

PRIMER HANDS ON- CHILD WELFARE

HANDOUT 7.1

National Child Welfare Resource Center for Organizational Improvement

ENHANCING THE SERVICE ARRAY IN CHILD WELFARE:

**Assessing the Capacity of a Jurisdiction/State to
Meet the Individualized Needs of Children and
Families**

and

**Creating and Implementing a Resource and
Capacity Development Plan**

www.nrcoi.org

ENHANCING THE SERVICE ARRAY IN CHILD WELFARE:

**Assessing the Capacity
of a Jurisdiction/State
to Meet the Individualized Needs
of Children and Families**

and

**Creating and Implementing
a Resource
and Capacity Development Plan**

A DESCRIPTION OF THE PROCESS

August 31, 2007

Introduction and Overview

The National Child Welfare Resource Center for Organizational Improvement (NRCOI) and the National Resource Center for Child Welfare Data and Technology (NRCCWDT), based on experience in assisting a number of states and jurisdictions with service array issues, have developed a process to assist jurisdictions as they assess and enhance their capacity at community, regional, and state levels to meet the individualized needs of children, youth, and families. This service array process is designed to:

- Engage the state's leaders as active stakeholders in the development and provision of outcomes-based services for children and families in the child welfare system (agency leadership, community leadership, funding resources, providers, multiple stakeholders). Enhance relationships across the various child- and family-serving systems.
- Clarify for state leadership, community leadership, funding sources, providers, and other supports for families the importance of their participation in improving the child welfare system which will also benefit them and their work.
- Enhance working relationships across the various child- and family-serving systems.
- Assist internal and external community stakeholders in formulating the core values and principles that need to guide the work of the child welfare system.
- Address practice at both the casework and system levels.
- Provide a mechanism through which a jurisdiction at the local level can continually assess and enhance its capacity to address the individualized needs of children, youth, and families.
- Build the state's/tribe's/stakeholders' capacity at the system level to assess and enhance the service array on an on-going basis.
- Incorporate information from already existing needs assessments previously conducted and build on existing planning processes.

The assessment and enhancement of a state's/tribe's/stakeholders' capacity to meet the individual needs of children, youth, and families is based on a number of requirements that are critical to the success of the process. This process is:

1. Built on the fact that jurisdictions must meet the individualized needs of children, youth, and families in the child welfare system.
2. Predicated on the establishment of a child welfare practice model that is based on the practice principles of the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR): family-centered, community-based, individualized services, and enhanced parental capacity.
3. Data driven so that jurisdictions and states can assess and improve performance utilizing outcome measurements in the CFSR.
4. Collaborative in nature and necessitates the building, strengthening, and maintaining of a Stakeholder Collaborative in the jurisdiction as well as community partnerships in the delivery of services.
5. Built on the recognition that state, tribal, and community stakeholders, along with the state and/or local child welfare program, hold ownership of the outcomes for children and families and consequently share responsibility for ensuring that services and resources are available for families when they are needed.

Engaging in this process requires a commitment by the state/tribe/stakeholders to deal with the implications of furnishing the service array, which could require:

For the public or tribal child welfare agency:

- Pursuing additional funding from various sources if needed, including general revenues and grants.
- Reapportioning/redirecting existing funding.
- Changing contracts for services to provide vendor flexibility needed to individualize services and streamline procedures used by caseworkers to secure contracts and expedite individualized services.
- More fully engaging private service providers not only in service provision but in the assessment of child and family needs and the joint development of service plans.
- Changing elements of the current service array to improve access to and the quality of the services.

For state and community stakeholders:

- Changing service models so that services are adapted to fit the unique needs of children and families, rather than maintaining a “one size fits all” service array for children and their families.
- Re-thinking resource allocations to give some level of priority to goods and services that can meet individualized child welfare service plans, strengthen the likelihood of positive outcomes, and increase the likelihood that family members will be more productive members of the community.
- Building on/incorporating already existing community needs assessments and service development processes.
- Enhancing provider participation in the family needs assessment and the child and family service plan development process so this is a joint effort.

This service array process can be adopted at the state/tribal level and implemented incrementally at a site or jurisdiction level. In most instances, a county will constitute a jurisdiction, but in rural or frontier areas, a site may encompass a region. Typically, after the initial training of state staff, this process is piloted in one jurisdiction in a state, with the technical assistance of the NRCOI and the NRCCWDT, while simultaneously providing training of trainers to state leaders and leaders of other jurisdictions so it can be replicated in the state’s other jurisdictions.

The service array process, as described here, is a comprehensive process that requires resources for it to be carried out effectively within a jurisdiction and across a state. The resources dedicated to the implementation of the service array process (see below: the three assessments and the creation and implementation of the *Resource and Capacity Development Plan*) will vary depending upon the jurisdiction and the state. There is no exact dollar figure that can be provided; however the state and the jurisdictional child welfare agency should be prepared to dedicate extensive staff time to coordinate and implement the process. Additionally, resources will be necessary to provide lunch at the day-long meetings, the facilitation of the process at the community and work group meetings, and the production of the reports for the members of the Stakeholder Collaborative. Finally, the cost of the service array process will vary due to the

scope and the scale of the process ultimately adopted by the jurisdictional and state child welfare agency.

This service array process may not neatly fit the needs of a particular state/tribe; state/tribal leadership can make alterations to the process to meet its particular needs.¹ However, it is important to maintain a consistent process throughout the local jurisdictions in a state in order to ensure that information can be assembled and merged at a regional and state level upon completion of the jurisdictions-based *Service Array Assessment Reports* and the *Resource and Capacity Development Plans*.

Step 1: Creation of the State Service Array Steering Committee

The process begins with key state child welfare agency leaders creating a state-level service array steering committee which includes representatives from the leadership team, program staff, contract management staff, financial staff,² data and technology staff, and Quality Assurance/Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) staff. The State Steering Committee will learn about the service array process from NRCOI staff/consultants (including the time and work commitment involved), modify the process to meet the state's needs, and plan and implement the service array process in the state. A work plan will be created with assistance from the NRCOI. The work plan includes the selection of a pilot jurisdiction. Typically, a pilot jurisdiction is used to train the State Steering Committee and other jurisdictional child welfare leaders in the state on the service array process. Through this process, the NRCOI assists in helping the state build its capacity to assess and enhance its service array on an on-going basis.

The State Steering Committee will:

1. Develop a work plan to implement the service array process throughout the state, including the recruitment/selection of a pilot jurisdiction.
2. Study existing needs assessments or other documents in the State relevant to child and family welfare to understand past and ongoing efforts so as not to duplicate these and build on existing planning processes.
3. Create a Child and Family Snapshot for the recruited jurisdiction. This snapshot will incorporate available data about the children and families coming into the child welfare system in the jurisdiction and overall child and family well-being in the jurisdiction. The state can request technical assistance from NRCCWDT in utilization of NCANDS and AFCARS and other SACWIS and Quality Assurance data in creating the Snapshot.
4. Expand the State Steering Committee, after completing these tasks, to incorporate representatives from the courts, the tribes, child abuse prevention, family support, and early childhood services, as well as the juvenile justice, education, domestic violence, health, mental health, and substance abuse systems at the state-level, as well as birth parents, family caregivers and youth.

¹ See the section on Adaptation near the end of this document for examples.

² If the public agency is responsible for programs in addition to child welfare (for example, Temporary Assistance to Needy Families [TANF], Title XIX, etc.), financial staff should include not only those assigned to child welfare but those with knowledge about and/or responsibility for these other funding streams.

5. Agree on the state-wide philosophy, values, and principles of the child welfare system through the facilitation and training provided by the NRCOI selected by the State from among the following mini-modules: (i) what is child welfare; (ii) what is the CFSR; (iii) strengths/needs-based child welfare practice principles and values that are drawn from the experiences of systems of care; (iv) the CFSR practice principles; (v) evidence-based practice; (vi) child welfare practice models; (vii) definitions/examples of practices versus services; (viii) prevention in child welfare; (ix) systems of care in child welfare; and (x) lessons learned about the service array from the first 52 CFSRs.
6. Pursue changes required at the State level so that the pilot jurisdiction and other jurisdictions that follow are able to implement the jurisdiction's ensuing *Resource and Capacity Development Plan* (for example, (a) utilization estimates, (b) costs, (c) financing strategies, (d) contracting methodologies, (e) policy, (f) procedures, (g) training, (h) supervision, (i) quality improvement, etc.).

Step 2: Creation of the Community Service Array Steering Committee and the Community Stakeholder Collaborative

The State Service Array Steering Committee will partner with the pilot jurisdiction's child welfare leadership to create a community-level service array steering committee. The Community Service Array Steering Committee needs to be multidisciplinary and involve the key leaders at the jurisdictional level, including: public and private sector providers of child welfare services; birth parents, family caregivers (resource, foster, kinship care, and adoptive families) and youth, who have experience with the child welfare system; court, legal, and law enforcement officials, including staff from the Administrative Office of the Court (AOC) and the Court Improvement Program (CIP), and CASA volunteers; tribal representatives; mental health, substance abuse, and domestic violence services providers; educators, health care providers, home visiting staff; child abuse prevention advocates and staff; other key provider (for example, housing, food resources, transportation, recreation); elected officials and administrators, including legislators and legislative staff; representatives of the business, faith, labor, and media communities; other public sector employees, community-based organizations, and representatives of entities such as the United Way and local foundations. The State Steering Committee and the Community Steering Committee, with the assistance of the National Resource Centers, will complete a work plan for the pilot jurisdiction. Completing the work plan entails:

- Reviewing the state-wide philosophy, values, and principles of the child welfare system decided upon by the State Steering Committee and receiving training, provided by the National Resource Centers in the pilot jurisdiction, from among the following mini-modules: (i) what is child welfare; (ii) what is the CFSR; (iii) strengths/needs-based child welfare practice principles and values that are drawn from the experiences of systems of care; (iv) the CFSR practice principles; (v) evidence-based practice; (vi) child welfare practice models; (vii) definitions/examples of practices versus services; (viii) prevention in child welfare; (ix) systems of care in child welfare; and (x) lessons learned about the service array from the first 52 CFSRs.

- Studying existing needs assessments or other documents in the State and the jurisdiction relevant to child and family welfare to understand past and ongoing efforts so as not to duplicate these and build on existing planning processes.
- Synthesizing the information in these documents for the Community Stakeholder Collaborative.
- Reviewing the Child and Family Snapshot prepared by the State Steering Committee.
- Planning on how to involve birth parents, family caregivers, youth in the jurisdiction's service array process.
- Recruiting and retaining a wide range of traditional and non-traditional stakeholders for the Community Stakeholder Collaborative, including persons who participated in other needs assessments in the jurisdiction.
- Scheduling meetings of the Community Stakeholder Collaborative and securing meeting facilities and food/refreshments:
 - First Meeting (full day)—introduction of the process, engagement of the stakeholders, training, and beginning the work.
 - Second Meeting (1/2 day)—reporting out the strengths and weaknesses in the jurisdiction's capacities (*Service Array Assessment Reports*).
 - Third Meeting (full day)—reporting out the work groups development plans, and finalization of the *Resource and Capacity Development Plan* to enhance the jurisdiction's capacity to meet the individualized needs of children, youth, and families in the child welfare system, and begin implementation of the Plan.
 - Quarterly Meetings after the third meeting (1/2 day)—assess implementation of the activities to improve the jurisdiction's capacity to meet the individualized needs of children and families, address barriers, and celebrate successes.

Step 3: The Assessment Process (Four Assessments) and Writing the Consolidated Assessment Report

The First Meeting of the Community Stakeholders Collaborative

The Community Steering Committee will invite all identified stakeholders to this day-long meeting to begin the process of assessing the capacity of the jurisdiction to meet the individualized needs of children and families in the child welfare system. The Community Steering Committee will:

- Welcome all participants and facilitate introductions.
- Explain the purpose of the service array process and where it fits into the larger picture of child welfare in the jurisdiction.
- Review the Child and Family Snapshot and hold an extended dialogue with the community stakeholders about the data, its meaning, and what it tells us about our task.

The Community Stakeholders will then engage in an interactive exercise that will help them experience the difference between a service approach in child welfare and a needs/strengths-based practice approach. A child welfare case scenario, developed from the jurisdiction's Child and Family Snapshot, will be distributed. Participants will be divided into small groups. Half of the small groups will be instructed to identify the services the family and family members need,

based on the scenario. The other small groups will be instructed to identify the needs of the family and each family member. Groups will report out. The contrast can be revealing and demonstrate the advantages of the strengths/needs-based practice approach in child welfare that will require the individualizing of services to meet the needs of children, youth, and families versus the provision of services that are available or the cookie-cutter approach that exists in many child welfare systems.

After the interactive exercise, the Community Steering Committee, with assistance from the National Resource Centers, will provide training to the community stakeholders. This training will be tailored to the knowledge needs of the group. The training mini-modules that can be chosen from include: (i) what is child welfare; (ii) what is the CFSR; (iii) strengths/needs-based child welfare practice principles and values that are drawn from the experiences of systems of care; (iv) the CFSR practice principles; (v) evidence-based practice; (vi) child welfare practice models; (vii) definitions/examples of practices versus services; (viii) prevention in child welfare; (ix) systems of care in child welfare; and (x) lessons learned about the service array from the first 52 CFSRs.

Then the Community Steering Committee will present:

- The role and responsibilities of the Community Steering Committee and the Community Stakeholder Collaborative, including time and work commitments involved.
- The community's philosophy, values, and principles of child welfare.
- The synthesized information on past needs assessments and reports on child welfare and the plan to incorporate this information into the service array process in order to prevent duplicative efforts.
- The outcome measurements, data indicators, and performance goals of the community.
- The work plan to the stakeholders, including full disclosure of the time and effort that will be needed.
- The capacities the jurisdiction needs to flexibly meet the needs of children, youth and families in the jurisdiction's child welfare system. These capacities (see attachment) are drawn from the CFSR.
- A review of the assessment process (with an example in the large group) before splitting into the five work groups.

In order to conduct the assessment of the capacities just reviewed, the Community Stakeholder Collaborative will break into five work groups. The five work groups will each be assigned certain capacities to assess:

- Work Group 1: assess the capacity of the jurisdiction on Safety Outcomes 1 and 2.
- Work Group 2: assess the capacity of the jurisdiction on Permanency Outcome 1.
- Work Group 3: assess the capacity of the jurisdiction on Permanency Outcome 2.
- Work Group 4: assess the capacity of the jurisdiction on Well-Being Outcome 1.
- Work Group 5: assess the capacity of the jurisdiction on Well-Being Outcomes 2 and 3.

Four assessments will be conducted for each assigned capacity in each work group: (1) assessment of current practice in the jurisdiction, (2) assessment of current leadership and systemic culture in the jurisdiction, and (3) assessment of current services in the jurisdiction; and (4) Assessment of the need for other services not currently available in the jurisdiction.

First Assessment: Assessment of Current Practices in the Jurisdiction as They Relate to Building Capacity.

The following questions are asked of the work groups:

1. Does the jurisdiction have an explicit child welfare practice model? If so, how does this practice model help or hinder the jurisdiction's ability to meet the capacity being assessed? If there is no explicit practice model, how does this hinder the jurisdiction's ability to meet this capacity?
2. What are the current practices utilized to achieve this capacity? Practices that may be identified include ones such as family group conferencing, wrap-around services, case management, concurrent planning, flexible funds, multi-disciplinary teams, and alternative response systems.

Once the current practices have been identified, each will be assessed with the following criteria:

- How does the practice promote individualized service planning?
- How does the practice promote provider participation in needs assessment and individualized service planning?
- How does the practice promote caseworker flexibility to do "whatever it takes"?
- How does the practice promote provider flexibility to do "whatever it takes"?
- How does the practice allow for meeting the individualized needs of children in the home to prevent unnecessary removal?
- How does the practice allow for ample communication and collaboration between agencies on cases?
- How does the practice involve case supervision using specific unit/worker data to supervise to achieve better results/outcomes?
- How do workers receive proper training and ongoing supervision to hone skills on the practice?
- How does current caseload support effective utilization of the practice?
- How does the practice include after-hours professional response?
- How does the practice empower families to make better decisions and enhance parental capacity?
- How do contract practices with third-party vendors ensure flexibility to meet the needs of children?

Second Assessment: Assessment of Current Leadership and Systemic Culture in the Jurisdiction as They Relate to Building Capacity.

Each work group will be asked to assess the leadership and systemic culture in the jurisdiction by applying these criteria as they related to the capacity being assessed:

- Assess the commitment of leadership in the community to strengths/needs-based child welfare practice principles and values that are drawn from the experiences of systems of care (presented to the community stakeholders earlier in the day) for providing services to children and families in regard to the capacity being assessed.
- Assess the ability of the jurisdiction to collaborate across agencies to provide effective and efficient services resulting in successful outcomes related to the capacity being assessed.
- Assess the ability of the child- and family-serving agencies in the jurisdiction to function as learning organizations that have the capacity to think outside the box.
- Assess the empowerment of front-line service workers and middle-management supervision by leadership to do “whatever it takes” to achieve outcomes for children and families in regard to the capacity being assessed.
- Assess the empowerment of private providers to do “whatever it takes” to achieve outcomes for children and families in regard to the capacity being assessed.
- Assess the current accountability structures in which the community holds agencies and agency leaders accountable for performance outcomes in regard to the capacity being assessed.
- Assess the empowerment of front-line service workers to establish multidisciplinary treatment teams to address multi-need children, youth, and families in regard to the capacity being assessed.

Third Assessment: Assessment of Current Services in the Jurisdiction as They Related to Building Capacity.

Three items in the federal Child and Family Services Review are used to assess the service array:

Item 35: The State has in place an array of services that assess the strengths and needs of children and families and determine other service needs, address the needs of families in addition to individual children in order to create a safe home environment, enable children to remain safe with their parents when reasonable, and help children in foster and adoptive placement achieve permanency.

Item 36: The services in item 35 are accessible to families and children in all political jurisdictions covered in the State’s Child and Family Services Plan.

Item 37: The services in item 35 can be individualized to meet the unique needs of children and families served by the agency.

The third assessment concentrates on these three items.

What services currently exist in the jurisdiction which could be used to achieve the particular capacity under review? These identified services are then assessed on the following dimensions:

- Availability/Accessibility of the Service
- Quality of Service
 - Are the services community-based?
 - Are the services family-centered?
 - Can the services be individualized, and are they being individualized?
 - Does the service build parental capacity?
- Cultural responsiveness of the Service
- Effectiveness of the Service
- Quantity of the Service
- Importance of the Service

Fourth Assessment: Assessment of the Need for Other Services Not Currently Available in the Jurisdiction.

What services are currently not available that would enhance the particular capacity of the jurisdiction to address the individualized needs of children and families? And why would these services be important for building the capacity being assessed?

Continuing the Assessment after the First Meeting

This four-part assessment process (assessment of current practice; assessment of current leadership and systemic culture; and assessment of current services; and assessment of needed, non-existing services) begun at the first Community Stakeholder Collaborative Meeting will be continued over two months in individual meetings of the work groups. A leader/recorder is assigned by the Community Steering Committee to each work group to provide guidance and support. To assist in the assessment process, the work groups are provided a *Child and Family Services, Supports, and Practices Tool Kit* and other needed tools. Each work group will produce a report of the four-part assessment of the capacities assigned to them (*Service Array Assessment Reports*) and will present their findings at the second Community Stakeholder Collaborative Meeting. Prior to this second meeting, the Community Service Array Work Group will consolidate the products of the work groups and will also analyze the consolidated assessment for cross-cutting conclusions.

Step 4: Creation of the Resource and Capacity Development Plan

This meeting is held approximately two months after the first meeting. The work groups individually present the assessment of the respective capacities. Each work group will receive feedback and recommendations from the full Community Stakeholder Collaborative. Additionally, any discrepancies between the assessments of the work groups can be discussed and resolved at this meeting.

The work groups will then be charged with creating their part of the *Resource and Capacity Development Plan* for each capacity over the next two months. The *Resource and Capacity Development Plan* will provide strategies to enhance the capacity of the community to meet the

individualized needs of children and families. Tools and technical assistance will be provided to the work groups as needed. The Resource and Capacity Development Plan will address:

- Reforming current practices to enhance the capacities of jurisdiction;
- Improving systemic culture to enhance the capacities of the jurisdiction;
- Enhancing existing services that are important to building the jurisdiction's capacities;
- Recommended new services that have been identified as needed to enhance the jurisdiction's capacities;
- Incorporating a continuous quality improvement process which evaluates the effects of changes on outcomes for children and families.

Step 5: Consolidation of the Resource and Capacity Development Plan

This meeting is held approximately two months after the second meeting. The purpose of this meeting is for each work group to present to the full Community Stakeholder Collaborative its part of the *Resource and Capacity Development Plan*. Discrepancies and needed integrations between each work group's Plan can be resolved and finalized. The Community Stakeholder Collaborative will meet again with the Community Steering Committee in approximately two months to discuss implementation.

Step 6: Adoption of the Resource and Capacity Development Plan

The Community Steering Committee sends the *Resource and Capacity Development Plan* to the State Steering Committee. Over approximately the next two months, the Plan is reviewed by the two Steering Committees and an implementation plan of selected priorities within the *Resource and Capacity Development Plan* is created and agreed to.

In addition, for recommendations and priorities regarding services, these two Steering Committees will need to identify and pursue changes required to implement the plan (for example, utilization estimates, costs, financing strategies, contracting methodologies, policies, procedures, etc.).

At the first quarterly meeting of the Stakeholder Collaborative (three months after the third stakeholders meeting), the Community Steering Committee presents implementation priorities to the Community Stakeholder Collaborative. Participants may modify the implementation plan if needed. The participants then focus on beginning implementation.

Step 7: Implementation of the Plan and Monitoring Progress

The significant challenge for the Steering Community and the community stakeholders will be to sustain both the process and the projects on which they have agreed. Sustaining the work implies that the collaborators agree upon the scale and scope of the efforts. On a practical level, this requires that they develop a philosophy (purpose) for the work, process, policies, practices, procedures and performance measures for components of the service array. In addition, the Steering Committee should create a funding strategy that either redirects resources or develops a

new and flexible funding source. The tasks associated with this sustainability effort should become regular items on the Committee's agenda.

Quarterly conjoint meetings of the Community Steering Committee and the Community Stakeholder Collaborative are held on implementation and the achievement of performance goals. The Community Stakeholder Collaborative can be utilized by the Steering Committee in order to create implementation work groups for the prioritized initiatives. Barriers are addressed and successes can be celebrated at the quarterly meetings.

Typical Timeline

State contacts Regional Office, NRCOI, forms State Service Array Steering Committee, recruits a local jurisdiction for the pilot, completes work plan.	Months 1 and 2
Creation of the Local Committee, creation of the Community Stakeholder Collaborative begins in the pilot jurisdiction, development of the work plan, etc.	Months 2 and 3
First Meeting of Community Stakeholder Collaborative	Beginning of Month 4
Second Meeting of Community Stakeholder Collaborative	Beginning of Month 6
Third Meeting of Community Stakeholder Collaborative	Beginning of Month 8
First Quarterly Meeting	Beginning of Month 11
Second Quarterly Meeting	Beginning of Month 14
Third Quarterly Meeting	Beginning of Month 17
Fourth Quarterly Meeting	Beginning of Month 20

Creating Regional and State Assessments and Resource and Capacity Development Plans

Some States are beginning to experiment in developing regional and state service array assessments and resource development plans after completion of county/jurisdictional assessments and plans. For example, in Maryland, the Eastern Shore counties have all completed the assessments and plans and are now looking at region-wide trends and needs, with the goal of working with the region's legislators (local and state) to increase resources. Maryland is also planning on the completion of the service array process in all 24 jurisdictions and then looking at state-wide trends and needs.

Adapting This Process to Meet the Needs of a State/Tribe/Jurisdiction

The service array process described in this document can be used at any time by a state/tribe/jurisdiction as a means to fully assess and address its capacity to meet service needs of children and families involved with child welfare. Since the process is designed to address the systemic requirements of the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) for the Service Array, it can also be incorporated into the preparations for the CFSR or as a strategy in the Program Improvement Plan (PIP).

However, there may be jurisdictions that do not want or need to assess all the child welfare capacities listed in the accompanying document.

- For example, in the CFSR, a State may have completed its Statewide Assessment and/or Onsite Federal Review either of which has identified the outcomes, items, and systemic factors which are not in substantial conformity or which have been rated as an Area Needing Improvement. In this situation, the State may decide to adapt this service array process as part of its Program Improvement Plan (PIP) to assess only those non-conforming outcomes/capacities and to create and implement a *Resource and Capacity Development Plan* to improve capacities in those areas.
- Another example is a jurisdiction in a State that has identified the need to build capacities to support its efforts to impact portions of its system. For instance, a desire to reduce a high rate of residential care often dictates enhancing those capacities required to successfully return children home and keep them home safely.

For More Information

Staff and consultants from the two National Resource Centers are currently developing a series of tools and materials to help in the implementation of this service array process. As products are completed, they will be posted on NRCOI's website (www.nrcoi.org). To discuss any aspects of this process, please contact:

Steven Preister
Associate Director
National Child Welfare Resource Center for Organizational Improvement
202.723.0320
spreister@usm.maine.edu

PRIMER HANDS ON- CHILD WELFARE

HANDOUT 7.2

Examples of Potentially Harmful Programs and Effective Alternatives

Source: Dodge, K., Dishion, T., & Lansford, J. (2006). "Deviant Peer Influences in Intervention and Public Policy for Youth," *Social Policy Report*, Vol. XX, No. 1, January 2006. As published in Youth Today: The Newspaper on Youth Work, Vol. 15, No. 7.
www.youthtoday.org

YOUTH TODAY

THE NEWSPAPER ON YOUTH WORK

Tutoring: How youth development agencies meet the challenge while holding true to their missions. Page 10.

\$5.00

© 2006 YOUTH TODAY. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

WWW.YOUTHTODAY.ORG

VOL. 15, NO. 7

JULY/AUGUST 2006

Contagion Dangers?

In an article published in the January issue of *Social Policy Report*, Kenneth Dodge, Thomas Dishion and Jennifer Lansford list youth work approaches that they say carry a risk of deviancy training, and approaches that carry less risk. Following are selections from those lists.

Risk

Programs and policies that aggregate deviant peers and sometimes have harmful effects

Mental Health

- Any group therapy in which ratio of deviant to nondeviant youth is high
- Group therapies offering opportunities for unstructured time with deviant peers
- Group homes or residential facilities
- Discussion groups focused on eating disorders

Education

- Tracking of low-performing students
- Self-contained classrooms for unruly students in special education
- Group counseling of homogeneously deviant youth
- Alternative schools that aggregate deviant youth
- School-choice policies that leave low-performing students in homogeneous low-performing schools

Juvenile Justice and Child Welfare

- Group incarceration
- Military-style boot camps and wilderness challenges
- Incarceration placement with offenders who committed the same crime
- Custodial residential placement in training schools
- Scared Straight
- Group counseling by probation officers
- Guided Group Interaction
- Positive Peer Culture
- Institutional or group foster care
- Vocational training

Community Programming

- Midnight Basketball
- Unstructured settings that are unsupervised by authority figures (e.g., youth recreation centers designed as places for teens to hang out)
- Group programs at community and recreation centers that are restricted to deviant youth
- After-school programs that serve only or primarily high-risk youth
- 21st Century Community Learning Centers
- Gang Resistance Education and Training program
- Comprehensive Gang Intervention program
- Safe Futures program

Alternatives

Effective programs that offer viable alternatives to aggregating deviant peers

Mental Health

- Individually administered treatment
- Adolescent Transitions Program
- Iowa Strengthening Families Program
- Mentoring programs such as Big Brothers/Big Sisters

Education

- Universal, environment-centered programs that focus on school-wide reform
- Universal classroom programs to build social competence (e.g., Responding in Peaceful and Positive Ways)
- Good Behavior Game
- Family-based Adolescent Transitions Program
- Matching deviant youth with well-adjusted peers (e.g., coaching, BrainPower, Peer Coping Skills Training, the Montreal Longitudinal Project)
- Multimodal programs (e.g., Fast Track, Seattle Social Development Project)

Juvenile Justice and Child Welfare

- Functional Family Therapy
- Multisystemic Therapy
- Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care
- Teaching Family Home Model
- Sending delinquent youth to programs that serve the general population of youth in their neighborhoods (e.g., Boys and Girls Clubs)
- Community rather than custodial settings
- Interpersonal skills training
- Individual counseling
- Teen Court programs

Community Programming

- Public or private organizations that are open to all youth, regardless of risk status, and that provide structure and adult involvement (e.g., religious groups, service clubs, Scouts, Boys and Girls Clubs)
- School-based extracurricular activities
- Early childhood interventions such as the Perry Preschool program
- Job Corps
- Policing programs that target high-crime neighborhoods where high-risk youth congregate
- Community efforts to reduce marginalization of specific groups of youth

Source: "Deviant Peer Influences in Intervention and Public Policy for Youth," *Social Policy Report*, Vol. XX, No. 1, January 2006.

PRIMER HANDS ON- CHILD WELFARE

HANDOUT 7.3

The “Matrix” from Oregon System of Care How to Fund the Service Array and How to Process

www.oregon.gov/dhs/children/welfare/systemofcare

Example: Oregon's Cost Center and Object Code Matrix

OBJECT CODES	DESCRIPTION	FED CLAIM	COST CENTERS			
			SYSTEM OF CARE	IV-E WAIVER	FOSTER CARE PREVENTION	ONE TIME PAY
Administration (1)						
921.XXX	Temporary Salaries and OPE			X		
922.602	Insurance (Commercial Bldg.)			X		
925.889	Contracted Services (Administration)			X		
Purchase of Care (2)						
983.001	Clothing	IV-E	X	X	X	X
983.002	Food	IV-E	X	X	X	X
983.003	Home Appliance/Kitchen Wares	Non IV-E	X	X	X	
983.004	Home Repairs	Non IV-E	X	X	X	
983.005	Housing/Lodging	Non IV-E	X	X	X	
983.007	Sanitation Cleaning	Non IV-E	X	X	X	
983.008	"Statutory FDM's for Waiver Only"	Non IV-E		X		
983.009	Counseling/Family Decision Mtgs.	Non IV-E	X	X		
983.010	Mentoring	Non IV-E	X			
983.011	Tutoring	Non IV-E	X			
983.012	Meditation	Non IV-E	X			
983.013	Adoption Preparation	IV-E	X			
983.014	Medical (no other resource)	Non IV-E	X			
983.015	Therapeutic Support	Non IV-E	X			
983.016	Legal Fees (see policy)	Non IV-E	X (3)	X (3)	X (3)	X
983.017	Transportation – Other non IV-E	Non IV-E	X	X	X	X
983.018	Transportation – child visit to home (IV-E)	IV-E	X	X	X	X
983.019	Educational Costs – IV-E service (4)	IV-E	X	X	X	X
983.020	Educational Costs – non IV-E service (4)	non IV-E	X			
983.021	Therapeutic Visitation	non-IV-E	X			