**CSWE 2014**

**Child Welfare Track**

October 23rd, 2014, Tampa, FL

**Notes of Meeting**

**Business Meeting:**

* Welcome, introductions, and preview of day
* CW Track information:
	+ Thanks to CSWE and University of Minnesota for space and refreshments
	+ Thanks to track reviewers
	+ Review of information on CW track submissions
	+ CW is the third largest track (after Field Education and Teaching Methods and Learning Styles). This is dependent upon number of proposals submitted
	+ Eight tracks within CW
	+ Request for reviewers for CSWE APM, 2015. Please contact Track Co-chairs to express interest. Co-chairs will contact prospective reviewers. Those with CW expertise needed to ensure validity of review process.
	+ 2014 APM review dates are not known at this time (this is unusual)
	+ Review process is three phases,:
		- Phase I: Blind peer review, 3 per paper (around the beginning of March, lasting approximately 10 days)
		- Phase II: Co-chairs do a second blind review of papers passing Phase I review (3.5 or higher). 75% of papers go on, some may be accepted as posters.
		- Phase III: CSWE’s Council on Conferences and Faculty Development (CCFD) determine the final acceptances.
* Please update IV-E program information on the Stipend Matrix
* Journal of Public Child Welfare: Special Issue on In-Home Services; submission deadline is November 18th. Will be putting journal forward for an index rating soon. Current Special Issue is on evaluation.
* Planning for next year:
	+ Thanks to Planning Committee for this year
	+ Invitation for serve on Planning Committee for next year (Sharon Kollar, Jessica Strolin, Barb Pierce , Diane Falk, and Bert Ellett)
	+ CW Track Meeting is a full day (Business Meeting and three slots)
	+ Request for sponsor for refreshments for next year
	+ Suggestions for next year’s topics:
		- Include Children’s Bureau every year
		- Findings from first six years of NCWWI
		- National IV-E data set (recruitment, retention, and practice)
		- Contribution to addressing disproportionality in IV-E education (race; rural/urban; cross systems concerns)
		- How to define outcomes for IV-E education, particularly at the child and family level? Perhaps referencing the new CFSR. Also outcomes for graduates.
		- Practice models related to supervision (NCWWI, Butler Institute)
		- Domestic sex trafficking
		- Using multimedia tools to teach clinical CW practice
		- CW Faculty professional development (scholarship; advancement concerns; ‘our retention and development’)
		- Cross discipline concerns (e.g. SW and Developmental Psych)
* What are we doing well as a IV-E partnership network and CW Track?
	+ Networking (APM; SSWR)
	+ Leadership
	+ Partnering with states
	+ Information dissemination (meetings; list serve; journal; bringing in CB)
	+ Volunteerism
	+ Generosity of group
	+ Visibility of research

Request from Monit Cheung and Patrick Leung – please advise any additional relevant journals to add to existing list to track impact factors.

* What do we want to do to move forward?
	+ Create a repository for information on dissertations and data sets (need a point person to collect and update information)

Volunteer: Claudette Grinnell Davis, University of Nebraska.

* + Awards ceremony (Dissertation Award?)
	+ Introduce new faculty each year
	+ Career achievement awards for this group
	+ CB Dissertation awards – list and find topics (Thank Melinda Baldwin today)
	+ How can we work together towards establishing minimum qualifications for who does CW work
	+ Integration of scholarship, concerning education and workforce development and CW practice outcomes

**NCWWI: Sharon Kollar**

* [www.myncwwi.org](http://www.myncwwi.org)
* Extensive resource library, including archived webinars
* NCWWI workforce development planning process
* Topics list, plus an advanced search function
* Customizable options: RSS feeds (select by topic)
* Strong social media presence: Facebook; Linked In; Vimeo; Twitter (information to be disseminated, send to NCWWI – good news, positive media, resources, scholarship)
* Details of NCWWI services to NCWII sites

Will be a Webinar on Child Fatality with Patricia Brincefield from the Commission to Eliminate Child Abuse and Neglect Fatalities (CECANF). Details will be sent out via the IV-E Listserv.

**The Children’s Bureau Vision for Moving Child Welfare Forward – Melinda Baldwin**

Introduced by Crystal Collins-Camargo

Melinda is: the New Federal Project Officer for NCWWI. Four years at CB, as a Staff Development Specialist. CW worker, then administrator of small non-profit contracted CW and MH provider. Field Coordinator at Northeastern. Finishing CW dissertation (University of Illinois at Chicago), looking at CPS investigative workers decision making regarding criminal justice involvement.

National Center for Evidence based Research in CW

Working with Associate, JooYeun Chang, on:

* Congregate care – who and what happens to them?
* Trauma-informed care (to be infused across many initiatives)
* Invested in tribal work
* Last round of IV-E waivers
* Third round of CFSR’s

Total of $8bn budget, only $100m is discretionary (see HHS grants forecast, <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cb/grants/discretionary-grant>)

See CB website for funding this year (examples include):

* Doctoral awards
* Maltreatment research
* Trafficking
* Infant toddler court teams (‘Baby courts’)

There is not a lot of discretionary grant money available - mostly related to Adoption Opportunities (especially adoption disruptions; adult adoptions for ages 18-21 – including model legislation, advisory committee for youth)

Up for renewal:

* Data
* Youth homelessness

Grant reviewers needed – perhaps in the summer. Re-sign up if you have reviewed before. Ms. Baldwin will send information to Crystal Collins-Camargo, who will disseminate. There is a new vendor and Bureau is hoping that technical issues will be improved / resolved.

New Capacity Building Centers – consolidated ten centers into three:

* Serving public CW agencies (to ICF International) Individual TA to jurisdictions; development of learning materials, including curricula; peer networking, such as learning communities
* For Legal and Judicial (American Bar Fund for Justice and Education) Online training to elevate practice for new judges and attorneys; training to elevate practice for more experienced practitioners; Individual TA projects with states (20% of effort)
* Institute for Tribes (to Butler Institute, Denver) Development of skills (including policy implications; tribal council interactions; infrastructure building needed; constituency groups; other macro- and micro-structure layers not required elsewhere; culturally aware practice

Two projects:

**NCWWI** – just funded 13 university partnerships (NCWWI Round 2) working with Deans. Leadership Academies for Middle Managers (going from 5 to 3 days) and Supervisors

National Center for Evidence Based Practice in Child Welfare

Looking at cross-systems work in MH and CW. Training for both sets of practitioners, TOL. Looking at CBTPlus, will look at others.

Theme of online training – is it effective? How do we do engagement in the online environment?

Can we still develop peer networks?

CB view on SW education:

Good understanding of justice issues, social justice, systems theory – balance with need for very technical knowledge – plus engagement skills – plus critical thinking skills.

Katherine Cahn, Portland State – Rural and Tribal Training Grants (5-10 years ago) - worked on developing education in grant on training rural CW workers – this included online. Found it is possible to create a strong sense of community. Limits are infrastructure.

Alaska – rural areas don’t have the bandwidth – used POT (‘plain old telephone’). Have to play up and down the continuum of technology.

**Transfer of Learning from classroom to practice?**

Liz Winter, PA: Team-Based Learning – flipped classroom, highly structured teaching and learning model, concept application occurs in the classroom, from ‘sage on the stage’ to the ‘guide on the side’ (<http://www.teambasedlearning.org/>). Includes a lot of front-end work to prepare assignments to bring important concepts and practice points to surface.

Robin Saunders, GA State: Creates multiple assignment options – front-end work of designing assignments.

Question: Can we create a repository of teaching and learning resources?

Diane Falk, NJ: Baccalaureate program – senior year in field in CW agency, explaining CW to colleagues in classroom. Strong partnership with CW agency and hire adjuncts from agency.

Tracy LaLiberte, MN: IV-E partnership, trainers of foundation of practice know SW class content

Bert Ellett, GA: Case-based engagement assignment. Court observation hours required (continuances don’t count!). Gave a list to field agency of requested experiences.

Mary McCarthy, NY: Transition meetings with new SW graduates – present to agency CW commissioners and leadership what they have learned and what are they bringing to the CW workforce? Some have been put in charge of initiatives and work teams.

**Requests to CB?**

* Consistency across regions
* Request for some basic funding to track workforce outcomes nationally

Respectfully submitted by Liz Winter

University of Pittsburgh (eaw44@pitt.edu)

**Child Welfare Track: The New CFSR: What Is It and What Does It Mean for Us and Our Programs**

**Date: Thursday, October 23, 2013, Time: 3:15 pm-4:30 pm**

 ***Implications of CFSR 3 for IVE Programs***

Presenters: Richard Barth (University of MD) and Kathrin Cahn (Portland state)

* Welcome remarks from Richard Barth
* The purpose of the presentation is to start talking about what the implications of the CFSR 3 really means. Terry Shaw assisted with the putting together of this presentation.
* There are two questions that we need to start thinking about: (Information presented was part of the CB advisory group discussion.)
	+ How can we strengthen university partnerships with state and local agencies?
	+ How to improve the CFSR process – including the CB discussions at the advisory group that consisted of the guidelines for the 2nd and 3rd round of the CFSR
* \*See Slide Show
	+ The CFSR guiding principles we agreed upon by the CB as well as the CB advisory group
	+ The National Standards were proposed by CB and agreed upon as a group determining how to move forward.
	+ The national standards were considered after a lengthy discussion that indicated applied methodology was necessary for evaluating data.
	+ The previous national standard was set at the 75th percentile and it was agreed upon that this need to be changed to meet the need of the families served.
	+ We discussed that we needed an applied methodology for evaluating data
	+ Issues to discuss if we can compute data for each state in variation of population and picking a number that we can all agree on – risk adjustments were standardized; how to do it and what are the standards including reporting requirements
* Final results
	+ The issue still arises that there is maltreatment in foster care and the data from the NCANDS and foster care is indicative of this result.
	+ Data does not indicate when children are in foster care are maltreated it was not determine who the perpetrator was at the time whether it was foster/kinship/ etc. It was reported that the perpetrator was identified in the report.
	+ There was an agreement determining the re-report of maltreatment
	+ There issues around
	+ The timeframe around of maltreatment – we should keep a child safe for a year vs the six months that was the previous standard
	+ Further discussion in language between substantiated and reported abuse -- the new standards include all screened-in reports.
	+ Expanded the exists from reunification alone to permanency (including kinship, adoption, guardianship)
	+ Expand the base time from six months to twelve months and includes all entries not just the first entry into foster care
	+ The composites that try to balance out the number of stays into foster care – the shorter stays indicate more frequent visits into the foster care system. These are not easily communicated in the methodology. This has been deleted
	+ Re-entry in 12 months – measure is now based an entry cohort instead of an exit cohort
	+ The denominator has been expanded and now includes guardianship as well as reunification.
	+ Measure is now based on an entry cohort instead of all children served in terms of in care of a period. All placement moves will be counted during a period rather than identification of stable vs. not stable.
* Risk Adjusted Analysis: Adjust risk on these basic factors – the total number of removals; family stressors and capacity; understand the statewide population
* What are the types of performance of evaluation – currently individuals that are in the 95th percentile are considered okay however those that are within the 5th percentile will receive additional review
* What are the case review standards?
	+ Panel discussed that he case review should not be used to determines substantial conformity
	+ How would case review results be used to meet legislative objectives to measure state performance and improvement?
	+ What is the standard CQI process to do it independently without CB input and use the CB input.
	+ See what the CQI criteria is in terms of case review standards (see the slides)
* Sampling issues: Consider alternative sample size strategies
* Standards of systematic measures are 95th percentile.
	+ Should the standard be different for the systematic capacity items through case review
* Implications
	+ The process will be clear if we can find a way to communicate the risk adjustment performance and discussing outcomes including achievement
	+ Opportunities for the SSW to increase their knowledge on their CQI
	+ Increasing the focus in CQI in the social work education
	+ Critiquing CFSR 3 or designing the 4th CFSR could become a useful activity for research or CSW course
	+ Opportunities to work with state partners on the importance of understanding the trajectory of children into and through the service systems.

**New Presenter (Kathrine Cahn)**

* There is a repeat challenge that we have as a network and we are social educators or faculty; and we are running programs that are designed to meet the workforce development in the Child welfare programs. These have two different cultures between SSW of and Child Welfare agencies that have conflicting issues – especially when they don’t understand where they connect. Where is the bridge between these diverse cultures?
* Why should we care about the CFSR?
	+ In the end like any client/agency/system that you are working – you are there to solve the client's problem as they identify it
	+ Understanding the client agency system – and we do not do enough to become engaged with the client
	+ They will be asking about solutions to the indicators. The CFSR drives the amount of money through the Title IV-E funding stream or the sanctions from that program.
* What are the underlying interests/limitations of both parties (between SSW and the Child Welfare agencies – CSWE and CFSR)?
* There was a moment in the early 90s we decided that Child Welfare should be an uncapped Title IV-E stream funding -- these relationships with the state agencies are local and we should understand the CFSR and who gets to interpret the Title IV-E regulations and the program improvement plan and how to follow the training regulations – this is the state Child Welfare agency. There is no regulatory interpretation before the audit as it is after.
* It's about having impact on the field, workforce, and having professional social workers so that we can produce positive outcomes for children and families. What are the outcomes that they have selected and that are what is the NCWII is discussing in their learning center.
* The one place that where the CFSR programs are found is in the systemic factor (26-28) – this is where the program lives within the audit that the agency receives. States do not do well in item 27 – but work with state partnership to encourage ongoing training within the agency/school partnership
* How did my state do in the CFSR – how are we doing in the program improvement plans on the items that they failed—how can I set up my student field units to meet the standards as indicated through the CFSR
* Focusing on what the issue is as identified by the agency through the CFSR.
* Support the state change initiatives that are related to the program improvement plans, including self-assessments based upon the CFSR. There is a Quality Assurance CFSR. Can experts in the field do the reviews themselves?
* Waiver states – it means if you have regular iv-e states and what the funds can be used for; we are going to waive those iv-e boundaries – we can discuss prevention and evidence based practice. We don’t know what the implications are for ongoing education and training. Ensure that the employees, students, and training ship are out of the title-iv-e programs.

**Audience Questions**

* When they do review – will the CB retain the worker background and that of the children? Is Title IV-E better than none?
	+ That is something that will need the discussed at the case level. There are a number of indicators that are needed to handle that data and the evaluation process
* Calculating of the risk of assessments – what is the sophistication within state agencies to be able to do the anticipatory investigation to determine outcomes in the CFSRs?
	+ It is the state's responsibility to send a data file that is clean and is entry cohort to the CB. This follows a similar hospital model and will be sent back to the states. The CB will have to contract out.
* The repeat maltreatment for NY – that is a recurring issue the Child Welfare service unit is held responsible for – this where community partnerships could be used especially where there are high numbers from those demographic areas. There are ways to engage areas that they are unable to control and do not have expertise to improve the service array within the community engagement. Continue to engage those that are working within those partnerships within 6 months to 12 months and may require a change with intervention. Who will fund the situation for that time?
* How have you discussed the client versus the case load? The number of clients in a caseload can vary. We are setting up the case manager for failure to be able to be more realistic to be able to understand the capacity for the worker.
	+ Family focused/family decision making to focus specific client/child risks and protective factors. States use families or clients in determining case load the federal government did not set a criterion
* Does the Title IV-E waiver program include the penetration rate in 1996?
	+ The interventions will cost less than following the guidelines and the recommendations of the current Title IV-E?
	+ There is a national finance reform underway – PEW, Casey Family Programs, how can we do financial planning for Title IV-E?
	+ How can we learn more about the future of Title IV-E?

**15 minute discussion** – different programs handle the CFSRs (education into practice)

* How does your curriculum use the CFSRs currently?
* How will 2-3 CFSR approach change your curriculum?
* What are some activities to use?