

**REPORT OF THE ACF REGION V
2008 ROUNDTABLE ON CHILD WELFARE TRAINING SYSTEMS**

Table of Contents

Section		Page
I.	Introduction and Overview	2
II.	Roundtable Agenda	4
III.	Evaluation Results	6
IV.	Roundtable Planning	9
V.	Roundtable Participant List	10
VI.	Detailed Transcript of the Roundtable Large Group Discussions	13
VII.	Meeting Materials	36

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

To increase information sharing and collaboration among training system directors in Region V states, the ACF Region V office recently hosted a Roundtable on Child Welfare Training Systems. This day and a half meeting built upon the successes of last year's roundtable discussion. The 2008 roundtable was held in Chicago, Illinois on October 28-29, 2008. This event provided a forum for Regional Office personnel and 16 child welfare training directors, state agency executives, university partners, curriculum writers and stipend program representatives from Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin to gather together to discuss mutual training issues, challenges and successes. One participant was able to join via conference call. Minnesota, another ACF Region V state was invited to participate in the roundtable but representatives were unable to attend. (See pg. 10 for a full list of participants).

The goal of this 2008 roundtable was to bring together leaders in child welfare training in ACF Region V states and provide opportunities for them to confer about quality training with peers from other states. The roundtable was designed to be an interactive, peer to peer, working event that responded to the needs and interests of the states. Throughout this roundtable, participants shared strategies, tools, practical examples, and approaches that they use to strengthen the training they offer within their state.

Topics discussed during the 2008 roundtable included:

- Overview of each state's training system
- Regional Office status report
- Curriculum development process
- Coaching and mentoring
- E-Learning and learning management systems
- What states are doing to support supervisors
- Curricula sharing

During the roundtable participants had opportunities to join in large group conversations led by their peers, and to also meet in networking groups based on topics they identified during the first day. This mix of settings encouraged positive networking, resource sharing, and joint problem solving.

Qualitative and quantitative feedback from participants indicated that they found the roundtable very helpful, energizing, and informative— a valuable learning experience which included useful presentations, discussions and brainstorming with peers on what works and what is challenging in their training systems. Participants appreciated the opportunity to share training materials and have this networking opportunity with states throughout region V. Because the learning was so helpful, attendees plan to sustain and build upon the conversations and networking started during the roundtable through holding quarterly conference calls throughout the upcoming year. (See pg. 6 for summaries of the participant evaluations.)

The planning group has identified several factors that contributed to the success of this event including:

- sponsorship and active involvement throughout the process by the ACF Regional Office
- state input into the planning and selection of topics for the agenda
- peer presentations
- planning group that included multiple perspectives and areas of expertise (RO, State, and NRC)

- allowing sufficient time during the event for networking
- an environment, tone and intent that encouraged and supported lively discussions, exchange of ideas and sharing of materials
- deciding to transcribe the large group discussions versus teleconferencing them

The remainder of this report contains detailed information about the ACF Region V 2008 Roundtable on Child Welfare Training Systems.

- Section II contains the roundtable agenda
- Section III presents the evaluation results
- Section IV describes the planning for the roundtable
- Section V is a list of roundtable participants
- Section VI is a detailed transcript of the large group discussion
- Section VII contains meeting handouts

SECTION II: ROUNDTABLE AGENDA

CHILDREN'S BUREAU REGION V ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION ON CHILD WELFARE TRAINING SYSTEMS AGENDA

TUESDAY OCTOBER 28, 2008

TIME	TOPIC	PRESENTERS
8:30 – 9:00	Registration	
9:00 – 9:30	Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Walkthrough	Carolyn Wilson-Hurey
9:30 – 10:30	Overview of Each State's Training System	Each State* Pamela Severs
10:30 – 10:45	Break	
10:45 – 12:15	RO Status Report CFSR/PIP	Barbara Putyra Krista Thomas Indiana and others
12:15 – 1:30	Lunch on your own	
1:30 – 3:00	Curriculum Development Process - How are training needs identified? - Who is involved? - Piloting	Krista Thomas All states
3:00 – 3:15	Break	
3:15 – 5:00	Coaching and Mentoring	Illinois (facilitating) Wisconsin Indiana
5:00 – 5:30	Wrap-up – Ask for additional Networking Table topics for next morning	M.B. Lippold Chris Sieck

- * Each state will have 10 minutes to address:
- Organizational Structure
 - Strength— one item you are proudest of
 - Biggest Challenge/Need

**CHILDREN'S BUREAU REGION V ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION ON
CHILD WELFARE TRAINING SYSTEMS
AGENDA**

WEDNESDAY OCTOBER 29, 2008

8:00- 9:00	Networking Tables: (Ask for volunteers to take notes of these discussions) - E-Learning (IL) (development, resources etc) and Learning Management Systems (OH) (policy implications, funding). - Other?	
9:00 - 10:30	What States are Doing to Support Supervisors	Wisconsin and others
10:30 - 10:45	Break	
10:45 - 11:45	Sharing of Specific Curricula List/brief description of current curricula, including: - method of delivery (e-learning other) - availability - cost? - Q&A	All states/Ohio facilitating
11:45 – 12:30	Next Steps, Evaluation and Wrap-up	Carolyn Wilson-Hurey Chris Sieck

SECTION III: EVALUATION RESULTS

ACF REGION V ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION OF CHILD WELFARE TRAINING SYSTEMS

**COMBINED EVALUATION
DRAFT**

Date: November 4, 2008

I. Your Functional Area N=15

Child Welfare Training Director 5 State Agency Executive 1
 University Partner 1 Curriculum Developer 2
 Other: 6

II. Your Ratings

		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Comment
1.	The right people attended the roundtable from my state.	1*		2	11	
2.	The roundtable met my expectations.	1*		3	11	
3.	Overall, presenters were prepared and organized.	1*		4	10	
4.	Overall, the presenters engaged me.	1*		5	9	
5.	The presentations were at the right level.	1*		4	9	
6.	The format of the presentations encouraged discussion.	1*		5	9	
7.	Logistics regarding the roundtable were satisfactory.	1*		6	7	
8.	I learned information that will help my agency improve our training system.	1*		1	11	
9.	I will use the information from the roundtable.	1*		2	11	
10	Handouts and other materials were helpful.	1*		5	9	
11	Agency staff will benefit from my attending this roundtable.	1*		3	9	

**Strongly disagree* was selected on the evaluation, but the comments did not reflect a negative experience; perhaps respondent intended to select *strongly agree*.

***Not all respondents responded to all evaluation items.*

III. Your Comments (Use back of form if needed.)

Were the topics presented during the roundtable the 'right' topics? 14 Yes ___ No ___ Both

If you selected 'no', please explain why and identify topics you would have preferred.

- I would like to have continued discussion regarding supervisor training (yes selected)
- Excellent agenda – even better than last year (and last year was excellent) (yes selected)

What were the strengths of the roundtable?

- Great collaboration amongst the team; great resources shared; I look forward to seeing how our Roundtable evolves following the implementation of expanded TA centers in 2008 forward.
- Nice movement through topics.
- Networking, sharing freely of information and resources; pertinent topic areas; well organized regarding contact information and facilitation.
- Interaction between States; sharing of resources.
- Opportunity to network and share across the States; candid and open strengths about what works and what doesn't; no hyperbole of trying to make state "look good;" support that "We're all in this together" and can use each other as technical and 'emotional' support.
- Sharing of information; ongoing relationship building/opportunities.
- Sharing resources for e-learning; planning for quarterly conference call structure.
- Sharing and exchange of curricula, information on training.
- Face to face contact and discussion with other people from different states; helps build and establish rapport in relationship with others.
- Level of engagement; LMS and e-learning discussions.
- Openness; the right people; regional office support.
- It was beneficial to hear the spectrum of training and the helpfulness of participants.
- Information sharing.
- Knowledge, willingness to share; no one person hogged the mic.

What were the areas needing improvement?

- None.
- Would have been nice to have more nuts and bolts conversations about curriculum development.
- Cost of location (hotel especially); more input and participation from "feds;" felt like they were watching and writing but not sharing what they were thinking (maybe this happens outside of this meeting and I am not aware).
- Hotel rates; internet access.
- The only thing that would have been helpful (and may not be in your control) is to schedule meeting and a room block at a hotel in advance so that we could have all been at one hotel and at a more reasonable rate (we almost weren't allowed to attend due to very expensive hotel rates).
- More of everything.
- Can we use a "wired" connection to the Internet next time? Maybe a Federal employee could logon to your network using a data port in the room and we could use your internet access to logon on to our websites.
- Can't think of any.

Other Comments:

- Thanks for allowing me to participate by teleconference call. It was not the most ideal, however, it met our needs due to restrictive travel.
- Great dialogue and resource sharing amongst participants; at future PIP related calls, brief information from this Roundtable should be shared with States for any additional supports.
- Overall good job.

- Thank you! This has been extremely helpful and well worth the time away from the office (I can't say that for many meetings).
- Would have liked additional staff and university; but budget precluded.
- Great meeting.
- Could be condensed to one day.

SECTION IV: ROUNDTABLE PLANNING

This Roundtable built upon the successes of the first meeting, held in Chicago, Illinois on October 23-24, 2007, which brought together child welfare training directors, university training partners, and university stipend programs to engage in collaboration and information sharing on a regional level, as well as to strengthen the network of training professionals in the region.¹

The planning for this Roundtable was truly a collaborative effort, with representation from each of the six states as well as the ACF Region V office and the National Child Welfare Resource Center (NRCOI) for Organizational Improvement working together and following an approach that had proven successful for the 2007 roundtable. Over the course of the summer and into the fall of 2008, this group met (via conference call) several times to plan the event.

Based on the evaluations of the 2007 event, the planning group agreed that this roundtable would also be a peer to peer, interactive event, with a mix of folks involved with child welfare training be invited, including child welfare training directors, state agency executives, university partners and curriculum writers. The planning group was clear from the first that the cost of travel and meals would be an agency responsibility.

The planning group drafted an agenda that suggested several topics, highlighted common identified interests, and encouraged participant interaction. After consultation with others in each state, the agenda was agreed upon, including the state presenters and notetakers. The planning group suggested that the Regional Office invite participants and that NRCOI handle the registrations.

¹For more detailed information on the 2007 Roundtable planning process, including sample forms, refer to the 2007 Roundtable Report located at <http://muskie.usm.maine.edu/helpkids/rcpdfs/RoundtableReportFinal.pdf>.

SECTION IV: ROUNDTABLE PARTICIPANTS

ACF – Region V Office						
Name		Title	Agency	Phone	Email	Functional Area
Carrillo	Irene	Child Welfare Program Specialist	ACF - Region V Children's Bureau 233 N. Michigan Ave, Suite 400 Chicago, IL 60601	312-886-4934	Irene.Carrillo@acf.hhs.gov	CB Regional CW Program Specialist
Doran	Mary	Program Specialist	ACF - Region V Children's Bureau 233 N. Michigan Ave, Suite 400 Chicago, IL 60601	312-886-4597	Mary.doran@acf.hhs.gov	Federal Staff
Flagg-Ross	Ruby	Program Specialist	ACF - Region V Children's Bureau 233 N. Michigan Ave, Suite 400 Chicago, IL 60601	312-886-4202	Ruby.flaggross@acf.hhs.gov	Other
Guthrie	Christine	Children and Families Program Specialist	ACF - Region V Children's Bureau 233 N. Michigan Ave, Suite 400 Chicago, IL 60601	312-886-4916	Christine.guthrie@acf.hhs.gov	Federal - Program Specialist
Putyra	Barbara	Children and Families Program Specialist	ACF - Region V Children's Bureau 233 N. Michigan Ave, Suite 400 Chicago, IL 60601	312-353-1786	Barbara.putyra@acf.hhs.gov	Federal Staff
Sanchez	Carmen	Program Specialist	ACF - Region V Children's Bureau 233 N. Michigan Ave, Suite 400 Chicago, IL 60601	312-353-9678	Carmen.sanchez@acf.hhs.gov	Federal Specialist
Thomas	Krista	Children and Families Program Specialist	ACF - Region V Children's Bureau 233 N. Michigan Ave, Suite 400 Chicago, IL 60601	312-353-1122	Krista.thomas@acf.hhs.gov	ACF RO Specialist
Wilson-Hurey	Carolyn	Regional Program Manager	ACF - Region V Children's Bureau 233 N. Michigan Ave, Suite 400 Chicago, IL 60601	312-353-9672	Carolyn.wilson-hurey@acf.hhs.gov	RO Employee
Illinois						
Hall	Joyce	Regional Administrator	Department of Children and Family Services 3518 W. Division Street Chicago, IL 60651	312-793-2003	Joyce.hall@illinois.gov	Cook County Regional Administrator
Howard	Judy	E-Learning Manager, Office of Training	Department of Children and Family Services 227 So. 7 th Street Springfield, IL 62701	217-785-5689	Judy.howard@illinois.gov	Training Manager

Missel	Craig	Assistant Administrator – Office of Training. Administrator of Child Welfare Employee Licensure	Department of Children and Family Services 227 So. 7 th Street, Station #122 Springfield, IL 62701	217-785-5689	Craig.missel@illinois.gov	Training Administrators/ Manager
Nelson-Phillips	Joan	Deputy Director of Quality Assurance	Department of Children and Family Services 160N LaSalle, 6 th Fl. Chicago, IL 60601	312-814-5527	Joan.nelson-phillips@illinois.gov	Training Administrators/ Manager
Weck	Terrence	POS Monitoring	Department of Children and Family Services 1026 S. Damen Avenue Chicago, IL 60612	312-793-8527	Terrence.weck@illinois.gov	POS Monitor
Zaleski	Judy	Administrator – Office of Training and Professional Development	Department of Children and Family Services 227 So. 7 th Street, Station #122 Springfield, IL 62701	217-785-5689	Judy.zaleski@illinois.gov	Training Administrators/ Manager
Indiana						
Lippold	M.B.	Deputy Director of Staff Development	Indiana Department of Child Services 302 W. Washington Street, Room E306 – MS 47 Indianapolis, IN 46204	317-234-3925	Mb.lippold@dcs.in.gov	Child Welfare Training Director
Votapek	Jackie	Training Manager	Indiana Child Welfare Education & Training Partnership 515 East Main Street, Suite 165 Carmel, Indiana 46032	317-278-9813	jvotapek@iupui.edu	Training administrators/manager & University training partner
Michigan						
Davis-Schneider	Laura	Manager	Department of Human Services Child Welfare Training Institute 3038 W. Grand Blvd. Ste. 6-300 Detroit, MI 48202	313-456-1343	davisL7@michigan.gov	Curriculum Developer

Siemon	Carol	Director	Department of Human Services Child Welfare Training Institute 235 S. Grand Ave. Ste. 510 Lansing, MI 48909	517-241-9275	siemonc@michigan.gov	Child Welfare Training Director
Ohio						
Gruber	Kelley	Trainer, Development Coordinator	Institute for Human Services 1706 E. Broad Street Columbus, OH 43203	614-251-6000	kgruber@ihs-trainet.com	Training Administrators/ Manager
Handon	Rose	Bureau Chief	ODJFS – Office for Children & Families 50 W. Town Street – 6 th Floor Columbus, OH 43215	614-752-0655	Rose.Handon@jfs.ohio.gov	Bureau Chief
Severs	Pamela	Training Consultant	Institute for Human Services 1706 E. Broad Street Columbus, OH 43203	614-251-6000	psevers@ihs-trainet.com	Training Administrators/ Manager
Wisconsin						
Sieck	Chris	State Child Welfare Training Coordinator	WI Department of Children and Families 455 Science Drive, Suite 110 Madison, WI 53711	608-262-5712	crsieck@wisc.edu	Child Welfare Training Director
Smith	Ellen	Curriculum Coordinator	WI Department of Children and Families 455 Science Drive, Suite 110 Madison, WI 53711	608-890-0976	Ecsmith4@wisc.edu	Curriculum Developer
Konop	Greg	E-learning Coordinator	UW-Madison 1210 W. Dayton St. Madison, WI 53706	608-265-6485	gkonop@wisc.edu	E-Learning
Additional State CW Training Contacts						
Dean	Richard	Training Unit Supervisor	Minnesota Department of Human Services PO Box 64943 St. Paul, MN 55164-0943	651-431-4669	richard.f.dean@state.mn.us	
Crozier	LeRoy	Human Services Developer	Bureau of Family Services 50 W. Town Street – 6 th Floor Columbus, OH 43215	614-752-0264	leroy.crozier@jfs.ohio.gov	

SECTION V: DETAILED TRANSCRIPT OF ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION

October 28, 2008

■ **Welcome, Introductions, and Agenda Walkthrough**

Carolyn Wilson-Hurey, ACF Regional Program manager, welcomed all participants. All of the roundtable participants then introduced themselves. This included representation from Wisconsin, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, and Region V staff. Ms. Wilson-Hurey walked through the two day agenda for the meeting.

■ **Topic: Overview of Each State's Training System**

Each state gave an overview of their child welfare training system.

➤ ***Chris Sieck, Wisconsin***

WI is a state supervised, county administered system except for BMCW, which is state administered. Chris is the state training coordinator and manages the contracts with the university training partnerships – 5 regional partnerships and the intertribal training partnership and the student stipend programs.

The Curriculum coordinator shepherds the training development process (Ellen Smith). The E-learning coordinator works throughout the curriculum development process. They have developed a blended format in the training and have developed an entire pre-service training in an on-line format.

The statewide post QSR training component is new. They work with counties on their action plans post the QSR process that may or may not involve training activities. They have developed a process to work individually with counties on skill-based areas and develop individualized training events for the counties. This can be classroom based or done around a conference room table. This has been a great addition to WI's "training toolbox."

Regional training partnerships deliver all of the training statewide.

The biggest 2008 accomplishment for WI is that they've completed a comprehensive assessment of the training system. They contracted with Butler Institute and Colorado University to develop a strategic plan and to develop training most efficiently; how to best incorporate research into both policy development and training programs as well; and looking at strengthening distance learning and making it most useful for the counties who have difficulties making it to training in other parts of the state.

Challenge: Revolved around the development of their new department. WI transitioned into a free standing Department of Children and Families. This is the first time WI has a cabinet position working with children and families. There have been many new position created that are still vacant – this has been a challenge throughout this assessment process. Some advocates in the training program have now moved into a different position or are now covering two positions. It has been a challenge to keep the level of contact needed to move forward the system of goals.

Number of staff:

Regional training partnerships – 15 people total in the regions

Centralized administrative structure – 4

➤***M. B. Lippold, Indiana***

In July 2005, Children’s Services was established as a cabinet department in Indiana. Previously, it was part of a larger department. The last Governor separated the free-standing department. Indiana training needs to be looked at pre- and post-2005. Pre-2005, there were relatively few staff positions and most training was delivered by contractors.

During the first CFSR, initial training was identified as an area needing improvement (ANI). Staff received caseloads without preservice and there was no training department. M. B. became the lead for the new training department in the new Children’s Services department. This is an executive level position and she participates in the executive level meetings of all the other departments because the director believes training is just that important and needs to be part of those high level discussions.

A training partnership was developed with Indiana University; this was also new in 2005. The contract has four deliverables: classroom training, production support area (2 million imprints last year), training records information system (they have tied into Enterprise Learning Management system through PeopleSoft); and they have successfully automated their registration process, and when folks sign in, it goes directly to their training record and their personnel record, etc. It’s now “magically taken care of.”

Number of staff: 2 training managers (one state, one at IU), 4 supervisors, 18 trainers (split between IW and State), and 2 curriculum developers.

Biggest success: Think they have a plan to do a level 4 evaluation process; think they have a way to track their training to their performance outcomes. They have also doubled their workforce in the last 3 years; and now have about 1600 caseworkers. They meet CWLA standards for recommended caseloads and have met their target for 12 initial assessments on a caseload.

IN has worked with the Butler Institute to develop a new supervisor training. Indiana’s mission and values are incorporated into this new supervisor training, along with IN specific modules which include models targeting specific needs like “how to use ICWIS as a supervisor.”

Biggest challenge in 2008: Staff retention. They are new and it took a lot of work to develop new, good trainers— they travel so much for not a lot of pay and several people have moved on. People have had to step in and cover the absences; however, they did get trainers a 10% raise. They are trying to upgrade this position. They are installing video-conferencing to have it be available from all 18 regional training centers to try to minimize travel for both training staff and workers/supervisors around the state.

The Leadership Transformation Group are the consultants the state is working with for the next 8-10 months—funded by Casey Family Programs (Casey came to the State and offered this service). They will be developing IN specific workgroups (ink is not dry on the contract).

➤ *Judy Zaleski, Illinois*

Illinois is a centralized state, and the training office has a long history and has been in existence since 1980. Judy and Craig Missel were hired back in 1980; both left for a while and are now back.

It is a substantially large office, one in Springfield and Chicago, both have classrooms and both are fully staffed. The training staff has decreased over the past year, and there are currently 54 staff members. Staff turnover and keeping your best trainers is a continual challenge faced by Illinois. They have approximately 16 trainers out of 54 staff. They travel all the time and have struggled to even get their vacation time; there's little down time at all. The upside to their training system is that there are approximately 200 contractual training primarily for PRIDE and foster/adoptive parent training.

There are 110,000 learners in the IL database.

There are 250,000 registrations per year.

They have delivered 4500 classes.

They have awarded over 1,000,000 CEUs; they do almost everything they can do to earn staff CEUs.

Travel needed for training is a challenge for IL as well; staff travel and per diem for training purposes is difficult. IL is now divided into 32 learning collaboratives so that staff do not have to drive far to access training (about 40 minutes); hard data on these learning collaboratives will be available next year.

They divide up their courses into pre-service and in-service; specific trainings where licensing is involved, as well as other job-specific areas. Pre-service – everyone comes through there before beginning his or her positions. They've had E-learning in place the last 3 years

Training is a combination of in-house, classroom, and on-line courses. Pre-service training for foster/adoptive caregivers includes nine PRIDE modules—all trainings are evenings and weekends, and a combination of in-house, classroom, and on-line.

IL does work with any outside trainers that come in to make sure the language and curriculum that is used is Illinois specific so that it is relevant and sustainable. Specific university partnerships exist around training; one with Western Illinois University – they helped IL develop and host the e-learning component. They have a separate contract with sociology dept at Western – they help with pre/post tests and evaluations for all pre-service training – it's a great collaboration. They also have another one with Southern Illinois University, and a new one with Chicago State University around trauma-informed services who have been willing to listen and work together with them around where IL wants to go with this project so that everything they are doing is looked through a trauma-informed lens. They also contract with Northwestern University

Biggest strength: Attitude change within the department. They worked on a total paradigm shift within the department which brought on a big change in perspective on on-line learning and the Learning Management System – they are now much more open and engaged in the processes and systems and it has been such a big pleasure to overcome this resistance. A great part of the Learning Management System is registering on-line, and the fact that staff and supervisors can access their transcripts and training records which saves lots of time and phone calls.

Biggest challenges:

- Funding issues; lots of what they are able/not able to do is based on funding. There has been difficulty with meeting the demand for training that staff need.
- Trainer stability; it's so hard to develop a good trainer, and when they lose them, it takes 6 months to a year to get somebody else to where they need to be.
- Software compatibility issues.
- ADA compliance issues, it's a struggle and an expense.

➤ ***Carol Siemon, Michigan***

Michigan is a centralized state-administered training system.

Biggest driver right now in State CW system is the Children's Rights settlement.

They have created a separate Children's Services Administration (not a new dept, but a new administration within the dept). Carol is the Director of the new CW Training Institute – a Cabinet level position with the Children's Service Administration.

There are many new staff and managers within Michigan. They have some things in place that have worked pretty well, including an extensive pre-service training which is a blended learning experience that encompasses both public and private agency workers. The state contracts out a lot, especially things related to adoption.

Pre-service is in pretty good shape and they are developing a competency based evaluation, working to an extent with Michigan State University on this project as well as some supervisor training, also as it relates to worker retention.

They are in the process of switching from an archaic registration system, monitored primarily by one person, to another that will have a tracking component and also allow for more video-conferencing and other stuff that is not currently available. This new computer program will facilitate tracking of the training records.

In the past, they have done some work with Tribes, and there are some partnerships with Universities, but not much. They are moving in that direction now; there is new political will in the administration and collaboration is increasing at the top levels. They are also expanding what they are doing with the private agencies—working to offer regional training opportunities on a rotating basis so private workers don't always have to come to state agency training. There are new requirements for increasing on-going training hours

Biggest challenge: Funding. Funding is a little better due to the lawsuit, and more resources have been made available. The biggest challenge will be meeting the new requirements and timeframes from the lawsuit, and Michigan will have to hire and train lots of new workers. They will not be able to carry a caseload prior to training like they could in the past. What they're trying to do is have experienced trainers work with the new ones and to try and anticipate the training needs the next CFSR will identify. Capacity is not where it needs to be at this time.

MI will probably be in a much better place 6 months from now.

➤ ***Pam Severs, Ohio***

The Ohio Child Welfare Training Program work has been part of the State for about 25 years now and is a good solid program. There are eight regional training centers, so no one has to travel more than 45 minutes to an hour for training.

Since last year:

OH is most proud of trainer development and their work in the cultural competency area. They've worked not only with the workers but have examined all of the curricula as well. The state has a large immigrant population, and they have cultural maps of Ohio indicating where different cultural groups are located – which they're very proud of.

They're getting more involved in looking at evidenced-based practice and making sure it is incorporated in the curricula. They're also looking more at Alternative Response.

Kelly Gruber –walked through the materials they provided.

All trainers are contract, and are hired per training. There is a booklet that explains the process and a manual they receive once they are approved.

OH is rewriting all of their competencies to make sure they are at an 8th grade reading level.

Ohio is also moving to Trauma-informed practice and training, and is a part of that workgroup. Trauma informed services will be the theme for their annual trainer's conference

OH is also looking to engage youth who are currently in the system, or recently aged out, to get their feedback on the trainings and the curricula. Two foster caregivers were selected to sit on the Statesteering committee and they have both voice and vote (legislatively determined).

Rose Handon added that OH has also worked on a compensation schedule, which is now about \$550 per diem for each training.

Pam Severs stated that another strong partnership is with PCSAO (Public Children's Services Agency Organization).

- Chris Sieck asked the following question: What is shared with TANF folks around training?

WI is looking at how to share their information with related programs, particularly as they've moved to the new department and are working more closely with them – right now they're looking at the highest levels of sharing and collaboration (space, for example).

IN is trying to work more with Child Support to see more of what their needs are and how they can be incorporated, though they struggle with all child welfare references and examples in the training.

IL also shares space and equipment, there is some collaboration that goes on between the agencies but a lot more is needed.

■ **Topic: Regional Office Status Report; CFSR/PIP**

➤ **Barbara Putyra**

Barbara gave an overview of the new Implementation Center Grants. The grantees were announced last week, and the kick off is today in Washington, DC. There are five child Welfare Implementation Centers that are complementary with the 7 National Child Welfare Resource Centers. They will be assisting states and tribes with in depth and long-term projects to increase sustainable system change, whereas the Resource Centers provide more short-term technical assistance. They'll have a system of care framework that's holistic, family-centered, and culturally sensitive.

Implementation Centers:

- Regions I and II, University of Southern Maine, Muskie School of Public Service
- Regions III and IV, University of Maryland, Baltimore, ICF International
- Regions V and VII, University of Nebraska at Lincoln
- Regions VI and VIII, University of Texas, Arlington
- Regions IX and X, American Institutes for Research, Georgetown University, NICWA

The first forum will take place in Chicago in April 2009. They will hope to have an application process developed around the 1st of the year.

There will be 2 years per project. The first year will look at partner agencies, key stakeholders, and binding agreements. The implementation of the plans for systemic change will occur in the second year. There will be 2 projects in year one, and a minimum of 4 in 5 years. They will spend approximately \$100,000 to \$700,000 per project.

Goals of regional forum in March, 2009:

- awareness of available TA resources
- encourage states to apply for projects
- build relationships

The second regional forum, 3 years down the road, will be to re-energize, share preliminary results, and encourage the second round of applications. During the 4th quarter of the 5th year,

there will be regional forums on how to sustain results. There will also be specific regional forums (i.e. tribal collaborations and response).

- What kind of proposals will you be looking for?

There will be a written guide to develop proposals, broken down to identify areas of needs/concerns.

- Will each state be part of an implementation center project?

They're targeting states that have gone through Round 2 of the CFSR (Minnesota, Kansas, Indiana, and Ohio).

They're looking to make sustainable changes, but other states can still apply because it's likely that they may be considered.

- How will TA be delivered?

On-site, video conferencing, coordinated collaboration, visits to other states/tribes, train the trainers, job restructuring.

Emphasis on face-to face TA—this creates richer, more engaging interaction and is crucial. Funds are allocated to pay for states and Tribes to go to the regional forums.

- Will statewide CFSR Needs Assessments be available to the Implementation Centers for TA?

They will have access to all information posted.

The Implementation Centers will work with what exists already in states (Casey, etc.) rather than superimposing a specific structure on states. The ICs may be able to provide funding for non-project states to visit with successful SOS projects.

➤ **Krista Thomas**

- Overview of Child Welfare Workforce Initiatives
- Role of CW Workforce Initiatives

- Why the new Workforce proposals?
 - Build on our previous investment in gaining knowledge of workforce issues (i.e., recruitment, training, retention) and improving systems
 - Integrate new workforce programs with the existing T/TA Network, Child Welfare Information Gateway, and other cooperative agreements
 - Focus on leadership and professional development in workforce more broadly, and attempt to tap members of the workforce, across professional levels, as potential instruments of change
 - Allow for more flexibility in project funding for development of practices that are specific to the unique workforce needs of an agency
 - Increase the opportunity for systemic change with greater emphasis on building networks, sustainability, and capitalizing on existing resources and technology

- Retain the current number of IV-B traineeship programs for current and prospective child welfare professionals while increasing the likelihood of their integration into systems change
- Emphasize strategic dissemination of best and promising practices, including direct access to the professionals in the field
- Prioritize evaluation
- Align with the CB vision for a system of care approach to Network T/TA services

There were 5 grants awarded:

- National Child Welfare Training Workforce Institute: The Research Foundation of SUNY, University of Albany, Albany NY
- Child Welfare Comprehensive Workforce Grants:
 - Colorado Seminary, University of Denver, Denver, CO
 - Louisiana State University and A&M College, Baton Rouge, LA
 - University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC
 - The University of Kansas Center for Research, Inc., Lawrence, KS

The Leadership Institute and Workforce Institutes will train child welfare professionals. The key components of the Workforce Institute are:

- Center for Leadership and Professional Development
- Best practice providers
- Evaluation
- Center for Dissemination
- Facilitator for Peer Network coordination
- Knowledge development via training curricula

In Round 2, 32 states were reviewed. Nine of those states were found to be in substantial conformity with the Training Systemic Factor, 5 were not.

Three items are considered under the training systemic factors: initial training, ongoing training, and training for foster and adoptive parents (including institutions). Information was gathered through the statewide assessment as well as through stakeholder interviews. The assessment must include a training description, requirements, and effectiveness evaluations.

Key questions for statewide assessments are focused around pre service, mentoring, training caseloads, and what happens if training is not completed. Does the policy of how training is supposed to happen really occur at the local level? There are desires to see a difference between public and private pre-service. How are training needs assessed?

Other questions posed were around tracking, and timely completion of training requirements, as well as how to measure the effectiveness of foster and adoptive parent training. How do you know workers and caregivers are learning what they need to e-learning? How do states determine training needs?

Training is more effective when the same key staff are involved in all phases—statewide assessment, review process, PIP development.

See PowerPoint presentation for complete information on Training.

➤ ***M.B. Lippold, Indiana***

Indiana did not pass Round 2. There wasn't any initial training in the 2001 CFSR, but the ongoing training was a strength (although they did not offer in-house training). Foster and adoptive parent training was rated as an area needing improvement in 2001, but was not directly related to their particular training program. They need to review policy, practice, changes from the PIP, other initiatives/strategies, and performance measures that showed effectiveness.

During exit conferences their new workers training is complemented and comments are made that it is very comprehensive. This includes 12 weeks of classroom and field experience with a mentor, as well as pre and post testing. For 30 weeks, pre-service starts every Monday. They found that outcomes were directly linked to the amount of time they had utilized practice models. For foster and adoptive parents there is one curriculum, but no evaluations of effectiveness.

They found that they need more additions and licensing training, on-going training, a system to track training, and a training effectiveness assessment.

➤ ***Rose, Ohio***

Ohio did not pass Round 2, but did fairly well in the training area. They need to strengthen tracking the effectiveness of their training and evaluation. They've experienced difficulties with the county offices wanting to do things their own way, and not understanding how this impacts training. There are opportunities for new learning. Their on-site review consists of stakeholders, judges, CASAs, staff, and youth.

They also conduct an exit conference with staff and stakeholders. The exit conference is very detailed, and led into PIP planning. There are overarching themes for states within their PIPs, and training needs can be interweaved within these (i.e. engagement with families—a theme needing work—refine child welfare visitation, engagement, etc.).

For Ohio, the SACWIS is not yet implemented throughout the entire state.

➤ ***M.B. Lippold, Indiana***

Indiana has 10 different subcommittees focused around safety, permanency, well-being, engaging fathers, and youth. Within the PIP, training is used to support the plan and change, but is not the solution (i.e. training is not the answer). They need to have specific goals about what training will do and what change will occur to be sustained. They required a county assessment and 3 areas where worker improvement could occur. Questions asked were: who was to be trained? What would happen? They then would send out training at local levels.

■ **Topic: Curriculum Development Process**

Questions that were raised included:

- How are training needs identified?
- Who is involved?
- How does piloting occur?

Indiana

Indiana shared some of the tools that they are using for consistency purposes. They are trying to work toward establishing some consistencies. The University and the state started a partnership in 2007, and early on identified some curriculum writers and then came up with standards around the curriculum process. They had purchased core curriculum from IHS and had some curriculum prepared by Butler and the Child Welfare Policy and Practice Group. They broke down into four phases as evidenced by the handouts. They do this for any new curriculum that they have, and also have a needs assessment process. Indiana is still in the learning mode, and want to learn from others here as well.

- Phase one: The first phase is the planning and assessing phase. This is the most important phase. This phase, if not done well, impacts on the rest of the process in term of moving forward. They engage a wide variety of subject matter experts as well as the trainers, and can tap into the expertise of professors at the university. They have been able to work with some consultants as well. Once that is done, they want to try and conduct a needs assessment, facilitate some group planning sessions, obtain some core consensus, and then identify appropriate policies. The needs assessment tool is very thorough.

Indiana is currently in the process of updating the entire new curriculum and aligning everything from the training competencies to the overall agency outcomes. They are asking questions regarding the relevant practice indicators for each training. They are also looking at the skills needed after each training and how this will be applied in the field. This helps with alignment to make sure that their system is working. They begin to look at who the learners are, their desired type of training, and need to make sure workers have the skills when they walk out the door.

They review the transfer of learning methods. Each of the trainings has a satisfaction survey. Core new worker has a pre- and post-test period. They do skill assessment scales at 3 months post training and also at 6 months post-training.

- Phase two: The second phase is the development process. This phase focuses on the content. Indiana uses an info-mapping format to put the curriculum together. It takes 4 to 8 hours to develop just 1 hour of training. If they're just updating, it takes 9 days to develop. New coursework takes 18 days.

- Phase three: The third phase is the delivery process. During this phase, they prepare trainers who have participated in the workgroup. They pilot the draft at least 3 or 4 times to get all of the kinks worked out. They take the feedback and then do revisions if appropriate. They use trainer feedback as well as the level 1 evaluations. Level 2 evaluations are acquired after the post test.
- Phase four: The last phase is the finalization of the curriculum. This is when they obtain approval from DCS. They then implement and track any further modifications that occur.

Indiana would appreciate any feedback from any others.

- How do topics come up?

The response was new worker training foundation practices, and for experienced workers, do an ITNA process. They have done some surveys, and conducted a survey of supervisors. They have also done focus groups.

- Who is involved in the pilot?

They still have staff in the classes but let them know that this is a pilot. They used information from the CFSR to identify topics as well. Attendees have given us information about what can be improved.

- What about level IV evaluation? Is it too far away from what we control?
How are we going to tie this together?

There are many factors involved after they go to training – should training be held accountable given all of the other factors that are involved? Questions arose around how Indiana is going to segment out some of the variables that can affect this. There are lots of issues involved and IN may need to move cautiously forward.

This process nicely describes standardized curriculum development. Specialized workshops—policy staff is assisting with some specialized workshops especially as it relates to policy.

Michigan

Michigan is really driven at this time by a lawsuit. Some administrative changes have occurred. They compared how things used to be vs. what they are now. In 2004, they were canceling the pre-service institute because of a hiring freeze. Counties would call the training department and give a need and they would go to the county and provide what was asked. They would meet with peer review folks and determined needs and build something for that county. They had the time to do that. They would consult with subject matter experts, but the majority of the development occurred within CWI.

From 2006-2007, they had large numbers in the training institutes. Trainers focused on the new hires coming in and spent a lot of time on that. Any down time was spent on updating policy based on new legislation. Some budget directives came down, and staff were directed not to go to trainings, and could only attend mandated trainings. They weren't able to attend any outside trainings.

Then, in 2008, they felt a big positive change coming. With the new administration, a new cabinet level department was designed and focused on children's services making training a priority. They really understood the focus of training.

Michigan has a very active, involved legislature. That drives training needs. They have some trainings responding to specific incidents and sometimes develop training due to that.

The methodology is good, i.e. like Indiana. They need to make sure that policy changes are known. All of the training is built around competencies. Internal and external staff were used to identify what the objectives and outcomes were.

A curriculum position was developed in May of 2008. Previously, trainers really did this after identifying changes that needed to be made. Now they have a unit that can focus more on how to develop appropriate trainings.

They are strengthening partnership with local universities. They work a lot with private agencies, and try to collaborate with them on the development and delivery of training. They're trying to work with the tribes as well, but this is challenging with unique sets of rules.

They have separate units for different classifications, and some trainings cover a lot of staff. Many internal departments are brought in to assist with the development of training. Also, they bring in parents, youth, foster parents etc. Youth come into new worker training to talk about their experiences.

Piloting: They typically have at least 1 pilot. They will be doing many pilots in December, and use this as a train the trainer approach. Folks from the field are invited, as well as other internal stakeholders so that they can obtain their feedback. They will look to put many of these things into practice in January.

After each training, they look at feedback and make small changes if possible. They may add activities to make it more engaging, etc. It is as if every training is a pilot.

Illinois

All of their curricula and coursework is contained in the course catalog. Coursework is developed around pre-service and in-service, from clerical level to executive level staff. They train the department and colleagues – about 7000 people.

This is a big amorphous group. It's really an ongoing process, with steps 1-11. They're constantly looking at what employees are asked to do in terms of knowledge, skills, and abilities and constantly re-assessing. Jobs tend to change. This is a dynamic process. At step 11 there is a balanced feedback loop, for every classification, they all continue to learn. The job task analysis is a career long model. Step 11 is an ongoing annualized process of needs assessment.

Training competency analysis: everything that a person does is observed and they catalog each thing that they do to the most discreet detail. It's important to identify what programs are available to meet the needs—this is a way of categorizing the competencies.

They have a learning competency level key, and cross reference in this document for the CFSR, Council on Accreditation, and do the same thing for the Office of Inspector General. They look at the rules and procedures and the level of competency by the end of the course and after one year on the job.

It takes 12 to 18 months for a new hire to reach the point with supervision of really being able to provide appropriate child welfare services. The first year in the field is looked at as the learning period of time. At the end of the year, they tie the job evaluations with management in the field and identify additional learning needs.

For ongoing purposes, job competencies really do not change, but they need to raise the bar from a skill-building standpoint. They have constant improvement and continue to work towards raising the bar. Training needs assessment grows out of the field. They work with the management team and constantly obtain information from them to find out what the learning needs are and tie to the original baseline on competencies.

There are record job competencies in the professional development plan and they have an on-line account for every employee. Individual learning needs can be recorded to this system as well.

There is a discussion of the employee training evaluation as completed by the supervisor/manager. Feedback on skills is requested and obtained. They always go back to baseline competencies.

Again, they model the curriculum to the competencies identified. There are content experts that they use along with the other methods already discussed. They are always looking for ways to improve—the week long training has been modified; and a new hire is given a caseload as a parallel assignment with another experienced worker in the lead. When a week is spent on assessment, that is then reinforced in the field with actual clients under supervision. New worker training is a blend of classroom time, field time, and virtual time. They're beginning to recognize that that need to have demonstrated that they can do the job. Previously, they just did classroom training and then “turned them loose.” Some was guesswork. Now they really connect the curriculum to the job tasks.

They have a new trauma informed perspective so they need to incorporate this into other casework—using the life of the case model and go from intake all the way through to case closing and all of the IV-E and IV-B allowable activities.

Step 4 is when the trainer, supervisor, and manager meet. Attachment D that was distributed is a sample of that.

Illinois is glad to share any of their work product with other states.

- There was a question on CFSR and what is connected in relation to the competencies? i.e. safety items or well-being items.

They do a cross walk through the entire list and can make that available. They have more complete examples compared to the sample. When they get requests, they try to determine exactly what the need is, and be very specific.

Illinois has involved others (i.e. judges, GALs) in the job task analysis. There are supervisors and others who almost become trainers to assist. A review again of new worker training, current structure of classroom and on the job training—seems to be a good mix of what is needed. Constant interaction is needed between training, the field, and OAR.

Wisconsin

Overall, the process looks very similar to what others have done. WI is a state supervised county administered system. Training does not have a direct relationship since the counties are independent agencies. They can give them feedback but it's really up to them whether or not to use it.

□ How are needs identified?

Needs are funneled through the case process subcommittee, which contains representation from all over Wisconsin. This committee is heavily involved in the policy area and members of the training system are members of this. They're able to distill training needs from that committee.

QSR process has been able to identify trends and have relayed that information. That has been very useful. They have one county that is state administered and that has a training system in place. Supervisors in this county let them know what they see in new employees and what the training needs are.

They have a curriculum committee that is part of the regional training partnerships and the training needs funnel through this committee and have more discussion really trying to zero in what the need is and what it means.

They also have an ITNA system and all of the counties are using this. Over the years, they've seen the same kinds of needs so have moved past the ITNA and use other avenues to identify training needs.

A lot has been covered. The path of curriculum development has been very collaborative. Training partnerships have taken the lead, and they're moving toward a more centralized system. If there are other specialized curriculums needed, they can bring someone else in and develop them quickly.

□ Who is involved?

They have a group process which includes all of the stakeholders from all over the state; policy individuals are also involved. Supervisors participate in workgroups to list objectives and knowledge that they are expecting people to gain. They're looking at on-line development, and are asking themselves what do we want people to know? Skill development also goes into the classroom.

This creates challenges around evaluation. The curriculum writer starts developing the curriculum; they create a substantial outline and bring stakeholders together and then present what it looks like, look at the content and some of the exercises and give people a chance to react before moving to a piloting phase. They do 22 pilots with a training of content at the end. They have a fairly stable group of trainers for each curriculum and bring them together twice a year to do skill building and look at other needs they might have. A 12-month update to curriculum occurs to include updates and have this on a steady revision schedule.

Ohio

Ohio has a standardized process is similar to what everyone else is using. They will talk about specialized and related trainings. They contract with each trainer for each specific workshop. Trainers develop workshop based on needs. Ohio also conducts a similar needs assessment as everyone has talked about. The same needs keep being identified. Needs assessment is a process.

They will either approach trainers in the system to develop or trainers will come to them and ask about a specific topic and see if that is needed. They collaborate with the 8 regional training centers. They did not have a way to evaluate individual trainers, and needed to come up with a way to be standardized but still have flexibility.

They have looked at all trainers and workshops and asked them to send a content outline and then have a standard tool to evaluate that outline. Also, they then have to re-interview trainers and look at expertise and their relevance to child welfare. They have about 300 trainers so this is a huge task. The regional training center directors are assisting in this. They're helping each trainer to understand expectations; this is a good way to track what they are doing.

With the records system that is coming, they want to make sure that the data is good data so that is why they are evaluating at this time. They want to be able to say that the trainer and the workshop have been thoroughly evaluated.

Ohio has 1500 competencies sorted by 80 skill sets and that is posted on their websites. They're currently looking at quality improvement and having the documentation to show that they have a good training system. They're meeting face to face with regional training centers and also using "go to" training where travel is not required.

Ohio has a curriculum development work team that reviews standardized curricula and then assists with the one on one interviews as well.

- Are the specialized workshops tied to the competencies?

There are two ways, if a need is identified then will seek someone out. If trainers come to them, they will evaluate areas of expertise and then will gather information and go back to the work team and talk about whether that is a need for the program.

- How does this become institutionalized?

Each trainer identifies competencies he or she is going to address. The region requests what competencies that they want to address. There is always a balance between standardizing and meeting individual needs.

■ **Topic: Coaching and Mentoring**

Illinois facilitated this portion of the roundtable; Wisconsin and Indiana presented.

Wisconsin

WI started this in the last year. They are looking for suggestions since the program is in its infancy.

Overview—coaches and mentors are being developed. They have supervisors that self-identify, and identify their needs.

Ways to get counties ready— Leadership meeting. They have hired a consultant to develop coaching staff. Then there will be a mentor (supervisor) remaining in the county. They hope to have this in place in 2009. This may look different in different counties. For instance, in a larger county, they will have a more formalized mentoring development program. They are still learning, and are hoping to get feedback about what works. In rural areas they will have phone conferences. What have other States done? What support system is in place?

- What about Indiana? They seem to have a sophisticated process, but how do they assure this is in place in the rural counties?

Indiana

It's definitely a learning process. Indiana worked with Dr. Anita Barbee from KY. They have a formal program where the mentor is a family case manager.

- What if there's only one worker and the supervisor is not suitable for the mentor role? They assign them from a similar type of county, but have not had to do that very often. They have had some problems. There was a \$500 compensation. They're now training more people and are looking very closely at the evaluations of the trainings that were conducted by the mentors. The highest praise for training by new workers has been a good field mentor in place. A curriculum writer was assigned to develop field mentor training. They have also started a supervisor mentor program. Each new supervisor gets his/her own supervisor-mentor. Mentors do not get compensation and their regular caseload is not decreased. However, this has not decreased the number of people who are volunteering to be mentors. They are promoting this as a leadership opportunity—raises are also based in some part on this. People who have participated are now keeping in touch with other mentors as questions arise. People are selected by the agency heads in the counties.

- Illinois asked if there are any internship opportunities for this. Yes, internships are available.

Ohio

They have an informal mentoring process, but nothing for supervisors yet. They may want to ask Children's Bureau Implementation Centers to help with this.

Wisconsin

Wisconsin has a much more formal setup in Milwaukee County.

- What about peer mentors? Pros and cons?

IN tries to do both. New supervisors can ask that a clinical consultant come into the county to help.

- Illinois asked if there was any difference with working in a union atmosphere. WI responded yes especially in Milwaukee County. An issue that came up was his/her caseload reduced if a worker became a mentor. This has been a challenge if they want a mentor to go into a county where he does not work. Another county is a completely autonomous entity. They also have had different levels of success depending on the subject—e.g. some may not feel as comfortable mentoring about child safety as with a general area of social work.

Illinois

IL is doing the preliminary work and find it hard in the rural areas. One county only has one worker. They're trying to combine with an adjoining county into a collaborative. They would train as a facilitator for that collaborative. They want to try to attack at the supervisor level—they felt left out previously when they were not included. They have to have them as primary coach-mentor, and have to enable them to have the time to take this on.

Michigan

The leadership academy is an initiative not done by the institute but through the office of professional development. This is open to levels 12 and above and promotes succession planning. It's very intensive and competitive based. For the last class there were 70 applicants for only 12 spots. Areas identified in the class resulted in further study, most recently a more thorough study of the Indian Child Welfare Act. Another example is the Leadership Development Program. They are finding there are some areas that are not addressed in normal training. The promotions of those who had participated in the academy were very high.

- Have you asked the stakeholders about input? Especially the courts? How are they doing with those they are mentoring?

IN thought this was a great idea they have not yet done but they are working more closely with the courts and are building partnerships. They're currently conducting trainings for the courts. Collaborating with the courts is critical.

IN plan to do more joint training. IN will soon be funding probation, so they need to address that. CIP is a good way to build the bridges.

IL has a lot of crossover with DCFS and the courts. This started in the southern part of the State, and is now moving to Cook County. They have done some work with racial disparities in foster care, and are working with the African American Commission in the State and Illinois State University.

WI stated that Milwaukee Co. has the strongest mentoring and strongest ties to the courts. In the other counties, the mentoring project is in its infancy. One source they have looked at is other county agencies. WI also had judges on the first CFSR team.

Minnesota uses the experience of sophisticated counties to help other counties who are just beginning projects. They also have regionally based teams.

WI, just last month, had a CW/Court meeting on how to put good things in practice back in the counties.

IL likes what IN has done in this area. Supervision is not mentoring. It's important to keep the definition of terms straight. The mentor should be disinterested (neutral) for the supervisor.

□ OH asked: Does anyone have a mentoring program for foster caregivers?

WI replied no, but had the beginnings of a program and the counties put the brakes on it. They questioned whether the people who would be involved really had the high level of skills that would be needed. They have to strike a balance between autonomy of the mentors and the qualifications needed.

IL has a semblance of a program.

There is value to this type of program.

□ Question- has anyone collected data on the mentoring efforts?

IN has not yet looked at this. So many of their staff is new, that is they have less than two years on the job. They had a pilot where half of workers had a mentor and half did not. Those who had mentors felt so much better about the experience than the half who did not, so now everyone gets a mentor.

This would be a good area to try to keep data on and evaluate. States will keep this in mind for next year.

DAY 2

■ Topic: Networking Tables

- E-Learning (development, resources, etc.) presented by IL
- Learning Management Systems (policy implications, funding, etc.) presented by OH

Illinois, E-Learning

<https://www.dcfstraining.org>

Staff does not have internet access but instead have a portal they can access it through the intranet. They have training ID's, auto generated, and every staff person and every foster caregiver has one. Once they have this ID they can log on to get to the e-learning courses. They still require registration. This needs to be a secure website due to the confidentiality concerns.

They use the story-boarding process, pull together the content experts, and agree on what needs to be done and then direct the vendors. The vendor has their own authoring tools. Some of this is hard coded, and the courses are not transportable. A 3 hour highly interactive module costs about \$30,000. They don't really have videos but have a process to use still pictures put together and they look like videos.

□ What becomes an E-learning module?

They look at subject area that would lend itself to flash movies, interactivity. There are standards related to internet accessibility for visually or hearing impaired (federal standards). They're building some flash movies on testifying in court, how to be sworn in, and how to be qualified as an expert witness.

□ Issues

- They recommend staying away from real time video. This structure is not robust enough to run real time video—there are lots of technology challenges.
- There are issues with the network as well. One really needs the IT departments to work with them.

Things to consider: Look at how long the training needs to be used, look at cost benefit, and how long is the course going to be needed. IL has a set of questions they review to see if this is a good investment. Always try to have a blended approach.

Also build "How to" tasks which are much simpler. These break down very concretely, and they are using software from QARBON.com that only costs \$99.00. You can't really make assumptions of what the workforce knows or doesn't know. They found that some basic things are very helpful.

With this one can track to see if the course was completed. This is then posted to their permanent training record. Every course has an evaluation at the end; some are self-evaluations and self-skills. The act of submitting the evaluation with data on it signals the credit.

Every exercise on the higher end is tracked so you know how people answered the questions in that section. Even for classroom based delivery, workers can get the information sent to them as well to pull up on their laptops.

IL is a sponsor-agency who can authorize CEU's and maintain data to be able to back up that decision. Child welfare licensed staff are required to take 20 hours of continuing education every 2 years. E-learning assists with tracking this. Staff can also locate external training and ask that they receive credit, but the on-learning approach makes sure that the class is related to child welfare.

There really is a change of attitude. Initially the staff did not embrace e-learning; now, they're demanding more all of the time. Printing costs have gone down tremendously. There have been ½ million dollars in savings for travel this last year.

They want to add web-cams to some local offices to do web-conferencing from the desktops. They use ATT web based audio tool for conferencing. E-strategy encompasses several different strategies—you can link computers and watch individuals enter their data and have them demonstrate in real time some of their skills.

There is a super computing backbone in IL so bandwidth is unlimited. Whenever the policy is updated, the training is automatically updated.

They have seen an increase in number of individuals who do their coursework on evenings and weekends. This also helps night and weekend staff so they do not have to come in during the day to take training.

Initially, they had to walk people through how to take these on-line courses. They needed to have some change in management ideas about people using their computers to take these kinds of courses. There are 11 on-line courses during the pre-service and then there is a structured manual for employees when they are on the job. They need a graphics artist on the team and to approach all of the different learning styles.

Every course has a mentor, a person who leads through the course. Workers can contact the mentor through email and get answers to their questions. Also, there is a HELP menu and embedded resources in all of the courses. Someone can come back later and always look at the resource section.

One can access policy from the training, but at this time within the policy area you cannot access trainings. IL has policies, but also has procedures which give a little more guidance. WI is working on a new policy manual which will include policy, rule, procedure, and then training. Three hours is the length of the longest course they have.

- What kind of questions are they seeing and what is turnaround?

The mailbox is checked every morning. Generally, the questions are content; navigation questions are usually called in. They only get about 3 questions a week. People have gotten used to this now and it's very accepted. They're getting new hires used to this from the beginning and they then are mentoring those who are more experienced.

Audio is important in everything, but not everyone has speakers or the ability to use audio. So it was necessary to get PC earphones out to the group, which has now occurred. It's hard to find good individuals who can prepare the audio. They have a team member who does this. First built is a wave file, compressed, and then put in the course. A female voice is more pleasant per market research.

The cost of laptops/earphones varies. It's important to really make sure that everyone is on board with this and understands the importance and benefits. 40,000 out of the 117,000 in their files have used the virtual training center.

Ohio, Learning Management Systems

Ohio has contracted with an organization to provide their learning management system, ETrack. They're still in the process of determining what they want. OH comes to the Roundtable with questions to the group about how to successfully implement LMS.

- Question: What is the status update of all the States in Learning Management? Is it web-based or a central location?

MI (Carol)

MI used to have intranet based, limited tracking function, with limited access except for a few people. No one in the field had access, and it was very difficult to work with private agency folks on registering/tracking course.

The Juvenile justice people have "J-jolt" with a vendor and child welfare will be switching over to that type of system. This will be much more effective—users will be able to access their own transcripts, and will have Flash and e-learning components. Now it will not matter if it is a private agency worker, a trainer, workers, whoever – as long as they are an approved user they will be able to access appropriate records. There will be 'ticklers' that will send reminders automatically about when deadlines are coming up, but it is undetermined yet who all will be receiving those ticklers. Administrators are excited about the change and it has worked very well for the juvenile justice system and child welfare will be transferring over to this system this week.

- Will MI tracking competencies or trainers?

They will have the ability to track competencies; they have the capacity but they have yet to build all of that in.

Right now they can't track all of the community trainings that staff may be able to access to meet training requirements, but will hopefully be able to do so down the road.

WI (Chris Sieck)

WI has difficulty as a county-based system because the county workers are not State employees and it is the counties' responsibility to track their workers' training. The only requirements they have at this point is that when a new worker is hired, they are required to put in their hire date into the SACWIS system and the date of completion of their pre-service training and date of foundation completion. Everything else is tracked at the county level. Registrations for courses are tracked regionally at the Regional Training Center.

They are down the road a little bit on their Administrative Rule on Training and they are moving toward a more centralized system. People are starting to get more receptive to moving in this direction and counties are getting more on board with having all the records in one place and staff being able to access their records. They are moving in this direction.

IL (Judy)

LMS includes a lot of their business components as well. Every staff member, private agency worker, and Foster/Adoptive (F/A) parent has their own access to their own account. Everything is recordable, and everything can be tracked. They have the ability to track competencies as well.

- Have they found F/A parents not having a computer a challenge?

They have research that F/A parents do have computers and they need to get more of their e-mail addresses into the system. They initially had pushbacks from F/A parent groups about engaging these folks on-line, but they are seeing it become more popular.

Staff and caregivers are having DVD and CD players on their computers in the home and office and are able to take these self-contained courses and are doing so. IL has found that men are really receptive to this.

States around the room have had positive foster/adoptive parent feedback to the Foster Parent College.

- Can IL run reports on the info they are tracking?

Yes, they can get aggregate statewide reports, and are able to analyze the info by region to see if certain geographic areas are struggling, etc. If people take the self-contained reports on CD/DVDs, it automatically sends a message to the state system that the training is completed when the learner is done with the course.

IN (M. B.)

They are somewhere between WI and IL – but are not near the level of sophistication of IL. They went to Eastern Kentucky to investigate their “TRIS” system—Training Records Information System. They have been looking into their own PeopleSoft system to see what they can do within that system and modify it to meet their LMS needs. Trainers can run reports to see which courses they need to be training where. Information is now being input into the system, going as far back as 2007, to demonstrate what trainings have been conducted. Learner completion of courses will be implemented within the next few months and they are looking to incorporate the evaluations and competency tracking into the system and also into the worker profiles so that it

can be looked at during their individual evaluations. They're not there yet, but this is the direction they are going.

- OH asked how other states dealt with moving from paper evaluations to online evaluations.

IN says it was a struggle with the trainers to delay their receipt of the evaluations. Now it's online and goes directly to the university and then gets transmitted to the trainers. Now they are getting complete and more honest feedback, but the time delay was initially a problem with the trainers. They are finding that learners are providing more detailed, extensive, and constructive information in the evaluations than they did when it was on paper. This has worked so well that they have implemented a new protocol for areas that can't do online evaluations – a volunteer from the class collects the paper evaluations, puts them in a sealed envelope, and mails them— They do not go directly to the trainers.

- Question: if there are problems with the system, who is called? How is it dealt with when there are outside vendors handling the system?

IN kept their system in house to avoid having to deal with outside vendors for all questions and problems.

MI is going in a similar direction, and they plan to hire a tech person in house to handle the “help desk” duties. They are in the middle of the transformation, but the system appears to be very customizable, as reported by the juvenile justice contact person that has been working with the system they will be transferring to.

■ Topic: How States are Supporting Supervisors and Supervisory Training

Wisconsin

Over the years, WI has utilized a number of supervisory trainings. They started out using OH's IHS curriculum; right now they are looking for training to support supervisors in being child welfare supervisors specifically. They struggled a bit with the IHS curriculum not being child welfare specific. WI has been working a bit with the Butler Institute and piloted that curriculum with BMCW. Feedback was that the material was good, but also not hitting the mark. WI is stuck right now looking for a curriculum that will really support supervisors in their transition to being supervisors within the child welfare system—they're looking to find what really resonates with supervisors statewide.

WI has a requirement for 30 hours of on-going training for supervisors every two years. If a new supervisor has not been through the foundation series for caseworkers, they have to take that series within the first 12 months of their employment. They have found that supervisors have varying needs depending on where they are coming from. Those that come up through the ranks need basic leadership training and others need more CW specific curriculum – a hybrid model is needed.

Ohio

OCWTP feels similar to WI, and feels that the existing IHS training is not meeting current supervisor needs. They are piloting a revamped curriculum that is tailored to casework supervision and not leadership in general. It's being piloted, so there is no data to date.

Michigan

There is a new supervisory institute, which is a general supervisory training. Feedback is that it is not relevant to child welfare supervisors. A new lawsuit mandated for a 40 hour, competency based training within 3 months after a new supervisor takes the supervisory position. They have also developed a CPS supervisory training back in 2006 in response to some child death issues and the training component of their Child Death Review Board – this training has received positive feedback. When it came out it was mandatory for every supervisor and included components on why this training is necessary, had ethics components, and scenario based situations and accountability. The training included components on how to coach, how to mentor, how to do case-reads, and a policy review. It also included report writing and what is expected from staff, focusing on necessary content, and SWSS reports as well. It has a very strong focus on child safety.

With the new mandate, they will have five 8-hour days, using Michigan State School of Social Work workbooks. They will focus on the first 6 months of supervision; the transition in moving from worker to supervisor; communication; and accountability. The first 2 days are general days focusing on the previous topics; the last 3 days they will break out into individual groups based on their job focus. Tracks include CPS and foster and adoption. They are then split off on the last day into public and private agency groups. A child welfare training group will be the lead on every planning group, but all appropriate stakeholders are involved in the planning process. They will pilot this training in advanced and there will be competency-based evaluations. Per the law suit, supervisors have to pass the test within 3 attempts.

It is a new requirement that supervisors have Masters' degrees; As of January 1, 2009, supervisors must have one out of a list of acceptable master's degrees. If you are a sitting supervisor, you have a certain amount of time to get your MSW (preferred degree as it is the most applicable).

They also hope to have second tier of training, with specific topics being available as online modules. They also want additional training to be mandatory within the first year (not first 3 months) to be available via webcasts focusing on disciplining, EEO issues, and other important topics that aren't included in that initial week of training.

Indiana

Currently there are no ongoing supervisory training requirements. Now the training staff has been staffed with developing training requirements for every job classification. Their past focus has been on new hires and they will be adjusting their focus and including supervisors. They have a new practice model and they've wanted to train supervisors in supervising this practice model but the evaluations were not positive on the initial training developed. They have developed a newer training that seems to be working better and they are working with that module now.

They need to do more work in on-going supervisory training and they are looking at the Michigan State workbooks to customize the training for Indiana. IN plans to have the authors of these workbooks come down to Indiana and do 6 one-day trainings (one per workbook) with the training staff.

The plan for the next year is to do the 2 day training on the practice model, then do the 6 one-day trainings on the workbooks, and then develop what the other needs are for on-going training for future years.

Illinois

IL have bought and utilized different curricula for supervisors since 1980. Since Judy and Craig came back to the training staff, they were tasked with developing a supervisory curriculum. They did thorough task-analysis, taking broader topics and paring them down to meet specific needs of different kinds of supervisors. They learned they couldn't use general trainings to do supervisory training—they need supervisors to do this, and only people that have been supervisors do the supervisory training. They spent a lot of time with subject matter experts to develop the curriculum and they did train-the-trainers.

It is a 9 module program (in place about a year), using the “Management/leadership team” model. They focus on “thinking like a manager” not like a “super-worker” and teaching that supervisors represent management's interests because they work within a union environment. They modulated the units so that the supervision unit each supervisor receives is specific to areas they manage. They are going in the direction of one module per week; the total is about 120 hours of training, and 120 hours of work—totaling 240 hours of supervisory related training activities. They have not yet tied the supervisory training to licensure requirements.

IL has requirement that front line workers and supervisors have to be licensed in the State-specific licensure program. There are licensure requirements specific to caseworker duties and specific to supervisory duties, and you have to be licensed in the appropriate duties to have particular jobs and move up in the system.

None of the courses are written in stone, and they can make adjustments as new training needs arise, like SACWIS training. As they learn and grow, they are consistently changing their curriculum.

State training websites where training curricula and related information is available:

OH/IHS: www.ocwtp.com

IN: www.in.gov/dcs (training)

WI: www.wcws.wisc.edu

IL: www.dcfstraining.org

■ Topic: Next steps, Evaluation, and Wrap-up

- Updated email lists will be sent out to everyone.
- First decision is to decide whether or not there is an interest in continuing regional discussions and moving forward. What do people think?
- Conference calls.
 - Critical piece is to have a good agenda for the conference call; that has been a struggle the last year. If we set this call on a quarterly basis, we usually don't think about the agenda until right before the call. Chris had solicited agenda items but did not have a great response. Are there suggestions on how to structure that and make it a better format?
 - There was a suggestion to set the agenda at the end of each conference call for the next conference call. Maybe have each State responsible for a conference call so everyone feels part of the process.
- Standing items on the agenda:
 - What is in the development stage for each state? There was encouragement to do this visually as well as auditory. A webinar call—IL can host from their site. Instructions will be sent as to how to access.
 - Scheduled Date: Friday, January 30, 1:30 Central, 2:30 Eastern. IL will host but then a state will take a turn.
- Agenda for January:
 - Evaluation review from Roundtable
 - Early development process – sharing of resources
 - Prospective development process – sharing of resources
 - Progress for records management systems
 - Evaluation and testing update
- The host state will be responsible for maintaining and distributing minutes.
- Prior to the meeting, if there are Level 1 and Level 2 materials in advance—Materials should be sent to Judy Zaleski by January 10, 2009.
judy.zaleski@illinois.gov
- Everyone should send their materials to each other from the master list; add colleagues from Minnesota and Ohio.
- Michigan has a lot of new staff; what about train the trainer? IHS has a comprehensive train the trainer program and Butler Institute for Families in Denver also has a Trainer Boot Camp program. IHS also does a curriculum

development class and Charmaine Brittain from Butler Institute also is developing a seminar. ASTD, American Society for Training Development has a lot of options as well. ASTD does an international congress each year which is also a great learning resource for everyone.

- If we continue to do this meeting, there are considerations for moving it out of Chicago. How do we address travel restrictions?
 - Trying to find hotels in Chicago was very challenging. Can we meet outside of the city?
 - Some like having it in Chicago for the regional office, which gives the process more credence. Everyone agrees about having regional office staff participate, but it's still a challenge for other states.
 - There was a suggestion to look at dates when people can get better hotel rates.
 - Can we move somewhere where there is better technology?
 - Would regional staff be willing to travel within the Chicago area.
 - If within train or bus area that could be possible. First look at getting a better hotel rate and look at different time of year. We'll try and pick next year's date earlier. This will be discussed further in conference calls.
 - There was a suggestion that through university systems one could set up videoconferencing—the Thompson Center could accommodate this.

SECTION VII: MEETING MATERIALS

Various materials were utilized during the Roundtable, including PowerPoint presentations and handouts. They contain helpful information related to topics addressed during the meetings. These can be accessed by clicking on the following links:

- **Child & Family Service Review Process Including the PIP, PowerPoint Presentation**
M.B. Lippold, Deputy Director of Staff Development, Indiana
- **Indiana's Field Mentor Program and Supervisor Mentor Program, PowerPoint Presentation**
M.B. Lippold, Deputy Director of Staff Development, Indiana
- **National Child Welfare Workforce Initiatives, PowerPoint Presentation**
Children's Bureau
- **Child Welfare Training and the CFSR Process, PowerPoint Presentation**
Krista Thomas, Children's Bureau, with material from Linda Mitchell's 05/07 presentation for the NRCOI Peer Training call
- **Ohio Child Welfare Training Program, Course Descriptors**
- **Ohio Child Welfare Training Program, Standardized Courses**