Convene a one-day summit for Wraparound parent partners to assess support for training and technical assistance needs.
- Convene a one-day summit specifically designed to address probation youth in Wraparound programs.
- Provide Wraparound training and technical assistance for adoption agencies and state adoption district offices that provide post-adoptive services.
- Execute a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Department of Mental Health (DMH) and CDSS regarding data exchange between the departments for the purposes of matching specified mental health and children's services data.
- Execute an MOU to formalize the roles and responsibilities of DMH and CDSS in support of the MHSA and related child welfare initiatives.
- Partner with the California Institute for Mental Health and DMH to implement a two-year pilot of Wraparound Development Teams comprised of five-to-seven counties.

This cohort will test a Wraparound fidelity tool, receive Training for Trainers for Supervisors, establish outcomes and measures and prepare a final evaluation.

- Continue planning for the 2008 Wraparound Institute.
- Ensure that a special identifier is available for the next updated release of the CMS/CWS. This identifier will track children that are receiving Wraparound services.
- Continue technical assistance and on-site reviews.
- Establish outcome measures to meet the reporting requirements for the Mental Health Services Act.

The Progress of the State Interagency Team (SIT) in Increasing Access to Mental Health Treatment Services for Foster Youth Placed Out Of County

This year the SIT continued work on a variety of issues that impact children and families. One of the objectives for this year was to ensure that needed mental health, health and educational services are provided to foster children placed out of county. To address this issue, the DMH drafted regulations. At a recent SIT meeting, it was reported that the DMH emergency regulations to assure the provision of mental health services to children placed out-of-county are currently under review by the state Department of Finance. This is measurable progress over the past six months in addressing a long-standing problem for foster children placed out-of-county. Team members noted that this may also be an issue that the soon-to-be-launched state Child Welfare Council might wish to pursue if problems arise in implementing solutions. Copies of Senate Bill 785 were distributed to SIT members, which is a recently introduced piece of legislation that addresses this issue. The bill, if enacted, would require DMH to create a standardized contract, service authorization procedure and related procedures to facilitate a foster child's receipt of medically necessary services. The SIT will be tracking the progress of the bill, as well as the implementation of the regulations.

The Implementation of Legislation to Increase Connections for Foster Children

In order to further facilitate connections, CDSS budgeted for and began implementation of Assembly Bill (AB) 408 (Chapter 813, Statutes of 2003), which dealt with efforts to identify, evaluate and assess relationships between foster children and other important people in their lives. AB 1412 (Chapter 640, Statutes of 2005) was subsequently passed by the Legislature and signed by the Governor on October 7, 2005, to ensure that children and youth are actively involved in their case plan and permanency planning process as age and developmentally appropriate.

AB 1412 created a phased-in expansion of requirements that county social workers ask children 10 years of age or older, beginning with those children placed with a non-relative, about important adult relationships and to make efforts to support those relationships. AB 1412 also required a court determination whether the agency has made reasonable efforts to maintain the child's relationships with individuals other than the child's siblings who are important to the child, consistent with the child's best interests. Further, AB 1412 specified that every foster child has the right to be involved in the development of both his/her case and permanent placement plans. It requires that a child's case plan include a statement of the child's wishes regarding their permanent placement plan and an assessment of those stated wishes. It also allows foster children 12 years of age or older to review, sign and be given a copy of their own case plan.

The state budget for SFY 2006-07 included \$7.7 million for the implementation of AB 1412, which includes and expands implementation of AB 408. Counties have been funded for the increased workload associated with social workers' efforts to identify, evaluate and assess relationships between foster children and other important people in their lives. Regulations are being promulgated.

The Linkages Project

The CalWORKs/Child Welfare Partnership Project, also known as the Linkages Project, was launched in November 2000 to develop a coordinated services approach to better serve families and improve outcomes. Through improved coordination, child welfare services can also serve as an anti-poverty program; and CalWORKs (known formally as the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids) can help to prevent child abuse and neglect. Funded by the Stuart Foundation as a four-year initiative and founded in partnership with CDSS, Phase One of the Partnership Project was designed and directed by the California Center for Research on Women and Families, a program of the Public Health Institute.

Recommendations were developed in six programmatic areas identified as priorities: Organizational Structures, Flexible Financing, Organizational Change and Training, Data Systems, Confidentiality and Coordinated Case Planning. Recommendations related for changes in state law and practice were also developed. Over 50 county and state leaders worked for 6 months in a facilitated process to develop the recommendations, which were summarized in a series of publications, distributed to all 58 counties and presented at a statewide conference for county and state leaders in May 2002. These original documents continue to be available at www.ccrwf.org.

The second stage of Phase One provided modest two-year grants to support 13 counties to implement coordinated welfare/child welfare services. Counties were supported with informational convenings and technical assistance. Each county designated a Linkages Coordinator, organized a Planning and Implementation Committee, developed an annual work plan and strategically went about planning and implementing their Linkages services.

Due to the success of Phase One, the Stuart Foundation committed to funding for another phase of Linkages. Phase Two, which began in April 2005, is directed through the Child and Family Policy Institute of California. In Phase Two, 17 additional counties are receiving modest financial support and technical assistance to plan and implement Linkages. More information may be found at: http://www.cfpic.org/linkages/linkages_001.htm

In partnership with the Child and Family Policy Institute, CDSS submitted a proposal for funding and was awarded a federal grant in October 2006 to expand The Linkages Project. Approximately 30 counties will participate in the grant implementation and will receive training and technical assistance over the five year grant period. The goal of the grant is to deepen and broaden the collaboration between CalWORKs and Child Welfare Services at the county level to better serve families involved in both systems and to improve client outcomes. The ultimate goal is to guide a transformation on the statewide level which strengthens the effective and seamless coordination of services between these two systems. The participating counties met at the end of March 2007 to begin the implementation phase.

California Foster Youth Education Summit

On January 23, 2007, Casey Family Programs and the Child and Family Policy Institute of California co-hosted the 2007 California Foster Youth Education Summit, under the auspices of the Foster Youth Education Task Force. The Summit involved a broad collaborative of 300 child welfare professionals, advocates, foster youth and others representing education, child welfare, and the courts. The participants gathered to attend the first California statewide summit to forge solutions to the daily challenges and obstacles foster youth face in attaining an education. In preparing for the Summit, a number of professionals and advocates from across California prepared several background/issue papers. Solutions and recommendations from the Summit participants were presented to lawmakers.

PIP Outcome: Systemic Factors

Systemic Factors

Progress made through the Program Improvement Plan (PIP) in the federal Systemic Factors is as follows:

Objective 1: California will develop and fully implement its new outcomes based quality assurance system, the California Child and Family Services Review (C-CFSR) in January 2004 and complete a review of at least 15 counties by June 2005. (PIP Systemic Factor 3, Item 31.)

This objective has been met. The new outcome-based quality assurance system has been fully implemented, and serves as the starting point in the ongoing process of collecting, analyzing and applying data to hold the state accountable. After only two years, there is measurable statewide improvement in California's child welfare system. For example, one of the state outcome measures, which is the rate of children entering foster care, has shown a decrease of 3.4%. In another state measure, the placement of children with their siblings in foster care has increased by 2.8%.

The state and counties find the new system to be very useful. The next steps are to continue to track the data over time, and to come to a thorough understanding of the interaction between outcomes. In the next phase of this quality assurance system, more in-depth analyses can be performed to produce information that can help guide policy and practice -- this includes the use of the Peer Quality Case Review (PQCR).

The purpose of the PQCR is to learn, through intensive examination of county child welfare practice, how to improve child welfare services and practices in California -- both in the participating county and in other jurisdictions, as well. The PQCR goes beyond the county self-assessment by incorporating outside expertise, including county peers, to help identify the strengths and weaknesses of county child welfare services delivery systems and social worker and probation officer practices. In SFY 2006-07, 28 counties were scheduled to use the PQCR process. Eight counties focused their PQCR to examine the issue of improving recurrence of maltreatment, one county focused on monthly social worker visits, six counties focused their PQCR to examine the time to reunification; nine counties focused on decreasing the number of foster care re-entries; and four counties focused on improving placement stability.

Brief Summary of a Recent PQCR Analysis

Some Factors Affecting Performance:

- CWS social workers linked heavy workloads and documentation requirements to reduced time with children and families; one caseworker described her job as "drive-by social work." Other factors ascribed to burdensome or increased workload include high caseloads and staff turnover, as well as implementation of time-consuming new initiatives such as the Standardized Safety Assessment (SDM or CAT), Team Decision Making and Differential Response.
- The most frequent recommendations were to lower caseloads and to hire additional staff. Methods to implement the recommendation included reviewing caseloads and

assignments to redistribute and equalize more difficult cases among staff; using paraprofessional and clerical staff to handle duties not required to be handled by social workers; reviewing case transfer procedures; and using multi-disciplinary teams.

- Twenty (41.7%) and seven (18.4%) counties, respectively reported challenges in staff turnover, recruitment and retention for CWS and probation. Small counties noted that it was difficult to recruit qualified workers to rural areas, where compensation is relatively low. Moreover, they found significant difficulty in retaining supervisory and management staff, who frequently move to larger counties after a short time. Larger counties, while drawing from a larger pool of potential staff, reported high turnover due to stress, high and difficult caseloads, and inability to lower caseloads due to county policies or restrictive budgets.
- Twelve counties (25%) reported difficulty in recruiting and hiring bilingual staff as social workers, probation officers, translators or paraprofessional staff.
- A few counties reported that they had developed on-line or hard-cover guides to services and resources within their communities, and that these guides were very useful.

The counties through the PQCR describe the services needed as indicated below:

SERVICE NEEDS				
Services Needed	CWS Agencies Citing Service Needs		Probation Agencies Citing Service Needs	
	#	%	#	%
Transportation or visitation services	25	52.1	16	42.1
Mental health services (Medi-Cal)	23	47.9	13	34.2
Alcohol and drug treatment for adults and youth	24	50.0	5	13.2
Housing	12	25.0	5	13.2
Parenting classes	11	22.9	1	2.6
Domestic violence	6	12.5	0	0
Preventive services	6	12.5	0	0
Aftercare services	7	14.6	6	15.8

- Additional service-related challenges include an overall lack of services in rural areas, identified in 22 (45.8%) CWS reports and 10 (26.3%) probation reports, and inadequate bilingual or culturally competent services, identified in 21 (43.8%) CWS reports and 4 (10.5%) probation reports.

Recommendations:

- The most frequent recommendations were to lower caseloads and hire additional staff. Methods to implement the recommendation including reviewing caseloads and assignments to redistribute and equalize more difficult cases among staff; using paraprofessional and clerical staff to handle duties not required to be handled by social workers; reviewing case transfer procedures; and using multi-disciplinary teams.

- Recommendation include re-defining the roles of clerical and paraprofessional staff, and using or hiring support staff to provide the following functions:
 - Parent partners/advocates.
 - Relative assessment.
 - Referrals to services.
 - Requests for travel and medication, transportation.
 - Supervising parent/sibling visits.
 - Obtaining information on services, especially out of county.
 - Coordinating services provided to children and families.
 - Serving as a liaison to education, eligibility, foster family agencies.
 - Coordinating group home referrals.
 - Making packets for probation families.
 - Support documentation of children's health and education services.
 - Ten counties (20.8%) recommended hiring additional staff to work with resident with little or no English. Other recommendations included developing additional written materials in Spanish and other languages.
- Eight (16.7%) CWS and four (10.5%) probation reports made recommendation to address challenges in locating appropriate services for their clients either within or outside of their communities. Most recommended developing resource guides.
- Recommendations centered primarily on increasing culturally competent services and services in rural areas. Several counties recommended building community collaborative to provide services.
- Work closely with partners to provide parent partners/parent mentors, voluntary family maintenance services and aftercare services.
- Increase wraparound services involving multi-disciplinary teams, to provide intensive services to families.

Objective 2: By June 30, 2005, the State's objective is to reach the PIP target that a core curriculum is developed and delivered by all training entities statewide. (PIP Systemic Factor 4, Item 32.)

This objective has been met. A common core curriculum was developed utilizing information obtained regarding current training practices, training needs and input from stakeholders to address the goals and objectives of the Child and Family Service Plan.

All County Information Notice (ACIN) I-49-05, issued on September 8, 2005, provided information on the development of the statewide common core curriculum training components. The next revision of the common core was completed by June 30, 2006.

The evaluation framework has been implemented, and data is being collected for all new line workers and supervisors who complete common core training. Data from the common core evaluations have been collected and analyzed by CalSWEC. Reports are generated as the data is received, and are used to inform curriculum revisions and improve delivery of the training. Preliminary analysis using knowledge testing for the common core curricula has been completed. Data collection and pilot analysis continued through the Summer of 2006.

Finally, the May Revision of the Governor's Budget contained \$5.9 million in state funds for additional training days for SFY 2006-07, which are required as part of the common core curriculum.

Objective 3: By June 30, 2005, the State's objective is to meet the PIP target that statewide minimum requirements for the ongoing training of existing staff will be established and implemented. (PIP Systemic Factor 4, Item 33.)

This objective has been met. The proposed regulations were initially submitted to the Office of Regulation Development in June 2005. An ACIN (I-85-04) was disseminated alerting counties to these proposed regulations. The regulations have since been revised based on the review by CDSS legal staff. They are continuing on through the regulatory process.

Objective 4: By June 30, 2005, the State's objective is to meet the PIP target that a standard core curriculum will be developed and used to train caregivers in all counties. (PIP Systemic Factor 4, Item 34.)

This objective has been met.

Objective 5: By June 30, 2005, the State's objective is to meet the PIP target that where service gaps are identified by counties in the C-CFSR process, 20% of the counties will have addressed at least one identified service gap. (PIP Systemic Factor 5, Item 36.)

This objective has been met.

Objective 6: By June 30, 2005, the State's objective is to meet the PIP target that of counties where improvement is needed, as identified in the C-CFSR process for 1) service array for youth and Native American and African American children, and 2) case plans are generic and lack an individualized approach, 20% of the counties will have addressed at least one identified service gap. (PIP Systemic Factor 5, Item 37.)

This objective has been met.

Objective 7: By June 30, 2005, the State will ensure that all State/county licensing and approving staff are trained on and apply the same licensing/approval standards to all foster family homes. (PIP Systemic Factor 7, Item 42.)

This objective has been met.

Objective 8: By June 30, 2005, the State's objective is to reach the PIP target that each county will implement a State-approved recruitment plan that reflects the racial and ethnic diversity of children in care. (PIP Systemic Factor 7, Item 44.)

This objective has been met.

Other Efforts:

The Court Improvement Project: Self-Assessment for California Juvenile Dependency Courts

The Dependency Court Improvement Project (CIP) of the Administrative Office of the Courts Center for Families, Children & the Courts (CFCC) is developing a local Self-Assessment and Court Improvement project for California Juvenile Dependency Courts. CDSS is providing technical assistance to the project through quarterly meetings with CIP staff and its participation on the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee.

Using a process designed by the CFCC, local courts will be encouraged to assess their dependency policies and operations around the key topics identified by the *2005 Dependency Court Improvement Program Reassessment* as deficiencies or areas in need of further study. The self-assessment tools—modeled on tools developed by CFCC’s Domestic Violence Safety Partnership (DVSP) program— will include sections for assessing compliance with state and federal mandates, as well as adherence to best practice standards from the *Resource Guidelines* and elsewhere.

Topic areas for self-assessment will include the detention hearing, collaboration including court participation in the CFSR, notice and the Indian Child Welfare Act. Courts will choose specific areas of improvement, create a local court improvement plan that addresses these areas and set measurable outcomes for improvement. The CFCC’s CIP will facilitate the development of these plans, monitor the progress of the plans and report non-confidential outcomes as part of the CIP report. CIP will also coordinate CFCC’s dependency-related training and technical assistance resources to assist the courts in carrying out their plans. CDSS’ role in the Project is to offer technical assistance as requested, as well as having a staff member from CDSS as a part of the small working group.

The Court Improvement Program

The Court Improvement Program (CIP) staff has attended all the joint meetings on the upcoming Child and Family Services Review, and is planning to coordinate the input of the California judiciary to the Statewide Self Assessment. CDSS staff attended the national Court Improvement Program meeting in June 2006 as part of a team including the CIP staff and a California judge, and used the meeting to plan California’s coordination of efforts during the CIP. The CIP is entering into an interagency agreement with CDSS to use the CFSR data resources to provide data on safety and permanency outcomes for children specifically to judicial officers to further their involvement in the state’s Outcomes and Accountability project. The CIP staff is also coordinating the input of CDSS and CWS/CMS designers into the upcoming California Court Case Management System to align data elements, reduce duplication, enhance information sharing and follow a common schema of performance measurement.

Child Welfare Co-Investment Partnership

The California Child Welfare Co-Investment Partnership is a public-private partnership whose purpose is improving the lives of children and families who are in or are at risk of entering the state’s child welfare system. Formed in 2006, the Partnership includes organizations

committed to investing in the practices and supportive infrastructure that will improve the child welfare outcomes of safety, permanency and well-being.

Founding members of the Co-Investment Partnership include the California Department of Social Services, the County Welfare Directors Association of California, private philanthropic foundations including the Annie E. Casey Foundation, Casey Family Programs, the Stuart Foundation, the Walter S. Johnson Foundation and the Zellerbach Family Foundation and the Administrative Office of the Courts. Staff support is provided by the Child and Family Policy Institute of California.

Private philanthropy has been a crucial partner in improving outcomes for children and families involved with the child welfare system. While philanthropic investments have played a pivotal role in seeding localized child welfare improvements, never before has there been an intentional, public-private effort to consider how philanthropic investments can be leveraged to create statewide impact. That is a primary goal of the Co-Investment Partnership—to institute an ongoing, strategic approach that identifies and seeds promising ideas, monitors outcomes, documents results and educates about the need for increased public resources to sustain and spread proven strategies.

In 2006-07, the Partnership's public education goals are to:

- Develop a five-year strategic communication plan;
- Continue to increase key audience understanding of Co-Investment Partnership and to build support for Partnership priorities and
- Implement a strategic communications action plan.

Specific objectives include educating policymakers about the need for expanded:

- Higher education support for youth who have been in foster care, particularly to expand tuition assistance and the guardian scholars program;
- Local capacity to identify family connections for youth in care, particularly technical assistance and search tools and
- Increased reimbursement rates for resource families.

Foundations have made considerable and successful investments in the first two of these areas to improve outcomes for older and transitioning youth. The key measure of success for the Partnership will be increased understanding among policy makers about how higher education supports and the identification of family connections are impacting youth permanency and successful transitions and what more is needed to affect a greater number of California's youth.

Symposium on Fairness and Equity Issues in Child Welfare Training

The fifth annual Symposium on Fairness and Equity Issues in Child Welfare Training was held on April 12-13, 2007, at the University of California, Berkeley. It was sponsored by CalSWEC in conjunction with the Regional Training Academies, the Inter-University Consortium and the California Department of Social Services. The Symposium serves as a statewide forum to create collaborative training solutions to advance fair and equitable

practice and policy in child welfare. Presenters and participants shared their expertise, and this year's keynote speaker was Dr. Ruth McRoy.

The California Disproportionality Project

As previously described in the Safety section, racial disproportionality in California's CWS system is being addressed through our participation on the California Disproportionality Project, which is co-sponsored by the CDSS, the Annie E. Casey Foundation, and Casey Family Programs through the California Co-Investment Partnership. The goal is to launch the initiative in Summer 2007. In addition to a state level team, the project will include approximately 14 county CWS agencies and will involve their community and interagency partners.

Training and Staff Development Plan

TRAINING AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT

California's state-supervised, county-administered Child Welfare System (CWS) presents unique challenges and opportunities for developing and delivering training to various professional and paraprofessional child welfare staff and providers throughout the state.

The 58 county CWS programs vary in many ways: from rural to highly urbanized; from a workforce of a few public child welfare workers to a staff of thousands and from no formal staff development organization to very sophisticated staff development departments. Meeting the evolving and diversified training needs for these programs requires a continuing innovative and multi-faceted approach.

Welfare and Institutions Code section 16200 et. seq. requires CDSS to provide practice-relevant training for social workers, agencies under contract with county welfare departments, mandated child abuse reporters and all members of the child welfare delivery system. The stated purpose of the program is to develop and implement statewide coordinated training programs designed specifically to meet the needs of county child protective service social workers assigned emergency response, family maintenance, family reunification, placement and permanency responsibilities (Wel. & Inst. Code § 16206).

Consistent with the CDSS' federally approved cost allocation plan, training expenses are directly charged to the benefiting program. For costs allocated to Title IV-E, the non-federal discount rate is applied to account for the non-federal caseload. Also, all training contracts reflect the appropriate allocation of Title IV-E dollars for the application of the 75% enhanced training rate and the 50% administrative rate.

THE TITLE IV-B PLAN TRAINING AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT GOAL

GOAL 4: Prepare and support the workforce to help children and families reach positive outcomes.

Objective 1: Develop and implement a core curriculum for all new child welfare workers and supervisors.

Objective 2: Establish minimum training requirements for ongoing training of existing staff.

Objective 3: Develop and implement a standard core curriculum for caregivers.

Specific accomplishments/progress:

Objective 1: This objective has been met as of June 2005.

Objective 2: This objective has been met as of June 2005.

Objective 3: This objective has been met as of June 2005.

TRAINING AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT UPDATE

Regional Training Academies (RTAs)

The five academies, listed below, are committed to offering a continuum of training services that will: eliminate the duplication of, and offer consistency in, the delivery of training; assure linkages between the classroom and the field; support staff retention; promote the professionalism of current and potential staff in public social services and child welfare agencies within California and promote promising practices in the field of child welfare.

Bay Area Training Academy (BAA)

<http://www.sfsu.edu/~bayacad/>

The BAA at California State University, San Francisco, serves 12 counties that are very diverse in size, challenges and internal resources. The BAA provides professional development services for the following 12 counties: Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Monterey, Napa, San Benito, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano and Sonoma.

BAA has:

- Continued and increased cycles of new worker and supervisor core training. By 12-30-06, had completed 174.5 days of training, out of 235 proposed days of training, for 2,718 students. The Academy is on target to meet or exceed the deliverables in terms of training days/classes by 06-30-07.
- SDM training in San Francisco County for 300 staff.
- Completed a tri-county PQCR with Monterey, San Benito and Santa Cruz counties.
- Delivered training, "Undoing Racism", to the managers in the region.
- Assisted all of their 12 counties in building their capacity for best practices.
- Developed a one-day training on transfer of learning for supervisors.
- Continues to collaborate with CalSWEC and the other RTAs in curriculum revisions, as well as electronic learning and a learning management system.

The BAA staff has experienced an increased work load due to the demands of core training. Also, due to the training demands of the core, the Academy has experienced difficulties in meeting the advanced training needs of experienced workers.

Northern California Training Academy (NCTA)

<http://humanservices.ucdavis.edu/Academy/>

The NCTA located at the University of California, Davis, provides training tailored to the varied needs of 33 counties in Northern California: Alpine, Amador, Butte, Calaveras, Colusa, Del Norte, El Dorado, Glenn, Humboldt, Inyo, Lake, Lassen, Marin, Mendocino, Modoc, Mono, Napa, Nevada, Placer, Plumas, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Shasta, Sierra, Siskiyou, Solano, Sonoma, Sutter, Tehama, Trinity, Tuolumne, Yolo and Yuba.

The participant and county totals are representative of only the first three quarters in FY 2006-2007.

The NCTA has:

- Core Training for New Child Welfare Social Workers delivered seven (six modules, 18 days) core trainings for new child welfare social workers in Davis, Humboldt, Sacramento, Rocklin and Redding. Training was delivered to 1,086 participants from 27 counties.
- Core Training for New Supervisors in Child Welfare Services delivered 2 (3 modules, 10 days) core training for new child welfare supervisors. Training was delivered in Davis to 88 participants from 12 counties.
- Advanced and Specialized Courses delivered 52 courses across the region to 1,744 participants.
- SDM training: delivered ongoing SDM training to 186 participants from 19 counties. The NCTA worked with Nevada, Sierra, Alpine, Yolo, San Joaquin, Calaveras, Tuolumne, Lake, and Del Norte counties as they implemented SDM which requires additional coordination and training support.
- Online Courses: Confidentiality, Dependency Legal Update, ICWA, Project Management and Multi-Ethnic Placement Act. Over 135 participants have taken online courses.

Research to Practice: Creating Permanency for Foster Youth

Four days of training over 200 participants attending were held in Redding (March 20-21, 2007) and Davis (March 21-22, 2007) with 30 counties.

Critical Mental Health Issues in Children: A Symposium for Nurses

Symposium held in Davis on May 1, 2007 for child welfare and probation nurses.

Peer Quality Case Review (PQCR)

The NCTA supported 17 counties in PQCR process: Yuba, Alpine, Tuolumne, Shasta, Sutter, De Norte, Yolo, San Joaquin, Sierra, Amador, Butte, Plumas, Calaveras, Colusa, Mendocino, Siskiyou and Lake.

Significant accomplishments:

For the NCTA, it is balancing the increased need for training with the increased diversity of topics requested, as well as the continued support needed for all staff working in child welfare services; nurses, paraprofessionals and social workers. The majority of social work staff is BA level educated or less.

Barriers:

The ongoing challenges for the NCTA are of implementing standardized Core curricula for line social workers continued in this fiscal year. The workload related to the following issues continues to be significant:

Communication and training of instructors
Communication and coordination with counties

Coordination and scheduling of cores
Evaluation, implementation and workload

Central California Public Social Services Training Academy (CCPSSTA) (Central)

<http://www.centralacademy.org/>

Located at California State University, Fresno, Central works collaboratively with 11 counties in the central region: Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera, Mariposa, Merced, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Stanislaus, Tulare and Ventura.

CCPSSTA has:

- As of 02/28/07, trained approximately 986 CWS staff, supervisors, managers, and administrators.
- Assisting with implementation and training of TDM in Fresno County.
- Assisting with implementation and training of SDM in Santa Barbara County.
- Assisting with the implementation and training of CAT in Stanislaus County.
- Assisting with the evaluation of the Statewide Core Curriculum and with the evaluation of items used for the evaluation tools.
- Researching and assisting with the development of the curriculum for ICWA, Values and Ethics, Basic Interviewing, Court Procedures, Partner Abuse, Multicultural Practice, Education Advocacy, Human Development and Foster Parent training.
- Assisting in CalSWEC Mentoring Evaluation Study.

Significant accomplishments:

Co-organized a Central Valley ICWA Task Force which included partners representing the San Joaquin Valley tribes, county child welfare ICWA liaisons, university partners from the CSU, Title IVE Programs of Stanislaus and Fresno. The task force organized the 1st Annual Central Valley ICWA conference attended by tribal representatives, county child welfare staff and juvenile court judges and attorneys.

Strategically linked utilization of field-based trainers in Fresno and Tulare counties to System Improvement Plan (SIP) activities.

Used a field-based trainer (FBT) in Fresno County to train cultural broker teams to address disproportionality issues in the West Fresno district.

Developed a paraprofessional Core Training Series. Initiated use of the curriculum with Cultural Brokers in Fresno County as part of their Family to Family Initiative. Future training of a variety of paraprofessional staff used by CWS agencies in the region is planned.

Partnered with Southern, Bay Area, and Northern Training Academies to offer the First Annual Central Valley Symposium for Title IVE Public Health Nurses. (05/03/07)

Provided Peer Quality Case Review (PQCR) training and support to Merced, Madera, Stanislaus, Kings, Kings County Probation and Kern County Probation departments.

Developed Permanency is Priceless curriculum focused on incorporating youth as leaders as part of the Permanence for Youth project. Initiated a series of community-sited trainings for groups of social workers, foster youth and foster parents.

Created a Central Region CWS/CMS Business Objects User Group. The group meets regularly to review county progress toward achieving CFPSR outcomes and to review data changes related to SIP implementation strategies.

Public Child Welfare Training Academy (PCWTA)

<http://pcwta.sdsu.edu/courses.html>

Based at California State University, San Diego, and in partnership with California State University, San Bernardino, the Academy provides a comprehensive, competency-based in-service training program for the public child welfare staff of five Southern California counties: Imperial, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino and San Diego.

PCWTA has:

- Delivered 234 days of Line Worker Core for 224 trainees,
- 12 days of Manager Core for 54 trainees,
- 21 days of Supervisor Core for 105 trainees,
- 98 days of Advanced Classes for 2,000 trainees and
- 2 days of Training for Trainers for 45 trainers.

These classes total 367 days of training with 2,428 trainees/trainers.

- Completed the statewide standardized curriculum, "Child Maltreatment Identification II-Sexual Abuse".
- Completed the CalSWEC Fairness & Equity curriculum, "Diversity in Foster Care."
- Completed revisions to the statewide standardized curriculum, "Child Maltreatment Identification I-Physical Abuse, Emotional Abuse, & Neglect."
- The first RTA to roll out the standardized core curriculum and utilize embedded evaluation in the CMI-I curriculum.
- Developed a written Policy & Procedures regarding the "Trainer Development" plan.
- Applied for and received the FY 2006-07 grant from CalSWEC to develop a Fairness and Equity curriculum, "The Other Side of ICWA" in collaboration with Tribal Star.
- Involved in standardized core curricula revision committees, contributing to Placement & Permanency, Human Development, Legal Documents and Child Maltreatment Identification I.
- Developed an enhanced evaluation form for evaluating training delivery. This has been expanded to include evaluations for observer to use for periodic evaluation of all trainers. The latter is a part of the enhanced trainer development efforts.
- Moving to a higher level of evaluation with advanced classes. Have engaged two contracted experts to work on this effort and piloted an enhanced class in April 2007.

Changes:

Staffing changes: hired a program specialist to support the training administration activities. Also, recently filled the vacant position of Training & Curriculum Specialist III; this has and will continue to enhance the ability to provide more enhanced curricula in that they have staff to provide the hours of work. Work was expanded by the augmented budget.

Barriers:

There was a delay in receiving the augmented funds which caused some anxiety as our training deliveries were moved forward. This was resolved by ongoing communication with CDSS.

Plans for the future:

They plan to continue to enhance training with the latest findings from evidence based practice; to continue working on updating advanced classes with examples of how the class subject can impact fairness and equity concerns; to update class menus on the website to make class choices more readily identifiable by subject category/area; to continue to work more closely with trainers around their development as a trainer and to infuse the statewide themes in every class and to focus advanced classes more consistently with county SIP needs.

Also, they plan to move forward in collaborative efforts in the community to enhance training content and reflect the collaborative values of the counties. They plan to further collaborative efforts with other RTAs and IUC partners to share and learn from each other and thereby enhance the delivery of standardized curricula as well as advanced classes.

Inter-University Consortium-Los Angeles County (IUC)

<http://iuc.spsr.ucla.edu/>

The Inter-University Consortium Department of Children and Family Services (IUC/DCFS) Training Project continues as a collaborative endeavor between DCFS and the graduate social work programs at California State University Long Beach, California State University Los Angeles, University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), the University of Southern California (USC) and California State University Northridge (CSUN). The overall goal of this collaborative project is to increase the professional skills and knowledge of Los Angeles County public child welfare workers. Through specialized training centers located at each university (with the exception of CSUN), the Training Project provides in-service training to newly hired social workers, case-carrying social workers, supervisory social workers and management staff. The IUC also provides generous stipends and specialized training to up to 16 Master of Social Work (MSW) students at each university who intern at DCFS, receive specialized child welfare training as part of their MSW course work, and commit to a year employment at DCFS after graduation. To date, more than 550 individuals have received IUC stipends to support their MSW training. The IUC/DCFS Training Project is coordinated by a centralized staff that serves as the liaison between DCFS and the universities, conducts evaluation of training activities, operates the Training Project's data system and coordinates activities affecting all four universities.

The IUC has developed a range of methods for evaluating the training that is offered to DCFS. At a minimum, all trainings are entered into the Training Data System for accountability and monitoring of deliverables under the contract. The IUC Training Data System (TDS) is the primary data management system used by the Consortium and DCFS and serves as the principal data source for coordinating and monitoring the performance of the IUC/DCFS Training Project. The IUC assesses participant reactions to training in almost all presentations, generally assessing satisfaction, trainees' perceptions of learning in the training and its applicability to the job situation. Assessment of knowledge learned by new workers in the CSW Core Academy has been conducted for many years through pre- and post-Academy training evaluation. In 2004, the IUC initiated the assessment of knowledge learned by staff in system-wide training, including Strength-Based Family Centered Practice, Concurrent Planning, Kinship Caregiver Training, and Team Decision-Making. In 2005, the IUC initiated evaluation of knowledge and skill in key priority areas, and now include Legal Foundations, SDM, Kinship Caregiver, Court Report Writing, Child Maltreatment Identification, Family Engagement in Case Planning and Case Management, and Placement and Permanency.

- The IUC presented 191 training classes to 5,043 staff through February 28, 2007; between April 1 and June 30, 2007, approximately 75-100 classes were planned. DCFS presented 252 training classes to 4,663 staff through February 28, 2007, and approximately 75-100 classes are planned for the remainder of the year.
- Seven new worker eight-week CSW Core Academies have been delivered and five more are planned. In all, some 500 new staff will have been trained.
- Four three-week Human Services Assistant Academies are planned. Approximately 140 new staff will have been trained.
- Training in major initiatives in support of department program outcomes have or will be delivered. Highlights of these include, but are not limited to:
 - Kinship Caregiver Training: 5 presentations to 133 staff, with more due to be rolled out to most regions;
 - SDM (refresher, 2.0 upgrade, etc): 10 presentations to 214 staff and more planned;
 - TDM Facilitator Training: 2 five-day trainings to 24 staff, with more being planned for each region;
 - TDM Reinforcement Training: 6 presentations to 156 staff with more planned for each office;
 - Full Disclosure Interview Training: 44 presentations to 1,115 staff with more planned for each office;
 - Concurrent Planning Redesign Training: 35 presentations to 641 staff with more planned;
 - Management training on various initiatives and department outcome priorities (Family to Family, TDM, Title IV-E Waiver, Gangs, Permanency, etc.) have been offered to 300 managers with more being planned;
 - Court Report Writing Training: 22 classes were delivered to 709 staff following CSW Core Academy;
 - Implementation of a revised Academy for Emergency Response staff;
 - Continued Training on Points of Engagement: Team Based Service Delivery Model;
 - Ongoing SCSW Core Training as needed to fill/support promotions to Supervisor;
 - Legal Sufficiency Training for Supervisors (425 staff to be trained);

- Selected E-Learning Modules that have now been made available to staff including: ICWA; Substance Abuse Issues; AB 490 Training etc.;
- Large scale Management and Community Partner Training Events on: Title IV-E Waiver; Gang Awareness and Intervention; Team Decision Making and Family to Family Core Strategies; and
- Large scale judicial trainings with judicial partners to support implementation of key Departmental initiatives including: SDM, TDM, Points of Engagement and Wraparound.

This has been a rich, challenging and exciting time for the IUC/DCFS partnership, managing high numbers of new hires with the roll outs of major initiatives to support improved practice. The focus of effort for the coming year includes a renewed focus on strengthening the supervisory rank and file to insure improved oversight of practice through targeted training, an upgraded approach to evaluating training effectiveness and further implementation of the core Family to Family strategies. DCFS and its training partners continue to focus on ways and means to strengthen transfer/application of learning for accountable managers and supervisors to support the application of what is learned in training to the field. The Department and its stakeholders also share excitement regarding the approval of the Title IV-E Waiver for California and for Los Angeles County as it provides opportunities for increased flexibility in service delivery in order to achieve improved outcomes for the children and families we serve.

California Social Work Education Center (CalSWEC)

<http://calswec.berkeley.edu/>

The CDSS partners with the CalSWEC to facilitate the integration of education and practice to assure effective, culturally competent service delivery to the people of California. CalSWEC, based at the University of California, Berkeley, is the nation's largest state coalition of social work educators and practitioners. It is a consortium of the State's 18 accredited social work graduate schools, the 58 California county departments of social services and mental health, the CDSS, and the California Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers. In addition, the Administrative of the Courts JRTA project staff serves as a liaison to CalSWEC. CalSWEC is responsible for the implementation and oversight of the following projects:

The Regional Training Academy Coordination Project

In this project, CalSWEC supports the CDSS in its mission to improve training throughout the state by coordinating training efforts, sponsoring trainings and symposia and developing statewide curricula. Highlights for state fiscal year 2006/2007 include:

- Co-chaired (with the CDSS) the Statewide Training and Education Committee (STEC), which coordinates statewide training initiatives and oversees the development of statewide curricula.
- Facilitated the continued implementation, evaluation and improvement of the standardized common core training for newly hired line workers and supervisors. CalSWEC provides funds and coordinates curriculum development for all of the common core. With the implementation of the Framework for Evaluation of Training, CalSWEC also coordinates the evaluation of the core, including data analysis and reporting.

- Planned and facilitated the Tenth Annual National Human Services Training Evaluation Symposium held May 23-25, 2007. Symposium is widely known as the premier national event for training evaluation in the Human Services.
- Planned and facilitated the Fifth Annual Symposium on Fairness and Equity Issues in Child Welfare Training. This was held April 12-13, 2007, and was a forum for the training community to present and discuss the issues of culture, fairness and over-representation in child welfare.
- Planned and co-sponsored (with the Children and Family Policy Institute) a symposium on evidence-based practice in child welfare held June 28, 2007, with the aim of infusing research evidence into child welfare practice via training and education.

California's Title IV-E Social Work Training Project

Through the Title IV-E Project, the CalSWEC coordinates and supports Master of Social Work (MSW) programs in the State's 18 accredited schools of social work, as well as Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) programs in six of the member schools. The number of MSW students enrolled during the 2006-2007 academic year totaled 709, with an additional 14 students on temporary leave from the program, and 10 students who are completing their theses. The six BSW programs enrolled 53 students during the 2006-2007 academic year, with an additional 2 students on leave.

The participating MSW programs include 14 California State Universities, (Bakersfield, Chico, East Bay, Fresno, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Northridge, Sacramento, San Bernardino, Stanislaus, Humboldt, San Diego, San Francisco and San Jose); two University of California schools (Berkeley and Los Angeles) and two private schools (University of Southern California and Loma Linda University). CSU Long Beach also includes Distance Education programs at the Channel Islands and San Marcos campuses. The participating BSW programs are at California State Universities, Chico, Fresno, Humboldt, Long Beach, San Bernardino and San Diego.

The MSW programs, each of which follows a specialized child welfare curriculum, are designed to increase the number of professionally-trained social workers in the public child welfare workforce, as well as increase the ethnic diversity of the workforce. The BSW program offers a child welfare concentration in the senior undergraduate year and prepares graduates to work in entry-level public child welfare positions. Students commit to a number of years of employment equivalent to the number of years for which they received aid. Priority for financial aid is given to current county employees and persons who reflect the populations they serve. The Title IV-E project also conducts program evaluation activities.

The MSW program at California State University, Stanislaus, and the Title IV-E Child Welfare Training Project under a special contract with the CalSWEC, has spearheaded a full-time effort to recruit students from California's Native American communities to the Title IV-E Master of Social Work program. This is part of the ongoing contract and training efforts with CalSWEC. The goal of the program is to improve the perception of both leaders and youth in the Native American community about the role of the university, and more specifically about social work in their lives and to promote the value of a career in public child welfare.

Highlights for 2006/2007 include:

- California State University, Northridge joined the CalSWEC consortium as the 18th participating University with their first cohort of Title IV-E students in the Fall of 2006.
- Three new Title IV-E BSW programs also joined the Project. California State University, San Bernardino, California State University, San Diego, and California State University, Humboldt, enrolled 12 Title IV-E BSW students in the Fall of 2006.
- Continued support and development of the Title IV-E BSW Project, including ongoing development of process and program evaluation components. This year CalSWEC continued meetings of the BSW Planning Group.
- Continued the revised online version of the New Graduate Survey, an annual survey in which recent graduates are asked to examine the relationship between their academic programs and their work in the field of public child welfare.
- Planned and facilitated the Title IV-E Student Day, an annual conference of MSW and BSW students enrolled in the Title IV-E programs throughout the state. This conference, coordinated by a team of MSW students, provides current and former students with the opportunity to learn clinical and theoretical approaches utilized in the field of child welfare that are not necessarily taught during the traditional academic calendar. The 2007 conference theme was: "Strengthening the Many Faces of Title IV-E: Program and Practice."

Highlights of the Survey of Graduates:

- Graduates and alumni of this project have been employed in 50 of the 58 counties and with state adoptions.
- Graduates have a broad and diverse ethnic and cultural background, as well as considerable language diversity. Forty percent of the MSWs and forty-seven percent of the BSWs in the program reported speaking at least one language other than English.
- Two-hundred fifty-four (80%) of the Title IV-E MSWs who graduated in the 2005-2006 academic year found employment in 34 of the 58 counties.
- Seventeen Title IV-E BSWs graduated and twelve of these graduates were employed in the counties.
- One hundred-fifty-three Title IV-E MSW graduates completed their payback obligation years to public child welfare during the 2005-2006 academic year. These MSWs are from earlier and multiple cohorts.
- The first of the CalSWEC BSW graduates completed work obligation in public child welfare.
- The numbers of IV-E MSW graduates who remained in public child welfare after they completed payback has increased over the years from 40% of the 1993 graduates to 83% of 2003 graduates. The data are based on all graduates who completed their work obligation in public child welfare from 1996 through 2006.

Resource Center for Family-Focused Practice (RCFFP)

<http://humanservices.ucdavis.edu/resource/>

The RCFFP supports a variety of initiatives and practice approaches that are consistent with family-centered and strengths based practice, including: Family to Family, Wraparound services, Family Group Decision Making, Integrated Services and California Connected by 25. Additionally, the RCFFP has provided training to juvenile probation officers.

RCFFP has:

- Developed a nine-day training program for juvenile probation placement officers. The training covers legal and regulatory requirements related to delinquent minors placed in IV-E eligible placements including required face-to-face visits, safety, strengths and needs assessments, case planning, transitional independent living program plans, concurrent planning, youth and family engagement, termination of parental rights and permanency planning for youth. Five regional trainings have been conducted by June 2007 for approximately 150 deputy probation placement officers from throughout the state. Customized training for probation to support permanency, teamwork, case planning, youth and family engagement, and required visits has been conducted in 5 counties for approximately 175 officers.
- Developed and delivered a one-day training regarding the responsibilities of juvenile probation departments regarding abuse of youth in placement in five regional locations for approximately 175 officers.
- Developed a three-day curriculum for juvenile probation placement supervisors that will be delivered throughout the state during state fiscal year 2007-08.
- Developed a one day training for probation department managers regarding IV-E services and requirements with emphasis on case planning, face-to-face visits, permanency, and federal outcomes.
- Conducted training in Family Centered Practice topics (including strengths based training for social workers) for 5 counties and for 175 participants.
- Wraparound services is a model of providing support and mental health services for high-need children who otherwise would be placed in group care, often away from their communities. Training for 7 counties with 245 participants was provided throughout the state. Regional presentations were provided on topics identified as high need by the counties.
- Planning has begun on the Fifth California Wraparound Institute which will be held in June 2008. The last Institute was held in June 2006 and served 1,000 participants throughout California.
- Family to Family is a model to rebuild foster care through the implementation of four core strategies of self-evaluation, TDM, building community partnerships, and recruitment, development and support of resource families. Four trainings for TDM leaders were conducted with a total of 60 participants. Six convenings to provide training to groups of counties implementing Family to Family were conducted with a total of 560 participants. One statewide California Family to Family Convening was held in January 2007, with an emphasis on "Strengthening Our Response to Domestic Violence".
- Integrated services training has been provided to 7 counties with 245 participants on such topics as basic orientation and coordinated case planning.
- Developed a nine-day training program for parent partners working within child welfare services. Parent partners are parents whose families have successfully reunified with their children and are part of the team in partnership with child welfare social workers to provide support, mentoring, role modeling, education, and training to other families involved with child welfare. This training was piloted in April, May and June 2007.
- Support Family Group Decision-Making through training in 4 counties to 140 participants.

Foster Parent and Relative Caregiver Education Program

Training of Resource Families (foster parents and relative caregivers) is provided through an interagency agreement between CDSS and the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges (COCCC). Foster parent and kinship care education training programs are conducted by the local community colleges statewide as required by state statutes. Training is geared to those who want to become licensed foster parents, approved relative caregivers, and in some cases adoptive parents. This training is designed to develop and support caregivers to enhance their ability to promote the health and safety of children and youth placed in foster care.

The education/training sessions include training topics, such as, but not limited to:

- overview of the child protective system;
- age-appropriate child development;
- effects of child abuse and neglect on child development;
- caregivers' role in the family reunification or permanent placement process for foster children and youth;
- safety issues regarding contact with birth parents;
- permanency options for children in relative care, including legal guardianship; and
- emancipation and independent living.

Approximate Number of Days/Hours of Training Activity

Currently, the existing pre-service training is designed around the mandated topics of training according to Health and Safety Code section 1529.2. It includes 12 hours of training before the placement of a child in the licensed foster home, and 8 hours of in-service training per year. The number of hours of training required varies from the minimum of 8 hours to as high as 30, with most counties requiring 12-to-18 hours of pre-service training for foster parents. It is estimated that over 7,000 hours of training will be provided by community colleges under the COCCC.

Perinatal Substance Abuse/HIV Infant Program (formerly Options for Recovery Perinatal Program)

The CDSS has the authority and funding to plan and implement services for court dependent children, aged 0-60 months, residing in out-of-home care that are substance-exposed or test positive for Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV). All counties submit a county plan for approval to CDSS, specifically outlining a proposed budget, budget justification and detailed job specification for each requested staff position within the Perinatal Substance Abuse/HIV Infant Program.

County allocations and expenditures are controlled by CDSS. The responsibility for the development, implementation and monitoring of program policies and procedures to ensure compliance with state law also falls within the purview of the CDSS. The CDSS provides training and technical assistance to all participating Perinatal Substance Abuse/HIV Infant Program county staff. Emphasis is placed on assuring that all staff responsible for

implementing the Perinatal Substance Abuse/HIV Infant Program at the local level has an understanding of the needs of the target population and the local resources to serve them.

The following counties are currently participating in this Program: Alameda, Butte, Glenn, Contra Costa, Monterey, San Francisco, San Diego, San Luis Obispo, Santa Cruz and Shasta. The philosophy of this program recognizes that drug and alcohol abuse is a disease that requires treatment and compassion. The service delivery consists of interagency collaboration, targeted recruitment, specialized training, respite care and support services for foster parents and federally-eligible relative caregivers.

Counties are required to provide 33-hour core curriculum to foster parents and relative/non-relative caregivers that care for SA/HIV Infant eligible children.

- Butte County provides an additional 13 hours
- Contra Costa County provides additional 3 discretionary hours, to cover extra topics of interest, i.e. "Shaken Baby Syndrome."
- 39% of the total number of foster parents in Contra Costa County are SA/HIV Infant Program graduates.

Significant accomplishments:

- Shasta County added a substance abuse counselor to their staff.
- San Diego County started providing a recruitment letter in both English and Spanish to all licensed foster parents – totaling 1,600.
- San Diego County started making visits to CPS units providing information and seeking new SA/HIV Infant eligible relative caregivers.
- San Diego County started a Spanish speaking support group.
- Butte/Glenn County started a successful SA/HIV Infant Program Shelter Care Home Program.
- Butte/Glenn County started a SA/HIV Infant Mentor Program.
- San Luis Obispo County designed a Foster Parent Academy and a Positive Parenting Series for birth parents. The county is working more effectively with both foster and birth parents providing them with tailored training and team building experiences.

Changes:

- San Diego County has started the process of contracting for television advertisements for SA/HIV Infant Program homes
- Butte County recently began a quarterly SA/HIV Infant Program Sensory Integration Play Group for children with sensory integration issues.
- San Luis Obispo County will be requiring all foster families who are licensed for children 5 years old and under to be certified SA/HIV.

Barriers:

- Butte/Glenn County did not have enough SA/HIV infant trained foster homes to accommodate the number of children that have been detained that are drug/alcohol exposed. They increased their advertisement campaign to recruit more foster homes.

They are also working with their local newspaper on writing an article on the Butte/Glenn County SA/HIV Infant Program to inform the community about the need for more SA/HIV infant homes.

- Butte/Glenn County was experiencing some of the SA/HIV infant eligible children were being placed in Foster Family Agency Homes due to the emergency nature of the detentions. They are overcoming this problem by opening four SA/HIV Infant Shelter Homes in Butte County. Their SA/HIV Infant Project Coordinator is also attending all the Family Placement Meetings for all of the Butte County Detentions (under 5 years of age) to ensure SA/HIV infant eligible children are placed in SA/HIV infant trained foster homes.
- Contra Costa County was experiencing the relative caretakers being more wary of involvement with Children's Services Programs. Outreach and personal contact are being used to overcome this, with good results. Relatives are attending support group meetings and at least one is additionally pursuing a license to do foster care.
- Handling non-caregivers taking core curriculum classes and determining their eligibility to graduate. Regular meetings with the community colleges are scheduled to discuss this matter.

Plans for the future:

- Updated foster parent computerized tracking system which will begin to interact with the Emergency Placement Unit.
- Fresno, Orange and Stanislaus counties will be participating in the SA/HIV Infant Program in the 2007/08 state fiscal year.

Specialized Training for Adoptive Parents (STAP) Program

The STAP Program provides specialized recruitment, training and services to pre-adoptive/adoptive parents of children born HIV positive and/or substance exposed. The program is designed to assist the adoption of medically fragile children who are dependent children of the court, have an adoption case plan and reside with pre-adoptive or adoptive parents.

Participating counties are required to provide a training curriculum which includes all of the following:

- Orientation.
- Effect of alcohol and controlled substances on the fetus and children.
- Normal and abnormal infant and early childhood development.
- Special medical needs and disabilities.
- Recovery from addiction to alcohol and controlled substances.
- Self-care for the caregiver.
- HIV/AIDS in children.
- Issues in parenting, providing lifelong permanency and substance abuse prevention to children with prenatal alcohol and other controlled substances exposure.
- Issues specific to caring for a child who tests HIV positive.

There were no programmatic changes to the STAP Program in SFY 2006-07.

The CDSS will continue to provide technical assistance to those counties participating in the program and to any counties that submit a plan to participate in the program.

Child Abuse Prevention, Intervention and Treatment Training (CATTa)

<http://www.cattacenter.org/>

For the training from July 1, 2006 through March 9, 2007, there were a total of 17 sessions and 1,176 participants trained. Below are the titles of the trainings provided with the Office of Child Abuse Prevention (OCAP) funding:

- 20th Annual Children's Network Conference "20 Years: Improving Communication, Coordination, and Collaboration" – 309 participants;
- Child Abuse Prevention Council Roundtable – 3 presentations with 47 participants;
- Fall Children's Conference Family Wellness: Survival Skills for Healthy Families – 136 participants;
- One Size Does Not Fit All: An Integrated Approach to Helping Abused and Traumatized Children – 157 participants;
- Parenting with Positive Discipline: Techniques and Interventions – 4 presentations with a total of 186 participants;
- Regional Resource Consortium Coordinator Meeting – eight participants;
- Get Your Kicks on Route AB 636: Using Data to Improve Accountability – 34 participants;
- Internet Child Abuse: Protecting Children Against Perpetrators Online – 48 participants and
- Establishing and Enhancing Prevention Partnerships – 2 presentations with 63 participants.

Recognizable changes for this reporting period include an increase in the number of councils receiving funding through Children's Trust Fund (CTF) and Child Abuse Prevention Intervention Treatment (CAPIT) funding. There is an increase in the number of child abuse prevention councils (CAPC) receiving CAPIT and CTF funding and is attributed to CATTa and OCAP training and education on funding. The 2006 Trend Data Survey report indicates a 28% increase in coordination meetings when compared to the 2000 trend report. The Trend Data Report also indicates that the percentage of CAPCs having paid employees has significantly increased. Combing these two trends, it seems reasonable to conclude that the capacity of the CAPCs has increased over the past few years.

A challenge in some counties continues to exist around creating genuine collaborative partnerships in addressing child abuse prevention. This year working closely with the eight Regional Resource Consortium Coordinators and OCAP, CATTa has developed a new workshop entitled Establishing and Enhancing Prevention Partnerships and is designed to improve and support the collaborative work of CAPCs, county liaisons and community-based service providers.

Parent Leadership Training

<http://www.parentsanonymous.org/pahtml/paAbout.html>

Since 1999, Parents Anonymous[®] Inc. has been partnering with CDSS to provide parent leadership training and technical assistance to child abuse prevention agencies across the

State to encourage and support shared leadership. Parents Anonymous[®] Inc.'s, grant objectives include: the provisions of intensive training and technical assistance to 8 counties per fiscal year; the provision of one general parent leadership training to three counties; the expansion of leadership training and activities of the California Parent Leadership Team; and production of a newsletter biannually that highlights successful parent and shared leadership strategies throughout the state. The Parent Leadership grant with Parents Anonymous[®] Inc. provides training and technical assistance to administrators and service providers at the county level to increase their awareness of the benefits of working in partnership with parent leaders. Additionally, a State Work Group has been developed to: (1) assist with the design and dissemination of a survey instrument to identify needs and supports for Parent Partners in Wraparound Programs; and to plan and implement a Wraparound Summit to present the results of the surveys and develop recommendations for supports for Parent Partners. The overall goal of the grant is to foster a collaborative relationship in local communities where parents and professionals can work together to ensure quality services for children and families. This grant is funded through June 30, 2007.

Activities Update and Accomplishments:

One-hundred and eighty-seven parents and agency representatives received Parent Leadership Training. Trainings and technical assistance were provided to seven Office of Child Abuse Prevention targeted counties including Kings, Tulare, San Luis Obispo, Ventura, Santa Barbara, Lake, Mendocino and Napa. Follow-up trainings and technical assistance will be provided to these counties as well as three additional counties including Orange, Riverside and San Bernardino by to June 30, 2007. It is anticipated that an additional 178 parents and agency representatives will receive Parent Leadership Training by the end of the state fiscal year. It is expected that approximately 100 participants will attend a Wraparound Summit focusing on Wraparound survey results in June 2007. Through the trainings and technical assistance, the outcome has been that parents are able to take on leadership roles such as co-trainer; contributing to written materials; participating at conferences and working meetings; grant reviewing; participating in quality improvement and evaluation activities; participating in needs/strengths assessment processes; public speaking; becoming peer review team member; becoming advisory board member, participating in focus groups and other important roles. Parents have received recognition by boards of supervisors, numerous agencies and Parents Anonymous[®] Inc. The parents are able to raise public awareness about the important role parents play in shaping the child abuse prevention agenda.

Accomplishments this reporting period include:

- The Governor proclaimed February 2007 as California Parent Leadership Month;
- Members of the California Parent Leadership Team served on the Conference Planning Committee and assisted with development and implementation of Office of Child Abuse Prevention Parent Leadership Conference held in January 2007;
- California Parent Leadership Team members participated in two focus groups sponsored by the National Alliance of Children's Trust and Prevention Funds to discuss successful Parent and Shared Leadership strategies in California;
- A member of the California Parent Leadership Team attended a leadership training with a representative from the Office of Child Abuse Prevention and had the opportunity to

network and share California Parent Leadership experiences with other state representatives;

- A Statewide Wraparound Work Group was created with participants from the California Parent Leadership and staff and Parent Partners from Wraparound Programs across the state;
- The Wraparound Work Group assisted with the development and posting of an online survey instrument and 210 surveys were completed by Wraparound staff and Parent Partners; the Work Group is currently working on plans to implement the Summit in June and
- The Parents Anonymous[®] Inc. has enhanced collaboration and communication between Parent Leaders and Child Abuse Prevention councils throughout the state.

Changes:

Additional trainings were provided to the California Parent Leadership Team to assist in further expanding their leadership roles on policy and planning work groups.

Barriers:

Outreach to parents has sometimes been difficult due to large geographic distances between and within counties.

Future Plans:

Parents Anonymous[®] Inc. continues to provide evaluation information and will be submitting a proposal seeking continued OCAP funding into SFY 2007-08.

Family Support Training Model/Family Resource and Support Training and Technical Assistance Project (“Strategies”)

www.familyresourcecenters.net

The Family Support Training Model/Family Resource and Support Training and Technical Assistance Project (Project) provides training and technical assistance to prevention/early intervention-focused family resource centers (FRC) and family support programs through a network of three regional training centers known as “Strategies.”

Strategies this year has:

- Delivered 3 FRC core trainings to a total of 107 participants.
- Presented 6 (all day) peer review training sessions to 27 FRCs from 19 counties.
- Training sessions and workshops attended by a total of 1,286 participants.
- Co-sponsored/assisted in organizing 6 statewide/regional conferences.
- Conducted 8 statewide teleconferences addressing FRC fundamentals and nonprofit management issues.
- Participated in a series of teleconferences with a total of 81 FRCs statewide.
- Initiated the Family Develop Project with 17 family support programs and their public child welfare partners from five counties.

- Maintained a statewide e-mail listserv, “Strategies Announce”, that allows more than 6,778 subscribers to network with each other.
- Redesigned the website to be more user-friendly. Approximately 52,374 people visited the website.
- Distributed the “Working Strategies” quarterly newsletter to 25,372 subscribers, as well as posted each issue of the newsletter on the website.
- Assisted 110 agencies in 25 counties to develop FRC networks.
- Included networking activities (interactive exercises, networking opportunities, etc.) in all Strategies trainings and workshops.
- Provided technical assistance and training to local citizen review panels.
- Provided training/technical support for the Supporting Father Involvement Study, including providing two training sessions for grantees implementing the Supporting Father Involvement Study.
- Strategies training sessions reached 3,530 participants from 982 agencies in 53 counties across California.

The grantees have met or exceeded their objectives. The main challenge for this project includes the successful incorporation of training activities related to Differential Response (DR) as it pertains to path one and path two families.

The first three-year grant term for the Strategies project ended June 30, 2005. A new three-year grant cycle began July 1, 2005, and will end on June 30, 2008.

Special Start Training Program

www.mills.edu/specialstart/program.html

The Special Start Training Program (SSTP) at Mills College is funded by Office of Child Abuse Prevention Bureau (OCAP) to provide a statewide training program for social workers, community professionals, foster parents, adoptive parents and relative care providers on the developmental and behavioral needs specific to high-risk newborns, who are graduates of the newborn intensive care nursery. It is a unique, one-of-a-kind training program.

In FFY 2006, approximately 200 participants throughout California completed the training program, the Family Infant Relationship Support Training (FIRST). The number of participants is consistent from year to year and thus it is anticipated that, by June 30, 2007, 200 participants will have completed the training program.

A website was developed to present information that describes the training program, training resources in both English and Spanish and permits online training registration. Future plans discussed, but not currently contracted, are to have the website expanded to include videotaped vignettes that demonstrate patterns of high-risk infant behavior that include autonomic and motor.

Information on their website states that for the past five years the SSTP has offered community professionals and foster parents newly available information about the behavioral patterns of medically fragile preterm and other high-risk infants and developmental assessment techniques. The training has increased their recognition of specific high-risk newborn signals and behaviors, which in turn enable them to help parents understand their

infant's unique behavior and cues [which differ from those of a full term newborn]. In learning to differentiate between what is stable behavior from what is stressful for the infant, parents are able to help their infant work towards organized behavioral patterns that support their medical recovery and development. The training is strength-based. Each training day is taught by a professional trainer, and a parent trainer who had an infant in the Neonatal Intensive Care Unit (NICU).

The training program is presented in six parts starting with an Introductory Workshop [Day 1] that discusses the developmental issues for preterm infants and assisting parent/infant interactions. The Practicum [Day 2] is for those participants who wish to integrate assessment and interventions into their work with these infants and families. Mentoring and skills check days follow this level [Days 3 and 4] to determine independent and reliable use of the FIRST observation tool. Advanced clinical training [Day 5] is offered to those participants who have become proficient and additional education days are offered to all participants. Beyond these five levels, continuing education opportunities are also planned throughout the year.

National Council on Crime and Delinquency/Children's Research Center's (NCCD/CRC) SafeMeasures Reporting Service

The contractor, NCCD/CRC, has designed tools and training, SafeMeasures, that support the CWS Outcomes and Accountability Review System. The training and tools are used to aid the counties and the CDSS in better understanding data collection, analysis and reporting techniques aimed at ensuring compliance with Division 31 regulations, Titles IV-B and IV-E requirements, and improving state and federal outcome indicators. SafeMeasures provides counties with the tools and knowledge to conduct a more thorough assessment of their child welfare system, identify data trends and assist in the allocation of resources. CRC analysts provide both online and onsite hands-on technical assistance with the SafeMeasures application for counties on request.

Training is conducted by Children's Research Center staff in county offices statewide for social workers, supervisors and managers, and consists of a full day of training. CRC developed additional measures and has revised the Permanence Outcome Measures in SafeMeasures. A training curriculum has been developed.

Training

- Vendor completed two on-site trainings with Riverside and San Diego Child Welfare Staff in January with a total of 14 students. Training evaluations were very positive.
- The curriculum was developed and utilized during the training. Based on the evaluations the trainees felt that the information was pertinent and insightful.
- The evaluations indicated that the hands-on approach using the application on a big screen as a demonstration tool helped the trainees to visibly and manually see how to best navigate in the application.
- Many of the participants shared that the training taught them new things about the SafeMeasures application that they did not know.

Significant accomplishments

- The two counties (San Diego and Riverside) have gained a better understanding of how to monitor SafeMeasures to improve their Safety and Permanency Outcomes. Some county employees have noticed a trend leading toward positive improvements.

Changes

- The contract start date was moved from July 1, 2006 to November 1, 2006.
- Effective March 2007, the contract has been fully executed.

Barriers

The greatest barrier is the slow contract process. More than four months has passed since the revised start date of November 1, 2006, was agreed upon. The vendor is not able to invoice for services provided and is reluctant to incur costs and provide services beyond those already incurred without a signed contract.

Plans for the future

- To improve the coordination with vendor for PQCR counties. The training will be more effective if it can dovetail with scheduled PQCR reviews.
- CRC believes that the role of a quality improvement system is to make a supervisor's difficult job a little easier by giving them up-to-date, organized information that identifies problem cases and points to emerging trends. As a result, SafeMeasures is built with the busy supervisor in mind, providing the information needed to ensure that services are provided in a timely manner and in accordance with agency policy and guidelines.
- A fundamental premise of SafeMeasures is that positive outcomes are the result of a supervisor actively managing practice effectively. This is done not by looking in the rear-view mirror for outcomes from three, six or twelve months ago, but by monitoring what is happening now with services and case practices that drive better outcomes.

EASTFIELD MING QUONG FAMILY PARTNERSHIP INSTITUTE (EMQ-FPI)

<http://www.emq.org/about/index.html>

EMQ-FPI continues to provide on site technical assistance to counties and lead agencies, including open forums for all county partnerships. EMQ FPI provides coaching and mentoring at the child and family team level. They continue to assist the CDSS in conducting site reviews for fidelity of the California Wraparound model.

EMQ FPI has:

- Provided tailored, solution-focused training to counties as they develop and adjust Wraparound programs that fit the county's unique situation. The provider assisted counties with the systemic integration of Wraparound and other initiatives.
- Provided on-site training and technical assistance to counties and lead agencies including open forums for all county partners.
- Provided coaching and mentoring at the child and family team level.

- Provided training to counties that want to expand their Wraparound programs pursuant to the Mental Health Services Act/Proposition 63 requirements.
- Assessed and/or responded to any needs or requests from existing Wraparound programs that are at various stages of implementation. In addition, the site reviews assessed the fidelity of the Wraparound program.

Since the contract became effective in October 2006, there have been 12 training sessions and 268 participants.

No significant changes.

Barriers:

There were delays in renewing their contract as it had to go out for bid. This made it impossible to hold any sessions during the first quarter of 2006-07 state fiscal year since the contract had not been awarded and executed until late October 2006.

Plans for the future:

EMQ-FPI will continue to provide TA on Wraparound to individual counties, as well as, hold regional TA sessions. They will assist in the planning and the development of the 2008 Wraparound Institute. They are planning to have 1,200 people attend this Institute that will be held in June of 2008.

Breakthrough Series Collaborative (BSC)

The Breakthrough Series Collaborative (BSC) trainings teach counties how to effectively and efficiently study, test, evaluate and implement child welfare service practice changes. Learning sessions are held in which the counties gather together for face-to-face learning, strategizing and networking. These sessions are led by national experts. The counties have been focusing on the following subjects: the intake structure as three pathways of service response; and a standardized approach to assessment of safety, risk, protective capacity and needs.

The time period in between the learning sessions is called the Action Period. During this time, Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA) cycles are conducted to test and evaluate a series of small-scale changes with the goal of more rapidly bringing about a larger scale change in a particular area. The counties participate in a series of collaborative conference calls to report their progress, receive technical assistance regarding their work and get feedback and insights from other counties. The calls are oriented around specific topic areas, such as Assessment, Partnering, Engagement and other topics pertinent to the implementation of DR.

During SFY 2005-06 (the last quarter only), and SFY 2006-07, the Child and Family Policy Institute of California (CFPI) continued two core BSC activities to spread the learning and practice change that has occurred in the pilot counties to additional counties in California.

The two core activities are:

- Peer Technical Assistance Teams participated in another phase of Peer Technical Assistance. Four mentor teams, all of whom are DR pilot counties, were matched with five trainee teams to further advance their implementation of DR through the BSC method. The activities included:
 - Five Peer TA sessions were held to educate Mentee counties on the Differential Response implementation efforts in Mentor counties.
 - The Mentor counties for Peer TA included: Sacramento, Stanislaus, Placer and Contra Costa.
 - The Mentee counties included: Marin, Santa Cruz, San Luis Obispo, Fresno and LA (the Pomona Office)
 - Each session included 16 people—8 from the Mentor site and 8 from the Mentee site.
 - The BSC on DR Extranet (interactive website) was also actively maintained during this time period. While a number of counties visited the site, very little new materials were uploaded.

The significant accomplishments were:

- All of the visits were successfully planned and attended.
- Feedback from sites was that learning from others was very valuable in advancing their own thinking about DR implementation.

The CFPI maintained the project extranet through 2006. The extranet is an interactive website that contains information about DR implementation from both California counties and other states who have implemented DR. The range of information includes cycles of change counties have tried (PDSAs), forms, policies and procedures, national DR research, practice guides, and contact information from every participating county. The extranet also includes a discussion board where counties can pose questions and dialogue with one another about DR implementation.

There are no plans to continue the Breakthrough Series Collaborative supports for Differential Response at this time as counties have indicated it was no longer as useful as other activities, such as an annual convening. Therefore, the Breakthrough Series ended on June 30, 2006.

CWS System Improvements Implementation

The CDSS provided funding to counties for training CWS staff and selected county partners to ensure that the CWS System Improvements are successfully implemented. The three primary areas are:

- Safety Assessment
- Differential Response

- Permanency and Youth Transition

Training for the Safety Assessment Approach continued this fiscal year, after the implementation of the Approach by the 11 pilot counties on June 30, 2005. There are two sets of tools that meet the requirements of the Safety Assessment Approach. One set is the CAT (Comprehensive Assessment Tools) and the other is Structured Decision Making (SDM). Additional counties have been trained in either CAT or SDM as they have selected which set of tools they wished to implement and have implemented this SFY.

Training for counties for Differential Response is discussed under the Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF) Program section.

An essential component of the permanency protocols is family engagement. Family to Family counties were trained on and rolled out Team Decision Making (TDM). Training is provided through the Annie E. Casey Foundation and the Stuart Foundations, or through the Regional Training Academies. As of December 31, 2005, 22 of the 25 Family to Family counties were using the TDM core strategy. San Diego County began their TDM rollout in January 2006, and Kern and Solano counties rolled out TDMs in fall 2006. In addition, the statewide convening was held in January 2007.

Structured Decision Making (SDM)

The purpose of SDM is to assist child welfare workers in assessing risk; to assist counties in targeting services to children who are at greatest risk of maltreatment and to improve outcomes for children and families such as the reduction of the recurrence of child maltreatment. Workers are trained to use the tools, which consist of a safety and risk assessment, family strengths and needs assessment, and reunification tools. The tools are used throughout the life of a case, from the intake at the hotline until the child is reunified with his or her family. The only time the use of the SDM tools ceases is when it is determined that the child may not be reunified with his or her parents, and the case goal is changed from reunification to permanent placement.

Training on the SDM tools is a two-step process. In California, child welfare workers are trained to use SDM by either attending a class at the Regional Training Academies or by being trained by county trainers. Workers gain an understanding of the philosophy and research behind SDM through the training. They learn to use SDM by examining and practicing each tool in the SDM model. The second step is to learn to use the web-based tools. Staff from the National Council on Crime and Delinquency's Children's Research Center conduct the training for trainers in each county. Supervisors and managers are trained separately, prior to line staff being trained. They are trained using an additional module, which includes conducting supervisory case reviews, producing and utilizing management reports, and motivating staff to fully utilize SDM.

In FY 2006-07, CRC provided (or is scheduled to provide) 63.5 days of on-site training/technical assistance to counties. CRC also provided 6 days of collective or centralized on site training/technical assistance such as core team, lead expert, trainer summit, conference presentation. CRC also provided 10 training/technical assistance sessions ranging from 1-7 hours using GoToMeeting. The Northern Regional Academy

reported they delivered ongoing SDM training to 186 participants from 19 counties. They worked with Nevada, Sierra, Alpine, Yolo, San Joaquin, Calaveras, Tuolumne, Lake, and Del Norte counties as they implemented SDM which requires additional coordination and training support. The Bay Area Academy reported providing SDM training in San Francisco County for 300 staff. The Inter-University Consortium - Los Angeles County (IUC-LAC) reported they provided SDM training for refresher classes and for the 2.0 upgrade: 10 presentations to 214 staff.

University of California, Berkeley – Performance Indicators/California Children’s Services Archive

<http://cssr.berkeley.edu/cwscmsreports/>

The Performance Indicators Project at the Center for Social Services Research (CSSR) provides timely and useful data to California counties regarding children in the CWS system. Through an interagency agreement with the CDSS, the CSSR receives quarterly extracts of data from the state’s SACWIS system, CWS/CMS, and reconfigures and analyzes the data to produce information at the state and individual county level. Data is posted on the public website and most tables are updated quarterly. Data that is posted includes, but is not limited to, the national standards used in the CFSR review and its resulting PIP and additional outcome measures required by California’s Child Welfare Outcomes and Accountability System (AB 636). In addition to statewide and county specific totals for many measures, data are stratified and presented by age, race/ethnicity and gender. CSSR staff continues to provide training to many state and county staff in a variety of ways.

Training is administered through the provision of data, through e-mail technical assistance on demand, through telephone conference call trainings, telephone technical assistance on demand and through numerous on-site trainings throughout the state in individual counties, at CWDA regional meetings, at CWDA statewide Children’s Committee meetings and for CDSS staff. Training is given to county administrators, managers, line staff and state administrators and managers. In addition, since the website is public, advocates, legislators and representatives from other agencies serving children and families have access to this information.

Since there are several types of training, durations vary. On-site visits typically include either half-day or full-day sessions. CWDA monthly meetings occur over two half-days each month. County specific conferences generally include half-day sessions. Telephone technical assistance can be anywhere from a few minutes to an hour, telephone conference calls can be anywhere from one-to-three hours in length. E-mail assistance is ongoing. All types of training are long-term.

Most on-site training is provided by Barbara Needell, MSW, PhD, Principal Investigator, on the Performance Indicators Project. In addition, Daniel Webster, MSW, PhD, Project Director, conducts some on-site training. Phone and e-mail conference calls, and responses on demand are handled by Drs. Needell and Webster, along with several PhD Graduate Student researchers and the web person, Helen Kim.

Virtually all of the work on the Project is directly, or indirectly, a training activity. In addition to the time required to reconfigure, run, test, and post the data quarterly, staff spend much time

creating training tools (e.g., PowerPoint presentations, Excel spreadsheets with graphs, etc.), and working with state and county staff to understand the data and use the tools. Then, this acquired knowledge and skill is used to present data to other child welfare staff and community partners. This work has been extremely useful to county staff that has responsibility for data entry, and has resulted in improved data quality.

Significant accomplishments:

County and state staff continue to improve in their ability to use data as an important decision making tool. We are transitioning to a new, dynamic website that makes it much easier for staff to access publicly available data and have developed several new Excel spreadsheet tools that are training aids.

Changes:

We have incorporated training about the new composite measures that are a part of the second round of the CFSTRs and how to integrate them with ongoing statewide Outcomes and Accountability efforts. We are using Webex technology to hold web-based training sessions.

Barriers:

No real barriers.

Plans for the future:

To continue training state and county staff transition to the use of the new CFSTR data indicators/composites as well as other state indicators, and to transition all website material to our dynamic site, to expand training on the issue of ethnic disproportionality and to encourage the ongoing linkage on process to outcomes.

CWS/CMS Training

<http://www.hwcws.cahwnet.gov/training.asp>

The CWS/CMS is currently operational in all 58 counties and serves approximately 19,000 state and county CWS workers. A standardized statewide curriculum is available to all state and county staff working in the CWS program.

From October 2005 to December 2006, the approved California Multiple Award Schedules vendor, CGI-AMS, provided statewide CWS/CMS classroom training and included the following: New User Training, Business Objects Training/County Access to Data Training and County On-Site Refresher/Advanced Training. The procurement of a new vendor to provide statewide classroom training will be selected through the Invitation for Bid process, opening the competition to a broader range of competitors. The previous bid process used CMAS which only allowed pre-approved vendors to bid.

Many counties participated in CWS/CMS Statewide Training offered to staff from October 2005 to December 2006. The most recent data from October 2005 to December 2006, shows that 161 days of New Users Training was conducted with 293 participants; 44 days of

Onsite training occurred with 522 participants and 58 days of Business Objects training was given with 176 participants.

A separate CWS/CMS training allocation (CWS/CMS staff development) is provided to counties to train staff on how to use the CWS/CMS. Counties use these funds to provide local system training to new staff, staff whose functions within the program are changing, or special training to meet county or individual staff member specific needs. Classes include both locally delivered training similar to that provided under the statewide contract curriculum, as well as locally determined training priorities, which may not be readily available at a statewide level.

A CWS/CMS training region simulates the actual CWS/CMS for training purposes. This ensures counties can train their users on replicated CWS/CMS cases without negatively impacting the production environment. This tool is used to train new users, to refresh the skills of staff, to train staff on recent application changes and to test changes to new releases of the system.

The CWS/CMS Training Unit develops, updates, and maintains all of the state's CWS/CMS training tools and materials, including Computer Based Training (CBT), Online Release Notes, Quick Reference Guides and the standard training curriculum that is maintained on the CWS/CMS website. Updating and maintenance is performed on an ongoing basis to ensure that training tools and materials provide statewide uniformity on how the CWS/CMS application should be used to record information and data. The Training Unit provides oversight of CDSS vendor contracts for statewide classroom training manages the IBM Training Region contract and provides training for trainers (including county, state and contract trainers).

A replacement for the current CBT and web based training online training tools called Statewide Training Application Resource (STAR) is nearing completion and should be ready shortly. It will provide a more effective authoring tool for updating scenarios, images, and curriculum lessons. In addition, stakeholders will have the opportunity to interact with the tool in a more realistic manner.

Training for Group Home Staff

The California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Division 6, Chapter 5 requires group home staff be trained regarding the children served in the group home. Section 84064 requires the group home administrator to develop a training and orientation plan for group home staff. Section 84065 requires the plan have an overview of the client population served by the group home and training on the group home regulations. The training plan also includes training on the needs and services plan that is required for each child in care. Section 84068.2 requires the group home social work staff to develop the needs and services plan based on the needs of the child as outlined in the case plan with the child and the placement social worker. The group home must obtain written approval from the child's placement social worker on the needs and services plan. If the child is 16 or older, the needs and services plan incorporates the child's Transitional Independent Living Plan (TILP) in the case plan and outlines the group home role in meeting the child's goals in the needs and services plan. Further, section 84072, Personal Rights, states, "(25) To work and develop job skills at

an age-appropriate level that is consistent with state law. (27) To attend Independent Living Program classes and activities if he or she meets age requirements.”

New group home administrators must complete 40 hours of training, which may include modules on the needs of transition age youth. Community Care Licensing reports that some vendors have offered these modules, but they do not have the information on the numbers of classes offered or the numbers of administrators trained. Similarly, continuing education for group home administrators may include this topic.

The child’s social worker must meet the Manual of Policies and Procedures, section 30-504.1, Service Delivery Methods: “1. Independent living services shall be provided to all eligible youth, based on needs, services and goals identified in the most recently completed Transitional Independent Living Plan (TILP).” The placement social worker and the group home staff work together to meet the child’s needs as outlined when the child is placed in the facility.

Child Death Review Team Training

The CDSS has contracted with the Interagency Council on Abuse and Neglect (ICAN) for county and regional child death review team training. ICAN is providing training to over 100 local child death review team members in 5 regions. The training provides information to team members on properly identifying child abuse and neglect related deaths and review team processes. (See additional information under Resulting Programmatic Efforts to Identify and Prevent Child Fatalities.)

The first training was held on October 25, 2006, at the Sheraton Universal, Universal City. Attendees included 235 people representing the following professions: law enforcement, prosecutor, civil law, social services, health/public health, education, mental health, child advocates and others. At least 44 of the attendees were Child Death Review (CDR) Team members. Agenda items were based on the CDSS-sponsored document – Child Death Review in California: A Curriculum and Training Manual. Agenda items were: Suspicious Child Death and Severe Non-Fatal Injury Review; CDR Teams Working; Together to Share Resources and Manage Cases that Cross Regional Lines; Completing Local and Regional Reports; Responding Sensitively and Responsibly to an Infant Not Breathing Call; Hospital Team Investigations of Child Abuse and Neglect; Medical Syndromes that Mimic Child Abuse; Law Enforcement’s Response to Suspicious Child Deaths and Injuries; Adolescent Suicide: What We Need to Know for Prevention; Suspicious Child Death and the Autopsy and Helping Professionals Deal with Child Injury and Death. Seven counties were represented.

The second training was held on February 5, 2007, in Contra Costa County. There were 45 attendees, 28 from Child Death Review Teams representing 11 counties, including Contra Costa, Alameda, Riverside, Monterey, Napa, Santa Clara, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Solano, Marin and Los Angeles. Agenda items were based on the CDSS-sponsored document – Child Death Review in California: A Curriculum and Training Manual. Agenda items were: Fetal Infant Mortality, SIDS and other Child Health Programs & Reviews; Suspicious Child Death and Severe Non-Fatal Injury Review; CDR Team Confidentiality; CDR Teams and the Media; Law Enforcement’s Response to Child Deaths and Injuries; Providing Schools with Rapid Notification of Student Fatalities; Forensic Pathology in Suspicious Child Death Cases; Helping Professionals Deal with Child Injury and Death and Virtual Review of Case Study.

The first two regional training events hosted 280 professionals, 72 of which were CDR Team members. The third training took place in San Diego on March 21, 2007. There were 22 attendees, 10 of which were CDR Team members. Agenda items included: Child Abuse Prevention Councils and Child Death Review; Suspicious Child Death and Severe Non-Fatal Injury Review; The California State Child Death Review Council - Why We Are Here, Who's Who, and How We Can Help; Virtual Child Death Review - How Child Death Review Works; The Importance of CDR Team Reporting - NCFR Online CDR Report; Five-year CDR Report, San Diego; Helping Professionals Deal with Child Injury and Death; The Role of the Pediatrician in Suspicious Child Deaths; The Role of the Medical Examiner/Coroner in the Investigation of Sudden Infant Death Syndrome; EMT/Paramedics as Integral Partners in Prevention and Child Death Review; The Role of Law Enforcement in the Investigation of Suspicious Child Fatalities; and Safe Surrender Baby Law – From Tragedy to Hope.

Two more trainings sessions are being planned in Redding and Bakersfield. Agendas are in various stages of development, as the needs of each county are taken into consideration when deciding on agenda items and presenters. At each training event, a compact disc of the curriculum and training manual is distributed and the audience instructed on how to find it on the ICAN Website.

Over the past three years, it has become increasingly clear that the consistency of holding these training sessions throughout California, including the smaller out-of-the-way counties, has 1) brought needed attention to the importance and far reaching effects of conducting Child Fatality Reviews and 2) increased the credibility to the CDR process. To ensure the relevance of the changing dynamics of child death and child abuse and neglect prevention, they have continued to refine and improve the content and implementation. The continuity of these efforts into the next fiscal year will be vital in helping professionals understand and accept the death review process as a key to prevention.

Significant accomplishments

- Assisted CDRT members in accessing and using the CDR Curriculum and Training Manual.
- Created an abbreviated version of the CDR Curriculum and Training Manual, "At a Glance," which is distributed to all training attendees.
- Assisted with the revitalization of CDR Teams, especially those that have been somewhat inactive for some time.
- Highlighted local heroes in each county.
- Had representation from many counties at each training.
- Provided CDRT participants with networking opportunities.
- Provided presenters with expertise and relevance, who shared their experience and passion on a range of topics covered in the CDR Curriculum.
- Included Child Abuse Prevention Councils in CDR Teams and in training planning and presentations.
- Interested participants in the CDSS sponsored Curriculum.
- Interested participants and counties in the ICAN/NCFR Online CDR Team Automated Report Builder.

- Audience had positive response to information about how agencies and professionals work together to determine child abuse prevention efforts from the findings of review teams.
- Audience members expressed how training inspired them to learn more about and/or become more involved with Child Death Review.
- Experienced a growing interest in subjects such as children's grief and helping professionals who deal with death issues, the use of data, and communication with media.
- Increased marketing efforts, which included timely posting on website and multiple mass e-mailings to CDRT members in California.

Barriers:

The curriculum needs updating and should include more information about types of reviews such as domestic violence fatality, suicide, elder abuse and severe non-fatal injury. There should be a section on Fatal Family Violence. Grief and Mourning is becoming a huge area of interest and should be expanded. Barriers have not yet been overcome, but we have continued to stay in touch with teams so that we remain aware of areas of interest and can add items to the curriculum when feasible to do so.

The Redding training was scheduled for May 4, 2007, and Bakersfield was scheduled for June 8, 2007. The Redding training took place in a telecommunications center so we could broadcast the presentations. We are now basing the entire day's presentations and discussions around the morning Virtual CDR Review of a Case Study.

Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC) Training

The CDSS has plans to provide training when the new Compact is enacted even though these plans continue to be modified because of the national efforts to re-write the Compact.

In the interim, the CDSS schedules quarterly regional meetings with California ICPC liaisons. These meetings provide the opportunity for CDSS to consult with county staff and clarify ICPC requirements. The CDSS met with the Northern Counties Placement Committee on July 11, 2006, and again in October 17, 2006. Twelve to fifteen counties were represented in these meetings. The Southern Counties Placement Committee meeting was held again in June 2007.

- The CDSS provides ICPC training to California placing agencies and ICPC liaisons through Regional Training Sessions.
- Additionally, staff from the Out-of-State Placement Policy Unit (OSPPU) are continually available by telephone to provide technical assistance to parties involved in the interstate placement of a child.
- CDHS, is working on a training CD for American Public Services Association (ASPHA), Interstate Compact on Adoption and Medical Assistance (ICAMA) and Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC), tentatively scheduled to be done by May 2007.
- Finally, the CDSS continues to provide technical assistance to county staff for the out-of-state group home placement of children.

Interstate Compact on Adoption and Medical Assistance (ICAMA) Training for County Liaisons

The CDSS continues to actively pursue training considerations in ICAMA.

- The CDSS has a representative who is a member of the Executive Committee for the Association of Administrators of the ICAMA (AAICAMA).
- The AAICAMA has released ICAMA training on compact disc (CD). The CDSS OSPPU staff has instructed counties to contact APHSA to obtain a copy of ICAMA training, on CD, if needed.
- Even though proposed training for ICAMA liaisons continues to be modified as required, the CDSS OSPPU staff provides training and technical assistance by telephone to county ICAMA administrators as needed.

Kinship Support Services Program (KSSP)

Allowable IV-B

\$225,000

Setting/Venue

Fourteen counties currently operate a KSSP and seven counties are engaged in planning activities for potential operation of a KSSP in SFY 2007-08. The training provider conducts training and technical assistance at KSSP or county sites within each of the 21 counties. The training provider also conducts two conferences per fiscal year at a location in both northern and southern California.

Training Duration

July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007

Training Activity Provider

Edgewood Center for Children and Families

Approximate Number of Days/Hours of Training Activity

Each county with an existing KSSP, all new start-up and planning counties, and, any interested county without a KSSP program, attended one-day KSSP training in December 2006. There was a one-day training on March 30, 2007 and another one-day training in June 2007.

In addition to the one-day training events, training and technical assistance is provided by telephone, email, other written means and via onsite visits on an ongoing, as-needed basis throughout the term of the training period. Training and technical assistance is also provided related to data collection and reporting activities. Approximately 315 hours have been dedicated to those activities from July 1, 2006 to July 1, 2007; it is estimated that an

additional approximately 80 hours of training and technical assistance will be provided from April 1 to June 30, 2007, for a total of 395 hours SFY 2006-07.

Target Audience

County and private non profit personnel who administer and/or operate the KSSP sites and relative caregivers/volunteers who help staff the KSSP sites.

Total Cost Estimate

SFY 2006-07 = \$225,000 (100% PSSF funds)

Cost Allocation Methodology

This training is allocated to Title IV-B.

Description of How Training Meets Goals and Objectives of the CFSP

The KSSP promotes the well-being of children and families by providing funds for the planning, start-up and expansion of county kinship support services programs. These programs provide community-based family support services to relative caregivers and the court-dependent children placed in their homes, and to relative caregivers of children who are at risk of dependency or delinquency. Training and technical assistance is provided to county and non-profit personnel operating KSSP sites so that they can provide the most effective and efficient services to children and their relative caregivers that will result in improved outcomes related to safety, stability, permanent placements and the well-being of children and their families.

Number of Students

Training is provided to county and private nonprofit personnel that operate KSSP sites.

Significant Accomplishments

Training and technical assistance was increased by serving ten additional counties.

Changes

The same provision of training and technical assistance continues to be provided as in prior years, but was increased (see above).

Barriers

None identified.

Future Plans

To continue providing the same level of training and technical assistance to KSSP counties and to conduct outreach efforts that will increase the number of counties participating in the KSSP.

NOTEWORTHY PROJECTS, CONFERENCES AND SYMPOSIUMS

The Independent Living Practice (ILP) Training Institute

The annual Independent Living Practice (ILP) Institute provides an array of ILP related information and training. The Institute offers a wide variety of workshops related to the provision of services required under the federal John H. Chafee Foster Care Independence Program. Participants included county ILP coordinators, foster parents, county social workers, county probation officers and other stakeholders.

This year's Institute was particularly ambitious and workshop topics included:

- Permanency planning,
- Employment,
- Education,
- Transitional housing
- Innovative programs

Because of CDSS' participation in the National Governors Association (NGA) Policy Academy for Youth Aging Out of Foster Care, the Institute's workshops centered around "The New Vision for ILP." The New Vision focuses on redesigning the ILP by providing individualized services and experiential training based on an individual youth's needs in order to better assist youth who are eligible for the ILP. This initiative actively engages caregivers in the process of identifying, developing and providing services to meet the needs of youth. The Institute was held April 18-19, 2007 in Sacramento. There were approximately 300 attendees.

Annual ILP Teen Forum

The CDSS sponsors a Teen Forum for foster youth, ages 16-18, to provide them with an opportunity to learn more about independent living skills, housing resources, educational and employment resources and eligibility for the Former Foster Youth Medi-Cal Program. This year, the Foster Club All-Stars were featured; the group travels throughout the country and members share information about their personal experiences in an effort to improve the lives of youth in foster care.

This annual event provides youth with a unique opportunity to network with youth throughout the state. The forum was held June 22-24, 2007, on the San Francisco State University campus. Approximately 200 youth and sponsors attended this event.

Beyond the Bench Conference

Beyond the Bench is an annual, multidisciplinary conference that brings together juvenile dependency and delinquency professionals, including judicial officers, court administrators, child welfare professionals, public defenders, district attorneys, probation officers, educators, mental health professionals and service providers from many of California's 58 counties to learn about the latest research and best practices with regard to improving juvenile justice, child abuse and neglect proceedings. The conference is funded by court improvement funds and conference fees. The most recent conference was held in December 2006 in Monterey.

Parent Leadership Conference

In addition to meeting federal funding requirements, the OCAP recognizes the importance of parent engagement in child welfare services. It is critical for consumers of these services to have roles in the planning, implementation and evaluation of programs and policy decisions aimed at the prevention of child abuse and neglect. The purpose of the "Parent Leadership Conference" is to organize a one day conference with a focus on engaging parents into advisory groups, governance structures, decision making bodies and leadership roles.

The goals of Parent Leadership Conference are to:

- Raise public awareness about the important roles parents play in shaping the lives of children and families.
- Expand opportunities for parents to participate in meaningful leadership activities.
- Recognize individual parents whose contributions make a positive difference to their families and communities.
- Build successful partnerships between parents and professionals to strengthen and support families and communities.

The California Department of Social Services, Office of Child Abuse Prevention in partnership with the County Welfare Directors Association of California hosted the premier Parent Leadership Conference on January 30, 2007, at the Hilton Sacramento Arden West and kicked-off California's celebration of National Parent Leadership Month. The Parent Leadership Conference was meaningful and inspiring with various county stakeholders and parent speakers. It provided an opportunity for parents and members of both public and private sectors to join together and build partnership to strengthen children and family services programs.

Attendees had the opportunity to hear from local, state and national experts about the important roles and contributions parents can provide. The information provided shared experiences and practical tools for every county to establish and strengthen local parent leadership models. These models help build meaningful roles for parents and ensure a place at the table for parents to share their experiences, knowledge and perspective. The goal is to facilitate collaborative efforts that engage parents in meaningful leadership activities. At the conference, six parents were recognized and honored for their leadership in the child welfare services system and how they made a difference in their families and their communities. Organizations and counties throughout California had the opportunity to showcase parent

programs from their local areas and to exhibit their products and information related to the goals of the conference.

The conference was both informational and interactive. The audience included parents, public agencies and private organizations, local and statewide government and decision makers and parent groups. Conference attendance was approximately 300 individuals.

It is anticipated that the second annual Parent Leadership Conferences will be held in January 2008 to continue to increase parent partnerships with child welfare services at the state level and in all 58 California counties.

Annual California Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) Conference

The 14th Annual Statewide ICWA Conference entitled "Healing Our Homes for the Protection of Our Native Children" was held June 17-20, 2007 in Lakeside, and was sponsored by the Santa Ysabel Band of Diegueno Indians. Many participants attended the conference including tribal ICWA workers; tribal advocates, tribal council members and community leaders; law enforcement; child welfare and probation staff; judges; attorneys; foster/adoption agencies; social services agency personnel and other interested parties. The mission of the conference is to support positive partnerships between tribes and federal, state and local governments for the benefit of all Indian children.

Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) Curriculum Training

The Resource Center for Family-Focused Practice (RCFFP), a part of the University of California Davis Extension Center for Human Services, will deliver training to increase coordination, knowledge and skills in implementing ICWA. The training stimulates greater understanding of tribal issues for individuals responsible for making decisions regarding Indian children and their families. Through the training process, participants develop skills on effectively engaging tribal members in cooperative relationships, as well as assist tribes in understanding and effectively negotiating with public child welfare agencies. The training better informs participants of the requirements of ICWA and provides strategies to improve compliance. Participants also develop a greater understanding and appreciation of tribal challenges and historical barriers to effective relationships with government representatives. In turn, tribal participants develop effective skills in working with public child welfare agencies.

This project is funded at the 75% enhanced federal financial participation rate for Child Welfare Services Title IV-E training. The total cost for the project is \$150,000, with \$84,375 being claimed under Title IV-E training and state General Fund of \$65,625.

The training is presented at tribes or tribal organization locations whenever possible. This long-term training is provided through an annual contract that CDSS has with RCFFP to coordinate the training and revise curriculum, as necessary.

This training activity meets the goal of Permanence, Objective 7, to prepare and support the workforce to help children and families reach positive outcomes, and Objective 10, ensure that continuity of family relationships and connections are preserved for children in foster care.

The current focus on this project has been to modify CDSS' existing ICWA training curriculum to focus on tribal culture and better meet the day-to-day application processes of ICWA for county child welfare workers and juvenile probation placement officers. The curriculum was developed with extensive input from tribal representatives, advocates and county child welfare and probation agency staff. Many of these representatives are being used as co-trainers. The CDSS plans to continue this project into future years.

The Judicial Council of California's Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) Initiative

The Judicial Council of California-Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) will support CDSS' commitment to the full implementation of ICWA by providing technical assistance to county child welfare and probation staff, judges, judicial staff and county counsels on the requirements of the Act. The AOC will develop protocols to assure complete understanding of ICWA and will facilitate education by a broad-based group of subject matter experts on a statewide, regional and local basis. The ICWA Full Compliance Project will improve compliance with the ICWA by making available a range of cross discipline facilitation and education services provided by the AOC staff and outside consultants. These services will be tailored to meet the needs of the local county or region.

The cost for the training is \$150,000 and is fully funded by the state General Fund. The technical assistance is provided at the local court or other community sites, depending on the size of the audience. Subject matter workshops are conducted regionally. This long-term training is provided by AOC staff and outside subject matter experts. For a description of specific training activities conducted by the Judicial Council, see the Indian Child Welfare Act Initiative section under ICWA.

For SFY 2007-08, ICWA conference will be funded by the State General Fund, except for the ICWA/UCD training. The ICWA/UCD training will be funded 53% by Title IV-E and 47% by State General Fund.

County/regional ICWA subject matter workshops will be delivered. County facilitation training will be offered to assist counties with communication regarding possible solutions to extremely difficult procedural and process issues. The number of workshops and trainings will be determined by assessment of local needs. The audience is county child welfare and probation staff, state juvenile court judges, commissioners, referees, judicial staff and attorneys.

This training activity supports the goal of Safety Objective 5, to "ensure that children are maintained in their own homes whenever possible and appropriate." It also meets the goal of Permanence Objective 7, "prepare and support the workforce to help children and families reach positive outcomes" and Permanence Objective 10, "ensure that continuity of family relationships and connections are preserved for children in foster care." The CDSS plans to continue this project into the future.

Tribal Youth

(<http://the.academy.sdsu.edu/TribalSTAR/welcome.htm>)

Tribal STAR (Successful Transitions to Adult Readiness) is funded by the United States Department of Health & Human Services, Administration on Children, Youth & Families

(ACYF), and Children's Bureau. The intent of Tribal STAR is to ensure that Tribal foster youth are connected to culture, community and resources as they successfully transition to adulthood.

Tribal STAR provides interdisciplinary training for providers who work with Native foster youth. In addition, communities are also offered technical assistance to aid them as they work to build collaborative relationships and implement the training.

As an interdisciplinary training program, Tribal STAR training is designed for all Tribal youth service providers, including: Native American professionals and leaders, public human service agency staff, regional training academy staff, MSW students, and others who provide services to Native American foster youth. Topic areas covered in the training include: Tribal values & culture, collaboration, youth development philosophy, protocol and ways to effectively address the needs of Native American foster youth.

For the time period July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007, Tribal STAR provided training in San Diego and Imperial Counties to a total of 205 individuals. In addition, Tribal STAR also facilitated the Annual Tribal STAR Celebration (September 13, 2006) which gathered together a group of 62 native and non-native service providers and a Think Tank Forum (September 27, 2006) which gathered together a group of 13 Tribal trainers.

Tribal STAR was invited to participate in the CWDA Annual Conference on October 12, 2006, and has joined together with the Public Child Welfare Training Academy to develop a new training curriculum, *The Other Side of ICWA*. During the reporting period, Tribal STAR also continued to maintain the Tribal STAR website (<http://theacademy.sdsu.edu/TribalSTAR/welcome.htm>) and publish the quarterly newsletter, *Drumbeats*.

As a result of Tribal STAR training and technical assistance, several outcomes have been reported, including:

- Increased successful collaboration of Tribal and non-Tribal providers that serve Tribal youth;
- Increased successful placements of Indian children to Indian homes as a result of collaborative efforts;
- Increased number of providers that demonstrate a gain in knowledge about American Indian culture;
- Stronger regional and statewide support for partnerships that support successful transition of Tribal youth to adulthood and weekly Independent Living Classes provided on the Rincon reservation to Tribal foster youth

The addition of six partners to the Tribal STAR Team. The Tribal STAR partner agencies now include:

- County of San Diego Health & Human Service Agency, Indian Specialty Unit and Independent Living Unit
- Indian Health Council, Inc.
- San Diego Youth and Community Services

- Santa Ysabel Band of Diegueno Indians
- South Bay Community Services
- Southern Indian Health Council, Inc.
- Intertribal Court of Southern California and
- YMCA Youth & Family Services

During the 2006-2007 federal fiscal year, Tribal STAR provided a Training for Trainers course in each region of the state (Southern, Los Angeles, Central, Bay Area and Northern). Tribal STAR provided training in a revised format to social work students attending accredited MSW programs across the state of California during the 2007-2008 federal fiscal year. Technical assistance (TA) and training will be provided to those providing services to Tribal youth. The areas of focus for the TA and training included the creation of a judge's checklist, assistance with the development of memorandums of understanding (MOUs) between tribes and county child welfare agencies, support of the SIP and CFSR efforts, and other activities.

Native American Social Workers

The Master of Social Work program at California State University, Stanislaus, and the Title IV-E Child Welfare Training Project under a special contract with the CalSWEC, has spearheaded a full-time effort to recruit students from California's Native American communities to the Title IV-E Master of Social Work program. This is part of the ongoing contract and training efforts with CalSWEC. The goal of the program is to improve the perception of both leaders and youth in the Native American community about the role of the university and, more specifically, about social work in their lives, and to promote the value of a career in public child welfare.

Training Classes

Training was provided to current MSW Students in San Francisco and Oakland:

- San Francisco American Indian Healing Center - September 2006 - 6 MSW Students
- San Francisco American Indian AIDS Project - December 2006 - 8 MSW Students
- Oakland American Indian Child Resource Center - December 2006 - 7 MSW Students

Training was provided to current MSW Students at California State University, Los Angeles:

- 54 MSW Students - November 2006

Training has been provided to current MSW Students at the Joint CSU CalSWEC Child Welfare Training Project "Indian Child Welfare Act" Summit- Visalia:

- 38 MSW Students - October 2006

Significant Accomplishments

There have been several major accomplishments of the American Indian Graduate Outreach & Recruitment Project during this report period. The first major accomplishment has been that of the planning, development and implementation of the first Joint California State University, County Counsel, and Tribal Partnership in the "Indian Child Welfare Act" Summit. The CSUs of Fresno, Bakersfield and Stanislaus served as lead agencies in this Summit which was held in Visalia during October 2006. There were over 200 participants and many were MSW

students from throughout the state in addition to Tribal Social Services, County Attorneys, Probation Department representatives and California State Department of Social Services, as well as county Child Welfare Agency representatives. Keynote Presenters included national pioneers of the Indian Child Welfare Act. Plans are being made to continue this summit in subsequent years.

The second significant accomplishment has been the development of a partnership with California Tribal TANF (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families) state contractors to provide ongoing recruitment efforts throughout the state. The Tribal TANF contractors are recruiting American Indian Social Service workers as they develop their TANF services for American Indian families. This will provide the opportunity to arrange recruitment presentations for potential graduate studies candidates from this pool of social work professionals. There are currently nine Tribal TANF contractors throughout the state.

Changes and Barriers

There were no significant changes in project activities during this report period, and no specific "barriers" encountered. However, during this year city, county, and Tribal communities have expressed a need for Native American social workers for human/social service specialist positions. There have been multiple instances in which these positions have gone unfilled. This clearly indicates a need for an increase in Native American social workers throughout the state.

Plans for the Future

The plans for the future include the above referenced continuing efforts to present the second annual Joint CSU Partnership effort for the Indian Child Welfare Act Summit planned for October 2007. Other planning efforts include the development of Tribal TANF contractor partnerships as recruitment venues for the Title IVE MSW/BSW Social Work Training Project.

COUNTY STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING

Counties provided various levels of in-service training to all their staff, which is described in an annual training plan. Counties are required to adhere to the Staff Development and Training regulations contained in the CDSS' Division 14 of the Manual of Policies and Procedures. These regulations serve as a guide to county welfare departments in the administration of county training programs. Division 14 provides the mandate and structure of county accountability in the development and implementation of training programs, annual training plans, evaluation and training need assessments. These regulations establish claiming and cost reimbursement criteria and guidelines for allowable staff development cost and activities.

ADDITIONAL TRAINING HIGHLIGHTS

Multi Ethnic Placement Act (MEPA)

The Northern California Children and Family Services Training Academy updated the curriculum regarding the Multi Ethnic Placement Act so that it is available for use throughout

the state for existing and new state and county adoptions workers. This training is available online.

County Counsel/Social Worker Joint Trainings

The purpose of this training activity is to further the IV-B Plan Training and Staff Development Goal of workforce preparation and support (Goal V: Prepare and support the workforce to help children and families reach positive outcomes) through multi-disciplinary training regarding permanency. This goal is achieved by: 1) providing specific training on case planning as related to reunification and other permanent plans and 2) providing training emphasizing respective participant roles in achieving systemic permanency goals.

This training activity falls under the following category necessary for the administration of the foster care program: preparation for and participation in judicial determinations. These training activities are short-term. The duration of specific training programs varies according to type of training offered and audience served. The trainings will be coordinated and overseen by the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC); the AOC will contract with statewide and local training providers with experience in the specific subjects being covered by the trainings.

Training

Trainings have been conducted in Los Angeles, San Diego, San Luis Obispo, Santa Cruz and Stanislaus counties. The number of attendees per training is as follows:

Los Angeles:	1,026 (social workers 61%, county counsel 18%)
San Diego:	178 (social workers 55%, county counsel 12%)
San Luis Obispo:	49 (social workers 89%, county counsel 1%)
Santa Cruz:	61 (social workers 61%, county counsel 19%)
Stanislaus:	73 (social workers 82%, county counsel 3%)

Significant accomplishments:

This is the second year in which grant funds have been provided to the Administrative Office of the Courts to conduct interdisciplinary permanency trainings. In the second year of the grant they have built upon the teams established in the first grant period; a representative from county counsel, the social services agency, parents and minors counsel comprise the county planning teams. The groups' familiarity with both the process and one another has led to more sophisticated trainings in the current year, with county-specific permanency issues being addressed head-on by either local or national experts. The teams met in November 2006 to plan training for the fiscal year. Each county team reviewed its respective AB 636 data and developed training agendas specific to the permanency barriers extant in their particular counties. The November planning meeting generated agendas not only for this year's trainings but also for trainings in the future; the interdisciplinary process is a success as reflected by equal engagement and participation by each of the targeted training populations (social workers, county counsel, parents and minors counsel).

Changes:

There have been no deviations from the current year training plan.

Barriers:

The primary barrier faced thus far is related to domestic violence training. Several counties have identified the specific issue of reunification with parents engaged in domestic violence as a key training need. While they have been able to secure local and national experts in domestic violence treatment for trainings, none of these practitioners are able to address dependency – specific issues such as the relationship between ASFA timelines and 52-week batterer’s treatment programs; or parents/parent/boyfriends/girlfriends who defy court orders and continue to see each other or remain living together during the juvenile court proceeding. They plan to engage a domestic violence expert to work jointly with a social worker and court-appointed attorney on a specific Domestic Violence and Reunification curriculum.

Plans for the future:

They have submitted a 2007-2008 proposal for courtroom advocacy permanency training; many of the county teams and training participants have identified this as a critical training need.

Judicial Review and Technical Assistance (JRTA)

Technical assistance for judges, as well as dependency and delinquency court stakeholder groups was provided under the provisions of the Judicial Review and Technical Assistance (JRTA) contract, during this past fiscal year. A JRTA .5 staff attorney coordinated and staffed court/county collaborative workshops in California’s largest counties. The agenda for each workshop was developed through feedback from the dependency court judicial officers regarding obstacles and challenges to permanency, in their respective counties. Each agenda included promising practices in permanency issues, such as: finding life-long connections for youth, engaging youth in dependency process, concurrent planning, prioritizing permanency for youth, ADR methods, Family to Family models, termination of parental rights and adoption. Each court/county collaborative was able to identify and share key county programs which they either sought to strengthen or initiate.

The JRTA attorney will continue to provide technical assistance and training related to permanency through continued research, development of curriculum and maintaining relationships with local, state and national experts. Future technical assistance and training will focus on working collaboratively with dependency and delinquency court judges and county agencies in the areas of ILP, transitional housing and finding connections. In addition to expanding these services to delinquency court system stakeholders, they will be made available statewide as resources permit.

TRAINING EVALUATION

The following outcomes were planned from July-December 2006 and have been met:

- Data from knowledge and skills tests were analyzed, leading to initial validation of assessment instruments and protocols.
- A process for using assessment findings to review and revise curricula was developed.
- A study was designed to measure the effect of mentoring (field training) on transfer of specific skill from the classroom to the job.

Background:

The CDSS uses a multi-pronged approach to the evaluation of training programs. To address the ever increasing importance of evaluating training activities, the Macro Evaluation Team was established. The membership is comprised of representatives from the CDSS, county staff development organizations, Regional Training Academies (RTAs), the Resource Center for Family Focused Practice (RCFFP), and the Inter-University Consortium (IUC) in Los Angeles. The Team is charged with making recommendations about statewide CWS training evaluation that includes the development of a statewide training evaluation framework, as mandated by California's PIP. Counties and RTAs can also access training from CalSWEC and national experts in training evaluation via the Macro Evaluation Team. This evaluation framework was first applied with the introduction of the common core curricula training for new child welfare workers and supervisors.

The framework addresses assessment at seven levels of evaluation, which together are designed to build a "chain of evidence" regarding training effectiveness.

These levels are:

- Level 1: Tracking attendance.
- Level 2: Formative evaluation of the course (curriculum content and delivery methods).
- Level 3: Satisfaction and opinion of the trainees.
- Level 4: Knowledge acquisition and understanding of the trainee.
- Level 5: Skills acquisition by the trainee (as demonstrated in the classroom).
- Level 6: Transfer of learning by the trainee (use of knowledge and skill on the job).
- Level 7: Agency/client outcomes - degree to which training affects the achievement of specific agency goals or client outcomes.

Establishing that training leads to an important part of the groundwork for tying training outcomes to program outcomes that is being laid by the field as a whole.

Benefits of implementing a framework for training evaluation:

- Data about the effectiveness of training at multiple levels (a chain of evidence) can be used to help answer the overall question about the effectiveness of training and its impact on child welfare outcomes.
- Data about training effectiveness is based on rigorous evaluation designs.
- Curriculum writers and trainers have data focused on specific aspects of training, allowing for targeted revisions of material and methods of delivery.
- Evaluation provides a standardized process for systematic review and evaluation of different approaches to delivery of training.

For the time period, July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007:

Implementation accomplishments to date:

- A decentralized system that is monitored by the RTAs and counties has been designed to track attendance and transmit information to the CDSS.
- Data from the common core evaluations have been collected and analyzed by CalSWEC. Reports are generated as the data is received, and are used to inform curriculum revisions and improve delivery of the training.
- Transfer of learning continues to be evaluated as part of the field training program at Central California Regional Training Academy. A preliminary report will be ready for distribution in late Summer.

Significant accomplishments:

- Knowledge tests were administered by the RTAs and analyzed by CalSWEC for the initial versions of the common core curricula with standard content.
- To date about 34% of the total 253 multiple choice test questions have been included in actual tests. Preliminary item analysis was completed on these items, and a very large percentage (93%) of the items that were used in the first round of tests performed adequately enough to continue without revision.
- Information from the preliminary analysis was used to refine the curricula and test materials.
- New multiple choice test items were developed for use with knowledge tests, with the goal of creating a bank of items that can be used interchangeably. This will enhance the validity and the security of the items, and allow for flexible use of different items at different sites.
- New tests were generated and distributed that include the new items. They are currently being used to evaluate the revised curricula.
- A new, scenario-based embedded evaluation tool was developed for use with the Child Maltreatment Identification, Part II: Sexual Abuse curriculum. The embedded evaluation for Child Maltreatment Identification, Part I was refined and continues to be used for all newly hired employees, statewide.

Barriers:

- Test item development and validation is a lengthy process, which involves collecting data over a fairly long period of time. While the items that have been developed are performing very well, more test data is needed to complete a bank of validated items. This process is complicated by the fact that the curriculum has also been under revision.

Plans for the future:

- As noted above, the next version of the common core curriculum for line workers will be implemented in SFY 2007-08.
- The evaluation framework will continue to guide the ongoing curriculum development and revision process. This includes continued use of knowledge tests and embedded evaluations with common core curriculum trainees.
- The validation process continues for multiple choice test questions that are used for knowledge tests.
- Quality assurance procedures will be developed and implemented for the common line worker and supervisor cores.
- The data analysis from the field training evaluation will be used to make recommendations for the evaluation of transfer of learning.

Policy Guidance and Information Provided to Counties

All County Information Notice (ACIN) I-80-05 issued on December 30, 2005, provides information on the telephone access rights for children and youth in foster care.

ACIN I-82-05 issued on December 30, 2005, provides information on health assessments, diagnosis and treatment services for children in foster care.

ACIN I-83-05 issued on December 30, 2005, provides information on state's Program Improvement Plan parent and foster parent final survey.

ACIN I-05-06 issued on May 12, 2006, provides information on implementation of Assembly Bill 129, dual status children.

ACIN I-18-06 issued on May 12, 2006, provides information on 2005 chaptered legislation affecting emergence response, family maintenance, family reunification, and permanency planning components of the Child Welfare Services and the Adoptions Program.

ACIN I-19-06 issued on March 30, 2006, provides information on federal statutory regulations changes to the Rosales Title IV-E eligibility criteria.

ACIN I-25-06 issued on April 7, 2006, provides information on documentation on foster care placement episode in CWS/CMS.

ACIN I-26-06 issued on April 7, 2006, provides information on documentation on 23-Hour assessment centers in CWS/CMS.

ACIN I-27-06 issued on April 25, 2006, provides information on court ordered requirements in the Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Foster Care (AFDC-FC) Program.

ACIN I-30-06 issued on April 14, 2006, provides information on Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Project.

ACIN I-34-06 issued on April 28, 2006, provides information on changes to public disclosure requirements in child fatalities and near fatalities.

ACIN I-46-06 issued on July 10, 2006, provides information on safely surrendered baby law publications.

ACIN I-47-06 issued on June 30, 2006, provides information on Title IV-E Child Welfare Demonstration Capped Allocation Project.

ACIN I-47-06E issued on July 7, 2006, is an errata to ACIN 1-47-06, Title IV-E Child Welfare Demonstration Capped Allocation Project.

ACIN I-49-06 issued on June 30, 2006, provides information on Katie A. lawsuit.

ACIN-I-56-06 issued on September 8, 2006, provides information on requests for training and technical assistance from National Resource Centers.

ACIN I-59-06 issued on August 23, 2006, provides information on the state Program Improvement Plan parent and foster parent survey.

ACIN I-86-06 issued on December 1, 2006, provides information on recording time "time to investigation" in CWS/CMS.

ACIN I-90-06 issued on January 7, 2007, provides information on 2006 chapter legislation affecting child abuse reporting, Indian children, foster youth, foster caregivers and adoptions.

ACIN 1-94-06 issued on December 22, 2006, provides information Tribal/State intergovernmental agreements.

ACIN 1-95-06 issued on January 8, 2007, provides information on documentation of ICPC in CWS/CMS.

ACIN I-02-07 issued on January 11, 2007, provides information on child and family services review parent and foster parent survey.

All County Letter (ACL) 05-09 issued on April 26, 2005, provides information on reporting and investigation requirements for child abuse regarding children in out-of-home placements.

ACL 05-09E issued on June 3, 2005, replaces attachment II in ACL 05-09 (reporting and investigation requirements for child abuse regarding children in out-of-home placements.)

ACL 05-13 issued June 13, 2005, provides information on relative and non-relative extended family member approvals, frequently asked questions and answers, and CWS/CMS 5.4 functionality.

ACL 05-13E issued on February 15, 2006, provides clarification to several questions in 05-13.

ACL 05-17 issued on August 8, 2005, Gresher v. Anderson impact on licensed foster family homes and family child care homes and on the relative/non-relative extended family member caregiver approval.

ACL 05-23 issued on August 19, 2005, foster parent child care program.

ACL 05-23E issued on September 2, 2005, update contact phone number in ACL 05-23 (foster parent child care program).

ACL 05-25 issued on November 2, 2005, provides information foster youth proof of dependency/wardship document.

ACL 05-39 issued on December 30, 2005, provides information on changes which entitles foster youth to participate in age-appropriate extracurricular, enrichment, and social activities.

ACL 06-02 issued on March 7, 2006, provides information on the use of occasional short-term babysitters by foster caregivers.

ACL 06-04 issued on June 20, 2006, provides information on changes made by SB 500 to minor dependent parents in foster care.

ACL 06-05 issued on May 12, 2006, provides information on the use of Adopt 226, notice of voluntary adoption proceedings for an Indian child.

ACL 06-07 issued on April 12, 2006, provides on the change in time period for completion of a case plan.

ACL 06-15 issued on August 4, 2006, provides information on the requirements of child abuse allegations regarding probation wards in out-of-home placements.

ACL 06-19 issued on June 30, 2006, provides information on final court order and clarification on changes to the foster care program made by the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005.

ACL 06-20 issued on July 21, 2006, provides information on public disclosure of child fatalities and near fatalities caused by abuse or neglect.

ACL 06-40 issued on November 2, 2006, provides information on Mary Glesmann v. Saaenz, et.al. impact on licensed foster family child care homes, and relative/non-relative extended family member caregiver approvals.

ACL 06-50 issued on November 9, 2006, provides information on promoting safe and stable families.

ACL 06-54 issued on December 6, 2006, provides information on policy and procedure to refer young children under the age of three with a substantiated case of child abuse or neglect to the early start program.

ACL 07-03 issued on January 9, 2007, provides information on duties of adoption service providers in the independent adoptions program.

ACL 07-09 issued on February 6, 2007, provides information on changes relating to education requirements for 18 year old foster youth. Also receipt of Supplemental Security Income/State Supplemental Payment.

ACL 07-10 issued on February 28, 2007, provides information on Best Practice Guidelines for screening and proving for foster children with disabilities.

County Financial Letter (CFL) 05/06-44 issued on April 26, 2006, provides information on federal budget reconciliation bill changes to Title IV-E administrative funding.

CFL 06/07 issued on September 12, 2006, provides information on donated funds as county match for general funded programs.

Evaluation and Technical Assistance

EVALUATION AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Supporting Father Involvement Study

The CDSS entered into an Interagency Agreement with the University of California, Berkeley to conduct a study to: 1) determine the effectiveness of a particular intervention to increase positive father involvement and, 2) measure organizational culture change to determine if the family resource center implementing the intervention becomes more inclusive of fathers in other programs and services. The intervention is being implemented in Santa Cruz, San Luis Obispo, Tulare and Yuba Counties. Grantees are the CWS agencies in these counties which are required to partner with a local family resource center for implementation. The target population is co-parenting couples with children age seven and younger. Families are randomly assigned into one of three groups: 1) a one-time educational presentation about how positive father involvement improves outcomes for children; 2) a 16-week (2 hours per week) group meeting for fathers and, 3) a 16-week group for couples (2 hours per week). All project participants receive case management services. Data will be collected through a battery of assessments that will be administered three times during each family's participation in the study. It is anticipated that interim report will be issued in Summer 2007, and a final report in 2009.

CAPIT and CAPTA funds are being utilized to fund the intervention.

Significant Accomplishments

The principal investigators were retained through contracts with the Connecticut Department of Mental Health (to retain investigators from Yale University Medical School) and with University of California, Berkeley. Project meetings, to provide face-to-face training and technical assistance to staff of the five sites, were held in April and November of 2005 and in May and November 2006. A project listserv that facilitates communication, training and technical assistance was launched in 2004 and continues to provide continuity in communication between sites, research team and CDSS. All clinical study sites (four family resource centers) have enrolled families into the study and are providing intervention services. At this time, 289 families are participating actively in this study.

The design of the Supporting Father Involvement study for low-income families involves random assignment to (1) a single-session information session (the control group), (2) a 16-week fathers-only group, or (3) a 16-week couple's group. The same male-female staff pairs conduct interventions with all study participants. The 289 participants have completed a pre-intervention assessment, a post-intervention assessment 3 months after the groups end, and some have completed a third assessment 18 months after entering the study. Analyses of changes in the full sample assessed at baseline and again three months after the intervention showed that a single meeting focused on father involvement (the control condition) produced, on the average no significant positive changes, and allowed some significant negative changes to occur in the fathers and mothers who participated. By contrast, the father's groups and the couple's groups produced a number of positive effects on the participants as individuals, on their couple relationship, and on their relationships with their children. Participants in the ongoing groups reported fewer symptoms of anxiety and depression at the

post-test assessment than they had before the intervention began. They maintained their satisfaction with their relationships as couples, in contrast with control couples whose couple relationship satisfaction declined. Fathers in both the father's groups and couple's groups showed significant increases in their hands-on involvement in the daily tasks of child care. Finally, participants in both ongoing interventions experienced a significant rise in annual income, in comparison with control participants whose incomes remained stable. In some areas of functioning, the couple's group participants showed greater gains than the father's group participants (larger declines in parenting stress and larger increases in father involvement).

Preliminary analyses of the third assessment, 18 months after the couples entered the study, 9 months after the first post-test, reveal that intervention gains are being maintained over time, and that the father's group participants appear to be "catching up" to the couple's group participants in terms of the positive effect of the intervention.

In short, the results, especially for the groups in which both mothers and fathers participate regularly, appear promising - in terms of fostering increased father involvement in their young children's care and parents' satisfaction with their relationships as couples, and the parents' ratings of their young children's aggressive behavior.

Barriers/Unexpected Events

Initially, Sacramento County participated in the study as the fifth site. The Sacramento County site experienced difficulty identifying and engaging target population families, and it was decided that the intervention was not a good fit for the identified community. The CDSS and Sacramento County mutually reached an agreement that allowed the county to end its participation in the study and to provide alternate services to fathers who reside in the neighborhood of the FRC. Subsequently, the four remaining sites needed to plan to serve an additional 60 families to ensure that 300 co-parenting couples needed for the study complete intervention groups. In order to reach the target number of the study, the time period has been extended from September 30, 2006, to June 30, 2007.

Future Plans

The project will proceed as planned with the remaining four counties. Additionally, CDSS is in the process of expanding the study to new target populations within the current four sites. By July 2006, a dissemination plan was developed for the purpose of providing practice information to other agencies within the original four counties and plans are in development to use that experience to roll out the results of the study to agencies in other counties of California. A full description of the dissemination plan and implementation process will be provided during the next reporting period.

During SFY 2007-08, the focus of dissemination will be to expand the SFI Study target populations and establish protocols for a longitudinal study of a subset of families from Phase I. The expansion will include two areas: a) at the four current sites, include non-biological fathers/father figures and families with children up to the age of 11 years; b) select a fifth site to implement the intervention in an African American community.

Promoting Safe and Stable Families

THE PROMOTING SAFE AND STABLE FAMILIES PROGRAM

California continues to use the Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF) grant to operate and expand on a PSSF program that incorporates services covering the federally identified categories of Family Preservation, Community-Based Family Support, Time-Limited Family Reunification and Adoption Promotion and Support.

To verify that the CDSS has met the non-supplantation requirements for Title IV-B subpart 2 programs in Section 432(a) (7) (A) of the Act, we have compared the state and local funds spent in the State Family Preservation programs for FFY 1992 and FFY 2005. The State Family Preservation program is the state level program that relates directly to the Title IV-B subpart 2 programs. In FFY 1992, CDSS spent \$13,138,422 in state and local funds for this program compared to \$50,887,305 spent in PSSF for FFY 2005.

Selection Process for County PSSF Programs

California allocates approximately 85% of its PSSF grant directly to counties for the community provision of direct services and sets aside 15% of the total PSSF grant for state operated programs and administrative costs (no more than 10% of the total grant). The state does not take any administrative costs out of the matching state Family Preservation Fund. The total amount is allocated to counties to use for service.

Each county selects programs for funding in accordance with its own needs assessment, and conducts procurement activities in accordance with local administrative requirements. This occurs at least every three years, as counties are required to develop and submit PSSF plans to the CDSS for review and approval on three-year cycles, including annual PSSF updates. The CDSS provides technical assistance to the counties, addressing the need for consistency and coordination among the C-CFSR, the county's SIP and the county's three-year PSSF plan. The CDSS reviews the three-year plans addressing the need for such consistency and coordination, prior to approving a county plan and authorizing its PSSF allocations.

Three-Year Plans

California has required counties to develop plans for use of the PSSF funds on a three-year cycle with annual updates based on federal fiscal year with the current cycle ending September 30, 2008. Accordingly, the CDSS disseminated an instruction letter for the new three-year cycle of October 1, 2005 through September 30, 2008. To best address the findings of the federal CFSR, the state's PIP, the county SIP, the CWS System Improvement activities and the new Outcomes and Accountability System (AB 636), California required counties to combine their PSSF plans with their Child Abuse Prevention, Intervention and Treatment (CAPIT)/Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention plans. The cycle began on July 1, 2005, and extends through June 30, 2008. The resulting consolidated plan provides a more complete picture of the continuum of needs and services within each county and facilitates blending and maximizing of funds.

The CDSS' OCAP has the oversight responsibility for the PSSF Program. As such, OCAP provides technical assistance to the counties. The technical assistance provided by OCAP stresses the need for consistency and coordination between the C-CFSR, CWS System Improvements and the consolidated three year plan and annual updates.

Needs Assessments and Types of PSSF Services

Preventive services are determined by each county based on their own community needs assessment. Such assessments have identified a greater need for family preservation and support services in rural areas where isolation is a challenge to families needing preventive services. The needs assessments also show that the size of the population in these areas does not support a wide variety of adoption services.

On the other hand, these assessments show a greater parity among categories of services in the urban areas where a larger population base increases the need for, and provision of family reunification, adoption and adoption support services.

As previously stated, it is the intent of CDSS to continue to have local community services funded by PSSF funds to follow PSSF program criteria in each of the four federal categories. PSSF criteria states that at minimum 20% of the service funds must be spent in each of the four federally identified categories: Family Preservation, Family Support, Time-Limited Family Reunification, and Adoption Promotion and Support services. Current examples of PSSF services provided by counties this year include, but are not limited to, the following:

- **Family Preservation**
Programs such as in-home services for at-risk children and their families; programs providing follow-up care to families where a child has been returned after a foster care placement, including integrated case management, intensive home visiting and strength-based parenting services designed to improve parenting skills by reinforcing parents' confidence in their strengths.
- **Family Support**
Health screenings and physical examinations including kindergarten health check-ups, nutrition education classes, family assessment and referral services, strength-based parenting and parent leadership services, individual and group counseling, mentoring, gang intervention, and other services designed to enhance student success and youth enrichment programs.
- **Time-Limited Family Reunification**
Individual, family and group counseling; inpatient residential and outpatient substance abuse treatment; mental health; domestic violence; temporary child care; therapeutic services for families, including crisis nurseries; transportation to and/or from services; family assessment and referral services; case plan development; supervised and guided visitation services; father involvement services; in-home support; crisis intervention for children at risk of removal (emphasizing reunification when in the best interest of the children) and aftercare services to reunifying families.

NOTE: Unless specifically tailored for reunifying families (e.g., aftercare, case plan development and supervised visitation specific to targeted reunifying families), these services are also available under the other three categories.

- **Adoption Promotion and Support Services**
Services include, but are not limited to, adoptive parent recruitment, including public service announcements; orientations for pre-adoptive families to prepare them for adoptive home studies and parenting skills and training programs for adoptive parents.

The attached CFS-101, PART II: Annual Summary of Child and Family Services chart includes specific data on the estimated number of individuals and/or families to be served and the estimated expenditures by fund source for the services.

Identified Gaps in PSSF Services

Gaps in PSSF services have been identified through county-submitted PSSF updates, the C-CFSR process, and the CDSS' consultation process. These sources have identified that not all services are accessible to families in all geographic regions of the state.

Due to the decrease in PSSF funding, it been challenging for state and local service provides to effectively fill the identified service gaps. CDSS continues to explore new ways of addressing these gaps and have incorporated tribal representation into local planning. Some of the gaps are being addressed through the work being done at the state level through the SIT.

Various gaps exist in rural areas. Lack of readily accessible transportation can impede service. Limited availability of appropriate foster family homes makes it more difficult to access and provide time-limited family reunification services. Smaller populations make adoptive parent recruitment and provision of post-adoption services more challenging.

The CDSS county contacts also revealed gaps in culturally-appropriate services specifically for Native Americans. The OCAP staff noted the following additional service gaps in their review of county self assessments and SIPs, which affect the four PSSF categories:

- Supervised visitation resources for children.
- Substance abuse treatment facilities for parents with young children.
- Post-adoption services.
- Respite care.
- Affordable housing.

Twenty percent minimum of PSSF funds are to be spent in each of the identified categories

The annual update instruction letter to counties requires that a strong rationale must be provided for each decision where a county is not meeting the specified 20% minimum. Additionally, All County Information Notice (ACIN) 06-50 dated November 9, 2006, was sent to all the counties stressing this requirement. The ACINs for 2006 can be found on the CDSS website located at: http://www.dss.cahwnet.gov/lettersnotices/2006AllCou_2303.htm

Although counties make their local categorical decisions based on local needs, the OCAP continues to instruct them on the 20% categorical spending requirement, monitor county

expenditure data, and provide technical assistance and administrative assistance necessary to correct any issues. The OCAP monitors county expenditures quarterly to determine if additional technical assistance or development of a corrective action plan (CAP) is necessary for a county not meeting its goals as identified in the county three year plan and/or subsequent PSSF annual updates.

Each situation where there is a deficiency will be examined as to the reasonableness of meeting the goals on a county-specific basis. If there are reasons for not meeting each one of the goals, the specific county goals and the associated justifications will be documented. To ensure that the 20% goals are met on a statewide basis, the OCAP considers the information reported by each county when assessing the state's overall achievement.

There are some difficulties with reporting expenditures on a federal fiscal year basis, as the state allocates funds to the counties on a state fiscal year basis of July 1 to June 30. This means that when the state reports its expenditures, because of the nature of the state's budgeting and accounting system, it would include funding from two separate federal grants as well as funding from special projects, partially funded by the 15% set aside. Notwithstanding this, for federal fiscal year 2005, the state expended funds in the following proportions: for Family Preservation the percentage expended was 28.83%, for Family Support the percentage expended was 38.28%, for Time-Limited Family Reunification the percentage expended was 17.64%, and for Adoption Promotion and Support Services the percentage expended was 15.25%.

In reviewing the expenditures we have noted that there is significant improvement over SFY 2004-05; however, the expenditures are not to the minimum percentages we require. While efforts to improve the percentages individually with counties are described in the section below, we also worked with the County Welfare Directors Association to ensure that both county fiscal personnel as well as county program personnel are aware of the 20% requirement and that we continue to monitor expenditures. In addition, counties receive instructions each year with their allocation letter as to the 20% categorical spending requirements. Internally, we requested assistance from our fiscal staff in helping us monitor expenditures on a quarterly, county-by-county basis. As the quarterly expenditure reports are issued, we will be discussing the reports with the counties who appear to be having difficulty meeting the minimum percentages.

We believe that the current fiscal data clearly indicates that counties have made tremendous progress toward achieving the required 20% minimum in each category. Finally, there are some activities which we believe counties can legitimately claim to another category that better reflect their actual compliance with the PSSF 20% requirements. Through continued work with both county program and county fiscal staff as well as our own fiscal staff, we anticipate we will meet the 20% minimum spending requirements.

The Impact of Los Angeles County on California's Percentage Deficiency

A significant issue with respect to the state's inability to achieve the 20% spending requirement were the previous PSSF expenditure patterns of Los Angeles County. The county in past years had not claimed PSSF funds for its Time Limited Family Reunification or for Adoption Promotion and Support services. This is highly significant for the state, as Los Angeles County receives the largest PSSF county allocation.

In response to our concerns, Los Angeles County submitted a corrective action plan (CAP) to the OCAP. Since then, the CDSS and Los Angeles County representatives have been in constant communication regarding their progress on the CAP. The Los Angeles Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) continues to make progress in all areas of their CAP. Recent fiscal update shows that services are being provided in all four categories, and that the county has made great progress moving toward the 20% minimum spending requirement. The CDSS will continue to support Los Angeles County with focused technical assistance regarding claiming and coordination of services to ensure PSSF compliance.

The OCAP staff provided technical assistance to counties through in-person visits and via e-mail and phone calls to counties that were not demonstrating a minimum of 20% expenditure in each category. OCAP staff has worked to bring counties into compliance as they developed their three-year plans. Current data and information shows the counties moving toward compliance and have developed their new three-year plans assuring a 20% minimum expenditure in each category and writing their contracts accordingly. The state is not quite yet at 20% for each category of service, since counties were given permission to extend their existing contracts up to a year. However, with the progress made by Los Angeles in combination with the new county contracts, the CDSS expects full compliance soon.

PSSF Linkages to Other Family Support and Family Preservation Services

The OCAP will continue working with counties to identify linkages with existing family support and family preservation services. The OCAP requires counties to submit a report annually that includes a request for information on linkages with other programs. Of particular interest to the OCAP is information that identifies county PSSF efforts linked to the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) cash assistance program, and other programs such as substance abuse, child abuse prevention, early intervention services, mental health, local correctional facilities and work force development.

Blending of Funds

The OCAP encourages counties to maximize services through linking to other fund sources. As a rule, counties blend funds from available sources that include the following programs: PSSF, Child Abuse Treatment Act (CAPTA), Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP), the California Child Abuse Prevention, Intervention and Treatment (CAPIT) Program, the Children's Trust Fund, funds from tobacco tax, city and county funds, foundations and private donations. The intent is to maximize services by providing a continuum of services for children and families from all serving agencies.

DIFFERENTIAL RESPONSE

The PSSF Funds will be Used to Develop and Expand Family Support and Family Preservation Services

Differential Response is an intake system which allows the child welfare agency to respond in an individualized manner to referrals based on the unique needs, resources and circumstances of the family. It is designed to engage the participation of vulnerable families

and children currently not receiving services. For more information, please refer to the Safety Section of this report.

The PSSF funds will continue to be used to broaden the network of services that counties have available to serve families without having to open a case in the CWS system. These services are essential for the early intervention intake system within a Differential Response framework. They will allow CWS to respond earlier, with greater flexibility, and with customized services and support for families ensuring child safety and reducing or eliminating re-entry into the CWS system.

In SFY 2006-07, 3 additional counties requested and received funding through CWS Outcome Improvement funds (state General Fund) to implement Differential Response: Del Norte, Lake and Ventura. Counties who requested funds to expand existing Differential Response programs were Butte, Calaveras, Contra Costa, El Dorado, Fresno, Humboldt, Kern, Marin, Mendocino, Monterey, Nevada, Plumas, Sacramento, San Francisco, San Joaquin, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Shasta, Solano, Sonoma, and Stanislaus counties are using a variety of funding sources to fund the implementation and expansion of Differential Response, including PSSF, grant funds, etc. Future expansion is dependent on the availability of funds.

Expanded Family Support and Family Preservation Services Connect To Existing Preventive Services

Some communities have gaps in services so that families are not able to obtain the appropriate services when they need them. As a result, circumstances in the family often deteriorate to the point that CWS must become involved, and perhaps, remove children from their homes. By expanding on these services in a carefully planned manner so that they are integrated with existing services, a complete spectrum of core services may become available.

Differential Response redefines the relationship between the child welfare agency and existing and new community providers as partners in protecting children. The goal is that PSSF funds will be used to build this network of services through the partnership between CWS and community providers. The overall goal of Differential Response is to provide support and preservation services to families before they become formally involved with the CWS agency. This process involves an active partnership with community based organizations, as well as other county service agencies.

Additional funds were included in the 2006-2007 budget for Differential Response to support the following activities related to the CWS System Improvements, including Differential Response: 1) guideline development; 2) implementation planning; 3) development of community resources; 4) staff and community partner training and 5) implementation. Funding for future years is heavily dependent on the amount of state general fund available for the CWS System improvement activities, as although PSSF funding is utilized, the amount of federal funds received are insufficient to sustain these improvements.

Differential Response Linkages to Other Services and the Child and Family Services

Within California, the Differential Response strategy creates a new early intervention intake system in which the child welfare agency responds in a more flexible manner (with three response paths rather than one) to referrals of child abuse or neglect based on the perceived safety and risk factors present in the family. Services are provided based on the family's needs, resources and circumstances.

Path One assumes there will be no further involvement of CWS in the case unless the circumstances prove to be different than what was known at intake. These cases would be typically low or no risk of child abuse and neglect, but it is clear the family is experiencing problems or stressors which could be addressed by community services. Through this path, community agencies expand CWS ability to have someone respond, see the child is safe, preserve the family and provide support/services to families.

Path Two is for families that present with moderate risks of child abuse and neglect. Safety factors may not be immediately manifested in all cases, but risk is present. CWS will conduct an in-person contact (this contact may include a community partner). Services may be provided through CWS and/or partnership with community organizations to ensure that families are receiving services and support based upon their needs.

Path Three is for families that present with higher risk and/or safety concerns. These cases require a more immediate response to ensure child safety. CWS and law enforcement (where necessary) will be the key responders for this path. Through the support of county interagency partners and community service providers, services and support will be enhanced to ensure child safety within the home or in out-of-home care.

The Breakthrough Series Collaborative (BSC) and CWS System Improvements

During SFY 2005-2006, the 11 pilot counties continued implementation of the Differential Response framework in targeted communities within their respective counties. Breakthrough Series Collaborative (BSC) provides training and technical assistance to these counties (and 31 other counties) through December 2006 regarding the implementation of this new system. Some PSSF funds were used to fund the BSC.

As a result of the BSC trainings, counties learned how to effectively and efficiently study, test, evaluate and implement child welfare service practice changes. Learning sessions were held in which the counties gathered together for face-to-face learning, strategizing and networking. These sessions were led by national experts as faculty who mentor the participating county teams. Counties have been focusing on the following subjects:

- The intake structure as three pathways of service response and
- A standardized approach to assessment of safety, risk, protective capacity and needs.

Based on county input, at the end of the first year of this three-year contract, the CDSS worked with the contractor to make important adjustments beginning in the second year and continuing through the end of the project to the training and Technical Assistance (TA) activities being provided to the counties. There were an increased number of training

sessions which were held regionally. These were be full-day sessions and were targeted to the specific training needs for implementation of Differential Response.

The time period in between the Learning Sessions is called the Action Period. During this time the counties have been conducting Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA) cycles to test and evaluate a series of small-scale changes with the goal of more rapidly bringing about a larger scale change in a particular area. During these Action Periods, the counties have had a series of collaborative conference calls to report their progress, receive technical assistance regarding their work and get feedback and insights from other counties. The calls were oriented around specific topic areas, such as Assessment, Partnering, Engagement and other topics pertinent to the implementation of Differential Response.

To assist counties in shared learning, the BSC developed an extranet message board on which counties post implementation objectives and outcomes, and share information on lessons learned in the process. The extranet was a method for the counties to learn both from each other and from the input of the faculty related to specific topic areas.

In addition, the training addressed a planning and evaluation component. Counties provided BSC with structured monthly reports on their progress and collect data to monitor and evaluate outcomes. To make sure counties were consistent in their approach to practice change, the training cross-referenced BSC with the Self Assessment and System Improvement Plan as delineated in the C-CFSR. There were a total of 43 counties represented within the three groups who received the training.

During SFY 2005-2006 (last quarter only) and SFY 2006-2007, the Child and Family Policy Institute of California will continue two core BSC activities to spread the learning and practice change that has occurred in the pilot counties to additional counties in California. These two core activities are:

1. Peer Technical Assistance

Teams will have an opportunity to participate in another phase of technical assistance (TA). Four Mentor teams, all of whom are Differential Response pilot counties, will be matched with five Mentee teams to further advance their implementation of Differential Response through the BSC method.

2. Extranet

The Child and Family Policy Institute of California has maintained the project extranet through 2006. The extranet is an interactive website that contains information about Differential Response implementation from both California counties and other states who have implemented DR. The range of information includes cycles of change counties have tried (PDSAs), forms, policies and procedures, national Differential Response research, practice guides and contact information from every participating county. The extranet also includes a discussion board where counties can pose questions and dialogue with one another about Differential Response implementation.

The Breakthrough Series ended in June 30, 2006.

Child Abuse and Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) Funds Integration and Coordination with Child and Family Services

Child Abuse and Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) funds are used to strengthen child abuse prevention services and support various demonstration projects that implement best practices for integration with the local child and family services continuum. The emphasis is on child abuse prevention services, including family preservation and support. For example, CAPTA funds are used to provide training and technical assistance that focus on Family Resource Centers (FRCs) and the wide variety of child and family services they provide; the development and support of Citizen Review Panels (CRPs) in selected counties; by providing stipends to parents and foster parents so that they can attend statewide CRP meetings and the development and implementation of the Supporting Father Involvement (SFI) Study as a promising practice.

In SFY 2003-2004, the SFI Study began testing a particular family-based intervention that is designed to enhance the positive involvement of fathers with their children and to enhance the organizational culture of FRCs to be more inclusive of fathers. In addition to the outcomes of the intervention, it is anticipated that the study will increase parent engagement into FRC services due to increased outreach and training and technical assistance for staff on skills related to community engagement, retention of families and expertise in referral strategies. The study has been extended through June 2009 in order to test the intervention with new populations and to disseminate research findings. An interim report will be available Summer 2007 with a final report during Fall 2009.

Small County Initiative II (SCI II)

Building upon the successes of the initial Small County Initiative, SCI II focuses on the unique needs of small counties (defined here as those with populations of 70,000 or less) supports expanding and strengthening the existing county prevention infrastructure and capacity to deliver services to small rural communities. The initiative provides additional funding and resources and also provides another link to local public and private prevention and family support activities.

Eleven counties¹ were selected to participate in the initiative through a competitive process. These counties include: Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Del Norte, Glenn, Plumas, Siskiyou, Tehama, Trinity, Tuolumne and Yuba. The selection process was based on how well the county identified and submitted a plan and budget to meet its needs in accordance with the established guidelines. The implementation period for SCI II is January 1, 2004 through December 31, 2006, due to changes in state administration and processes around the grant/contract process, as well as delays in release of funding and start-up at the county level and the degree of implementation varies from county to county. Program funding is a combination of PSSF and CBCAP. Additional PSSF funds were augmented to complete the full SFY ending June 30, 2007.

The University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) is evaluating SCI II, and has noted that overall the selected counties have made some progress with their preventive infrastructure

¹ Not to be confused with the 11 pilot counties implementing the CWS System Improvements.

and capacity to deliver services to rural communities. However, counties by their own self-evaluation determined that they still need more effort in achieving their SCI II objectives.

CONCLUSION

The state continues to take a strong approach toward PSSF program improvement. It is expected that quarterly fiscal expenditure monitoring, CAPTA assistance, the new intake structure referred to as Differential Response, the CDSS technical assistance and reviews of the consolidated three-year county plans and related annual updates, along with the focus on interagency and community partnerships will all strengthen the PSSF Program. In addition, this approach is expected to strengthen existing linkages with other services and establish new ones where currently there are gaps. The state remains committed to achieving and maintaining compliance with all PSSF Program requirements.

Title IV-E Waiver Demonstration Project

Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Project Update

The extension for the previous Intensive Services Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Project ended on December 31, 2005. The two remaining counties operating under the extension, Sacramento and San Luis Obispo, have completed all phase down activities and services for children in the project.

Accomplishments/Progress

On March 31, 2006, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) approved California's Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project (CAP) proposal that would allow Title IV-E funds, which are restricted to pay for board and care costs and child welfare administration, to be used by the counties for direct services and supports in order to avoid the over reliance on out-of-home care and reunify families more expeditiously.

The intent of the five-year demonstration project is to test a capped allocation strategy which would block grant a portion of the federal Title IV-E and State General Fund Assistance and Administrative costs and will support improved safety, permanency, and well-being outcomes for children and families. The specific goals of the CAP are:

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

The CAP will target IV-E eligible and non IV-E eligible children ages zero through 19 years currently in out-of-home placement, or who are at risk of entering or re-entering foster care. The two counties participating in the CAP are Alameda and Los Angeles. The foster care population from these two counties that would be impacted under the demonstration project represents 37% of the foster care caseload in California.

To implement the CAP, Alameda County proposes to redirect financial resources from the existing congregate group home model to family-based resource homes and community-based services that more directly engage children and families with health, mental health, education, social and self-sufficiency supports to achieve higher level of safety, permanency and well-being.

Los Angeles County aims to improve community partnerships, improve service delivery and create new accountability structures and will use the funding flexibility to make strategic investments in structural and programmatic reforms and accelerate local system improvement efforts already underway among county departments and community partners to improve outcomes for children. The county has identified universal and specific needs and requirements for dependent and delinquent foster care populations.

The Los Angeles County implementation plan proposes the development, implementation, and expansion of a wide array of programs and supports to provide individualized services to children and families. The service array is strength-based, family-centered, child-focused and

community-based and will span the continuum across early intervention, crisis intervention, intensive services and permanency services.

Priorities for the first year of the demonstration project include:

- Expand family support networks to develop and maintain a coordinated continuum of care for primary, secondary, and tertiary prevention;
- Expansion of Family Team Decision-Making conference model;
- Expansion and use of community-based placement resources;
- Restructure Placement services;
- Expansion of Family Preservation Service contracts;
- Expansion of Multi-Systemic Therapy and Functional Family Therapy;
- Expansion of Special Investigations Unit/Dual Supervision;
- Establishment of enhanced front-end assessment services for families with identified domestic violence, substance abuse, and mental health issues;
- Development of community crisis family intervention teams;
- Development of enhanced parent-child visitation services;
- Expansion of Family Finding activities and
- Utilization of aftercare support services.

Under the federal Waiver Terms and Conditions, the CAP was originally planned to implement by January 1, 2007. In late 2006, CDSS received approval from DHHS to revise the federal Waiver Terms and Conditions to extend the implementation date to July 1, 2007.

The CAP evaluation consists of three components: a process evaluation, an outcome evaluation and a cost analysis. The CDSS has contracted with a third-party evaluator to conduct the evaluation for the demonstration project.

Indian Child Welfare Act

INDIAN CHILD WELFARE ACT (ICWA)

The CDSS continues to work with the self identified representatives of 107 federally recognized California tribes, as well as the approximately 50 tribes that are not currently recognized. The activities/projects discussed below describe the measures that the CDSS continues to take to ensure compliance with the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA).

Specific Accomplishments/Progress

Child and Family Services Division ICWA Workgroup

The ICWA Workgroup was formed in July 2002. It continues to expand its membership and now consists of over 35 tribal ICWA workers/advocates, 10 county child welfare and probation representatives and 10 CDSS staff. The CDSS utilizes the ICWA Workgroup as a means of consulting with tribes. The tribal members of the Workgroup were chosen by the California tribes as their representatives to the CDSS. The Workgroup meets bimonthly to discuss ICWA issues and make recommendations on how to ensure implementation of the Act. Consultation also occurs via electronic mail.

The ICWA Workgroup continues to meet bimonthly to identify ICWA issues/problems that exist and develop recommendations and solutions for tribes, counties and the state. Several accomplishments of the Workgroup this year are (details follow):

- Developed the CDSS ICWA “102” training curriculum to provide more “advanced” training to county social workers and probation officers. This training places more of a focus on tribal culture and better meets the day-to-day application of ICWA processes.
- The Northern California Training Academy produced a special issue of “Reaching Out”, Current Issues for Child Welfare Practice in Rural Communities, Spring 2006.
- Continued work with the Judicial Council of California in the continuation of the ICWA Initiative Project.
- Collaborated with the author, sponsors and CWDA regarding Senate Bill (SB) 678 (Ducheny) Chapter 838, Statutes of 2006, that codifies the requirements of ICWA into California statutes. SB 678 took effect January 1, 2007.

Tribal/State Agreements

The CDSS has been pursuing tribal/state agreements which will allow for the pass-through of Title IV-E funds to tribes. These funds will provide tribes with foster care funding for Indian children.

On March 14, 2007, the CDSS and the Karuk Tribe of California signed the first ever Tribal/State agreement in California. State staff is now in the process of providing training and technical assistance to staff of the Karuk Tribe to prepare them for the implementation of the agreement. CDSS and the Karuk Tribe have sought technical assistance through Region IX and the National Resource Center for Organizational Improvement (NRCOI). The next step prior to implementation is the development of the Tribe’s Child Welfare Services Plan. The NRCOI has provided critical technical assistance to the Karuk Tribe in the development and implementation of this plan and their child welfare services program. The CDSS has also

sought and received technical assistance from Region IX regarding funding issues for these agreements. Discussions of funding issues continue with the tribes and the affected county child welfare agencies.

While there has been a hiatus in the negotiations of a Tribal/State agreement with the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California, recent communications with the Washoe Tribe indicate a renewed interest in pursuing an agreement. The most recent version of the agreement has been presented to the Tribe for their review, and the CDSS is awaiting their response.

With the signing of the Karuk agreement, CDSS expects an increased interest on the part of other tribes in pursuing such agreements. The Yurok Tribe, the Morongo Tribe, and the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians have initiated communications to begin negotiations. In addition, there are others interested.

ICWA Training Projects/Conferences

ICWA Curriculum Training

The Resource Center for Family-Focused Practice (RCFFP), a part of the University of California Davis Extension Center for Human Services, developed "ICWA 102" training curriculum to increase coordination, knowledge and skills in implementing ICWA. The training is designed to stimulate a greater understanding of tribal issues for individuals responsible for making decisions regarding Indian children and their families. This training goes beyond the basic "ICWA 101" training and serves as a "how to" with actual practice application. Through the training process, participants develop skills on effectively engaging tribal members in cooperative relationships, as well as assist tribes in understanding and effectively negotiating with public child welfare agencies. The training better informs participants of the requirements of ICWA and provides strategies to improve compliance. Participants also develop a greater understanding and appreciation of tribal challenges and historical barriers to effective relationships with government representatives. In turn, tribal participants develop effective skills in working with public child welfare agencies.

This project is funded at the 75% enhanced federal financial participation rate for Child Welfare Services Title IV-E training. The total cost for the project is \$150,000, with \$84,375 being claimed under Title IV-E training and State General Fund of \$65,625.

The training is presented at tribal organization's locations whenever possible. This long-term training was provided through an annual contract that CDSS has with RCFFP to coordinate the training and revise curriculum, as necessary.

This training activity meets the goal of Permanence, Objective 7, to prepare and support the workforce to help children and families reach positive outcomes, and Objective 10, ensure that continuity of family relationships and connections are preserved for children in foster care.

The current focus on this project has been to modify CDSS' existing ICWA 101 training curriculum to focus on tribal culture and better meet the day-to-day application processes of ICWA for county child welfare workers and juvenile probation placement officers. The

curriculum was developed with extensive input from tribal representatives, advocates and county child welfare and probation agency staff. Many of these representatives are being used as co-trainers. The CDSS plans to continue this project into future years.

Annual ICWA Conference

The 14th Annual Statewide ICWA Conference entitled "Healing Our Homes for the Protection of Our Native Children." was held June 17-20, 2007 in Lakeside, and was sponsored by the Santa Ysabel Band of Diegueno Indians. Nearly 200 participants attended the conference including tribal ICWA workers; tribal advocates, tribal council members and community leaders; law enforcement; child welfare and probation staff; judges; attorneys; foster/adoption agencies; social services agency personnel and other interested parties. The mission of the conference is to support positive partnerships between tribes and federal, state and local governments for the benefit of all Indian children. CDSS presented a panel discussion regarding Tribal-State IV-E Agreements. Additionally, CDSS, together with ICWA workgroup partners, presented a workshop on the activities and accomplishments of the workgroup.

Additional training activities this year:

Indian Child Welfare Act Initiative

Effective December 2005, the CDSS entered into an interagency agreement with the Judicial Council of California to create the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) Initiative. While the agreement's end date is June 2007, the agreement is expected to be renewed for three years through June 2010. This initiative is now 100% funded out of state General Fund dollars. The initiative was created because Indian children continue to be removed from their families and tribal communities and placed with non-Indian caregivers. While juvenile court judges and placing agency staff have received some training on ICWA, this initiative presents an opportunity to provide targeted training and technical assistance in order to increase knowledge of ICWA by making available a range of facilitation and training services through cross-disciplinary regional and locally targeted trainings for judicial officers, clerks, attorneys, social workers and probation officers. Services are tailored to the needs of the local court system or region. As part of this initiative, educational materials addressing the federal requirements under the Indian Child Welfare Act have been developed. These materials include charts, agency checklists on notice procedures and case planning, a judicial handbook, descriptions of available services to Indian children and families, and a qualified ICWA expert witness list. Educational workshops have been provided by a broad-based group of subject matter experts on a statewide, regional and local basis. This initiative continues to impact, not only the preservation of connections for Indian children, but also achieving permanency, as defined by the Indian community.

The start of the fiscal year began with the last and fourth in a series of regional trainings across the state. Held in Redding on August 7, 2006, the Northern California Symposium on the Indian Child Welfare Act focused on the nuts-and-bolts of applying ICWA in dependency and delinquency cases. There were approximately 65 attendees, including numerous tribal representatives, judicial officers, child welfare and probation staff, and attorneys. The evaluations received were very positive.

One of the key speakers at the symposium was Justice William Thorne, Utah Court of Appeals. He is recognized as a foremost authority on ICWA, and is requested to speak at numerous conferences/symposia/gatherings nationwide. A video has been made of his presentation, "An Historical and Cultural Perspective on ICWA," and is available for use by any interested party.

As with each of the regional trainings, a resource binder was created for participants and has been made available on CD and posted on the Judicial Council's Web site located at: <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/cfcc/programs/description/jrta-ICWAResourceBinder.htm>.

As this was the last of the four regional trainings, a video bringing together all of the symposia presentations was made, and is available upon request. In addition, all Native American resources compiled for each regional symposium, which will soon be posted to the Judicial Council's Web site.

The initiative staff conducted two workshops at the annual Beyond the Bench Conference, entitled "The Nuts and Bolts of the Indian Child Welfare Act" and "Tribal Courts and Jurisdiction." This conference is the largest statewide conference for courts, state agencies, county child welfare and probation agencies, attorneys and children's advocates. The workshops were well received with 57 and 46 persons in attendance, respectively.

In addition to the Beyond the Bench statewide conference, the following educational offerings were made at statewide conferences: (1) the U.C. Davis Child Abuse and Neglect Conference in Sacramento, held on September 12, 2006; (2) the Tribal State Jurisdiction Symposium in Pala, held on September 20, 2006; (3) the 11th Annual Los Angeles Partnership Conference: A New Beginning," held on October 5, 2006; (4) the Spirit of the Law Conference in Lemoore, held on October 19 and 20, 2006 — the Administrative Office of the Courts co-sponsored the conference by contributing \$3,000 toward conference expenses, offering continuing legal education credit to attorney attendees, and assisting in facilitating focus group discussions. It is anticipated that the initiative staff will be on the planning committee for next year's conference and assist with workshop content and outreach to the judiciary; and (5) the "The Tribal and State Justice Summit" in San Francisco, held on November 13 through 15, 2006.

In the 2006 Legislative Session, the California Legislature passed and the Governor signed Senate Bill (SB) 678 (Ducheny) Chapter 838, Statutes of 2006, effective January 1, 2007, a comprehensive act affecting Indian children that revises existing provisions of state law governing child custody, adoption, guardianship, conservatorship, and juvenile proceedings, including termination of parental rights and the voluntary relinquishment of a child by a parent. Initiative staff prepared training materials on the new legislation and conducted a workshop for all clerks statewide, which was held on November 8, 2006, in San Francisco.

During the second half of the fiscal year, the initiative's focus shifted from statewide educational efforts to local court/county educational meetings and efforts to implement SB 678. The first, entitled "Collaborative Meeting on the Indian Child Welfare Act," was held in Orange County at the Orange County Superior Court on March 10, 2007. The series of collaborative meetings will continue in Sacramento County scheduled for April 30, 2007, and

Glenn County scheduled for June 18, 2007. The location of the fourth has yet to be determined, but it will likely be in Alameda County.

In addition to these numerous training events, staff has updated training materials in light of SB 678 and worked with the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee and the Probate and Mental Health Committee to propose new rules and forms relating to ICWA to implement SB 678. The proposal will be circulated for public comment from April 20, 2007 through June 15, 2007.

Coordination with Tribes Regarding the Section 422 Protections for Children

In 1953, Congress enacted Public Law (PL) 280, which required several states, including California, to assume criminal and some civil jurisdiction over all or part of Indian country within these states. PL 280 did not eliminate tribal jurisdiction. Although states were delegated criminal and civil jurisdiction, that jurisdiction remained concurrent with some aspects of inherent tribal jurisdiction. However, not all tribes have developed courts and so not all tribes exercise their jurisdiction.

There are very few Indian children in California under tribal jurisdiction, as only a small number of tribes have tribal courts and social services departments that could provide necessary services, partly due to the size of the tribes and the lack of adequate funding to the tribes for these services. For those tribes that do take jurisdiction, most often the initial contact regarding a family is made to the local child welfare agency who then contacts the tribe to allow them to take jurisdiction.

Many tribes and county child welfare agencies have developed protocols whereby they work together to provide child welfare services. A number of counties and tribes have convened ICWA roundtables/working groups which meet on a regular basis to discuss issues relative to the provision of child welfare services and how to better protect children. Some counties contact the tribal social services worker when an emergency response call is received allowing for both parties to respond to the family. Some tribes have services that can be provided early in the case to allow for the children and families to remain together. Counties are responsible for applying Section 422 protections including the care and supervision of tribal children that remain under the State/county's jurisdiction. For tribes that enter into a Title IV-E agreement with the state, and assume responsibility for the care and supervision of tribal children, the tribe is responsible for applying Section 422(b)(8) protections for those children, including six month periodic review, 12 month permanency hearings, reunification services, services to achieve other permanency goals, pre-placement preventative services, etc.

The CDSS has collaborated with Tribes and the state Attorney General's Department of Justice (DOJ) in conducting training sessions regarding the application of PL 280 in California. CDSS continues to work with the DOJ in efforts to promote improved understanding of PL 280.

CDSS has reviewed data regarding Indian children in the California CWS system and incorporated new outcomes data regarding ICWA compliance. Specific ICWA indicators have been incorporated into the SB 636 Outcomes and Accountability System. While the specific 'active efforts' documentation is still difficult to cull from CWS/CMS, CDSS is continuing to

explore ways of improving such reporting. Documentation regarding 1) notification of Indian parents and tribes of State proceedings involving Indian children and their right to intervene; 2) special placement preferences for placement of Indian children; 3) active efforts to prevent the breakup of the Indian family; and 4) the use of tribal courts in child welfare matters, tribal right to intervene in State proceeding, or transfer proceedings to the jurisdiction of the Tribe services provided, would be documented in the case notes in a WORD document. However, because such services are documented in case notes in a WORD format, the information is difficult to retrieve and compile. An ad hoc report would be required to attempt to search for such data and would require a case by case review of all identified Indian children in the CWS/CMS system.

In preparation for the CFSR, CDSS is in the process of reviewing existing data that will provide comparisons between the data for Indian children in 2003 and 2006. Preliminary data indicates that the number of referrals and substantiations for Indian children in California is decreasing. However, as we consider the issue of disproportionality, Native American children are the second most over-represented group in the California child welfare system, and is an area that the state will be addressing. Infants are more likely to be reported for child maltreatment, have their allegations substantiated, and enter foster care than older children. This difference is most pronounced for Black and Native American children. Over 9 percent of Native American infants were reported for child maltreatment in 2005. Child welfare, presumed to be a system of last resort, is not rare for Native American (and Black) children. Over a quarter of Native American children have been reported to the child welfare system a least once by the time they are six years old and about 8 percent of Native American children have entered foster care at least once by that time. ²

Data from April to June 2005 (January 2006 Report) indicates that there were 1102 Indian children in Out of Home Placements, of those 313 (28.4%) were placed with relatives; 79 were placed with non related (NREFMs) substitute care providers (SCPs) (7.2%) and 572 were placed with non-relative, non-Indian SCPs (51.9 %). This data appears to indicate that placement preferences per ICWA are not being made.

It is expected that an ACL regarding the intent of ICWA and SB 678 will help address some of the on-going issues related to ICWA compliance. Additionally, per on-going discussions with ICWA Workgroup members regarding issues related to the use of tribally approved homes; CDSS has established a subgroup to consider what the barriers may be to county recognition of tribally approved homes. CDSS expects to release an ACIN to provide clarification regarding the intent of ICWA regarding tribally approved homes and possibly some best practice guidelines to assist counties in this area.

Another area that CDSS has established a subgroup to explore is the issue of permanency for Indian children and youth. This group will consider the implications of “customary adoptions” in California and will make recommendations regarding the potential implementation of this approach.

² Race/Ethnic Disparities in California: the Data Testimony to the California State Assembly; 03/07/07; Dr. Barbara Needell of UC Berkeley.

Foster Care/Adoption Recruitment Plan

FOSTER CARE/ADOPTION RECRUITMENT PLAN

The CDSS' Role in the Family to Family Initiative

The CDSS continues to contribute substantial resources to support the implementation of Family to Family in California. Approximately 85% of the 83,091 children in foster care in California live in a Family to Family county.

In 2006, the Family to Family Initiative restructured how counties were going to be grouped together. The California Family to Family counties are divided into four regional groups, Northern cluster, Bay Area cluster, Central/Coastal Cluster, and Southern Cluster. Los Angeles County is divided into three regional groups based on their Service Planning Areas and is also part of the Southern Region. The following is a report on the progress of Family to Family counties in recruitment, training and support of resource families. Counties plan to continue many of these activities into 2007, and are planning for the next steps of implementation of the core strategies of Family to Family.

Currently, there are 25 counties involved in Family to Family. All Family to Family counties are utilizing the Family to Family recruitment strategy, as well as the other three core strategies.

A Family to Family website www.f2f.ca.gov is hosted by CDSS and maintained by CDSS staff.

Specific accomplishments/progress

Central California Family to Family Counties: Fresno, Kern, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Stanislaus, and Ventura Counties.

Fresno

Fresno County's target strategy for 2006 was successful in recruiting families who were willing to adopt older youth. The number of County licensed homes increased 15% from 329 to 384, reflecting a net gain of 55 foster homes. The Placement Services are geographically assigned, dividing up resource families regionally, and assigned to one case manager. The department combined all Placement Services together (i.e. Licensing, Adoptions, Foster Parent Resources, Emergency Shelter Care and Relative Home Assessment), which has increased staff collaboration towards improved outcomes.

Three of Fresno County's earliest neighborhood collaborative are sending Community Representatives on a regular basis to TDM meetings. Both outcome data (from UC Berkeley) and real-time data are presented during every collaborative meeting. The numbers serve to advise collaborative members about how many children were removed from the particular community over the prior month, how many TDM's were held, and where each child was placed.

The Fresno Facilitators sponsored and organized the first-annual Resource Provider Fair. There was over 50 booths set up in the DCFS parking lot so that service providers could share and introduce their programs to agency staff. Fresno has begun holding bi-monthly

recognition and training luncheons for TDM Community Representatives. As part of the Fresno Disproportionality workgroup strategy, trained African American TDM representatives are paired with African American families whenever possible.

The Self Evaluation Team has taken the lead in the development of the County's System Improvement Plan. As the quarterly report published by the state with the AB636 data become longer, the team felt it would be beneficial to supplement the AB636 report with a shorter, two-page overview. This two-page report shows current data along with analysis of historic and current trends. A longitudinal report from 2001-05 looks at Fresno's Disproportionality data, along the key decision points throughout the child welfare system.

Fresno County is also involved with California Connected by 25 Initiative, California Permanency for Youth Project (CPYP), and the Department formed a task force to address Disproportionality and Disparity which has been in place for approximately one year.

Kern County

The RDS committee helped plan the first "Taking Care of Business" day in Kern County. The event targeted African-American families and the Southeast Bakersfield community and allowed applicants to attend orientation, complete licensing applications, obtain CPR and First Aid certification, fingerprinting, and TB testing, all at one location on a single day. There were 39 individuals (22 households) in attendance and 14 completed applications were received that day. The RDS committee is implementing a tracking system on resource families to improve resource family retention.

The BCP committee focuses on expanding and enhancing collaboration with traditional and nontraditional community partners. The committee participated in community events including local festivals, a race, and a diversity symposium. In 2006, Customized surveys were developed for agency staff, birth parents, and community partners. To date hundreds of surveys have been gathered, analyzed and compiled, providing an excellent tool for the BCP work group to utilize as it tailors its approach to best fit the needs of the community.

In November 2006, Kern County rolled out TDMs. The three key phases of implementation and types of TDMs have progressed in 2007 to: placement changes, emergency removals and exits from care. The strategy of starting with placement changes is to assist in stabilizing placements and reduce multiple placement changes.

The SE committee is comprised of internal staff and community partners, including CASA, Cal State Bakersfield, Kern County Network for Children, and foster family agencies. GIS data specific to child abuse and foster care has been geo-coded and mapped. The reports have included visuals of foster homes in specific neighborhoods, foster homes within school boundaries, and child abuse rates and child removals by neighborhoods.

San Luis Obispo County

Highlights and accomplishments include participation in events like the Farmer's Market and Children's Day in the Plaza. The Heart Gallery produced 19 foster/adoption placement inquiries thanks to a successful radio, press and TV campaign. A contracted Public

Information Officer (PIO), in partnership with a half-time social worker, is now dedicated to recruitment efforts. Icebreakers are in the expansion phase with the FPA's involvement. The FPA will receive training on TDM with the goal of reducing the number of 7-day notices. A new assessment and treatment center for children, Martha's Place, opened its doors for children and works with children 0-5, including children in foster care who are prenatally exposed to alcohol and other drugs and also those with behavioral issues. The Kinship Center was established in San Luis Obispo County in 2006, and in 2007 began providing direct services for children ages 0-17 in support of relatives and other caregivers.

San Luis Obispo County has had 100% community partner involvement, as identified by the family, at all its TDMs. The Equal Access Committee is leading the Model Standards efforts for LGBTQ youth. The Vulnerable Families Committee is working on countywide utilization of early assessment tools for children 0-5 years old, and assessments for children 6-17 including those in foster care. This group consists of representatives from AOD, Probation, EOC, Public Health, DSS, schools, birth parents, and the SAFE sites. Sharing child welfare data specific to a local area is an important component of community engagement.

Quarterly data reflects ongoing outcomes improvement directly attributed to TDMs. The TDM facilitators are re-introducing the Department's TDM policy and procedure to staff and will review new and existing forms such as the revised DSS801, which has been reformatted to include standard language around the Safety and Action plan. An internal protocol is being developed that utilizes the existing "Foster Care Child Location Form" to ensure that a TDM is held on every child move; and where appropriate, to identify if a "TDM Exception" applies (e.g., respite care, child is 5150'd.).

San Luis Obispo County has a dedicated Information Reporting Team, which provides ongoing and ad hoc reports for line staff, supervisors, managers and community partners. The quarterly "Child Welfare Services & Linkages" report provides data on the AB636 outcome domains of Safety, Permanence, and Family/Child Well-Being in a user-friendly format. The semi-annual "Snapshot of Children in Foster Care" report provides data on the children and youth currently in foster care, and helps to educate staff and community as related to the nine Family to Family outcomes.

Santa Barbara County

Santa Barbara has one-full-time recruiter. Some recruitment activities conducted included interviews with local English and Spanish-speaking TV stations, magazines, and letters sent to local nonprofit agencies. A Yahoo account was created so that the recruiter's name came up when there were local searches for adoption and foster parenting and the recruiter was successful in getting items donated for foster youth and for the shelter from the Symphony, Botanic Garden, Zoo, Natural Museum, and Yacht Club. PRIDE classes were published in 11 newspapers and in the county's Recreation Guide.

Presentations on Family to Family are made to the communities on a regular basis. Specific outreach activities include: letters to all Santa Maria schools, regular meetings with community partners, First Five Commission, drug and alcohol contractors, local hospitals, law enforcement, domestic violence programs, Family Resource Centers, counseling agencies, Foster Youth Services, public health organizations and with faith-based organizations.

TDMs continue to be used at different points throughout a case. TDMs are well accepted by the courts and are sometimes held at the request of the judge. There has also been positive feedback on TDMs from attorneys and community members who are regularly invited to attend.

Santa Barbara's self-assessment plan continues to work with several groups, including the Kids Network (an advisory group to the Board of Supervisors), the Child Abuse Prevention Council, Children's System of Care, Juvenile Court, and partners with several community agencies, private agencies and youth.

Stanislaus County

Since Family to Family implementation, Stanislaus County has made numerous recruitment, development and support changes. These include: implementation of the Family to Family PRIDE curriculum; including community partners, resource/birth parents, and youth in the training and recruitment of new families; development of support groups for resource families; inclusion of resource families in decision making, such as TDM, as well as system improvement activities, training and conferences; development of Icebreakers; supporting activities for resource families and youth.

The Family Resource Center received funding from the department as well as the Children and Families Commission (Prop 10/First Five) to provide strength-based comprehensive assessment, case management, parenting and support groups, school readiness, development screenings, linking to mental health, prenatal and other community services. Stanislaus County continues to partner with the West Modesto King Kennedy Multicultural Neighborhood Collaborative for community-based resource family recruitment and support.

TDMs are mandated for removals and changes of placement with some exceptions as approved by the Supervisors and System Improvement Supervisor and/or Manager through the waiver process. Valid exceptions include severe cases of physical or sexual abuse, high profile or confidential cases, chronic runaway behavior (when it's not appropriate), and when a youth-driven TDM data is evaluated quarterly by the data analyst/researcher. The information from the TDM database is analyzed in addition to review of approved TDM waivers and change of placement information. The most important change in the agency as a result of implementing TDM has been their reduction in removals. The number of children entering foster care has decreased and the number of families served in voluntary services has increased.

The Self Evaluation team reviews all outcomes and practice in all areas of the Family to Family work. Analysis of Family to Family outcomes, TDM data, AB 636 (C-CFSR) outcomes and accountability report, Connected by 25 initiative, Quality Assurance, Council on Accreditation, and others are reviewed on a quarterly rotation. Data is shared through presentations, graphic display, newsletter, periodic tune-up flyers, and other means at Self-Evaluation, community and/or unit focus groups. TDM data and placement stability data are analyzed quarterly by Self-Evaluation and Supervisors/managers. The C-CFSR Outcome and Accountability Report is reviewed quarterly in Self-Evaluation and shared with others in the Child and Family Services Advisory Board.

Ventura County

Data was generated on specific geographical areas to support recruitment of foster homes in targeted areas. There has also been an increase in recruitment with faith-based organizations. In 2006, a total of 44 homes were licensed with a net gain of 8 homes. Vendors are utilized for support services such as respite care, child care, and training. Data indicate from January to June 2006, there was a decrease of 13 in group home placements. Data indicate that of 334 children removed from home in 2006, 24% (n=79) were placed close to home. In addition, 200 of the children removed were part of a sibling group. Of the 200 children who had a sibling, half were placed with at least 1 of their siblings. An Ombudsman provides one-on-one support to resource families and does an assessment of the family to assess the families' needs and the best match possible when placing a child in their home. An additional recruiter was hired to support the recruitment of resource families and provide resource families with assistance through the licensing processes.

New and existing relationships have been strengthened through common projects and regular meetings. A database has been developed to track community contacts as well as the interest level. Efforts with the faith-based community have resulted in an increase in licensed foster homes. The agency has gained support from a County Supervisor who is active in speaking on resource family recruitment. Data shared has consisted of rate of removals, the number of licensed foster homes and the cities in which those homes are located, as well as TDM outcome statistics.

TDMs are held for placement changes, imminent risk, and emergency placement. Meetings are mandatory. For 2007, the focus is on refinement of placement changes, imminent risk, and emergency placement TDMs and implementation of emergency response night shifts. Firewalls have been implemented so that staff is required to schedule a TDM before information on a new placement is provided. The department's placement coordinator will seek placement options upon request, but will not release the placement until a TDM is scheduled. Monthly data reports review all change of placements and all TDMs scheduled within current month. To ensure that Safety/Action plans are completed, each supervisor receives a copy of the Safety/Action plan so follow-up can be ensured.

The Self Evaluation team developed a plan to evaluate processes and outcomes related to TDMs for placement moves. Data regarding foster home placement and licensing activity by city and ZIP Code are contained in a monthly report for the Supervisor for District 1, Ventura County Board of Supervisors. Also reported are monthly totals for (c) new licenses issued and (c) licenses terminated. Ad hoc reports from the TDM CA database have been prepared for the TDM Strategy Group and Family to Family Strategy Group Leaders to support the development and implementation of TDM. The Operations Team in County Department of Child and Family Services has adopted a monthly process for reviewing performance for selected AB 636 outcomes. The process employs a report, referred to as the Balanced Scorecard Ledger, which includes performance trends for Placement Stability Measure 3C and Least Restrictive Placements Measure 4B. The Ledger also reports measures for internal processes related to these outcomes including number and placement decisions for TDMs for placement moves, referrals and referral outcomes for relative approval and children placed in a relative home.

Bay Area California Family to Family Counties (7): Alameda, Contra Costa, Monterey, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Santa Cruz

Alameda County

A faith-based recruitment effort has been initiated to recruit new foster homes. A speaker's bureau was also developed to attend events in the local faith based organizations and churches. Recruitment, development and support of resource families regularly attended community events, had a media campaign that includes a DVD with former foster youth, adoptive parents, foster parents and department staff as well as billboard ads. PRIDE trainings have been held at local churches and one of the four monthly orientations is regularly held at a church in South Hayward. There has been an increase in both the number of licensed resource parents and adoption-only families since Family to Family has started. Foster parent socials are held regularly and a program manager attend foster parent association meetings on a regular basis.

The Building Community Partnerships workgroup has evolved into three (3) sub-committees: Parent Engagement, Youth Engagement, and Community Engagement. The Differential Response program has been the catalyst for the Community Engagement Workgroup. A partnership with community-based organizations has been formed in the three target areas that experience the highest rates of referrals that provide services to low risk referrals. Training is provided to the contracted community-based agency for professional development. Early data returns show a low rate of recidivism for clients that were served by the Differential Response program.

TDMs were implemented in September 2004 and are mandatory for all new intake cases, change of placements, and reunification TDMs. As of 2007, the majority of TDMs are held in county sites, however when requested, TDMs are held in the community. As a result of the Linkages initiative, there is a partnership with the Workforce Benefits and Administration (WBA) by staffing TDMs with a CalWORKS employment counselor. CalWORKS staff provides resources and referrals to eligible families. Due to the success of the Parent Advocate program, there is a pilot that has Parent Advocates attend new intake TDMs.

The Self Evaluation workgroup provides requested "data byte" reports that go out to staff by email with information related to outcome measures. There is a Business Objects Users group - a sub workgroup that meets to share Business Object (BO) reports and has created a method in a drive in the Agency's network where all BO reports are contained and can be assessed by users. The reports are 1) relative placements sorted by CWW with Reassessment Due Date, 2) children 15 ½ years old who need a TILP completed, 3) licensed foster homes with openings is sent to the Placement Units and 4) school letter - youth turning 18 report. In addition to the monthly Business Objects reports, QA has been providing Group Home staff with ad hoc reports to help with the step down project.

Contra Costa County

Two Community Engagement Specialists were hired to commit 10% of their time to recruitment activities, especially in the targeted Family to Family areas. Data on the numbers of removals and resource homes in the targeted Family to Family areas are reviewed on a

quarterly basis to measure the progress of the targeted recruitment. Monthly orientations are held across the county, with additional orientations held in the Family to Family targeted areas. An experienced foster parent has been contracted to attend orientations and provide follow-up calls to prospective resource families. Contra Costa County continues to implement informal "Icebreakers" between the caregiver and birth parent with mostly positive results.

Statistical and outcome data is shared with the community at Redesign Partnership meetings. TDM trainings are offered on a regular basis and are open to community partners, as well as foster parents. A new community needs survey was conducted, utilizing the survey tool created in collaboration with community members and foster parents. Local community and faith-based organizations were hired to administer the survey. The Redesign Partnerships are closely involved in disseminating information from the survey and the seventeen min-grant funding available to the community to address identified service gaps. There is increased collaboration with schools and county Office of Education in providing educational liaison positions co-located at the child welfare and education offices.

TDMs are held at Imminent Risk, Emergency Placement, Placement Change, and Exit. The Imminent Risk and Emergency Placement TDMs are mandatory for certain zip codes and for African American families with children under 5 years old countywide. The Placement Change and Exit TDMs are still in the development stages and currently target children and youth with the highest level of need who are experiencing multiple placements, as well as transitional-aged youth who have not been served by traditional ILSP services. Community Representatives are recruited by contracting with a local community-based agency. Providing support, as well as recognition of the Community Representatives is an ongoing process. The most important change in Contra Costa's child welfare practice as a result of holding TDMs is providing Exit TDMs for youth as they transition into adulthood.

The Self Evaluation team consists of two evaluators with clerical support, guided by a Children and Family Services Division Manager. Data reports include monthly caseloads, quarterly on referrals and removals at the district level and outcome reports on specific projects that are completed as needed (e.g. effectiveness of Parent Partners on speed of reunification and recidivism). A comprehensive self-assessment, as a part of a countywide self-improvement plan, was also recently completed.

Monterey County

A partnership has been formed with the local media so that PSAs recruiting foster parents are regularly broadcasted in English and Spanish on local television and radio. There has been an increase in child welfare staff that volunteers for events, as well as foster parents who apply to be peer recruiters. In several coalition areas, members are walking door-to-door to provide information. Local businesses have been willing to distribute information on pizza boxes, car repair bills, and to post information in windows or on bulletin boards. With information provided by the self-evaluation team, the recruitment subcommittee has begun to plan for the largest growing first placement population of children and youth over the age of 11.

Quarterly countywide partnership meetings, with simultaneous translations, are being held throughout the county, bringing together representatives of all the coalitions. Increased outreach to all the cities in south Monterey County has resulted in local sites being made

available in each of the cities for TDMs. Connections are being made with the Oaxacan service provider networks which has increased capacity to respond to families who speak in the indigenous dialects. Increased resources to build partnerships for Salinas, which has the highest removal rates, were realized by restructuring of the Monterey Peninsula liaison duties. All Family to Family community liaisons speak English and Spanish.

Monterey County is currently holding TDM's for initial entries, imminent risk, reunification and placement changes. For first entries and imminent risk, TDMs are mandatory in areas that have rolled out geographically. Once a family has had a TDM, then subsequent moves and exit decisions are made through TDM ("once a TDM, always a TDM"). The Family to Family community liaisons employed by the county's lead agencies are present at TDMs in their geographic areas. Having birth parents as part of the decision-making and identifying relative or near kin as placement options at the TDM are two of the most significant practice changes. There are now 10-12 community sites that have committed space for TDMs, so the need to have a meeting at Family and Children's Services is now more an exception, rather than a rule.

The Self Evaluation team meets monthly and sometimes more. All participants sit on other interagency and intra-agency evaluation workgroups and participate in state evaluation sub-committees. Within the Department, the following reports are generated: AB636 outcome based reports, referral based reports, case reports, adoption reports, SIP reports, comparison reports with matching between the TDM Data base both by client and zip code. Regular coalition specific reports are provided to community partners on rates of referrals, placement first entry, foster care, relative and near-kin, as well as the numbers of foster families.

San Francisco County

Currently targeted areas include homes for older youth (ages 13-18), bilingual youth (including two Asian homes), and targeted neighborhoods. Some identified supports include Icebreakers, which are in the planning stage, and regular management meetings with group home, FFA, and foster parent providers. San Francisco HSA is expanding supports to Spanish-speaking foster parents by providing monthly meeting space and logistical supports at one of the family resource centers that serve Spanish-speaking clients. San Francisco also plans to expand recruitment through partnership with the school district.

Some of the community partners with the department include SafeStart, Greenbook, Courts, Mental Health, and community-based agency. Community partnership has been particularly successful in the implementation of the Differential Response program. SFHSA continues to contract with two family resource centers in targeted communities to attend TDMs and provide support to families. There is a citywide Foster Care Improvement Task Force, which focuses on reducing disproportionality and a Core Team Meeting, which provides input into SIP development and implementation.

San Francisco HSA currently holds mandatory TDMs for all placement changes and initial removals from a child's family of origin. San Francisco HSA has developed protocol for the final implementation stage of TDM Permanency/Reunification, and holds these as requested. San Francisco HSA instituted a new firewall for TDM in 2006 that resulted in an increase in TDMs. The TDM Scheduler receives a weekly census of the placement moves for that

particular week and compares it to which TDMs occurred. A report is developed identifying which moves did or did not have TDMs; this is distributed to all management and supervisory staff for follow-up as needed. A school district staff attends the TDM and helps to identify educational information to be considered in the TDM process.

The Self-Evaluation team has been meeting on a regular basis to assess data needs and evaluate data measures. By trying different methods, San Francisco HSA has been able to successfully survey a random sample of emancipated youth and found that 78% were still attending school six months after emancipation. One third has not graduated from high school prior to emancipation, but almost all of them were trying to get their GED or otherwise continue their education.

San Mateo County

San Mateo County hired two African-American staff in the Adolescent Services unit to provide representation and cultural support to clients of African-American descent. A new Foster Parent Liaison was also hired to support resource families and to facilitate communication between the department and resource families.

Support, training and resources about TDM are provided to court workers, community partners, families, facilitators, high-risk groups, Family Resource Centers and school workers. Asset Coaches for youth are being utilized in some of the TDM meetings through the Fostering the Future Initiative in an attempt to actively engage youth who do not have an assigned personal advocate to help determine their individual needs, services and goals. CASA volunteers are assigned to 75% of the clients participating in TDMs strengthening the relationship between the child welfare workers and the court workers. Holding TDM's for client placement facilities outside of San Mateo County increased community participation and helped relationship building and education about purpose and process of TDM. This year, there were 4 new and 10-15 total facilities and community partners, including juvenile hall.

TDMs provided to community increased by 16%. Parents are required to attend TDMs and support services are provided to youth who do not want their parents present at their TDM. TDMs are utilized in cases transitioning from Family Reunification status to Family Maintenance status with the attempt to improve re-entry rates by maintaining services and case management to families that are not showing stability after 3 months of placement. Collaboration with the a domestic violence coordinator; utilizing Family to Family principles, also cross-trains with TDM facilitators to improve the recognition, evaluation and treatment outcomes of clients experiencing domestic violence

Data reports are produced monthly and quarterly and are used by regional managers and supervisors to monitor placement changes, the needs of the clients and increase the effectiveness of casework provided by workers and agencies. The F2F Coordinator facilitates quarterly meetings of program evaluation with the self-assessment policy team.

Santa Clara County

DFCS has shifted recruitment efforts from internal and centralized to community-based and regional. The Resource Family Support Team was developed to provide additional support for the county's licensed resource home providers. The team is comprised of former or current foster parents. Each resource home advocate is assigned to a specific family and participates in TDMs whenever a placement change occurs. Santa Clara also has a Foster/Adoptive Parent Resource Center. Relative finding is a key strategy in Santa Clara. Data has shown a higher proportion of children are being placed with relatives.

Six community action teams were developed. Four teams are defined by region. Two teams are defined by culture and ethnicity. Each community action team (CAT) is co-chaired by a community member and department staff. The county has created a joint response with law enforcement to reduce the number of children coming into care, with a major emphasis on children of color. This joint response program has expanded beyond the San Jose Police to all jurisdictions within the county. Each respective CAT has representatives who are available to participate in TDMs on an as-needed basis.

TDMs began in July 2003. Meetings have been conducted for children entering foster care, children changing homes within foster care, and children exiting foster care due to family reunification or aging out of the foster care system.

Southern California Family to Family Counties (Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego counties)

Los Angeles County

The targeted populations for recruitment are medically fragile, sibling groups, teens, specific needs related to culture, religion and language. There was significant decrease in group home placements in 2006: in December 2005, 139 children were living in group homes, in December 2006, there were 69. The county began a sibling awareness campaign for staff and community. There was a focused effort at collaboration with the faith-based communities.

New community partnerships were developed with social service and community resource agencies, private businesses such as Toyota, service organizations such as the Archdiocesan Youth Employment Service (AYE) program, California Permanency for Youth Project, the Kiwanis Club and local school districts. Billboard space next to a car dealership in the city of Glendale was donated for the purpose of resource family recruitment. As a result of the partnership with the faith based community, new resources have become available to foster youth including substance abuse treatment, mentoring development, outpatient treatment, counseling, anger management and domestic violence services, and also has increased identification of community resources for Los Angeles families.

TDMs are completed for placement decisions involving removal, replacement and reunification with parents. TDMs are mandatory for initial removal decisions. The county has made progress in their goals to increase the number of children reunified, reduction in the median length of stay for children in out-of-home care and to locate permanency for youth in

long-term foster care. For example, the Pomona office met the goals of a 20% and exceeded it by attaining a 46% increase and the Torrance office showed a 39% reduction.

Data is shared with community members and staff periodically and regularly at other established meetings. This data include Family to Family Quarterly Reports, TDM Database reports, LA Kids, MAPP reports and executive committee reports. Other data provided include reports from CWS/CMS, Structured Decision Making (SDM), Children's Resource Center (CRC), Concurrent Planning: Permanency Planning Liaison/Adoption Assessment reports (CPPL), Safe Measures.

Orange County

The PRIDE training, offered in English and Spanish, are well attended. PRIDE Boot Camp is for families that have already gone through PRIDE and are ready for a placement. The first faith-based convening took place with representatives from over 30 congregations. Twenty-four faith-based organizations expressed interest in recruiting and supporting foster families. The first Faith in Motion Newsletter was distributed in August. Twenty-five professional photographers donated their services to take pictures of children needing permanent families. The Orange County Heart Gallery photos have been displayed in several community organizations, which resulted in over 300 phone calls and nine children being matched with adoptive parents.

The Building Community Partnership strategy group helped organize a Community Forum at the Southwest Senior Center in Santa Ana. As a result of the forum, several community partners offered to be part of Differential Response in Orange County. The BCP Strategy group developed and expanded Differential Response after the Forum. A pilot Differential Response unit was regionalized in the west district Cal Works office along with an Emergency Response Unit.

TDMs are held on all initial placements decisions that occur during normal working hours and all placement changes. In an effort to keep children from entering foster care without prior social work intervention, Orange County has implemented a second shift of Emergency Response workers that employs regular staff. This expanded Emergency Response Service allows more children coming into care after 6 PM to have a TDM.

The Self Evaluation team has created geo-maps by gathering information for targeted high client geographical areas. The SE team recently completed a study called "Reasons for Recurrence of Maltreatment Referrals in Families with Young Infants" to determine factors that lead families to have two consecutive referrals in a relatively short time period. Results show that risk factors included domestic violence and substance abuse.

Riverside County

A brochure was designed entitled, Can You Help?, which presents the results of recruitment-based data and illustrates the need to keep children in their communities whenever possible. The Desert Region has been successful in engaging businesses such as WalMart, Der Wienerschnitzel, Tarbel Realtors (800 participating agents) and Elmer's Restaurant in distributing recruitment fliers. Riverside County relative placement homes continue to increase. Riverside County subcontracts a portion of their recruitment effort with Inland

Valley of Riverside and For the Children. There is an annual dance given to the resource families at a community restaurant and agency staff provides childcare. Former foster youth provide presentations at community forums, staff trainings and resource family trainings.

Riverside County has doubled the number of their community partners due to extensive outreach by the agency to faith-based organizations, law enforcement, health care providers, social service providers, teachers, tribal leaders and elected officials. Existing partnerships were strengthened with Advisory Committee meetings, SIP update meetings and special events in target communities. For example, staff partnered with the City of Desert Hot Springs and other local organizations to participate an annual event entitled "Day of the Child" which helped to recruit resource families.

TDMs are mandatory for every child at risk of removal in the four-targeted communities. TDM meeting "re-caps" are provided weekly. Once a child has had an initial TDM, the case is coded and tagged for TDMs whenever the identified child is at risk of a removal from their family or if in out-of-home care, at risk of a placement change. TDMs are mandatory for children who are eligible for protection pursuant to the Indian Child Welfare Act; tribal representatives are included. The majority children for whom TDMs is scheduled are under the age of five years old. There is an increase in the number of pre-detention TDMs and placement saves. Progress has been made with increase use of relative and non-related extended family homes from 2005 to 2006. Data shows an increase from 77% to 82% respectively.

Riverside County Self Evaluation team meets monthly. A monthly report to include aggregate data is provided to management to use in conjunction with other operational reports. Quarterly data is produced to monitor outcome and accountability measures and year-to-year comparison on key indicators.

San Bernardino County

Recruitment efforts included enhancements of countywide and regional tracking tools from application to license (orientation, application, PRIDE, home studies, licensing and retention). Resource parents participated in recruitment events, strategy meetings, Kinship Center activities, mock TDM trainings and faith-based outreach. Staff collaborated with Parent Partners in other county departments and contracted vendors.

The BCP Strategy developed new partnerships with programs in each region, such as the Young Visionaries Youth Leadership (gang prevention and male mentoring), Asian American Resource Center, Building a Generation, Same Team Kids, San Manuel Band of Mission Indians and Mother's Against Predators. Stronger relationships were formed with faith-based organizations and services (immigration, food, clothing job training, addiction and teen programs), including the nationally recognized crime reduction program, Phoenix Operation Program. The Desert Community Partners assisted with Family to Family presentations and trainings in their community.

Imminent Risk, Emergency Placement and Placement Move TDMs were mandatory in all implementation areas. Once a child and family received a TDM, the TDMs were held at all placement decision points throughout the course of the case. In the Spring of 2007, the West

End region will fully implement the above TDMs in all cities. In the interest of fairness and equity and decreasing the disproportionality of the number of black infants entering care, the West End and desert regions conducted TDMs on all black infants 12 months and under and their family members.

The Self Evaluation team responds to data requests from the other strategy workgroup. The team produced and updated fact sheets that were shared with staff and community partners. Fact Sheets were produced for 18 cities out of 31 cities located in San Bernardino County (58% of the cities in the County), which meant that every city that implemented Family to Family TDMs had a fact sheet. All county staff attended mandatory training on Fairness and Equity and the Culture of Poverty. A Fairness and Equity committee was established within DCS and across systems in San Bernardino County.

San Diego County

A "Taking Care of Business Day" was held for potential foster parents who could attend an orientation, fingerprint, CPR/First Aid – all in one day. There was a newspaper story about a foster parent in the local paper, a one-hour TV program featuring staff from Foster Home Licensing and Adoptions and ads promoting sibling placement. The partnership between San Diego County Foster Home Licensing and San Diego Futures Foundation gave away 500 refurbished computers to foster families. KIDSline is a toll-free "hotline" for foster parents to call for information or resources. San Diego identifies foster homes that are trained to take medically fragile children, and these foster parents have their own support group. San Diego County also has staffs that carries specialized caseloads of deaf clients (parents or children) and are fluent in American Sign Language (ASL).

Community partners are involved with recruitment efforts, respite events, foster parent appreciation events, holiday toy drives, and other support activities. Community representatives are included in TDMs. The east region was able to bring the Incredible Years (an evidenced based parenting program) to families by partnering with community collaborative. The program includes a visitation/meal time between parents and their children prior to their class: this program boasts a 95% attendance rate. Child welfare staff work in five distinct geographical regions and have created relationships with school personnel, law enforcement, faith-based organizations, foster parents and service organizations to keep children in their familiar environment.

San Diego County rolled out TDMs in three of their six regions in January 2006 (Central–Mills, North Inland and North Coastal). Currently all regions have implemented TDM meetings, along with two centrally managed programs: Residential Services and Adoptions. Both Emergency Placement and Placement Move TDMs are mandatory in all locations. In Adoptions, staff are required to hold a case consultation if they are considering moving/removing a child. When they are scheduling a case consult, staff is required to indicate when the TDM is scheduled or if it has already been held.

The Quality Assurance Data Unit is charged with data collection and assessment on a wide range of areas for CWS, and supports the Family to Family self-evaluation. The reports generated include: semi-annual Family to Family reports, monthly change of placement reports, monthly internal audits of relative home assessments, monthly performance reports, monthly Safe Measures compliance reports, quarterly CWS Trends reports, and quarterly

AB636 summary reports. The spreadsheet breaks information into Regional sections, but does not identify specific staff or families.

Glenn County

Two resource family appreciation events were held – the Recruitment, Development and Support team sponsored a luau at a local park and a holiday event in appreciation of the resource families. Glenn County has four AmeriCorps members who have brought energy and new ideas to the Recruitment, Development and Support team. One of the AmeriCorps members was hired as the new Glenn County licensing social worker in the Fall.

The Glenn County Children's Interagency Coordinating Council (CICC) functions as the Child Abuse Prevention Council and oversees children's services within the county. The executive body consists of the department heads from social services, probation, education, health and the courts. The Child and Family Resource Network, which consists of all the community partners involved in children's services, operates as a subgroup of CICC and reports to that body. Glenn County has two Family Resource Centers and is instrumental in providing community based services that support F2F strategies.

TDMs were implemented in July 2005 at the front end (i.e. risk of removals and emergency removals prior to detention hearing). They are mandatory meetings without exception. Front end TDM's are challenging because of the short timeframes. Staff has to immediately make phone calls to invite the TDM participants. A community services staff arranges the TDMs and makes many of the participant phone calls. Front-end TDMs have helped meet the objectives of: early assessment for child safety, awareness of placement options (including remaining in the home) and early family involvement with community services. This early intervention strategy has reduced the number of juvenile court petitions and kept many children at home with supportive services.

Glenn County uses Business Objects, UC Berkeley website quarterly data reports, and CWS/CMS Program Reports as the primary sources of statistical information for self-evaluation. The TDM quarterly reports are helpful in practice review, such as the effectiveness of TDMs held at the local jail.

Humboldt County

Humboldt County hosts an annual Foster Parent Appreciation luncheon and Winter Holiday Dinner party. Humboldt County recruited nine new resource families, seven of whom received their foster family home licenses by the end of the year. AmeriCorps volunteers work with the RDD coordinator on recruitment activities. Child Welfare and Probation staff worked together to design a new interagency recruitment brochure, with AmericCorp staff assisting in mass distribution. The local community college has a coordinator, a former foster youth and current adoptive parent, who staff the Foster and Kinship Care Education Program.

Bi-monthly Foster/Kinship Care Community Partners meetings are held. Child Welfare Services (CWS) has strengthened an existing partnership with the Humboldt County Office of Education (HCOE). Last Fall, HCOE's new AB 490/Homeless Education coordinator reconvened the Focus Group's Education/AB 490 subcommittee. There is a strengthened relationship with the Family Resource Centers through Differential Response and TDMs. The

Family Resource Centers are becoming trained partners in the evidence-based Incredible Years program, piloted in select target areas of the county. AmeriCorp staff has assisted with foster family recruitment efforts. There has been successful recruitment of a new Spanish speaking resource family. Relationship with local Tribes continued to improve, due to ongoing collaboration between the Tribes and CWS placement and relative specialists. Tribal representatives participated in relevant TDMs.

Over the past year, Humboldt County has seen a marked increase in the use of TDMs, both in ongoing units of Family Reunification, Family Maintenance, and Permanency Planning, as well as Emergency Response. At the end of 2006, TDMs were being held for Imminent Risk of Removal, Emergency Placement, and Exit from Placement. Placement Change and Exit from Placement (Reunification) TDMs are mandatory. Entry into Care was the last area in which TDMs were implemented. The two main focus areas on recruiting community representatives for TDMs have been the geographically based Family Resource Centers and local Indian Tribes.

The Self Evaluation Leadership Team met several times this past year. A F2F multi-agency recruitment subcommittee provides regular updates to the SE Leadership group. Data is especially volatile in counties such as Humboldt, where populations are low and data snapshots can be misleading, because periods of good performance may be lost. Humboldt County now has learned to drill down to determine the why and how behind the data.

Placer County

Since implementing Family to Family activities to recruit, train and support resource parents, Placer County has increased both the overall number of families participating in orientation and initial training, and the number of families willing to foster and adopt older children. Placer has increased the percentage of children with two or fewer placements, as well as the percentage of children placed with siblings. The percentage of children placed in group homes has also been reduced. A foster parent liaison facilitates interaction with staff, and efforts are in place to ensure effective and prompt communication between caseworkers and resource families. The number of resource parents participating in family support groups has increased, due to improved outreach and meeting planning. An annual picnic recognizes caregivers and each month, a resource family is recognized as the Family of the Month. As part of the honor, they are featured in the local newspaper and receive gift certificates donated by the community. Resource families regularly participate in TDMs for placement changes and reunification.

The county's Family Resource Centers participate in Family to Family work groups, employ the county's Foster Family Recruiter and TDM scheduler, provide space for TDMs and offer services to resource families. Sierra Adoption Services works with the County through a unique public-private collaboration to recruit, train and support resource parents. The agency assists resource parents to prepare for TDMs, and participates in the various Family to Family workgroups. Koinonia Family Services works closely with the County and Sierra Adoption Services to plan and oversee resource family placements. They also recruit, train and support resource families. During the past year, the County has strengthened relationships with two agencies providing services to families affected by domestic violence.

During 2006, the county implemented mandatory TDMs for all placement changes and some permanency placements. Safety/Action Plans are completed for all TDMs. To ensure that caseworkers schedule and convene TDMs, a TDM database and tracking system have been implemented. Currently, the child welfare manager responsible for TDMs receives monthly CWS/CMS data on all children who have reunified with parents/guardians and compares it to the list of TDMs that have been held or scheduled.

Family to Family self evaluation is handled by the Child Welfare System Improvement Accountability Team. At each bi-monthly meeting, the Accountability Team reviews county progress on the federal and state outcomes, as well as Placer's System Improvement Plan (SIP). The Family to Family activities are included in the system improvement plan. Until recently, very limited data was available to measure the impact of changes in practice. With more data now available, managers and staff frequently use the data to justify changes in practices, such as convening TDMs or working with birth parents to reduce placement changes and reunify children more quickly.

Sacramento County

Recruitment efforts have focused on communities that have a high rate of removals but historically have had fewer resource homes available. Neighborhood orientations have taken place in these targeted communities. One area has seen a 25% increase in the number of resource homes available to serve children. Sacramento County has also entered into an MOU agreement with Sacramento County Unified School District. Children are now being placed closer to home and with their siblings: 80% of the children placed in care are placed with their siblings. Sacramento developed a Resource Family Liaison position. This position provides assistance to resource and relative caregivers when they experience difficulty navigating the Child Welfare System. A mentoring program has been developed to assist new resource parents by having a seasoned resource parent available to provide support. Support groups are offered in both English and Spanish.

Sacramento has been working on strengthening partnerships with faith-based organizations using the Family Resource Centers. Sacramento is also working to strengthen partnerships with ethnic communities. In October, there was a convening held with Asian and Pacific Islander (API) service providers and community members to discuss strategies for serving API families. Faith-based organizations have hosted foster parent recruitment presentations. Efforts are currently underway to begin two Community Service Networks within two zip code areas.

In Reunification, TDMs are held when the social worker requests a meeting for placement changes, imminent risk of removal and for reunifications. Sacramento recently rolled out TDM in the Permanent Placement and Guardianship programs where recruitment efforts have begun. The use of a "communication sheet" has helped. TDM participants share their telephone numbers and email addresses and keep in contact regarding their tasks. Social worker feedback has shown that this is a helpful step for accountability.

The Self Evaluation team is integrated into each of the Redesign workgroups. The Redesign Steering Committee meets monthly, and information is shared and analyzed with this group. The members include both internal and external partners. There is also staff assigned internally who pull data reports for all programs on a monthly basis. A quarterly Data Book is

produced and shared with partners. The information in the Data Book is an overview of data from each of the programs, including the number of referrals each month, the number of families who reunified, the number of youth involved in ILP, etc.

Solano County

Solano County has partnered with the Foster Parent Association and the Foster and Kinship Care Education through Solano Community College to improve relationships between foster parents and social workers. Child welfare services worked closely with the Foster and Kinship Care Education program in designing this year's foster parent conference. Solano County is focusing foster parent recruitment efforts in the city of Vallejo and the foster parent pre-service training is now being offered in Vallejo three times per year. The county recruitment workgroup held a foster parent brunch in collaboration with Vallejo Family Resource Center, CASA Solano and the Foster Parent Association this year and is a key support in the planning of the annual Foster Parent Appreciation event and the annual Foster Care Barbecue.

Solano County is exploring ways to partner with community members, schools, families, youth, faith-based organizations and others. In June of 2006, Solano County sponsored the first ever community resource event in Vallejo. This event showcased over 25 community resources from the Vallejo area including churches, youth activities, family support services and county agencies. The Foster and Kinship Care Education program sponsored a half-day resource fair that highlighted over 30 local service providers. Two main projects are to revitalize the county's youth advisory and advocacy boards and the development of a parent advisory and advocacy board consisting of birth parents that have successfully reunified.

Solano County has begun the initial rollout phase of the TDM strategy. On December 1, 2006, all families from Vallejo whose children were at risk of being removed from their homes, participated in a TDM. In implementing emergency response and imminent risk TDM meetings, the TDM workgroup has met weekly to debrief the recent TDM meetings and further define the protocol specifically around the areas of domestic violence, safety factors and confidentiality.

The target community is quite large and made up of numerous smaller close-knit neighborhoods. The Self Evaluation team created a map of the first entries into foster care and other reports, which were shared on the intranet and with community partners. The group has identified a subcommittee (the Data Improvement Project or DIP) whose primary focus is cleaning up the data and reviewing standards for data entry. Solano County will hire a data consultant to specifically address integrating data into day-to-day child welfare practice.

Tehama County

Joint recruitment and support activities have been developed by the child welfare agency and key foster family agencies, state adoptions, child abuse council, foster/adoptive parent association, and a local adoption support agency. There is an increased focus on support for foster parents. Resource families and parents are regularly included in TDMs. Birth parents and youth are part of the PRIDE curriculum. There is an increased awareness of the

importance towards permanency for each youth. Community awareness of this issue has been greatly increased through outreach to service clubs and newspaper articles.

The collaboration amongst agencies, community partners and individuals around the community's children and families continues to grow and improve. Although no formal efforts have been launched for recruitment, development and support through BCP, there continues to be a connection in the goal of the two strategies and the increased awareness of BCP partners regarding the foster care system and the needs of the youth have allowed those partners to in turn help to spread the word throughout the community. Some community representatives are in attendance at TDMs.

Tehama County currently has mandatory TDMs for placement disruptions and reunifications/exits from care, including permanency planning. Icebreakers were rolled out in mid-2006 and are not mandatory at the present time.

Tehama County's Self Evaluation team meets monthly and is connected to the other strategy groups by the Family to Family Coordinator and the overlap of staff participation on the different groups. Data has been shared with the community through newspaper articles as well as personal contacts and outreach events. Regular reports are created which include caseload statistics, such as number of cases by service component, children in out-of-home placement and their placement location, etc. Other reports are run as needed related to specific topics including referrals related to substance abuse and differential response referral assignments.

Trinity County

Several appreciation and recruitment events for Resource Families were held, including distribution of free literature, weekly front page ads in the local free paper, open house, foster care appreciation dinner, pool party, and winter carnival. Due to the positive responses received from the families, the Foster Care Month, pool party and Winter Carnival will become annual events. It is often difficult for families to attend training provided by the local community college located over an hour's drive away so Trinity county began sending each family a monthly letter with information about the department and training opportunities along with a monthly training module that they could read and return the answer sheet to earn hours toward their mandatory training requirements. Trinity County has found that the most effective recruitment technique in small communities is word-of-mouth. There are five AmeriCorps volunteers located in the Child Welfare Services Unit who are available to provide respite care for resource families. A protocol was also developed for families to be reimbursed through Title IV-E funding for childcare when they attend classes, court or family meetings.

Trinity County Health and Human Services hosted a dinner for the faith-based community, which included representatives from over 20 churches. Two members of our Board of Supervisors attended the event. The honored guest, Pastor Raymond Lankford, discussed his experience with the Foster Care System as a Child Welfare Worker and a foster parent and provided information on how all organizations could work together. An advisory committee was created as a result of this event.

TDMs were implemented for all placement moves in July of 2004. To ensure the TDM occurs, TDM action plan must be attached to the detention report or the judge will order the TDM to be held. The Safety/Action plans are attached to court hearing reports and the workers are including them in the case plans. Compliance with the plans is reported back to the court during reviews. One of the most important changes in Trinity's Child Welfare Services is by using the TDM tool, the process of placement is slowed down which allows the best decision to be made. Less time is spent justifying the decision to Agency partners since it was made in a collaborative manner.

Santa Cruz

Santa Cruz County is the most recent county to join the Family to Family Initiative. Santa Cruz has been assigned technical assistants to assist in getting the four core strategies up and running in their county. During the first year, counties develop workgroups for each core strategy, look at their data, and develop their plans for implementation of the strategies. Santa Cruz is currently in the planning stage.

GENERAL RECRUITMENT ACTIVITIES

These activities will continue into the next FY 2008. We have established a partnership with the Annie E. Casey Foundation, and we also plan to continue the events at the State Capitol and with the 58 counties.

Family Builders by Adoption (California Kids Connection) Program

The Family Builders by Adoption Program is the California online adoption exchange registry of (1) children whose placement plan is adoption and (2) qualified families approved for adoption by public and private agencies. An adoption exchange is an organized means of sharing information about available children and searching families. The exchange also facilitates permanence on a local, regional, statewide and nationwide level for California's children. Services include an internet registry site, a photo listing book, exchange meetings, matching events and training and education for caseworkers. In addition, Family Builders is the California Resource and Recruitment Team for the National Adopt US Kids Campaign. The contractor provides the CDSS with monthly data reports. These reports reflect cumulative totals of children who are registered, successful matches, adopted, ethnicity, legal status and training provided, to name a few of the statistical categories of data currently being captured. Data specific to queries not currently listed on the reports may be extrapolated upon request.

At the present time, 78% of all public agencies participate in exchange meetings and list children on the exchange, as well as 55 private agencies that participate by listing families on the exchange site.

From July 1, 2006 - June 30, 2007, Family Builders By Adoption has recorded 146 matches attributable to state exchange activities (including the California Kids Connection website, exchange meetings, and matching events such as Family Fairs and matching picnics).

This number is higher than the yearly average for 2001 - 2006 (approximately 111/year). The numbers are only as good as are reported by the County social workers. Unfortunately, the system for social workers reporting back to Family Builders By Adoption regarding the children listed on the CKC website is as efficient as it could be. The social workers may only request that the child be removed from the website with no explanation for the removal. Family Builders By Adoption reminds county social workers to report more specific outcomes of children placed on the CKC website for tracking purposes. During the 2006-2007 SFY, Family Builders By Adoption reminded social workers each exchange meeting, through memos, emails, phone calls, and in-person conversations and also through the CKC newsletter.

Family Builders By Adoption also attribute the higher number of matches to the greater number of children listed on the website this year. On July 1, 2006 there were 505 children listed on California Kids Connection, and on June 30, 2007, there were 651 children listed on the website.

Foster Care Initiative (Assembly Bill 2129)

Assembly Bill (AB) 2129 (Chapter 1080, Statutes of 1993) made funds available in the annual Governor's Budget county allocations through the CDSS to support county recruitment efforts. All counties are responsible for recruiting foster and adoptive families and pursuant to the passage of AB 2129 are required to complete the annual year end report/survey in order to be eligible for the funding. The report is designed to collect recruitment, training and retention program data and accomplishments achieved during the fiscal year. The counties are required to submit a year-end report outlining their recruitment, training and retention program data and accomplishments achieved during the fiscal year regardless if the activities are funded by AB 2129 funds, county funds, grants, contributions, or other funding streams. This data is compiled into a comprehensive report for statewide distribution, via the internet (see below) that can be used by the state and counties in planning future activities. This report is called the Resource Family Recruitment, Training and Retention Annual Report 2006. The community colleges, counties and foster parent associations collaborate to complete the report. The data from the online survey is shared with counties in a report that is sent out to all 58 counties and discussed at quarterly Regional meetings, as well as at Family to Family meetings for resource families.

The 2006 report indicates many positive results, including a 9% increase in the amount of Kinship Emergency Funds being utilized by counties with 41 counties now utilizing these funds increasing the amount of Kin Care families in the state. Statewide, 50 counties designated 763 staff to the recruitment of resource families. This is a 116.7 percent increase over last years staff total of 352. Forty one counties had bilingual staff dedicated to resource family recruitment. Additionally, the report corroborated a long assumed belief that the most effective recruitment sources and materials utilized were other resource families/friends and newspaper advertisements. The categories of children for which counties conducted specialized recruitment of potential resource families were adolescents, youths, infants born substance abuse exposed, and sibling sets. The categories of children most difficult to recruit for or place with resource families were adolescents with psychological or mental disabilities, youths with psychological or mental disabilities, and adolescents/youths with substance abuse. The report further strengthened the resolve that enhanced recruitment, training and retention must continue in order to allow California's children in out-of-home placement an

opportunity to live in safe, stable and permanent homes. Goals were in place in 46 counties to measure the success of resource family recruitment efforts. These goals resulted in increased recruitment in 38 of these counties. The most frequently cited activities or goals to improve recruitment were Expand Community Outreach and Media usage, Create Resource Family Database and Establish Recruitment Campaigns.

The report can be accessed on the CDSS' Children and Families Services Division website at <http://www.childsworld.ca.gov>, under "Foster Care Reports" or the California Family to Family website, <http://www.f2f.ca.gov>, under the "What's New" section.

In addition to their annual report, many counties also addressed recruitment in their SIPs. A number of counties identified recruitment strategies in their SIPs, in order to increase the number of resource families. Some counties identified media outreach as part of their strategy. Others identified faith based outreach efforts, targeted recruitment (such as for sibling groups or older youth), education of the community on the need for foster parents and the children who need homes, media campaigns and booths at community events as their planned strategies to recruit more resource families. For AB 2129, we have an online survey for the counties to complete as explained above, and the annual year-end report comes from information contained in the survey.

Toll-Free Hotline

Some recruitment is done through the toll-free hotline. The hotline receives approximately 500 calls a month regarding Adoption and Foster Care. When a call comes in with a question regarding the Adoption or Foster Care process, the staff will answer the question if they know the answer. If not, the call will be directed to the welfare department in the county where the caller resides. Fifty-five percent of the calls come from Los Angeles, Sacramento and Orange counties. Calls are also received from Nevada and Arizona. The toll-free hot line number is 1-800-543-7487.

Perinatal Substance Abuse/HIV Infant Program (formerly known as Options for Recovery)

The CDSS has the authority and funding to plan and implement services for court dependent children, aged 0-60 months, residing in out-of-home care that are substance-exposed or test positive for Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV). All participating counties submit a county plan for approval to CDSS, specifically outlining a proposed budget, budget justification and detailed job specification for each requested staff position within the Perinatal Substance Abuse/HIV Infant Program.

County allocations and expenditures are controlled by CDSS. The responsibility for the development, implementation and monitoring of program policies and procedures to ensure compliance with state law also falls within the purview of the CDSS. The CDSS provides training and technical assistance to all participating Perinatal Substance Abuse/HIV Infant Program county staff. Emphasis is placed on assuring that all staff responsible for implementing the Perinatal Substance Abuse/HIV Infant Program at the local level has an understanding of the needs of the target population and the local resources to serve them.

The following counties are currently participating in this Program: Alameda, Butte, Glenn, Contra Costa, Monterey, San Francisco, San Diego, San Luis Obispo, Santa Cruz and Shasta. The philosophy of this program recognizes that drug and alcohol abuse is a disease that requires treatment and compassion. The service delivery consists of interagency collaboration, targeted recruitment, specialized training, respite care and support services for foster parents and federally-eligible relative caregivers.

Counties are required to provide 33-hour core curriculum to foster parents and relative/non-relative caregivers that care for SA/HIV Infant eligible children.

- Butte County provides an additional 13 hours
- Contra Costa County provides additional 3 discretionary hours, to cover extra topics of interest, i.e. "Shaken Baby Syndrome."
- 39% of the total number of foster parents in Contra Costa County are SA/HIV Infant Program graduates.

Significant accomplishments:

- Shasta County added a substance abuse counselor to their staff.
- San Diego County started providing a recruitment letter in both English and Spanish to all licensed foster parents – total 1600.
- San Diego County started making visits to CPS units providing information and seeking new SA/HIV Infant eligible relative caregivers.
- San Diego County started a Spanish speaking support group.
- Butte/Glenn County started a successful SA/HIV Infant Program Shelter Care Home Program.
- Butte/Glenn County started a SA/HIV Infant Mentor Program.
- San Luis Obispo County designed a Foster Parent Academy and a Positive Parenting Series for birth parents. The county is working more effectively with both foster and birth parents providing them with tailored training and team building experiences.

Changes:

- San Diego County has started the process of contracting for television advertisements for SA/HIV Infant Program homes
- Butte County recently began a quarterly SA/HIV Infant Program Sensory integration Play Group for children with Sensory Integration issues with Integrative Therapy.
- San Luis Obispo County will be requiring all foster families who are licensed for children 5 years old and under to be certified SA/HIV.

Barriers:

- Butte/Glenn County did not have enough SA/HIV Infant trained foster homes to accommodate the number of children that have been detained that are drug/alcohol exposed. They increased their advertisement campaign to recruit more foster homes. They are also working with their local newspaper on writing an article on the Butte/Glenn County Sa/HIV Infant Program to inform the community about the need for more SA/HIV Infant homes.

- Butte/Glenn County was experiencing some of the SA/HIV Infant eligible children were being placed in Foster Family Agency Homes due to the emergency nature of the detentions. They are overcoming this problem by opening four SA/HIV Infant Shelter Homes in Butte County. Their SA/HIV Infant Project Coordinator is also attending all the Family Placement Meetings for all of the Butte County Detentions (under five years of age) to ensure SA/HIV Infant eligible children are placed in Sa/HIV Infant trained foster homes.
- Contra Costa County was experiencing the relative caretakers being more wary of involvement with Children's Services programs. Outreach and personal contact are being used to overcome this, with good results. Relatives are attending support group meetings and at least one is additionally pursuing a license to do foster care.
- Handling non-caregivers taking core curriculum classes and determining their eligibility to graduate. Regular meetings with the community colleges are scheduled to discuss this matter.

Plans for the future:

- Updated foster parent computerized Tracking System which will begin to interact with the Emergency Placement Unit.
- Fresno, Orange and Stanislaus counties will be participating in the SA/HIV Infant Program in the 2007-08 fiscal year.

Specialized Training for Adoptive Parents (STAP)

The STAP Program provides specialized recruitment, training and services to pre-adoptive/adoptive parents of children born HIV positive and/or substance exposed. The program is designed to assist the adoption of medically fragile children who are dependent children of the court, have an adoption case plan and reside with pre-adoptive or adoptive parents.

Participating counties are required to provide a training curriculum which includes all of the following:

- Orientation.
- Effect of alcohol and controlled substances on the fetus and children.
- Normal and abnormal infant and early childhood development.
- Special medical needs and disabilities.
- Recovery from addiction to alcohol and controlled substances.
- Self-care for the caregiver.
- HIV/AIDS in children.
- Issues in parenting, providing lifelong permanency and substance abuse prevention to children with prenatal alcohol and other controlled substances exposure.
- Issues specific to caring for a child who tests HIV positive.

There were no programmatic changes to the STAP Program in SFY 2006-07. The CDSS will continue to provide technical assistance to those counties participating in the program and to any counties that submit a plan to participate in the program.

Foster Care Month

The CDSS, the counties, and a collaboration of organizations, legislators, private foundations, foster parents and youth gathered at the State Capitol on May 1, 2007, to participate in the kickoff for Foster Care Month. The event launched National Foster Care Month in California and raises public awareness about foster children and young people's needs for permanent life-long connections with adults, and other foster care system improvement efforts. This year's Capitol event honored visionary efforts that have enriched the lives of foster youth and highlighted bi-partisan leadership efforts to fulfill the foster care system's promise of safety, permanency and well being for the children it touches. During the first week in May, there was a special performance at the Sacramento Theatre Company, a one-woman play by Regina Louise entitled "Someone's Somebody." In addition to the state event, there were numerous county based Foster Care Month events held throughout the month of May.

Other Activities

A project of interest in terms of recruitment activities is the Alameda County's Group Home StepUp Project: Moving Up & Out of Congregate Care. The project was funded through assistance from Casey Family Programs and the California Permanency for Youth Project. This was a six-month project designed to improve the long-term outcomes for adolescents in group home care. Alameda County made a commitment to focus on "mining" cases and using web based search technology to find family members. The target group was youth, ages 11-18 years, who had been placed in group home care for a significant length of time.

There were 72 youth assigned to the project, which was more successful than anticipated. After 6 months, 36 youth left group home care and were placed with family. Another 6 youth were waiting for placements with family within the next quarter. There were 3 youth who had pending ICPC applications awaiting approval for placement with family in other states. Eight of the youth were connected to family, and placements were possible within the next quarter. Four of the youth were placed in transitional housing programs, with family involved in the decision making and supporting the placement. Another 12 of the youth remained in group homes, and were progressing in treatment, in large part because of support from newly found family now involved in treatment and visiting the youth. Many of the youth's behavioral troubles subsided when connected with family. One youth was still building relationships with family, with the possibility of a future placement. Only 2 of the youth were found placements through "traditional means" with foster family agency foster parents.

Success was almost exclusively due to placements with parents, relatives and non-related kin—not with finding foster homes as was originally believed. Extensive efforts were made by the County to create financial incentives in the form of special rates for county foster parents willing to commit to caring for youth moving out of group homes. Licensing staff discussed this prospect with all prospective county foster parents. No placements were made with county foster parents, despite this effort. The project succeeded due to the locating of family, which has many implications for the recruitment of permanent homes for older youth, particularly those who are placed in group homes.

We are planning to allocate state money to Alameda County to sustain this project in SFY 2007/2008.

Specific Progress and Accomplishments Related to Diligent Recruitment

Throughout the year, the 11 largest counties meet twice a year for a “convening/training” around topics such as recruitment/training and retention of foster parents, youth permanence and disproportionality. Through the UC Berkeley Center for Research, the counties are provided information on how to self-evaluate through the collection, analysis and interpretation of data about child and family to find out where they are making progress and to determine where they need to make changes in practice. The CDSS, in partnership with the Annie E. Casey Foundation, provided the technical assistance and training to these counties.

The Resource Family Recruitment, Training and Retention Annual Report for SFY 2006/2007 for AB 2129 funding will be released in September of 2007. Participating counties will be asked about their activities, goals and/or resources, and how effective their recruitment methods were in SFY 2006/2007. This will continue through FY 2008.

The 2006/2007 Resource Family Recruitment, Training and Retention Annual Report addressed several questions concerning the recruitment of potential foster/adoptive families that reflected the ethnic and racial diversity of the children in foster care. Counties were asked if any bilingual staff was available for the recruitment of resource families. Forty-three counties had bilingual staff dedicated to resource family recruitment. All these counties had staff fluent in Spanish. Counties were also asked to indicate any difficulty in placing foster youth due to language and cultural differences. Twenty-seven counties responded that there were difficulties in placing foster youth because of language and cultural differences. Counties were also asked if they conducted specialized recruitment for children of ethnic and racial diversity in their county. UC Berkeley continues to provide information to counties at all Family to Family Convening’s regarding their data and has developed a new dynamic reporting interface which allows users to produce custom data tables.

Adoptions Program

ADOPTIONS PROGRAM

Intercountry Adoption

Activities That the State Has Undertaken For Children Adopted From Other Countries, Including the Provision of Adoption and Post Adoption Services

Under California law (Family Code section 8900 et seq.), the provision of intercountry adoption services fall exclusively within the purview of licensed private adoption agencies. California's intercountry adoption program provides for two kinds of adoptions, those finalized in the child's country of origin (Adopt Abroad) and those finalized in California. In each case, pursuant to the California Code of Regulations, a California adoption agency, in order to provide intercountry adoption services, is required to have an agreement with a foreign agency that, in part:

- Verifies that the foreign agency is authorized to place children for inter-country adoption under the laws of its country;
- Specifies the responsibility of the foreign agency for the care of the child, including medical care and financial support; and
- Specifies the authority and responsibility of the foreign agency in relation to placement, disruptions, finalization of the adoption or the return of the child to his or her native country.

Based on such agreements, California licensed intercountry adoption agencies perform home studies on prospective adoptive parents, provide required post-placement supervision on adoptions finalized in California, and may provide post-finalization supervision as required by the child's native country if the adoption is finalized in that country. Agencies also assist with re-adoption if required by Homeland Security in the Adopt Abroad program. Additional information about California's intercountry adoption program may be found in Title 22, California Code of Regulations section 35241 et seq.

Children Who are Adopted From Other Countries and Who Enter Into State Custody as a Result of the Disruption of a Placement for Adoption or the Dissolution of an Adoption, Including the Number of Children, the Agencies Who Handled the Placement or the Adoption, the Plans for the Child, and the Reasons for the Disruption or Dissolution

In each case, pursuant to the California Code of Regulations, the California adoption agency providing inter-country adoption services is required to have an agreement with a foreign agency that meets the regulatory requirements stated above.

Furthermore, California Family Code section 8903 provides that, "For each inter-country adoption finalized in this state, the licensed adoption agency shall assume all responsibilities for the child including care, custody, and control as if the child had been relinquished for adoption in this state from the time the child left the child's native country."

Based on the provisions of California law described above, a child that comes to California through an intercountry adoption process is not allowed to enter foster care if the adoption disrupts. Therefore, there were no children who have come to the United States for the purpose of adoption who entered foster care prior to the finalization of the adoption. Similarly, since there can be no foreign born children in such circumstances, there will be no agency to identify, nor corresponding reporting on any plans for such children or reasons for the disruption of adoptive placements prior to finalization.

In April 2007, the CDSS adoptions district offices, who have the sole responsibility for investigating all petitions to set-aside adoptions (dissolutions) in California, reported that in the last year, there have been no dissolutions of intercountry adoptions.

Cross-Jurisdictional Plan and Probation Data

CROSS-JURISDICTIONAL PLAN AND RESOURCES

The CDSS has continued to increase the use of cross-jurisdictional resources for adoptive placements, which include recruitment strategies such as the California Kids Connection Program/Website. Statewide, five programs have met monthly to share specific information regarding family and children. A support coordinator is responsible for assisting in matching waiting children with available families identified by the exchange. This website has, and will continue to have, both a secure and a public website. The public website is accessible to any Internet user. Visitors indicate their interest in specific children by sending an e-mail to the placing agency identified for each child. Many public adoption agencies throughout the state also maintain their own website featuring children who are available for adoption.

AdoptUSKids website is the result of the Children's Bureau Initiative, a collaborative funded by the Adoption Exchange Association, Health and Human Services/Administration for Children and Families and the Children's Bureau. The California Kids Connection, Recruitment Response Team is a part of the Children's Bureau's national recruitment initiative campaign for finding potential adoptive families. California's adoption exchange program, California Kids Connection provides several important services, all of which have the final goal of finding permanent homes for children who are available and waiting in the foster care system.

The California Kids Connection, Recruitment Response Team has been very successful in finding permanent homes for our foster children/youth. For the quarter ending March 2007, there was an average of 623 children listed with a monthly average of 646 inquires for qualified and approved families for that period. At the present time, 78% of all public agencies participate in exchange meetings and list children on the exchange, as well as 55 private agencies that participate by listing families on the exchange site.

A cooperative placement is a placement where one agency represents a family that has had a homestudy and another agency has custody of the child. During SFY 2006-07, the number of cooperative placements was approximately 4,168. The number of cross-jurisdictional placements has continued to increase each fiscal year. California is committed to increases in cross-jurisdictional placements with a continued effort to further streamline the adoption process. To facilitate cross-jurisdictional placements, the state: 1) issued an ACIN clarifying state and federal law regarding cross-jurisdictional adoptions; 2) amended the adoption regulations handbook referencing current state law regarding cross-jurisdictional adoptions; 3) reviewed the existing regulations for consistency with cross-jurisdictional adoption requirements; and 4) amended training curriculum to include cross-jurisdictional adoption requirements. The Governor has proposed increased funding in adoptions for SFY 2006-07, which is anticipated to facilitate cross-jurisdictional placement as well.

CHILD WELFARE SERVICES CASES TRANSFERRED TO PROBATION

Description of the number of children under the care of the State child protection system who are transferred into the custody of the State juvenile justice system

Methodology:

Two separate data files were created for the year under review using an extract from the CWS/CMS. The first file represented closed child welfare supervised placements. The second file represented Probation supervised placements with start dates within the same year. Children that appeared in both files were unduplicated and counted. Please see the following data table for results.

CWS/CMS

Children with WIC 300 and WIC 601/602 authority codes within a given year*

Federal Fiscal Years	Number of Children
1999/2000	559
2000/2001	644
2001/2002	709
2002/2003	643
2003/2004	815
2004/2005	994
2005/2006	1,013

*Data Caveat:

This data should be considered preliminary, as the state is still exploring the most accurate data method to identify this population as well as a means of validating the data. Data from the CWS/CMS, California's Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (SACWIS) system, is able to identify the number of children in out-of-home placement supervised by CWS, who have been terminated from a CWS placement, then subsequently placed in a Probation-supervised placement within a given Federal Fiscal Year. We cannot measure the duration of time this process takes until a system change occurs to track end dates for legal authority changes.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

**CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION
AND
TREATMENT ACT (CAPTA)**

**APPLICATION
for
Federal Fiscal Year (FFY)
2008**

CFS-101

June 30, 2007

**State of California
Department of Social Services**

CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT ACT

**APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR (FFY) 2008 FUNDING
PLAN FOR FEDERAL FISCAL YEARS 2005-2009**

APPLICANT AGENCY:

State of California, Department of Social Services

Organizational Unit:

Office of Child Abuse Prevention
744 P Street, M.S. 11-82
Sacramento, California 95814

Designated Child Abuse and Neglect State Liaison Officer with NCCAN:

Susan Nisenbaum, Chief
Child Protection and Family Support Branch
(916) 651-6200

Application Information Contact:

Teresa Contreras, Chief
Office of Child Abuse Prevention
(916) 651-6960

Applicant Agency's Employer Identification Number:

94-6001347

Introduction

The Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) Plan is the primary prevention component of the State's Child and Family Services IV-B Plan, which is also referred to as the Child and Family Services Plan (CFSP). The programs, services, and activities outlined in the CAPTA component are linked to the following goals and objectives of the entire CFSP plan:

- **Safety Outcome**

Goal 1: Children are first, and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect; they are safely maintained in their homes whenever appropriately possible and provided services to protect them.

- **Well Being Outcome**

Goal 3: Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate; families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs; children, youth and families are active participants in the case planning process; and children receive adequate and appropriate services to meet their educational, physical and mental health needs.

It is the state's intent to ensure a clear link between CAPTA and the Title IV-B CFSP goals by utilizing CAPTA funds to enhance community capacity to ensure the safety of children and promote the well-being of children and families. The California Department of Social Services (CDSS), through its Office of Child Abuse Prevention (OCAP), uses the CAPTA grant, in combination with other funds such as Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF) and state funds from the Child Abuse Prevention, Intervention and Treatment (CAPIT) Program and the state Children's Trust Fund to support counties, family resource centers, and other community based organizations through grants, contracts and interagency agreements to promote child abuse prevention and to provide early intervention services that serve children and families within their own communities whenever possible.

When evaluating the programs that provide the services and the training that is necessary to ensure that there is the sufficient capacity to keep children safe and to enhance the well being of children and families, CDSS/OCAP reviews the activities and assesses the results associated with these specific programs. The following is a report on the CDSS/OCAP programs and activities for federal fiscal year (FFY) 2006. Discussions of future directions address FFY 2007 and FFY 2008.

There have been no substantive changes in state law that could affect California's eligibility for CAPTA funds.

Identification of Program Areas Selected for Improvement

Area 8: Developing and facilitating training protocols for individuals mandated to report child abuse and neglect.

Area 12: Developing and enhancing the capacity of community-based programs to integrate shared leadership strategies between parents and professionals to prevent and treat child abuse and neglect at the neighborhood level.

Area 14: Supporting and enhancing collaboration among public health agencies, the child protection system and private community-based programs to provide child abuse and neglect prevention and treatment services (including linkages with education systems) and to address the health needs, including the mental health needs, of children identified as abused or neglected, including supporting prompt, comprehensive health and developmental evaluations for children who are the subject of substantiated child maltreatment reports.

Program Improvement Area 8: Programs, Activities, Services and Training

Child Abuse Training and Technical Assistance

Program Description

In accordance with sections 18961, 18963 (2), and 18978, *et. seq.* of the California Welfare and Institutions Code, CDSS/OCAP is required to use private, non-profit agencies to provide the training and technical assistance necessary for planning, improving, developing and carrying out programs and activities related to the prevention, identification and treatment of child abuse and neglect; to disseminate information addressing issues of child abuse among multicultural and special needs populations; and to provide assistance and funding for the coordination and strengthening of Child Abuse Prevention Councils (CAPCs). In keeping with this mandate, the CDSS/OCAP and the California Office of Emergency Services (OES) have a grant with the California Institute of Human Services (CIHS) at Sonoma State University to provide these services through the Child Abuse Training and Technical Assistance (CATT) Program. CIHS has an agreement with the California State University, Channel Islands, that link these two entities as CATT training centers. Both the grant and the agreement were due to sunset on June 30, 2005, however, both have been extended until June 30, 2007.

Objective

To provide training and technical assistance for direct service providers in the field of child abuse prevention, intervention and treatment with an emphasis on prevention and family support services.

Activities/Results

From October 1, 2005 to September 30, 2006, CATT has conducted 40 training and technical assistance events serving 3,685 professionals. Training participants during this report period included individuals from 57 of California's 58 counties and technical assistance activities which reached individuals from all 58 counties. In addition, CATT has provided nearly 1,700 hours of technical assistance to individuals and agencies statewide. CATT's Regional Resource Coalition Coordinators have provided an additional 1,550 hours of county technical assistance.

Examples of technical assistance include providing logistical support for training events (i.e., registration, providing Continuing Education Units, securing Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) certification), providing face-to-face topic-specific training (i.e., strategic planning, database development and evaluation consultation), connecting agencies with expert consultants and providing support for their services, onsite consultations and distribution of educational and research publications and videos.

Objective

To assist local CAPC in strengthening their prevention communities' capacity and expertise by utilizing the eight (8) Regional Resource Consortia (RRCs) to provide training, technical assistance, and networking opportunities.

Activities/Results

During the reporting period of October 1, 2005 to September 30, 2006, CIHS completed the annual statewide needs assessment of the CAPCs. The needs assessment supplied data to provide a more targeted, solution-focused delivery of technical assistance. The following training needs were identified by the survey:

Needs specific to CAPC operations fell into the following categories:

- Marketing and outreach
- Funding sources
- Strategic planning
- Best practices.

The top ten identified training topic needs fell into the following categories:

- Methamphetamines and their impact on children
- Dynamics of child sexual abuse
- Victim to Perpetrator: breaking the cycle in abused children
- Teens and high-risk behaviors
- Juvenile offenders
- Fathers and their influence on the lives of children
- Strengthening families
- Child trauma treatment
- Positive parenting
- Trauma and emotional readiness in children

The increase in overall strength of the councils, along with stable structure, reliable funding and improved performance, were also supported by findings from the 2006 Action Planning activity report.

In this activity, the county teams determine their goals for self-improvement for the coming year in five different areas: organization, policies and procedures, funding, function/council's work and dissemination. These goals were formulated after reviewing the components of an exemplary council.

To summarize the areas of need, CATA tabulated the components identified by each county team and their priority levels. Three major areas that most CAPCs identified with number one priority in their 2006 action plan were 1) Organization, 2) Policies and Procedures and 3) Function.

CATTA provided technical assistance and support to the eleven Small County Initiative II (SCI II) grantees during the period from October 1, 2005 to September 30, 2006. CATTA provided travel stipends that allowed the grantees to participate in the meetings held by their Regional Resource Coordinator and other related events. These stipends helped the grantees attend the statewide summit of child abuse prevention councils that was held in February 2006. During this conference, counties reported that they are:

- Reaching underserved populations in remote areas.
- Implementing Differential Response in differing degrees.

Seeking sustainability to continue activities after the OCAP Small County Initiative grant ends in December of 2006. The Small County Initiative II ended December 31, 2006 and had until June 30, 2007 to submit final invoices.

Pertaining to sustaining activities the following is offered:

- Alpine's new Early Learning Center has been the focus for prevention and family support, and First 5 has contributed significant resources to that Center. Redesign is a continuation of the preventive approach the County has taken, and the focus on outcomes and the Peer Quality Case Review sharpened their desire to be efficient. Sustaining of these SCI 2 trends will be difficult.
- Amador's SCI-II program: No viable plan to sustain SCI-II funded outreach and support programs was identified, but efforts at fund-raising by the CAPC, using local foundations and voluntary property tax donations were made.
- Calaveras County's CAPC made strides in broadening membership to parents/consumers and service providers under SCI-II, despite turnover in its Coordinator position. They had success in raising funds to support prevention efforts, most notably by an annual voluntary property tax contribution campaign.
- Del Norte County focused its SCI-II program on Redesign and delegated responsibility for all objectives to its community partner agency, which itself is closely engaged with community organizations. The County and its CBO have successfully leveraged funds for the DR program, and they are committed to using public funds to continue DR as an essential component of their SIP.
- Glenn County indicated that SCI-II was critical for developing its FRCs and that the County is committed to sustaining them, using Child Welfare Improvement money for that purpose, and blending other funds for clients based on their needs and eligibility.
- Plumas County maintains an active CAPC with prominent local agency leadership, but has had difficulty in engaging remote and non-traditional partners. Community outreach is mostly handled by word-of-mouth through community agency staff living in remote communities. SCI-II is credited with helping to build strong public/private collaboration, which is especially needed currently as overall funding to sustain DR and FRC services is becoming increasingly scarce.

- In Siskiyou County, the CAPC and County generated a successful proposal to fund a DR Path One pilot program, and the CAPC was instrumental in the plan for allocating child abuse prevention resources to agencies and communities. While there are barriers to networking, it appears that SCI-II funding allowed the FRC Network to expand its capacity.
- Tehama County expanded its FRC network to Corning under SCI-II and this new agency has joined the CAPC. Difficulty in enlisting an active parent advisory board has persisted, however. Over time, through outreach, community members such as the Hispanic population have begun to feel more comfortable at the FRC, and county agencies have started to use it as a program site. A foundation proposal was submitted to augment Redesign and other blended public sector funds for future operation.
- Trinity's SCI-II funded program through the Human Resource Network (HRN) has succeeded in engaging youth in multiple sites around the County in leadership councils and pro-social activities. HRN also provides services with SCI-II resources to DR Path One referrals. Trinity used SCI-II to launch a child abuse prevention web-site.
- Tuolumne, and its SCI-II grantee agency, The Infant Child Enrichment Services, Inc. (ICES) succeeded in developing a community-based parent council and received local and state-wide recognition for these efforts. The CAPC was utilized in Redesign activities, notably the SIP, and in DR/Path One development. Sustainability of services is uncertain, however, especially as DR referrals increase and given that base CWS administration and staffing is problematic.
- Yuba's initial SCI-II contractor, Grace Source Inc (GSI), runs two FRCs, and used Americorps members to raise awareness of local services for families. Yuba participates in CDSS's sustainability project to help agencies learn how to secure on-going prevention resources and has submitted applications to a number of potential sources for sustaining resources.

CATTA also completed extensive planning and coordination for the grantees that met on March 22-23, 2006 in Redding. An agenda was developed in collaboration with OCAP and the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), and appropriate panel presenters were identified. The workshop was attended by 33 SCI II grantee representatives and the event included an OCAP update and a presentation by UCLA on the Interim Evaluation Report. Panel discussions were held on Differential Response Programs, Family Resource Centers, Child Abuse Prevention, Intervention and Treatment programs, Engaging the Community, and Outreach to Underserved Populations. Grantees exchanged information on their successes and challenges in each of these areas, and reported that this structured, interactive approach was extremely helpful.

Objective

To support direct service providers in the field of child abuse prevention by developing informational materials and distributing relevant information from a variety of sources.

Activities/Results

CATTA made available over 1,650 resources on child abuse prevention to the approximately 17,000 contacts that are stored in its database.

CATTA maintains a web site of online resources including:

- A quarterly newsletter (the newsletter is also distributed in hard copy to approximately 10,000 constituents).
- An online directory of the Child Abuse Prevention, Intervention and Treatment organizations in the 58 counties of California that provide support services to children and families.
- Web pages that provide links to CAPCs; Multi-Disciplinary Interview Centers/Teams; training that is available; publications, directories and searchable databases that are focused upon the prevention, intervention and treatment of child abuse and neglect; topics of interest to the CATTA constituency and additional online resources.

CATTA operates a toll free information and referral number that is utilized by the public and by professionals.

CATTA maintains listservs for the following groups:

- General CATTA Constituency.
- Child Abuse Prevention Councils.
- Child Advocacy Centers/Teams.
- Child Abuse Treatment (CHAT) Programs.
- Small County Initiative II Counties.
- Spanish-speaking child forensic interviewers.

Objective

To maintain the high quality services of the CATTA project through evaluation processes.

Activities/Results

CATTA developed and implemented the annual evaluation plan for its three program components which are training and technical assistance; development of Regional Resource Consortia and information development and distribution.

Training is evaluated on an on-going basis as participants are asked to complete written evaluations at the conclusion of each training. Participants are asked to complete a 90 day follow-up evaluation that includes questions regarding the implementation and utilization of the training material by individuals and agencies.

The CAPC needs assessment that was completed by the CIHS, as mentioned earlier, was one component of the evaluation plan for the Regional Resource Consortia.

CDSS, OCAP is taking a new direction in the development and implementation of trainings to the field that will bring the department closer to the goal of improving outcomes for California's children and families. With this goal in mind, the contract with the Child Abuse Training and Technical Assistance (CATTa) Center expired June 30, 2007. In efforts to develop local capacity and expertise, the department is investing in a network of regional CAPC Coalitions and providing direct funding to assist them in carrying out the coordination aspects of regional network development. They will be OCAP's channel for dissemination of information and to help facilitate the developing collaboration and coordination with their local child and family serving partners. OCAP is negotiating the augmentation of an existing contract to provide additional preventative training.

Activities/Results:

From September 2006 to October 2007, CATTa conducted the following events:

One-day regional prevention training events:

Parenting with Positive Discipline: Techniques and Interventions

- August 28, 2006 in Grass Valley
- October 19, 2006 in Fort Bragg
- October 27, 2006 in Atascadero
- February 2, 2007 in Stockton

Get Your Kicks on Route 636: Using Data to improve Accountability

- February 8, 2007 in Merced
- May 14, 2007 in Hayward
- May 22, 2007 in Sacramento
- June 4, 2007 in San Diego

Migrant Trauma

- May 14, 2007 in San Diego
- June 1, 2007 in Santa Rosa

Child Abuse Prevention Council Round Table peer and support review sessions

- November 6, 2006 in Chico
- January 5, 2007 in Salinas
- February 1, 2007 in Santa Ana

The Round Table events were attended by CAPC representatives from different regions allowing for a true cross-region exchange of challenges and promising practices. The interactive workshops were structured around the areas of: coordination, training, raising community awareness of child abuse issues, advocacy and resource development.

April 18, 2007 CAPC one-day Summit "Children, They're Everybody's Business:

Face to Face targeted technical assistance

- March 22, 2007 in Hanford for Kings County
- March 22, 2007 in Tulare for Tulare County
- April 30, 2007 in Susanville for Lassen County
- April 30, 2007 in Susanville for Plumas and Lassen County

P25 SCI one two –day Small County Initiative grantee meeting. The final meeting of the Small County Initiative (SCI) grantees was conducted on March 27-28, 2007 in Redding. The panel presentations focused on: Infrastructure Development: Data, Evaluation, and Sustainability: Differential Response Program Development: and Promising Approaches to Prevention Services in Small Counties.

All CATTAs workshops and technical assistance events were evaluated for quality and relevance.

Strategies: Family Resource Center and Family Support Program Training and Technical Assistance

Program Description

The CDSS/OCAP has developed a consortium of three regional training centers, Strategies, to enhance the quality of the programs and services provided by Family Resource Centers (FRCs) and family support programs. Strategies is comprised of three non-profit organizations: Youth for Change/Paradise Ridge FRC in Butte County (Region 1); Interface Children Family Services in Ventura County (Region 2) and, the Children's Bureau of Southern California with offices in Los Angeles and Orange Counties (Region 3). Evolving research indicates that FRCs offer promising approaches to address issues such as: child abuse and neglect; substance abuse; family violence; family instability; juvenile violence/crime; employment; community disintegration; family isolation; health and educational outcomes.

The Strategies project is one aspect of the CDSS/OCAP statewide-integrated training program. The goal of Strategies is to provide training and technical assistance to develop and support prevention-focused FRCs that offer core services (parent education, child development activities, resource and referral, drop-in availability, peer-to-peer supports, life skills and advocacy) and comprehensive support to families.

FRCs offer comprehensive support services and provide integrated services that often include case management, home visitation, child abuse/neglect treatment, family health and wellness, family economics and self sufficiency, family literacy, substance abuse treatment, youth development and community development.

In addition to providing training and technical assistance to organizations using the center-based model of FRCs, Strategies increasingly provides services to other types of family support programs that utilize prevention models and asset focused services. To accomplish this, Strategies trains professionals, paraprofessionals, volunteers and parents regarding in-home visitation, center-based services, team case management, non-profit management, public and private partnerships and community leadership.

The three Strategies project sites are key partners in developing and supporting both regional and statewide networks of FRCs and family support programs. Strategies employs a variety of technical assistance techniques including onsite consultations, teleconferences, online communications, lending libraries and in office/phone consultation. Strategies fosters statewide communication through its comprehensive website and quarterly newsletter.

The Strategies training and technical assistance project is currently funded through June 30, 2008.

Objective

To increase the capacity and expertise of FRCs and family support programs throughout California, Strategies will deliver three, three-day comprehensive FRC core trainings per year; conduct three peer review trainings per year (approximately 20 organizations will participate); implement leadership training for up to 25 organizations; conduct teleconference series and provide six capacity building events.

Activities/Results

FRC Core Trainings: Three trainings, attended by 97 people, were presented in FFY 2005. During FFY 2006, three core training were held and 107 participants attended. The FRC Core Training curriculum was updated to reflect changes in policy and practice in the field of family support.

Peer Review: The peer review process acts as a networking tool as it facilitates a self-reflective process that nurtures trust and self-disclosure within a working partnership of FRCs. These partnerships evaluate and strengthen the approaches and services offered by the participating FRCs. Through participation in peer review, FRCs develops an enhanced awareness of the statewide issues affecting them, while developing greater connections with other FRCs.

Strategies strengthens the follow-up technical assistance portion of the peer review process by having each representative from a FRC write down a specific goal and outcome of his or her own choosing to achieve. Regional project specialists then provide coaching to help them achieve their goals.

During this reporting period, peer review activities were carried out with 27 FRCs from 20 counties through their involvement in the Strategies Family Support Sustainability Project. In addition, three peer review trainings were conducted and 14 FRCs completed the peer review process. The benefits to participating FRCs included the knowledge gained from the self-assessment experience and the close relationships formed with their partnering FRCs.

Teleconference Series: As a training tool, the teleconference series is used to connect participants from across the state to expert trainers. Designed with two tracks (FRC Fundamentals and Non-profit Management), the teleconference series served two primary purposes: (1) to act as a training vehicle, which provides information and training to FRC staff regarding program and organizational development and (2) to act as a means of support by facilitating networking among FRCs across the state.

Given the vast geographical distances between FRCs, the teleconference series afforded urban, rural, and suburban FRCs an opportunity to communicate without the impediments of the distance, cost and time incurred through physical travel. Topics for this reporting period were:

- Introduction to Family Support Principles
- Making Supervision Work
- Political Engagement
- Human Resources
- Program Evaluation
- Parent Involvement
- Successful Grant Writing
- Working with Difficult Clients
- Time Management -- Prioritizing

Leadership Academy: Strategies completed its three year cycle of Leadership Academies in January 2005. In a final assessment of this project, it was concluded that the facilitative leadership training impacted its participants by extending the field of family support in California and by elevating their leadership and management skills.

Capacity-Building Events: during FFY 2006, Strategies' trainings and workshops were attended by 3,530 participants from 982 agencies in 53 counties during this reporting period. Strategies also provided 411 hours of individual technical assistance to 178 agencies. During these sessions, Strategies staff helped build individual capacity amongst family support staff in a variety of areas pertinent to non-profit management, sustainability, program development, facility management, and family support principles. Strategies provided 779 hours of group technical assistance to 112 agencies in 21 counties. In addition to the FRC core training series described above, regional trainings were delivered in response to local requests or emerging needs. The topics covered by these training sessions are included in Table 1.

Training Topics	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brain Driven Behavior • Crime Prevention & Personal Safety • Strategic Planning • Home Visiting Essentials • Parent Involvement • Integrating Elders into FRCs • Supporting Fatherhood Involvement • Self Care for the Holidays and Everyday • Mandated Child Abuse Reporting • Case Management • Sustainability • Youth Development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making Supervision Work • Teaching Problem Solving for Parents • Family Development Matrix • Beyond the Rhetoric High Performance Partnership • Partnering with Youth • Coaching for the Sustainability of FRCs • Family Support Principles • Social Conditions Matrix • Professional Development for Family Liaisons • Working with Human Resources • Political Engagement

Training Topics	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of Depression • Maintaining Good Boundaries with Staff & Clients • Time Management • Effective Family Support Practice • High Performance Partnerships • Case Management & Confidentiality • FRC Core Training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Abuse Across the Lifespan • Peer Review Training for Trainers • Sustainability Building Blocks • Citizen Review Panels • Grant Writing • Fundamentals of Grant Writing • Developing Positive Interagency Relationships • Intercultural Communication • Child Sexual Abuse Awareness & Prevention

Table 1

Future Directions

With the exception of the Leadership Academy which ended in January 2005, Strategies is expected to continue the same activities with the same expected outcomes in FFYs 2007 and 2008. The lessons learned from the Leadership Academy have been incorporated into several new projects of Strategies, including the sustainability project, the community development matrix project, high performance partnerships, and the community development training. All these projects include a team capacity building approach followed by on-site structured technical assistance.

Objective

To increase the utilization of promising practices and improve the quality of services for home visitation and family support programs, Strategies will provide 80 hours of training per year in the areas of in-home visitation, supervision, case management and family support strategies.

Activities/Results

The case management and home visitation trainings are highly interactive two-day training sessions. The curricula were revised in FFY 2005 based on participant feedback and trainer research. The case management training was presented 4 times to a total of 140 participants. The home visiting training was presenting 4 times to a total of 204 participants.

The locations of these trainings throughout the state show not only the challenge of serving a state as diverse as California, but Strategies' commitment to meeting that challenge. For example, during this reporting period training was conducted as far north as Shasta County and as far south as Los Angeles County. Other locations included Santa Cruz, Kern, Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo Counties.

The Home Visiting Essentials is a two-day training that highlights the essential elements of home visiting, utilizing a case study to engage participants. Participants have requested an

advanced version of this training for more experienced professionals. Strategies, led by Region 1, is currently developing this training and will roll it out during FFY 2007.

Future Directions

CDSS/OCAP anticipates that funding levels will remain constant and the program is expected to continue the same activities with the same expected outcomes in FFYs 2007 and 2008.

Objective

To increase networking among FRCs statewide and regionally, Strategies will provide a statewide listserv, maintain an effective web site, disseminate the "Working Strategies" newsletter, add networking activities to all training activities, and convene regional meetings for the purpose of promoting peer-to-peer communications.

Activities/Results

Web page and listserv: In FFY 2006 a statewide listserv, known as "Strategies Announce", included more than 1,100 subscribers and has become a key resource for publicizing trainings. It is being used increasingly as a tool for staff recruitment by the FRCs. In FFY 2006 there were 56,241 visits to the Strategies' website, www.familyresourcecenters.net. Many visitors entered the website through the training calendar and then registered for events.

Working Strategies Newsletter: The four issues of the newsletter produced and disseminated during this reporting period were made available via download from the Strategies' website, distribution through the Strategies' statewide mailing list, and mailing of hard copies. In an effort to continue content quality and relevancy to the family support field, topics were chosen to reflect consumers' areas of interest, as well as current trends and issues of concern to those within the state. The lead articles for this reporting period include:

- Summer 2006 – "Moving Beyond Vendor/Contractor Relationships in Public/Private Partnerships," by Annette Marcus and Judy Sherman.
- Spring 2006 – "The Climate for Success," by Joshua Freedman and Thomas Wojick.
- Winter 2006 – "Expanding the Definition of Family Net Worth," by Derek Peterson.
- Fall 2005 – "Two Ends of the Rainbow: Intergenerational Family Support," by Gail Koser.

Network Development: Network development has been approached through three interlocking ways: participation, partnership, and provision.

- Participation: Strategies' staff participates in FRC networks by first seeking out new, emerging or established networks and then becoming active network members. By attending meetings and generally contributing to network activities, Strategies staff members build essential relationships within the network and contribute to FRC development.
- Partnership: Strategies' staff partner with networks by developing network-specific training and technical assistance plans and co-sponsoring training and other network activities.

- Provision: Strategies' staff members provide services to networks by assisting with the development and implementation of network training plans and providing network-specific technical assistance.

This year Strategies helped 111 agencies in 17 counties develop networks and focused on identifying promising practices for FRC networks, which will be delineated in a lead article to be written by Strategies staff for the Strategies newsletter due to be published in November 2006. The following summarizes the diverse areas of support Strategies has provided FRC networks:

- Retreat Facilitation.
- Strategic Planning Assistance.
- Training and technical assistance to strengthen partnerships between public and private agencies.
- Assistance in developing network wide training and TA plans.
- Co-sponsorship or co-development of conferences and convenings.
- Development of trainings customized to meet specific to network needs.
- Sharing of resources (such as standards, decision-making structures) across networks.
- Training and TA in implementation of the Family Development Matrix as a shared outcomes tool.

Highlights of Strategies' work with FRC networks include:

- Assisting emerging Family Support networks in Napa and Ventura counties to develop vision, mission, shared values and working agreements.
- Guiding the children's health network in Oroville through a process to develop a service delivery model through their FRCs to support youth and mentoring the network through application for foundation funding.
- Facilitating a strategic planning retreat for the San Francisco Family Support Network.
- Providing TA to strengthen the infrastructure of Siskiyou Family Resource Network and helping them to develop a plan for distributing MHSA funds to their 8 member FRCs.
- Participating, as associate members, in the Ventura County Partnership for Safe Families, the Santa Cruz Family Resource Network and the Kern County Network for Children.
- Regularly attending/monitoring the progress of a variety of Los Angeles County networks including six of the Service Planning Area (SPA) Councils, the Children's Planning Council and the Los Angeles County Healthy Start/FRC Network
- Providing TA around strategic planning, partnerships and change processes which supported the development of a Family Support network in San Luis Obispo County.
- Working closely with the Imperial County FRC network to develop individualized member capacity building, such as support for an incoming coordinator of the FACT (Families and Children Together) FRC in El Centro.
- Participating in conference planning and design of the 4th Annual National Latino Fatherhood Conference, the Nurturing the Whole Child Conference of the San Diego County Commission on Children, Youth and Families, and the Males as Positive Forces Awards of the Chula Vista Community Collaborative.

- Developing specialized capacity building plans with a variety of networks including the FRC network (FaCT–Families and Communities Together) in Orange County and the Kern County Network for Children, and Project Access in Los Angeles, Orange and Ventura counties. Please note, FACT and FaCT are two different groups, even though the acronyms are very similar.
- Facilitating a strategic planning meeting of the Fresno Neighborhood Resource Center (NRC) network in which the NRCs and their partners identified key areas for capacity-building and goals for strengthening their public/private partnerships.
- Seventeen family support programs from five counties (San Francisco, Butte, Ventura, Stanislaus, and Tehama Counties) along with partners from their child welfare agencies participated in the Family Development Matrix project.
- Twenty-six FRCs completed the Sustainability Project which included training, onsite technical assistance and peer to peer activities.
- Santa Cruz, San Luis Obispo and Butte Counties participated in the High Performing Partner project. This project provides training and TA to counties in implementing Differential Response through effective public/private partnerships.

Future Directions

Strategies will continue to utilize these networking approaches in FFY 2007 to promote networking and will further integrate the approaches into two particular initiatives: the Family Development Matrix and the High Performing Partnerships. The Family Development Matrix project, which is a partnership between the Institute for Community Collaborative Studies (ICCS) at California State University Monterey Bay (CSUMB) and Strategies, builds capacity to support FRCs as they partner with local child welfare systems to utilize the Family Development Matrix as a tool for:

- developing shared target outcomes for families in which family support services have been indicated as the appropriate Differential Response, and
- facilitating usage of the outcome data to improve services to families.

It is anticipated that 20 FRCs and their CWS partners will participate in 2007.

Another related project, the High Performance Partnership Project, assists public and private partners to assess their “partnership readiness” and strategically plan to develop the relationships, structure and accountability needed to make significant systemic changes. One aspect of a third project, known as the Sustainability Project, will promote increased networking among FRCs by convening six peer-to-peer learning events throughout the year.

Objective

To improve and expand the dissemination of information to isolated areas and special needs populations. Provide regional lending libraries of family support, home visiting, organizational development/practices, strategic planning and best practices materials.

Activities/Results

The most important outreach that Strategies has employed has been its ongoing relationship building that has taken place at training events, in networking meetings, through phone calls and through site visits. The positive relationships developed through these activities have proven vital to the success of all aspects of Strategies' service delivery.

Additionally, distance learning (teleconferences and web-conferencing) has been used to reach the diverse (urban, suburban, and rural) communities in the state, as well as those individuals unable to travel to a given site for training.

Strategies convened an outreach workgroup, which assembled an outreach packet, reviewed promotional material (i.e., brochures and the statewide training description sheet) and initiated a statewide survey. The overall purpose of the workgroup was to expand Strategies' recruitment into isolated and geographically remote areas.

In FFY 2005, Strategies connected with the largest special needs family support network in California (Family Resource Centers Network of California – FRCNCA) in an effort to reach and serve special needs families. Strategies Region 3 developed ongoing relationships with the state network and several local and regional FRCs and networks, including the FRCNCA, San Bernardino Special Needs Network, the Exceptional FRC in San Diego, and the Lanterman Regional Center in Los Angeles. Strategies continues to work with these FRCs.

Standard surface mailing of project information and training flyers continued to be an effective outreach method. The statewide mailing list was continually updated to eliminate outdated information, thus lowering mailing costs and reducing duplication. The statewide mailing list currently has in excess of 4,500 entries.

California Family Resource Association: Strategies played a supportive role in the launch of the California Family Resource Association (CFRA), a new statewide membership association of organizations and individuals that serve children and families. Their stated purpose is to advocate for programs, policies and resources that help families and communities thrive and succeed, with a focus on public policy, networking and capacity building in the policy arena. Strategies was a co-sponsor and part of the design team of CFRA's inaugural conference in April 2005, which was attended by 340 people from 44 of California's 58 counties. Strategies staff facilitated sessions on differential response and a forum on Family Support networks. As a result of the networks forum, CFRA and Strategies will partner to host regional meetings of Family Support networks to in the Spring of 2007.

Future Directions

Strategies will continue to utilize these successful outreach approaches in FFYs 2007 and 2008 and will maintain its relationship with the California Family Resource Association, a newly emerging statewide network.

Objective

To support the successful implementation of Citizen Review Panels (CRPs) through training and technical assistance. Provide training and technical assistance for four or more citizen review panels.

Activities/Results

This reporting period, Strategies Region 2 provided training and TA to citizen review panels in five counties: Alameda, Calaveras, Kern, Napa and San Mateo through site visits, ongoing e-mail correspondence and statewide meetings. Technical assistance was also provided to the Statewide Citizen Review Panel.

Future Directions

During FFYs 2007 and 2008, training and technical assistance will continue to be provided to local panels through site visits, conference calls and email communications.

Objective

To provide training and technical support for the Supporting Father Involvement (SFI) study through meeting facilitation/coordination, training development, and communication.

Activities/Results

In FFY 2006, two all-project training meetings were held with the four SFI sites. The topics covered included project management, clinical intervention skills, case management strategies, data collection/retrieval, engagement and retention of families and dissemination approaches.

Future Directions

In FFY 2007, a fifth site will be added to primarily bring African American families into the Study. As with the other sites, all staff members at the site will receive an initial orientation and specific implementation training throughout the first year of operation.

Mandated Reporter Training

Program Description

In response to the increasing numbers of mandated reporters requiring training, CDSS continues to focus on the availability and accessibility of mandated reporter training. Free online training is offered and in all instances, attendance, consumer profile and consumer satisfaction data are collected for this online training. The mandated reporter training is offered through a grant with Sonoma State University. In FFY 2006, the grant was extended until June 30, 2007.

Objective

To provide online mandated reporter training, training of trainers, and educational materials.

Activities/Results

A basic online training for mandated reporters was placed on the web during FFY 2003. The training was developed by subject matter experts, in cooperation with CDSS. The materials were developed to both enhance other forms of mandated reporter training (e.g., classroom) and/or provide stand-alone mandated reporter training to participants at-home and to other participants. Continuing education units are provided for a minimal fee upon request. Thus far, the total number of online participants is 7,118 (March 2003- September 30, 2006). The number of people completing the profession specific modules include: Child Care (326), Educators (561), MFTs-LCSWs (271), Probation Officers (227), Teachers who work with developmentally disabled children (105), specific to Spanish speaking (261) and general module (5,367).

- The mandated reporter online training was translated into Spanish and posted online in May of 2005.
- A specialized module focusing on children with developmental disabilities was added to the online training in June of 2005.
- The professional module for special educator teachers, staff & volunteers was launched in April 2006.
- A total of 823 participants completed the online training in FFY 2006.

Promotional materials, which were developed, included a mandated reporter themed bookmark. The bookmark was developed as a handy reference guide for mandated reporters. It includes specifics as to who, what, when and how to report suspected child abuse. Resource and referral information is listed on the back. This bookmark was approved in March 2005 and by June 2005, 21,083 bookmarks were distributed to specific groups of people throughout the state, including county welfare directors and people attending workshops and trainings statewide. In FFY 2006, 49,648 mandated reporter bookmarks were disseminated in both English and Spanish.

Objective

To increase the capacity of the Mandated Reporter Training project to provide face-to-face trainings for mandated reporters and training of trainers.

Activities/Results

In FFY 2006, three regional training events for mandated reporters were conducted in Madera (March 17, 2006), Ventura (May 11, 2006), and Redding (May 15, 2006). The target audience included those employed in social services, child care centers, education and mental health positions. There were 138 participants in all. In addition, a new mandated reporter training for Spanish language audience was conducted in Riverside on May 12, 2006 (23 participants).

In FFY 2004, the Mandated Reporter Training Project staff worked with subject matter experts and key consultants to develop a one-day mandated reporter training and a “training of trainers” session. Subject matter experts and key consultants represented education, the clergy, child care providers, health care and criminal justice.

In the past, a one-day training of trainers (TOT) session was developed to encourage training sessions to be conducted locally. In January 2006, one mandated reporter TOT kit was sent to 78 CAPC.

Objective

To increase awareness of prevention activities and parenting resources to underserved populations.

Activities/Results

The goal of the mandated child abuse reporter project is to research, develop, and deliver informational materials and training to mandated reporters of suspected child abuse. The materials and activities increase public awareness via training about reporting child abuse. The materials include prevention websites and telephone numbers for participants to use.

In FFY 2006, training and outreach materials were disseminated in the form of: 1) mandated reporter bookmarks in English & Spanish (49,648 in SFY 2006), 2) a mandated reporter postcard announcement of online modules was placed in the California Teachers Association Newsletter (*The California Educator*) reaching 350,000 California teachers, 3) One hundred sixty-one participants participated in face-to-face training sessions, and 4) Eight hundred twenty-three participants completed the online mandated reporter training.

The Parent Outreach portion of the contract plays a significant role in increasing awareness and sharing resource information. During FFY 2006, eight Parent Outreach events were held throughout California to engage the attendees in parent education and prevention awareness building activities. There were 359 participants involved in these trainings.

Medically Fragile Infants

Program Description

The CDSS continues to utilize CAPTA funds for the Special Start Training Program (SSTP), which provides training to medical professionals, social workers, professionals from other disciplines, and foster and adoptive parents on assessment and developmental interventions for high-risk newborns who are discharged from intensive care nurseries. The primary objective of this program is to facilitate enhanced parent/infant interactions and promote the development and recovery of these medically fragile infants in the hospital environment. The core training program is called Family Infant Relationship Support Training (FIRST). www.mills.edu/specialstart/program.html

Objective

To provide core training for foster parents, relative caregivers, social workers and other professionals, including psychologists, physical, speech and occupational therapists, public health nurses, early childhood educators, marriage and family therapists and home visitors in the assessment and planning of appropriate interventions to meet the needs of medically fragile infants.

Activities/Results

In FFY 2006, approximately 200 participants throughout California completed the training program, the Family Infant Relationship Support Training (FIRST).

Objective

To ensure curriculum meets the certification standards for FIRST (Browne, et al, 1995), based on the methodology of the Newborn Individualized Development Care and Assessment Program (NIDCAP, Als, 1985).

Activities/Results

On an on-going basis, CDSS will continue to offer the eight-hour introductory workshop; the practicum workshop; twelve individual practice and mentoring sessions; the skills check; the advanced practicum; continuing education days; and the training of trainers program in a manner that meets certification requirements. Some of the project material that will be developed, revised and updated as required, includes digital video training tapes of premature infant behavior, SSTP brochures and other hard copy material. Project staff utilizes the website to provide current resources/links regarding the condition/care of medically fragile infants. Staff also developed the booklet, "Getting to Know Your Baby". The companion book for caregivers/parents is still in the process of being developed. This book will focus on the development of self regulation competence in infants supported by caregivers.

Objective

To increase and broaden the audience of professionals requesting training statewide in California.

Activities/Results

In FFY 2002, the program began to offer FIRST, which is co-facilitated by a professional trainer and a parent trainer. The parent trainer is able to provide peer training and support which includes her experiences with her infant while in the neonatal intensive care unit.

In FFY 2005, a web-site was established displaying information about the Special Start Training Program, including the availability of dates, registration, and other applicable information. The website provides information that describes the training program, training resources in both English and Spanish, and permits online training registration. In 2006, the

website was maintained as required. Future plans discussed, but not currently contracted, are to have the website expanded to include videotaped vignettes that demonstrate patterns of high-risk infant behavior that include autonomic and motor.

In FFY 2006, the program offered training to prepare foster parents and biological parents for the transition of medically fragile infants from one caregiver to another. The training included curricula to instruct foster parents on engagement techniques with biological parents to promote individualized caregiver interactions and support foster infant care during and after the transition period. Professionals, including nurses, teachers, and social workers, attended seven "Special Start" trainings. There were five "Special Start" Day 1 Introductions, and two "Pre-to-Three" trainings.

Other workshops scheduled for the period of October 1, 2005 through September 30, 2006 included: "Day 2 Practicum," "Development of Self Regulation," and "Management of Difficult Behaviors." One-on-one guidance was given to 24 participants during the year, which included observation and intervention with foster parents and caregivers.

Program Improvement Area 12: Programs, Activities, Services, and Training

Parent Leadership Training

<http://www.parentsanonymous.org/pahtml/paAbout.html>

Program Description

Since 1999, Parents Anonymous[®] Inc. has been partnering with CDSS to provide parent leadership training and technical assistance to administrators and service providers at the county level to increase their awareness of the benefits of working in partnership with parent leaders. The goal of the grant is to foster a collaborative relationship in local communities where parents and professionals can work together to ensure quality services for children and families. This grant is funded through June 30, 2007.

Objective

To provide intensive training and technical assistance to designated county teams selected by CDSS/OCAP. The purpose of this intensive training is to support counties in adopting shared leadership approach as a key component in the decision making process of the county child abuse prevention system.

Activities/Results

One-hundred and eighty-seven parents and agency representatives received Parent Leadership Training. Trainings and technical assistance were provided to eight Office of Child Abuse Prevention targeted counties, including Kings, Tulare, San Luis Obispo, Ventura, Santa Barbara, Lake, Mendocino and Napa. Follow-up trainings and technical assistance will be provided to these counties as well as three additional counties - Orange, Riverside and San Bernardino - prior to June 30, 2007. It is anticipated that an additional 178 parents and agency representatives will receive Parent Leadership Training by the end of the fiscal year. Through the trainings and technical assistance, the outcome has been that parents are able

to take on leadership roles, such as co-trainer; contributing to written materials; participating at conferences and working meetings; grant reviewing; participating in quality improvement and evaluation activities; participating in needs/strengths assessment processes; public speaking; becoming peer review team member; becoming advisory board members; participating in focus groups and other important roles. Parents have received recognition by boards of supervisors, numerous agencies and Parents Anonymous[®] Inc. The parents are able to raise public awareness about the important role parents play in shaping the child abuse prevention agenda.

Objective

Develop a Statewide Wraparound Work Group to (1) assist with the design and dissemination of a survey instrument to identify needs and supports for Parent Partners in Wraparound Programs; and (2) to plan and implement a Wraparound Summit to present the results of surveys and develop recommendations for supports for Parent Partners.

Activities/Results

A Statewide Wraparound Work Group was created with participants from the California Parent Leadership staff and Parent Partners from Wraparound Programs across the state. The Wraparound Work Group assisted with the development and posting of an online survey instrument and 210 surveys were completed by Wraparound staff and Parent Partners. The Work Group is currently involved in planning a Wraparound Summit in June 2007 focusing on the Wraparound survey results. This Summit is expected to draw approximately 100 participants.

Objective

Produce a newsletter biannually that highlights successful parent and shared leadership strategies throughout the state.

Activities/Results

In order to expand dissemination of information about Shared Leadership strategies throughout the state, Parents Anonymous[®] Inc. produces and distributes two issues of the Parent Leadership Express newsletter during the contract period. These newsletters highlight ways that California child abuse prevention organizations can successfully incorporate Shared Leadership strategies into their work with families and assist parents in taking on leadership roles within their communities, schools, social service programs and other settings. A subcommittee composed of California Parent Leadership Team (CPLT) members and Parents Anonymous[®] Inc. staff work together in the writing and editing of articles for this publication. The first issue of this newsletter was distributed in December 2006.

The second issue of the Parent Leadership Express is currently in the process of being developed by the CPLT Subcommittee and will be disseminated in June 2007. It will include the following articles:

- News from CDSS: Statewide Parent Leadership Conference that was held in January 2007

- 2007 CDSS Statewide Parent Leadership Conference: A Parent's Perspective – (written by Drena Jensen, Lake County)
- Sharing Leadership with Parent Partners in California Wraparound Programs: Announcement of the Wraparound Summit and update on the survey – (written by Hermelinda Ortiz, CPLT, Orange County)
- California Parent Leadership Team Gains One New Member - (written by Drena Jensen, Lake County)
- Kid's Day at the Capitol – (written by Lisa Nedd, CPLT, Alameda County and Tammy Ghasvarian, CPLT, Nevada County)
- National Parent Leadership Month in Ventura County – (written by Elizabeth Humphrey, CPLT, Ventura County)
- Moving Parent Leadership Forward: County Highlight in Kings and San Luis Obispo

The Parent Leadership Express is disseminated to CAPIT/CBCAP liaisons, child abuse prevention councils, northern and southern offices of CATTA, parents and staff in community-based prevention organizations and other key stakeholders in the prevention field throughout California. Additionally, the newsletter is mailed to all individuals who participated in Shared Leadership Trainings provided by Parents Anonymous® Inc.

Objectives

To provide training and technical assistance to strengthen the parent leadership efforts in the "non-targeted" counties.

Activities/Results

Accomplishments this reporting period were:

- The Governor proclaiming February 2007 as California Parent Leadership Month.
- Members of the California Parent Leadership Team served on the Conference Planning Committee and assisted with development and implementation of OCAP Parent Leadership Conference held in January 2007.
- The Team members participated in two focus groups sponsored by the National Alliance of Children's Trust and Prevention Funds to discuss successful Parent and Shared Leadership strategies in California.
- A member of the California Parent Leadership Team attended leadership training with a representative from OCAP and had the opportunity to network and share California Parent Leadership experiences with other states' representatives.
- Two previously trained parent leaders are members of the Statewide Citizen Review Panel.

Future Directions

The contract with Parents Anonymous® Inc. ends June 2007 and continued funding is under consideration.

Program Area 14: Programs, Activities, Services and Training

Small County Initiative II

Program Description

The Small County Initiative II (SCI II) builds upon the successes of the initial SCI. It is targeted toward small counties (population 70,000 or less) and provides additional funding and resources to support and strengthen the child abuse prevention systems of these counties. In addition to the CWS agency, child abuse prevention systems may include agencies such as public health, mental health, substance abuse services, law enforcement, schools, regional centers and private nonprofit agencies that provide family support services.

The core objective of the program is to support positive systemic change that increases county capacity for the delivery of child abuse prevention services. Limited fiscal resources, personnel and supportive services make it difficult for some small counties to compete for funding and to participate in service initiatives that are likely to require matching funds, sufficient quantities of highly qualified professional staff and extensive supportive services.

Eleven counties (Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Del Norte, Glenn, Plumas, Siskiyou, Tehama, Trinity, Tuolumne, Yuba) were selected to participate in the initiative based on a competitive process. Each participating county organization developed a scope of work specific to the status and needs of its county. The University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) has been contracted to provide the evaluation of the SCI II.

Objective

To provide training and technical assistance to county level organizations through various CDSS/OCAP funded projects (CATTA, Strategies, and the Breakthrough Series Collaborative).

Activities/Results

During this reporting period, CATTA provided planning and coordination for the first SCI Summit on March 22-23, 2006 in Redding California. The Summit was attended by 45 county and private prevention partners representing the 11 counties prevention networks. The Summit provided attendees with program peer sharing strategies focused on community capacity development, differential response delivery systems, and updates on social service decentralization and organizational change. Technical assistance has been provided to SCI II counties through CATTA. Activities included the maintenance of the SCI II listserv and the distribution of pertinent program updates or information; travel stipends to support SCI II grantees' participation in their Regional Resource Consortium meetings and the annual Child Abuse Prevention Council Summit; research and distribution of professional materials and responses to individualized training requests as needed.

In addition, counties and their family resource center partners participated in technical assistance provided by Strategies including the Sustainability Project, which promoted increased networking among Family Resource Centers through the convening of peer-to-peer learning events.

Objective

To support the development of networking among the participating counties through scheduled meetings, teleconferences, and web based communications with CDSS/OCAP, UCLA and county level organizations.

Activities/Results

The primary purpose of the SCI is to expand capacity and improve the delivery of services to support California small rural counties, families, and children. One component of this strategy facilitate participation in the Child Abuse Prevention Month "Kid's Day at the Capitol" and the annual statewide Child Abuse Prevention Council Summit in April of 2006. Twenty-five SCI II representatives participated in these two events and were provided with stipends to support their travel and per diem costs by the CATT training contract. The activities provided an opportunity for small rural county staffs to connect with staff from larger counties, and state program consultants, FRCs and other community based organizations throughout the statewide network.

Small County Initiative II Evaluation

Program Description

CDSS/OCAP has a contract with UCLA to design and conduct an evaluation that will generate data that can be used by CDSS and the counties participating in the SCI II. The evaluation will be used to identify successes and the barriers to achieving the goals and objectives identified in each county's scope of work. The program in each county is focused on strengthening its child abuse prevention system.

Objective

To collect data to evaluate the SCI II by coordinating evaluation design and data needs with UCLA and the participating counties

Activities/Results

During FFY 2006, UCLA continued to gather data from counties utilizing the Prevention System Assessment tool. The instrument focuses on: Community Capacity Development; Differential Response and Service Availability to Vulnerable Families; Treatment and Specialized Services for Vulnerable Families and Organizational Culture Change. UCLA will submit a final evaluation report to CDSS/OCAP by June 2007 that will summarize county capacity improvements as a result of the initiative.

Objective

To determine to what extent, each SCI II county has successfully implemented the program development objectives specified in its plan.

Activities/Results

Participating small counties continue to submit quarterly reports to UCLA and the OCAP per the initiative scope of work. The survey instrument captures local program activities measuring CAPC development, Neighborhood Partnerships, Public Education and Prevention Strategies and System Management Evaluation. This qualitative information will be analyzed during the evaluation process and a final report will be submitted to the OCAP in June of 2007.

Objective

To evaluate the local level of success of the SCI II initiative in building service capacity, outreach to underserved populations and to support implementation of a differential response system.

Activities/Results

During FFY 2006, the UCLA evaluators completed site visits to all 11 small counties. The established protocol included the interview of program directors, line level staff, CAPC staff, and CPS representatives. The site visits focus included measurements of system governance, integration of prevention with CPS, differential response, community involvement, outreach to populations in need, and promising prevention service models for these rural communities. The OCAP will receive a final evaluation report in June of 2007.

Prevention Advisory Council

Program Description

The Prevention Advisory Council (PAC) was created pursuant to the federal Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention program requirements. The PAC acted in an advisory capacity to CDSS/OCAP. The focus of the PAC was on the development and expansion of family resource and family support collaboratives and networks that are comprised of community-based, county and state level organizations and agencies serving children and families.

In keeping with the Stakeholders' recommendation that prevention be incorporated into all aspects of the Child Welfare Services System, the statewide Citizen Review Panel will now provide the function that was provided previously by the PAC. This holistic approach fulfills the Stakeholder finding that prevention must be the foundation of Child Welfare Services System Improvement and not a separate or stand alone activity. This will also meet the requirements of the Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention Program, by providing input to the CDSS on community-based, prevention-focused family resource and support programs. The focus of the PAC has been on the development and expansion of family resource and family support collaboratives and networks comprised of community-based, county and state level organizations, and agencies service children and families. In its advisory role, the statewide CRP will integrate a primary prevention and early intervention perspective into its review of statewide CWS policies, practices and procedures The statewide CRP continued to meet during this reporting period.

Evidenced-based Clearinghouse for Child Welfare Services in California

Program Description

As part of the California statewide CWS system improvement activities to transform how child welfare services are practiced in California, CDSS/OCAP conducted a competitive process to develop, implement, and maintain an evidence-based clearinghouse for child welfare practice. Children's Hospital, San Diego was awarded the grant on January 1, 2004. The grant will end on June 30, 2007.

Development of the California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse (CEBC), in the form of a website was accomplished through a participatory process involving an advisory committee and a scientific panel. The California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse for Child Welfare website, is designed to:

- Serve as an online connection for child welfare professionals, staff of public and private organizations, academic institutions, and others who are committed to serving children and families.
- Provide up-to-date information on evidence-based child welfare practices.
- Facilitate the utilization of evidence-based practices as a method of achieving improved outcomes of safety, permanency and well-being for children and families involved in the California public child welfare system.

Activities/Results

The sixteen-member Advisory Committee (AC), which was selected in 2004, includes researchers, child welfare services practitioners, as well as representatives from the County Welfare Directors Association, the CDSS Systems Improvement project, community agencies, and foundations. The AC has face-to-face meetings in Sacramento twice a year and teleconferences twice each year. During this reporting period, the Advisory Committee continued to inform the topic selection process and provide feedback regarding the website content.

Objectives:

Develop formal criteria for selection of practices as evidence-based and review a wide variety of sources to identify practices meeting the criteria.

To design a conceptual framework for an interactive web-based application of the Clearinghouse that supports access to and implementation of evidence-based practices in the field of Social Work.

Activities/Results

The Clearinghouse uses a standardized process to identify and review child welfare programs and practices for inclusion on the website. The statewide Advisory Committee selects an average of 10-12 topical areas per year. The Clearinghouse staff works closely with the Scientific Panel to identify the need for additional topical area expertise, which will be

provided by leading child welfare authorities. The National Scientific Panel is comprised of five core members who are nationally recognized as leaders in child welfare research and practice, and who are knowledgeable about what constitutes best practice/evidence-based practice. Working with the Scientific Panel and topical experts, the Clearinghouse staff elicits “nominations” for inclusion in the Clearinghouse. These generally involve 5-to-15 discreet programs or models selected that fit one of the following criteria:

- Have strong empirical support for their efficacy.
- Is in common use in California.
- Are being marketed in California.

The Advisory Committee selects five to ten of the most compelling programs and models that can be effectively reviewed and rated for the list of programs and models nominated.

The Clearinghouse staff work with the topical expert and also directly with the developer of the program or model to identify all relevant literature on each individual model. The Clearinghouse staff examines all peer-reviewed research literature on the models along with a sample of proprietary and other relevant peer-reviewed clinical literature. The information from the reviews and the developers are synthesized to create the topical outline contained on this website. The Clearinghouse staff and topical experts review the research and science supporting the model and “rate” the model based on the strength of the evidence supporting it utilizing a scientific rating scale. They determine the research and particular model’s relevance to child welfare outcomes based on the three fundamental goals: safety, permanency and well-being.

During SFY 2006 - 2007, forty-two (42) programs were reviewed and rated in six (6) Topical Areas.

Activities/Results

The website, <http://www.cachildwelfareclearinghouse.org>, became operational in the spring of 2006.

The CEBC website statistics for SFY 2006 – 2007 are as follows:

- 22,566 visitors counted
- 13% (2,848) of the total visitors were from over 70 countries
- 87% (19,718) were from the United States
- 37% were from California

Safely Surrendered Babies

Program Description

This program provides public awareness of the State law regarding abandonment of newborn babies. The Safely Surrendered Baby (SSB) Law allows a responsible party to confidentially surrender a baby to a hospital and, in designated counties, fire stations. A parent who is unable or unwilling to care for an infant can legally and confidentially surrender their baby within three days of birth, so long as there is no evidence of abuse or neglect. The goal of the

SSB program is to prevent injury or death to newborns that may have been abandoned under unsafe conditions.

Objective

To provide public awareness through education and outreach by providing and disseminating materials that educates the general public about the state law.

Activities/Results

In an ongoing effort to increase public awareness the CDSS/OCAP has updated and redesigned public outreach materials. The new public education materials include posters and brochures that are available in both English and Spanish at no cost. To enable counties and public agencies to personalize the brochures, space has been provided on the back to insert specific information, e.g. toll-free telephone or contact information. CDSS is exploring the feasibility of translating the materials into other languages.

CDSS is exploring the establishment of a statewide 1-800 number that would be available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week and have operators who speak a variety of languages. Information could be provided about various options available, including adoption and safe surrender of the newborn. The toll-free number would be printed on the informational materials to inform the general public about this additional resource.

Safely Surrendered Baby public education materials have been distributed throughout the state to a wide variety of local public and private agencies that serve children and families. The OCAP sent over 20,000 SSB packages with samples of the publications and instructions for ordering additional materials to stakeholders. There were three letters developed: an All County Information Notice, an All Community-Based Organizations Letter and an All School and Institutions Letter. This last letter was in partnership with the Department of Education to assist with an individualized outreach and education campaign on this program. The types of agencies that received the SSB packages included:

- Local health departments, hospitals and other health care organizations (e.g., the California Health Care Association).
- Community-based service organizations (e.g., family resource centers).
- Law enforcement (e.g., district attorneys, police departments, sheriff's departments, and probation offices).
- Public agencies, private organizations, and policy/decision makers from local government.
- State Departments (e.g., Education and Health Services).
- Community Institutions (e.g., schools, colleges and universities).

Parent Outreach Project

Program Description

Currently, CDSS/OCAP funds a grant program to plan, develop, implement, and evaluate a multi-year child abuse prevention outreach campaign through the Institute for Human Services at California State University, Sonoma. This campaign is designed to: (1) build public awareness of parenting resources and (2) build and strengthen the capacity of local

communities to conduct prevention activities that include media outreach and other public relations activities.

Objective

To promote public awareness of parenting resources and strengthen the capacity of local communities to conduct prevention activities.

Activities/Results

In FFY 2006, project staff:

- Identified eight regional resource coordinators throughout the state that had strong prevention leadership experience and a strong desire to promote prevention and build awareness about parenting resources and good parenting skills through the Parent Outreach Project.
- Developed and delivered eight Parent Outreach events throughout California to engage in parent education and prevention awareness building activities. There were 359 participants in FFY 2006. Places and dates included: Santa Rosa (12/10/05), Fresno (2/4/06), Sacramento (2/25/06), Chico (3/11/06), Santa Maria (3/25/06), Escondido (4/29/06), Carson (5/6/06) and Modesto (6/3/06).
- Maintained a resource table at the events and provided participants with Parent Outreach materials.
- Maintained and updated the comprehensive, statewide, online, searchable directory of parenting resources. As of June 30, 2004, this database had over 10,000 records. Directory resources are continually researched and updated. As of June 2006, 7,833 resources were verified or updated.
- Provided information and referral (I&R) services via a toll-free phone number that offered information about local resources for parents. This service fielded approximately 563 calls during the SFY 2006. Training was provided to the regional resource coordinators regarding the I&R service that supports callers in using the statewide online resource directory.
- On the Parent Outreach website, 9,336 website hits were recorded during SFY 2006, averaging 778 per month (www.parentoutreach.org)
- Developed resource display tables at conferences throughout the state announcing the toll free I&R phone number and online parenting resource directory. Displays were conducted by way of: 1) the Parent Outreach program at the statewide conference for Quality Child Care and Child Development Training in Millbrae (March 9, 2006), and 2) in lieu of staffing a second conference, 5,000 Parent Outreach packets were distributed in tote bags at the California Association for the Education of Young Children conference (April 21-22, 2006).
- Continued to distribute materials to promote the toll free phone number and the website address.

- In FFY 2006, promotional materials were distributed throughout California. They included: Magnets -15,578, Bookmarks (Spanish/English) - 12,168, Parenting Tip poster (English) - 11,243, Parenting Tip poster (Spanish) - 11,102, Pens with Parent Outreach 1-800 #imprinted - 10,332, Post Its with Parent Outreach 1-800 # imprinted - 9,560.
- In SFY 2006, 244,220 items were distributed. They included magnets, bookmarks, flyers (English & Spanish), pens, and Post-Its. Agencies requesting materials included the county Offices of Education, Healthy Start programs, counseling centers, Victim Witness programs, clinics, child care centers, therapists, child care resource and referral centers, county child support services, legal foundations, churches and dioceses, and events hosted by Wal-Mart stores.

Future Directions

The project will continue the existing activities in FFY 2007 until the grant ends on June 30, 2007.

Supporting Father Involvement Study

Program Description

During SFY 2002-03, CDSS/OCAP designed, developed, and implemented a five- site study of an intervention intended to improve the quality and level of positive father involvement in at-risk families. The intervention is now being implemented in Santa Cruz, San Luis Obispo, Tulare, and Yuba Counties. Grantees are the CWS agencies in these counties, which are required to partner with a local family resource center for implementation.

Initially, Sacramento County participated in the study as the fifth site. The county site experienced difficulty identifying and engaging target population families, and it was decided that the intervention was not a good fit for the identified community. The CDSS/OCAP and Sacramento County mutually reached an agreement that allowed the County to end its participation in the study and to provide alternate services to fathers who reside in the neighborhood of the FRC.

The CDSS/OCAP entered into an Interagency Agreement with the University of California, Berkeley (UC Berkeley) to conduct a study to: (1) determine the effectiveness of a particular intervention to increase positive father involvement; and (2) measure organizational culture change to determine whether the family resource center implementing the intervention becomes more inclusive of fathers in other programs and services.

The target population is co-parenting couples with children age seven and younger. Families are randomly assigned to one of three groups: (1) a one-time educational presentation about how positive father involvement improves outcomes for children; (2) a 16-week (2 hours per week) group meeting for fathers; and (3) a 16-week group for couples (2 hours per week). All project participants receive case management services. Data are being collected through a battery of assessments that are administered three times during each family's participation in

the study. It is anticipated that an interim report will be issued in Summer 2007 and a final report in 2009.

Objective

To complete a qualitative and quantitative evaluation of the SFI study.

Activities/Results

The principal investigators were retained through contracts with the Connecticut Department of Mental Health (to retain investigators from Yale University Medical School) and with UC Berkeley. Project meetings, to provide face-to-face training and technical assistance to staff of the five sites, were held in April and November of 2005, May 2006, and November 2006. A project listserv that facilitates communication, training, and technical assistance was launched in 2004 and continues to provide continuity in communication between sites, the research team and CDSS. All clinical study sites (four family resource centers) have enrolled families into the study and are providing intervention services. As of September 2006, 346 families are participating in the study.

The design of the SFI study for low-income families involves random assignment to: (1) a single informational session (the control group); (2) a 16-week fathers-only group; or (3) a 16-week couple's group. The same staff pairs (each pair comprised of a male and female) conduct interventions with all study participants. The first half of the expected 300 participants has completed a pre-intervention assessment and a post-intervention assessment three months after the groups ended.

Analyses of changes in the full sample assessed at baseline and again three months after the intervention showed that a single meeting focused on father involvement (the control condition) produced, on the average no significant positive changes and allowed some significant negative changes to occur in the fathers and mothers who participated.

By contrast, the father's groups and the couple's groups produced a number of positive effects on the participants as individuals, on their couple's relationship and on their relationships with their children. Participants of the ongoing groups reported fewer symptoms of anxiety and depression at the post-test assessment than they had before the intervention began. They maintained their satisfaction with their relationships as couples, in contrast with control couples whose couple relationship satisfaction declined. Fathers in both the father's groups and couple's groups showed significant increases in their hands-on involvement in the daily tasks of child care. Finally, participants in both ongoing interventions experienced a significant rise in annual income, in comparison with control participants whose incomes remained stable. In some areas of functioning, the couple's group participants showed greater gains than the father's group participants (larger declines in parenting stress and larger increases in father involvement).

Preliminary analyses of the third assessment, 18 months after the couples entered the study, 9 months after the first post-test, reveal that intervention gains are being maintained over time, and that the father's group participants appear to be "catching up" to the couple's group participants in terms of the positive effect of the intervention.

In short, the results, especially for the groups in which both mothers and fathers participate together, appear promising—in terms of fostering increased father involvement in their young children's care and parents' satisfaction with their relationships as couples. Although the participants from the fathers-only groups were slower to show change, those fathers and mothers did show positive results in the longer term. UC Berkeley has almost completed the collection of data from the final assessments of 298 families, 18 months after they entered the study. Once those data have been entered into the computers at UC Berkeley and analyzed, the early trends will be further summarized.

Objective

To proceed as planned with San Luis Obispo, Santa Cruz, Tulare, and Yuba Counties in Phase II of the Supporting Father Involvement Project, which involves recruiting additional families and bringing the results of Phase I to staff in other agencies in each of the four counties.

Activities/Results

CDSS/OCAP is in the process of expanding the study to new target populations within the current four sites. By July 2006 a dissemination plan was developed for the purpose of providing practice information to other agencies in the counties of the four original sites and plans are in development to use that experience to roll out the results of the study to agencies in other counties of California.

Objective

Develop and deliver an effective training and technical assistance program to the four implementing sites and the new site to replace the Sacramento County site. (The new site is in Contra Costa County; the plan is to recruit and enroll more African American fathers and their families, as the families at the other four sites are predominantly Latino and Caucasian).

Activities/Results

During SFY2006-07, CDSS continued to provide training and technical assistance to the four sites that are implementing the SFI study. Twice a year, all project staff and the county liaison from each site are convened for training that focuses on:

- Model fidelity.
- Data collection and reporting.
- Project oversight and sustainability development.
- Clinical skills/group intervention approaches.
- Case management strategies.
- Activities to disseminate the results of Phase I to other agencies in the counties hosting the four original sites.

The research team is comprised of Carolyn Cowan, Ph.D., Phil Cowan, Ph.D., Co-PIs, and Jessie Wong, Data Manager, all from UC Berkeley. Kyle Pruett, M.D. and Marsha Kline Pruett, Ph.D., of Yale University, provided the staff training. In addition, monthly clinical consultations are provided via conference calls for key staff from each site and site visits are

conducted as necessary by the Cowans, the Pruetts, or Ms. Wong, to provide additional technical assistance.

A listserv is maintained by Strategies to provide ongoing communication among the sites, the research team, data manager, and CDSS/OCAP staff, as well as to facilitate peer support for the four SFI study sites.

Future Directions

In SFY 05-06, CDSS processed grant amendments to extend the SFI study until June of 2009. During this period, CDSS identified a fifth county site (Contra Costa) to replace Sacramento County and the same methodology will be tested there with predominantly African American families.

Citizen Review Panels

Program Description

The function of CRPs is to evaluate the effectiveness with which state and local child protection agencies are discharging their responsibilities. Evaluation involves examining child protection policies, practices, and procedures. Recommendations are then made to county and state governments for improvement.

CRPs bring together citizens, former consumers of services, foster parents, child welfare services professionals, court-appointed special advocates, children's attorneys, educators, representatives of tribal governments, representatives of county public health and mental health agencies, law enforcement officials and others to review these policies, practices and procedures.

Objective

To implement a new statewide panel by October 1, 2004, to examine the policies practices and procedures of the state's CWS agency.

Activities/Results

Twenty-two panel members were selected by October of 2004 and the number grew to 30 members over the last two years. The membership draws from child advocates, parent leaders, tribal leaders, foundation officers, county mental health managers, law enforcement, county counsels, alcohol and drug program administrators, foster parents, foster youth, social workers, probation officers and the Judicial Council. Membership is also geographically diverse with representatives from both metropolitan and rural counties in all parts of California.

Three meetings were held in FFY 2006: December 12, 2005, March 20, 2006 and June 19, 2006.

Each year the panel reviews, provides information, and comments upon the Annual Progress and Services Report (APSR), which updates the Title IV-B Child and Family Services plan prior its submission to Region IX of the Administration for Children and Families.

Objective

To maintain at least three citizen-review panels operating in the state each year.

Activities /Results

A two year funding cycle began for the county citizen review panels on October 1, 2004. Alameda, Kern, Napa and San Mateo Counties were funded through September 2006.

CDSS released a new Request for Applications to fund panels for the period of July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2009. San Mateo and Calaveras Counties applied for and received funding. In addition to the two local panels, there is a statewide CRP which brings the number of citizen review panels in California to the required three panels.

Objective

To provide general information to the public on the CRPs and to allow for public input.

Activities/Results

During the prior reporting period, the CDSS and Strategies completed a CRP resource manual, which is designed to assist local panels with their organizational development, training of panel members, and review activities. This manual was posted to the Strategies website (www.familyresourcecenters.net) in October of 2005.

During FFY 2006, Napa and Kern Counties presented findings and or recommendations to their respective boards of supervisors at meetings that were open to the public. Napa distributed its report to senior managers of the Napa County CWS and to the various agencies represented on the CRP. The San Mateo County CRP sent representatives of the CRP to the Children's Collaborative Action Team to inform this group of the work of the CRP and to recruit members for the CRP.

Objective

To enhance training opportunities available to panel members.

Activities/Results

To facilitate understanding, of the changing focus of the child welfare system in California, CDSS engaged a consultant who had background in child welfare service system improvement. The consultant, Louanne Shahandeh, provides consultation to panels through site visits, conference calls and e-mails and assisted in drafting and organizing the CRP Resource Manual for California's counties.

As reported in the Citizen's Review Panel, Technical Assistance Consultant Report, October 1, 2006 – September 30, 2007, the following Citizen Review Panels received technical assistance: San Mateo County, Napa County, Alameda County, Calaveras County and the Statewide CRP. Also receiving technical assistance was CDSS' Office of Child Abuse Prevention, who oversees the CRPs. The total number of TA hours provided were 104.5 hours.

The Type of Technical Assistance Provided:

Site visits to CRP counties:

- Check in on current work plans and provide guidance regarding facilitation of activities etc.
- Provide consultation and problem solving at the request of the CRP (i.e. role of a County Board of Supervisor member on the CRP)
- Provision of support documents requested to assistance in the facilitation of CRP review activities as defined in individual Scope of Work
- Provide Best Practice documents that support CRP objectives
- Provide support documents, other county practices, current trends and data to support CRP objectives as requested by CRP.
- Telephone conference calls to obtain updates, provide guidance and answer questions
- Review of and revision input regarding documents (i.e. quarterly reports etc) submitted to CDSS
- Review and revisions of all quarterly and annual report documents
- Review of work plans, assist in formalization of objectives and corresponding review activities
- Provision of on-going guidance to CRP counties as requested
- Provision of on-going guidance, CRP updates and the refinement of reports to CDSS

Technical Assistance to Counties:

Alameda County:

This was the last year that Alameda participated in the CRP process. Technical assistance was focused on the development of the annual report.

Napa County:

This was the last year that Napa County participated in the CRP process. Technical assistance was focused on the development of the annual report

Calaveras County:

Being this was the first year that Calaveras County participated in the CRP process, all technical assistance was focused on assisting with start up activities and training on CRP functions etc. Also included was a review and input on objective activity documents such as case check lists etc. All quarterly reports were reviewed with input for revisions prior to submission to OCAP

San Mateo County:

All technical assistance provided was directly related to support documents, best practices, articles etc that assisted in the review activities as they related to their objectives focusing on Team Decision Making and Parent Advocates. All quarterly reports were reviewed with input for revisions prior to submission to OCAP. Annual Report was also reviewed.

State CRP:

Technical assistance and consultation provided via telephone conference regarding membership issues on the State Panel.

CDSS' Office of Child Abuse Prevention:

Technical assistance given:

- Training to new CRP/CDSS staff regarding all aspects of the CRPs
- Revised quarterly and annual report formats
- Review and revisions to all quarterly and annual reports working directly with the local CRPs to make needed changes
- Conference calls to provide updates on CRP activities
- CRP site visit reports to CDSS

Annual CRP Meeting:

The annual meeting was held July 30, 2007, with members from both Calaveras and San Mateo CRP's attending. Focus of this meeting was to review quarterly and annual report formats, review Scope of Work plans and discuss expectations for completion of the documents as well as establish timeframe of reports.

Objective

To integrate county CRP panels into a statewide CWS advisory structure.

Activities/Results

During FFY 2006, the statewide CRP reviewed the annual reports submitted by the county panels. The panel focused on the recommendations that panels made to the state and reviewed the recommendations to county departments to determine if there were statewide implications. The state panel provided feedback on the recommendations to CDSS staff for their consideration in responding to the county panels. The CDSS utilized its own review and the feedback from the state panel to determine whether programmatic, policy or legislative changes are needed in the statewide CWS program.

Objective

To maintain compliance with all federal requirements regarding CRPs.

Activities/Results

All county panels were required to submit an annual report including recommendations to the state and/or local government to CDSS. The statewide CRP made its recommendations to

the CDSS. The CDSS responded to the recommendations made by San Mateo and Napa Counties by May 1, 2006. The response to Kern County was delayed due to the number of recommendations submitted, and was sent on July 5, 2006. In total, Kern CRP submitted 113 recommendations. To ensure a thorough review, the Child and Youth Permanency Branch, the CWS/CMS Support Branch, the Legal Division and the Child Protection and Family Support Branch reviewed and provided input to the response to the recommendations submitted by Kern County's CRP.

Three of the county panels conducted a review process and the state panel reviewed CDSS policies and practices.

Individual counties received public input in a variety of ways:

- Napa County relied on panel members and their interactions with the organizations that they represent.
- San Mateo County received public input through the Children's Collaborative Action Team (CCAT) and its subcommittee, the Family and Community Advisory Committee.
- Kern County interacted with the public through presentations to the Bakersfield Police Department and the governing board of the Kern County Network for Children. It also presented its recommendations and findings at a public meeting of the County Board of Supervisors and made a summary of its annual report and recommendations available to the local media.

County CRPs have expressed interest in receiving direction from the federal government in terms of appropriate practices, policies and procedures with regard to public input. Technical assistance was requested from the National Resource Center for Child Protective Services.

Future Directions

In FFY 2007, CDSS will utilize an "All County Information Notice" to issue a request for applications to operate a county CRP in the new funding cycle. This cycle will begin on July 1, 2008 and end on June 30, 2010. As a result of requests made by the County Welfare Directors Association (CWDA), priority will be given to counties that have not been funded before.

Child Fatality Analysis

I. Introduction

Since 2001, as part of its oversight responsibility for the delivery of CWS, the CDSS, Children Services Operations Bureau (CSOB) has conducted electronic and, as necessary, on-site case reviews of child fatalities and prepared summaries on the circumstances of the death. These reviews included all children under the agency's supervision or previously known to the agency and had not been limited to children in foster care.

The information from the reviews has been used to improve regulatory changes or policy changes that will protect vulnerable children. Further, the information identified additional training needs of social work staff. The CSOB also completed ad hoc reviews of deaths

based upon requests by the CDSS Directorate, Administration for Children and Families (ACF), or county Child Welfare/Probation Departments.

In December 2005, CDSS received notice from ACF that the state was out of compliance with CAPTA requirements for states to have “provisions which allow for public disclosure of the findings or information about the cases of child abuse and neglect which have resulted in a child fatality or near fatality.” Prior to the implementation of the Corrective Action Plan (CAP), the CSOB had not reviewed near fatalities or provided case specific child fatality summaries for public release. Effective July 21, 2006, pursuant to All County Letter (ACL) 06-24, the CDSS implemented a CAP with ACF. This plan required counties to submit a Child

Fatality/Near Fatality Questionnaire to CDSS:

- If the county has reasonable suspicion that the fatality/near fatality was caused by abuse or neglect.
- If a fatality/near fatality initially appears unrelated to abuse or neglect, but the county subsequently has reasonable suspicion that in fact it may have been so caused.

The plan and instructional ACL provided the counties with a definition of near fatality that they were to use to guide them in reporting. For the purposes of the CAPTA, a near fatality is defined as “a severe childhood injury or condition caused by abuse or neglect which results in the child receiving critical care for at least 24 hours following the child’s admission to a critical care unit.”

As a result of this new requirement the CDSS received notification of 193 child fatalities/near fatalities occurring between July 21 through December 31, 2006. CDSS is required to produce a summary of the findings or information about the cases of fatalities or near fatalities that were the result of child abuse or neglect. Due to the change in reporting requirements under the CAP, this annual summary report will be limited to an analysis of those fatalities/near fatalities that had occurred, as a result of abuse or neglect, between July 21 to December 31, 2006.

When county child welfare workers believe that a fatality or near fatality has been caused by abuse or neglect, the county will notify CDSS via a form entitled Child Fatality/Near Fatality Questionnaire. Thereafter if it is substantiated that the fatality or near fatality was the result of neglect or abuse, CDSS will complete a Summary Report in coordination with the county, CWS/Probation. Upon finalization, the Summary Report will be released to the public, upon request.

- **Aggregate Child Fatality/Near Fatality Information**

Child Fatalities

The CDSS received 140 notifications of child fatalities for this reporting period. Upon further review it was determined that these deaths were suspected by the county child welfare agency of being caused by the following types of child abuse:

18 Physical Abuse (non-accidental head injury)	5 Severe Neglect and Physical Abuse
5 General Neglect	17 No referral or unknown
1 Substantial Risk	1 Emotional Abuse
91 Severe Neglect Accidental	2 General Neglect/Suspected Abuse

For example: vehicular accidents, drowning, fire and choking.

For example: suspected physical abuse or severe neglect.

The cause of death findings are categorized in the table below. These determinations have been made by either the county coroner or law enforcement and reflect what was reported to CDSS by the county.

35 Homicide (result of a fatally inflicted wound or injury).	24 Natural Causes (illness or medically fragile conditions)
4 Suicide (death by one's own actions)	11 Medical Neglect
8 Vehicular accidents	8 Victim unresponsive
16 Head and Body trauma	17 Unknown/undetermined
17 Other (suffocation, drowning, fire and poison)	

The CSOB also determines what involvement, if any, the child had with the child welfare agency at the time of the child's death. This provides important information in determining where along the spectrum of the child welfare services delivery system programmatic or policy change should occur.

The CWS agency involvement in the 140 child fatalities was reported as being:

14 In-home with an open child welfare case or referral	88 Not a current child welfare client but had history or prior referrals/cases
21 Placed out of home with an open case or referral	17 No prior or current child welfare history

Further analysis of these cases determined that 73 of the 140 fatalities were children under the age of 3 years with 52 being between the ages of 0-to-1 year.

Near Fatalities

The CDSS received 53 notifications of near fatalities for this reporting period. The suspected abuse and neglect referral allegations included:

31 Severe Neglect Accidental	1 Sexual Abuse/ Severe Neglect
16 Physical Abuse (non-accidental)	3 General Neglect
1 Physical Abuse/General Neglect (suspected)	1 Severe Neglect and Physical Abuse

For example: vehicular accidents, drowning, fire and choking

For example: suspected physical abuse or severe neglect

The cause of near fatality findings is categorized in the table below and reflect what has been reported to CDSS by the county.

1 Gunshot	6 Burns
3 Attempted Suicide	8 Head and Body Trauma
9 Vehicular Accident	2 Medical Neglect
6 Near Drowning	1 Maternal Drug Use
5 Body Trauma (bruising, broken bones)	4 Shaken Baby
2 Falls	1 Dog Bite
3 Other (fractured jaw, surgery)	2 poison/toxicity

The CWS agency involvement in the 53 child near fatalities was reported as being:

4 In-home with an open child welfare case or referral	28 Not a current child welfare client but had history or prior referrals/cases
1 Placed out of home with an open case or referral	20 No prior or current child welfare history

Further analysis of these cases determined that 32 of the 53 near fatalities were children under the age of 3 years with 15 being between the ages of 0-to-1 year.

c) **Summary of Child Fatality/Near Fatalities That Were a Result of Abuse and Neglect.**

A total of 59 of the above mentioned 193 child fatality/near fatality notifications were determined to meet the CAPTA requirements for preparation of a Summary of Findings. This number represents those questionnaires that have consistently been released as a result of a Public Record Act request and where the allegations of abuse and neglect have been substantiated by the CWS agency and the CWS agency has made a link to the cause of the child fatality/near fatality.

Fatalities

Thirty-four of the 140 fatality notifications were reported to be the result of abuse and neglect. These deaths were suspected by the county child welfare agency of being caused by the following types of child abuse.

13 Severe Neglect	13 Physical Abuse
2 General Neglect	5 Severe Neglect and Physical Abuse
1 Emotional Abuse	

The cause of death findings are categorized in the table below. As reported above, these determinations have been made by either the county coroner or law enforcement and reflect what was reported to CDSS by the county.

1 Homicide	4 Medical Neglect
3 Drowning	1 Suicide
4 Other (suffocation, poisoning)	2 Vehicular Accidents
13 Trauma to the head and/or body	6 Unknown

The CWS agency involvement in the 34 child fatalities was reported as being:

5 In-home with an open child welfare case or referral	20 Not a current child welfare client but had history or prior referrals/cases
3 Placed out of home with an open case or referral	6 No prior or current child welfare history

Further analysis of these fatality cases determined that 21 of the 34 fatalities were children under the age of 3 years with 11 being between the ages of 0-to-1 year.

Near Fatalities

Twenty-five of the 53 near fatality notifications were reported to be the result of abuse and neglect. These near fatalities were suspected by the county child welfare agency of being caused by the following types of child abuse.

12 Severe Neglect	10 Physical Abuse
1 General Neglect	1 General Neglect and Physical Abuse
1 Severe Neglect and Physical Abuse	

The cause of near fatality findings are categorized in the table below.

1 Near Drowning	2 Vehicular Accident
12 Trauma to the head and/or body	1 Medical Neglect
4 Burns	4 Other (fall, poisoning)
1 Attempted Drowning	

The CWS agency involvement in the 34 child fatalities was reported as being:

3 In-home with an open child welfare case or referral	13 Not a current child welfare client but had history or prior referrals/cases
0 Placed out of home with an open case or referral	9 No prior or current child welfare history

Further analysis of these near fatality cases determined that 19 of the 25 near fatalities were children under the age of 3 years with 11 being between the ages of 0-to-1 year.

d) Current Programmatic Efforts to Identify and Prevent Child Fatalities

Broad Based Systemic Changes

California’s CWS program continues to evolve in response to the federal Child and Family Services Review (2002) and subsequent Program Improvement Plan, CWS Redesign activities (2000-2004) and implementation of the new CWS Outcomes and Accountability System (2004). These broad programmatic changes promote the need to continually improve outcomes in the core areas of Safety, Permanency and Well-being at the county level through improved program and practice to better serve children and families.

In 2004, primarily as a result of the California-initiated CWS Redesign and the Child Welfare Services Outcome and Accountability System, the state implemented the Child Welfare Service Improvement pilots in 11 counties. Beginning with the CWS Hotline, the new Differential Response intake system provides a more customized response to families through case planning and development, and provides enhanced services to support the specific needs of children and families. The Standardized Safety Assessment System establishes the standards, tools, and practice application to improve California’s safety outcomes. Permanency and youth services are aimed at increasing permanence and stability for children in the CWS system, as well as supporting foster youth as they transition to adulthood. These programmatic changes will ensure that children who remain with their parents or who are placed in foster care are provided with safe and stable homes.

The development work for the pilots occurred in 2004/05, and in June 2006, all 11 counties implemented the pilots in accordance with their plans. These improvements, which impact both system and practice, are the keys to the ongoing effort to improve statewide program outcomes and continually improve outcomes for children and families including the prevention of child fatalities. In this last year, the CDSS has been working with the 11 pilot counties and the Results Group to complete an evaluation on the effectiveness of these pilots. The full evaluation has not been completed as of the writing of this report, but it expected to be completed by Fall 2007.

Pursuant to state law (Assembly Bill 636, Steinberg, Ch. 678, Statutes of 2001), effective January 2004, a new Child Welfare Services Outcome and Accountability System began operation in California. The new system, referred to as the California-Child and Family Services Review (C-CFSR), was developed to significantly strengthen the accountability system used in California to monitor and assess the quality of services provided on behalf of maltreated children. The C-CFSR results in a continuous process of improvement that builds

on baselines, projections, monitoring and annual updates. In this last year CDSS contracted with the Child and Family Policy Institute of California to complete an analysis of the county System Improvement Plans submitted to CDSS in the 2004 implementation year. Some of the preliminary findings include:

- Data outcome measures are focusing discussions in the county toward common goals.
- Child welfare staff and other agencies are sharing information and knowledge to improve outcomes for children.
- Counties are involving communities throughout the state in an open problem-solving process on behalf of children and families.

CDSS is pleased in these achievements as they are the critical first steps towards developing a successful process for ensuring greater safety, permanence and well being for California's children. It is anticipated that the final report entitled "*Planning for Success: An Analysis of California Counties' Child Welfare System Improvement Plans*" will be available in late summer of 2007.

The California Family to Family Initiative is a public-private partnership between national and state foundations and the state of California. Partners in the California Initiative include the Annie E. Casey Foundation, the Stuart Foundation, the Walter S. Johnson Foundation, the California Department of Social Services and the Center for Social Services Research at UC Berkeley. Currently there are 25 California Family to Family counties and they are divided into four regional areas with anchor and network sites. Implemented in 2004, Family to Family counties are working with families to improve safety of placement and mitigating placement changes by having families participate in the team decision-making (TDM) process, which includes the child. California counties use the TDM CA database to record TDM information, to create reports for self-evaluation, communication with community partners and to export data to UC Berkeley.

Specific CDSS Activities

The CDSS' prevention activities over the last year include continued participation on the state Child Death Review Council. In an effort to better understand the issues with collecting accurate fatality data, the CDSS, through the Council, participates in an annual data reconciliation audit with partnering state agencies including the Department of Health Services and the Department of Justice. There are four statewide databases (Child Abuse Central Index [CACI], Homicide Files, Vital Statistics and CWS/CMS) used in the reconciliation audit. The results are published in the annual report issued by the Council. The information is also used to obtain a better understanding of the data trends and to implement more focused prevention campaigns.

The CDSS has also continued to contract with the Interagency Council on Abuse and Neglect (ICAN) for county Child Death Review (CDR) team training. The contract requires local CDR team members to receive training on a common curriculum. The training provides information to team members on properly identifying child abuse and neglect related deaths and review team processes. The training is to be provided in five regions across the state. For 2006-07, five training sessions were completed. The five training events hosted 374 professionals, 124 of which were CDR Team members.

The CDSS also continues to promote the Safely Surrendered Baby media campaign. This campaign seeks to inform child bearing aged women that they can safely surrender their baby, up to three days old, to a designated place without fear of criminal prosecution, so long as there is no evidence of abuse or neglect. The CDSS has completed new, update pamphlets and posters, in English and Spanish, and is now exploring the possibility of a toll free hotline number. In FFY 2006 there were 60 safely surrendered babies.

How California Meets the Provisions of Section 106(b)(2)(A)(xxii)

As part of the reauthorization language for CAPTA, each state must describe the provisions and procedures they have in place for criminal background checks for prospective foster and adoptive parents and other adult relatives and non-relative residing in the household in accord with section 106(b)(2)(A)(xxii).

California statute, as found in Welfare and Institutions Code section 361.4 (b) and 361.4(c), provides that whenever a child may be placed in the home of a relative, or the home of any prospective guardian or other person who is not a licensed or certified foster parent, a state and federal level criminal records check shall be conducted. The check shall be conducted on anyone in the household who is 18 years of age or older. Within five days of the criminal records check, a fingerprint check is initiated through the California Department of Justice (DOJ) to ensure the accuracy of the criminal records check. DOJ shall forward the fingerprint check to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. A check of CACI shall also be done. Welfare and Institutions Code section 361.4(d)(1) provides that if the person has no criminal history, the home may be considered for placement.

In addition to the Welfare and Institution Codes cited above, the state's following regulations governing licensure/approval of foster and adoptive homes also require that all related and non-related adults residing in a prospective foster family/adoptive home undergo a criminal background check:

- Title 22, Division 6, section 80019, General Licensing Requirements – Criminal Record Clearances (includes small foster family homes);
- Title 22, Division 6, section 88019 (applicable to Foster Family Agency certified foster family homes);
- Title 22, Division 6, section 89219 (applicable to Foster Family Homes),
- Title 22, Division 6, section 89213 (applicable to approved relative and non-relative extended family member foster family homes);
- Title 22, Division 6, section 89319 (applicable to Foster Family Homes); and
- Title 22, Division 2, section 35184 (applicable to adoptive homes).

**Budget for Federal Fiscal Year
2006 and 2007 Basic State Grants**

Activities	FFY 2006 (Actual)	FFY 2007 (Estimate)	Total
Projects (90%)	\$2,786,103	\$2,877,038	\$5,663,141
Administrative Costs* (10%)	\$309,566	\$319,670	\$629,236
Totals	\$3,095,669	\$3,196,708	\$6,292,377
* Administrative costs include:			
Staff	\$269,323	\$278,113	\$547,436
Travel	\$40,243	\$41,557	\$81,800

**State of California Department of Social Services
Office of Child Abuse Prevention**

**SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CALIFORNIA
CITIZEN REVIEW PANELS**

October 1, 2005-September 30, 2006

June 2007

State of California

Since 1999, California has been required to have at least three Citizen Review Panels (CRPs) in operation in order to receive its grant for child abuse and neglect prevention and treatment programs under the Federal Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA). Since that time, the California Department of Social Services' Office of Child Abuse Prevention (CDSS/OCAP) has provided the funding and technical support necessary to ensure that at least three counties operate CRPs and that there is a body that functions as a statewide CRP by reviewing the policies, practices and procedures of California's Child Welfare Services System.

This report covers the activities of California's panels for Federal Fiscal Year 2006 which began on October 1, 2005 and ended on September 30, 2006. Future directions will address Federal Fiscal Years 2007 and 2008. The annual reports and recommendations of the counties included in this report are on file at the CDSS/OCAP.

County Citizen Review Panels

Objective

To ensure that there are a minimum of three county-level citizen review panels in operation at all times.

Activities

Alameda, Kern, Napa, San Mateo and Calaveras Counties received funding to operate panels during this reporting period. A report on their activities, findings and recommendations along with a discussion of their future directions for FFY 2007 and FFY 2008 can be found under the specific county sections below.

Future Directions

The fourth citizen review panel funding cycle began on October 1, 2006 and will end on September 30, 2008. The selection process for the fourth funding cycle began in March of 2006, with the issuance of an All County Information Notice (ACIN) requesting applications to operate a CRP.

As a result of the FFY 2006-2008 application process, two county CRPs were funded. The San Mateo County CRP, which has been in existence since June 1999, was re-funded and Calaveras County CRP, which is a new panel, was also funded.

Objective

Provide training and on-going technical assistance to the three county level citizen review panels.

Activities

Strategies, Region II, which is implemented by Interface Children Family Services, is still retained by CDSS/OCAP to provide technical assistance to the county CRPs. One of CDSS/OCAP's requirements when the technical assistance consultant was hired for the October 1, 2006 to September 30, 2008 funding cycle was that the consultant has experience with Child Welfare Services System Improvement at the county level. This is important as county panels are beginning or continuing to review the effectiveness of the child welfare service departments in implementing policies, practices and procedures that support these departments in meeting the goals and objectives of county System Improvement Plans that are being prepared as part of Child Welfare Services System Improvement. The consultant that was hired, Louanne Shahandeh, continues to share with the county CRPs her knowledge of program and staff development, children's residential facilities, and CWS management. The consultant has provided on-going assistance to the new Calaveras County CPR through technical assistance with the structure and reporting responsibilities of the CRP. The consultant has also attended the meetings to assist with identifying realistic goals and work plans.

Objective

To review and respond to panel recommendations.

Activities

During this reporting period, the Kern County CPR submitted eleven recommendations to the county and four recommendations to the state. Kern CRP's county recommendations focused on more public representation on CWS oversight boards and committees and the need for non-emergent medical care for children in the emergency shelter. Kern's state recommendations concerned CAPTA requirements for reporting child fatalities and *guardian ad litem* responsibilities.

The San Mateo County CRP made seven recommendations to San Mateo County Human Services Agency. The recommendations focused on Team Decision Making (TDM), re-entry into the CWS and Differential Response. The Napa County CRP made recommendations addressing independent living staffing and Mandated Reporter training. The Alameda County CRP also focused on TDM. Since the Calaveras CRP was established in July 2006, it has been focused on establishing its structure and identifying goals so no recommendations were submitted for this report. See the county reports below for more information.

CDSS responded to the state recommendations by May 1, 2007. The Statewide Citizen Review Panel will review the recommendations made by the counties and make comments to the state regarding these recommendations prior to any response to the local panels by the CDSS/OCAP. County CWS agencies will be notified of their obligation to review and respond to recommendations from their panels.

The Statewide Citizen Review Panel

Objective

To ensure that there is a review body that examines the state-level Child Welfare Services System.

Activities

The statewide Citizen Review Panel, which grew out of the Child Welfare Services Stakeholders' Group, has worked over the past year to develop a functional panel with by-laws, regular meeting attendance and a cohesive strategy. New members have been recruited to represent the diverse perspectives that comprise the CWS in California. The statewide CRP has received technical assistance from CDSS, including presentations and documents on a wide variety of topics related to CWS.

CDSS staff made a detailed presentation on the first draft of California's Annual Progress and Services Report (2004-2005) to the statewide CRP. This report, which was submitted to ACF, Region IX, in June of 2006, represented efforts at the local and state levels to improve outcomes, such as reducing incidents of recurrent abuse and the time that children remain in out of home care. The CRP members provided CDSS staff with valuable feedback and information about projects in the state to include in the report.

The statewide CRP had a conference call with the county CRPs at the December 2005 meeting concerning the county panels' activities and recommendations to their CWS. The statewide CRP members interacted with the county members on the recommendations that they were making to the counties and the state.

Future Directions

In FFY 2007, the panel will focus its attention on the state's efforts to standardize the decision making process at critical stages of a child abuse investigation. A secondary issue is whether this process has an adverse impact on ethnic groups or parents who are socio-economically disadvantaged. The statewide CRP will review the assessment tools—Structured Decision Making (SDM) and the Comprehensive Assessment Tool (CAT)—utilized in this standardized process and how the tools are used by the line staff.

Kern County

County Profile

Kern County is located in California's Central Valley. In 2000, Kern's population was approximately 713,087. About 32% of its population is under the age of 18. In 2005, there were 15,314 child welfare referrals. In 2006, there were 2,466 children in foster care.

White persons (non-Hispanic/Latino) comprise roughly 50% of the Kern County population, while persons of Hispanic/Latino background represented about 33% of the population. People who reported being "some other race" were 23.2% of the population, while Blacks/African Americans represented 6%. Persons who reported being "two or more races" were 4.1% of the population, Asians were 3.4%, American Indians and Alaska Natives were 1.5% and Native Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders were less than 1%.

In 2000, foreign born persons accounted for 16.9% of the population and 33.4% spoke a language other than English at home. Of the population 25 and older, 68% have graduated from high school and 13.5% have bachelor's degrees.

Kern's population is at an economic disadvantage relative to the state as a whole. Kern's median household income is \$35,446 compared to \$47,493 for California. The per capita income for Kern is \$15,760 and the percentage of persons below the poverty line is approximately 20.8%. The figures for the state of California are \$22,711 and 14.2%.

Panel Activities

The Kern County Citizen Review Panel has been in existence for four years. During 2005-2006 the panel's work focused on the following objectives:

- Reviewing current practices regarding the availability of medical care for children who are placed in the county's Emergency Shelter Care Facility.
- Assessing the Mandated Reporter training, as well as assessing response follow up to child abuse reports by the local CWS staff.
- Assessing responses and/or changes made in practice, written policy and/or impact of the previous years recommendations made on both the local and state level.

Formal Recommendations

Recommendations to the County

- Add public members to internal child welfare policy/procedure development, quality assurance review processes and foster care administrative review body
- Add CWS expertise to Kern County Board of Supervisors by creating a CWS staff position for the Board.
- Demand improved collaboration among public agencies serving dependent children, especially emancipating youth.

- Improve quick identification of cases involving history of severe child abuse.
- Expand the reach of the Family to Family Initiative and the Differential Response program.
- Add more local housing for youth emancipating from foster care.
- Support continued health care services to children sheltered at the Jamison Center.

Recommendations to the State include:

- Public access to case information involving fatalities and near fatalities provided no later than 7-10 days after the incident.
- The state should comply with the CAPTA requirements that *guardian ad litem*s obtain first hand understanding of needs of children they represent. Also requested is the annual state data report concerning the average out of-court contacts between *guardians ad litem* and children they represent.
- The state should require performance measures for counties' ILPs in specified areas of their ILP work
- The state should comply with CAPTA provision relating to safe plans of care for drug-exposed infants and gathering of data to describe the county-level compliance with this requirement

CDSS has responded to the CRP's recommendations from FFY 2005. These responses are attached to this report. The responses must first be reviewed by CDSS legal staff prior to release. Kern County has responded to the CRP's FFY 2005 recommendations and those responses are attached to this report. CDSS is in the process of reviewing and responding to the CRP's FFY 2006 state recommendations and will include the state's response in the FFY 2007 CAPTA report and application.

Future Directions

Kern County chose not to apply for funding for the CRP in 2006-2008. Therefore, the Kern County CRP will not continue with its review of the county CWS.

Napa County

County Profile

Napa County, which is world-famous for its wines, is a rural county with a population of approximately 131,607 people. Population is concentrated in the cities of Napa, American Canyon, St. Helena and Calistoga which have many of the commercial features of larger cities: hotels, restaurants, and upscale shops that accommodate the tourist industry that has been spawned by the wineries. The wine industry employs many Hispanic farm workers. In 2005, there were 1,206 child welfare referrals. In 2006, there were 118 children in foster care.

Whites (non Hispanic/Latino) comprise roughly 69.1% of the population. Hispanic/Latinos are approximately 23.7%. Asians comprise approximately 3% of the population; Black or African Americans are roughly 1.3%; American Indians/Alaska Natives are approximately 0.8% and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders are 0.2 %.

Approximately 80.4% of the population aged 25 or older is comprised of high school graduates. About 26.4% hold bachelor's degrees. Median household income in 2000 was higher than that of the state as a whole, \$51,738 compared to the state's \$47,493. Per capital income was also higher: Napa's was \$26,395 as compared to \$22,711 for California. Persons in Napa living below the poverty line comprise roughly 8.3% of the population compared to 14.2% for the state as a whole.

Panel Activities

Napa County Citizen Review Panel has been in existence since June 1999. During 2005-2006 the panel's work focused on the following objectives:

- Reviewing the effectiveness of the Independent Living Program (ILP) components in preparing youth to transition out of care.
- Reviewing the level of engagement of families in the case planning process.
- Reviewing the practice components of the child welfare system (CWS) agency focused on reducing the recurrence of maltreatment.

Formal Recommendations

- The ILP Policy and Procedures should be written as soon as possible by CWS.
- CWS and schools to schedule Mandated Reporter Training.
- Safe Measures be expanded to give all social workers access to the program.
- Parent Partners to be used to help families understand the CWS system.

Future Directions

Napa County did not apply for CRP funding for FFY 2006-2008. The panel has decided to "remain a Panel and work on issues specific to our county."

County Profile

San Mateo County is located in the western portion of the San Francisco Bay Area, directly below the city/county of San Francisco. It is one of California's most affluent counties and, as part of "Silicon Valley," is home to many high-tech firms. Many of its foreign-born are highly educated professionals who are proficient in English. However, service industries employ both Americans and the foreign-born who have limited skills.

San Mateo's population is approximately 697,456 people, of whom approximately 23% are under 18 years old. In state Fiscal Year 2005-2006 there were 4,081 child welfare referrals and 477 children in foster care.

White persons (non-Hispanic/Latino) make up roughly 50% of the population, while persons of Hispanic/Latino origin make up 22%. Asians are 20% of the population, persons who reported being "some other race" are 10%, persons who reported being "two or more races" are 5%, Blacks or African Americans are 3.5%, Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islanders are 1.3%, and American Indians and Alaska Natives are less than 1% of the population.

The median household income for the county is \$70,819, per capita income is \$36,045 and the percentage of persons below the poverty line is 5.8%. The median household income for California is \$47,493 and the state's per capita income is \$22,711. In the state of California approximately 14.2% of the population is below the poverty line.

Panel Activities

The San Mateo County Citizen Review Panel (CRP) has been in existence since June 1999. During 2005-2006 the panel's work focused on the following objectives:

- Reviewing re-entry factors and the impact of current family support and engagement practices facilitated by the San Mateo County Human Services Agency (HSA). In doing so, the panel focused on review activities involving Best Practice Models of Family Engagement, Best Practice Models regarding family support and resources referrals.
- Reviewing the Team Decision Making (TDM) process, as it relates to practices and policies focusing on engaging families in their own case planning.
- Reviewing the county's Differential Response implementation strategies.

Formal Recommendations

The CRP's recommendations to the HSA include:

- Continue to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the TDM model and promote its use in all appropriate situations.
- Continue to provide opportunities for regular community input regarding the implementation of the TDM model and inform CRP as the opportunities are scheduled.

- Continue efforts to address the relatively high re-entry rate and report on its progress quarterly.
- Study the possibility of implementing a parent mentor program to assist parents in navigating the child welfare system.
- Review and update the parent education curriculum and information ensuring that it is accessible for parents who may have language, reading or learning challenges.
- Pursue funding for enhanced family services, such as family maintenance after reunification and after-care.
- Closely monitor the implementation of Differential Response to ascertain its impact on keeping families out of the child welfare system.

Future Directions

The CRP has been funded by OCAP for the FFY 2006-2008. In the upcoming year, this CRP will focus on:

- Reviewing data and reports concerning the implementation of TDM.
- Exploring options, such as “Parents Helping Parents”, to mitigate difficulties child welfare clients experience in accessing services.
- Seeking information on improving effectiveness of the CWS and reducing re-entry into the CWS.

County Profile

Alameda County received funding from OCAP to operate a citizen review panel for the 2004-2006 funding cycle. That was the first time that the county applied and received funding for a panel.

Alameda County is an urban county in the San Francisco Bay Area and the county seat is Oakland. Its population is approximately 1,461,030. Roughly 25% of the population is under the age of 18 years old. In 2005, there were 13,888 child welfare referrals. The foster care caseload was 2,714 in 2006.

Whites (non-Hispanic/Latino) comprise approximately 41% of the population, while Asians make up 20%. Hispanics/Latinos and Blacks make up 19 and 15% respectively of the county's population and 8.9% are those who report being "of some other race." Those who are of two or more races represent 5.6%. American Indians and Alaska Natives make up less than 1% of the county's population. Twenty-seven percent of the population is foreign born. Eighty-two percent of those age 25 or older are high school graduates, while 35% have bachelors' degrees. Median household income is roughly \$55,946, per capita income is \$26,680 and 11% of the people live below the poverty line.

Panel Activities

The Alameda County Citizen Review Panel (ACCRP) has been in existence for two years. During 2005-2006 the panel's work focused on the effectiveness of the Team Decision Making (TDM) process and the relationship between this practice and the well-being of the families and clients participating. The ACCRP also explored the impact TDMs have on the follow through of the case plan by families and social work staff.

Formal Recommendations

Recommendations made by the ACCRP to the Alameda County Social Services Agency (SSA) are as follows:

- More broad-based training is needed for all key system stakeholders to be educated about the strengths and value of the TDM process.
- Hold TDMs in the evening and in the client's own community.
- Include a mental health specialist in the TDM meeting.
- Include a drug counselor on the team and/or have substance abuse services available.
- Establish a process to contact families in a timely manner to ensure maximum participation in TDM.
- Establish a "timed" follow-up session with all participants to ascertain if the case plan that was established at the initial TDM was successfully implemented.

Future Directions

The ACCRP did not apply for funding for the 2006-2008 funding cycle.

Calaveras County

County Profile

Calaveras County received funding to implement a citizen review panel for the funding cycle of FFY 2006 to 2008. This is the first time this county has applied and received funding for a panel. The panel has only been functioning since July 2006.

Calaveras is a rural county in the "Gold Country" of the Sierra Nevada Mountain range. Its population is approximately 45,711 and roughly 22% of the population is under the age of 18. In 2005 there were 124 child welfare referrals. The foster care caseload was 99 in 2006.

The racial make-up of the county was 91% White, 7% Hispanic/Latino, .75% Black or African American, 1.74% Native American, .85% Asian, 2.07% from other races and 3.3% from two or more races.

The median income for household in the county was \$41,022 and the per capita income was \$21,420. The population below poverty level was 11.8% with 15.6% of those under age 18.

Panel Activities

The Calaveras County CRP has only been in existence since July 2006. The panel is part of the child abuse prevention council. The panel's initial activities centered on training the members about the functions and responsibilities of CRPs, determining the focus of the panel during the funding cycle, and developing a work plan to achieve its goals. The CDSS staff and consultants, Louanne Shahandeh and Annette Marcus, from Strategies have attended meetings of the panel to provide an overview of the CRP process and reporting responsibilities and to provide guidance on development of a work plan and CRP goals. Additionally, conference calls have been conducted to provide ongoing technical assistance and support.

The panel developed six goals, which address CRP membership recruitment and training, work plan development, reporting and dissemination of the CRP findings and recommendations and a CRP self-review component. The panel has developed a work plan to assess the policies, procedures and practices of the Calaveras County Child Welfare Services. Rate of foster care re-entry was a topic the panel members identified for study during the first year of its inception.

Formal Recommendations

During this reporting period, the Calaveras County CRP's focus has been on start-up activities including creating the structure, orientating members and developing goals. During the next reporting period, the panel will submit its first annual report including any recommendations to Calaveras County or the state.

Future Directions

In the FFY 2007, the CRP plans to hold focus groups including foster youth, bio-parents, social workers and community partners. University of California, Davis, staff will facilitate these groups. Current policies that impact re-entry will be reviewed by the panel and any issues that arise from this review will be integrated into the focus group interview questions. To accomplish the goals of the CRP, three subcommittees (Case History Review, Focus Group and Policy and Procedure Review) will be formed.

Appendix A : Statewide Citizen Review Panel Member List

NAME	TITLE and ORGANIZATION	CONTACT INFORMATION
Robin Allen	Executive Director, California Court Appointed Special Advocates	660 13 th Street, Ste 300, Oakland CA 94612 (510) 663-8440 Fax (510) 663-8441 rallen@californiacasa.org
Nancy Antoon, LCSW	Deputy Director for Child and Family Services, Trinity County Behavioral Health, California Mental Health Directors Association	P.O. Box 1640 Weaverville, CA 96093 nantoon@trinitycounty.org
Bill Bettencourt	Site Leader and Consultant, Family to Family, Annie E. Casey Foundation	8 Young Court, San Francisco, CA 94124-4427 (415) 824-9033/cell (415) 748-1053 Fax (415) 873-1554 bbetten@sbcglobal.net
Mike Carll	California Parent Leadership Team (CPLT) Parent Leader, Parents Anonymous of California	Mike: PO Box 98, San Andreas, CA 95249-0098 (209) 754-6885 Fax (209) 754-6721 mcarll@co.calaveras.ca.us
Miryam Choca	Director, California State Strategies San Diego Division Casey Family Programs	3878 Old Town Ave, Suite 100, San Diego, CA 92110-3032 (619) 543-0774 X 224 Fax (877) 501-7339 mchoca@casey.org
Kate Cleary	Executive Director, Consortium for Children	1115 Irwin Street Ste. 2000, San Rafael, CA 94901-3321 (415) 458-1759 Fax (415) 453-2264 kate@consortforkids.org
Jacqueline Flowers	Assistant Superintendent, San Joaquin County Operated Schools and Programs	PO Box 213030, Stockton, CA 95213-9030 (209) 468-9107 Fax (209) 468-4951 jflowers@sjcoe.net (Kelly Fry is executive assistant)
Terri Kook	Program Officer, Stuart Foundation	50 California Street, Ste 3350, San Francisco, CA 94111-4735 (415) 393-1551 Fax (415) 393-1552 tkook@stuartfoundation.org

Pamela Maxwell	California Parent Leadership Team (CPLT) Parent Leader, Parents Anonymous of California	Pamela: PO Box 233462, Sacramento, CA 95823-0441 (916) 453-2704 X21 (916) 206-1721 Fax (916) 453 2708 pmaxwell@starsprogram.org
Francine McKinley	ICWA/Social Services Director, Mooretown Rancheria	1 Alverda Drive, Oroville, CA 95966-9379 (530) 533-3625 Fax (530) 533-0664 icwa@mooretown.org
Michelle Neumann-Ribner, LCSW, JD	Senior Deputy San Diego County Counsel, Juvenile Division, San Diego County Office of County Counsel	4955 Mercury Street, San Diego, CA 92111-1703 (858) 492-2521 michelle.neumann@sdcounty.ca.gov
Carolyn Novosel	Director, Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services	N/A (510) 567-8115 novosel@bhcs.mail.co.alameda.ca.us
James Michael Owen, JD	Assistant County Counsel, Training & Litigation Division, LA County, California County Counsel Association	201 Centre Plaza Dr., Ste 1, Monterey Park, CA 91754-2143 (323) 526-6250 Fax (323) 881-4560 jowens@coconet.org
Pam Miller	Director, Yolo County Dept. of Employment and Social Services, County Welfare Directors Association	25 North Cottonwood St., Woodland, CA 95695-6609 (530) 661-2757 pam.miller@yolocounty.org and laura.argumedo@yolocounty.org
Cora Pearson Alternate: Velma J. Moore	California Foster Parent Association, Inc. <i>Velma: 3900 Moran B, Ceres, CA 95307</i> (209) 541-3819 <i>vel45ee@aol.com</i>	Cora: 2414 Marigold Ave, Harbor City, CA 90710 (310) 539-0268 Fax (310) 539-8120 preciouspearl1@aol.com
John Phillips, MA	Program Supervisor, AOD Services, Mariposa County Behavioral Health and Recovery Services, County Alcohol and Drug Program Administrators Assn. of CA (CADPAAC) rep.	PO Box 99, Mariposa, CA 95338-0099 (209) 966-2000 Fax (209) 966-2000 jphillips@mariposacounty.org
Patricia Reynolds-Harris	Director, California Permanency for Youth Project	4200 Park Blvd, Oakland, CA 94602-1312 (510) 562-8472 Patrh@sbcglobal.net

Jennifer Rodriguez	Former foster youth, California Youth Connection	c/o Janet Knipe (415) 442-5060 X15 jknipe@calyouthconn.org Jennifer's contact info: jennar22@hotmail.com
Carroll Schroeder	California Alliance of Child and Family Services	2201 K Street, Sacramento, CA 95816 (916) 449-2273 x22 cschroederl@cacfs.org
Carole Shauffer, JD, MEd	Youth Law Center	417 Montgomery Street, Ste 900, San Francisco, CA 94104 (415) 543-3379 (W) (415) 320-2147 (cell) cshauffer@ylc.org
Norma Suzuki	Chief Probation Officers of California	921 11th Street, Ste. 902, Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 447-2762 Fax (916) 442-0850 norma.suzuki@cpoc.org
Susan A. Taylor, PhD	National Association of Social Workers, CA Chapter	Dept. of Social Work, CSUS 600 J Street, Sacramento, CA 95819-6104 (916) 278-7176 (w) (530) 622-7602 (h?) taylor@s@hhs4.csus.edu
Christopher Wu, JD Alternate: Don Will	Supervising Attorney, Center for Families, Children and the Courts, Judicial Council of CA-- Administrative Office of the Courts <i>Don, Supervising Research Analysis</i> Administrative Office of the Courts (415) 865-7557 don.will@jud.ca.gov	445 Golden Gate Ave, San Francisco, CA 94102- 3688 (415) 865-7721 Fax (415) 865-7217 christopher.wu@jud.ca.gov

No members left the California Citizen Review Panel in FFY 2006. Patricia Reynolds-Harris was added as a member.

**Chafee Foster Care Independence Program/Education and
Training Vouchers Program**

**CHAFEE FOSTER CARE INDEPENDENCE PROGRAM/EDUCATION AND TRAINING
VOUCHERS PROGRAM
ANNUAL PROGRESS AND SERVICES REPORT**

Program Contact Person:

Name: Jill Sevaaetasi
Independent Living Program Policy Unit

Address: California Department of Social Services
744 P Street, M.S. 14-78
Sacramento, CA 95814

Telephone: (916) 651-7465

1. Program Plan Narrative

1) The state of California, Health and Welfare Agency, Department of Social Services (CDSS) administers, supervises or oversees the programs carried out under this plan; 2) CDSS agrees to cooperate in national evaluations of the effects of the independent living programs implemented to achieve the purposes of this plan; and 3) CDSS has reported on those accomplishments for the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2006 that are promising practices, and demonstrated state technical assistance to counties in the provision of core services. While there were no significant programmatic changes made during the reporting period, CDSS continues its efforts to develop and implement promising practices to improve the delivery of services to current and former foster youth who are eligible for Independent Living Program (ILP) services.

CDSS, in anticipation of implementing the Chafee National Youth in Transition Database, is collaborating with counties to identify and develop methods for capturing information related to the demographics of the population of eligible current and former foster youth and the mandate to gather and report on the collective outcomes for these youth in order to evaluate the effectiveness of program services.

The CDSS continues to require the submission of the ILP Narrative Report and Plan by counties. Each of the 58 counties report relevant data regarding the administration of the ILP. The data provided by counties in this report is utilized to determine the need for technical assistance and to assist counties to improve specific areas of ILP services. In addition, counties are required to provide statistical data via the state of California (SOC) 405A form.

For FFY 2006, the data captured in the SOC 405A reflects positive improvements in several areas of well-being for youth including:

- A 1% increase in the number of youth to whom ILP services were offered;
- A 6% increase in the number of youth who received services;
- A 4% increase in the number of youth who completed ILP services or a component of services;
- A 4% increase in the number of youth who completed vocational or on-the-job training;
- A 1% increase in the number of youth who enrolled in college;
- A 3% increase in the number of youth who obtained employment (part- and full-time);
- A 16% increase in the number of youth who were living independently of agency maintenance programs.

In 2006, California was one of six states chosen to participate in the National Governor's Association (NGA) Policy Academy on Youth Transitioning out of Foster Care. The Academy, which runs from June 2006 through December 2007, provides a unique opportunity for state teams to work together, with the assistance of national and state experts, to improve outcomes for youth transitioning from foster care to adulthood.

California's team is comprised of county and state leaders from multiple public systems such as child welfare, mental health, employment, education and corrections, as well as private providers, philanthropy, youth and advocates. The team has identified three key goals:

Permanence - Every youth will have lifelong connections with family and supportive adults.

Education - Every youth will have a quality education, a high school diploma and support in pursuing post-secondary opportunities.

Employment - Every youth will have work experience and training opportunities that will prepare them for and place them in living wage employment and careers.

To achieve these goals, California has embarked on a "New Vision for ILP." The project focuses on redesigning the ILP by providing services and experiential training based on an individual youth's needs and is designed to actively engage caregivers in identifying and developing services to meet the needs of transitioning youth.

For FFY 2006, the actual expenditure of federal and state funds was \$39,735,443. For FFY 2006/2007, the CDSS received a federal grant of \$23,198,000 and provided \$15,166,000 in state share dollars for a total allocation of \$38,364,000 combined federal and state funds. Year-to-date expenditures for the 1st quarter of FFY 2007 are \$9,195,874.

a) Help youth make the transition to self-sufficiency

FFY 2007 Accomplishments:

- The Transitional Independent Living Plan (TILP), available on the Child Welfare Services Case Management System (CWS/CMS), is a written service delivery plan that identifies the youth's current level of functioning, emancipation goals and the specific skills needed to prepare the youth to live independently upon leaving foster care. The plan is mutually agreed upon by the youth and his or her social worker/probation officer and significant persons in the youth's life.

In an effort to develop protocol to enhance the current level of youth and family participation in the transition planning process, the CDSS convened a workgroup made up of CDSS and county representatives to collaborate on the revision of the TILP. The workgroup is currently exploring avenues for integrating the TILP information in the youth's case plan as opposed to maintaining it as a stand-alone document; it is expected that doing so will improve California's Well-being outcomes the collection of TILP data on progress made in serving youth. The group anticipates the completion of the revised TILP in the Fall of 2007.

- The CDSS continues to expand the Transitional Housing Placement Program (THPP) and the Transitional Housing Placement Plus (THP – Plus) Program.

The THPP provides youth aged 16-18 with the opportunity to experience semi-supervised apartment living while receiving supportive services. There are 29 counties participating in the THPP during FY 2006-07. For FY 2007-08 an additional 3 counties have been approved, bringing the total to 32 counties that will participate in the THPP.

Due to the increased public awareness of the housing shortage for former foster youth in California, as well as the elimination of county cost for services, the number of counties participating in the Transitional Housing Placement – Plus (THP – Plus) Program has increased significantly. This program provides youth, aged 18 to 24, a safe living environment while helping them to achieve self-sufficiency and learn life skills upon their emancipation from the foster care system. For FY 2006-07, 17 counties are participating in the THP – Plus. For FY 2007-08 an additional 27 counties have been approved, bringing the total to 44 counties that will participate in the THP – Plus.

- The CDSS is partnering with the John Burton Foundation to expand the THP – Plus program. The John Burton Foundation for Children Without Homes (Foundation) is a non-profit organization based in San Francisco, California dedicated to improving the quality of life for California's homeless children and developing policy solutions to prevent homelessness. In October of 2006, the CDSS and the Foundation collaborated on and presented an all day workshop held at the CDSS headquarters on the development and implementation of the THP – Plus program. On March 7, 2007, the Foundation also partnered with the CDSS at a Department of Housing and Community Development sponsored housing forum in Oakland.

The 2007 Annual ILP Institute (Institute) entitled, "A New Vision for ILP," was held April 17-19, 2007 in Sacramento. The Institute provided workshops centered on developing and implementing the new ILP service delivery system for foster youth in California. During the Institute, county coordinators, county social workers and probation offices came together with foster parents to discuss this new system of service delivery. This was the first time foster parents were convened at the Institute to participate in a facilitated discussion of how to increase caregiver involvement in assisting youth to receive ILP services. In the future, the CDSS will host similar convenings of other caregivers including group home staff.

Workshop topics included:

- Permanency planning,
- Employment,
- Education,
- Transitional housing and
- Innovative programs.

The CDSS annually sponsors a Teen Forum for foster youth, ages 16-18, to provide them with an opportunity to learn more about the ILP, housing resources, educational and employment resources and eligibility for the Extended Medi-Cal Program. The 2007 Teen Forum was held June 22-24, 2007, on the San Francisco State University campus. Approximately 200 youth and sponsors attended. This year, the Foster Club All-Stars were featured participants; the group, comprised of former foster youth, travels throughout the country and members share information about their personal experiences in an effort to improve the lives of youth in foster care. CDSS is sponsoring one youth to become an All Star in fiscal year 2007-2008.

During this year's Forum, CDSS took the opportunity to engage youth in the CFRS process by consulting with youth about their experiences in foster care as well as their opinions related to the ILP.

FFY 2008 Planned Activities:

- Develop strategies for implementing "New Vision for ILP"
- Evaluate effectiveness of new TILP through soliciting input from county ILP Programs.
- Continue to collaborate with the John Burton Foundation to evaluate and improve the transitional housing programs.

b) Help youth receive the education, training and services necessary to obtain employment

FFY 2007 Accomplishments:

The Foster Youth Employment and Training Taskforce continues to be a catalyst for multi-agency collaboration and partnering. The group consists of representatives from the Employment Development Department, Workforce Investment Board, the CDSS Community Care Licensing Division, the CDSS Children and Family Services Division, the US Department of Labor, the New Ways to Work Initiative (a workforce development organization), Casey Family Programs, the Community College Chancellor's office, counties, school districts and other community based organizations.

CDSS also convenes a workgroup that is addressing the needs of youth in group homes and is drafting regulations to ensure that licensing requirements promote a "normal childhood" experience in a home-like environment, encourage the self-

reliance and independence of youth who are leaving foster care, as well as promoting the health, safety and well being outcomes.

Currently, two bills have been introduced in the California Legislature to increase employment opportunities for eligible current or former foster youth:

Assembly Bill (AB) 121 would allow employers who receive special tax incentives to give current and former foster youth priority in hiring.

Assembly Bill (AB) 671 would require that state law be amended to provide preference points on state civil service exams to current and former foster youth ages 15 to 25.

An example of a best practice related to employment of former foster youth is Alameda County's Project HOPE: Helping Our Young People with Education and Employment. The project prepares youth who are aging out of care or who are emancipated by offering an array of academic enhancement and/or job preparation activities. The project, designed to make the One Stop center more youth friendly, utilizes former foster youth who serve as peer educators to assist youth to navigate all of the available community services.

FFY 2008 Planned Activities:

- Increase outreach efforts to improve enrollment in ILP through the mailing of information flyers regarding the ILP program to eligible youth. Youth who participate in ILP receive information regarding education, training, and available services for obtaining employment.

c) Help youth prepare for and enter postsecondary training and educational institutions

FFY 2007 Accomplishments:

- The CDSS has effectively administered the Chafee Education and Training Voucher (ETV) Program with the assistance of the California Student Aid Commission (CSAC).

The state has implemented a method for distribution of the ETV grants to youth and for the accounting of unspent funds earlier in the fiscal year. Grants that otherwise would have been unclaimed by youth, will be reissued to other eligible youth as a way of preventing the forfeiture of funding. In FY 2006-07, a new three-year contract became effective between CDSS and CSAC. The contract allows for utilization of state General Funds at the beginning of the state fiscal year with federal funds becoming available at the beginning of the federal fiscal year. This overlapping of the release of funds will facilitate the timely receipt of grants and eliminate any hardships experienced by youth awaiting grants from federal funding.

For FY 2005, CDSS was awarded \$8,547,517 for the ETV. Of that amount, 98% or \$8,451,971, was expended. Difficulties arose as a result of funds not being available

at the beginning of the FFY. Hence, the Department was unable to spend 2% of the ETV grants that were unclaimed by youth. We now take advantage of the full two years to expend all ETV funds. To eliminate future problems, CDSS has entered into a three-year contract with CSAC allowing for the utilization of state General Funds and spends ETV funding over a two-year period.

Data received from the CSAC shows that:

For FY 2005-06:

- 1,899 youth received awards.

For FY 2006-07:

- 2,643 youth have received grants (year to date).
- The average award is \$4,518.
- The total expenditure as of March 28, 2007 is \$11,833,716.
- Of that number, 1,484 (year-to-date) received the grant for the first time.

FY 2008-09:

The estimated number of youth who could be eligible to receive an award is 2,643. This estimate is based on the number of awards that have been processed, year-to-date.

To assist emancipated youth to apply for ETV funds, CDSS is in the process of releasing an All County Letter providing county welfare departments with a sample letter that includes standardized language for "Proof of Wardship" documentation. Having this documentation will help youth to provide required information to college financial aid offices and eliminate delays in processing financial aid applications and related hardships for former foster youth.

Notification of the availability of the ETV grants and other funding opportunities for postsecondary education is provided by counties to youth participating in the ILP. Youth also receive information about the grants via inserts in mailings from the Department of Health Services that are sent to youth to provide information about the Former Foster Youth Extended Medicaid Program. Additionally, the CDSS has a contract with the Employment Development Department to disseminate information about the ETV and other financial aid opportunities to all eligible youth.

Due to lack of funding, the E-Bus that previously traveled to communities throughout the state and provided workshops to eligible youth with information about applying for the ETV and other financial aid and educational support is no longer in operation.

A best practice related to providing supports for youth in postsecondary educational settings is the Guardian Scholars Program. The program began in 1997 at California State University, Fullerton. Since then, it has grown to include 20 plus universities and community colleges in California, including San Francisco State University, University of California Santa Cruz, San Diego State University, California State University, East Bay, and Sacramento State University.

The program offers specialized counseling and financial aid services, mentoring and academic help and year-round on-campus housing for former foster youth who qualify. In addition, the program connects these youth with supportive adults and peers who care about their well-being and have a stake in their success.

Assembly Bill (AB) 1808 (Chapter 75, Statutes of 2006) expanded the Foster Youth Services (FYS) program, which previously limited the provision of educational support services to youth in group home placements, to include all foster youth in California. The FYS, under the auspices of the Department of Education, provides instruction, counseling, tutoring and other educational support services. It is expected that the expansion of this program will help eliminate the barriers faced by foster youth and assist the estimated 70% of foster youth who have the desire to attend college but cannot do so without the state's assistance. Assembly Bill (AB) 1808 was enacted on July 12, 2006. Since the passage of AB 1808, the service capacity has increased to 32,660 in SFY 2006/07 which is an increase of 22,000 more foster youth receiving services through FYS. Additionally, the FYS has expanded to 57 counties and the funding has increased from \$9.5 million to \$18.3 million. (This information is from the Department of Education.)

Assembly Bill (AB) 1578 has been introduced in the California Legislature which, among other provisions, would establish a statewide program similar to the Guardian Scholars program to be under the auspices of the Department of Education. This purpose of the program is to provide comprehensive support on college and university campuses to students who are former foster youth with the objective of meeting the unique needs of these youth and supporting and improving their rates of matriculation, graduation and academic success.

FFY 2008 Planned Activities:

- Improve collaboration with California Department of Education, Foster Youth Services Program (FYS) through annual meetings, to discuss strategies for ensuring county ILP Programs are aware of the resources and services provided through FYS to improve educational outcomes for foster youth.

d) Provide personal and emotional support to youth through mentors and the promotion of interactions with dedicated adults

FFY 2007 Accomplishments:

The CDSS continues to work on the provisions of AB 1412 (Chapter 640, Statutes of 2005). This legislation created a phased-in expansion of requirements that county social workers ask children 10 years of age or older, beginning with those children placed with a non-relative, about important adult relationships and to make efforts to support those relationships. The court is required to determine whether the agency has made reasonable efforts to maintain the child's relationships with individuals other than the child's siblings who are important to the child, consistent with the child's best interests. The CDSS is also required to encourage counties to develop approaches to ensure that no youth leaves care without a lifelong connection to a committed adult.

Many counties include individuals who have been identified by youth as significant, in conferences during which emancipation plans are discussed and agreed to by the youth and the supportive individuals in his or her life. This bill also allows foster children aged 12 years and older to review, sign and be given a copy of their own case plan. CDSS does not track or monitor the implementation of AB 1412. The courts are responsible for the provisions identified in AB 1412

The practice of “family finding” has been identified as a promising practice to assist youth to connect with family members with whom the youth has lost contact. Because of the cost related to utilizing the technology developed by US Search, CDSS and counties are examining ways of implementing methods for assisting youth through other methods. Absent the use of costly technology, Santa Clara County created a unit of social workers dedicated to finding families for foster children and youth.

Shasta County has embarked on a promising practice for establishing enduring relationships for youth transitioning from care to emancipation. Long term, one-to-one relationships are established beginning at the age of 16 when a caseworker is assigned to each youth. Each case worker serves as a mentor to assist youth in establishing their transition plan and assist the youth in planning their short- and long-term goals. On an as-needed basis, the caseworkers help youth to cope with personal problems that arise; each youth is given the cell phone numbers of two or more caseworkers who can help them when they need it.

FFY 2008 Planned Activities:

- The ACL that will be issued to introduce the new TILP will also contain language to remind counties to include mentor(s) and dedicated adults in the development of a youth’s TILP.

- e) **Provide financial, housing, counseling, employment, education and other appropriate support and services for former foster care recipients between 18 years of age and up to the day before their 21st birthday. Including services for youth between the age of 18 and up to the day before their 21st birthday.**

FFY 2007 Accomplishments:

The Transitional Housing Placement - Plus (THP-Plus) was established to provide safe, affordable housing and supportive services to emancipated foster youth through the age of 21. Legislation that was passed in 2005, Assembly Bill (AB) 824 (Chapter 636, Statutes of 2005), extends the maximum age for the receipt of THP-Plus services to youth aged up to 24 years.

Senate Bill (SB) 436 (Chapter 629, Statutes of 2005) requires counties to report on the housing resources available to parenting and pregnant youth. Counties are required to include in their reports information about increased services to this population of youth.

Emancipated Youth Stipends (EYS) are 100% state General Fund allocation to counties. The EYS is allocated to counties based on the number of ILP eligible youth in care. \$3.6 million is allocated to the program. Counties utilize the funds for the emergency needs of youth such as rental deposits, minor medical emergencies and transportation.

The state utilizes the option to provide continuing Medi-Cal coverage to youth aged 18 to 20 who emancipated from foster care. In order to receive federal funds, counties are required to determine the youth's eligibility by verifying the following:

- The youth's consent to continue with the Medi-Cal services.
- The youth's current address.
- When a third-party health insurance is involved Medi-Cal seeks reimbursement from the third-party. If applicable, a youth's health insurance must be reported to the eligibility worker.

At this time, enrollment in the extended Medi-Cal program is not uniformly automatic throughout the state. According to the California Department of Health Services, for the month of July 2007, there were a total of 5,314 recipients of Extended MediCal.

Counties continue to provide aftercare services to emancipated youth aged 18 up to the day prior to their 21st birthday. The youth continue to receive information on a wide range of successful daily living skills:

- Employment skills,
- Health, safety and hygiene,
- Banking, money management and budgeting,
- Consumer purchasing, loans and contracts,
- Obtaining housing and home maintenance,
- Interpersonal skills and
- Knowledge of community resources.

Counties provide aftercare services to all youth, including those who emancipated from another county or another state.

The actual expenditure of the Chafee Room and Board funding for FFY 2006 was \$3,785,725. Twenty counties reported utilizing the 30% allowance for assisting former foster youth with housing related costs. The state remains well within the limit for use of these funds as only 9.5% of the state's allocation was spent. THP-Plus Program is funded with 100% state General Funds; therefore, Chafee funds are not used for the room and board of youth participating in this program.

The housing needs of all emancipated foster youth increases yearly as additional youth leave foster care. In contrast, federal funding for the Independent Living Program has decreased yearly resulting in Counties having to stretch their Chafee allocation further in order to provide a variety of services to emancipated youth in their counties. In addition, in 2001, California passed Assembly Bill (AB) 427, Statutes of 2001, that created Transitional Housing Placement-Plus (THP-Plus). THP-Plus is funded with 100% state General Fund dollars. This

Program allows counties to utilize state general funds to provide more housing options to emancipated youth while enabling them to spend their federal Chafee funds for other much needed ILP services.

Each year in California, approximately 4,200 young adults exit foster care when they turn 18 or 19. Of this total, two out of three have an "imminent housing need".

FFY 2008 Planned Activities:

- Currently, the department mails out information flyers regarding ETV to current and former foster youth. The mail outs will be expanded to include information regarding ILP and Transitional Housing.

2. Briefly describe how the Independent Living Program is served by political subdivisions in the State.

- CDSS actively collaborates with other state of California departments, such as the Department of Education, the Department of Health Services, the Employment Development Department, counties, Casey Family Programs, the Community College Chancellors Office and other community-based organizations.

In addition, CDSS collaborates with statewide initiatives that are focusing on meeting the needs of youth who are emancipating from care into adulthood.

The Youth Transition Action Team (YTAT) Initiative focuses on bringing together the resources of the workforce, education and child welfare systems to better prepare adolescents who are aging out of foster care.

The teams are comprised of community leaders from child welfare, education, workforce development, juvenile justice, as well as, the philanthropic community.

Teams meet in their respective counties to identify and leverage the current approaches, strategies and resources in place to ensure successful transitions to adulthood. Additionally, each team is charged with assisting its respective county in achieving their child welfare system enhancement goals, particularly in the area of youth permanency.

During 2006, the YTAT: developed a formal relationship with CDSS which includes agreements on relationships between the YTAT initiative and the State Interagency Team; formed teams in twelve counties; conducted numerous training and strategic planning sessions; and participated in the Governor's Foster Youth Employment, Training and Housing Task Force (this task force is comprised of representatives from the Employment Development Department, Community Housing and Development, Department of Mental Health, Department of Health Services and various additional stakeholders).

California Connected by 25 Initiative

In California, the Connected by 25 Initiative (CC25I), sponsored by the Annie E. Casey Foundation, is currently in the process of helping five Family to Family counties in the

process of developing an integrated system of supports and services for transition-aged foster youth ages 14 through 24. The five counties are: Alameda, Fresno, San Francisco, Santa Clara and Stanislaus. The CC25I project manager is currently working with Orange and Humboldt counties to bring them into the initiative during 2007.

Each of the counties has developed a work plan and is actively pursuing implementation. Each plan addresses seven CC25I focus areas: K-12 Education; Housing; Employment/Job Training/Postsecondary Education; Independent Living Programs; Financial Literacy, Savings and Asset Development; Person and Social Asset Development; and Permanency.

- The state consistently encourages youth participation to inform public policy through the California Youth Connection, as well as, youth representatives referred to the state by counties.
- In 2007 the CDSS conducted focus groups which included current and former foster youth as part of the CFSR process. The information regarding the number of youth and location of the focus groups is as follows:

Two focus groups in Los Angeles County for youth in-and-out of foster care.

One focus group in the central valley counties for youth out of foster care

One focus group in the Bay Area for youth who are in care

- Additionally, a youth survey was distributed during the ILP Teen Forum held June 21 – 23, 2007 in San Francisco. The survey was designed to receive input from youth ages 16 to 18 about their experiences in foster care and their experience(s) and knowledge of available services that are provided to youth who participate in ILP specifically. The questions the youth were asked to respond to fell into four categories:

Education/Employment

Health

Involvement in ILP

Connections.

Each category required a response of, Yes/No/Don't Know. Also in each category was one or two questions that required the youth to provide a brief narrative response.

Out of 175 surveys that were distributed, 51 were completed and returned.

- The CDSS contracts with the CYC to perform the following activities:
 1. Assist County youth in developing CYC chapters.
 2. Explore and promote training activities for youth and CYC supporters to develop leadership skills.
 3. Coordinate an annual "Day at the Capitol" conference for all CYC chapters to educate legislators and state department executives about the unique needs of foster youth.

4. Provide technical assistance to youth to facilitate meetings with members of the legislature as part of the "Day at the Capitol" activities.
 5. Provide training and technical assistance to youth in CYC chapters on organizational development and meeting facilitation skills.
 6. Help youth develop public speaking skills and presentations.
- The CDSS participates monthly in an ILP County Workgroup that often include members of the CYC and other community foster youth.
 - In SFY 2007, the CDSS promoted a one-person play entitled, "Someone's Somebody". The play was written and performed by a former foster youth who talked about her experiences in foster care.
- 3) Describe how youth of various ages and at various stages of achieving independence, are to be served, particularly with regard to services for 1) youth under 16, (2) youth 16-18, and (3) youth at least 18 years of age that have not yet attained their 21st birthday.**

- ILP regulations reinforce that counties may serve youth under 16 at county option. Los Angeles County has served youth aged 14 and older for many years and continues to offer services to this age group.
- ILP regulations require that counties offer core ILP services to this age group, including education/career counseling, employment services, life skills training, housing, and mentoring opportunities. Services are designed to meet the individual needs of youth based on the TILP.
- ILP services to youth at least 18 years of age and who have not yet attained their 21st birthday focus on providing youth with postsecondary education information and referrals, transitional housing opportunities, employment assistance, mentoring and Medi-Cal services.
- Effective October 2000, California enacted legislation that extended Medicaid services to eligible emancipating foster youth up to age 21.

4) Describe how the State involves the public and private non-profit sectors in helping adolescents in foster care achieve independence.

- Collaboration with the public and private non-profit sectors is a core value for CDSS. All major initiatives have actively involved other state agencies, counties, state/local educational institutions, foundations and non-profits. The Foster Youth Employment, Training and Housing Taskforce and the Youth Transition Action Teams mentioned previously in this report are examples of current efforts.

On March 14, 2007, CDSS signed an historic agreement with the Karuk Tribe – located in northwestern California - to independently provide funding for services including foster care, independent living and adoption assistance programs. CDSS hopes to reach similar agreements with other California Tribes.

CDSS is working to increase its outreach to state tribal leaders to inform them of the ILP services available to Tribal foster youth. To better learn how ILP services can meet the unique needs of Tribal foster youth, staff members of the Department's Foster Care Support Services Bureau will become active members of Department's ICWA Workgroup. The workgroup is comprised of Tribal representatives, ICWA expert witnesses from throughout the state and CDSS staff. CDSS is in the process of ensuring tribal representation at the monthly CWDA, ILP Coordinators' Subcommittee meetings to ensure full access to ILP benefits and services to transition aged Tribal foster youth.

CDSS continues to collaborate with Tribal STAR (Successful Transitions to Adult Readiness) regarding ILP policies and outreach to California tribes. The intent of Tribal STAR is to ensure that Native foster youth are connected to culture, community and resources as they successfully transition to adulthood. The program provides interdisciplinary training for providers who work with Native foster youth. In addition, communities are offered technical assistance to aid them as they work to build collaborative relationships and implement the training. Years one and two of this five-year program focused on developing a curriculum and providing training for supervisors and frontline workers in southern California to enhance their competency in working with Native foster youth. During years four and five statewide training will be provided with ongoing technical assistance being provided to the communities that were trained in years two and three. Year five will be devoted to training MSW students throughout the state.

The training consultant for Tribal STAR worked for many years as an ILP service provider at the county level. She is a strong proponent of working collaboratively with the state and Tribes to offer ILP services to youth in their communities. Her efforts, in partnership with tribal representatives, have resulted in the provision of ILP services on the Rincon Reservation in San Diego County.

In the Annual ILP Narrative Report and Plan counties are required to report on the provision of services to Indian youth. Counties report that Indian youth receive the same services as all eligible youth. Counties with higher populations of Tribal foster youth report that they work with the county ICWA worker to assist in connecting youth to Tribal leaders/members. Some counties work with specific organizations such as Indian health clinics and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. A small number of counties report working directly with tribes.

5) Describe the objective criteria the State uses for determining eligibility for Independent Living Program benefits and services, including the process for developing the criteria.

Youth who are eligible to receive ILP services are those youth whose placement meets the federal definition of foster care: "24-hour substitute care for children placed away from their parents or guardians and for whom the state agency has placement and care responsibility." Youth who are or were 16 years of age, and expected to remain in care up to the age of 18 are eligible for services. In addition, youth who

were 16 years of age up to 18 years of age and in receipt of Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment Program (KinGap) funds are eligible for ILP services.

Once eligibility has been determined, ILP participants are individually assessed on their needs in conjunction with the development of the TILP. The TILP is updated every six months or sooner, if necessary. In accordance with Welfare and Institutions Code section 11375, any child in receipt of Kinship Guardianship Assistance Program benefits is eligible to receive ILP services. California maintains state funding of ILP services, in addition to federal ILP funding, in order to meet this need. However, these funds are not included in the state funds that are used as a federal match.

6) Describe how the State ensures fair and equitable treatment of benefit recipients.

ILP regulations are the primary means of ensuring fair and equitable treatment of ILP recipients. California is a county-administered state and as such the provision of the array of services is based on geography, local resources, and the individual needs of youth.

7) Public Comments

Recipients of the Proposed State Plan:

All County Independent Living Program Coordinators
Executive Director, County Welfare Directors Association
Executive Director, California Probation Officers Association
Director, Community College Foundation
Foster Youth Services Program Coordinator, Educational Options Office,
California Department of Education
Chief, Program Support Branch, California Department of Health Services
President, California Foster Parent Association
President, California State Care Providers Association
Executive Director, California Youth Connection
Tribal representatives

Annual Budget Request & Summary

Placeholder for Budget info

Placeholder for Budget info

Placeholder for Budget info

Disaster Plan

Disaster Plan

The State of California's Office of Emergency Services' Emergency Plan (Part Two Attachment A, B and C.) incorporates the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) in their overall disaster plan. The plan can be viewed at the following website <http://www.oes.ca.gov/Operational/OESHome.nsf/LevelTwoWithNav?OpenForm&Key=Plans+and+Publications>

In addition to the State's emergency plan the CDSS' Disaster Services Section is responsible for supporting counties' mass care and shelter programs in California and State and Federal grant recovery programs for individuals and households. These program responsibilities are delegated to the Department by an Administrative Order from the Governor's Office of Emergency Services, issued under the authority of Executive Order W-9-91.

The CDSS issued All County Letter (ACL 07-30) informing all 58 counties of new federal disaster response requirements. The ACL established that counties are required to incorporate the new federal requirements within their local child welfare plans by September 28, 2007.

The CDSS is moving toward a comprehensive department wide disaster response plan that will incorporate all 58 county child welfare services emergency response plans. Part of that effort will include integration with other departmental programs, protocols and emergency response teams.

All 58 counties were informed per (ACL 07-30) to provide copies of their Child Welfare Services Disaster Response Plans to CDSS by September 14, 2007 and be operational by September 28, 2007.

All county plans will be reviewed to ensure the inclusion of the following new federal requirements on how states would:

- (A) Identify, locate, and continue availability of services for children under State care or supervision who are displaced or adversely affected by a disaster;
- (B) Respond, as appropriate, to new child welfare cases in areas adversely affected by a disaster, and provide services in those cases;
- (C) Remain in communication with caseworkers and other essential child welfare personnel who are displaced because of a disaster;
- (D) Preserve essential program records; and
- (E) Coordinate services and share information with other states."

The CDSS will maintain an electronic and paper copy of all Child Welfare Services Disaster Response Plans. An electronic copy of the county plans will be placed on the Department's website at <http://www.dss.cahwnet.gov/cdssweb/default.htm> which will enable viewing access to all counties. The CDSS will also request an annual updated plan from each county.

Community Care licensing regulations require children, adult and elderly residential care facilities, and adult day programs to notify their local licensing office immediately or within one working day (80061, 87561, 87861) of any disaster that threatens the health and safety of facility clients. To ensure that community care facilities are able to respond appropriately in

the event of a disaster, licensees are also required to develop and maintain a current and well practiced Emergency Disaster Plan (LIC 610C, 610D, 610E.) Facility plans must be developed accordingly to regulatory requirements (Title 22, Division 6, Section, 80023, 87223, 87823).

The CDSS' Community Care Licensing Programs, providers of placement services maintain safety and disaster response protocols as licensees.

Children placed with non-licensed substitute caregivers fall under the same requirements as set forth in the regulations for the licensing of foster family homes (Welfare and Institutions Code, Section 361.45).

Once emergency response plans have been submitted and reviewed the CDSS will collaborate with other programs within the Department to develop and/or coordinate the use of a toll free number that counties could access in the event of an emergency.

The Departmental contact is Frank Sanchez, Bureau Chief – Adoptions Services Bureau. Mr. Sanchez can be reached at Department of Social Services, 744 P Street, MS 3-31, Sacramento, CA 95814-5512 or at 916-651-8089. An alternate contact is Patricia Roth, Manager - Adoptions Services Bureau. Ms. Roth can be reached at Department of Social Services, 744 P Street MS 3-31, Sacramento, CA 95814-5512 or at 916-651-8089.

California's Collaboration with the Courts in the Implementation of the Child and Family Services Plan

California's Collaboration with the Courts in the Implementation of the Child and Family Services Plan

The Children and Family Services Division (CFSD) of the CDSS plays a vital role in the development of policies and programs that implement the goals of CDSS' mission. In developing policies and programs, the Division collaborates with other state and local agencies, tribal representatives, foster/kinship caregivers, foster youth, foster care service providers, community-based organizations, the Judicial Council, researchers, child advocates, the Legislature and private foundations to maximize families' opportunities for success. This section will discuss CDSS' numerous collaboration efforts with the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), the staff agency of the Judicial Council, which has policy-making authority over the state court system.

The AOC is based in San Francisco and maintains three regional offices. Chief Justice Ronald M. George serves as chair of the Judicial Council. William C. Vickrey is the Administrative Director of the Courts, and Ronald G. Overholt is the Chief Deputy Director. Under the direction of the Chief Justice and the council, the AOC serves the courts for the benefit of all Californians by advancing excellence, leadership, and service in the administration of justice. The AOC also serves as a major source of input for the Judicial Council's strategic planning efforts.

There are several interagency teams, commissions or other efforts that include both CDSS and the AOC. One important team that addresses a multitude of issues is the State Interagency Team (SIT). Not only has the SIT continued to increase the number of agencies participating, it has also continued work on a variety of issues that impact children and families. The SIT is chaired by the CDSS, and is comprised of representatives overseeing programs effecting children from departments within the California Health and Human Services Agency (CHHS), such as the California Department of Health Services, the California Department of Mental Health, the California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs and the California Department of Developmental Services. In addition to those agencies, the California Department of Education, the California Employment Development Department, the California First 5 Commission, the California Workforce Investment Board, the California Department of Justice, the Judicial Council/Administrative Office of the Courts, and the Foundation Consortium also participated. A recent addition to the team is a representative from the Office of the Chancellor for California Community Colleges.

The SIT priority work plan objectives for calendar years 2006-07, which involve collaboration with the AOC/Judicial Council, are described in an earlier section. These include decrease racial disproportionality and disparities in outcomes across systems with a focus on CWS; sharing data across systems; improve access to AOD services by families in the child welfare system; and to overcome real and perceived legal barriers to sharing "confidential" client information in order to strengthen services.

The SIT has created work groups to achieve several of its 2006-07 objectives, which include the following:

The Alcohol and Other Drug (AOD) Workgroup is comprised of representatives from the Departments of Alcohol and Drug Programs, Health Services, Mental Health, CDSS,

Education, Developmental Services, AOC and California's First 5 Commission. In 2006, the Work Group results included improving the collection of data on substance abuse by families in the child welfare, health and education systems; and assisting counties in estimating substance abuse treatment needs for child welfare families. They also developed a county survey of AOD screening protocols and tools to determine promising practices and recommendations for improving screening and referral. This survey is underway and recommendations are due to the SIT in June 2007.

The Work Group to Eliminate Disparities is comprised of representatives from the Departments of Alcohol and Drug Program, Health Services, Mental Health, CDSS, Education, Developmental Services, AOC and the Annie E. Casey Foundation. Their focus for 2007 is addressing racial disproportionality in CWS through their participation as the state level team in the California Disproportionality Project, which is co-sponsored by the CDSS, the Annie E. Casey Foundation and Casey Family Programs through the California Co-Investment Partnership. The goal is to launch this initiative in Fall 2007, which, in addition to the state level team, will include approximately up to 14 county CWS agencies and involve their community and interagency partners. As the state level team, the Work Group will develop recommendations to the SIT for policy, practice and cross system changes to reduce the disproportionate representation of children of color in the CWS, as well as to improve outcomes for children and families of color across the state of California.

The Core Indicator Workgroup has been charged with developing a state enriched core set of indicators of child and family well-being for the California Outcomes and Accountability System. This includes recommendations for the potential use of outcome data from systems other than child welfare, such as health, education, substance abuse treatment, etc. The CDSS is leading the workgroup, and the Departments of Health Services, Mental Health, Education, Developmental Services, and Alcohol and Drug Programs and the AOC are participating.

Another collaborative effort is the Blue Ribbon Commission on Children in Foster Care. The Commission began meeting in 2006 to begin a study of one of the most critical issues facing the justice system – the need to quickly secure safe and permanent homes for California's children. Appointed by Chief Justice Ronald M. George, the representative Commission, chaired by California Supreme Court Justice Carlos R. Moreno, is made up of judges (including a tribal judge), legislators, attorneys, representatives from CDSS, county social services and probation representatives, former foster youth, community leaders and others. They are exploring the causes and consequences of court-based delays and are in the process of making some recommendations on how to improve the ability of courts to move children quickly out of foster care and into permanency. An update of their activities this year is contained in the Permanency section. Recently the Commission worked closely with representatives from CDSS and the Center for Social Services Research to draft quantitative performance measures for the juvenile court. The final report and recommendations of the Commission will be launched in March 2008.

The CDSS also collaborates with the AOC/Judicial Council pertaining to the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA). The Judicial Council of California-Administrative Office of the Courts supports CDSS' commitment to the full implementation of ICWA by providing technical assistance to county child welfare and probation staff, judges, judicial staff and county counsels on the requirements of the Act. The AOC will develop protocols to assure complete

understanding of ICWA and will facilitate education by a broad-based group of subject matter experts on a statewide, regional and local basis. The ICWA Full Compliance Project will improve compliance with the ICWA by making available a range of cross discipline facilitation and education services provided by the AOC staff and outside consultants. These services will be tailored to meet the needs of the local county or region.

Another example of collaborative effort with the courts is the Dependency Drug Courts (DDC). The DDC monitor families who are involved with the child welfare system and for whom substance abuse is a significant issue. Since 2004, the CDSS has provided technical assistance and staff support to the Judicial Council's Collaborative Justice Advisory Committee and to local efforts to test and disseminate these practices. With the Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs, the CDSS is planning the next phases of DDC expansion and evaluation of prospective data. Approximately 20 additional counties will be funded under the expansion.

The DDC oversees compliance with the law, protection and permanency planning for children and therapeutic interventions for individuals with substance abuse problems. In California and in other states, dependency drug courts have been determined to have important positive effects on child welfare case outcomes.

An additional collaborative endeavor is the Dependency Court Improvement Project (CIP) of the Administrative Office of the Courts, Center for Families, Children & the Courts (CFCC) is developing a local Self-Assessment and Court Improvement project for California Juvenile Dependency Courts. CDSS is providing technical assistance to the project through quarterly meetings with CIP staff and its participation on the Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee.

Using a process designed by the CFCC, local courts will be encouraged to assess their dependency policies and operations around the key topics identified by the *2005 Dependency Court Improvement Program Reassessment* as deficiencies or areas in need of further study. The self-assessment tools—modeled on tools developed by CFCC's Domestic Violence Safety Partnership (DVSP) program— will include sections for assessing compliance with state and federal mandates, as well as adherence to best practice standards from the *Resource Guidelines* and elsewhere.

Topic areas for self-assessment will include the detention hearing, collaboration including court participation in the CFSR, notice and the Indian Child Welfare Act. Courts will choose specific areas of improvement, create a local court improvement plan that addresses these areas and set measurable outcomes for improvement. The CFCC's CIP will facilitate the development of these plans, monitor the progress of the plans and report non-confidential outcomes as part of the CIP report. CIP will also coordinate CFCC's dependency-related training and technical assistance resources to assist the courts in carrying out their plans. CDSS' role in the Project is to offer technical assistance as requested, as well as having a staff member from CDSS as a part of the small working group.

Further, the Court Improvement Program (CIP) staff has attended all the joint meetings on the upcoming Child and Family Services Review, and is planning to coordinate the input of the California judiciary to the Statewide Self Assessment. CDSS staff attended the national Court Improvement Program meeting in June 2006 as part of a team including the CIP staff and a

California judge, and used the meeting to plan California's coordination of efforts during the CIP. The CIP is entering into an interagency agreement with CDSS to use the CFSR data resources to provide data on safety and permanency outcomes for children specifically to judicial officers to further their involvement in the state's Outcomes and Accountability project. The CIP staff is also coordinating the input of CDSS and CWS/CMS designers into the upcoming California Court Case Management System to align data elements, reduce duplication, enhance information sharing and follow a common schema of performance measurement.

Technical assistance for judges, as well as dependency and delinquency court stakeholder groups was provided under the provisions of the Judicial Review and Technical Assistance (JRTA) contract, during this past fiscal year. A JRTA half time staff attorney coordinated and staffed court/county collaborative workshops in California's largest counties. The agenda for each workshop was developed through feedback from the dependency court judicial officers regarding obstacles and challenges to permanency, in their respective counties. Each agenda included promising practices in permanency issues, such as: finding life-long connections for youth, engaging youth in dependency process, concurrent planning, prioritizing permanency for youth, ADR methods, Family to Family models, termination of parental rights and adoption. Each court or county collaborative was able to identify and share key county programs which they either sought to strengthen or initiate.

The JRTA attorney will continue to provide technical assistance and training related to permanency through continued research, development of curriculum and maintaining relationships with local, state and national experts. Future technical assistance and training will focus on working collaboratively with dependency and delinquency court judges and county agencies in the areas of ILP, transitional housing and finding connections. In addition to expanding these services to delinquency court system stakeholders, they will be made available statewide as resources permit.

The AOC/Judicial Counsel also collaborates with CDSS in the statewide Citizen's Review Panel (CRP). The function of CRPs is to evaluate the effectiveness with which state and local child protection agencies are discharging their responsibilities. Evaluation involves examining child protection policies, practices, and procedures. Recommendations are then made to county and state governments for improvement. The membership draws from child advocates, parent leaders, tribal leaders, foundation officers, county mental health managers, county counsels, foster parents, tribal members, foster youth, social workers, and the Judicial Council. Membership is also geographically diverse with representatives from both metropolitan and rural counties in all parts of California.

Each year the panel reviews, provides information, and comments upon the Annual Progress and Services Report (APSR), which updates the Title IV-B Child and Family Services plan prior its submission to Region IX of the Administration for Children and Families.

Lastly, representatives of the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) are participating on the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) writing team in the drafting of the Statewide Self-Assessment. During the last CFSR, AOC staff assisted as onsite case reviewers and it is anticipated that they will be doing so again.

The CDSS has enjoyed a long and productive collaboration with the AOC and plans to continue the efforts in the future.

Training & Technical Assistance Provided

Request for Training & Technical Assistance

Request for Training and Technical Assistance

As noted throughout the Annual Progress and Services Report, there are instances in which we believe the state would benefit from the training and technical assistance offered through Region IX, either directly provided by the staff, or through a National Resource Center (NRC).

The CDSS continues to monitor counties' progress on their system improvement plans related to a number of areas, such as safety, concurrent planning, etc. Counties in the process of updating their SIPs or who undergo a peer quality case review may identify issues in which they would desire technical assistance. We anticipate in the coming year that some counties will request technical assistance from the National Resource Centers (NRC) through CDSS on a variety of issues. The CDSS issued an All County Information Notice outlining the process by which counties could request training and technical assistance, and continues to encourage counties to use the services offered by the NRCs.

The California plan for training and technical assistance offered through Region IX, either directly provided by the staff, or through a NRC was submitted to Region IX in 2007. A copy of the plan is included in this section.

Training and Technical Assistance

Also included in this section is a list of entities, in addition to CDSS, that provide training and technical assistance to counties through contracts and other means.

Training and technical assistance is provided to California counties through contracts and also directly by California Department of Social Services (CDSS). Training and technical assistance has also been provided by the following groups:

- Administration for Children and Families, Region IX;
- Annie E. Casey Foundation with CDSS (providing a “convening/training” around topics such as recruitment/training and retention of foster parent, youth permanence and disproportionality);
- California Connected by 25 Initiative (supported by the Anne E. Casey Foundation, the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, the Charles M. Schwab Foundation, the Stuart Foundation and the Walter S. Johnson Foundation);
- California Permanency for Youth Project (through the Public Health Institute) is supported by a five-year grant awarded by the Stuart Foundation;
- CalWORKS/Child Welfare Partnership Project or Linkages;
- Child Abuse Training and Technical Assistance (CATT);

- Citizen Review Panels (Alameda, Calaveras, Kern, Napa and San Mateo counties);
- Connecticut Department of Mental Health and U.C. Berkeley (Supporting Fatherhood Involvement Study);
- Eastfield Ming Quong Family Partnership Institute (EMQ-FPI);
- Family and Juvenile Law Advisory Committee;
- Family Support Training Model/Family Resource and Support Training and Technical Assistance Project (“Strategies”);
- Interstate Compact on Adoption and Medical Assistance (ICAMA) Training;
- Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC) Training
- Judicial Council through the California’s Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) Initiative (100% general fund)
- Judicial Council’s Collaborative Justice Advisory Committee;
- Judicial Review and Technical Assistance (JRTA) ;
- Kinship Support Services Program (KSSP) ;
- Mental Health Services Act – Wraparound Services;
- National Council on Crime and Delinquency/Children’s Research Center’s SafeMeasures Reporting Service;
- National Resource Center for Child Protective Services;
- National Resource Center for Organizational Improvement (NRCOI);
- Parents Anonymous Inc.;
- Perinatal Substance Abuse/HIV infant Program (formerly Options for Recovery Perinatal Program);
- Small County Initiative II ;
- Specialized Training for Adoptive Parents (STAP);
- Statewide Citizen Review Panel;

- Strategies: Family Resource Center and Family Support Program Training and Technical Assistance. Strategies is comprised of three non-profit organizations: Youth for Change/Paradise Ridge FRC in Butte County (Region 1), Interface Children Family Services in Ventura County (Region 2) and the Children's Bureau of Southern California (Region 3);
- Structured Decision Making ;
- The Breakthrough Series Collaborative (BSC) and the Peer technical Assistance Teams;
- The Child and Family Policy Institute of California;
- The Court Improvement Project: Self-Assessment for California Juvenile Dependency Courts;
- The Dependency Court Improvement Project (CIP) of the Administrative Office of the Courts Center for Families, Children and the Courts (CFCC);
- The Promotion Safe and Stable Families Program, including the Peer Technical Assistance ;
- Tribal STAR; and
- University of California, Berkeley- Performance Indicators/California Children's Services Archive.

Describe the Training/ Technical Assistance Request	Branch	Timeframe When and # of Days (Estimated)	The need for T/TA is related to the following: (Check the appropriate subject)	Additional Information	National Resource Center/Regional Office Contact
Technical assistance for the implementation of the State's first Tribal agreement with the Karuk Tribe of California.	CPFSB (Susan Nisenbaum/ Teresa Contreras)	Request submitted 4 days	<input type="checkbox"/> PIP <input type="checkbox"/> CIP <input type="checkbox"/> CFSP <input type="checkbox"/> Data Issues <input type="checkbox"/> SACWIS/AFCARS) <input type="checkbox"/> Other needs (specify) <input type="checkbox"/> CFSR <input type="checkbox"/> Federal Requirements <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Social Security Act that requires Tribes to secure agreements with states in order to receive the pass through of Title IV-E funding	The T/TA will help the state build a framework from which to implement future Tribal-State agreements (we have others pending). This will also help the State facilitate the implementation of these agreements at the local level, helping build relationships with tribes and counties which will be essential to the success of the tribes in operating their child welfare services system.	Child Welfare Policy & Program Development Bureau has discussed this request with Pat Pianko and she has discussed this with Peter Watson of the NRC for Organizational Improvement.
Consultation from NRC regarding the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) data composites and analysis.	CSOEB (Glenn Freitas/Ellie Jones)	June 07 Qtr 2 days	<input type="checkbox"/> PIP <input type="checkbox"/> CIP <input type="checkbox"/> CFSP <input type="checkbox"/> Data Issues <input type="checkbox"/> SACWIS/AFCARS) <input type="checkbox"/> Other needs (specify) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CFSR <input type="checkbox"/> Federal Requirements <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Consultation is needed to assist with understanding the data composites and extraction methodology for the purposes of replication and ongoing monitoring of the state's performance.	CFSD has not spoken with any NRC. However, the NRC for Child Welfare data and Technology would be the likely choice.

Describe the Training/ Technical Assistance Request	Branch	Timeframe When and # of Days (Estimated)	The need for T/TA is related to the following: (Check the appropriate subject)	Additional Information	National Resource Center/Regional Office Contact
Follow-up consultation to build upon and support the technical assistance provided to the State on April 18 and June 9, 2006. This follow-up is essential since all key management positions within the Division will be filled by January 2007.	CFSD (Mary Ault/Greg Rose)	June 07 Qtr 3 days	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PIP <input type="checkbox"/> CIP <input type="checkbox"/> CFSP <input type="checkbox"/> Data Issues <input type="checkbox"/> SACWIS/AFCARS) <input type="checkbox"/> Other needs (specify) <input type="checkbox"/> CFSR <input type="checkbox"/> Federal Requirements <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other	The consultation and recommendation given by Peter Watson will contribute to the organizational structure of the Children and Family Services Division (CFSD), which will build capacity and efficiency in regards to the State's priority of safety, permanency, and well-being of children.	NRC for Organizational Improvement has been working with the CFSD on this T/TA.
Technical Assistance regarding general CAPTA requirements. Including TA for the Statewide Citizen Review Panel	CPFBSB (Susan Nisenbaum/ Linda Hockman)	June 07 Qtr 1 day Sept 07 Qtr 1 day	<input type="checkbox"/> PIP <input type="checkbox"/> CIP <input type="checkbox"/> CFSP <input type="checkbox"/> Data Issues <input type="checkbox"/> SACWIS/AFCARS) <input type="checkbox"/> Other needs (specify) <input type="checkbox"/> CFSR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Federal Requirements <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Consultation and overview is needed to train new State lead on CAPTA.	CFSD has not spoken with any NRC.
Assess the current structure of California's Training System and provide technical assistance to identify areas of improvement and quality assurance.	CPFBSB (Susan Nisenbaum/ Linne Stout)	June 07 Qtr 2-3 days	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PIP <input type="checkbox"/> CIP <input type="checkbox"/> CFSP <input type="checkbox"/> Data Issues <input type="checkbox"/> SACWIS/AFCARS) <input type="checkbox"/> Other needs (specify) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CFSR <input type="checkbox"/> Federal Requirements <input type="checkbox"/> Other	A quality training system will help to provide and support statewide training of Child Welfare Workers, Supervisors, and Juvenile Probation Officers, which will support the State's commitment of successful outcomes of safety, permanency, and well-being for children.	NRC for Organizational Improvement – CFSD has not spoken with any NRC.

Describe the Training/ Technical Assistance Request	Branch	Timeframe When and # of Days (Estimated)	The need for T/TA is related to the following: (Check the appropriate subject)	Additional Information	National Resource Center/Regional Office Contact
Technical Assistance regarding CAPTA requirements for 0-3 children.	CPFBSB (Susan Nisenbaum/ Linne Stout)	June 07 Qtr 2-3 days	<input type="checkbox"/> PIP <input type="checkbox"/> CIP <input type="checkbox"/> CFSP <input type="checkbox"/> Data Issues <input type="checkbox"/> SACWIS/AFCARS) <input type="checkbox"/> Other needs (specify) <input type="checkbox"/> CFSR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Federal Requirements <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Preliminary consultation is needed with the Regional Office and NRC for Organizational Improvement to discuss quality improvement/assurance strategies.	NRC for Child Protective Services – CFSD has not spoken with any NRC.
Technical Assistance regarding PSSF requirements.	CYP (Karen Gunderson/ Linda Shill)	June 07 Qtr 1-2 days	<input type="checkbox"/> PIP <input type="checkbox"/> CIP <input type="checkbox"/> CFSP <input type="checkbox"/> Data Issues <input type="checkbox"/> SACWIS/AFCARS) <input type="checkbox"/> Other needs (specify) <input type="checkbox"/> CFSR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Federal Requirements <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Consultation is needed to implement new requirements for required social worker visits and to discuss quality improvement strategies for the coordination and use of PSSF funds.	CFSD has not spoken with any NRC.
Technical Assistance regarding foster care rate setting methodologies in other states, including the benefits and/or disadvantages, etc.	Foster Care & Rates (Barbara Eaton/ Sheilah Dupuy)	Sept 07 Qtr 3-4 days	<input type="checkbox"/> PIP <input type="checkbox"/> CIP <input type="checkbox"/> CFSP <input type="checkbox"/> Data Issues <input type="checkbox"/> SACWIS/AFCARS) <input type="checkbox"/> Other needs (specify) <input type="checkbox"/> CFSR <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Federal Requirements <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Rate setting systems help support family home care type providers in achieving successful outcomes of safety, permanency, and well-being for children. Consultation is needed to understand the various types of methodologies available especially with respect to therapeutic foster care models.	CFSD has not spoken with any NRC.

FFY 2007 Quarters:

- Oct – Dec 06
- Jan – Mar 07
- Apr – Jun 07
- Jul – Sep 07

Title IV-B, Subpart 1

Title IV-B, Subpart 1 Funds

During Federal Fiscal Year 2008, the services and activities to be funded using Title IV-B, subpart 1 funds are described in pages 12 through about page 139. These funds represent a small part of the total funding used to fund child welfare services activities in counties. No FY 2004 and FY 2005 title IV-B, subpart 1 funds were expended for child care, foster care maintenance, or adoption assistance payments during FY 2005. The amount of non-Federal funds expended by California for FFY 2005 for foster care maintenance is \$ 388,214,602.

As described in detail on these pages, there are a myriad of prevention services being provided for at-risk children, services to children and families in-home, and services to emancipated youth and youth in out-of-home care. Counties have also trained staff in family engagement, and engaged community partners, families and youth in planning and implementation of family engagement strategies. County social workers and probation officers are being trained in a variety of subjects as well as professionally developed, as described in the training section.

As outlined in these pages, California provides child welfare services which are directed toward protecting and promoting the welfare of all children, including handicapped, homeless and dependent children. We provide services preventing, remedying or assisting in the resolution of problems that contribute to the exploitation or delinquency of children. Services preventing the unnecessary removal of children are provided by identifying family needs; by assisting families in resolving those issues that lead to child abuse and neglect; by reunifying families whose children have been removed, and by providing necessary services to the children and their families to enable them to reunify as quickly as possible while maintaining the safety of the children. Finally, we assure permanence for dependent children, who cannot be returned home, by promoting the timely adoption, guardianship or alternative permanent placement for these children through services provided.

Glossary

Glossary

10-Largest Counties

The 10 counties which, in aggregate, contain 60% of the child welfare services caseload in California. These counties are: Alameda, Fresno, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco and San Mateo.

Consolidated Home Study

Our current system licenses foster parents, and if a foster parent decides that they wish to adopt a foster child they have in their home, a separate process called an adoptive home study is completed. The consolidated home study is a one-time study that would certify families for foster care and/or adoption, and would facilitate concurrent planning.

Differential Response (DR)

Differential Response is a new intake structure that responds differentially to all the referrals of child abuse and neglect made to county hotlines/intake in order to support families and reduce the number of placements of children in out-of-home care. Each referral will be evaluated in terms of statutory definitions for child welfare system (CWS) involvement for immediate safety considerations; for the choice of a response time for the initial face to face interview and for the path of response. Some referrals will be screened out as not appropriate for CWS. Others will be referred to a community network of response (after permission from the parents/caretakers is granted), and still other referrals will be opened for CWS face to face assessment.

Some CWS face to face assessments will be done without anticipating court involvement, but with the expectation that the family will be engaged to participate in services to protect the children and strengthen parental protective capacity as well as child and family well-being. Some initial assessments will be handled by CWS alone, and some by a team including CWS and partner agencies from the community. The purpose of this initial assessment is to understand what is going on within the family, what has to be done immediately to assure child safety and to engage the family in services to support parental responsibilities. All families not screened out will receive a comprehensive assessment as to their needs. This may be done by the community network of services and supports or by CWS – alone or in partnership with team members.

Fairness and Equity In the Child Welfare Services System

Fairness and Equity in the child welfare services system is characterized by:

- families whose children enter foster care who are treated the same regardless of race or ethnicity;
- children's lengths of stay in foster care are not related to their race or ethnicity;
- children's rates of reunification with their birth families are the same regardless of race or ethnicity; and
- services are culturally competent and available in the languages of the families served.

The Family to Family Initiative

The Annie E. Casey Foundation, in consultation with community leaders and child welfare practitioners nationwide, developed a reform initiative called Family to Family. Family to Family was designed in 1992 and has now been field tested in sixty communities nationwide. Family to Family is in a total of seventeen states, including Arizona, Alaska, Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, Colorado, North Carolina, Georgia, New York (New York City), Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, New Mexico, Oregon, Tennessee, Washington and California.

The Family to Family Initiative provides an opportunity for communities to better screen children being considered for removal from home, to determine what services might be provided to safely preserve the family and/or what the needs of the children are; be targeted to bring children in congregate or institutional care back to their neighborhoods; involve foster families as team members in family reunification efforts; become a neighborhood resource for children and families and invest in the capacity of communities from which the foster care population comes; and provide permanent families for children in a timely manner.

Family to Family is comprised of four core strategies: Recruiting, Training and Supporting Resource Families; Building Community Partnerships; Team Decision Making and Self Evaluation. The Annie E. Casey Foundation's role has been to assist states and communities with a portion of the costs involved in both planning and implementing innovations in their systems of services for children and families, and to make available technical assistance and consultation throughout the process. The Foundation also provided funds for development and for transitional costs that accelerate system change. The states, however, have been expected to sustain the changes they implement when Foundation funding comes to an end.

Counties in California presently participating in the Family to Family Initiative are: Alameda, Contra Costa, Fresno, Glenn, Humboldt, Kern, Los Angeles, Monterey, Orange, Placer, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Francisco, San Diego, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Santa Barbara, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano, Stanislaus, Tehama, Trinity and Ventura.

Peer Quality Case Reviews (PQCR)

The PQCR is an extension of the county's self assessment process and is guided by questions raised by the analysis of outcome data and systemic factors.

The goal of the PQCR is to analyze specific practice areas and to identify key patterns of agency strengths and concerns for the host county. The PQCR process uses peers from other counties to promote the exchange of best practice ideas within the host county and to peer reviewers. The peer reviewers provide objectivity to the process and serve as an immediate onsite training resource to the host county.

Permanence

Permanence is the maintenance and/or establishment of enduring family attachments. This includes a broad array of individualized permanency options for all children and youth, including Reunification, Adoption, Legal Guardianship and alternative permanent living arrangements, to promote their safety, permanence and well-being.

Pilot Counties

The 11 pilot counties are counties that volunteered to implement the child welfare system improvements (Standardized Safety Assessment System, Differential Response and Permanency and Youth Transitions). These counties are Contra Costa, Glenn, Humboldt, Los Angeles, Placer, Sacramento, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Stanislaus, Tehama and Trinity.

Quarterly Reports

Each quarter, the state provides county child welfare agencies with county-specific data on outcome measures related to safety, permanency and well-being. These quarterly reports provide counties with quantitative data and serve as a management tool to track performance over time. The quarters are defined as:

1st Quarter: January – March

2nd Quarter: April - June

3rd Quarter: July - September

4th Quarter: October - December

Risk, Safety and Needs Assessments

After the initial face-to-face assessment, there will be subsequent meetings with the family to do a comprehensive assessment of strengths and needs, parental protective capacity, ongoing risks and continued review of safety plans. If safety is a continuing concern and the case is being handled by the community network, the agency will re-refer the case to CWS. The nature of the case plan that emerges from the comprehensive assessment will differ based on what has to be done to assure safety, what the goals are for the case, and who should be involved in promoting the necessary changes within the family. The tools for the comprehensive assessment will apply for both in-home and out-of-home cases.

Safety assessments will be done at multiple times during the life of a case. The first face-to-face assessment will be done when direct information is gathered as to the current safety and risk. Based on this initial assessment, safety plans will be put into place immediately, as needed. By gathering information as to the concerns about the protection of the child, by exploring the protective capacity of the parents, and by preliminarily identifying needs for services, the worker will address risk. As the case moves forward to comprehensive assessment and service planning, a more thorough understanding will be obtained of family strengths and needs, as well as changes that must be made to assure the ongoing safety and protection of the child. Services and resources will be evaluated as to their effectiveness in reducing risk and in making an impact towards the needed changes. Decisions on case closure will also address safety, risk and whether necessary changes to assure child safety have been made.

Team Decision-Making (TDM)

A meeting of key stakeholders in the child's case specifically used to determine placement decisions. The meetings are always facilitated by a trained facilitator.