

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

February 15, 2008

Table of Contents

Section	Page
Introduction and Overview	2
Roundtable Agenda	4
Evaluation Results	5
Roundtable Planning, including Sample Forms	7
List of Roundtable Participants	15
Detailed Transcript of the Roundtable Large Group Discussions	20

**ACF REGION V  
ROUNDTABLE ON CHILD WELFARE TRAINING SYSTEMS**

**SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW**

To increase information sharing and collaboration, the ACF Region V office recently hosted a Roundtable on Child Welfare Training Systems for Region V states. The roundtable was held in Chicago, Illinois on October 23-24, 2007. This event provided a forum for 23 child welfare training directors, state agency executives, university partners, curriculum writers and stipend program representatives from Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Minnesota and Wisconsin to gather together to discuss mutual training issues, challenges and successes. (Michigan, another ACF Region V state was invited to participate in the roundtable but was unable to attend due to budgetary restrictions.) Personnel from the ACF Region V office and the National Child Welfare Resource Center for Organizational Improvement at the University of Southern Maine also attended this event. (See pg. 15 for a list of participants.)

The goal of this 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. In fact, the topics discussed during the roundtable were identified by the states in a pre-roundtable survey that asked them to suggest ideas for the agenda and highlight unique or innovative training activities that they would be willing to share with the other participants. 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 included:

- Overview of each state's training system
- Opportunities for collaboration around distance learning
- The level of training system involvement in foster parent training
- The relationship between quality assurance, training and policy development
- Training Evaluation

During the roundtable participants had opportunities to join in large group conversations led by their peers, as well as to meet in affinity groups. (These groupings included: university partners, training directors, university stipend programs and state agency administrators.) 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 explore future partnerships around items such as curriculum development and distance learning with other states. In fact, several participants indicated that they would like to see this roundtable as the beginning of collaborative development of training resources between the states. Because the learning was so helpful, attendees would like to sustain and build upon the conversations and networking started during the roundtable. They suggested a combination of phone conferences and in person meetings on a regular basis. (See pg. 5 for summaries of the participant evaluations.)

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

- Section 2 contains the roundtable agenda

- Section 3 presents the evaluation results
- Section 4 describes the impetus and planning for the roundtable, including success factors identified by the planning committee and samples of the forms developed for the roundtable
- Section 5 is a list of roundtable participants
- Section 6 is a detailed transcript of the large group presentations

**SECTION 2: AGENDA**

**ACF REGION V ROUNDTABLE CHILD WELFARE TRAINING SYSTEMS  
AGENDA  
TUESDAY OCT. 23, 2007**

<b>TIME</b>	<b>TOPIC</b>	<b>PRESENTERS</b>
8:30 – 9:00	Registration	
9:00 - 9:30	Welcome and Introductions	Carolyn Wilson-Hurey Susan Kanak
9:30 – 10:30	Overview of Each State’s Training System	Each State
10:30 – 10:45	Break	
10:45- 12:15	Opportunities for Collaboration in the Development of Distance Learning	Illinois, Minnesota, Wisconsin
12:15 – 1:30	Lunch on your own	
1:30 – 3:00	Discussion of the Training System’s Involvement in Foster Parent Training	Ohio, Minnesota, Wisconsin
3:00 – 3:15	Break	
3:15 – 5:00	Affinity Breakout Group Discussions: University Partners, Training Directors, University Stipend Programs and State Agency Administrators	
5:00 – 5:30	Wrap-up	Carolyn Wilson-Hurey Susan Kanak

**WEDNESDAY OCT. 24, 2007**

8:00- 9:00	Networking Tables: distance learning, supervisory supports, assessing your training system and training ideas for an urban workforce.	
9:00 - 10:30	Relationships Between Quality Assurance, Training and Policy Development	Indiana, Wisconsin
10:30 - 10:45	Break	
10:45 - 11:45	Evaluation of Training	Indiana
11:45 – 12:30	Next Steps, Evaluation and Wrap-up	Carolyn Wilson-Hurey Susan Kanak

## SECTION 3: FORMAL EVALUATION RESULTS

### ACF REGION V ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION OF CHILD WELFARE TRAINING SYSTEMS

We asked participants to provide feedback on several topics and received responses from 18 individuals. Our analysis of the responses indicated that participants ---regardless of functional title--- generally agreed in their evaluation ratings and comments of the roundtable. The ratings are shown in the table below, followed by selected comments.

#### Ratings

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
The right people attended the roundtable from my state.			8	9
The roundtable met my expectations.			8	9
Overall, presenters were prepared and organized.			11	7
Overall, the presenters engaged me.			12	6
The presentations were at the right level.		1	9	8
The format of the presentations encouraged discussion.		1	6	11
Logistics regarding the roundtable were satisfactory.		2	8	8
I learned information that will help my agency improve our training system.		1	7	10
I will use the information from the roundtable.			8	10
Handouts and other materials were helpful.			11	7
Agency staff will benefit from my attending this roundtable.			9	9

#### Comments

##### What were the strengths of the roundtable?

##### Networking between States

- Sharing between states of what is working and what is challenging
- Opportunities for informal discussions (breaks, lunch, morning of day 2) were very helpful
- Learning about the similarities and challenges experienced by staff in other states was highly informative
- Sharing program materials from each state
- The opportunity to learn and share with others, identified possible ways we could share training resources between states
- This workshop exceeded my expectations. In fact, I was not sure what to expect. Being a new university partner, I was not aware of the scope of training issues. From this workshop, I became aware of the multiple issues.
- Open and honest dialogue
- Compare/contrast ability with other states as a status check on our system

#### Affinity groups

- Really enjoyed and got a lot out of affinity group
- The affinity group and interactions were the strongest elements. Would have loved more time in these forums.
- The affinity group was excellent

#### Content/ Topics

- Networking in the area of distance learning
- Information about evaluation
- The topics selected were the right topics for a first meeting

#### Logistics

- The breakouts and the questions in the large group sessions
- The number of participants was just about right
- Length—lots of content in 1 ½ days but couldn't take in much more
- Outstanding facilitation
- The handouts were good, especially the ones on training evaluation
- Conversations and interactions between participants were encouraged
- Having input from the five states involved
- Presentations were in-depth on a few topics
- Lots of brief presentations to get conversations going

#### **What were the areas needing improvement?**

##### Logistics

- I'd suggest structuring presentations to include and take ample time for discussions and questions. Building this into presentations helps make sure it happens
- Would have liked more breakout sessions with more people
- Handouts were confusing, PowerPoint's printed too small, color code in the future?
- The hotel we stayed at was not good on many levels, having a different hotel next time would be better
- It will help next time to have a training/QI/eval conference call prior to the meeting---we could help shape the agenda and program.
- We arrived uncertain of the meeting room arrangements, planned on an internet connection but did not find out that none existed until arrival. Also think it will help if we can have a debriefing meeting with state directors/attendees to plan the next meeting and follow-up options but let's do this every year and have monthly web conference calls.

##### Content/ Topics

- Would like to discuss more on supervisory support
- Issue of supervisors as coaches/mentors needs to be a major roundtable issue
- Presentations on child welfare stipend programs seemed to be missing from this roundtable

#### **Other Comments:**

##### Hope for Continued Collaboration

- Would like to see this as the beginning of sharing of development of resources between the states--someone needs to coordinate this
- If this was the first such event, it should continue with annual meetings or roundtables
- I think this would be worth repeating regularly and maybe every year. Maybe next time we could do some more structured work such as bringing in specific curricula to compare and share

- I would appreciate the opportunity to meet regularly with university stipend programs in Region V--- perhaps on an every other year basis.
- Would like to see a follow-up session in the future
- This could not have been done without the assistance of ACF and the NRC.

#### Invited Participants

- It would be really helpful to have the federal staff present on their role and function in the ‘big’ picture of the child welfare training system; the role of federal region is often little understood by the child welfare training programs in the states.
- I would suggest opening up the next roundtable to all child welfare training and university staff, not just representatives from each state.
- In Wisconsin, with our regional partnership structure and directors, it would have been beneficial to have had the other 2 partnership directors at the meeting as a learning opportunity for them--- would hope to see this in the future. This was such a great opportunity that I think it would be beneficial for all training directors to be here.
- Making sure that the QA directors/ coordinators are part of the team.
- We need to always be aware of the need to train and expose students (and/ or younger child welfare professionals) to this area of child welfare practice (training, etc). Suggest each state invite one or two graduate students or new agency staff interested in training. This will help prepare the ‘next generation’ of child welfare trainers and persons interested in federal employment with ACF.

#### Logistics

- Putting us in one hotel would have increased the interaction
- I do not recommend broadening the scope of the participants. This was a manageable size group with individuals with similar job responsibility

#### ACF/ NRC involvement

- Thank you ACF for your wisdom and support for this event--- you are a treasure
- The helpful hand of ACF and the NRC was evident. Thanks for this help. I hope this it continues
- It would be helpful if Region V staff would formally encourage on-going networking among the states

## **SECTION 4: ROUNDTABLE PLANNING, SUCCESS FACTORS AND SAMPLE FORMS**

### **Background**

The ACF Region V Roundtable on Child Welfare Training Systems followed up on a Child Welfare Training System Symposium hosted by National Child Welfare Resource Center for Organizational Improvement and the Butler Institute for Families at the University of Denver. The symposium, funded by the Children’s Bureau, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, was held in Denver, Colorado on August 21-25, 2006. The target audience for this symposium was states that were focusing in their Program Improvement Plans on strengthening their training systems. This symposium provided a forum for 64 training managers, executive decision makers and university partners from child welfare agencies in 20 states, Puerto Rico and Washington DC to come together to confer about quality training systems with peers from other states and facilitators with years of experience both in child welfare and training. Attendees urged the sponsors to continue offering events that bring together these three groups--training managers, executive decision makers and university partners-- and suggested several ideas for continuing the momentum built during the symposium. The symposium ended with each state group developing an implementation action plan based on their assessment of their agency’s training system and some of the approaches to quality training systems that emerged during the symposium.

Representatives from the Indiana (IN) and Wisconsin (WI) child welfare agencies who attended the symposium appreciated the opportunity to network and learn from others who have a shared value of the importance of training and a desire to increase collaboration. They left the symposium eager to explore the possibility of having a similar event with other states in ACF Region V.

### **Planning**

In April, 2007, Chris Sieck, State Child Welfare Training Coordinator in WI, contacted Krista Thomas, Children and Families Program Specialist for WI at the ACF Region V Office (RO) to propose sponsoring a two day roundtable on Child Welfare Training Systems for the states in ACF Region V and to request technical assistance to help plan the event from the National Child Welfare Resource Center for Organizational Improvement (NRCOI). At the same time, MB Lippold, Deputy Director of Staff Development, made a similar request to Carmen Sanchez, Children and Families Program Specialist for IN. The requests from WI and IN state that the purpose of this two day meeting would be to bring together child welfare training directors, university training partnerships and university stipend programs to engage in collaboration and information sharing on a regional level.

Both Carmen and Krista were supportive of the idea and set about discussing the feasibility and interest in such an event with RO and NRCOI personnel. The idea was enthusiastically received by all and the RO agreed to host the event. In June, 2006 a planning committee was formed to organize and oversee the roundtable. The committee included:

- Carolyn Wilson Hurey, RO
- Ruby Flagg Ross, RO
- Carmen Sanchez, RO
- Krista Thomas, RO
- MB Lippold, IN
- Chris Sieck, WI
- Maureen Baker, NRCOI
- Susan Kanak, NRCOI

Over the course of the summer and into the fall, this group met (via conference call) several times to plan the event. During the first call, the group agreed that this event would truly be a peer to peer, interactive event filled with many opportunities to learn from colleagues, share training successes, raise training challenges and brainstorm solutions. At that time, the group also discussed who and how many people from each state should attend the roundtable. Because opportunities to discuss and share were believed to be key to the success of the roundtable, the planners decided to cap participation at 50, and ask each state to designate 5 individuals to attend the roundtable. Planners agreed that another factor that could contribute to the success of the roundtable was to ensure that a mix of folks involved with child welfare training be invited, including child welfare training directors, state agency executives, university partners, curriculum writers and stipend program representatives. The planning group was clear from the first that the cost of travel and meals would be an agency responsibility. Planners selected a tentative date for the event and decided that the RO Children and Families Program Specialist for each state should contact the the agency director to confirm interest in participating in this event and their willingness to cover the costs of participants from their state.

Responses from the states were slow in coming as states took a while to identify who should be the lead person to communicate for the state about the roundtable. By July, the planning group had heard from most states and received confirmation that there was an interest holding a roundtable. The next step was to get input from the states on the topics that should be discussed at the roundtable via a survey that was e-mailed to the agency administrators by the RO Children and Families Program Specialist for each state. (See survey form on page 11.) Planners asked each state to confer with their training system



colleagues and complete and return one survey form to identify possible topics for the agenda, unique or innovative training activities they would be willing to share and training system challenges.

The survey response was initially low and the RO specialists followed-up to urge return of the surveys. Ultimately planners received surveys from 3 states (IN, MI and MN. WI provided its input during the planning meeting.). Analysis of the input and surveys showed that the large group discussion topics should include:

- distance learning
- training system involvement in foster parent training
- the relationship between quality assurance, training and policy development
- training evaluation

The planning group then drafted and distributed an agenda that addressed the identified topics and encouraged participant interaction. For example, the planning group set aside time for affinity group discussions to allow participants with similar job functions to meet, get to know each other and share issues, solutions and successes. The planning group also organized small group networking discussions on topics such as:

- training ideas for an urban workforce
- assessing your training system
- supervisory support and training requirements

(During the roundtable the group added a networking table on distance learning.)

In September the RO Children and Families Program Specialist for each state e-mailed registration forms to each state. These specialists played an invaluable role in the planning process. For example, they made numerous calls to state personnel to answer questions about the roundtable, identified the state people who needed to attend the roundtable, encouraged participation and sent out reminder e-mails about returning the survey and registration forms. The RO also agree to collect handouts and ‘stuff’ participant packets.

Planning group members agreed to take on several roles during the roundtable. They:

- staffed the registration table, welcomed participants and coordinated logistics
- managed technology
- facilitated the affinity group discussions, including recording on flip charts the highlights (‘gold nuggets’) of the discussions
- agreed to be the ‘lead’ person for a topic discussion which included coordinating the presentation, lining up speakers and ensuring that the handouts were sent in on time.
- transcribed the large group discussions. Michigan was not be able to attend the event due to budget issues so the planning committee offered to keep a record of the large group discussions and share that information with all participants as well as folks from Michigan

### **Success Factors**

Participant evaluations indicated that the roundtable achieved its stated goals: bringing together leaders in child welfare training in ACF Region V states and providing opportunities for them to confer about quality training with peers from other states. The roundtable certainly turned out to be as interactive, informative and productive as the planners hoped.

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)

- a mix of large and small group discussions during the roundtable
- 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

## SAMPLE FORMS

### Survey to States

Roundtable Discussion on Child Welfare Training Systems  
October 23-24, 2007  
Chicago, IL.

#### Suggestions for the Roundtable Agenda

1. Possible Topics for the Agenda

Please rate each of the following topics using a scale of 1-3 where 1 is not important, 2 is somewhat important and 3 is very important.

- \_\_\_\_\_ opportunities for collaboration in the development of Distance Learning
- \_\_\_\_\_ a discussion of training in rural areas
- \_\_\_\_\_ training ideas for an urban workforce (how to effectively train large groups in a short period of time)
- \_\_\_\_\_ diversification of funding for training
- \_\_\_\_\_ a discussion of coaching and mentoring
- \_\_\_\_\_ information sharing around models of pre-service training
- \_\_\_\_\_ opportunities for collaboration in curriculum development and training delivery
- \_\_\_\_\_ models of collaboration between training partnerships and stipend programs
- \_\_\_\_\_ the relationship between Quality Assurance and policy development
- \_\_\_\_\_ Leadership development and succession planning
- \_\_\_\_\_ Evaluation of training
- \_\_\_\_\_ A discussion of the level of training system involvement in foster parent training
- \_\_\_\_\_ other (Please specify)

2. Successes and Challenges Facing Your Training System

a. Are there any unique or innovative training activities which are working really well for your agency that you would be willing to share with the other participants?

If so, what are they?

What makes them successful?

b. Are there any training system challenges you face that you want to discuss with the group to develop possible solutions?

If so, what are they?

3. Summary

Are there any other ideas for the Roundtable Discussion on Child Welfare Training Systems that you want to suggest?

Please return this survey to: Susan Kanak, skanak@usm.maine.edu by August 3, 2007.  
Thanks for your input.

Registration Form  
Region V Roundtable Discussion  
Child Welfare Training Systems

October 23 – 24, 2007  
ACF Region V Office  
Chicago, IL

Last Name: \_\_\_\_\_ First Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Agency Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_ Zip: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

Functional Area: Please check one

- child welfare training director
- training administrators/manager
- university training partner
- university stipend program
- curriculum developer
- other: please specify \_\_\_\_\_

Special Needs:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Conference registrations are due by:

Fax or E-Mail Registration Form to:

Hotel Information:

Congress Plaza Hotel ([www.congressplazahotel.com](http://www.congressplazahotel.com)) 520 S. Michigan, (312) 427-3800

Rate: \$169 plus tax per night. Refer to the "Region V Roundtable" when requesting the block.

Hotel reservations must be made by Oct. 23, 2007 to obtain the \$169 rate.

**EVALUATION FORM**

**ACF REGION V ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION OF CHILD WELFARE TRAINING SYSTEMS**

---

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**I. Your Functional Area**

Child Welfare Training Director \_\_\_\_\_ State Agency Executive \_\_\_\_\_ University Partner \_\_\_\_\_

Curriculum Developer \_\_\_\_\_ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**II. Your Ratings**

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

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

**Were the topics presented during the roundtable the ‘right’ topics? \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No**

**If you selected ‘no’, please explain why and identify topics you would have preferred.**

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**What were the strengths of the roundtable?**

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**What were the areas needing improvement?**

---

---

---

---

**Other Comments:**

---

---

---

---

*Thank you.*

<b>ACF – Region V Office</b>					
Carrillo	Irene	Children and Families 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
Doran	Mary	Children and Families 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
Flagg-Ross	Ruby	Children and Families 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
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
Miller	Constance	Children and Families Program Specialist	ACF - Region V Children's Bureau 233 N. Michigan Ave, Suite 400 Chicago, IL 60601	312-886-4922	constance.hf.miller@acf.hhs.gov
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
Sanchez	Carmen	Children and Families Program Specialist	ACF - Region V Children's Bureau 233 N. Michigan Ave, Suite 400 Chicago, IL 60601	312-353-9678	cisanchez@acf.hhs.gov
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
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

<b>Illinois</b>					
Maher	Jean	Manager	Illinois Department of Children and Family Services 406 E. Monroe Station 122 Springfield, IL 62701	217-524-3539	jean.maher@illinois.gov
Mann	Kimberly	Assistant Professor of Social Work	Chicago State University 9501 S. King Dr. SCI 116A Chicago, IL 60628	773-995-2374	kmann@csu.edu
McCarthy	Bernadette	Consultant	Northwestern University 6575 Caldwell Ave Chicago, IL 60646	312-505-7210 (cell)	<a href="mailto:Bmc211@aol.com">Bmc211@aol.com</a> <a href="mailto:Bernadette.mccarthy@illinois.gov">Bernadette.mccarthy@illinois.gov</a>
McClure	Dave	Executive Director	Youth Services Bureau of Illinois Valley 424 W. Madison St. Ottawa, IL 61350	815-431-3026	dmc@ysbiv.org
McNeilly	Catherine	Senior Training Consultant	Illinois Department of Children and Family Services 10 W. 35th St. 5th Floor Chicago, IL 60616	312-328-2882	catherine.mcneilly@illinois.gov
Missel	Craig	Assistant Training Administrator	Illinois Department of Children and Family Services 227 S 7th #122 Springfield, IL 62701	217-785-5689	craig.missel@illinois.gov
Rasheed	Mikal	Director, MSW Program	Chicago State University 9501 S. King Dr. SCI 116A Chicago, IL 60601	773-995-2415	mrashe20@csu.edu
Zaleski	Judy	Administrator - Training and Professional	Illinois Department of Children and Family Services 227 S 7th #122	217-785-5689	judy.zaleski@illinois.gov



		Development	Springfield, IL 62701		
<b>Indiana</b>					
Howes	Pat	Director, Child Welfare Education and Training Partnership	Indiana University School of Social Work 902 W. New York St. ES 4150 Indianapolis, IN 46202	317-278-4802	phowes@iupui.edu
Lippold	MB	Deputy Director of Staff Development, Indiana Department of Child Services	Department of Child Services/ Partnership of Child Welfare Education and Training/ Indiana University School of Social Work 402 W. Washington Street, W392 Indianapolis, IN 46204	317-234-3925	mb.lippold@dcs.in.gov
Votapek	Jackie	Training Manager	Indiana Child Welfare Education & Training Partnership IUPUI - Indiana University School of Social Work 515 E. Main Street, Suite 165 Carmel, IN 46032	317-278-9813	jvotapek@iupui.edu
Will	Jeanette	Curriculum and Assessment Specialist	Indiana Child Welfare Education & Training Partnership IUPUI - Indiana University School of Social Work 515 E. Main Street, Suite 165 Carmel, IN 46032	317-278-9870	jhwill@iupui.edu
<b>Minnesota</b>					
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
Nicholson	Jane	Dean of Continuing Education	Century College 3300 Century Avenue North White Bear Lake, MN 55110	651-779-3304	jane.nicholson@century.edu
<b>Ohio</b>					
Crozier	LeRoy	Contract Officer	Ohio Department of Job and Family Services/ Office for Children and Families/	614-752-0264	crozil@odjfs.state.oh.us

			BABF 50. W. Town St. 6th Floor Columbus, OH 43215		
Handon	Rose	Contract Manager	Ohio Department of Job and Family Services/ Office for Children and Families/ BABF 50. W. Town St. 6th Floor Columbus, OH 43215	614-466-1213	handor@odjfs.state.oh.us
Severs	Pamela	Training Consultant	Institute for Human Services 1706 E. Broad Street Columbus, OH 43203	614-251-6000	psevers@ihs-trainet.com
<b>Wisconsin</b>					
Brown	Julie	Director	Milwaukee Child Welfare Partnership Helen Bader School of Social Welfare University of Wisconsin –Milwaukee Milwaukee, WI 53201-0786	414-229-5274	jrbrown@uwm.edu
Hobbs	Harry	CQI Section Chief	DHFS/ Division of Children and Family Services 1 West Wilson St. Madison, WI 53708-8916	608-264-8525	hobbshm@dhfs.state.wi.us
Mattila	Matthew	Child Welfare Coordinator	University of Wisconsin - Green Bay, Social Work Professional Program 2420 Nicolet Dr, CL 710 Green Bay, WI 54311-7001	920-465-2867	mattilam@uwgb.edu
Reilly	Stephanie	Director	University of Wisconsin - Green Bay, NEW Partnership for Children and Families 2420 Nicolet Dr, CL 750 Green Bay, WI 54311-7001	920-465-2866	reillys@uwgb.edu
Sieck	Chris	State Child Welfare	Wisconsin DHFS & University of	608-262-5712	crsieck@wisc.edu

		Training Coordinator	Wisconsin - Madison 455 Science Drive, Suite 110 Madison, WI 53711		
Smith	Ellen	Statewide Curriculum Coordinator	Wisconsin Child Welfare Training System 455 Science Drive, Suite 110 Madison, WI 53711	608-513-2976	ecsmith@wcwts.wisc
<b>National Child Welfare Resource Center for Organizational Improvement</b>					
Baker	Maureen	Policy Associate	National Resource Cener for Organizational Improvement 400 Congress St, PO Box 15010 Portland, ME 04112	207-780-5869	mbaker@usm.maine.edu
Kanak	Susan	Policy Associate	National Resource Cener for Organizational Improvement 400 Congress St, PO Box 15010 Portland, ME 04112	207-780-5840	skanak@usm.maine.edu

## **SECTION 6: DETAILED TRANSCRIPT OF THE ROUNDTABLE**

**Tuesday, October 23, 2007**

### **Welcome and Introductions**

Carolyn Wilson-Hurey, ACF Regional Program manager, welcomed the group to Chicago and this event. She mentioned that ACF Region V is very pleased to host this roundtable and hopes that the time together is interactive. A committee comprised of Regional Office, National Resource Center and States worked together to plan this event. The hope is that the Roundtable will enhance training throughout the six states. The agenda for the day and a half is focused on topics that were identified in a need assessment survey sent out by the Regional Office.

Susan Kanak, National Child Welfare Resource Center for Organizational Improvement in Portland, Maine, then welcomed the group. She mentioned that the NRCOI is delighted to be part of this Roundtable and stated that the intent is for states to share training ideas, listen and learn and hopefully have some fun. This is a luxury to focus on training for a day with experts who share interests.

Susan then asked those present to introduce themselves:

- Julie Brown, Director of the Milwaukee Partnership for Professional Development, responsible for the training and development of 500 state employed and private agency staff. Also, 1,000 families who are licensed as foster families.
- Chris Sieck, State Child Welfare Training Coordinator for Wisconsin.
- Ellen Smith, Curriculum Coordinator for State of Wisconsin
- Krista Thomas, Program Specialist for Regional Office, Works with Wisconsin.
- Jane Nicholson, Dean of Continuing Education, Educational Partner in Minnesota.
- Dick Dean, Training Unit Supervisor in the Child Safety and Permanency Division in the state of Minnesota. Responsible for training county and tribal child welfare workers, adoptive parents, foster parents, etc.
- Maureen Baker, National Child Welfare Resource Center for Organizational Improvement
- Mary Doran, Program Specialist in Regional Office, Works with Ohio.
- Harry Hobbs, Section Chief with Wisconsin, liaison to linking CQI with the training system.
- Matthew Mattila, Child Welfare Coordinator with the University of Wisconsin at Green Bay, involved with BSW and MSW students.
- Stephanie Reilly, Director with NE Wisconsin Partnership for family and children. Serve 26 counties in northern Wisconsin
- Jackie Votapek, Training Manager with Indiana University in Indiana.
- Pat Howes, Indiana University, Director of the Child Welfare Training Partnership.

- Leroy Crozier, OH, Contract management for the Ohio Child Welfare Training Program (OCWTP). The OCWTP is responsible for training all child welfare workers, foster caregivers and adoption assessors in Ohio. The OCWTP also works with seven public universities in Ohio through a university partnership program to prepare BSWs and MSWs for work in public children services agencies upon graduation.
- Pat Severs, Institute for Human Services in Ohio, Contract Coordinators for OH. Works closely with state department.
- Jean Maher, IL DCFS. Manager of foster parent training program. Provides training for relative and kinship caregivers.
- Kathy McNeiley, Senior Administrator IL Department of Children and Family Services
- Mikal Rasheed, Director of Student Program, Training Partner with Illinois
- Kimberly Mann, Faculty at Chicago State University.
- M.B. Lippold. Deputy Director of Staff Development in Indiana.
- Judy Zaleski, Administrator of Office of Training and Professional Development in Illinois. Responsible for training all Department, private child welfare agency staff, and foster and adoptive caregivers.
- Craig Missel, Office of Training, Illinois DCFS
- Carmen Sanchez, Program Specialist for Regional Office, Works with Tribes.
- Ruby Flagg-Ross, Program Specialist for Regional Office, Works with Indiana.
- Barb Putyra, Child & Family Program Specialist with Regional Office, works with Michigan. Michigan is not able to be present so looking forward to getting notes. Also Michigan sent a presentation on DV to share – it is in your packets.
- Chris Guthrie, Program Specialist for Regional Office, works with Minnesota.
- Constance Miller, Program Specialist in Regional Office, works with Illinois.

Susan then reviewed the handout materials and agenda. She mentioned the Domestic Violence training material from Michigan in the participants' material. Michigan is very interested in making sure that everyone received a copy of this curriculum.

#### **Agenda Walkthrough:**

- After the welcome, we will have an overview presentation of each state's training program. We're trying to establish connections, have an understanding of what each state looks like and learn about the training initiatives states are proud of.

- Then we will take a break followed by opportunities for collaboration in the development of distance learning. We will have presenters from WI, MN and IL to begin the discussion; hopefully then you'll jump in and discuss your distance learning experiences.
- Lunch will be on our own.
- We'll then talk about foster parent training. On the need assessment survey, this was a hot topic. We want to know who is doing innovative and good work in this area. Where this is organizationally located in each state's system?
- After a break, we will then go to affinity breakout discussions. We thought that it might be helpful to give folks the chance to talk with others who do similar work. This will be a small group, informal discussion about challenges that are being faced as well as what is working. Each person has been assigned a small group based on your registration materials – there is a list in your packets. If misplaced, feel free to go where you feel comfortable. We will review this before we go into groups. This is an opportunity to talk with peers in a small group environment. Then we will close the day.
- Tomorrow. Networking tables—opportunity to share breakfast and talk with people on a particular topic. Topics include supervision, urban training, supervisory supports, and assessing your training system. If you have additional suggestions for other tables, we can add those as well. Feel free not to join a table if you like a bit of solitude in the morning.
- We will then talk about the relationship between quality assurance, training systems and policy development. IN and WI will start off the discussion; you can join in at any time.
- After break, we will have a discussion of evaluation of training. Indiana has preliminary information and will initiate the discussion. Also want to hear what everyone else is doing.
- We will end with an evaluation of this event, next steps and wrap-up. Please let anyone on the planning committee know if anything else is needed.

### **Overview of Each State's Training System**

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

#### **Minnesota**

##### **Presenter: Dick Dean**

Child Welfare is a joint effort between the Minnesota Department of Human Services and the counties in partnership with Century College, and four regional training units. Training is competency based and is provided for:

- County and tribal social workers
- County and tribal supervisors and administrators
- Foster, adoptive and kinship parents
- County and tribal Children's Mental Health workers

Training is provided at three levels:

- Social Worker Core – the fundamental and essential skills necessary for CW practice
- Specialized Child Welfare Practice – training on specialized program areas or special populations
- Related Child Welfare Practice – training that refines and enhances child welfare practice
- Supervisor Leadership Training – fundamental and essential leadership skill training

- Specialized Child Welfare Supervisor Training – supervision of specialized program areas
- Related Skills Supervisor Training – training to refine and enhance supervisory skills

Current and future initiatives include 1.) a focus on I-TV training for social workers and foster, adoptive and kinship parents and 2.) integrating system and policy training, 3) Development of ELearning

### **Wisconsin**

#### **Presenter: Chris Sieck**

Child welfare in Wisconsin is delivered through a state supervised, county administered system, except for Milwaukee that is state run. Child welfare training is a partnership between the Division of Child and Family services, county welfare programs, tribal child welfare programs, university based stipend programs and five regional university-based training partnerships. The five partnerships grew out of a county led grass roots effort started 15 years ago at UW Green Bay. The Ohio based Institute for Human Services (HIS) was actively involved in the development of the training early on.

Current and future initiatives include 1.) The CFSR found that child welfare training in WI was good but not consistently delivered. The legislature is working on an administrative rule to require participation in pre-service before a worker can be designated a ‘primary’ worker. 2.) Distance learning. WI’s pre-service is all online now and additional classes are being developed. 3.) Looking at statewide opportunities for two local initiatives: the supervisory mentoring program through UW Green Bay and the training team approach used by the Bureau of Milwaukee Child Welfare.

### **Illinois**

#### **Presenter: Judy Zaleski**

Child welfare in Illinois is state supervised. Through purchase of service contracts, child welfare services for placement cases have been privatized for approximately 80% of the children in foster placement. The lead agency is the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services. The present Illinois Office of Training and Professional Development was created in 1980. This office is responsible for training:

- Approximately 3,000 department staff
- 1,500 private agency child welfare staff
- 16,000 licensed foster caregivers
- 3,800 residential care staff
- 45,000 child care workers
- 160,000+ professionals who are mandated to report suspected cases of child abuse/neglect.

In IL, SACWIS is integrated as part of the core training course. IL is in the process of updating their core pre-service training course for all job positions. This includes lengthening the course to include field training and an increased participation of the supervisor ---they can see whether or not the classroom training is effective based on workers’ practice in the field.

Trainers have rigorous amount of trainings before they are deemed qualified to be a trainer, there are requirements established by law (education, background checks, etc) that need to be met before they can fulfill that role.

Distance learning makes all of this training doable. A central theme in IL’s annual and 5 year strategic plan is to use distance learning as a ‘blended’ learning strategy---combining distance learning with

classroom learning, including a new on-line learning center, on-line training courses, statewide web-conferencing, statewide video conference, and portable training classrooms, using wireless laptop computers.

## **Indiana**

### **Presenter: MB Lippold**

Child welfare in Indiana is state supervised and administered by the Indiana Department of Child Services. This agency was formed in July 2005; prior to that child welfare was under an umbrella agency. In the first months of existence, DCS created an agency mission, vision and values and worked with Casey Family Services to develop a practice model that uses the skills of engaging, teaming, assessing, planning and intervening to partner with families and the community.

The partnership between the Indiana University School of Social Work and DCS was formalized in early 2007. Prior to this partnership, IN's training relied heavily on curricula from IHS and was based on individual training needs assessments. With the advent of the state/university partnership, the practice model and the Child and Family Services Review, training is now evolving to align with the practice model.

A major challenge to the training system currently is the rapid growth in the number of workers and supervisors. The number of workers is going from 750 to 1500 in three years and the number of supervisors is growing from 150 to 225. Starting in January of 2008, every Monday, training for 30 new workers starts some place in the state.

## **Ohio**

### **Presenters: LeRoy Crozier and Pam Severs**

Child welfare in Ohio is delivered through a state supervised, county administered system. The training program in Ohio known as the Ohio Child Welfare Training Program (OCWTP), is comprised of the Ohio Department of Job and Family Services, the Public Children Services Association of Ohio (PCSAO), eight regional training centers (located throughout Ohio) and the Institute for Human Services (IHS). Presently, the Institute for Human Services serves as the state training coordinator for Ohio through a contract with the Ohio Department of Job and Family Services. As the coordinator, IHS is responsible for the coordination, management, evaluation and development of curricula and competencies offered through workshops and limited online training to Ohio's child welfare professionals, foster caregivers and adoption assessors. Over the course of the last two year contract with the direction of the OCWTP Steering Committee, IHS has revised supervisor and caseworker core, updated the competencies, conducted field tests of the curricula, piloted an online Foster Parent College and offered shorter workshops to all training populations.

The mission of the Ohio Department of Job and Family Services and the Ohio Child Welfare Training Program is to provide a comprehensive, competency-based in-service training system that provides high quality, culturally responsive, family centered, job-related training for staff in public child welfare agencies throughout Ohio.

Priorities for the training system include: the development of a learning management system, increasing the use of distance learning, developing new on-line courses and expanding the university partnership



program to include other Ohio colleges and universities to increase the number of students coming into the program.

## **Opportunities for the Collaboration in the Development of Distance Learning**

### **Wisconsin**

#### **Presenter: Ellen Smith**

WI is looking to deliver foundation training via a distance learning format. Most WI e-learning is available on their website: [www.wcwt.wisc.edu](http://www.wcwt.wisc.edu).

#### Pre-Service Training - on-line

- All pre-service training is on-line: parameters include providing basic knowledge and awareness, briefing new workers, integrating the training with on-the-job training and activities. They also want the pre-service training to be a resource for experienced workers to refer back to. It's simple, low-tech, easy to update, and incorporates evaluation components where everyone gets 100%. If they get it wrong, they get recycled back to the material until they get it right; program will be evaluated by participants.
- WI purposely went low-tech with pre-service because different county agencies have varying levels of available technology. WI had to develop something engaging, but accessible to the technologically lowest common denominator so that all agencies could benefit
- Ellen then demonstrated what their pre-service modules looked like –
- WI is working on domestic violence training, access, on-going services, court, and permanency. They are able to incorporate some skill-building in on-line training; participants are expected to incorporate what they learned in pre-service when they get to face-to-face training. They are working to set a culture that workers are expected to know pre-service material when they get to foundation training
- Workers should take about 2 weeks to go through pre-service on-the-job training and the interactive components that go along with that. Modules take about 30 to 60 minutes each to go through. WI workers are not case-carrying when they are in pre-service, not primary workers. They can, however, do case activity if they are supervised.

WI currently has committee looking at how to integrate SACWIS with the other training and activities. Currently, SACWIS training is separate. All training is being developed with the integration of what is in SACWIS, but does not address SACWIS specifically.

Counties can develop their own pre-service package. They must include the core modules, but they can add material and decide how they are going to structure the pre-service training.

#### Foundation training – blended learning:

- Every new foundation course is looked at through the lens of “What aspects of this course best lends itself to e-learning?”

- Wisconsin is working to make the training engaging and fun for the learners – they want them to want to go back and review the materials; want to incorporate positive feedback into the training for the learners

Primary curricula:

Child Development Curricula, Knowledge of Typical Child Development

- Wanted all trainings to start with some basic knowledge level – the foundation needs to service folks from all backgrounds, not only those with appropriate child welfare/child development backgrounds/course work.
- Interactive child development training
- WI does not have a state-wide requirement about specific degrees that must be held, though counties have their own requirements
- RE: Child development, there are a lot of opportunities to test where folks are at in the face-to-face training

Legal Training

- Incorporates several modules: Jurisdiction topics, custody intake, procedure topics, ICWA, etc – they are working to incorporate fun activities into each module.
- Each module includes: Overview, Learn it! Test Yourself! Closure
- Little “attention getter movies” are incorporated to show learners what they are going to learn; training validates how overwhelming it is to be a new social worker, incorporates some games as well like “Whack a Mole” addressing knowledge of legal terms (Whack a Term) – terms that require mastery appear over and over, ones that require familiarity appear less.

WI received additional funding for developing training as a result of their first CFSR - \$100K last year, a lot of the software is really low-tech and easy to use. The last two modules were just done in PowerPoint.

To ensure folks complete pre-service, they have a lot of reminders. They are considering “shaming” (tongue-in-cheek), working with county supervisors to ensure their people are doing what they are required to do. WI does not have a statewide system right now for ensuring completion of training.

During recent meeting/training, WI trainers talked about the positives of including competitive aspects (including scores, average) playing to the competitiveness of the learners, so that they do the trainings and games over and over again until they improve their score/beat the average, etc. This is positive mechanism, especially. since there is no statewide system for ensuring how/when this gets done.

WI is struggling with the concept that learners complete pre-service training meaningfully before they get to the classroom; working hard to establish the expectation that learners are to have gone through the pre-service activities before they get to the classroom because the instructors are not going back, and expect that their class knows the basics included in the prior activities.

All of WI’s web-based training activities are completely open to the public; working with the university to tackle the challenge of establishing the balance between having training accessible to all those who are interested and need it, and also protecting the university from any liability if folks use the material inappropriately.

**Minnesota**

**Presenters: Dick Dean and Jane Nicholson**

Dick confessed that MN is lagging behind WI and other peers in the area of e-learning. The need to develop this is recognized, but they don’t really have an e-learning system in place currently. Currently,

DHS has some on-line courses that are available to some counties. During the past two years strategic plan development, distance learning was recognized as an area of need, but not much has been accomplished to date.

For the past years, there has been a contract with the University of MN. The university was responsible maintaining the regional structure of the training system. Every 5 years they have to open the contract up to other interested parties. This past year, MN switched from U of Minnesota to Century College.

Century College won for several reasons:

- They do custom training.
- As the field is so dynamic and different groups do different things, this flexibility is needed.
- CC also said they could help the state with e-learning, and they needed a partner in this venture.

Currently this contract is only 4 months old, so outcomes are limited right now.

Jane Nicholson from Century College:

- MN envious of IL and their training budget
- CC has the largest customized training department in the State
- They can do stand-up training, on-line, a hybrid, whatever is needed by the consumer
- DHS has already identified which courses they wanted to start with for e-learning. Looking to start more of this in January 2008
- CC has material on “return on investment” for on-line training. Showing the benefits of this since it is so much more expensive to develop, but it is cheaper in the long-run

In MN, anybody can register for the trainings being offered, but they have to know how to/know the process. This information is not advertised to the whole world because “everybody” is not the target audience. Folks who want to attend the training but are not in the primary audience have to pay for the course.

MN is going to have to do some concurrent planning as the e-learning materials are developed to figure out how they are going to protect the use of the material. MN has liability wording incorporated into their established curricula – basically, if someone uses the material inappropriately and screws it up, DHS is not held accountable.

A culture shift is needed so that folks engaging in e-learning are left alone by their colleagues, isolated from their standard responsibilities, so that they can engage fully in their e-learning. Benefit to e-learning is that you can stop/start again, as the need arises.

Challenge will be how to develop a comprehensive, integrated training system that effectively addresses the different training mechanisms, responsibilities of the workers, and the other challenges that affect the child welfare workforce currently.

IL comment: An evidence-based practice model is a good place to start in terms of addressing all of this collaboration.

WI comment: Interested in knowing the great work that is happening among other states. Folks working on the same types of training areas, often related to the CFSR (mentioned great work IN is doing with some supervisory training) – does everyone have to be doing this independently, how can we share this info?

IN responds with some info about their budget, but then restrictions that are built into it stating that the curricula cannot be shared. Some info was shared with WI but special permission had to be sought to allow that to happen.

Outside vendors of training curricula do not want their materials being shared.

In MN, Century College does not have these restrictions, because the State is the owner of the curriculum, not CC. Advice from MN – look at what’s built into your contracts. If something is being developed for you, you should own that curriculum and the rights to make decisions about what happens to it.

There was a discussion about not recreating the wheel and dividing up the work that hasn’t been done yet among states. Customization would have to be done due to different state laws/practices.

Discussion started by WI about the possibility of States getting together, when they are interested in the same goals/objectives, and developing something together, particularly when outside partners that are expensive are needed to accomplish the objectives.

### **Illinois**

#### **Presenters: Judy Zaleski and Craig Missel**

Judy walked the audience through the packet IL provided to participants. She introduced Bernadette McCarthy, former deputy director of training, now independent consultant. Lots of current IL policy and practice around training exist because of what Bernadette put in place. Lots of folks in the training dept have been there since the 70s – lots of experience in IL

Programmatic aspect of distance learning strategy:

- Everything in the training dept is driven by the agency’s strategic program planning
- IL has a virtual training center (web-based)
- Lots of strategic partnerships with various IL universities
- Dave McClure is the chair of the advisory council on training for IL
- Everyone who is mandated to receive training by DCFS is given an account at this IL virtual training center – the State can then track everything these folks do in regard to training; collaboration with Western IL university, and this system is scaleable and replicable by other States, should work with everyone’s computer system, open architecture
- Folks can look on the calendar of events for upcoming trainings, or conduct searches by topic area, learners’ personal training history/upcoming training events is shown in their personal accounts.
- This training center provides a wealth of information regarding training data, CQI efforts, etc.; supervisors can keep track of their team’s training history/needs
- Licensing workers can track the trainings completed/needed by the caregivers in their caseload
- IL branded and marketed “How Tools” which show learners how to use various computer applications
- Training dept built their own tutorials to help them with tech needs of the staff; learned that basic tech skills were necessary to use SACWIS that folks on their staff didn’t have. Assumptions the training folks had about distance learning and their users are constantly being challenged, particularly by caregivers, so they’ve developed these tutorials to help bridge the necessary gaps.

Web conferencing (webinars) – is another distance learning strategy employed by IL.

DCFS has the ability to connect all their workers in real time to a network; can do videoconferencing as well (uses WebX as their 3<sup>rd</sup> party vendor).

Can fully engage folks in training and they never have to leave their offices or home computers

They noticed that caregivers have a fear of failing/fear of trying, related to web-based training (as well as other things) so they started by utilizing instructor led web-based training to engage them effectively in this process from the get-go.

To get folks to adjust to the paradigm shift of distance learning, a major strategy was to start the process with trainer-led learning sessions.

- Hooked folks up via phone,
- strong evaluative components,
- had folks post questions that were then addressed by the trainers – helped the instructors to gauge where their learners were at in the process.
- If there is an on-line course that they want people to do for homework, one strategy is to designate in-class time to do the on-line work, where there are instructors available to help with questions/concerns

Regarding caregivers, the training dept has the ability to track what courses have been registered for and when, what needs to be done, and how the caregivers fared in the courses they have taken.

Courses Available on CD:

- When caregivers are doing CD training, folks cannot skip around; have to go from one module to the next. During in-class training, folks space out, do other things besides pay attention, the trainer doesn't always know if folks are engaged. With the CD training, they cannot skip around, or skip any exercises; trainers can be sure of exactly what was done by the learners. CD training has 9 modules, same as in-class training.
- 75% of caregivers have responded that they have a PC or have access to one. Universities at times open up their computers to caregivers, and there are some public computers available (by state law and policy)
- IL has 25,000 caregivers. To have this additional CD resource available is huge.

IL is creating regionally and locally portable learning labs that learners can access wirelessly (and wired). IL has small scale and large scale computer conferencing ability. Not only web-based training, but also the state has portable video conferencing equipment. Both audio and visual conferencing is available, and this can be used in state agencies or campus buildings of the university partners.

None of this is possible in IL without the strategic partnerships:

- Mandated reporters
- Adoption learning partners
- Strengthening families IL
- Evidence-based Child Trauma Treatment program
- Psychiatric Tele-Services Clinics

Under Bernadette McCarthy, IL established both BSW and MSW stipend programs, gave the workers the opportunity to go back to school for the appropriate credentials. Supervisors weren't able to secure their positions without MSW degree. IL is working now to make these stipend programs as strong as they once were.

## **Discussion of the Training System's Involvement in Foster Parent Training**

### **Minnesota**

#### **Presenter: Dick Dean**

MN uses the same model for Foster Parent training as they use for caseworker training. Pre service training is 36 hours. This training is also used as a screening tool that allows foster parents to self select

out of foster parenting. MN has developed some training after the pre-service level. Legislature provided money to provide foster parent training. There is no statutory mandate for providers to attend training developed by DHS. This training is available to both county licensed foster homes and privately licensed foster homes. The pre-service curriculum comes from Institute for Human Services in Ohio.

### **Ohio**

#### **Presenter: LeRoy Crozier**

In 2001, Ohio Law mandated foster parent training through the OCWTP and the legislature allocated funds for foster parent training. OH is in the process now of making changes to the foster parent training system as a result of a child death in Ohio. This includes an increase in hours required of foster parent training (36 hours pre-service and 40 hours ongoing in 2 year period). Ohio presently does not offer training for kinship providers. Every foster parent training is also open to adoptive parents. Ohio provides a stipend for pre-service training. OH piloted an online foster parent college training at the in-service level for foster parents. (State of OH only allows 1/3 of training to occur online). OH uses trainers from I H S to provide foster parent training. Some foster parents are co-trainers. Most training is conducted at regional training centers. The regional training center coordinator is responsible for the development of a quarterly calendar covering the needs of foster parents in their regional. The foster care specialist in each district conducts Individual Training Needs Assessments with the foster parents in their district every two years.

### **Wisconsin**

#### **Presenter: Stephanie Reilly**

In WI, Foster parent training was developed at the grass roots level. There is no administrative rule for foster parent training statewide. Counties set their own training requirements. It is anticipated that during the next round of the CFSR there may be a required rule for FP training. Pre-service training has been developed using a lot of I H S curriculum. Training partnerships train foster care coordinators who, in turn, train foster parents. There have been problems in the northern part of Wisconsin getting a group together for foster parent training. Because of this, Wisconsin has developed various delivery modes of foster parent training that allow for individual training as well as training in groups. The foster parent training committee has developed levels of training to mirror the caseworker training in Wisconsin. This includes pre-service, foundation and ongoing levels of training. Outside of Milwaukee, the training partnerships are not directly involved in the provision of foster parent training.

### **Indiana**

#### **Presenter: MB Lippold**

IN has a pre-service requirement, but there is no mandate on the number of hours. Currently 20 hours is required, the basic curriculum was developed by HIS from Ohio. The state is moving toward managing foster parent training to ensure fidelity in curriculum delivery.

Question: How do the tribes fit into the plans for foster parent training? In Wisconsin 3 tribes (out of 11) are licensing foster parents. In Minnesota the Area Training Managers work with tribes to meet their training needs. Training is available to tribes through the training system.

### **Affinity Breakout Group Discussions, “Golden Nuggets” (from flipcharts)**

At the end of the affinity group discussions, facilitators asked participants to identify their ‘gold nuggets’ of learning from the conversation and recorded them on a flip chart.

### **University Stipend Program**

- Working with university to give credit for agency training
- Working with university and agency on leadership and succession planning
- Professionalize current workforce, recruit for next generation
- Public child welfare is better represented in research and curriculum
- Stipend program is flexible to allow local adaptation
- Clarity on requirements
- How can stipend program be used for POS staff who serve IV-E clients

### **Training Directors**

- Role of ACF in strategizing/promoting/supporting communication/training in region/across states?
  - a. Monthly teleconferences/video conference updates
  - b. Yearly meeting if possible
- Very interested in working together so as to not duplicate work. Identified common needs/themes/challenges that rural and/or urban areas face including:
  - a. Recruitment/retention of minority students
  - b. Stipend programs
  - c. Title IV-E maximization of funds
  - d. Integrating curriculum – SACWIS/core
  - e. Alternative response training
  - f. Staff turnover
  - g. Multi-cultural, multilingual training/resources/etc.
  - h. Computer technology – Is there federal money available to help?

### **University Partnerships**

- What should our training have fidelity to?
  - a. Practice model?
  - b. Standardized curriculum?
  - c. Other?
- Practice model development
  - a. By consensus?
  - b. Evidence based?
  - c. Evidence informed?
  - d. Combo
- Should have practice and evidence at the table. Do we bring evidence in at the wrong time/too late? Evidence informed practice VS evidence based.
- How do we know how effective on-line training is? Should we use on-line training for knowledge and classroom for skills?
- Key skills
  - a. Facilitation
  - b. Critical thinking
  - c. Empowerment
  - d. Leadership
- Challenge of hiring trainers

### **State Agency Administrators**

- The importance of having a strong, meaningful evaluative component of the training being delivered, accomplished most effectively by an outside entity
- WI has strong practice model: the foundation is engaging the family in a trust-based relationship

- The absolute importance of effectively linking/coordinating CW services w/THE BIG FOUR (among others)
  - a. Substance abuse providers
  - b. Mental health
  - c. Domestic violence
  - d. Trauma
- Permanency of children is influenced by many different practice partners, not just State/county child welfare agencies (judges, CASAs, GALs, DAs, community culture)
- Concerns about the usefulness of CFSR process relative to disproportionality
- The importance of having a standardized curriculum for the spectrum of Child Welfare staff and partners, and having that training be mandatory

**Wednesday, October 24, 2007**

### **Networking Tables**

The topics were:

- distance learning
- supervisory supports
- assessing your training system and
- training ideas for an urban workforce.

### **Relationships between Quality Assurance, Training and Policy Development**

**Wisconsin**

**Presenter: Harry Hobbs**

WI has limited authority countywide. There are 72 counties that have their own way of addressing issues. They have a partnership with the counties to address a continual quality assurance system. Look at CFSR process and learning components. WI chose a QSR system because of the learning product. Reviews began Sept 2005 and, as of 2007, 30 counties have been reviewed. Characteristics of parents were identified, struggles were addressed and data was available to support services needed. Noted that 43% of parent had ADA, 40% of parents and 30% children had a diagnosis of trauma. Both children and parents noted 11% of developmental delays.

Court improvement project has a measure of court performance that they were able to look at in a particular county.

The report is generated and given to the court and then goes out on the web. Training needs were noted as a critical piece, as well as changes in outcomes for children,

The Week of Review is composed of teams reviewing cases over a day and half. There are meetings with caseworker and supervisor where there is a debriefing and suggestions are made to note how an improved outcome could be developed. Then Grand Rounds were used to identify strengths and patterns of practice and they were shared with the county. The county then develops an action plan based upon these findings. WI learned that many counties did not have skills to develop an action plan. They then worked with contractors to develop a system to work with these counties to develop improvement in terms of outcomes with families. They used their practice model and used training partnerships to assist in skills development. The training system has been re-aligned. Relationships with training partners are now much more aligned.



## **Indiana**

### **Presenter: MB Lippold**

Indiana is not far along in this area. They are starting their process and are trying to loop feedback into the policy area.

#### Quality Service Review:

Process for learning how well children are doing and how services are working for them.

IN Selected the QSR process to take a look at how they are doing. Indiana used to do quality assurance reviews that looked at: timeliness, case assessment, case plan is signed by parents, and progress notes are in case file. Now they look at: is the child safe, does team understand what his happening with child, what are the needs, do parents feel like they have meaningful input into case? And, do the worker and therapist communicate and note parents' progress.

Compliance is important but quality is as well.

MB reviewed the QSR protocols, Child Status Indicators, Caregiver Status Indicators, Overall Child Status, and Overall Caregiver Status. They look at how engagement, teaming, assessing, planning and intervening are addressed. They speak with parents about their concerns. Wanted to address how to look ahead and see what things will look like in the future.

#### Indiana QSR Process

- Review 24 cases in 5 day period.
- Feedback to caseworkers, supervisors and key contributors.
- Bring all cases together for case findings and debriefings.
- Identify recurring patterns/lessons in cases.
- Aggregate quantitative results across all cases.
- Write case summaries and next steps.
- Used a scoring for indicator ratings from 6 to 1.
- Used the 5 day review schedule.
- Reviewers go through intense training before review.

Only two regions have completed the QSR process and developed strategic plans to improve areas that were identified as below an established standard. A roll out plan has been developed to complete the process in all 18 Indiana regions.

Second part is how you use information to make improvements. Who is responsible for doing what? Handouts: Steps to improve practice. Steps for supporting deputies. IN developed a timeline to note that things are done as scheduled. What needs to happen statewide? There is a plan developed to 2008 and they will also address what needs to be added or taken away to make it effective. They are in the process of redesigning SACWIS system to make it more used friendly.

## **Evaluation of Training**

### **Indiana**

#### **Presenters: MB Lippold and Patricia Howes**

Power Point Presentation and sample evaluation forms in packet.

Indiana is in the beginning stages of evaluating their training. They implemented Level 1 in October of 07 and are now starting Levels 2 and 3.

The Partnership was formed in 2001 but only with a stipend program. The BSW partnership was expanded in 2006. New Worker training is embedded in to the BSW program. The Indiana Department of Administration closely reviewed the value of such a program. As seniors they apply to the program and if accepted they are given \$2000/ semester for a total of \$4000. Applicants are interviewed by regional office using modified questions from the standard hiring process. They are conditionally accepted into the program and need to take the initial class on their own in their junior year. Following this, they can either opt out or opt in. There are about 36 students statewide. Then they continue in the program and the classes are paid for with the agreement that they will work for 2 years for the department once they graduate. They walk into the county offices already having gone through the pre service. Then they only need the 3 weeks of training rather than full pre service. The graduates can then be assigned to wherever they are needed in the state (although they try to accommodate the desired location). There are additional specialized trainings that they need to take.

Ohio has done a similar program since 2002. They pay \$5000 per year that students are in the program. There are currently 72 students in the program.

Illinois had a similar program. The directors of the BSW got together and developed curricula for this program. Agency training was offered in the summer. Course work in BSW. This was modeled after Kentucky. Kentucky was able to offer university credit for the pre-service course work. It was embedded into the university.

Wisconsin has a similar program but with a county administered system there are additional challenges.

Indiana Evaluation was guided by the work of Anita Barbee.

Level 1: Satisfaction – They were doing this

Level 2: Knowledge – They were doing this to some extent.

Level 3: Transfer of Skills – Never done this before this implementation

They developed a plan for implementing and reporting all three levels of evaluation. (See power point for plan)

Question: How do you measure whether or not people have gotten the skill in the level 2 evaluations?

Answer: Throughout the training, the students get feedback on skills.

Everything with this evaluation is available on the web. They are using Survey Monkey to capture data. They have 20% of a research faculty's time to help with this evaluation.

Level 1: Satisfaction Evaluation: Handout included in packet. Anita Barbee helped streamline this form and suggested inclusion of a space to comment on the logistics/ space, etc. so that this does not come out in other parts of the form. This form is used for new worker training (9 weeks in classroom) and practice reform workers. This form is done at the end of certain modules – not everyday. The reports from level one evaluations are in the power point presentation. IN has not finalized who gets the reports and in what order. (Trainers, Training Managers, Etc.)

Level 2: Knowledge: Handout is included in packet. Anita Barbee helped develop this as well. Pre test is done on day one Post test is given after 12 weeks on the graduation day. Pre/ post test is a

comprehensive test of the entire pre service training rather than separate tests for each module. Sample reports are in the power point. This sample is not of actual data since IN has not yet completed a round.

Level 3: Transfer of Skills: Handout is included in packet. Anita Barbee helped develop this as well. This form is not yet finalized. Field mentor and trainee will fill out the form at the point of graduation and 3 months after graduation the field mentor, trainee, and supervisor will fill out the form again.

Field Mentors are offered \$500/ per person that they mentor. The mentor is available to the new staff throughout the 3 months of in-service and then mentors have a three month follow up commitment once the new staff completes the graduation. This is a 6 month commitment and at the completion of the 6 months they are eligible for the \$500 stipend. Ideally, field mentors are from the county to which the new worker will be assigned, but that is not always possible.

Questions:

Wisconsin: They are trying to work through the question of how to demonstrate skill development as part of the level 2 evaluation process.

They have not started to track cost effectiveness.

### **Next Steps/ Evaluation and Wrap Up**

This is the first time that a regional office has brought together representatives from the training systems in the states. Has this been helpful? What will help you feel supported in the future?

Feedback:

- Thank you to all. Gave ample time to network and get good ideas.
- Very helpful event. Would have liked the topic of supervisors as mentors. Supervisors having a more prominent role in the agenda. Would have liked QA directors to be here as well.
- This is about the right size to network. There is so much wisdom / knowledge about resources. Maybe there could be a resource fair of some sort so that we can share with each other.
- Info on learning management system from IL was very helpful. Would like to know what other states are doing so we don't duplicate our work.
- Liked the delivery style and affinity groups were helpful. Would like to see a segment on supervision and the role of training in organizational development. The 426 grants and what each state is doing on succession planning and leadership.
- Question: Could we go to 2 days on an event like this? Answer: Maybe, but we liked 1.5 days.
- Maybe we could have invited a few supervisors to the event as well.
- Liked the presentations we had. They were a launching point for further discussion.
- Could not have done this without the support of the ACF and the NRC. Thank you.

- Next NSDTA (National Staff Development and Training Association) is in Atlanta in September of 08. NSDTA is a great resource for trainers.

Next Steps:

- Would like to keep the conversation going. Maybe via phone with a face to face a component 1 to 2 times per year.
- Would like to continue getting together (in person) on a regular basis because the learning was very helpful.
- Will be putting together a report of this roundtable. This will be distributed to all roundtable participants and the National Resource Center will forward the report to Patsy Buida as well.
- Chris Sieck has submitted a proposal to the Courts and Caseworkers conference in DC in December to present the model and the work done here.
- Possibly have some follow up to share resources with each other.
- NRC also hosts a peer-training network and everyone at the roundtable is invited to join if they would like. There are quarterly calls and the network is a resource bank as well. Contact Susan Kanak if you would like to be added to the email list.