



Board of Directors
Research and Development Committee

Practice/Research Partnership

May, 2014

Q U A R T E R L Y R E P O R T

General Information

Date funding began (i.e. the beginning of the planning period): Jan, 2012

Name of Partnership: Child Welfare Partnership for Research and Training (CW-PART)

University Partner(s): San Jose State University School of Social Work

County or Tribal Partner(s): Santa Clara County Social Services Agency/Dept of Family and Children's Services and Santa Cruz County

Lead University Staff/Faculty Assigned to Partnership (list as many as applicable)

Name: Laurie Drabble, Ph.D.

Title: Professor

Email: laurie.drabble@sjsu.edu

Name: Kathy Lemon, Ph.D.

Title: Associate Professor

Email: kathy.lemon-osterling@sjsu.edu

Name: Amy D'Andrade, Ph.D.

Title: Associate Professor

Email: amy.dandrade@sjsu.edu

Name: Ed Cohen, Ph.D.

Title: Associate Professor

Email: edward.cohen@sjsu.edu

Name: Pnina Green, MSW

Title: Title IV-E Program Coordinator, SJSU School of Social Work

Email: paulette.green@sjsu.edu

Name: Meekyung Han, Ph.D.

Title: Associate Professor

Email: meekyung.han@sjsu.edu

Lead County or Tribal Staff Assigned to Partnership (list as many as applicable):

Name: Barbara Watkins

Title: Social Work Supervisor at DFCS and Faculty Field Liaison at SJSU

Email: Barbara.Watkins@ssa.sccgov.org

Name: Stan Lee, MSW

Title: Administration Program Manager

Email: Stanley.Lee@ssa.sccgov.org

Name: Madeline Noya

Title: Director Planning and Evaluation Santa Cruz County

Email: Madeline.Noya@hsd.co.santa-cruz.ca.us

Name: Sherra Clinton

Title: Senior Analyst Planning and Evaluation Santa Cruz County

Email: Sherra.Clinton@hsd.co.santa-cruz.ca.us

Name: Melissa Delgadillo

Title: Program Manager Family and Children's Services Santa Cruz County

Email: Melissa.Delgadillo@hsd.co.santa-cruz.ca.us

Point of contact for this report: Laurie Drabble

I. Building a Sustainable Partnership

- A. Describe **the progress** you have made in forming the university/practice partnership that was outlined in your original funding proposal. If you have made changes to your partnership (e.g. how it is structured, who is participating, etc.), describe them.

Planning Period/Quarter 1: 01/01/12 through 08/31/12

- The core leadership team, including faculty, the IV-E coordinator, and County representatives meet during the planning phase of the project, both in person and by teleconference, to identify specific projects and begin the process of recruiting students for participation in research teams.
- All Title IV-E students were invited to participate in research teams in Santa Clara and Santa Cruz Counties. Students have selected projects of interest and registered in research courses taught by faculty leads for research projects, to be implemented through the course over the 2012/2013 academic year.
- Faculty teams worked with partners in both counties to refine/develop research projects (see details below)
- SANTA CLARA: Dr. Ed Cohen and Dr. Drabble are now participating in the Cross-Agency Systems Team meeting. This leadership committee includes leaders across systems (DFCS, SSA, Mental Health, Dept of Alcohol and Drug Svc, Judges/Courts, Attorneys, and others). Dr. Cohen was also invited to serve as consultant with a committee of data managers across system, convened by Social Services Agency (Gina Sessions, Chair).
- SANTA CLARA: All members of the CW-PART faculty, other School of Social Work faculty, and the new Director attended a meeting with the new Director of Social Services Agency (Bruce Wagstaff), which was organized with support from SJSU Graduate Studies and Research V.P., Jerry Flanzer. The meeting afforded an opportunity to share highlights of collaborative projects,

identify priority concerns of the Director, and affirm our mutual commitment to sustaining and deepening our partnership.

- SANTA CLARA: Report back meetings with various stakeholders at DFCS, organized as part of the final phase of our CalSWEC Field Instruction Initiative, provided valuable input about research ideas for the CW-PART.
- SANTA CRUZ: Dr. Kathy Lemon Osterling and Dr. Amy D'Andrade are utilizing an ongoing partnership with Santa Cruz County that formed as a result of our evaluation work on Santa Cruz's federal Diligent Recruitment grant to expand recruitment and support services for foster parents (the "Roots and Wings" grant). As the evaluation team for this project, Dr. Osterling and Dr. D'Andrade participate in an Operations Meeting that includes program managers from the Licensing Unit, the Teen Unit, the Adoptions Unit, and the Planning and Evaluation Department. These meetings have been used to update staff about the CalSWEC Permanency project and gather feedback on methods and processes.
- SANTA CRUZ: We will be inviting Santa Cruz representatives to participate in the CW-PART monthly conference calls.

CHANGES

- A new Director of the School of Social Work was recruited. Dr. Jack Wall has a substantial background in leading collaborative research initiatives (including development of research institutes and collaborative international projects in his prior position as Dean of the Loyola School of Social Work in Chicago. Dr. Wall is fully supportive of the CalSWEC partnership.
- The Cross-Agency Systems Team in Santa Clara County has prioritized trauma-informed services and systems as a common focal area for systems improvement. Consistent with our proposal, we plan to adapt proposed research projects to align with this focus (e.g., through adapting planned process and outcome evaluations, described in greater detail below)

Quarter 2: 09/01/12 through 12/31/12

- OVERALL: In this academic year, 14 IV-E students and 13 Non IV-E students are involved in partnered research teams. In addition, a total of 14 Field Instructors and 5 additional administrators/managers are involved in the projects in some capacity. The new Director of the School of Social Work is fully supportive of, and interested in extending, the partnered research model. We have continued to hold our leadership team meetings.
 - SANTA CRUZ: Instead of inviting Santa Cruz representatives to participate in the CW-PART monthly conference calls, we decided to working individually with Santa Cruz at this time. The research and partnership activities occurring in Santa Clara County are mostly distinct from the Santa Cruz research and partnership activities at this time. As a result, the monthly CW-PART calls are focused on Santa Clara County activities and it was decided that it would not be useful to have Santa Cruz representatives on that call.
 - SANTA CLARA: We continued to refine a series of research projects to be completed by student teams in consultation with County partners (specifically, Social Services Agency, DFCS, and Dependency Advocacy Center). Dr. Cohen continues to participate in the data sub-committee for CAST and is communicating with partners about selecting appropriate data for a research project on exploring "baseline" data related to trauma across systems. For this effort Dr. Cohen conducted a literature review to develop a "starter list" of known outcomes in child welfare research, with which to guide CAST in defining indicators for success in disseminating trauma-informed are. A request was submitted to one of the CAST participating agencies (Dept. of Children and Family Services) to gather assessment instruments currently in use in order to involve students in identifying existing trauma-related indicators. As part of the data sub-committee, Dr. Cohen has also gathered

information about county practices in sharing data across agencies for purposes of outcomes measurement.

Quarter 3: 01/01/13 through 03/31/13

- OVERALL: We have continued to work intensively with our student research teams, hold the leadership team meetings, and coordinate logistics with our partners in DFCS (e.g., accessing data).
- SANTA CLARA COUNTY: In March we held our first “Child Welfare Research/Practice Café,” which was a lunch event in which Drs. Drabble, Lemon Osterling, and D’Andrade shared research findings with groups of DFCS staff, including Field Instructors. This event was focused on sharing key research findings and discussing findings with staff. This event structure was successful in engaging partners in the research and informing staff about the activities of the CW-PART. In Santa Clara County, we have also planned logistics for the student research showcase in April as well as a report back to managers in May.
- SANTA CRUZ: Drs. Lemon Osterling and D’Andrade continue to utilize ongoing partnerships through their work as evaluators for Children’s Bureau Diligent Recruitment grant for Resource Parent recruitment and support. In this capacity, we attend regular operations meetings which allow us to maintain ongoing relationships with key partners.

Quarter 4: 04/01/13 through 06/31/13

- OVERALL: Recruitment for partnered research teams occurred in May and June and all IV-E students were invited to participate. A total of 16 IV-E students, 1 work-study student and 5 non-IV students will be involved in partnered research teams in the 2013-14 academic year. Field Instructors will be invited to participate in the Fall, as well as additional stakeholders. Leadership team meetings are continuing on a monthly basis.
- SANTA CLARA COUNTY: In April we held our second annual Research Showcase in which all of the partnered research teams presented findings from their studies. In May, Drs. Lemon and D’Andrade attended the DFCS manager’s meeting to present research highlights and discuss findings. The discussion of research findings with DFCS managers was helpful in developing concrete ideas for practice and policy changes. Due to the amount of research information, it was agreed that faculty should attend the manager’s meetings on a quarterly basis and discuss one study at each meeting. Dr. Cohen and Dr. Drabble continue to be involved in the Santa Clara County Cross Agency Systems Team meetings; Dr. Cohen attended the May, 2013 meeting to consult with members about planning for the 2013/2014 academic year collaboration.
- SANTA CRUZ COUNTY: Meetings with key staff and stakeholders are continuing.

Quarter 5 and 6: 07/01/13 through 12/31/13

- OVERALL: Student teams were finalized and oriented to their research teams.
- SANTA CLARA COUNTY: New field Instructors were oriented to the partnered research model as an integral part of FI orientation. Dr. Cohen and Dr. Drabble continue to be involved in the Santa Clara County Cross Agency Systems Team meetings; Dr. Cohen attended the May, 2013 meeting to consult with members about implementation of the 2013/2014 academic year collaborative projects. A notable development over the last few months involves faculty becoming actively involved in local county working groups related to use of data across systems planning. Extending our partnered involvement to consultation about data is described in an issue brief.

- The 3 issue briefs reflect a common key point about the role of the university research team members. We are developing a dual role as both researchers and consultants with our county partners. We have essentially adopted an “embedded” model where members of our research team are part of key planning teams. (Dr. Cohen is part of a data sub-committee of the Cross-Agency Systems Team, Dr. Drabble is part of a data/research committee of the Dependency Wellness Court (with DFCS, court, Dependency Advocacy Center, and other reps), Dr. Lemon is part of the Santa Clara County Differential Response Operations Committee.
- SANTA CRUZ COUNTY: Meetings with key staff and stakeholders are continuing.

Quarter 7: 01/01/14 - 3/31/14

- Our partnered activities over recent months have focused on coordinating with partners to implement research projects, including data specific to projects in each county.
- SANTA CLARA COUNTY: Our team has continued active participation in leadership groups with the County, including the Cross Agency Systems Team and the data committee of Superior Court/Dependency Wellness Court. In these roles, our research team members have worked with leaders to help identify research and evaluation projects for implementation next year. Our team members have also served as consultants in helping identify and address specific gaps and needs, such as consultation in development of outcome evaluation plans for DWC and process evaluation needs for the Cross Agency Systems Team trauma-informed systems change effort.
- SANTA CRUZ: During the previous three months, our research team has worked with Santa Cruz County partners on the logistics associated with collecting youth and staff interview data. The coordination of these data collection activities has occurred primarily through email communication.

B. Describe any *barriers or challenges* that have emerged related to the formation and sustenance of your partnership, and how you have addressed them

Planning Period/Quarter 1: 01/01/12 through 08/31/12

- SANTA CLARA: We were not initially included in the Cross-Agency Systems Team in Santa Clara County. We contacted the chair of the committee, clarifying that our role would be to observe and identify opportunities to support the work of the committee. Faculty are now included on the committee.
- SANTA CRUZ: No barriers have occurred in Santa Cruz County. The pre-existing partnership and structure has been very beneficial because it has allowed us to use on-going meetings to incorporate the work of this research project.

Quarter 2: 09/01/12 through 12/31/12

- No additional barriers or challenges were identified in this quarter.

Quarter 3: 01/01/13 through 03/31/13

- No additional barriers or challenges were identified in this quarter.

Quarter 4: 04/01/13 through 06/31/13

- No additional barriers or challenges were identified this quarter.

Quarter 5 and 6: 07/01/13 through 12/31/13

- No additional barriers or challenges were identified this quarter.

Quarter 7: 01/01/14 - 3/31/14

- Some challenges in obtaining data for Santa Clara County projects was encountered; however these issues were addressed in partnership with key contacts who were identified at the start of the academic year.

C. List the *key lessons have you learned* as part of your partnership that would benefit other partnerships?

Planning Period/Quarter 1: 01/01/12 through 08/31/12

- Creating opportunities to participate in or observe agency partner discussions of priorities is critical to successful partnership. Although it requires an investment of time from faculty, the opportunity to consider how research and evaluation might be employed to support and advance specific priorities is invaluable.
- Consistent with literature on University/Community collaboration, it is important to attend to the timing and demands of each system. For example, planning to define project that are feasible over an academic year and also considering deadlines for county partners (such as reports to Board of Supervisors or Systems Improvement Plan deadlines).
- Frequent opportunities for face-to-face dialogue promote a friendly relationship between individuals within the partnership. These interactions (both formal and informal) help to create a feeling that we are working together on shared goals and also help all partners to view issues and challenges through the perspective of the other system.

Quarter 2: 09/01/12 through 12/31/12

- Additional key lessons learned include:
 - **Support of leadership** in both the agency and university contexts is critical to both leveraging resources (i.e., time for agency staff to attend planning meetings and allowing integration of research into existing MSW courses) and endorsing the overall vision of creating a successful partnership.
 - **Liaisons** in each system are essential for managing the overall partnership, brokering resources, and serving as active conduits between systems. Liaisons in the partnership include an intern coordinator with the county, the IV-E Program Coordinator, and three to four faculty members.
 - Finally, successful implementation required **organizational assets**. Assets included a sufficient number of faculty who possessed backgrounds in conducting research in child welfare and/or use of relevant methodologies; relevant courses in the social work curriculum for accommodating a year-long research project; adequate numbers of interns/students for creating research teams; and funding to pilot the model (in this case, through the California Social Work Education Center).

Quarter 3: 01/01/13 through 03/31/13

- There is an advantage to considering how to advance research in stages that are feasible for both the academic year and meaningful in relation to advancing projects. This is particularly important for sustainability. For example, student projects in one AY may involve a systematic literature review, environmental scan, or development of a logic model (including interviews with key informants) with a second phase of data collection/analysis in a second year (with substantial advance notification/negotiation with county partners)

Quarter 4: 04/01/13 through 06/31/13

- As mentioned above, we have learned that in order to more effectively communicate research findings to managers at DFCS it is necessary to attend their manager's meeting on a quarterly basis and discuss just one study each meeting. We anticipate that this change will improve dissemination of research findings and their use in practice.

Quarter 5 and 6: 07/01/13 through 12/31/13

- Several lessons learned are summarized in issues briefs, attached to the report for this period. Issue briefs pertain to consultation around data issues (particularly cross-systems data sharing), confidentiality, and flexibility in research topics and methods.
- The time involved in planning, problem-solving, and consulting is important to calculate into sustainability. Our faculty team started to calculate the minimum and ideal level for the model (per research project). In our tem meeting we estimated that the "floor" would be a minimum of would be 10 to 15 days of summer time. That would allow for some planning in advance (project planning and team formation), implementation over the course of one academic year, and summary document at the end of the project (June). The "top of the scale" would be release time for 2 semesters. Ideally this would include some summer days for planning on front and final reports on the back end. Admin time is also needed to define projects, connect IV-E students to projects, communicate with partners (especially DFCS and SSA). Some administrative tasks could be coordinated through the IV-E program. At least one faculty member is needed to work closely with the IV-E coordinator and attend to overall coordination (above and beyond specific research projects). At SJSU, we plan to sustain the model through 1) integration into expanded IV-E/Field Initiative model, 2) continued integration into research classes, and 3) exploration of options for funding specific multi-year projects.
- In a partnered model, it is not unusual to encounter issues related to data quality/gaps, need to modify research questions to accommodate emerging priorities, and challenges linked to permission for research activity (e.g., client data). As a result of these types of issues (all described in the issue brief), having sufficient data or quality data for peer-reviewed publication is not always possible. In addition, some research questions of interest to the county may have been well-explored in the literature; local data are still important for planning even if publication is unlikely. Consequently, partnered project may yield more documents for local planning than peer-reviewed publications. In some cases, publication may depend on several years of data or combining several well-planned student projects. Because our model relies on master level students, who do not have the level of skills often available when working with doctoral level RA's, we have found that publishing with students requires an investment of time that extends well beyond the time frame of the projects (e.g., continuing over the year after they graduate). This model is still beneficial for faculty teaching research or whose research agendas intersect with county projects; at the same time the flexibility required for partnered research may be challenging for junior faculty.

Quarter 7: 01/01/14 - 3/31/14

- The high level of engagement by faculty team members in local planning meetings has been productive. Given the high level of other demands, it is important for any partnered research project to be selective about the number and type of projects that are initiated. We are finding that interest in the partnered model and the produces generated by the research is growing among other county and non-profit agencies. It will remain important to continue to assess faculty, school, and county capacities (in terms of time, interest, and resources) and project impact (e.g., impact across agencies/systems and/or alignment with major initiatives) as we continue.
- Long term sustainability will require continued infrastructure for advanced research at the school (no change expected) and will likely require identification of resources to support start up and report writing for projects, even when implementation is subsidized through research classes. We are currently exploring sustainability plans with our core team and our county partners.

D. What can *CalSWEC do to further assist you* with the development of your partnership?

Planning Period/Quarter 1: 01/01/12 through 08/31/12

- Document common lessons learned in partnership development across funded projects over the coming years in a form that could be accessible across projects and to other CA counties.
- Provide a formal acknowledgement of the contributions of county partners on this project.

Quarter 2: 09/01/12 through 12/31/12

- No additional assistance requested from CalSWEC at this time

Quarter 3: 01/01/13 through 03/31/13

- No additional assistance requested from CalSWEC at this time

Quarter 4: 04/01/13 through 06/31/13

- No additional assistance requested from CalSWEC at this time

Quarter 5 and 6: 07/01/13 through 12/31/13

- No additional assistance requested from CalSWEC at this time

Quarter 7: 01/01/14 - 3/31/14

- No additional assistance requested from CalSWEC at this time

II. Research Projects and Priorities

- A. List the *primary research project(s)* that you are currently pursuing via your partnership, and the *research questions that are being examined*. If these have changed since the last report, please indicate how they have changed and why:

Planning Period/Quarter 1: 01/01/12 through 08/31/12

- The Santa Clara County research question has evolved to “What will be the impact of a cross-agency effort to implement Trauma Informed Care on the outcomes of children, youth and parents involved with the child welfare system?” This will still involve cross-agency data collection and analysis as proposed initially.
- The reason this has changed is that CW-PART researchers have been included in a Cross-Agency Systems Team, charged with identifying cross-agency outcomes. This process is integral to the county’s efforts to integrate and coordinate services for child welfare.
- The Santa Cruz County research project is focused on the effect of permanency practices on permanent connections and youth well-being. No changes to the research questions have occurred. The three main research questions are:
 - 1) What permanency practices are associated with permanency, permanent connections, and youth well-being?
 - 2) How do contextual factors influence the effectiveness of permanency practices?
 - 3) What permanency practices do youth and caregivers identify as being the most helpful in establishing permanency?

Quarter 2: 09/01/12 through 12/31/12

- SANTA CRUZ: Through consultation with partners in Santa Cruz, the research questions were revised to the following:
 - 1) What permanency practices are associated with permanency, permanent connections, and youth well-being?
 - 2) What are the strengths and challenges in implementing these permanency practices?
 - 3) What does permanency mean for youth and caregivers?

These changes were made because the county is preparing for the end of their federal grant that is providing the funding for their expanded permanency services and is developing a sustainability plan. They would like to operationalize some of the core components within their services and consider how these services can be sustained. The above research questions were considered to better reflect these changing research needs.

- SANTA CLARA COUNTY: Multiple research projects and project teams were finalized. Research projects in Santa Clara County include the following:
 - Two research projects related to efforts to advance trauma-informed systems change in related to services for children and families. One is a process evaluation of the Cross-Agency Systems Teams initiative to advance trauma informed services and systems change across systems and the second is focused on barriers and opportunities for using data to inform trauma informed systems change across agencies.
 - Two research projects related to recipients of collaborative family dependency treatment court services, including one study examining longer term outcomes for Family Wellness Court participants and a second examining the impact and outcomes of Mentor Parent Project services;
 - One study with two components (process and outcomes study) related to overall evaluation of the partnered research project model
 - Human subjects protocols were submitted to the SJSU IRB Committee and have already received approval.

Quarter 3: 01/01/13 through 03/31/13

- SANTA CRUZ: Through consultation with the research team in Santa Cruz, the methods of the research project were altered to eliminate survey data collection with youth and instead use a semi-structured interview approach. After review and consideration of a draft of the youth survey questions, staff felt that the possibility of mis-interpretation of questions, and feelings of possible discomfort from survey questions was too great. However, county partners did not want to eliminate youth data collection altogether and felt that a semi-structured interview format would be a more suitable data collection strategy with a youth population. In addition, staff felt it important to keep the focus of questions on the ***youth's experiences with county practices***. Data collection with youth over 18 has begun and we are in the process of obtaining court approval for data collection with youth 16 and over.
- In addition, the staff interview questions have also been finalized. These questions focus on how staff engage youth and resource parents in the process of working toward permanency and the types of things that help or get in the way of those practices. Staff interviews will begin in May.
- SANTA CLARA: The research projects described above are well underway, with no significant changes from last quarter.
 - PRIMARY RESEARCH PROJECT: Two research projects related to efforts to advance trauma-informed systems change in related to services for children and families continue. Interviews with 11 Cross-Agency Systems Team members were completed as part of a larger process evaluation of an initiative to advance trauma informed services and systems change across systems. A second project focused on barriers and opportunities for using data to inform trauma informed systems change is currently (based on consultation with CAST members) focused on developing a "trauma profile" of children in the child welfare system using existing data. Data have been collected and are currently being analyzed. Our original proposal tentatively focused on merging data between MH and child welfare systems, but also specified that we would modify our research project as needed based on priorities of CAST. The studies related to trauma-informed systems change are the primary focus of CAST. We will have a planning meeting in April to map out projects for the upcoming academic year.
 - SUPPLEMENTAL PROJECTS: Two research projects related to recipients of collaborative dependency treatment court services continue. Data were collected by the end of March and analyses continue.
 - EVALUATION PROJECTS: Process and outcomes study related to overall evaluation of the partnered research project model are in process, instruments were finalized in the recent quarter. Data (survey and qualitative) will be collected in April.

Quarter 4: 04/01/13 through 06/31/13

- SANTA CRUZ: Four pilot interviews with youth over 18 have been completed. These interviews were conducted in order to explore how well the interview questions helped to answer the overall research questions and to identify any areas for question development. These were also analyzed by a IV-E MSW student (Samantha Esver) for a student research project and these results are summarized below in section c (findings and results).
- Dr. Lemon has met with managers in Santa Cruz to finalize the court approval process for the youth (ages 16 and 17) interviews. There are a number of steps involved in the process of obtaining approval from the dependency court in order to interview youth, including approval by minor's counsel and the youth's current caregiver. Once approval is obtained,

recruitment of youth will begin. Staff have already identified 30 potential youth for participation.

- In addition, staff interviews will begin in August or September. Dr. Lemon will be attending staff unit meetings to discuss the study and schedule the interviews with staff.
- Last, the resource parent survey is being revised and will be reviewed by staff in August. This survey will assess the perceptions of current resource parents (kin and non-kin) who are caring for older youth (ages 13 to 17). The survey will assess resource parent perceptions about county practices in encouraging and supporting permanency.
- SANTA CLARA:
 - PRIMARY RESEARCH PROJECT: Two research projects related to efforts to advance trauma-informed systems change in related to services for children and families were completed: 1) A process evaluation of the Cross-Agency Systems Team members and 2) a linked project focused on using data to inform trauma informed systems change, which used existing CWS/CMS data to create a “trauma profile” of children in the child welfare system. Project findings were reviewed with CAST members. Based on consultation with CAST members, a provisional list of projects were identified that would support the next phase of the systems change initiative. Primary research projects for the coming year include 1) exploration of trauma and service needs among “cross-over kids” in child welfare and juvenile justice and 2) evaluation of training efforts linked to trauma training and follow up consultation with juvenile justice and child welfare staff.
 - SUPPLEMENTAL PROJECTS: Two research projects related to recipients of collaborative dependency treatment court services were continued and combined findings were provided to Dependency Advocacy Center. Summary data were presented to the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors, who (in part based on findings) extended funding for the Mentor Parent Project. Dr. Drabble and Dr. Cohen worked with DAC to identify prospective projects for students for the coming academic year.
 - ADDITIONAL TEAM MEMBERS: Dr. Emily Bruce, whose research and practice is focused on work with children concurrently involved in juvenile justice and child welfare systems will work with Dr. Drabble and Dr. Cohen on Santa Clara County projects over the coming year. This addition was made in response to emerging priorities of the county and Dr. Bruce is a great addition.

Quarter 5 and 6: 07/01/13 through 12/31/13

- SANTA CRUZ: The court petitions for approval for the youth interviews are currently under review by the dependency court judge in Santa Cruz. The staff interviews are underway and the resource parent survey will be mailed out to resource parents in March.
- SANTA CLARA: Three core research projects related to cross-systems practice are underway. Two projects related to trauma-informed systems change in collaboration with the Cross-Agency system team were initiated: 1) a study of informed practices across systems and 2) a descriptive "trauma-profile" of youth in probation. Another core project, evaluation of the mentor parent program, has also been finalized and is underway. Other Santa Clara County projects include a continuing exploration of differential response (Dr. Lemon), examination of reunification and case planning (Dr. D’Andrade), and a descriptive study of dually involved youth (with Dr. Emily Bruce), .

Quarter 7: 01/01/14 - 3/31/14

- SANTA CRUZ: Staff interview data collection is completed and the analysis phase is now underway. The youth interview data are still being collected. The Resource Parent Survey is completed and is being translated.
- SANTA CLARA: The three core research projects (described above) remain the same. Supplemental projects on differential response, reunification and case planning, and dually involved youth also continue without significant changes in foci.

B. For each project, indicate any **problems or barriers** that you have encountered, and what you have done to address them.

Planning Period/Quarter 1: 01/01/12 through 08/31/12

- SANTA CLARA: The process has been as expected—a collaborative process in cross-agency development of a shared set of outcomes and measurements.
- SANTA CRUZ: No significant barriers have occurred.

Quarter 2: 09/01/12 through 12/31/12

- No additional barriers problems related to the research projects were identified in this quarter.

Quarter 3: 01/01/13 through 03/31/13

- SANTA CRUZ: As noted above, the research plan for Santa Cruz has changed from youth surveys to youth interviews. The problem encountered was that once staff reviewed the survey questions, it became apparent that a survey method was not appropriate for this population, however, it was not until the draft survey was reviewed that this became clear. The way this problem was addressed involved a series of phone meetings with selected staff to talk about the types of questions that would be more appropriate. Although this process slowed down the timeline for the project, it was extremely valuable and has improved the data collection method.
- SANTA CLARA: No additional barriers noted at this time.

Quarter 4: 04/01/13 through 06/31/13

- No additional barriers noted at this time.

Quarter 5 and 6: 07/01/13 through 12/31/13

- We encountered potential delays in permission to access descriptive trauma data through Juvenile Probation. Three faculty team members met with a key county representative to determine how to proceed. Dr. Cohen will take primary responsibility for analysis and we move a student off of this project because of high potential for delay (as experienced last year with Child Welfare data). We anticipate completing the project, with help of a paid student assistant.
- The Trauma Informed Systems Change project was modified from a training evaluation (with primarily DFCS and Juvenile Justice staff) to an investigation of trauma-informed practice in several settings (DFCS, Juvenile Justice, and community

- agencies. The change accommodated changes over several months of CAST meetings including 1) changes in the scope of planned training and, 2) increasing interest in including community agencies, and 3) recognition that there is a gap in documenting trauma-responsive practices that are already underway. The modified project is, essentially, a project to build practice-based evidence (rather than research implementation of specific evidenced-based interventions at this time).
- Several planning meetings with Dependency Advocacy Center staff and Dependency Wellness Court staff and data committee revealed substantial gaps in data collection and access. However, we were able to identify sources of current data that were complete and accurate enough for meaningful analysis, with supplemental input provided by DAC staff and mentor parents. We now have the data and are on track for early analysis for presentation to the Board of Supervisors in February.

Quarter 7: 01/01/14 - 3/31/14

- ED - DESCRIBE PROBLEMS AND ACTIONS RELATED TO PROBATION PROJECT??
- Santa Cruz: The main barrier encountered has been difficulty in obtaining interview data from youth participants. Out of our initial 7 youth participants, 5 declined to participate. Two of the five youth who declined never responded to SJSU Research Assistant's requests for an interview, so we asked their social workers to contact them and were informed that the youth were experiencing challenging circumstances and would not be interested in participating.

C. Please list **any new findings or results** that have been identified by your partnership's projects. If you do not have any new findings, indicate when you expect to have some.

Planning Period/Quarter 1: 01/01/12 through 08/31/12

- SANTA CLARA: The first "deliverable" for Santa Clara County is assistance in identifying priority outcomes for child welfare services from the available research literature (due by August 31), so that county staff, SJSU Investigators, and students can begin to identify existing data elements
- SANTA CRUZ: We expect to have findings in May when the projects are completed.

Quarter 2: 09/01/12 through 12/31/12

- Findings from research projects will be disseminated in May 2013.

Quarter 3: 01/01/13 through 03/31/13

- SANTA CRUZ: Our timeline has been pushed back (see above) and we expect to have findings in August 2013.

Quarter 4: 04/01/13 through 06/31/13

- SANTA CRUZ:

- The 4 pilot interviews with youth over 18 included questions focused on 3 primary areas: 1) engagement in permanency practices (e.g. “Did you meet your resource parent prior to living with them?” “How did your social worker assist you in getting to know your resource parent before moving in?” “Did you feel that your social worker listened to and considered your opinion about living with your resource parent?”), 2) perceptions of permanency practices (e.g. “How has your social worker(s), or other child welfare staff, helped you to make connections with important adults in your life, such as family members, foster parents or friends”, and 3) current connections to important people in their lives (“What types of things help you to keep in contact with important people in your life? How could social workers and other child welfare staff help you in keeping in contact with important people in your life?”). Results indicated that:
 - **3 out of the 4 youth did not meet their resource parent prior to living with them** and so permanency discussions about how the youth’s social worker prepared them for their placement did not apply to their situations. **These participants reported that the transition to their home would have been easier if they had had a chance to meet with their new resource parent prior to moving.** One youth described the process of being placed with their resource parent as, “here are your rights, sign this, sign that and then they bring you over and leave you there.”
 - One youth was placed with a family friend (after having been in a non-relative foster home); this participant described identifying the family friend as a placement himself and then proposing this idea to his social worker. This participant described their social worker as very helpful in facilitating the county processes necessary for the friend to obtain a foster care license.
- When asked to discuss how their social worker has helped them to make connections with important people in their lives, youth described a range of experiences, with some social workers described as being very helpful in this process, and others who were not helpful. All participants had been involved in the foster care system for many years, and so they all had several social workers over the years. **Positive experiences were described when the youth had a good relationship with their social worker and perceived their social worker as always being there for them.** When this context occurred, participants spoke positively about their social worker’s efforts to help them connect with family and friends. One participant stated, “She’s [social worker] really adamant about helping me find any family members so that I can have a connection with and still have that connection with to this day.” And “Well I was always able to visit my family. It was important for me to visit them. I always had that chance. It was okay to go visit them.”
 - **Negative experiences were described when the youth felt they could not contact their social worker, and their social worker was perceived as not being available to meet their needs.** When this context occurred, participants reported that no efforts were made to help them connect with important people in their lives. One youth stated, “we could never reach her, when we needed something or we needed to talk to her, we could never reach her.”
 - When asked to discuss what would help them stay in contact with important people in their lives, **all youth discussed the need for money to pay for transportation and phone calls to stay in contact with loved ones.** Many participants reported that their social workers have helped them with these expenses in the past, but these costs are ongoing, and youth reported that having more money would help them to stay in contact with loved ones.
- SANTA CLARA:

- Summary findings from the CAST systems change evaluation are included as a separate file for this report.
- Summary findings from the follow up of Family Wellness Court/Mentor Parent Program is provided as a separate document.
- Based on a request from Social Services Agency, Dr. Drabble and Dr. Cohen will conduct a modified analysis of the trauma profile data from CWS/CMS. An updated research brief will be available next quarter.
- See summary documents for 2 studies; revised summary of CWS/CMS “trauma profile” study to be provided next quarter.

Quarter 5 and 6: 07/01/13 through 12/31/13

- No new information to report. Findings from the studies will be reported in May/June 2014.

Quarter 7: 01/01/14 - 3/31/14

- No new information to report. Findings from the studies will be reported in May/June 2014.

D. What are the implications of your findings for *workforce development and curriculum*?

Planning Period/Quarter 1: 01/01/12 through 08/31/12

- The process of matching desired outcomes with measures is an important part of evaluating practice. This will be integrated into the first semester Special Project seminar, in which students assigned to the CW-PART team develop their individual research projects.
- Students are receiving training and education in applied research skills, which helps promote an understanding of research concepts and terms; this understanding is very important because it helps students understand the terminology and concepts within published peer-reviewed studies.
- In addition, students are receiving training in the use of the CSSR performance indicator website and will be expected to use that site to gather background information on the county or their research topic. This skill is very useful because it allows individual workers to track their own counties outcomes on federal indicators.

Quarter 2: 09/01/12 through 12/31/12

- No new information to report.

Quarter 3: 01/01/13 through 03/31/13

- No new information to report.

Quarter 4: 04/01/13 through 06/31/13

- Students benefit from solid foundation in understanding the purpose of partnered research and coaching for specific skills (e.g., how to give an “elevator speech” about research) need to be taught explicitly for students to master. We have begun development of core online modules for training students that may be used across research teams (and that may be

adapted for use in other settings in the future). Content for modules have been developed. Final production will be completed over the summer for core modules.

Quarter 5 and 6: 07/01/13 through 12/31/13

- Special training modules on working in partnered research projects, working on partnered research teams, using CWS/CMS data, and evidence-based practice were piloted in research classes and the IV-E seminar with student research teams. Modules will be refined.
- We held two special meetings of the CW-PART faculty team members (5 faculty) to discuss coordination of projects and long term sustainability. These discussions included reflection on how our curriculum structures the first and second year research sequences. Our experiences in the partnered research model have helped fuel ideas for modifying the curriculum. One of our leads (Kathy Lemon) is currently working on revisions to the overall research training to better prepare students for agency-based research and evaluation, such as focusing more on program evaluation models and skills. Although our faculty were already considering changes in alignment with new CSWE EPAS, the partnered model has provided key faculty with insights to guide overall curriculum revision. The fact that our core team includes the chair of our research committee (Lemon), MSW program coordinator (Cohen), and reaffirmation coordinator (Drabble) has helped to migrate some of these lessons learned into our overall curriculum re-design efforts.

Quarter 7: 01/01/14 - 3/31/14

- In our team meetings, we have identified key frameworks that are particularly useful for both student and practitioners/leaders in the field. First, exposure to logic models as an overarching framework for linking theory, practice/interventions, and research/evaluation is helpful. Second, explicit and accessible orientation to models of evidence-based practice are important, including both evidence based interventions and exposure to the process of developing and investigating evidence related to a practice-based question. Third, implementation science is an important framework for different stakeholder to "assess" where they are developmentally and to identify specific questions, tools, or strategies appropriate to those stages. We are exploring ways to make this accessible to students and partners.

E. What are the implications of your findings for *practice improvement*?

Planning Period/Quarter 1: 01/01/12 through 08/31/12

- We will consider this question after we have developed findings from the research projects.

Quarter 2: 09/01/12 through 12/31/12

- No new information to report.

Quarter 3: 01/01/13 through 03/31/13

- No new information to report.

Quarter 4: 04/01/13 through 06/31/13

Santa Clara County Trauma Informed Systems Change Initiative:
What "works"

- Developing a shared vision and strengthening a commitment to better address trauma within and across systems
 - Developing a common language around understanding trauma.
 - Building on existing relationships with each other and across systems.
 - Helping break down system “silos” and increase collaboration.
 - Strong leadership driven and buy-in is necessary in all levels of system.
- Addressing challenges:
- Keep the momentum and commitment going (e.g., Start implementing different specific ideas)
 - Identify/leverage resources (e.g., Provide the resources needed for change to happen; Train front-line staff to ensure a shift in practice)
 - Implementation and action steps (e.g., Form task groups that can help with implementation and monitor practice; Improve the process of decision-making and move forward)

Santa Cruz – No new information to report

Quarter 5 and 6: 07/01/13 through 12/31/13

- Recommendations for practice based on lessons learned are summarized in issue briefs.

Quarter 7: 01/01/14 through 03/31/14

- Recommendations for practice based on research pending final analysis and reports.

F. What are your *dissemination activities* for this period? For subsequent periods? (Please see the Dissemination Tool.)

Planning Period/Quarter 1: 01/01/12 through 08/31/12

- In April we will have a showcase event in which all of the research teams present their findings.

Quarter 2: 09/01/12 through 12/31/12

- In addition to the showcase event, research briefs will be prepared that summarize research findings and their implications.

Quarter 3: 01/01/13 through 03/31/13

- SANTA CLARA COUNTY: In March we held our first Child Welfare Research/Practice Café (see above under “Partnership”) in which we shared key findings from three research studies. On April 26, we will have the showcase event in which partnered research teams will present key findings from this year’s projects. In May, Drs. Lemon, Drabble, D’Andrade and Cohen will present key findings to DFCS Manager’s and discuss priority research topics for the next academic year.
- Three of the student teams applied, and are finalists, for the CalSWEC student research award. If our students are successful, we expect that will support dissemination of the research findings and our model.

Quarter 4: 04/01/13 through 06/31/13

- As noted above, in Santa Clara County we held the annual research showcase in which study findings were shared with DFCS employees and additional stakeholders. Research findings will be shared with DFCS managers on a quarterly basis.
- Research findings were also presented to the Santa Clara County Cross Agency Systems Team.
- Dependency Advocacy Center used evaluation findings in a presentation to the Board of Supervisors; funding for Mentor Parent Services was subsequently extended.

Quarter 5 and 6: 07/01/13 through 12/31/13

- Two special activities related to dissemination of the CW-PART partnered research model in the Fall of 2013 were completed 1) presentation of the model and project findings at the September statewide CalSWEC meeting and 2) presentation and consultation with faculty at Cal State East Bay (CSUEB) about possible adaptation of the model for their IV-E program.

Quarter 7: 01/01/14 - 3/31/14

Dissemination activities completed or planned over this quarter include the following:

- Findings from the Mentor Parent Project were reported to the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors in February of 2014, resulting in continued funding for the project. The BOS lauded SJSU and the Dependency Advocacy Center for the high quality of the report.
- A special "Showcase" of student team research projects in Santa Clara County for all interested DFCS staff and other interested individuals is scheduled for April 25, 2014.
- Development and distribution of brief "research briefs" on study findings will be completed by the end of May, 2014. Briefs will be distributed to county agencies and to other interested local or statewide agencies or universities.
- A special webinar presentation through the Regional Training Network (RTN) is confirmed for July of 2014. The Webinar will describe findings from both key research projects in Santa Clara and Santa Cruz counties and findings from the project evaluation.

G. What can *CalSWEC do to further assist you* with your research or evaluation projects?

Planning Period/Quarter 1: 01/01/12 through 08/31/12

- For both the Santa Clara and Santa Cruz projects, we would benefit from consultation by a child welfare research expert on outcomes for child welfare initiatives such as those both counties are engaged in. Consultation is needed for a) identifying priority outcomes in cross-agency initiatives, b) reviewing field survey drafts, c) ensuring maximum response rate in child welfare field surveys, and d) developing effective dissemination strategies for the findings.
- Specifically, both projects would benefit from structured consultation from Dr. Mark Courtney who is evaluating the impact of AB 12 in California. We are requesting consultation funds to meet with Dr. Courtney during this start-up phase so that we can align our work with his state-wide project and also provide a foundation for continuing collaboration with him.

Quarter 2: 09/01/12 through 12/31/12

- No requests or recommendations at this time.

Quarter 3: 01/01/13 through 03/31/13

- No requests or recommendations at this time.

Quarter 4: 04/01/13 through 06/31/13

- No requests or recommendations at this time.

Quarter 5 and 6: 07/01/13 through 12/31/13

- No requests or recommendations at this time.

Quarter 7: 01/01/14 - 3/31/14

- Although we are already working with CalSWEC on dissemination activities, we think it would be helpful to have additional consultation about other opportunities for dissemination. We think the webinar and presenting at the Field Instruction Symposium will be very helpful – and are interested in other CalSWEC related opportunities since we think these gatherings of university and county leaders is an ideal audience for our project.
- We are interested in using technology (web site) to create a central space for project materials and success stories. CalSWEC is a great exemplar along these lines; consequently we would be interested in consultation with both content and tech experts as we conceptualize and implement this project.
- Consultation with Barry about practical ways to use/introduce implementation science frames with our partners and students. We already have some useful suggestions – but it will be helpful to follow up with this over the summer.