

**Building the Child Welfare Team:  
Results of the 2003 Adoption and Safe Families Act Phone Poll**

**September 2003**

**Funded by:  
The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services  
Administration for Children and Families  
Children's Bureau  
Washington, DC**

**Project Team:  
Susan Kanak  
Mary Colombo  
Kathleen Fox  
Emily Sawyer**

**University of Southern Maine  
Edmund S. Muskie School of Public Service  
Institute for Child and Family Policy  
P.O. Box 15010  
Portland, ME 04112-5010  
Website: <http://www.muskie.usm.maine.edu/asfa>  
207.780.5840**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....	2
ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT .....	3
<b>RESULTS .....</b>	<b>4</b>
THEMES .....	4
CHILD WELFARE AGENCY POLL RESULTS .....	6
COURT PROJECT POLL RESULTS .....	19
<b>METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>24</b>
CHILD WELFARE AGENCY POLL .....	24
COURT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT POLL .....	25
<b>APPENDIX A. CHILD WELFARE AGENCY POLL – FREQUENCIES .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>APPENDIX B. COURT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT POLL - FREQUENCIES .....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>APPENDIX C: CHILD WELFARE AGENCY - POLL INSTRUMENT .....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>APPENDIX D. COURT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT - POLL INSTRUMENT .....</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>APPENDIX E. CHILD WELFARE AGENCY POLL PARTICIPANTS .....</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>APPENDIX F. COURT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT POLL PARTICIPANTS.....</b>	<b>75</b>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents findings from the third annual phone poll conducted by the Institute for Child and Family Policy at the Edmund S. Muskie School of Public Service, University of Southern Maine as part of a child welfare training grant funded by the Children's Bureau, Administration for Children and Families. The Muskie project team asked child welfare agency and court improvement project representatives to identify how implementing the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) has changed the way that child welfare agencies do business. While many 'promising administrative practices' emerged from the 2003 poll data analysis, five major themes stand out:

- Agencies are enhancing their case review and foster/adoptive parent recruitment systems to reflect the Child and Family Services Reviews (CFSR) findings
- Agencies view ASFA from a 'good practice' perspective and are striving to implement this approach throughout the agency and the child welfare network
- Agencies continue to deliver ASFA training and to integrate ASFA related topics into on-going training, meetings and forums
- Managerial and supervisory skills needed to implement ASFA continue to change while the workers' needed skill set remains steady
- Barriers to the agency's ability to support staff as they implement the requirements of ASFA reflect the economic difficulties agencies continue to face.

Reviewing these themes in conjunction with the comments made by poll respondents provides valuable lessons learned regarding the progress that public child welfare agencies are making in implementing the requirements of ASFA throughout the child protective system.

ASFA mandates regarding the achievement of outcomes and the use of data carry clear expectations for child welfare workers, supervisors and managers. The 2003 phone poll indicates that while agencies are showing significant increases in understanding and implementing the requirements of ASFA, recent retirement incentives and high staff turnover can slow continued progress. Agencies need to do more work to assure that their information system produces information and reports that support and inform managerial and supervisory day to day decision-making. Continued attention is needed to crafting training systems that result in key partners throughout the child protective network having an increased understanding of how to deliver effective, outcomes-based child welfare practice.

Please visit the website for this project (<http://www.muskie.usm.maine.edu/asfa>) to download this report, view a full description of the project and locate individual state by state responses to the 2001- 2003 ASFA phone polls.

## INTRODUCTION

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) of 1997 was passed in response to a growing national concern about the extended periods of time that children spend in foster care. ASFA establishes three goals for child welfare systems--attaining safety, permanency and well being for children in care. Additionally, ASFA requires the development of outcome measures for each goal, defines state reporting on progress toward achieving outcomes and modifies the procedures for federal reviews of public child welfare systems. These requirements, in combination with the mandates of other relevant legislation and regulations, substantially change the way child welfare systems are to be managed.

Federal legislation also provides for the development of three major child welfare data collection systems--NCANDS (National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System), AFCARS (Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Report System) and SACWIS (Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information Systems). It is now possible to use data to evaluate performance in child welfare programs and to establish clear measures of success. However, if these federal mandates and systems are to inform practice, child welfare professionals must put them to use.

To support that aim, the Children's Bureau, Administration for Children and Families, funded the Institute of Child and Family Policy at the Edmund S. Muskie School of Public Service, University of Southern Maine, in collaboration with the Commonwealth of Kentucky Department of Community Based Services, to develop a trainer's guide to support a curriculum that integrates ASFA mandates with the effective use of child welfare data to support decision making at both the case and system levels. This 3-year project, which began in September 2000, is now in its third and final year.

In Year 1 of the project the Muskie project team collaborated with the Kentucky child welfare agency to conduct a phone poll of 47 child welfare agencies and issue a report of the findings, *'Building the Child Welfare Team Promising Practices 2001 Phone Poll Results'*, published in May, 2001, create ASFA implementation competencies and design a core curriculum to train child welfare managers and supervisors on data use and ASFA implementation skills. The curriculum, *'Bringing Together the Child Welfare Team'*, was designed to help child welfare supervisors, managers and senior administrators implement the requirements of ASFA by ensuring that clients needs are assessed quickly, that individualized services are available and delivered promptly and that the agency systems support effective child welfare practice.

In Year 2 the Muskie project team updated the 'promising practices' phone poll and field tested, evaluated and revised the core curriculum in collaboration with: the Commonwealth of Kentucky Department of Community Based Services; the Department of Children, Youth and Families, New Mexico; Cuyahoga County Children and Family Services, Cleveland, Ohio; and the Division of Children and Family Services and the Training Partnerships, Wisconsin. The

'*Bringing Together the Child Welfare Team*' curriculum became available for use by child welfare agencies in the fall of 2002.

In Year 3, the current project year, the project team again updated the 'promising practices' phone poll, sponsored a Training Roundtable Conference to identify best practices and criteria for high performance training systems that support achievement of organizational mission, goals and objectives, provided intensive training of trainers to nine child welfare agencies on the '*Bringing Together the Child Welfare Team*' curriculum and customized the core curriculum into a five set training series and a course syllabus.

## ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

This report, *Building the Child Welfare Team: Results of the 2003 Adoption and Safe Families Act Phone Poll*, presents findings from the third 'promising practices' poll conducted by the Edmund S. Muskie School of Public Service. Project team members polled representatives from 37 child welfare agencies and 4 court improvement projects and asked them to identify the skills staff need to implement ASFA and how meeting the requirements of ASFA has changed the way the agency does business. The report includes:

- The **Executive Summary** which highlights the 2003 poll results
- The **Introduction** which provides a brief description of the curriculum development project and the organization of this report
- The **Results** section which presents the major themes learned from the poll, summarizes the data that we collected and presents remarks from participants that illuminate our findings
- The **Methodology** section which describes how the poll was conducted, the design of the data collection instruments and the approach to data analysis
- The **Appendices** which include documents showing frequencies, samples of the poll instruments and a listing of the individuals who participated in the poll.

The project team will distribute the *Building the Child Welfare Team: Results of the 2003 Adoption and Safe Families Act Phone Poll* report to respondents, child welfare agencies, court improvement projects and other interested entities and publish it on the project website (<http://www.muskie.usm.maine.edu/asfa>). We hope this report provides the child protective community with information and ideas about administrative practices that have proved helpful to individual child welfare agencies as they work to meet the challenge of implementing ASFA. Please visit the website for this project to view or download this report, the 2001 and 2002 poll reports and a full description of the project. Individual state by state poll results from 2001, 2002 and 2003 years can also be found on the project website.

## RESULTS

### THEMES

#### **Agencies are enhancing their case review and foster/adoptive parent recruitment systems to reflect findings emerging from the Child and Family Services Reviews (CFSR)**

The 2002 phone poll found that child welfare agencies were in the midst of preparing for or responding to the Child and Family Services Reviews (CFSR). The results of the 2003 poll show that agencies continue to feel the impact of the CFSR and are implementing changes in systems based on the CFSR findings. Specifically, 27 (73%) of the agencies responding to our poll, have modified their case review process during the past year in response to ASFA and the CFSR. Several agencies mentioned that their case review system is now based on the CFSR model. Additionally, 23 respondents, (62%) have changed their foster/adoptive parent recruitment process during the last year. Mentioned changes include: involving the business community in supporting and participating in recruitment efforts, hiring a marketing firm to design a campaign to attract families interested in special needs adoption, focusing on recruiting minority foster homes through ads in Spanish on Spanish radio, working in urban centers with black churches and partnering with Indian tribes to reach those populations and using a foster care mascot, 'Buddy, the Bear', who attends community-based activities and helps make the public aware of the need for foster parents.

#### **Agencies view the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) from a 'good practice' perspective**

Both the 2002 and 2003 ASFA phone poll analyses indicate that child welfare agencies continue to actively implement the provisions of the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA). Agencies tend to view ASFA requirements as 'good practice' and are taking steps, such as joint training, starting interagency workgroups, communicating the shared responsibility for meeting outcomes for children in care and setting up informational websites, to implement this approach throughout the agency and the child protective network. One respondent's comment sums up what many others stated '...case planning and caseworker contact appear to be key to positive outcomes in implementing requirements of both ASFA and CFSR'.

#### **Agencies continue to deliver ASFA training and to integrate ASFA related topics into on-going training, meetings and forums**

Of the 37 child welfare agencies surveyed in 2003, 33 (89%) reported that their agency continued to provide ASFA training to their staff during the last year. The most frequently mentioned training topics were ASFA requirements, time frames for reunification, concurrent planning and permanency issues. Agency training unit staff continue to be mentioned most frequently (n =25 or 68% of states responding) as delivering the training. The percent of respondents reporting that ASFA training was incorporated into other training increased from 59% in 2002 to 76% in 2003. There was also an increase in the percent reporting ASFA training was incorporated into new worker training, from 51% in 2002 to 65% in 2003.

24 agencies (65%) continue to do ASFA related training with or for the courts on topics such as permanency issues, legal issues, ASFA requirements, timeframes for reunification and reasonable efforts. Fewer agencies, however, report doing ASFA related training with other partners in the child welfare network; agencies report doing ASFA related training for tribes (27%), mental health (19%) and health care (14%) providers, community stakeholders (11%) and schools (8%).

**The managerial and supervisory skills needed to implement ASFA continue to change while the workers' needed skill set remains steady**

Interestingly in the 2001 poll, 'casework' was the key skill respondents said was needed by managers, supervisors and workers to implement ASFA. The results of the 2002 poll show that while 'casework' remains the 1<sup>st</sup> ranked skill for workers, 'understanding the requirements of ASFA' is ranked number one for managers and 'communication' is ranked first for supervisors. In the 2003 phone poll, 'using data effectively' was number one for managers, 'collaboration' and 'understanding how to implement ASFA' tied for 1<sup>st</sup> for supervisors and 'casework' remained number one for workers.

**Barriers to the agency's ability to support staff as they implement the requirements of ASFA reflect the economic difficulties agencies continue to face**

Barriers to the agency's support for staff as they implement the requirements of ASFA were similar in 2002 and 2003. In the 2003 poll, over three-quarters of the state respondents mentioned lack of resources, staff turnover and heavy workload as barriers to staff support as they implement ASFA. In contrast, in 2001 agencies mentioned lack of resources, difficult relationship with the courts, staff turnover and limitations or lack of computer systems most frequently.

## CHILD WELFARE AGENCY POLL RESULTS

### Understanding of ASFA

Respondents were asked to rate their agency's staff in terms of their understanding of ASFA requirements by ranking the level of understanding of managers, supervisors and workers on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being 'poor' and 5 being 'comprehensive'. The average ratings appear below:

Staff	Average Rating		
	2001	2002	2003
Managers	4.08	4.27	4.28
Supervisors	3.62	3.78	4.09
Workers	3.06	3.41	3.41

In terms of understanding of ASFA, managers ranked ahead of supervisors and workers in polls for all three years. All three groups showed an increase in understanding from 2001 to 2002 and 2003 with both supervisors and workers showing a statistically significant increase ( $p < .01$ ) over the three years.

The most frequent comment regarding worker understanding was that high staff turnover affects understanding, reported by 14% ( $n=5$ ) of the respondents. Eight percent ( $n=3$ ) reported that workers had good understanding of some elements, but not others.

In both the 2002 and the 2003 polls we compared how respondents rated 'Understanding of ASFA' by managers, supervisors and workers in states in the initial phases of the CFSR (planning or assessment) to states in the later phases (review completed or working to complete PIP activities). In 2002 there were statistically significant differences between the two groups, with states in the later phases of the CFSR process rating the 'Understanding of ASFA' by managers, supervisors and workers significantly higher than did states in the initial phases. In 2003 there were no statistically significant differences between states in the early and later stages of CFSR. It appears that due to early retirement programs and high turnover, some states gave lower scores to supervisors' and managers' understanding of ASFA, even states in the later phases of the CFSR process.

### Selected Participant Remarks Regarding Understanding of ASFA

We had a huge retirement incentive recently and that had an impact on staff throughout the agency. We have many new county directors who need training on many areas, including ASFA. Many of our supervisors are fairly new and thus weren't part of our early ASFA training and implementation efforts. 50% of our workers have been with us 5 years or less. (AL)

We've had higher turnover on the worker level than with supervisors or managers so some workers know ASFA well while others would ask what ASFA is all about. (CO)

Most child welfare staff who remain in their job for longer periods of time are very knowledgeable. The lower rating is due to high levels of turnover that effect continuity of application of ASFA-related practices. (VA)

### Skills

Respondents were asked to list the skills that managers, supervisors and workers need to have to implement ASFA. The average rank is based on scores between 1 (Do not need it) and 5 (Extremely important). The top skills for each are listed below.

#### Managers' Skills

Skills	2001	2002	2003	
	Ranking	Ranking	Rank	Avg.
Case work	1	5	5	3.73
Collaboration	2	4	4	4.68
Understanding the requirements of ASFA	3	1	3	4.70
Understanding how to implement ASFA requirements	4	3	2	4.76
Using data effectively	5	2	1	4.8

While ‘casework’ was listed as the number one skill needed by managers in the first poll (2001), it was ranked last in both 2002 and 2003. In 2003 ‘using data effectively’ was ranked as the most important skill for managers to have, up from second place in 2002, and ‘understanding how to implement ASFA’ was ranked number 2. However, if rounded to the nearest whole number, all of these skill areas except ‘casework’ average a ranking of ‘5’ – Extremely Important. These differences of less than .1 among these skills indicate that all of these skills are considered very or extremely important for managers to have.

#### Supervisors' Skills

Skills	2001	2002	2003	
	Ranking	Ranking	Rank	Avg.
Case work	1	4	4	4.49
Communication	2	1	3	4.68
Collaboration	3-4	2-3	1-2	4.73
Understanding how to implement ASFA	3-4	2-3	1-2	
Using data effectively	5	5	5	4.38

For supervisors, ‘using data effectively’ continued to be ranked as the least important skill needed to implement ASFA, while ‘collaboration’ and ‘understanding how to implement ASFA’ were ranked first or second by most respondents.

## Workers' Skills

Skills	2001	2002	2003 Ranking	
	Ranking	Ranking	Rank	Avg.
Case work	1	1	1	4.78
Collaboration	2	3	3	4.58
Communication	3	2	2	4.66
Understanding how to implement ASFA	4	4	4	4.32
Using Data Effectively			5	3.7

In the 2003 poll, ‘casework’ continues to be the skill most often mentioned as important to workers’ ability to implement ASFA. The rankings of the remaining areas are the same as in 2002, with a new category for workers, ‘using data effectively,’ ranked least important.

## Administrative Activities

Respondents were asked if, as part of the ASFA implementation, the agency had undertaken any activities during the past year in certain administrative areas. A summary of the responses appears below. Selected remarks by participants, which appear below as well, are very informative regarding the changes made.

Agency structure. Of the 37 states responding to this question, 54% (n=20) had changed agency structure based on ASFA. Thirty-two percent (n=12) had restructured the department or unit, 11% (n=4) added additional staff and 5% (n=2) added new positions.

Internal communication. Of the 37 states responding to this question, 46% (n=17) had undertaken ASFA related activities in the area of internal communication. Thirty-two percent (n=12) reported there was an increase in internal communication, 16% (n=6) reported an increase in communication with field staff, districts, and regions and 14% (n=5) reported an increase in the use of email, internet, and web sites. Activities in internal communication showed a moderate correlation (.365, p<.05) with the ratings of managers’ understanding of ASFA; that is, states who have undertaken these activities also were more likely to rate their managers’ understanding of ASFA more highly.

Performance appraisals. Of the 37 states responding, 24% (n=9) have undertaken ASFA related activities in the area of performance appraisals. Eight percent (n=3) reported they were looking at outcomes as part of the appraisals.

Job descriptions. Of the 37 states responding, 19% (n=7) have changed job descriptions to reflect ASFA. Eight percent (n=3) have ensured that job descriptions reflect ASFA requirements and 8% (n=3) have changed job descriptions while keeping titles the same.

Staff recruitment. Of the 37 states responding, 30% (n=11) have implemented activities in staff recruitment in response to ASFA. Sixteen percent (n=6) had made efforts in the

area of recruitment and retention. Hiring freezes and layoffs, factors that have negatively impact the organization, were mentioned by two agencies.

Case Review. Of the 37 states responding, 73% (n=27) have modified their case review process in response to ASFA and the CFSR. Thirty-five percent (n=13) modified the case review process, while 27% (n=8) implemented a case review process. Eleven percent (n=4) implemented a Quality Assurance review that mirrors the CFSR process.

Foster/Adoptive Parent Recruiting. Of the 37 states responding, 62% (n=23) have changed their foster/adoptive parent recruitment process. Thirty-eight percent (n=14) reported on-going campaigns focused on recruitment, 19% (n=7) reported increased support for foster adoptive parents and 16% (n=6) refined the on-going process of foster/adoptive parent recruiting.

### **Selected Participant Remarks Regarding Changes in Administrative Activities**

We are just starting to see generic statements about supporting ASFA principles in job descriptions. (AL)

Our agency has incorporated the various aspects of ASFA into the normal day- to -day casework practice, case management and our caseworker training curricula. We view the various requirements of ASFA i.e., concurrent planning, termination of parental rights filings, Establishing Permanency within timeframes etc., as good casework practice and management that if incorporated, would help us better serve the needs of vulnerable children of the state and their families as opposed to viewing them as activities separate and distinct from the case work. (AR)

We have increased family involvement in case planning and now relatives must meet the same licensing standards as other care givers. (CA)

We updated our case review instrument to include the ASFA elements. We have increased our foster/adoption services staff by more than 10. (CT)

We were provided funds by our legislature to staff and implement statewide centralized intake and statewide Title IV-E eligibility determination. (HI)

The case plan has been redesigned as a primary tool to assist workers in documenting compliance with ASFA. In addition, a cover letter for court reports prompts the worker and the judge to target ASFA requirements in court determinations. The court improvement project is developing model court orders that will also assist in triggering determinations in compliance with ASFA. (IA)

Our agency has launched a more diligent recruitment campaign which has resulted in more analysis of the pool of foster/adoptive parents. We are using more data in this area. (KY)

We increased the amount of graduate student stipends to allow more staff to go to graduate school and are using IV-E funds for recruitment on campus. (LA)

The Director of Recruitment has expanded the involvement of the business community in supporting and participating in our recruitment efforts. Despite budget cuts, the Department has been able to use television and public events to do recruiting that is focused on the needs of the children in care. This would not have been possible without the collaboration and support of our corporate partners. (MA)

We have taken the case management requirements and embedded them in performance appraisals for managers, supervisors and caseworkers. For example, meeting ASFA deadlines would become part of performance appraisal. (MD)

We have undertaken various efforts involving the media, including radio announcements, use of billboards, transit posters and have begun using private contractors to recruit foster/adoptive parents. (MD)

We have strengthened case reviews; now they are based on the CFSR model. (MN)

We have initiated a new review process where cases are selected at random and reviewed at quarterly supervisory meetings. (MT)

We have expanded the foster care health program. There are now a total of 8 field nurses who serve foster children. (NH)

We have placed a greater emphasis on hiring bi-lingual staff. (NC)

'Buddy, the Bear' is the Division's foster care mascot. Buddy attends community-based activities and helps make the public aware of the need for foster parents. Buddy often gets media attention at events he attends. (NJ)

The department has a marketing contract with a vendor who provides extensive media coverage via print, radio and television to recruit foster and adoptive parents; use of the Ohio Adoption Photo Listing that features children who are available for adoption; Ohio adoption web page; produced and disseminated a smaller more user friendly adoption magazine that features about 40 children; Adoption and Foster Care Conference that is attended by public and private agency staff, foster and adoptive parents. (OH)

Our CQI group continues to perform the internal CFSR process. We are almost ready to release new case review screens to our SACWIS. These screens will mimic CFSR tools and will be available to everyone who has security access. (OK)

An outcomes management function has been established which has resulted in an increase in cases that are being reviewed. Requirements of CFSR and PIP have strengthened case review practice in the field. (SD)

We recently updated the statewide Recruitment Plan to include Faith Based recruitment. (TX)

We have begun to use the CFSR process to review cases. (UT)

The agency received an Adoption Opportunity Grant to hire a marketing firm to design a campaign to attract families interested in special needs adoption. We have started using campaign materials, i.e., print, web page. The agency is also participating in a Casey breakthrough program for recruitment of foster families. (VT)

Our focus has been on recruiting minority foster homes. We put ads in Spanish on Spanish radio, worked in urban centers with black churches and partnered with Indian tribes to reach those populations. (WA)

### Training for Agency Staff

Of the 37 states surveyed in 2003, 89% (n=33) of the respondents reported that their agency continued to provide ASFA training to their staff during the last year. The most frequently mentioned training topics were ASFA requirements (32%), time frames for reunification (27%), concurrent planning (24%), and permanency issues (22%). In terms of methods of training, conducting statewide training sessions on ASFA was mentioned most often for the third year in a row. In 2003, 65% of respondents reported that they conduct statewide training sessions on ASFA. Including ASFA topics as part of in-service training, which rose from 36.2% of the responses in 2001 to 49% in 2002, remained at the 49% response level in 2003. Pre-service training, ranked third, was mentioned by 46% of respondents in 2003.

Training Method	2001 Ranking	2002 Ranking	2003 Ranking
Statewide training sessions on ASFA	1	1	1
Part of regular in-service	2	2	2
Forums on ASFA topics	3	9	8
ASFA discussed at regularly scheduled meeting	4-5	7	7
Managers were trained; then trained others	4-5	5	4
Interactive video training on ASFA topics	6	11	11
Teleconferences on ASFA topics	7-8	8	9-10
Staff attended training given by federal group	7-8	10	9-10
Circulating information about ASFA	9	3	5-6
Pre-service training	-	4	3
Conferences	-	6	5-6

Agency training unit staff continue to be mentioned most frequently (68% of states responding) as delivering the training. Others who were mentioned as providing training included outside consultants (38%), central office staff (38%), state university staff (35%), regional staff (22%), and court staff (19%). These numbers reflect an increase in the use of state university staff from 2003, when 15% of respondents reported using university staff for training. The percent of respondents reporting that ASFA training was incorporated into other training

increased from 59% in 2002 to 76% in 2003. There was also an increase in the percent reporting ASFA training was incorporated into new worker training, from 51% in 2002 to 65% in 2003. Only 11% indicated ASFA training was not incorporated into on-going training, compared to 20% in 2002.

### **Selected Participant Remarks Regarding Training for Agency Staff**

If best practice is followed, ASFA is attended to. Thus, we've done quite a bit of practice training but nothing specifically on ASFA. (AL)

We trained on how case planning leads to outcomes related to ASFA implementation. (KY)

The concepts of ASFA have been incorporated into the training that every social worker hired by the Department receives. (MA)

All new workers receive training on ASFA topics, but the topics are embedded in the curriculum and are part of the training--they are not identified specifically as requirements of ASFA. (MN)

Supervisory staff struggle with the guidelines for TPR under ASFA so we continue to provide training in this area. (MS)

We are totally redoing our training to develop a menu of options depending on the competency needs of the position. The types of training we have offered to date include: Engaging clients, Documentation, Family assessment, Concurrent planning and Risk assessment. The pre-service core training has also been modified to be inclusive of ASFA requirements in case work with clients. (NM)

Our training system is great. It has been knowledge based and now we are adding a focus on transfer of learning so that is what the managers and supervisors are learning. (PA)

### **Training with or for Courts**

Most agencies (65%) continue to do ASFA related training with or for the courts on topics such as permanency issues (24%), legal issues (22%), ASFA (22%), timeframes for reunification (19%) and reasonable efforts (14%). The most frequently mentioned method of training in 2003 was 'Court Improvement Project events are attended by agency staff', reported by 14 of the 37 states (38%). The percent of states using other training methods ranged from 0% (agency published newsletter, ranked 6th) to 35% (agency and court staff working together).

<b>Training Method</b>	<b>2001 Ranking</b>	<b>2002 Ranking</b>	<b>2003 Ranking</b>
Joint training sessions attended by agency and court staff	1	4	4
Agency and court staff working together on the local level	2	1	2
Court Improvement Project events are attended by agency staff	3	2	1
ASFA workgroups comprised of agency and court staff	4-5	5	5
Agency staff have trained court personnel	4-5	3	3
Agency published a newsletter for court staff	6	6	6

### **Training for Other Organizations**

As well as doing training with and for the courts, agencies report doing ASFA related training for tribes (27%), mental health (19%) and health care (14%) providers, schools (8%), foster care providers (5.4%), community stakeholders (11%) judges (5.4%), parents (5.4%), court services (5.4%) and staff in schools of higher education or graduate school (5.4%). One state reported providing training to each of the following groups: child welfare board members, legislators and substance abuse providers.

In 2003, agencies were asked what the number one training need was for their agency and community partners (not just on ASFA). Their primary responses are as follows

<b>Group</b>	<b>Number 1 Topic</b>	<b>Number 2 Topic</b>
Agency Managers	Knowing how to use data (27%)	ASFA Requirements (14%)
Agency Supervisors	Knowing how to use data (22%)	Supervisory Skills (19%)
Agency Workers	Assessment (22%)	ASFA Requirements (19%)
Foster Parents	Collaboration (22%)	Needs of abuse and neglected children (22%)
Schools	Needs of abuse and neglected children (30%)	Understand welfare system (16%)
Health Care Providers	Dealing with children with special needs (24%)	Needs of abused and neglected children (22%)
Mental Health Providers	Needs of abused and neglected children (27%)	Dealing with children who have special needs (19%)
Tribes	Collaboration (14%)	ASFA Requirements (8%)
Courts	ASFA Requirements (24%)	Legal Requirements (16%)

### **Selected Participant Remarks Regarding Training for Other Organizations**

We are developing foster/adopt training to help reduce the length of time in care and reduce multiple placements. In DE 65-68% of adoptions are foster parent adoptions. (DE)

Foster parents have received training in how to recognize the role they play in meeting ASFA requirements. (ME)

The tribal workers were invited to agency trainings and new worker trainings. Tribes have also arranged for training on IV-E and ASFA given by NICWA. (NE)

Providers are limited by a lack of knowledge about kids involved with the agency; they could benefit from training on the behavioral health needs of kids in care. (WV)

### **Information Systems**

Respondents were asked to rate on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being 'poor' and 5 being 'outstanding', the support provided by the state information system for the work of managers, supervisors and workers in implementing ASFA. The average rating was 3.14 in 2001, rose to 3.43 in 2002, and to 3.51 in 2003. In both the 2002 and 2003 polls, county administered states gave their information system a lower rating (average 3.14 in 2003) than state administered states (average 3.69 in 2003). This was a statistically significant difference ( $p < .05$ ). When the responses of agencies in the later phases of the Child and Family Services Review (review completed and working under a Program Improvement Plan) were compared to those agencies in the initial (planning and assessment) phases, states in the later phases gave their systems a higher rating (average 3.75) than states which are in the earlier phases (average 3.25). These results were similar to findings in 2002, but were not statistically significant.

### **Selected Participant Remarks Regarding Information Systems**

The system doesn't allow us to extract the information we need to help us know how workers are doing. Not all areas of the state are on the system. There is a high rate of worker error. (AK)

As additional management reports continue to roll out, our SACWIS (TRAILS) will become more and more useful. The data is in there; we're just now figuring out how to get it out in a meaningful way. (CO)

Our information system has made tremendous progress in recent years. We could not begin to address CFSR issues without TWIST (KY's SACWIS system) (KY)

The Division has developed a web-based system, the 'Permanency Tracking System,' to assist supervisory and management staff in their case review responsibility. The system captures important information and alerts supervisors to upcoming due dates and other significant events. (NJ)

We now have people who put the information that needs to be there into the system; at least for child welfare people entering data is second nature. The system gives you good data. I wish the system were child based not family based so information about the nature of the agency's status with a particular child would be more accurate. (RI)

## Staff Support

In previous years, respondents were asked what activities worked well in supporting staff as they implement ASFA requirements. In 2003, state respondents were asked to rate the activities mentioned in years 1 and 2 of the study from 1 ('not important') to 5 ('crucial'). 'Provide management support' was ranked number 1 in 2003, as it was in 2002, and 'view ASFA as good casework practice' was still ranked second, with 'training' still ranked third. However, all of these items were ranked close to the 'crucial' category; indeed, if they were rounded to single digits, they would all be equal to the '5' crucial designation.

### Most Effective Practices for Supporting Staff

Practice	2001	2002	2003	
	Ranking	Ranking	Ranking	Avg.
Training	1	3	3	4.69
Increased communication	2	8	6	4.59
Resources available to support staff	3-4	6	5	4.64
Collaborative efforts with stakeholders	3-4	7	4	4.66
View ASFA as good casework practice	5-6	2	2	4.792
Provide management support	5-6	1	1	4.797
Revising policy to support ASFA	-	5	8	4.50
Monitoring implementation	-	4	7	4.58

### Barriers to supporting staff as they implement ASFA

Barriers to the agency's support for staff as they implement the requirements of ASFA were similar in 2002 and 2003. In the 2003 poll, over three-quarters of the state respondents mentioned lack of resources, staff turnover, and heavy workload as barriers to staff support as they implement ASFA. Over half the states also mentioned large numbers of cases and lack of services as barriers. Two barriers mentioned by one state each were backlog of cases in court and a disproportional number of African American children in care.

Barrier	2001 Ranking	2002 Ranking	2003 Ranking	
			Rank	% Checked
Lack of resources - funding, staff, equipment, etc.	1	2	1	81%
Difficult relationship with courts	2	6	6	43%
Staff turnover	3	1	2-3	78%
Limitations or lack of computer system(s)	4	9-10	8-9	30%
Lack of Understanding of ASFA	5-8	11-12	10	24%
Heavy workload	5-8	3	2-3	78%
Lack of support	5-8	13	11	22%
Difficulty meeting ASFA requirements	5-8	9-10	8-9	30%
Large number of cases	9-10	5	5	60%
Difference in interpretation	9-10	8	12	16%
Lack of services	11	4	4	65%
Lack of time	12	7	7	49%
Lack of training	13	11-12	13	14%
County-based system	4 of the 8 county-based states checked this barrier			50%

### County-Administered States

Of the 37 states where the poll was conducted, 8 were state supervised, county-administered states. These states were asked if any of a list of items impacts their ASFA implementation. Among the 8 states, the following number of states checked these items:

Topic	Answer Checked
Limited resources	7
Must be responsive to local needs	5
Lack of uniform practice standards	5
Limited state control	5
Communication can be difficult	4
Approach is fragmented	3
Other: lack clear understanding of state/local roles/authority	1

## Child and Family Services Review Process

The poll asked agencies to identify where they were in the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) process.

	Initial Phase	Later Phase
Planning	2	
State Assessment Underway	10	
Review Complete		12
Working to Complete PIP Activities		13

### Selected Participant Remarks Regarding the Child and Family Services Review Process

We are through the CFSR, received our final report, submitted our PIP and had it approved. Involving everyone in the process increased familiarity with ASFA in persons throughout the agency. (AZ)

A significant lesson for Kentucky was the importance of analytical skills. We are able to produce lots of reports and staff are using the reports. We still need more depth in understanding the implications of the data. (KY)

Case planning and caseworker contact appear to be key to positive outcomes in implementing requirements of both ASFA and CFSR. (TX)

The CFSR taught us the need for greater consistency in child welfare practice--the need to improve focus on family needs and not only the target child, the need to adopt child welfare practice standards for all populations served by the Department including delinquent youth, the need for a good quality assurance program, the need for greater availability of services and the need for more worker contact and improved quality of that contact. (WY)

### General Remarks

Respondents were asked if there was anything else they wanted to tell others regarding the best way to implement the requirements of ASFA and the CFSR. Five people (14%) mentioned that they were able to use lessons from ASFA and the CFSR to improve practice; four (11%) recommended that agencies understand staff needs and four that they regard ASFA as best practice.

### Selected Participant General Remarks

Present, expect and normalize ASFA as best practice. (AL)

To support staff on the requirements of ASFA and the CFSR

- Continuous training and technical assistance to staff
- Look at current information systems - does it drive case practice?
- Assist in identifying the essential family services and helping staff obtain these services

- Look at developing or identifying non traditional services and seek assistance with the family's community support field staff/front line staff - continuously. (AR)

The accuracy of data in your SACWIS and the investment of stakeholders in service delivery are so important. (CO)

Need to involve non-custodial parent and get the judicial system on board. (CT)

We have seen the value of bringing information to the first line staff, especially in peer case review process. Staff liked doing the review. Plan to continue after the CFSSR review is complete. (LA)

ASFA is the foundation for the work we do. It's not the language we are after, it's the outcomes we want to use in a productive way. (NE)

Prioritizing how states can best address the staff resource/turnover issue is integral to any further improvement. (VA)

## COURT PROJECT POLL RESULTS

### Understanding of ASFA by Agency Staff

Court improvement project (CIP) personnel were asked to rate the child welfare agency staff in terms of their understanding of ASFA requirements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being 'poor' and 5 being 'comprehensive'. The average rating given in the 2001 poll was 3.25, which rose to 4.0 in the 2002 and 2003 polls. Participants noted that, while managers understood ASFA requirements, some 'field staff didn't seem to understand the requirements as well,' although they have improved from previous years. One interviewee found that state staff understood ASFA, but some local staff 'appear to never have heard of some of the provisions'; another responded that 'change in leadership and a move to prioritize child welfare services may impede progress'.

### Skills

Court improvement project respondents were asked to rate the skills (on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being 'don't need it' and 5 being 'extremely important') that child welfare supervisors and workers need to have to implement ASFA. The skills mentioned most often are listed below.

#### Supervisors' Skills

Skills	2002 Avg. Rating	2003 Avg. Rating
Ability to monitor staff to assure time lines are met	5.0	5.0
Ability to explain the law and requirements to staff	4.7	5.0
Knowledge of the law and requirements	4.7	5.0
Ability to develop a relationship with court where information is shared	4.0	5.0
Ability to set up hearings and court dates		4.0
Knowledge of gathering information about families for court use		4.7
How to testify in court regarding permanency and safety planning		4.3
Ability to identify resources		5.0

#### Workers' Skills

Skills	2002 Avg. Rating	2003 Avg. Rating
Knowledge of the law and requirements	4.7	5.0
How to testify in court regarding permanency and safety planning	4.7	5.0
Concurrent planning skills	4.7	5.0
Knowledge of how to gather info about families for court use	4.7	5.0

Ability to monitor staff to assure time lines are met	4.7	5.0
Ability to develop relationship with the court where information is shared		4.7
Ability to make decisions quickly		4.7

As we found in 2002, the skills that court improvement project (CIP) personnel think supervisors and workers need to have are focused on their understanding of the law, relationship building and the ability of agency staff to testify in court regarding ASFA issues. Child welfare agency staff, however, think the top skills needed by supervisors and workers are ‘communication, collaboration and casework’. There continues to be less emphasis on knowledge of the law or testifying in court for child welfare workers, supervisors and managers.

### **Administrative Activities**

Court improvement project respondents were asked if, as part of the state’s ASFA implementation activities, the court and the child welfare agency had undertaken or changed day-to-day joint activities and communication. Respondents reported that changes had occurred in both areas. Following are selected comments regarding these changes.

#### **Day to day joint activities**

We continue to hold annual Dependency Court Improvement Summits as a collaboration between the branches of government. The Summit features break-outs by judicial circuit to develop local action plans. Circuits also meet individually as follow-up to summit planning for self-assessment. (FL)

Some courts and agencies are ensuring that the next court date is scheduled during each hearing. In some jurisdictions, court reports have been modified to designate a certain part of the court report that addresses reasonable efforts. (MD)

About a year ago, the agency and its attorneys started submitting an ASFA 12 month permanency report as a way of improving the 12 month hearing. We are starting to see the positive impact when we receive that report in a timely way. The agency and court worked very hard to implement the Subsidized Legal Custodian option now available under our law. We needed to work out many issues and develop a complete policy to support this new option. The court was involved in all phases of the PA CFSR, including the PIP implementation. (PA)

There was a major training for Guardians Ad Litem. It was part of their required training. Consisted of a two-day session on ASFA. Attended by GALs and social workers, judges also. (WI)

#### **Communication**

A change in administration has curtailed communication at the state level. (FL)

Some jurisdictions are having regular multi-disciplinary meetings with all of its child welfare stakeholders to address ASFA-related issues. (MD)

The court and agency have a positive, productive relationship at all levels. We have a special courtroom and a committee that focuses on large families (4+ kids) and their unique service needs, which often include finances and housing. We have 10,000 court involved cases and 25% of them involve large families. Also we have a special aging out program and courtroom designed to help move kids into Independent Living. The court and agency meet in the CIP committees and subcommittees monthly to address problems and issues. (PA)

Communication has progressed since last year due to the various trainings that involve court and agency staff and because of preparation for the CFSR. Also, there is a good relationship between the director of the court improvement project and agency staff. (WI)

### **Sharing Information**

The project team asked court improvement project respondents if they were getting information they needed regarding cases from the agency. Three of the respondents (75%) said they were getting the information, while one (25%) noted that 'the agency does not file the required court reports or they are not filed timely'.

### **Training**

Respondents were asked how they handled training on ASFA for court and agency personnel. All four respondents indicated that during the past year there has been ASFA training for court personnel, for the child welfare agency, and for attorneys. Permanency issues were the number one training topic for court personnel (4 respondents) and for attorneys (2 respondents), while training for child welfare workers covered myriad topics such as Title IVE , performance contracting, use of forms and the CFSR process. These topics were also covered in training for attorneys and court personnel; in addition, court personnel received training in guardianship, timelines, orders and findings, concurrent planning, terminology and family conferencing. Training was generally provided jointly, and/or at conferences, meeting and seminars. Three of the four respondents reported that training in ASFA was incorporated into other training. Court personnel were trained by CIP personnel (n=3), court staff (n=2), attorneys (n=1) or consultants (n=1).

When asked what the number one training need was for judges, responses were: ASFA and permanency planning hearing requirements (2 responses), including completion of court orders; expediting petitions for termination of parental rights; and extraordinary findings for continuing case plans. For court personnel, the number one training need was felt to be: case management to assist judges in moving cases; the interplay between agency and court personnel, identification of roles and responsibilities; use of the computer system; and court orders. For child welfare staff, the number one training need was considered to be: Basics of ASFA; responsibility for attending court hearings and reporting on ASFA requirements; understanding of time frames; and concurrent planning (2 responses).\

<b>Topic</b>	<b>2002 Rank</b>	<b>2003 Rank</b>	<b>Avg. Rating</b>
Good working relationship among court and agency staff	1,2,3	1	5.0
Having the agency's involvement in the Court Improvement Project	1,2,3	2-3	4.75
Increased communication	1,2,3	2-3	4.75
Having the director of Court Improvement Projects involved in planning discussions	4-5	4	4.5
Having subcommittees that deal with interagency issues	4-5	5	4.25

### **What Worked Best**

In the 2002 poll, court improvement project respondents were asked to rate (on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being 'not important' and 5 being 'crucial') the importance of specific activities in terms of working with the child welfare agency as it implements ASFA requirements. The most important activity, according to these respondents, was maintaining a good working relationship between agency and court staff. This was rated 'crucial' by all four respondents.

### **Barriers**

As for the state interviewees, the court improvement respondents saw lack of resources, cited by three of the four persons interviewed (75%) as the primary barrier to implementing ASFA. Other barriers cited were: 'lack of understanding of the key stakeholders' responsibilities and how they are structured' (3 responses, 75%), 'timelines for TPR are too short, unable to make informed decisions in every case' (2 responses), 'lack of understanding of the law' (2 responses), 'federal and state law not clear on what a permanency hearing is' (1 response), 'some of the provisions of ASFA are nor clear' (1 response); and 'lack of information on how the statewide roll out of privatization will ensure adequate training of new providers on ASFA' (1 response).

### **General Remarks**

Any encouragement from the Children's Bureau on their expectation that the courts and executive branches continue to jointly strive for standards of excellence in achieving safe and permanent homes for children and their families (would help in the implementation of ASFA). (FL)

Provide resources so that the jurisdictions can receive one on one training on ASFA. Having persons who are available to travel throughout the State to provide 2 to 4 hour training sessions periodically would appear to be beneficial. The smaller, shorter seminars, discussions work with the local stakeholders seem to foster collaboration and a better understanding of the law and issues surrounding ASFA. (MD)

Training is critical. Need to have an atmosphere where people in the state can talk about their mistakes and what can be learned from them. A supportive environment makes it possible

for stakeholders to work together more easily. The result is the development of understanding and respect among stakeholders that has allowed us to move forward. (WI)

## METHODOLOGY

### CHILD WELFARE AGENCY POLL

The Muskie project team conducted the child welfare agency poll by telephone during February through June 2003. The team developed and used a data collection instrument that assessed areas in which meeting ASFA requirements has impacted staff or changed the way the agency does business and allowed agencies to update the information they provided during the 2002 poll. The final instrument consisted of eleven questions. (A copy of the final child welfare agency phone poll instrument appears in Appendix C in this document.) Most of the questions were multi-part, closed ended, with selections based on the results of the 2001 and 2002 polls. Space was provided for additional comments.

The eleven questions covered a variety of topics. They were:

- **Understanding of ASFA.** How would you rate your staff's understanding of ASFA?
- **Skills.** What skills do managers, supervisors, and workers need to have to implement ASFA?
- **Activities.** What activities has the agency undertaken as part of ASFA implementation?
- **Training.** How is training on ASFA handled? What training needs do agency and community partner staff have?
- **Information System.** How well does the state's information system support implementation of ASFA?
- **Staff support.** What worked best in supporting staff as they implement ASFA requirements?
- **Barriers.** What were the barriers to the agency's support of staff as they implement ASFA?
- **Child and Family Services Review.** Where is the agency in the process? What lessons have been learned?
- **General Remarks.** Do you have any other comments to make regarding the best way to implement ASFA?
- **County based.** How does the fact that a state is county-based impact implementation of ASFA?

If possible the 2003 phone poll was conducted with the person who responded to the 2002 poll. The poll took approximately 30 minutes to complete. Once the poll was completed, the Muskie project team e-mailed or faxed a copy of the completed instrument to the respondent for review and comment. When the respondent's comments were returned, the project team coded and entered data into a data base using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The analysts performed comparisons of data from the 2001 and 2002 polls, county-administered versus state based systems and states that were in the initial (planning and assessment) phases of the Child and Family Services Reviews versus those in the later phases (review completed and working under a Program Improvement Plan). Additionally, analysts ran frequencies to get an overview of the results. A complete print out of the child welfare agency poll frequencies appears in Appendix A. In addition, several direct quotes from the participants

are presented in the **Results** portion of the report to more comprehensively explain the details of the responses.

Responses were received from 37 states, which is 4 fewer than last year. The information on county-administered states represents the responses of 8 states where the child welfare system is state supervised, county administered.

### **COURT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT POLL**

As with the child welfare agency poll, the Muskie project team contacted the court improvement project representative who participated in the 2001 and 2002 polls and received responses from the 4 court improvement projects that participated in the 2001 poll. The poll was conducted during February through June 2003. The poll took approximately 30 minutes to complete. (A copy of this instrument appears in Appendix D.) Once the poll was completed, the Muskie project team e-mailed or faxed a copy of the completed instrument to the respondent for review and comment. When the respondent's comments were returned, the project team coded and entered data into SPSS and ran comparisons and frequencies to get an understanding of the results. A complete print out of the court improvement project frequencies appears in Appendix B.

The questions covered a variety of topics. They were:

- **Understanding of ASFA.** How would you rate the child welfare agency in terms of their understanding of ASFA requirements?
- **Skills.** What skills do child welfare supervisors and workers need to implement ASFA?
- **Activities.** As part of ASFA implementation have the court and child welfare agency undertaken or changed any day to day or joint activities or method of communication?
- **Sharing information.** Is the court getting the information it needs from the agency?
- **Training.** How is training on ASFA handled? What training is needed?
- **What worked best?** What has worked best for the court in terms of working with the child welfare agency as it implements ASFA requirements?
- **Barriers.** What does the court view as barriers in working with the agency as it implements ASFA?
- **General Remarks.** Do you have any other comments to make regarding the best way to implement ASFA?

**APPENDIX A. CHILD WELFARE AGENCY POLL – FREQUENCIES**

1. How would you rate your agency's staff in terms of their understanding of ASFA requirements? We are particularly interested in the level of understanding of managers, supervisors and workers. Please rate their understanding on a scale from 1 to 5 with 1 being 'poor' and 5 being 'comprehensive'.

**A. Managers:**

POOR            1        2        3        4        5            COMPREHENSIVE  
N=37

Rating	Frequency	Percent
2.00	1	2.7
3.00	2	5.4
4.00	18	48.6
4.50	3	8.1
5.00	13	35.1

**Average of the Rating: 4.28**

N=37

Comments	Frequency	Percent
ASFA requirements understood well	7	18.9
County-based system answer based on limited knowledge of staff	4	10.8
High staff turnover affects understanding	1	2.7
ASFA requirements incorporated not seen as ASFA	1	2.7
Comprehensive training understanding	1	2.7
Need more training	1	2.7
Supervisors/managers set up the structure implement ASFA	1	2.7

**B. Supervisors:**

POOR            1        2        3        4        5            COMPREHENSIVE  
N=37

Rating	Frequency	Percent
3.00	3	8.1
4.00	27	77.1
4.50	1	2.7
5.00	6	16.2

**Average of the Rating: 4.09**

N=37

Comments	Frequency	Percent
ASFA requirements understood well	4	10.8
Good understanding of some elements not others	2	5.4
High staff turnover affects understanding	2	5.4
Count-based system answer based on limited knowledge of staff	2	5.4
ASFA requirements incorporated not seen as ASFA	1	2.7
Need more training	1	2.7
Supervisors/managers set up the structure implement ASFA	1	2.7

**C. Workers:**

POOR            1        2        3        4        5            COMPREHENSIVE  
N=37

Rating	Frequency	Percent
2.00	3	8.1
3.00	16	43.2
4.00	18	48.6

**Average of the Rating: 3.41**

N=37

Comments	Frequency	Percent
High staff turnover affects understanding	5	13.5
Good understanding of some elements not others	3	8.1
ASFA requirements incorporated not seen as ASFA	2	5.4
County-based system answer based on limited knowledge of staff	2	5.4
ASFA requirements understood well	2	5.4
Comprehensive training understanding	1	2.7
New staff gets lots of ASFA information	1	2.7
Knowledge of issues unaware of relation to ASFA	1	2.7

2. Following are some of the skills that managers, supervisors and workers need to have to implement ASFA. Please rate each of these on a scale of 1-5 with one being 'do not need it' and 5 being 'extremely important.'

**A. Managers:**

Case work skills

DON'T NEED IT    1    2    3    4    5    EXTREMELY IMPORTANT

N=37

Rating	Frequency	Percent
1.00	1	2.7
2.00	4	10.8
3.00	7	18.9
4.00	17	45.9
5.00	8	21.6

**Average of the Rating: 3.73**

Collaborative skills

DON'T NEED IT    1    2    3    4    5    EXTREMELY IMPORTANT

N=37

Rating	Frequency	Percent
3.00	1	2.7
4.00	10	27.0
5.00	26	70.3

**Average of the Rating: 4.68**

Understand Requirements of ASFA

DON'T NEED IT    1    2    3    4    5    EXTREMELY IMPORTANT

N=37

Rating	Frequency	Percent
3.00	2	5.4
4.00	7	18.9
5.00	28	75.7

**Average of the Rating: 4.70**

Understanding how to implement ASFA requirements

DON'T NEED IT    1    2    3    4    5    EXTREMELY IMPORTANT

N=37

Rating	Frequency	Percent
3.00	1	2.7
4.00	7	18.9
5.00	29	78.4

**Average of the Rating: 4.76**





**C. Workers:**

Case work skills

DON'T NEED IT    1    2    3    4    5    EXTREMELY IMPORTANT

N=37

Rating	Frequency	Percent
2.00	1	2.7
4.00	5	13.5
5.00	31	83.8

**Average of the Rating: 4.78**

Collaborative skills

DON'T NEED IT    1    2    3    4    5    EXTREMELY IMPORTANT

N=37

Rating	Frequency	Percent
3.50	1	2.7
4.00	14	37.8
5.00	22	59.5

**Average of the Rating: 4.58**

Communication skills

DON'T NEED IT    1    2    3    4    5    EXTREMELY IMPORTANT

N=37

Rating	Frequency	Percent
3.00	1	2.7
3.50	1	2.7
4.00	9	24.3
5.00	26	70.3

**Average of the Rating: 4.66**

Understand how to implement ASFA

DON'T NEED IT    1    2    3    4    5    EXTREMELY IMPORTANT

N=37

Rating	Frequency	Percent
3.00	5	13.5
4.00	15	40.5
5.00	17	45.9

**Average of the Rating: 4.32**



- Internal communication? \_\_\_\_\_No \_\_\_\_\_Yes If yes, please describe.

N=37

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
No	20	54.1
Yes	17	45.9

N=37

<b>Comments</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Increase in internal communication	12	32.4
Increase in communication with field staff, districts, and regions	6	16.2
Increase in use of e-mail, intranet, and web sites	5	13.5
Increased collaboration	3	8.1
Set up committees to focus on information systems/casework	2	5.4
Peer review begun	1	2.7
Implemented quality review system to monitor work	1	2.7
Teleconferences and video conferences held	1	2.7
Training for staff	1	2.7

- Performance appraisals? \_\_\_\_\_No \_\_\_\_\_Yes If yes, please describe.

N=37

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
No	28	75.7
Yes	9	24.3

N=37

<b>Comments</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Looking at instruments	1	2.7
Made modifications refinements to policy	2	5.4
Using performance based system	2	5.4
Using case check-list with ASFA requirements	2	5.4
CW outcomes incorporated CFSR outcomes	2	5.4
Outcomes part of appraisals	3	8.1
ASFA outcomes in performance plans	2	5.4
New performance appraisal instrument focal point evaluation	1	2.7
Changes being implemented (overall agency plan)	1	2.7

- Job descriptions? \_\_\_No\_\_\_ Yes If yes, please describe.

N=37

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
No	30	81.1
Yes	7	18.9

N=37

<b>Comments</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Ensured that job descriptions reflect ASFA requirements	3	8.1
Changed job descriptions, titles stayed the same	3	8.1
Minor changes	2	5.4
Changed job titles, classifications	1	2.7

- Staff recruitment? \_\_\_No\_\_\_ Yes If yes, please describe.

N=37

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
No	26	70.3
Yes	11	29.7

N=37

<b>Comments</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Recruiting more not ASFA related	2	5.4
Continuing education training for para-professionals to MSW	2	5.4
Added Staff	3	8.1
Efforts for recruitment retention made	6	16.2
Hiring freeze layoffs	2	5.4
Changed recruitment process not policy	2	5.4
Emphasis on hiring people with skills related to ASFA	1	2.7

- Case review? \_\_\_No\_\_\_ Yes If yes, please describe.

N=37

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
No	10	27.0
Yes	27	73.0

N=37

<b>Comments</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Modifications to case review process	13	35.1
Case review process implemented	8	26.7
Implemented QA review that mirrors CFSR	4	10.8

Comments	Frequency	Percent
Supervisors/coordinators review cases	3	8.1
Changes planned not implemented	2	5.4
Statewide review program evaluates items/develops case plans	2	5.4
Checks for ASFA compliance	2	5.4
ASFA questions asked during case review	2	5.4
Case review done regardless of ASFA	2	5.4
Redesigning case conference tool	1	2.7
Developing outcomes measurement system	1	2.7
Using IV-E Federal Review tools	1	2.7

- Foster/Adoptive parent recruitment? \_\_\_No\_\_\_Yes If yes, please describe.

N=37

Responses	Frequency	Percent
No	14	37.8
Yes	23	62.2

N=37

Comments	Frequency	Percent
On-going campaigns focused on recruitment	14	37.8
Increased support for foster adoptive parents	7	18.9
Refined on-going process	6	16.2
Restructured recruitment efforts to focus on collaboration	3	8.1
Statewide recruiter works to support recruitment efforts	2	5.4
Private agencies contracted to perform recruitment function	2	5.4
Emphasis on minority recruitment	2	5.4
Changes planned not implemented	2	5.4
Using MAPP	1	2.7
Performance based focus on kinship care/permanency	1	2.7
Foster adoptive parent recruitment part of strategic plan	1	2.7
Committee workers, supervisor workers develop recruitment	1	2.7
Changed training strategies	1	2.7

4. In the past year, since our earlier survey, has there been any ASFA training for child welfare agency personnel? \_\_\_No\_\_\_Yes If yes, go to question 4a. If no, go to question 4e.

N=37

Responses	Frequency	Percent
No	4	10.8
Yes	33	89.2

**A. What topics were covered in that ASFA training?**

N=37

<b>Topics</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Various ASFA topics	12	32.4
Timeframes reunification	10	27.0
Concurrent planning	9	24.3
Permanency issues	8	21.6
ASFA incorporated into all relevant trainings	7	18.9
Reasonable efforts	5	13.5
IV-E eligibility	4	10.8
Assessment	4	10.8
Best practice	3	8.1
Safety well-being	3	8.1
Case planning	3	8.1
ASFA elements in new worker training	3	8.1
Child Welfare issues including CFSR	3	8.1
Adoptions	2	5.4
Service issues	2	5.4
MEPA training	1	2.7
Recruitment	1	2.7
Preparation for CFSR	1	2.7
Compelling reasons	1	2.7
Termination of parental rights	1	2.7
Supervising ASFA outcomes measures	1	2.7
Court requirements	1	2.7
Federal regulations	1	2.7
Court orders	1	2.7
Reunification	1	2.7
Importance of relationship between agency/community	1	2.7
Agency/case mandates	1	2.7
Indian Child Welfare Act	1	2.7

**B. Which of the following did you use for the ASFA training?**

N=37

<b>Methods</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Statewide training	24	64.9
In service training	18	48.6
Pre-service training	17	45.9
Managers train people	13	35.1
Conferences on ASFA topics	12	32.4
Information circulated about ASFA	12	32.4
Regularly scheduled meetings	11	29.7

Methods	Frequency	Percent
Forums on ASFA topics	9	24.3
Training by federal agencies	7	18.9
Teleconferences on ASFA topics	7	18.9
Interactive video on ASFA topics	5	13.5

**C. Who did the training?**

N=37

Topics	Frequency	Percent
Agency/training unit staff	25	67.6
Outside consultants	14	37.8
Central office staff	14	37.8
State university	13	35.1
Regional staff	8	21.6
Court staff	7	18.9

**D. Was the training just on ASFA or was it incorporated into other training that you provide?**

N=37

Topics	Frequency	Percent
Incorporated	28	75.7
Incorporated into new worker training	24	64.9
Not incorporated	4	10.8

**E. In the past year, since our earlier survey, have you done any of the following ASFA training with or for the courts? If yes, continue with this question; if no go to question 4g.**

N=37

Responses	Frequency	Percent
No	13	35.1
Yes	24	64.9

**How was the training delivered?**

N=37

Topics	Frequency	Percent
Court Improvement Project events attended by agency people	14	37.8
Agency and court staff have worked together on local level	13	35.1
Agency staff have trained court people	12	32.4
Joint training sessions	11	29.7

Topics	Frequency	Percent
ASFA workgroups of agency and court staff	8	21.6
Children's Law Project	2	5.4
Providers	1	2.7
Resource Center staff	1	2.7
Desk book for judges and attorneys	1	2.7
Agency/court worked together at state level	1	2.7
Consultants	1	2.7

**F. What topics were covered in that ASFA training for the courts?**

N=37

Topics	Frequency	Percent
Permanency issues	9	24.3
Legal issues	8	21.6
Various ASFA topics	8	21.6
Timeframes reunification	7	18.9
Reasonable efforts	5	13.5
Termination of parental rights	3	8.1
Child Welfare issues including CFSR	3	8.1
Court orders	2	5.4
IV-E eligibility	1	2.7
MEPA training	1	2.7
CPS	1	2.7
Best Practice	1	2.7
Compelling reasons	1	2.7
ASFA incorporated into all relevant trainings	1	2.7

**G. Have you done ASFA training with or for any of the following:**

N=37

Topics	Frequency	Percent
Tribes	10	27.0
Mental health providers	7	18.9
Health care providers	5	13.5
Community stakeholders	4	10.8
Schools	3	8.1
Foster care providers	2	5.4
Judges	2	5.4
Child care providers	2	5.4
Parents	2	5.4
Court services	2	5.4
Staff in schools of higher ed and grad school	2	5.4
Training at county level	1	2.7
Internal staff	1	2.7

Topics	Frequency	Percent
Contract providers	1	2.7
Child welfare board members	1	2.7
Legislators	1	2.7
Substance abuse providers	1	2.7

**H. What topics were covered in the ASFA training?**

N=37

Topics	Frequency	Percent
Various ASFA topics	8	21.6
Timeframes reunification	5	13.5
Permanency issues	4	10.8
Legal issues	3	8.1
Indian Child Welfare Act	3	8.1
Preparation of CFSR	2	5.4
Service issues	2	5.4
Best practice	1	2.7
IV-E eligibility	1	2.7
Child Welfare issues including CFSR	1	2.7
Reasonable efforts	1	2.7
Court requirements	1	2.7
Topics of interest to health care workers	1	2.7
Safety well-being	1	2.7
Court orders	1	2.7
Multi ethnic placement	1	2.7
Case planning	1	2.7

5. Thinking about future training for your agency and community partners (not just on ASFA), what you think is the number one training need of:

**A. Agency Managers:**

N=37

Topics	Frequency	Percent
Knowing how to use data	10	27.0
ASFA requirements	5	13.5
Collaboration	4	10.8
Use of community resources	3	8.1
Monitoring outcomes	3	8.1
Managing resources	3	8.1
Leadership skills	3	8.1
Staff development	2	5.4
Rolls and responsibilities	2	5.4
Funding issues	2	5.4
Strategic planning	1	2.7

Topics	Frequency	Percent
Transfer of learning	1	2.7
Concurrent planning	1	2.7
Implementing the PIP	1	2.7
Understanding ASFA as best practice	1	2.7
Establishing and maintaining agency culture	1	2.7
Understanding child welfare issues	1	2.7
Quality control	1	2.7
How and why to create a health care passport	1	2.7
CFSR issues	1	2.7
Decision making	1	2.7
Assessment	1	2.7
Developing a training plan	1	2.7
Communication	1	2.7

**B. Agency Supervisors:**

N=37

Topics	Frequency	Percent
Knowing how to use data	8	21.6
Supervisory skills	7	18.9
ASFA requirements	5	13.5
Monitoring outcomes	4	10.8
Concurrent planning	3	8.1
Case planning	3	8.1
Collaboration	3	8.1
Staff development	3	8.1
Assessment	3	8.1
Understanding ASFA as best practice	3	8.1
CFSR Issues	3	8.1
Transfer of learning	2	5.4
Coaching	2	5.4
Use of community resources	2	5.4
Leadership skills	2	5.4
Incorporating permanency into case plan	2	5.4
Clinical implications of CPS	1	2.7
Implementing the PIP	1	2.7
Managing resources	1	2.7
Roles and responsibilities	1	2.7
Child development	1	2.7
Developing a training plan	1	2.7
Quality control	1	2.7
Legal requirements	1	2.7
Decision making	1	2.7
Communication	1	2.7

**C. Agency Workers:**

N=37

<b>Topics</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Assessment	8	21.6
ASFA requirements	7	18.9
Case planning	7	18.9
Collaboration	7	18.9
Knowing how to use data	7	18.9
Casework skills	6	16.2
Incorporating permanency into case plan	5	13.5
Understanding ASFA as best practice	5	13.5
Roles and responsibilities	4	10.8
Use of community resources	3	8.1
Family Group conferencing	3	8.1
CFSR Issues	2	5.4
Communication	2	5.4
Needs of abused and neglected children	2	5.4
Child development	1	2.7
Concurrent planning	1	2.7
Developing a training plan	1	2.7
Managing resources	1	2.7
Monitoring outcomes	1	2.7
Mediation	1	2.7
Use of SACWIS	1	2.7

**D. Foster parents:**

N=37

<b>Topics</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Collaboration	8	21.6
Needs of abused and neglected children	8	21.6
Understand child welfare systems	7	18.9
Dealing with children who have special needs	6	16.2
ASFA requirements	4	10.8
Child development	4	10.8
Roles and responsibilities	4	10.8
Legal requirements	2	5.4
Use of community resources	2	5.4
Adoption knowledge	2	5.4
Assessment	1	2.7
CFSR Issues	1	2.7
Clinical implications of CPS	1	2.7
Communication	1	2.7

Topics	Frequency	Percent
Incorporating permanency into case plan	1	2.7
Monitoring outcomes	1	2.7
Foster parent knowledge	1	2.7
Casework skills	1	2.7

**E. Schools:**

N=37

Topics	Frequency	Percent
Needs of abused and neglected children	11	29.7
Understand child welfare systems	6	16.2
ASFA requirements	4	10.8
Dealing with children who have special needs	3	8.1
Reporting requirements	3	8.1
Child development	2	5.4
Collaboration	2	5.4
Assessment	1	2.7
CFSR Issues	1	2.7
Communication	1	2.7
Legal requirements	1	2.7
Roles and responsibilities	1	2.7
Staff development	1	2.7
Foster parent knowledge	1	2.7
Adoption knowledge	1	2.7
Casework skills	1	2.7

**F. Health care providers:**

N=37

Topics	Frequency	Percent
Dealing with children who have special needs	9	24.3
Needs of abused and neglected children	8	21.6
Collaboration	5	13.5
Understand child welfare systems	4	10.8
ASFA requirements	1	2.7
Case work skills	1	2.7
CFSR Issues	1	2.7
Communication	1	2.7
Managing resources	1	2.7
Reporting requirements	1	2.7
Roles and responsibilities	1	2.7
Use of community resources	1	2.7
How and why to create a healthcare passport	1	2.7
Need more providers	1	2.7

**G. Mental health providers:**

N=37

<b>Topics</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Needs of abused and neglected children	10	27.0
Dealing with children who have special needs	7	18.9
Collaboration	4	10.8
Adoption knowledge	3	8.1
ASFA requirements	3	8.1
Child development	2	5.4
Clinical implications of CPS	2	5.4
Understand child welfare systems	2	5.4
Use of community resources	2	5.4
Assessment	1	2.7
Case planning	1	2.7
Case work skills	1	2.7
CFSR Issues	1	2.7
Communication	1	2.7
Family group conferencing	1	2.7
Foster parent knowledge	1	2.7
Incorporating permanency into case plan	1	2.7
Managing resources	1	2.7
Quality control	1	2.7
Reporting requirements	1	2.7
Roles and responsibilities	1	2.7

**H. Tribes:**

N=37

<b>Topics</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Collaboration	5	13.5
ASFA requirements	3	8.1
Assessment	2	5.4
Case planning	2	5.4
Child development	2	5.4
Communication	2	5.4
Funding issues	2	5.4
ICWA requirements	2	5.4
Incorporating permanency into case plan	2	5.4
IV-E regulations	2	5.4
Needs of abused and neglected children	2	5.4
Understand child welfare systems	2	5.4
Use of community resources	2	5.4
CFSR Issues	1	2.7

Topics	Frequency	Percent
Dealing with children who have special needs	1	2.7
Family group conferencing	1	2.7
Knowing how to use data	1	2.7
Legal requirements	1	2.7
Reporting requirements	1	2.7
Supervisory skills	1	2.7

**I. Courts:**

N=37

Topics	Frequency	Percent
ASFA requirements	9	24.3
Legal requirements	6	16.2
Needs of abused and neglected children	5	13.5
Understand child welfare systems	5	13.5
Communication	4	10.8
Child development	3	8.1
Collaboration	2	5.4
ICWA requirements	2	5.4
Incorporating permanency into case plan	2	5.4
Roles and responsibilities	2	5.4
Adoption knowledge	1	2.7
Assessment	1	2.7
CFSR Issues	1	2.7
Concurrent planning	1	2.7
Developing a training plan	1	2.7
Family group conferencing	1	2.7
How and why to create a healthcare passport	1	2.7

**J. Is there any other group you think has a training need? Please specify**

N=37

Topics	Frequency	Percent
Attorneys	1	2.7
ASFA Requirements	1	2.7

**6.** How well does your information system support the work of managers, supervisors and workers in implementing ASFA? Please rate the support provided by your system on a scale from 1 to 5 with 1 being 'poor' and 5 being 'outstanding'

POOR            1            2            3            4            5            OUTSTANDING  
 N=37

Rating	Frequency	Percent
1.00	2	5.4
2.00	1	2.7
2.50	1	2.7
3.00	11	29.7
4.00	15	40.5
4.50	1	2.7
5.00	5	13.5

**Average of the Rating: 3.51**

**A. Why did you give your system that rating?**

N=37

Topics	Frequency	Percent
System difficult to use	10	27.0
Good system for all our needs	8	21.6
Gives a lot of information	7	18.9
Reports and Data not good	6	16.2
Old system insufficient for needs	4	10.8
In process of upgrading system	4	10.8
Enhanced system	2	5.4
Need more training on system	2	5.4
New workers	2	5.4
Entire state not on system	2	5.4
Outstanding for ASFA implementation	1	2.7
No system in place	1	2.7
Worker error	1	2.7

**B. If a rating of 1 or 2 is given, probe as to the status of the SACWIS system.**

N=37

Topics	Frequency	Percent
Do not have SACWIS system	3	8.1
Development/implementation of system in progress	1	2.7

7. Please rate the importance of the following in terms of supporting staff as they implement the ASFA requirements, with 1 being 'not important' and 5 being 'crucial.'

Training

NOT IMPORTANT 1 2 3 4 5 CRUCIAL

N=37

Rating	Frequency	Percent
3.00	1	2.7
4.00	9	24.3
4.50	1	2.7
5.00	26	70.3

**Average of the Rating: 4.69**

Increased communication

NOT IMPORTANT 1 2 3 4 5 CRUCIAL

N=37

Rating	Frequency	Percent
3.00	1	2.7
4.00	13	35.1
5.00	23	62.2

**Average of the Rating: 4.59**

Resources to support staff

NOT IMPORTANT 1 2 3 4 5 CRUCIAL

N=37

Rating	Frequency	Percent
2.00	1	2.7
3.00	1	2.7
4.00	8	21.6
5.00	26	70.3

**Average of the Rating: 4.64**

Collaborative efforts with stakeholders

NOT IMPORTANT 1 2 3 4 5 CRUCIAL

N=37

Rating	Frequency	Percent
4.00	12	32.4
4.50	1	2.7
5.00	24	64.9

**Average of the Rating: 4.66**

Seeing ASFA as good casework practice

NOT IMPORTANT 1 2 3 4 5 CRUCIAL

N=37

Rating	Frequency	Percent
4.00	7	18.9
4.50	1	2.7
5.00	28	75.7

**Average of the Rating: 4.79**

Management support

NOT IMPORTANT 1 2 3 4 5 CRUCIAL

N=37

Rating	Frequency	Percent
3.00	1	2.7
4.00	5	13.5
4.50	1	2.7
5.00	30	81.1

**Average of the Rating: 4.80**

Revising policy to support ASFA

NOT IMPORTANT 1 2 3 4 5 CRUCIAL

N=37

Rating	Frequency	Percent
2.00	1	2.7
3.00	4	10.8
4.00	7	18.9
5.00	24	64.9

**Average of the Rating: 4.50**

Monitoring implementation

NOT IMPORTANT 1 2 3 4 5 CRUCIAL

N=37

Rating	Frequency	Percent
3.00	2	5.4
4.00	11	29.7
5.00	23	62.2

**Average of the Rating: 4.58**

Other, please specify:

NOT IMPORTANT 1 2 3 4 5 CRUCIAL

N=37

Topics	Frequency	Percent
Resources to achieve permanency	1	2.7
Funding	1	2.7
Court resources	1	2.7

8. Do you see any of the following as barriers to your agency's support for staff as they implement the requirements of ASFA (check if 'yes')?

N=37

Topics	Frequency	Percent
Lack of resources	30	81.1
Staff turnover	29	78.4
Heavy workload	29	78.4
Lack of services	24	64.9
Large number of cases	22	59.5
Lack of time	18	48.6
Difficult relationship with courts	16	43.2
Limitations or lack of computer system	11	29.7
Difficulty meeting ASFA requirements	11	29.7
Lack of understanding/knowledge about ASFA	9	24.3
Lack of support	8	21.6
Differences in interpretation	6	16.2
Lack of training	5	13.5
Problems caused by a county-based system	4	10.8
Back log of cases in courts	1	2.7
Disproportional number of African American kids in care	1	2.7

9. (For County based systems only.) Do any of the following impact your ASFA implementation (check if 'yes')?

N=8

Topics	Frequency	Percent
Limited resources	7	87.5
Must be responsive to local needs	5	62.5
Lack of uniform practice standards	5	62.5
Limited state control	5	62.5
Communication can be difficult	4	50.0
Approach is fragmented	3	37.5
Lack clear understanding local rolls/authority	1	12.5

10. At which point in the Child and Family Service Review process is your agency?

A.

N=37

Topics	Frequency	Percent
Working to complete the activities described in the PIP	13	35.1
Review complete	12	32.4
Statewide assessment underway	10	27.0
Planning	2	5.4

**B. Are there any significant lessons you learned from the CFSR process? If so, please describe.**

N=37

<b>Topics</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Could have improved CFSR process	6	16.2
Advantages of collaboration	6	16.2
Statewide assessment helpful identifying strengths/weaknesses	4	10.8
Need to use & understand data and its implications	4	10.8
No surprises	4	10.8
Results discouraging based on old data	3	8.1
Preparation using agency staff	2	5.4
Overall very positive experience	2	5.4
Prepare early	2	5.4
Involve courts	2	5.4
Utilize ACF representatives	1	2.7
Accuracy of data important	1	2.7
Focus groups useful	1	2.7
Be organized and communicate w/team	1	2.7
Understanding what to do first who can help	1	2.7
PIP important to the process	1	2.7
Involves no-custodial parents	1	2.7
Accuracy of data	1	2.7

**11. Is there anything else that you want to tell us regarding the best way to support staff as they implement the requirements of ASFA and the CFSR?**

N=37

<b>Topics</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Using lessons learned from ASFA/CFSR to improve practice	5	13.5
Understand staff needs	4	10.8
Understand ASFA as best practice	4	10.8
Increase communication keep staff informed	2	5.4
Assess children/families more efficiently	2	5.4
Have adequate staff	2	5.4
Funding for resources	2	5.4
Understand ASFA requirements	2	5.4
Internal/External resources difficult	1	2.7
Design training to show ASFA is part of everyday work	1	2.7
Empower staff through knowledge training	1	2.7
Retention	1	2.7
Training	1	2.7

<b>Topics</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Management support for staff	1	2.7
More information about status of CPS	1	2.7
Understand concurrent planning	1	2.7
Include all community stakeholders	1	2.7







Knowledge of gathering information about families for court use  
 DON'T NEED IT 1 2 3 4 5 EXTREMELY IMPORTANT

N=4

Rating	Frequency	Percent
5.00	3	75.0

Average of the Rating: 5.00

Monitor staff to assure time lines are met  
 DON'T NEED IT 1 2 3 4 5 EXTREMELY IMPORTANT

N=4

Rating	Frequency	Percent
5.00	3	75.0

Average of the Rating: 5.00

3. In the past year, since our earlier survey, as part of your ASFA implementation have the court and the child welfare agency undertaken or changed any day to day joint activities? \_\_\_\_\_No\_\_\_\_\_Yes If yes, please describe.

N=4

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	4	100.0

A. Has communication changed? \_\_\_\_\_No\_\_\_\_\_Yes If yes, please describe.

N=4

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	4	100.0

B. Are you getting the information you need regarding cases from the agency? \_\_\_\_\_No\_\_\_\_\_Yes If no, please describe.

N=4

Response	Frequency	Percent
No	1	25.0
Yes	3	75.0

4. In the past year, since our earlier survey, has there been any ASFA training for court personnel? \_\_\_\_\_No\_\_\_\_\_Yes If yes, go to 4a. If no, go to 4e.

N=4

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	4	100.0

### A. What topics were covered in the training?

N=4

Topics	Frequency	Percent
Permanency	4	100.0
Guardianship	1	25.0
Performance contracting	1	25.0
Timelines, orders and findings, concurrent planning	1	25.0
Reporting requirements	1	25.0
Use of mandatory forms	1	25.0
Terminology	1	25.0
Case plans, family conferencing	1	25.0

### B. Which of the following did you use for staff training on ASFA?

N=4

Response	Frequency	Percent
Joint training sessions	2	50.0
Conferences	3	75.0
Seminars	2	50.0
Meetings	3	75.0
Presentations on ASFA	3	75.0
Part of training on other topics	3	75.0
Training on CFSR	1	25.0

### C. Who did the training?

N=4

Response	Frequency	Percent
Court Improvement Project personnel	3	75.0
Court staff	2	50.0
Consultants	1	25.0
Attorney	1	25.0
Department staff	1	25.0
Agency staff	1	25.0
ABA staff, agency representatives, additional court staff from Public Defenders Office and Attorney General's Office	1	25.0

**D. Was the training just on ASFA or is it incorporated into other training that you provide?**

N=4

Response	Frequency	Percent
Incorporated	3	75.0
Not incorporated	1	25.0

**E. In the past year, since our earlier survey, did you do any of the following ASFA training with or for the child welfare agency? \_\_\_No\_\_\_Yes**

If yes, continue with question 4e; if no, go to question 4g.

N=4

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	4	100.0

**How was the training delivered?**

N=4

Response	Frequency	Percent
Joint training sessions	4	100.0
Agency staff invited to some court training sessions	2	50.0

**F. What were the topics covered in the ASFA training for the child welfare agency?**

N=4

Topics	Frequency	Percent
Title IV-E	1	25.0
Permanency	1	25.0
Use of mandatory forms	1	25.0
Federal audit results	1	25.0
CFSR	1	25.0
Performance contracting	1	25.0

**G. In the past year, since our earlier survey, have you done any of the following training with or for the agency attorneys? \_\_\_No\_\_\_Yes**

If yes, continue with question 4g; if no, go to question 5.

N=4

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	4	100.0

**How was the training delivered?**

N=4

Response	Frequency	Percent
Joint training	4	100.0
Agency attorneys invited to some court training sessions	1	25.0
District Attorney handled training	1	25.0

**H. What were the topics covered in the ASFA training for the agency attorneys?**

N=4

Topics	Frequency	Percent
Title IV-E	1	25.0
Permanency	2	50.0
CFSR	1	25.0
Guardianship	1	25.0
Performance contracting	1	25.0

5. Thinking about future training on all subjects, not just ASFA, for judges, court personnel and child welfare staff, what do you think is the number one training need of:

**A. Judges:** More on ASFA topics (WI); Expediting petitions for termination of parental rights (PA); ASFA and permanency planning hearing requirements, including completion of court orders (MD); Permanency planning and extraordinary findings for continuing case plans (FL).

**B. Court personnel:** Information about the interplay between the agency and court personnel; Identification of roles and responsibilities (WI); We have a new computer system so we need to improve it and train on it (PA); court orders (MD); Case management to assist judges in moving cases (FL).

**C. Child welfare staff:** Understanding of time frames and concurrent planning (WI); Decide and train on whose responsibility it will be to attend court hearings and report on the ASFA requirements (PA); Basics of ASFA (MD); Concurrent planning to achieve permanency (FL).

6. Please rate the importance of the following in terms of working with the child welfare agency as it implements the ASFA requirements, with 1 being ‘not important’ and 5 being ‘crucial.’

Increased communication

NOT IMPORTANT    1        2        3        4        5        CRUCIAL

N=4

Rating	Frequency	Percent
4.00	1	25.0
5.00	3	75.0

**Average of the Rating: 4.75**

Having sub-committees that deal with interagency issues

NOT IMPORTANT 1 2 3 4 5 CRUCIAL

N=4

Rating	Frequency	Percent
2.00	1	25.0
5.00	3	75.0

**Average of the Rating: 4.25**

Having the Director of Court Improvement Projects involved in planning discussions

NOT IMPORTANT 1 2 3 4 5 CRUCIAL

N=4

Rating	Frequency	Percent
4.00	2	50.0
5.00	2	50.0

**Average of the Rating: 4.50**

Having the Agency's active involvement in the Court Improvement Project

NOT IMPORTANT 1 2 3 4 5 CRUCIAL

N=4

Rating	Frequency	Percent
4.00	1	25.0
5.00	3	75.0

**Average of the Rating: 4.75**

Good working relationship among court and agency staff

NOT IMPORTANT 1 2 3 4 5 CRUCIAL

N=4

Rating	Frequency	Percent
5.00	4	100.0

**Average of the Rating: 5.00**

Other, please specify and rate: Timely follow through by workers on court directives

Not Important 1 2 3 4 5 Crucial

N=4

Rating	Frequency	Percent
5.00	1	25.0

**Average of the Rating: 5.00**

7. Do you see any of the following as barriers to your work with the agency as it implements the requirements of ASFA? (check if 'yes')

N=4

Topics	Frequency	Percent
Lack of resources: staff, funds, time, etc	3	75.0
Federal and state law not clear on what a permanency hearing is	1	25.0

Topics	Frequency	Percent
Timelines for TPR are too short, unable to make informed decisions in every case	2	50.0
Lack of understanding of the key stakeholders responsibilities and how they are structured	3	75.0
Lack of understanding of the law	2	50.

**8.** Is there anything else that you want to tell us regarding the best way to support staff as they implement the requirements of ASFA?

Training is critical. Need to have an atmosphere where people in the state can talk about their mistakes and what can be learned from them. A supportive environment makes it possible for stakeholders to work together more easily. The result is the development of understanding and respect among stakeholders that has allowed us to move forward (WI).

The CFSR wasn't really helpful regarding judicial requirements, court timelines, sorting out review and permanency hearing requirements and court determinations. While ASFA is really clear about the time for filing petitions, it is silent about the end date. The CFSR focused on child safety, permanency and well-being and didn't address many important judicial concerns that ASFA addressed (PA).

Provide resources so that the jurisdictions can receive one on one training on ASFA. Having persons that are available to travel throughout the State to provide 2 to 4 hour training periodically would appear to be beneficial. The smaller, shorter seminars, discussions work with the local stakeholders seem to foster collaboration and a better understanding of the law and issues surrounding ASFA (MD).

Any encouragement from the Children's Bureau on their expectation that the courts and executive branches continue to jointly strive for standards of excellence in achieving safe and permanent homes for children and their families (FL).



							IMPORTANT
Other, please specify and rate: _____							
DON'T NEED IT	1	2	3	4	5		EXTREMELY IMPORTANT
b. Supervisors:							
Case work skills							
DON'T NEED IT	1	2	3	4	5		EXTREMELY IMPORTANT
Communication skills							
DON'T NEED IT	1	2	3	4	5		EXTREMELY IMPORTANT
Collaborative skills							
DON'T NEED IT	1	2	3	4	5		EXTREMELY IMPORTANT
Understand how to implement ASFA requirements							
DON'T NEED IT	1	2	3	4	5		EXTREMELY IMPORTANT
Using data effectively							
DON'T NEED IT	1	2	3	4	5		EXTREMELY IMPORTANT
Other, please specify and rate: _____							
DON'T NEED IT	1	2	3	4	5		EXTREMELY IMPORTANT
c. Workers:							
Case work skills							
DON'T NEED IT	1	2	3	4	5		EXTREMELY IMPORTANT
Collaborative skills							
DON'T NEED IT	1	2	3	4	5		EXTREMELY IMPORTANT
Communication skills							
DON'T NEED IT	1	2	3	4	5		EXTREMELY IMPORTANT
Understand how to implement ASFA							
DON'T NEED IT	1	2	3	4	5		EXTREMELY IMPORTANT
Using data effectively							
DON'T NEED IT	1	2	3	4	5		EXTREMELY IMPORTANT
Other, please specify and rate: _____							
DON'T NEED IT	1	2	3	4	5		EXTREMELY IMPORTANT

3. In the past year, since our earlier survey, as part of your ASFA implementation has the agency undertaken any activities in the following areas:

- Agency structure? \_\_\_No\_\_\_Yes If yes, please describe.
- Internal communication?\_\_\_\_\_No\_\_\_\_\_Yes If yes, please describe.
- Performance appraisals?\_\_\_No\_\_\_Yes If yes, please describe.
- Job descriptions?\_\_\_No\_\_\_Yes If yes, please describe.
- Staff recruitment? \_\_\_No\_\_\_Yes If yes, please describe.
- Case review? \_\_\_No\_\_\_Yes If yes, please describe.
- Foster/Adoptive parent recruitment? \_\_\_No\_\_\_Yes If yes, please describe.

4. In the past year, since our earlier survey, has there been any ASFA training for child welfare agency personnel? \_\_\_No\_\_\_Yes If yes, go to question 4a. If no, go to question 4e.

a. What topics were covered in that ASFA training?

b. Which of the following did you use for the ASFA training?

- \_\_\_Statewide training
- \_\_\_In service training
- \_\_\_Pre-service training
- \_\_\_Forums on ASFA topics
- \_\_\_Conferences on ASFA topics
- \_\_\_Regularly scheduled meetings
- \_\_\_Managers train people
- \_\_\_Interactive video on ASFA topics
- \_\_\_Teleconferences on ASFA topics
- \_\_\_Training by federal agencies
- \_\_\_Information is circulated about ASFA

c. Who did the training?

- \_\_\_Agency/training unit staff
- \_\_\_Outside consultants
- \_\_\_State university
- \_\_\_Court staff
- \_\_\_Central office staff
- \_\_\_Regional staff

d. Was the training just on ASFA or was it incorporated into other training that you provide?

- Incorporated
- Incorporated into new worker training
- Not incorporated

e. In the past year, since our earlier survey, have you done any of the following ASFA training with or for the courts?  No  Yes

If yes, continue with this question; if no go to question 4g.

How was the training delivered?

- Joint training sessions
- Agency and court staff have worked together on local level
- Court Improvement Project events attended by agency people
- ASFA workgroups of agency and court staff
- Agency staff have trained court people
- Agency published a newsletter for court staff
- other

f. What topics were covered in that ASFA training for the courts?

g. Have you done ASFA training with or for any of the following:

- Schools
- Health care providers
- Mental health providers
- Tribes
- Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_

h. What topics were covered in the ASFA training?

5. Thinking about future training for your agency and community partners (not just on ASFA), what you think is the number one training need of:

a. Agency managers:

b. Agency supervisors:

c. Agency workers:

d. Foster parents:

e. Schools:

f. Health care providers:

g. Mental health providers:

h. Tribes:

i. Courts:

j. Is there any other group you think has a training need? Please specify

6. How well does your information system support the work of managers, supervisors and workers in implementing ASFA? Please rate the support provided by your system on a scale from 1 to 5 with 1 being 'poor' and 5 being 'outstanding'

POOR            1        2        3        4        5            OUTSTANDING

a. Why did you give your system that rating?

b. If a rating of 1 or 2 is given, probe as to the status of the SACWIS system.

7. Please rate the importance of the following in terms of supporting staff as they implement the ASFA requirements, with 1 being 'not important' and 5 being 'crucial.'

Training

NOT IMPORTANT   1        2        3        4        5            CRUCIAL

Increased communication

NOT IMPORTANT   1        2        3        4        5            CRUCIAL

Resources to support staff

NOT IMPORTANT   1        2        3        4        5            CRUCIAL

Collaborative efforts with stakeholders

NOT IMPORTANT   1        2        3        4        5            CRUCIAL

Seeing ASFA as good casework practice

NOT IMPORTANT   1        2        3        4        5            CRUCIAL

Management support

NOT IMPORTANT   1        2        3        4        5            CRUCIAL

Revising policy to support ASFA

NOT IMPORTANT   1        2        3        4        5            CRUCIAL

Monitoring implementation

NOT IMPORTANT   1        2        3        4        5            CRUCIAL

Other, please specify and rate \_\_\_\_\_

NOT IMPORTANT   1        2        3        4        5            CRUCIAL

8. Do you see any of the following as barriers to your agency's support for staff as they implement the requirements of ASFA (check if 'yes')?

- Lack of resources
- Difficult relationship with courts
- Staff turnover
- Limitations or lack of computer system
- Lack of understanding/knowledge about ASFA
- Heavy workload
- Lack of support
- Difficulty meeting ASFA requirements
- Large number of cases
- Differences in interpretation
- Lack of services
- Lack of time
- Lack of training
- Problems caused by a county-based system
- Other, please specify

9. (For County based systems only.) Do any of the following impact your ASFA implementation (check if 'yes')?

- Must be responsive to local needs
- Lack of uniform practice standards
- Communication can be difficult
- Approach is fragmented
- Limited state control
- Limited resources
- Other

10. At which point in the Child and Family Service Review process is your agency?

- a.
- Planning
  - Statewide assessment underway
  - Review complete
  - Working to complete the activities described in the PIP

b. Are there any significant lessons you learned from the CFSR process? If so, please describe.

11. Is there anything else that you want to tell us regarding the best way to support staff as they implement the requirements of ASFA and the CFSR?

Do you mind if we call you again if we need additional information?

No  
 Yes



	DON'T NEED IT	1	2	3	4	5	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT
How to testify in court regarding permanency and safety planning	DON'T NEED IT	1	2	3	4	5	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT
Ability to develop relationship with court where information is shared	DON'T NEED IT	1	2	3	4	5	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT
Ability to make decisions quickly	DON'T NEED IT	1	2	3	4	5	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT
Concurrent planning skills	DON'T NEED IT	1	2	3	4	5	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT
Knowledge of gathering information about families for court use	DON'T NEED IT	1	2	3	4	5	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT
Monitor staff to assure time lines are met	DON'T NEED IT	1	2	3	4	5	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT
Other, please specify and rate: _____	DON'T NEED IT	1	2	3	4	5	EXTREMELY IMPORTANT

3. In the past year, since our earlier survey, as part of your ASFA implementation have the court and the child welfare agency undertaken or changed any day to day joint activities? \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes If yes, please describe.

a. Has communication changed? \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes If yes, please describe.

b. Are you getting the information you need regarding cases from the agency? \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes If no, please describe.

4. In the past year, since our earlier survey, has there been any ASFA training for court personnel? \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes If yes, go to 4a. If no, go to 4e.

a. What topics were covered in the training?

b. Which of the following did you use for staff training on ASFA?

\_\_\_ Joint training sessions

\_\_\_ Conferences

\_\_\_ Seminars

\_\_\_ Meetings

\_\_\_ Regularly distributed publications/bulletins/newsletters

- Presentations on ASFA
- Part of training on other topics
- Other. Please describe.

c. Who did the training?

- Court Improvement Project personnel
- Court staff
- Consultants
- National conferences
- Attorney
- Other Who?

d. Was the training just on ASFA or is it incorporated into other training that you provide?

- Incorporated
- Incorporated into new worker training
- Not incorporated

e. In the past year, since our earlier survey, did you do any of the following ASFA training with or for the child welfare agency?  No  Yes  
If yes, continue with question 4e; if no, go to question 4g.

How was the training delivered?

- Joint training sessions
- Agency staff invited to some court training sessions
- Other. Please describe

f. What were the topics covered in the ASFA training for the child welfare agency?

g. In the past year, since our earlier survey, have you done any of the following training with or for the agency attorneys?  No  Yes  
If yes, continue with question 4g; if no, go to question 5.

How was the training delivered?

- Joint training
- Agency attorneys invited to some court training sessions
- District Attorney handled training
- Other. Please describe.

h. What were the topics covered in the ASFA training for the agency attorneys?

5. Thinking about future training on all subjects, not just ASFA, for judges, court personnel and child welfare staff, what do you think is the number one training need of:

a. Judges:

b. Court personnel:

c. Child welfare staff:

6. Please rate the importance of the following in terms of working with the child welfare agency as it implements the ASFA requirements, with 1 being 'not important' and 5 being 'crucial.'

Increased communication

NOT IMPORTANT 1 2 3 4 5 CRUCIAL

Having sub-committees that deal with interagency issues

NOT IMPORTANT 1 2 3 4 5 CRUCIAL

Having the Director of Court Improvement Projects involved in planning discussions

NOT IMPORTANT 1 2 3 4 5 CRUCIAL

Having the Agency's active involvement in the Court Improvement Project

NOT IMPORTANT 1 2 3 4 5 CRUCIAL

Good working relationship among court and agency staff

NOT IMPORTANT 1 2 3 4 5 CRUCIAL

Other, please specify and rate: \_\_\_\_\_

Not Important 1 2 3 4 5 Crucial

7. Do you see any of the following as barriers to your work with the agency as it implements the requirements of ASFA? (check if 'yes')?

Lack of resources: staff, funds, time, etc

Federal and state law not clear on what a permanency hearing is

Timelines for TPR are too short, unable to make informed decisions in every case

Lack of understanding of the key stakeholders' responsibilities and how they are structured

Lack of understanding of the law

Other. What is the barrier?

8. Is there anything else that you want to tell us regarding the best way to support staff as they implement the requirements of ASFA?

Do you mind if we call you again if we need additional information?

No

Yes

**APPENDIX E. CHILD WELFARE AGENCY POLL PARTICIPANTS**

*We thank the following individuals for sharing their time and expertise during this poll.*

<b>Child Welfare Contact Information</b>			
<b>Alabama</b>	Freida Baker Deputy Director Alabama Department of Human Services 50 North Ripley Street Montgomery, Alabama 36130 Phone #: 334-242-9495 FAX: 334-353-1491 <a href="mailto:fbaker@dhhr.state.al.us">fbaker@dhhr.state.al.us</a>	<b>California</b>	Luigi Del Gaudio Manager, Kin-Care Policy Unit California Department of Social Services 744 P Street, MS 14-66 Sacramento, CA 95814 Phone #: 916-651-7393 <a href="mailto:Lou.DelGaudio@dss.ca.gov">Lou.DelGaudio@dss.ca.gov</a>
<b>Alaska</b>	Myra Casey Alaska Division of Family and Youth Services Field Administrator PO Box 110630 Juneau, AK 99801 Phone #: 907-465-2104 <a href="mailto:Myra_casey@health.state.ak.us">Myra_casey@health.state.ak.us</a>	<b>Colorado</b>	Sharon Ford Manager, Adoption, ICPC and Recruitment Colorado Department of Human Services 1575 Sherman Street Denver, CO 80203 Phone #: 303-866-3197 Fax #: 303-866-5563 <a href="mailto:Sharen.ford@state.co.us">Sharen.ford@state.co.us</a>
<b>Arizona</b>	Mark Schwartz Administrative Service Officer Linda Johnson Manager of the Policy and Program Development Unit Arizona Department of Economic Security 1789 W. Jefferson, Site Code 940A Phoenix, AZ 85007 Phone #: 602-542-2369 Fax #: 602-542-3330 <a href="mailto:mark.schwartz@mail.de.state.az.us">mark.schwartz@mail.de.state.az.us</a>	<b>Connecticut</b>	Barbara Claire Assistant Director, Legal Division Connecticut Department of Children and Families 505 Hudson Street Hartford, CT 06106 Phone #: 860-560-5056 <a href="mailto:Barbara.claire@po.state.ct.us">Barbara.claire@po.state.ct.us</a>
<b>Arkansas</b>	Carolyn Reynolds Program Coordinator, Professional Development Unit Arkansas Department of Human Services, Division of Children and Families PO Box 1437, Slot S570 Little Rock, AR 72203 Phone #: 501-682-8574 <a href="mailto:carolyn.reynolds@mail.state.ar.us">carolyn.reynolds@mail.state.ar.us</a>	<b>Delaware</b>	Frank Perfinski Adoption Program Manager Division of Family Services 1825 Faulkland Road Wilmington, DE 19805 Phone #: 302-633-2655 <a href="mailto:fperfinski@state.de.us">fperfinski@state.de.us</a>

<b>Hawaii</b>	John Walters Assistant Program Administrator State of Hawaii, Department of Human Services, Child Welfare Services 810 Richards Street, Suite 400 Honolulu, HI 96813 Phone #: 808-586-5697 Fax #: 808-586-4806 <a href="mailto:jwalters@dhs.state.hi.us">jwalters@dhs.state.hi.us</a>	<b>Massachusetts</b>	Leo Farley Director of Adoption Support Services Massachusetts Department of Social Services, Central Office 24 Farnsworth Street Boston, MA 02210 Phone #: 617-748-2267 leo.farley-dss@state.ma.us
<b>Iowa</b>	Krystine Lange Permanency Planning Program Manager Iowa Department of Human Services Hoover State Office Building, 5 <sup>th</sup> Floor Des Moines, IA 50319 Phone #: 515-281-6215 <a href="mailto:klange@dhs.state.ia.us">klange@dhs.state.ia.us</a>	<b>Minnesota</b>	Erin Sullivan-Sutton Minnesota Department of Human Services Director, Child Safety & Permanency Division 444 Lafayette Rd. St. Paul, MN 55155 Phone #: 651-296-2487 <a href="mailto:erin.sullivan-sutton@state.mn.us">erin.sullivan-sutton@state.mn.us</a>
<b>Kentucky</b>	Bonnie Hommrich Kentucky Department for Community Based Services 275 East Main Street Frankfort, KY 40601 Phone #: 502-564-7130 <a href="mailto:Bonnie.hommrich@mail.state.ky.us">Bonnie.hommrich@mail.state.ky.us</a>	<b>Mississippi</b>	Wanda B. Gillom Deputy Director Mississippi Department of Human Services Division of Family and Children's Services 750 N. State St. Jackson, MS 39202 Phone #: 601-359-4999 <a href="mailto:wgillom@mdhs.state.ms.us">wgillom@mdhs.state.ms.us</a>
<b>Louisiana</b>	Karen Apare Section Administrator, Adoption program P.O. Box 3318 Baton Rouge, LA 70821 Phone #: 225-342-4005 <a href="mailto:khebert1@dss.state.la.us">khebert1@dss.state.la.us</a>	<b>Missouri</b>	Janeene Foley Program Manager Missouri Division of Family Services PO Box 88 615 Howelton Court Jefferson City, MO 65103-0085 Phone #: 573-751-4344 <a href="mailto:jfoley@mail.dss.state.mo.us">jfoley@mail.dss.state.mo.us</a>
<b>Maine</b>	Karen Westburg Director Maine Department of Human Services Division of Child and Family Services 221 State St., State House Station #11 Augusta, ME 04333 Phone #: 207-287-5060 karen.m.westburg@state.me.us	<b>Montana</b>	Shirley Tiernan Bureau Chief for Training Montana Department of Public Health & Human Services Child and Family Services Division PO Box 8005 Helena, MT 59624 Phone #: 406-444-0043 Stiernan@state.mt.us
<b>Maryland</b>	Thomas Grazio Director, Office of Children and Family Services Maryland Department of Human Services 311 West Saratoga Street Baltimore, MD 21201 Phone #: 401-767-7269 Tgrazio@dhr.state.md.us	<b>Nebraska</b>	Margaret Bitz Nebraska Department of Health & Human Services P.O. Box 95044 Lincoln, NE 68509-5044 Phone #: 402-471-9457 <a href="mailto:Margaret.bitz@hhss.state.ne.us">Margaret.bitz@hhss.state.ne.us</a>

<b>New Hampshire</b>	Nancy Rollins Director, Division for Children, Youth and Families New Hampshire Department of Health and Human Services 129 Pleasant Street Concord, NH 03301 Phone #: 603-271-4837 nrollins@dhhs.state.nh.us	<b>Pennsylvania</b>	Cathy Utz Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare Office of Children, Youth and Families PO Box 2675 Harrisburg, PA 17105-2675 Phone #: 717-705-2912 cutz@state.pa.us
<b>New Jersey</b>	Kathy Morbit Supervising Program Support Specialist Oksana Koziak Special Assistant to the Deputy Director of Policy, Planning & Support NJ Division of Youth and Family Services PO Box 717 Trenton, NJ 08625 Phone #: Kathy: 609-984-7752 Oksana: 609-777-2052 Kmorbit@dhs.state.nj.us	<b>Rhode Island</b>	John Edward Farley Regional Director Rhode Island Department of Children, Youth and Families 101 Friendship Street Providence, RI 02903 Phone #: 401-528-3720 FAX: 401-528-3922 FarleyJ@dcyf.state.ri.us
<b>New Mexico</b>	Linda McNall Policy and Procedure Bureau Chief New Mexico Department of Children, Youth and Families PO Drawer 5160 Santa Fe NM 87502 Phone #: 505-827-3991 Fax #: 505-827-8480 Lsmcnall@cyfd.state.nm.us	<b>South Carolina</b>	Carolyn Orf South Carolina Department of Social Services PO Box 1520 Columbia, SC 29202 Phone #: 803-898-7707 corf@dss.state.sc.us
<b>North Carolina</b>	David Atkinson Local Support Operations Team Leader NC Division of Social Services 325 North Salisbury Street Raleigh, NC 27699-2408 Phone #: 919.733.7831 <a href="mailto:David.Atkinson@ncmail.net">David.Atkinson@ncmail.net</a>	<b>South Dakota</b>	Duane Jenner Program Specialist for Foster Care South Dakota Department of Social Services Child Protective Services 700 Governor's Drive Pierre, SD 57501 Phone #: (605) 773-3227 <a href="mailto:Duane.jenner@state.sd.us">Duane.jenner@state.sd.us</a>
<b>Ohio</b>	Frances W. Rembert Section Chief, Protective Services Ohio Department of Job & Family Services 55 E. Main Street, 3 <sup>rd</sup> Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215 Phone #: 614-466-9274 Rembef@odjfs.state.oh.us	<b>Texas</b>	Gilberto Cedillo Program Specialist Texas Department of Protective and Regulatory Services P. O. Box 149030 Austin, TX 78714-9030 Phone #: 512-438-3240 <a href="mailto:Gilberto.Cedillo@tdprs.state.tx.us">Gilberto.Cedillo@tdprs.state.tx.us</a>
<b>Oklahoma</b>	Elizabeth Roberts Program Field Representative, DCFS Adoptions OK Department of Human Services PO Box 5352 Oklahoma City, OK 73125 Phone #'s: 405-521-2475 <a href="mailto:e.roberts@okdhs.org">e.roberts@okdhs.org</a>	<b>Utah</b>	Linda Wininger State Milestone Coordinator Utah Department of Human Services 120 North 200 West, Rm. 225 Salt Lake City, UT 84103 Phone #: 801-776-7549 - Office, 801-558-6799 - cell lswininger@utah.gov

<b>Vermont</b>	Cindy Walcott State of Vermont Social and Rehabilitation Services 103 South Main Street 3 <sup>rd</sup> Floor Osgood Building Waterbury, VT 05671 Phone #: 802-241-2131 cwalcott@srs.state.vt.us	<b>West Virginia</b>	Michael O'Farrell Director, Division of Services for Children and Families West Virginia Department of Health and Human Resources 350 Capitol St., Room 691 Charleston, WV 25301-3704 Phone #: 304-558-6444 mofarrell@wvdhhr.org
<b>Virginia</b>	Therese Wolf Foster Care Policy Specialist Virginia Department of Social Services 730 East Broad Street Richmond VA 23218 Phone #: 804-692-1272 taw900@dss.state.va.us	<b>Wyoming</b>	Rick Robb Children's Services Program Manager Department of Family Services Hathaway Building 3 <sup>rd</sup> Floor Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002 Phone #: 307-777-7150 rrobb@state.wy.us
<b>Washington</b>	Laura Hurtado-Webb Permanency Planning Manager Washington Department of Social and Health Services PO Box 45710 Olympia, WA 98504 Phone #: 360-902-7568 hurl300@dshs.wa.gov		

**APPENDIX F. COURT IMPROVEMENT PROJECT POLL PARTICIPANTS**

*We thank the following individuals for sharing their time and expertise during this poll.*

<b>Child Welfare Contact Information</b>			
<b>Florida</b>	Patricia Badland Deborah Lacombe Office of the State Courts Administrator Supreme Court Building 500 South Duval Street Tallahassee FL 32399-1900 Phone #: 850-487-1414 <a href="mailto:Badland@flcourts.org">Badland@flcourts.org</a>	<b>Pennsylvania</b>	John Buggy Director, Court Improvement Project Philadelphia Juvenile Court 1801 Vine Street, Room 307 Philadelphia, PA 19103 Phone #: (215) 686-7786
<b>Maryland</b>	Althea R. Stewart Jones, Esq. Director, Maryland Foster Care Court Improvement Project Administrative Office of the Courts Maryland Judicial Center, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor 580 Taylor Avenue Annapolis, MD 21401 Phone #: 410-260-1296 <a href="mailto:Althea.stewart.jones@courts.state.md.us">Althea.stewart.jones@courts.state.md.us</a>	<b>Wisconsin</b>	Cheryl Calder Director, Court Improvement Project Wisconsin State Court 110 E. Main Street, Suite 410 Madison, WI 53703 Phone #: 608-266-1557 <a href="mailto:Cheryl.calder@courts.state.wi.us">Cheryl.calder@courts.state.wi.us</a>