Semi-Annual Progress Report-Intensive Services Component (September 30, 2002)

Overview

The following Semi-Annual Progress Report covers implementation progress for the period from April 1, 2002 to September 30, 2002 for Intensive Services (IS) which includes the Wraparound Component, the Family Conferencing Component (ISFC), and the Community Mentoring Component.

During this period, there were changes in the management of the evaluation. The Project Director left the study in June 2002. In July, a Co-Principal Investigator (Edward Cohen, Ph.D.) was added to the study to assume many of the duties of the Project Director as well as assist the other Co-Principal Investigator, Jill Duerr Berrick, in her transition while exiting the study1.

The Community Mentoring Component study completed its final focus group focusing on issues related to the program’s closure. The final process report is included as Attachment A in this Semi-Annual Progress Report-Intensive Services Component (September 30, 2002). The end of this reporting period also marks the beginning of the final year of interview data collection activities for the remaining IS components. Updated timelines for completing the interviews for the Wraparound and ISFC Sub-Studies are described below. The project timeline attached to the Revised Evaluation Plan (January, 2002) has been adjusted to reflect these changes, as well as a request to submit the Final Report by March 31, 2004, rather than the original due date of June 30 2004. The revised timeline is attached as Attachment B.

In addition to maintaining the evaluation information systems and collecting data, the evaluation staff also increased their time allocated to planning analysis activities. The evaluation team will produce a Preliminary Analysis Report in June 2003. The Report will profile enrolled children and families in the Wraparound and ISFC Sub-Studies. A description and outline of the report is included as Attachment C. (This outline was shared with CDSS in the monthly status meeting on 9/17/02.) For the Final Report analyses, the Technical Team has begun construction of an analysis dataset, a protocol to identify and match client ID numbers, and SAS programming to process the data.

Intensive Services Component – Wraparound Services Sub-Study

Five counties continue to participate in the Wraparound Services Sub-Study. This reporting period (April through August 2002) saw an increased enrollment of 26 children for Alameda, 3 for Humboldt, 47 for Los Angeles, 31 for Sacramento, and 1 for San Luis Obispo. The average enrollment rate for the five-month period is more than 21 cases per month. Details of treatment and control active vs. closed cases are shown in the Wraparound Sub-Study report.

---

1 As of January 1, 2003, Dr. Cohen will assume full Principal Investigator activities. A letter informing counties of the transition plan was distributed in September 2002.
For the Wraparound Sub-Study, the final date when any new children or caregivers will be administered first in-depth interviews and the CAFAS is September 30, 2002. From that point on, currently enrolled study children and caregivers will be interviewed in second or subsequent waves only, making 9/30/03 the last day for collecting interview data. Enrollment and assignment to the treatment and control groups will continue until counties cease referring new cases. New study cases will be included in the impact analyses using CWS/CMS data, even if they are not eligible for further interviews.

By the end of this reporting period, 80 caregivers and 49 children had been interviewed for baseline (first) interviews. Another 25 caregivers and 14 children had been interviewed for follow up data. These interviews were held with Alameda County participants only, as discussed in previous reports.

Evaluation staff continued activities to obtain appropriate client identifiers upon enrollment, provide assistance to counties about enrollment and eligibility issues, and reconcile enrollment discrepancies between UCB and county data.

Collection of CAFAS data continues as before. However, the Wraparound Sub-Study Report notes continued problems of counties submitting inadequate CAFAS protocols for their eligible children.

Services tracking data collection was developed in response to concerns about contamination—a condition that arises when both the treatment and comparison groups receive the same or similar intervention. In Alameda, Los Angeles Counties, and Sacramento counties information on services received by children in the treatment group continued to be tracked by the private agencies providing Wraparound to those children. Services data collection continued to be handled internally in Humboldt County and San Luis Obispo County during this evaluation period, with the counties relying on UCB for scheduling notifications. As of August 31, 2002, 1549 service weeks had been tracked and entered into the services tracking database.

Fidelity to the Wraparound model is being assessed using the parent/caregiver questionnaire of the Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI). As of August 31, 2002, 58 of a possible 78 interviews have been conducted. In the treatment group, 37 of a possible 49 interviews were conducted, while in the comparison group, 21 of a possible 29 interviews were conducted. Twenty interviews could not be conducted for several reasons, including prolonged difficulty in reaching respondents, or children no longer actively enrolled in the study. Preparations also began during this reporting period for the final set of process study site visits.

The Child Welfare Services/Case Management System (CWS/CMS) will provide the administrative-level data as the source of foster care placement and child safety outcome measures for the evaluation study. As seen in the revised project timeline, Attachment B,
we have adjusted the dates of collecting and processing these data to meet the revised timeline of the study Final Report.

Evaluation Information System (EIS) activities during this project period focused on four areas: (1) the continued development of an integrated data collection and management system for Wraparound, (2) supporting current data collection and data management efforts, (3) providing technical support and training, and (4) developing technical capacity.

The Wraparound Services Sub-Study team conducted two trainings in Los Angeles County focusing on services tracking and baseline (CAFAS) data collection.

**Intensive Services Component -- Family Conferencing Sub-Study**

During this reporting period, a total of thirty-two new children (including 22 siblings) were enrolled in Fresno County’s ISFC component, and an additional 18 children (including 11 siblings) enrolled in Riverside County. Of the cumulative total enrollment in Fresno (145 study children and siblings) and in Riverside (117 study children and siblings) the majority are Title IV-E eligible (92% in Fresno and 86% in Riverside). The remaining children are currently being served via the parallel State waiver and will be included in the final analysis. Monthly enrollment rates during this report period remained modest for both counties. Fresno County enrolled an average of 2 new study children and 4-5 siblings per month while Riverside enrolled 1-2 study children and 2 siblings per month, on average.

For the ISFC Sub-Study, the last day of enrollment for Baseline Interviews will by 3/31/03 (for completion by 4/30). Six-month caregiver interviews will be concluded by 10/31/03, and 12-month follow-up caregiver and youth interviews will also be concluded by 10/31/03. Enrollment and assignment to the treatment and control groups will continue until counties cease referring new cases. New study cases will be included in the impact analyses using CWS/CMS data, even if they are not eligible for further interviews.

Riverside County began utilizing electronic methods arranged by the evaluation team to submit the California Structured Decision Making Family Risk Assessment and Family Strengths and Needs Assessment (child portion only) data during this report period. Both counties currently submit these data electronically, which greatly increases their availability for analysis. Completed records have currently been submitted by both counties for all requested children (Fresno: 51; Riverside: 21).

For the ISFC Study, fidelity assessment instruments include, (1) the Conference Characteristics Survey, completed by the conference coordinator and facilitator immediately following the family conference; (2) the Conference Participant Questionnaire, completed by all other conference participants immediately following the family conference; (3) the Family Plan Effectiveness Survey, completed by the supervising child welfare worker at six and 12 months post-conference; and (4) the
Framework for Observing a Family Conference form used in recording direct observations of family conferences.

Surveys completed by conference participants and the conference coordinator and facilitator continue to be collected following all initial family conferences in both counties. To date, surveys regarding 22 initial conferences have been collected in Fresno County and surveys regarding 16 initial conferences have been submitted by Riverside County. Despite modifications to the surveys made during the pilot-testing phase of implementation, county staff feedback and reviews of completed surveys indicate that questions directing participants to complete one set of questions if the conference included “Private Family Time” and a second set of questions if it did not, continue to be problematic. Returned surveys also show that participants sometimes completed both sets of questions or parts of both sections, regardless of the type of conference they received. In order to attempt to address these concerns without making more substantive changes to the survey instruments (which is not advisable at this stage of implementation) the evaluation team has distributed copies of the survey instruments in which the “Private Family Time” and non-“Private Family Time” sections are color-coded. Evaluation team members currently await feedback from county staff regarding the extent to which these adjustments assist participants with completing the relevant sections of the survey.

The Family Plan Effectiveness Survey completed by the supervising child welfare worker regarding plan implementation also continues to be submitted by social workers in both counties. At this time, 15 six-month surveys have been completed by Fresno County social workers. Due to delays on the part of Riverside County staff in scheduling initial conferences (see the March 2002 Annual Process Study Report for further information), only 7 six-month surveys have recently come due in Riverside County. Three of these surveys have been completed by Riverside County staff.

Conference observations continue to be conducted in both counties. Observations completed during this report period were conducted on 4/20/02, 4/27/02 and 7/25/02 in Fresno County and on 5/8/02 and 8/9/02 in Riverside County. There have been some concerns expressed by Fresno County administrative staff that family members may experience some discomfort with the observer’s presence. These concerns were expressed by Fresno County staff during a visit to the county on July 30, 2002, and were addressed by generating a list of suggestions for minimizing observer intrusiveness while optimizing data collection. Evaluation team staff will continue to dialogue with Fresno County administrative staff regarding the effectiveness of these modifications and make adjustments to the protocol as needed.

Between both counties, a total of 42 family conference plans have been collected. In addition, 47 Fresno case plans for both control and experimental children had been collected by the close of August 2002. Efforts to develop the analysis approach for case and conference plans commenced during this reporting period. Preliminary codes have been applied to plans that have been received thus far. The coding scheme will be further refined and applied to incoming data as themes that are relevant to the evaluation begin to emerge from the data. At this time, theoretical exploration of the data is still in process.
As of the end of this report period, 14 baseline interviews with caregivers and 4 baseline interviews with youth have been completed in Fresno County. Similar numbers of baseline interviews have also been completed with Riverside County caregivers (14) and youth (5). Eleven 6-month telephone interviews were successfully completed with Riverside County caregivers and three youth and their caregivers also participated in 12-month face interviews in this county. Six Fresno County caregivers completed 6-month telephone interviews, but none of the 12-month face interviews that came due during this report period (4 caregiver, 2 youth) were successfully completed. Response rates for Fresno interviews about 50% those of Riverside. A variety of factors impact the response rate in Fresno, such as difficulty in reaching parent caregivers, distrust of the protective services system, staffing changes, and other issues described in the ISFC report. Staffing recruitment, especially for Spanish speaking interviewers, remains challenging in both counties. (UCB evaluators have been assigned to conduct Spanish language interviews by phone, even though the baseline and 12-month interviews were not originally designed to be conducted by phone.)

As part of the Process Study, a focus group with administrative staff was conducted in Fresno on July 30, 2002. A series of phone interviews were conducted with Riverside County administrative staff, in lieu of a focus group, on August 19, 2002 and September 20, 2002 due to scheduling challenges on the part of county staff participants. Process Study activities during the next report period will include focus groups with line staff in the winter of 2002.

During this period, the Cost-Effectiveness Study (Fresno County) has focused on monitoring data collection and transmission and incorporating some of the data into the Fresno Central Cost database for Fresno County that is being maintained by the evaluation team. To date, the evaluation team has received data on more than 22,000 caseworker contacts. Next steps for the Cost-Effectiveness Study include the preparation of data required for the Preliminary Analysis Report in June 2003 and validation of data with caseworker interviews and a review of case files.
This section describes process study findings for San Francisco’s Community Mentoring program for the period April 1, 2002 – June 30, 2002.

1. Methods and Procedures

A single focus group was conducted on-site in May, 2002. Focus group participants were the Special Projects Manager from the county social services department, the Program Coordinator, and one Mentor Supervisor. Additional participants were expected to attend the discussion, however, the Special Projects Manager noted that project staff were “angry” and “grieving” at the time of data collection and probably chose not to attend the meeting due to the project’s impending closure. Participants were informed of the nature and purpose of the focus group and read and signed consent forms at the beginning of the meeting. The focus group was audio-tape recorded and two UCB researchers took extensive notes during the discussion (one by hand and one using a laptop computer). The audio-tape was used as a back-up to researchers’ notes. All data was summarized and key themes were sought by the two researchers through the lens of “lessons learned” that might inform why the program was closing or how a future similar program might capitalize on the experiences of the Community Mentoring program.

Appendix 1 contains the semi-structured interview protocol developed by CSSR evaluation team staff in accordance with federal Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Project guidelines. The questions were designed to highlight problems that may have led to the program’s impending closure as well as to highlight successful aspects of the Community Mentoring project.

2. Key Features and Implementation Status

Program staff have been informed that the program is shutting down as of June 30, 2002.

a. Enrollment status: At the time of data collection, UCB records indicated that 61 children were receiving program services (experimental group, including siblings) and an additional 31 children (including siblings) constituted the control group.

b. Target populations: Focus group participants described program clients as needy, consistent with the fact that they have come into contact with the Department of Human Services, however, participants generally de-emphasized any characteristics of clients as being problematic for the administration or implementation of the program. Focus group participants highlighted the fact that the program was envisioned and began prior to the dot com boom and that since that time one of the target neighborhoods, Potrero Hill has gentrified. Gentrification of this neighborhood, combined with the availability of other social services in this area, was perceived as greatly reducing the numbers of children and families in need of Community Mentoring program services. In addition, focus group participants mentioned that the number of children in need of program services was lower than was envisioned due to a 50% decrease in general child welfare referrals over the last seven years.
c. Implementation difficulties: The program has encountered various implementation difficulties. The greatest difficulties appear to be budget related and have been problematic since the program began. For example, the program was designed as an innovative community collaborative. Unfortunately, many in-kind contributions from collaborators never were received. The failure to receive these projected contributions resulted in additional expenses being placed on the county and the program costs were much higher than initial projections. The program was not able to capture high start-up costs. In addition, focus group participants believe that the initial base rate set for children in the experimental group was much too low. Although the base rate was revised and the budget was revised during program implementation, the base rate was still too low and the program was not able to stay within set costs.

The referral process and informed consent procedures also contributed to implementation difficulties. Child welfare cases eligible for the program were not identified prior to hiring staff and greater numbers of staff people were hired than proved necessary. Furthermore, the program only receives funding for children in the experimental group and the program proposal did not anticipate so many children being enrolled in the control group. Thus, costs were higher than expected for experimental cases.

3. Organizational Aspects

a. Timelines: Families in the program received services as long as they had unmet needs. Consistent with the court calendar, a 6-12 month timeframe was initially envisioned for serving families. In hindsight, this timeframe was probably too short because many families in the program had problems that required at least a year of intervention. Participants noted that a key feature of the program, relationship building with whole families, takes time. Some families received services for up to 15 months and some families were served on a shorter timeline, depending on their needs.

b. Service delivery difficulties: Transportation was cited as a key problem for the program’s service delivery. A central component of the program is the ability to facilitate easy modes of transportation for enrolled children and their families, however, transportation was not considered in the program proposal. Oftentimes staff used their own cars to transport their clients. Finding safe housing for client families also was problematic.

Another aspect of service delivery that could have benefited from refinement was that frequently the mentors felt like the families they were serving didn’t understand the role of the mentor: “people didn’t know why we were there.” This could have been remedied if the process of introducing the family to the program (informed consent procedures) was more informative for the family. The program had envisioned hiring someone to serve this role, separate from mentors, however, the hire didn’t materialize due to budget problems.

Participants indicated no problems with regard to assessment of child and family strengths. DHS workers joined the mentors and families in the assessment to help identify the needs of the families and the adult’s level of commitment for fulfilling their case plans.
c. Staffing: Participants highlighted the need for a full or part-time staff person to entirely devote their time to the mentoring project, which was envisioned but didn’t occur. At the time that the program was starting up another initiative was introduced that required 80% of the Special Projects Manager’s time. An administrator working solely for the program could have expanded the program within the community so as to build additional working relationships. Participants agreed that the essence of the program was “a constant process of building relationship.” A dedicated administrator could have given the program the time it deserved while working within the department to maintain steady enrollments of children into the program. Due to high staff turnover within the county, many social workers did not know about the program and others tended to forget to refer children to the program. An administrator with more time for the program could have created a mechanism to ensure that new staff and continuing staff were consistently informed about the program and that team building routinely occurred between social workers and mentors.

Another staffing issue was the need to support further staff professional development, like licensure. If additional professional development opportunities were made available to the mentors it would be a way of giving back to the community because the community needs licensed professional helpers of color.

Participants felt that the Project Coordinator could have benefited from an assistant and it was noted that the Project Coordinator had five bosses who did not speak in a unified voice. In addition, the Executive Directors of the collaborating agencies were frequently in conflict with the Special Projects Manager which led to heightened feelings of tension among program staff.

With regard to relationships between social workers and mentors it was noted that not all social workers were open to the high level of collaboration needed to share a case with a mentor. However, the social workers and mentors who worked on cases for this program had excellent relationships with each other and were pre-identified for this program based on their interest in the community and their willingness to share power. Participants believed that social workers and mentors were mutually able to improve each other’s work. For example, if a mentor had difficulty with a family he or she could always call the social worker for assistance. Similarly, mentors could devote a lot of time to their client families and could visit the families when the social workers couldn’t, thereby reducing social worker workloads. In general, social workers and mentors had a substantial amount of communication and sharing of information and ideas. Mentors sent monthly reports to social workers noting all dates of contact with client families.

d. Program oversight and monitoring: Participants said that supervision of the mentors by the mentor supervisors was not problematic and that the use of pagers and cell phones facilitated communication and kept everyone accessible.

With regard to state oversight, participants felt that communication from the CDSS liaison was lacking and that more was needed. Early in the program the Special Projects Manager did not even realize that a CDSS liaison to the program existed. Participants believed that CDSS was not vested in the success of the program and that given how “revolutionary” the program was, CDSS guidance would have been welcome.
4. Contextual Factors

a. Community characteristics: Participants believed that the community was rich with resources to assist client families. Some staff members had previously worked in other agencies and therefore had established lines of communication with other supportive services. Oftentimes, if waiting lists existed for services, staff were able to move their clients to the front of the list. In addition, other professional service providers such as mental health workers or substance abuse counselors were brought in as consultants and played an important role in providing services to families. These professionals were available for consultation to discuss issues families were having and assist in the development of a treatment plan.

b. Agency factors: Focus group participants agreed that working in an out-stationed office for this program was desirable. The office culture was positive because staff volunteered to work in this extremely underprivileged community and all of their cases came from the community. Staff valued and treasured the opportunity to work within this community and these values were reinforced by the agency. All staff for this program were required to do volunteer work in the community in order to better understand the community. The culture at DHS headquarters was described as very different from the out-stationed office: this was perceived as neither good nor bad.

c. State factors: Focus group participants cited lack of assistance from CDSS as contributing to their inability to overcome program implementation difficulties. They felt more oversight and communication was needed from the state to make the program successful. Fiscal meetings with the state were helpful but should have occurred prior to the program implementation (not after the program was having major difficulties) and a clear description of what CDSS expected from the program was needed (but never communicated by CDSS).

Budget cuts and a decrease in the California general fund after September 11th, were the major economic factors at the state level that affected the program. In addition, the general decrease in the overall economy of the state of California, the dot com downturn, and the state cut of 20% to foster care administration all affected program implementation.

d. Federal factors: September 11th was the only social or economic factor at the federal level that was mentioned as having an impact on the community mentoring program.

e. Evaluation factors: Participants seemed to regret that they weren’t able to create a stronger relationship with the evaluation team during the early development of the program. They would have liked to have worked more closely with a senior researcher in the beginning of the project so that things that were supposed to have been completed would have been. For example, participants discussed an assessment instrument that they were supposed to have received from UCB but never did. This assessment tool would have given the program staff a way to measure a family’s progress before and after the mentoring intervention.

Participants said that they felt extremely disconnected from the UCB research team, especially prior to June, 2001. They described “locking heads” with their research liaison in ways that were very difficult for the program. With regard to that relationship they said “this is not how people
work together, there was no connection or relationship.” In contrast, participants said they had an easy and collaborative working relationship with the senior researcher who was in place from June, 2001-2002.

5. *Looking Toward the Future*

Program staff are slowly pulling mentoring services away from client families and turning the cases back to DHS. The mentors plan to continue personal relationships with their client families. Unfortunately, due to budget cutbacks within the agency, client families will receive fewer services than the previous norm for child welfare cases.

Participants felt that everyone knows that the program is important in the community and it has been successful on many different levels. Many of the mentors have lost hope for the community because they see a good program being taken away due to a lack of funding. They said that even if a new program were to be introduced to the community it would be difficult to gain community support for it since this program was removed (and community members are feeling insulted).

Consultants have been brought in to help move program staff into new positions and help the mentors with resume and interview building skills so that they can obtain new positions.

Participants asked themselves “What would the program have been like if it had reached its full capacity?” They said that with 40 staff members, social services might be in compliance with caseload sizes and reduce expenses for foster care services. Participants said they hoped the project would come back again at a later date in communities where it is needed. They believe the project gives communities the opportunity to help themselves and community members know where support is needed. They feel it is “a good program that could really change families’ lives” and that empowerment gives families support to rebuild themselves. Finally, participants agreed that this program represented “real social work.”
I. Implementation Status

1. What is the current status of the community mentoring program?

II. Difficulties/Solutions

2. What have been some of the major difficulties have you encountered?

3. Are there specific reasons you were unable to resolve the difficulties?

III. Target Population

4. Were there problems with the target populations for the community mentoring program?

5. Were there problems with the criteria for their selection?

IV. Services

6. Were there problems with the services you were providing?

7. Could you describe the services received by the comparison group?

8. Were there problems with the expected time children/families were in the community mentoring program?

V. Process

9. Were there problems with the process that took place when a family entered the project?

10. Was there a problem with the length of time families began receiving services after intake into the project?

11. Were there any problems with the relationships between mentors and families?

12. Was there a problem with the assessment of child and family strengths? Needs?

13. Were there problems with how is the services/support plan for the families was developed?
VI. **Supervising and Monitoring**

14. Were there problems with supervising and monitoring implementation of your program?
   a. What are some of the barriers, issues, and/or concerns?
   b. Are there specific reasons you were unable to overcome the barriers?

VII. **Staffing**

15. Were the problems with staff roles as mentors, in providing service to clients?

16. Were there problems with initial and ongoing training you completed as a direct service provider?

VIII. **Funding**

17. Were there problems with the funding process for the program?

IX. **Client Characteristics**

18. Were there social and/or economic characteristics of the client population you serve which might have affected your ability to implement the program?

X. **Community Characteristics**

19. Were there social and/or economic characteristic of the community you serve which might have impacted your ability to implement the program?

20. Were there enough community and neighborhood resources available to support your program.

XI. **Agency/County Factors**

21. Were there problems with the culture of your agency?

22. How did the culture of your agency influence implementation of your program?

XII. **State Factors**
23. Were there any social or economic factors at the state level that had an impact on your program?

XIII. Federal Factors

24. Were there any social or economic factors at the federal level that had an impact on your program to date?

XIV. Political Factors

25. Were there any political issues that positively or negatively affected your program?

XV. Evaluation Factors

26. Are there any issues relating to the design of the demonstration project and evaluation that had an impact on your program?

XVI. Conclusion

27. Is there anything you feel should be discussed that we have not covered?
## Intensive Services
### Wraparound Component
#### Data Collection Schedule – Interviews*
**Adults**

*based on 18 month interview period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Tot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/98-12/98</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/99-6/99</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/99-12/99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/00-6/00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/00-12/00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/01-6/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/01-12/01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/02-6/02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/02-12/02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/03-6/03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/03-6/04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admin Data</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pretest (in-person)</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Posttest 1 (phone)</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Posttest 2 (in-person)</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>93</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Consortium Meetings*  
X X X X X X X X X

*Site visits* 
X X X X X X X X X X

*based on 18 month interview period*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Tot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/99-6/99</td>
<td>7/99-12/99</td>
<td>1/00-6/00</td>
<td>7/00-12/00</td>
<td>1/01-6/01</td>
<td>7/01-12/01</td>
<td>1/02-6/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Data</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest (in-person)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest 1 (phone)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest 2 (in-person)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* based on 18 month interview period
### Intensive Services
#### Family Group Decision Making
#### Data Collection Schedule – Interviews
#### Adults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Tot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7/98-12/98</td>
<td>1/99-6/99</td>
<td>7/99-12/99</td>
<td>1/00-6/00</td>
<td>7/00-12/00</td>
<td>1/01-6/01</td>
<td>7/01-12/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Data</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest (in-person)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest 1 (phone)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest 2 (in-person)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium Meetings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Visits</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>Tot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/99-6/99</td>
<td>7/99-12/99</td>
<td>1/00-6/00</td>
<td>7/00-12/00</td>
<td>1/01-6/01</td>
<td>7/01-12/01</td>
<td>1/02-6/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Data</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest (in-person)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest 1 (phone)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest 2 (in-person)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Revised Work Plan and Deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Who Will Perform Task</th>
<th>04/30/01</th>
<th>12/31/01</th>
<th>06/30/02</th>
<th>12/31/02</th>
<th>06/30/03</th>
<th>12/31/03</th>
<th>06/30/04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete interagency agreement with CDSS</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with CDSS and DHHS to finalize the evaluation design</td>
<td>SMT,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize sampling plan for random assignment</td>
<td>SMT,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit the evaluation plan to CDSS for approval</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in the drafting of the Invitation to Counties</td>
<td>SMT, PC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in meetings with CDSS staff and counties interested in</td>
<td>SMT, PC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in the demonstration project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist CDSS in reviewing county proposals and in selecting</td>
<td>SMT, PC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstration counties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Deliverables are noted in bold

2 PI=Principal Investigator; TC=Technical Coordinator; SMT=Senior Management Team (PI, TC); FC=Family conferencing Coordinator; ISC=Intensive Services Component Coordinator; PC=Project Coordinators (FC, ISC); SP=Senior Programmer; AP=Assistant Programmer; AS=Assistant Specialist; GSR=Graduate Student Researcher[s]; I=Interviewer[s]; AA=Administrative Assistant
<p>| Task                                                                 | Who Will Perform Task | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Purchase equipment                                                  | TC                    | X | X |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Hire and train new staff†                                           | SMT, PC               | X | X | X |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Obtain protection for human subjects                               | PI                    | X | X | X |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Attend and participate in “kick off” meetings                       | SMT, PC               | X | X |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Meet with CDSS and counties to review and finalize evaluation       | SMT, PC               | X | X |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| procedures/measures                                                |                      |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Pre-test and finalize evaluation measures                            | PC                    | X | X |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Develop data coding schemes for questionnaire and interview data   | PC                    | X | X |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| County projects to become operational                               | N/A                   | X |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Meet with project consortia                                         | SMT, PC               | X | X | X | X | X | X |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Assist CDSS in preparing information to be presented at annual      | SMT, PC               | X |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| meeting with DHSS                                                   |                      |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Attend annual meeting with DHSS                                     | PI, CI, or TC         | X |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Attend meetings as required by CDSS in Sacramento or elsewhere      | SMT, PC               | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| as specified by CDSS                                                 |                      |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Begin random assignment of participants in the Intensive Services  | IS, FC, WRAP          | X |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Component (ISC)                                                     |                      |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Who Will Perform Task</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Begin random selection of children and caregivers for in-depth study in ISC – FGDM and WRAP</td>
<td>FC &amp; WRAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain administrative data for the ISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct face interviews with youth and caregivers in the ISC-FGDM &amp; WRAP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct phone interviews with the caregivers in the ISC-FGDM &amp; WRAP</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit semi-annual progress reports containing data from impact and process studies (March 31 and Sept 30)</td>
<td>PI, SMT, PC</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit an interim evaluation report for the first 8 quarters to CDSS (May 30, 2001)</td>
<td>PI, SMT, PC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit annual process report (March 31)</td>
<td>PI, SMT, PC</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit interim process studies</td>
<td>PI, SMT, PC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze data (Process)</td>
<td>SMT, PC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze data (Impact)</td>
<td>SMT, PC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit final process studies</td>
<td>PI, SMT, PC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit draft of final evaluation to CDSS for review</td>
<td>PI, SMT, PC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Who Will Perform Task</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise and submit final evaluation to CDSS*</td>
<td>PI, SMT, PC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present project findings</td>
<td>PI, SMT, PC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Final Report details:

2/18/04       Draft Final Report due to CDSS for review
3/31/04       Revised Final Report due to CDSS
California Department of Social Services

Title IV-E Waiver Pilot Evaluation
Outline of Preliminary Analysis Report, June 2003

University of California at Berkeley
Center for Social Services Research

Working Draft
September 17, 2002
Title IV-E Waiver Pilot Evaluation
Outline of Preliminary Analysis Report, June 2003

I. General Scope

The June 2003 Preliminary Analysis Report is being prepared by the Center for Social Services Research at the University of California, Berkeley. The purpose of the report is to describe the general profile of children and families enrolled in the Title IV-E Waiver Demonstration Intensive Services pilots. In most cases, the analyses will compare baseline differences between experimental and control groups. Data from second and subsequent follow up interviews will be used for the final report, by which time sufficient interviews will have been administered to provide comparisons over time.

Understanding the sample's baseline characteristics is an important first step in analyzing outcomes. This is especially critical in the Title IV-E Waiver evaluation, since the target populations vary among the counties and within counties upon implementation (e.g. “at-risk” vs. in RCL 12-14). Target populations within counties may have also changed over time as county screening processes matured.

For those counties whose sample size allows, outcome analyses must control for within- and between-group variation to ensure that any effects that are, in fact, the result of the experimental intervention cannot be attributed to other extraneous factors. Random assignment, while the most efficient and accurate way to equalize treatment and control participants, cannot be expected to eliminate all differences between groups in studies with small samples. The analysis of baseline characteristics will also provide a richer understanding of the outcomes: what works, for whom, under what conditions?

Data for the Preliminary Analysis Report will be collected up to March 31, 2003 to allow time for analysis and report preparation. The analyses will include data from baseline instruments, in-depth interviews (first interviews only), services tracking (Wraparound), fidelity measures, conference plan review (Family Conferencing), and cost-related data for the Fresno Family Conferencing cost study.

II. Wraparound Study Questions

A. What was the behavioral functional status of the children in the Wraparound study sample at the time that they were enrolled into the study?

1. CAFAS score analysis by county

2. CAFAS score analysis, by county and by group
B. What was the well-being status of the children in the Wraparound study sample at the time that they were enrolled into the study?

1. Summary scores of selected child well-being and family functioning instrument

2. Correlations between total CAFAS score and selected child well-being instruments

C. What has been the satisfaction level of caregivers and youth in the experimental group?

D. Program fidelity: profile of program fidelity (WFI) scores in Alameda County

E. How do experimental and control groups compare on services used, by county?

III. Family Conferencing Study Questions

A. What is the Family Risk Assessment profile of enrolled children and youth, comparing experimental and control groups in both counties?

B. How do experimental and control groups compare in the Child Strengths and Needs assessment?

C. What was the child well-being and family functioning status in the Family Conferencing study sample at the time that they were enrolled into the study?

1. Summary scores of selected child well-being and family functioning instruments

2. Are there any correlations between the SDM/FRA scores and selected child well-being scores?

D. Program Fidelity

1. Do the experimental group Conference Plans show fidelity to Family Conferencing principles, values, and operating procedures?

2. How do the experimental group Conference Plans differ in content from experimental and control group Case Plans?

3. Do survey responses from participants in the experimental group and observations of Family Conferences show evidence of model fidelity to Family Conferencing principles, values, and operating procedures?
4. To what extent are Family Conference participants satisfied with their services?

E. Cost Study (Fresno County)

1. What is the average cost of a family conference?

2. How do the quantity of caseworker contacts and visits (attempted and completed) differ between the experimental and control groups?

3. How do the services used differ between the experimental and control groups?
   a) Frequency distributions: 1) cases refused services, 2) used some services less than a month, or 3) used services one month or longer
   b) Comparison by type of service and user of service (parent, child, family)
   c) Comparison of costs of services

4. Are there correlations between Family Risk Assessment scores and 1) number of caseworker contacts, and 2) approximate costs of services used
Intensive Services Component – Family Conferencing Sub-study

Progress to date

This Semi-Annual Progress Report describes implementation progress for the period from April 1, 2002 to September 30, 2002 on the evaluation of the Intensive Services Component – Family Conferencing Sub-study (ISFC) of the California Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Project.

Enrollment Progress

Summary enrollment tables for Fresno and Riverside counties, covering the period from April 1, 2002 through August 31, 2002, are included in Attachment 1.

Thirty-two additional children (study children and siblings) were enrolled in Fresno County during the 4/1/02-8/31/02 enrollment period. At present, a total of 145 children are enrolled (including federally and non-federally eligible study children and siblings. The size of sibling groups continues to have a substantial impact on enrollment in that only ten additional study children (5 experimental; 5 control) were enrolled during this report period; the remaining 22 children are siblings. The county has enrolled 33 study children in the experimental group to date (8/31/02). Fifty-eight siblings of experimental group study children are also enrolled. Enrolled in the control group are 19 study children and an additional 35 control group siblings. The majority of enrolled children are Title IV-E eligible: 134 federally eligible vs. 11 non-federally eligible. The 11 non-federally eligible children are currently being served via the parallel State waiver and will be included in the final analysis. Fresno County’s program serves children maintained in-home who are assessed as being at high risk for removal from their families. The goal of the program is to prevent out-of-home placement via provision of a family conference and voluntary services. A shorter service period is a defining characteristic of Fresno County’s program design. For this reason, 31 study children have had their child welfare cases closed since initial implementation. 21 study children (14 experimental; 7 control) and 36 siblings of these children remain active in Fresno County’s program at this time (8/31/02). Reasons for case closure in Fresno County include the stabilization of the family situation (19) or family refusal to comply with services (11). In one instance, the child’s case was closed when the child was placed out of home with a relative.

During the enrollment period covered by this report (4/1/02-8/31/02), 18 additional children (study children and siblings) were enrolled in Riverside County. Seven of these children are study children; the remaining 11 children are siblings. A total of 117 children are enrolled to date (federally and non-federally eligible study children and siblings). There are currently 31 study children enrolled in the experimental group. An additional 44 siblings of experimental group children are also enrolled. Eighteen study children are enrolled in Riverside County’s control group, along with 24 siblings of those children. A small number of Riverside County’s enrolled children are being followed under the State waiver for non-federally eligible children: 14 non-federally eligible children vs. 103 federally eligible. The focus of Riverside County’s program is on enhancing the placement stability and timely permanence (by reunification, adoption and guardianship) of children placed in relative and non-relative care. Due to the longer time frames associated with achieving permanency for children in care, the majority of Riverside County’s cases remain open at this time. 16 study cases have been closed since initial implementation. 13 case closures were the result of a successful reunification with the biological
One case was closed less than a month after enrollment when the court dismissed the allegations. One case was “closed” to the experimental program when the court terminated reunification services to the parents prior to provision of a family conference and the case was transferred to the agency’s adoptions program. The remaining case was closed for reasons that the evaluation team is currently clarifying.

Monthly enrollment rates during this report period remained modest for both counties. Fresno County enrolled an average of 2 new study children and 4-5 siblings per month while Riverside enrolled 1-2 study children and 2 siblings per month, on average.

**Impact Study**

The following report section describes progress by the evaluation team on primary Impact Study evaluation activities.

**Technical Assistance to Counties and CDSS**

Technical assistance provided to counties and CDSS during this report period focused on CDSS efforts to clarify county interest in pursuing an extension of the Waiver demonstration from US DHHS and criteria to be used by US DHHS in evaluating extension requests from Waiver states. A series of meetings and phone conferences was convened by CDSS during this report period to address these issues. Evaluation team members attended these meetings in order to clarify research issues that would likely have an influence on county engagement in pursuing the extension process and the outcome of a CDSS request to extend the Waiver, if one were put forward. A central concern for the Family Conferencing Sub-study has been that enrollment of study children in both counties remains quite low and compromises the ability of the evaluation to detect between-group differences, if they exist. In order to address questions from county staff regarding the level of enrollment that might be needed to detect differences between the experimental and control groups, the evaluation team prepared a “power analysis” that estimates the sample size needed to detect the effect sizes expected by county staff and shown by prior child welfare research. This information (summarized in **Attachment 2**) was presented to CDSS and county staff during a meeting held in conjunction with the California Wraparound Institute in Anaheim on May 8, 2002.

In addition, evaluation team members provided periodic assistance to county staff by phone regarding enrollment and evaluation issues. In Fresno County, for example, staff expressed interest in exploring whether there might be a difference between the experimental and control groups on client family compliance with services offered and overall service usage. This question was motivated, in part, by county and evaluation team expectations that the evaluation was unlikely to indicate that there were significant differences between study groups on foster care entries or repeat abuse and neglect referrals, since few study children were experiencing these outcomes, and that alternative measures might better demonstrate the effects of Fresno County’s experimental intervention. Following a series of phone conferences to explore this question, county staff and the evaluation team concluded, however, that it was problematic to measure family compliance with services due to irregularities in the available data. In addition, while data being collected by Fresno County staff for the Cost-Effectiveness Study permits the evaluation team to analyze service usage patterns among experimental and control families for certain types of services, the meaning of service usage patterns may be difficult to interpret in
the absence of other outcome results. For example, high rates of service usage could reflect high levels of client engagement in services or higher client need for such services. Service usage data alone cannot determine which explanation is the most likely if a difference between study groups is found.

Fresno County staff also, for a period of time, considered revising the program enrollment criteria to include children who did not have a protective hold placed on them at time of enrollment, in order to increase the pool of eligible children. Discussions between evaluation team members and county staff regarding the proposed change suggested that such children were likely at lower risk for abuse and neglect than children who had been accepted into the study thus far and that the proposed change might therefore compromise the evaluation. For these reasons, the proposed change was not implemented by county staff.

Aside from the assistance provided to county staff regarding the Waiver extension process, technical assistance to Riverside County staff has also consisted of clarifying project timelines for the evaluation and their impact, or lack thereof, on county enrollment timelines.

Baseline Assessment

Riverside County began utilizing electronic methods arranged by the evaluation team to submit the California Structured Decision Making Family Risk Assessment and Family Strengths and Needs Assessment (child portion only) data during this report period. Both counties currently submit these data electronically, which greatly increases their availability for analysis. Completed records have currently been submitted by both counties for all requested children (Fresno: 51; Riverside: 21).

Model Fidelity Assessment

Model fidelity assessment instruments include, (1) the Conference Characteristics Survey, completed by the conference coordinator and facilitator immediately following the family conference; (2) the Conference Participant Questionnaire, completed by all other conference participants immediately following the family conference; (3) the Family Plan Effectiveness Survey, completed by the supervising child welfare worker at six and 12 months post-conference; and (4) the Framework for Observing a Family Conference form used in recording direct observations of family conferences. Current versions of these instruments developed by the evaluation team were included as attachments in the March 2002 Semi-Annual Progress Report.

Surveys completed by conference participants and the conference coordinator and facilitator continue to be collected following all initial family conferences in both counties. To date, surveys regarding 22 initial conferences have been collected in Fresno County and surveys regarding 16 initial conferences have been submitted by Riverside County.

Despite modifications to the surveys made during the pilot-testing phase of implementation, county staff feedback and reviews of completed surveys indicate that questions directing participants to complete one set of questions if the conference included “Private Family Time” and a second set of questions if it did not continue to be problematic. This structure was designed to verify the consistency with which counties implemented the indicated family
conferencing models and explore the extent to which participants confirmed that the intended model was the one they received. Difficulties with these questions include that county staff indicate that participants frequently have questions about which questions they are required to fill out. Returned surveys also show that participants sometimes complete both sets of questions or parts of both sections, regardless of the type of conference they received. Conference observations conducted by the evaluation team suggest that participants (including county staff) may not take the time to carefully read the survey directions, perhaps because the survey administration immediately follows the conclusion of the conference and, by this time, participants are often tired. In order to attempt to address these concerns without making more substantive changes to the survey instruments (which is not advisable at this stage of implementation) the evaluation team has distributed copies of the survey instruments in which the “Private Family Time” and non- “Private Family Time” sections are color-coded. Evaluation team members currently await feedback from county staff regarding the extent to which these adjustments assist participants with completing the relevant sections of the survey.

The Conference Participant Questionnaires are entered manually on an ongoing basis in a Microsoft Access database by evaluation team staff. Data entered in Access is easily uploaded to SAS statistical software, which will be used for future data analyses. Final adjustments to the Access database for the Conference Characteristics Survey, completed by conference coordinators and facilitators, are currently being made. Entry of the data into the database will commence as soon as the database is finished.

Early results from the Conference Participant Questionnaire were compiled by the evaluation team and presented at the American Humane Association Family Group Decision Making Roundtable (AHA FGDM Roundtable) in Monterey on June 4, 2002. Copies of handouts provided to the presentation attendees are included in Attachment 3.

The Family Plan Effectiveness Survey completed by the supervising child welfare worker regarding plan implementation also continues to be submitted by social workers in both counties. Because the time frame for delivery of experimental services in Fresno County is approximately six months, this survey will only be administered at six months in Fresno County. Riverside County’s service period is substantially longer and for this reason, the survey will be administered twice: once at 6 months and again at 12 months following the conference. At this time, 15 six-month surveys have been completed by Fresno County social workers. Due to delays on the part of Riverside County staff in scheduling initial conferences (see the March 2002 Annual Process Study Report for further information), only 7 six-month surveys have recently come due in Riverside County. Three of these surveys have been completed by Riverside County staff. Manual entry of the Family Plan Effectiveness Surveys into an Access database will also commence as soon as final modifications to the database are completed by technical support staff on the evaluation team.

Intermittent conference observations continue to be conducted in both counties. Model fidelity data regarding the conference is collected by conference observers on the Framework for Observing a Conference form. Observations also allow staff to gather data regarding the implementation of conferences in each county for the Process Study. Observations completed during this report period were conducted on 4/20/02, 4/27/02 and 7/25/02 in Fresno County and on 5/8/02 and 8/9/02 in Riverside County.
Fresno County conference observations are conducted by field staff hired specifically for this purpose, while Riverside County observations have been completed by members of the UCB evaluation team. Field observers were hired in Fresno County in order to increase the frequency with which observations could be conducted and to minimize the travel time required by UCB team staff to complete these activities. Hired observers were selected with the assistance of staff in the social work program at California State University at Fresno and Fresno County Waiver program staff. The current observation staff were selected based on their understanding of the research objectives, exposure to the experimental intervention, professional experience with child welfare services clients, professional demeanor and Spanish language abilities.

Prior to the conference start, informed consent is obtained from parents by county staff. UCB team observers typically observe all phases of the conference except the “Private Family Time” portion. On one occasion, with consent from family members, the observer remained for the “Private Family Time” phase of the conference. During most conferences, participants are reported to invite the observer to take notes during the entire conference and express no concerns regarding the observer’s presence. However, there have been some concerns expressed by Fresno County administrative staff that family members may nonetheless experience some discomfort with the observer’s presence. These concerns were expressed by Fresno County staff during a visit to the county on July 30, 2002, and were addressed by generating a list of suggestions for minimizing observer intrusiveness while optimizing data collection. The guidelines generated will be used to develop a conference observation protocol which will be distributed to Fresno County observers prior to the next conference observation. Evaluation team staff will continue to dialogue with Fresno County administrative staff regarding the effectiveness of these modifications and make adjustments to the protocol as needed. Riverside County staff have not expressed any concerns regarding observer intrusiveness as of this reporting period.

**Family Conference and Case Plans**

Both counties continue to submit copies of plans created during the family conference to the evaluation team. As discussed in the last *Semi-Annual Progress Report*, Fresno County also submits copies of the child welfare case plan for all experimental and control group children. Collection of both the conference and case plans for Fresno County will allow the evaluation team to assess whether the family conference facilitates the identification of service needs that are not already addressed in the case plan and whether planned services for the experimental and control groups in any way differ. This question is of particular concern in Fresno County, where staff provide services to both experimental and control group cases and the potential for control group contamination is therefore heightened. Riverside County staff only provide services to the experimental group. For this reason, the comparison of case plans with family conference plans is only being conducted with data from Fresno County.

In order to facilitate data entry and analysis of the case and conference plans, the evaluation team had requested that county staff explore the feasibility of submitting the plans electronically, in lieu of hard copy. Both counties indicated that it would be fairly simple to provide the plans in electronic form. To ensure the confidentiality of the data during electronic submission, the evaluation team provided technical assistance to county staff regarding the use of a password-protected electronic archive. Fresno County has implemented the electronic methods already. Riverside county staff currently submit hard copies only. Evaluation team staff continue to
provide Riverside with technical assistance and support as they work towards the goal of submitting these records electronically.

Between both counties, a total of 42 family conference plans have been collected. In addition, 47 Fresno case plans for both control and experimental children had been collected by the close of August 2002. Fresno County has been able to provide copies of case plans for all enrolled cases, while conference plans have only been available since the evaluation team requested them in April 2001. For this reason, the number of Fresno case plans currently exceeds the number of conference plans collected in both counties at this time. Efforts to develop the analysis approach for case and conference plans commenced during this reporting period. Evaluation team members are utilizing a grounded theory approach, aided by Atlas qualitative analysis software. A similar approach will be used to analyze both types of plans, in order to facilitate comparisons across plan types in Fresno County. Preliminary codes have been applied to plans that have been received thus far. The coding scheme will be further refined and applied to incoming data as themes that are relevant to the evaluation begin to emerge from the data. At this time, theoretical exploration of the data is still in process.

In-depth Interview Implementation

Implementation of the in-depth interviews with child and adult study participants continues in both counties. As of the end of this report period, 14 baseline interviews with caregivers and 4 baseline interviews with youth have been completed in Fresno County. Similar numbers of baseline interviews have also been completed with Riverside County caregivers (14) and youth (5). Several follow-up six-month telephone interviews and 12-month face interviews were also scheduled and completed during this report period. Eleven 6-month telephone interviews were successfully completed with Riverside County caregivers and three youth and their caregivers also participated in 12-month face interviews in this county. Six Fresno County caregivers completed 6-month telephone interviews, but none of the 12-month face interviews that came due during this report period (4 caregiver, 2 youth) were successfully completed.

Completion of the face and telephone interviews with study participants has proved to be quite challenging. Out of a combined total of 36 interviews attempted with Riverside County caregivers since implementation began (including baseline, 6-month and 12-month interviews), only 28 (77%) have been completed. Out of a total of 10 Riverside County youth interviews that have been attempted since implementation began, eight have been completed (80%). Response rates in Fresno County have been lower. Forty-one Fresno County caregiver interviews were attempted and 20 were completed (49%). Twelve youth interviews were attempted with Fresno County youth participants but only 5 were completed (42%).

A variety of factors account for the current response rates and differences in response rates between the two counties. In Riverside County, interviews are chiefly scheduled with youth placed out-of-home and their foster and kinship caregivers while Fresno County interviews are primarily conducted with parents who are the direct recipients of child welfare services and their biological children, who remain in-home. Factors related to family referral to the protective services agency may also inhibit the participation of Fresno County study families in the in-depth interviews. Such factors may include distrust of the protective services agency and its associates, despite confidentiality assurances, and difficulties with more basic life functions, such as employment, household maintenance and child care. While out-of-home foster and
kinship care providers in Riverside County are not immune to the same types of issues, one would expect them to be affected by such issues to a lesser degree. Financial incentives are currently provided to all youth and adult participants in the in-depth interviews. However, such incentives have been insufficient to ensure the cooperation of study participants in the in-depth interviews.

Staffing issues on the evaluation team have also affected the interview response rates. Within this reporting period, the evaluation team experienced significant turnover among staff hired to conduct the in-depth interviews as well as among staff responsible for coordinating the interview scheduling from Berkeley. In Fresno County, both interviewers left the project during this report period. One replacement staff member who received on-the-job training was hired and is currently conducting interviews in this county. This individual and two additional interviewers will receive formal training to conduct interviews by the beginning of October 2002. One of the two additional interviewers currently conducts conference observations for the evaluation while the other is a new hire. Two of the three staff speak Spanish. In Riverside, one of two staff hired to conduct interviews also left the project during this period. UC Berkeley staff are in process of hiring his replacement, who also will be trained and ready to be assigned interviews by the beginning of October 2002. Regrettably, neither this candidate nor the remaining interviewer in Riverside County speak Spanish. Although the evaluation team had hoped to identify a replacement interviewer who spoke Spanish, none of the position applicants met this qualification.

Recruitment for the open interviewing positions was conducted by posting a position announcement through the social work programs at California State University at San Bernardino and California State University at Fresno. In addition, evaluation team staff contacted the Title IV-E program coordinators in the social work programs at both universities for specific recommendations regarding qualified students who might be interested in the open positions. Few applications were submitted by students at either university. The fact that the positions needed to be filled during the summer, when the social work program is not in session, likely reduced the number of applications submitted by qualified candidates. Only three applications were submitted by San Bernardino State students, none of whom spoke Spanish. One of the three candidates was selected and is in process of being hired and trained, as discussed above.

Because neither of the two Riverside County interviewing staff speak Spanish, Spanish language interviews, when they arise in this county, will be conducted by UC Berkeley evaluation team staff by telephone. Although the baseline and 12-month interviews were not designed to be conducted by phone, these methods will ensure that Spanish-speaking study participants have the opportunity to participate in the in-depth interviews. To date, the need for a Spanish-speaking interviewer in Riverside County has only arisen on rare occasions. Should the need for a Spanish-speaking interviewer increase, the evaluation team will broaden recruitment efforts to identify such candidates.

As mentioned above, turnover among staff assigned to coordinate the in-depth interviews from Berkeley has also had an impact on the response rate, in that no consistent staff member was assigned for the duration of this report period to ensure timely interview assignment and problem resolution. The project director, whose role it was to supervise the interview scheduling staff, left the project in June 2002. During the months surrounding the project director’s departure
approximately four different staff members were responsible for coordinating the interview scheduling with in-county interviewing staff. A fifth staff person has recently been assigned to these duties, who is expected to be able to consistently fulfill these duties for a period of time. Overall interview management is currently supervised by the Family Conferencing Sub-study coordinator.

Consent Revisions

Adjustments to the wording of initial consent forms suggested by the UC Berkeley Human Subjects Review Committee and evaluation team staffing changes necessitated minor revisions to several consent forms during this reporting period. Language that further directs study participants to the appropriate UC Berkeley entities for questions or complaints related to the Title IV-E Waiver Demonstration Project was inserted into initial study consent forms. Due to staffing changes for the Principal Investigator role, forms indicating the names and contact information for the current co-investigators were also updated on forms where this information appears. Current versions of the updated consent forms can be found in Attachment 4. These forms were recently distributed to counties for immediate use.

Technical Activities

Technical staff on the evaluation team have been involved in a number of activities during this report period that facilitate the timely and complete collection and accurate entry of all study data. Technical team activities have focused on the following five areas during this report period: (1) providing ongoing technical support and training to evaluation team members regarding data collection and management efforts; (2) initiating construction of an analysis dataset integrating data from enrollment spreadsheets and supplementary databases with data from the California Children’s Service Archive (CWS/CMS data); (3) modifying, maintaining, and supporting use of the FC contact database designed to facilitate scheduling and tracking the outcome of in-depth interview attempts; (4) modifying, maintaining and supporting use of the FC Conference Instruments database for data entry of the model fidelity instruments; and (5) maintaining the network installation of Cardiff Teleform for processing of in-depth interviews. A more complete summary of technical staff activities is presented in Attachment 5.

Data Analysis Preparation

As evaluation team activities have shifted from initial implementation to ongoing data collection and management, the evaluation team has also initiated work to begin preparing for the eventual analysis of study data. Evaluation team members developed a preliminary data analysis plan for the Intensive Services Component-Family Conferencing Sub-study that is currently undergoing refinement. The data analysis plan will be used to direct the data analysis for this portion of the study. The intent of the analysis plan is to outline the research questions and their relevance to the study, identify specific items for analysis, and outline the statistical approaches that will be used for the analysis. The scope of this data analysis plan focuses on the outcomes for families and children participating in this intervention and the understanding of the model being implemented. This plan will be used by the evaluation team to direct analysis for the Preliminary Analysis Report, to be submitted to CDSS on June 30, 2003. This preparation and planning will hasten the ability of research staff to conduct data analyses as data is received. This plan will continue to be revised and improved throughout the data analysis portion of the study.
Planning for production of the Preliminary Analysis Report has also involved identifying the content areas to be covered in this report, addressing outstanding data entry needs and specifying timeframes for the report production. Analyses tentatively identified for inclusion in this report include: (1) county SDM Family Risk Assessment descriptive data regarding family risk of abuse and neglect and intervention reasons; (2) county SDM Strengths and Needs assessment summary scores and distributions of children assessed as high vs. low functioning; (3) summary scores for child well-being and family functioning scales from baseline in-depth interviews; (4) correlations between Family Risk Assessment scores and selected child well-being scores; (5) an expansion of the analyses conducted for the June 2002 AHA FGDM Roundtable regarding the model fidelity of county family conferencing programs; (6) frequency distributions of services satisfaction survey responses, including several family conference-specific items; (7) comparisons of case and conference plans.

Ongoing Impact Study Activities

All of the data collection and monitoring activities described above will continue. Evaluation team members will continue to focus on efforts to maximize successful data collection during the next report period. Preparation for the preliminary and final data analyses also will continue.

Process Study

Process Study activities during this period consisted of a focus group with Fresno County administrative staff and a set of telephone interviews with Riverside County administrative staff. These activities are discussed in further detail below. Observations of individual family conferences also inform the Process Study. These activities were previously discussed under the Impact Study section of this report.

Focus Groups with Administrative Staff

A focus group with administrative staff was conducted in Fresno on July 30, 2002. A series of phone interviews were conducted with Riverside County administrative staff, in lieu of a focus group, on August 19, 2002 and September 20, 2002 due to scheduling challenges on the part of county staff participants. The purpose of the focus group and the series of phone conferences was to collect Process Study data on the implementation of ISFC programs, their organizational structure, service aspects and contextual factors affecting ongoing program implementation. Administrative staff participating in the focus group and telephone conferences included: family conference coordinators, program coordinators, program managers, a departmental supervisor and a conference coordinator assistant.

Focus group questions, provided in Attachment 6 of this report, were developed by evaluation team staff in accordance with federal Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Project evaluation guidelines. Once informed consent was obtained from all participants, each interview was recorded on an audiocassette tape, and notes were taken by all evaluation team staff in attendance. Evaluation team notes are currently being compiled and key themes will be extracted and summarized. Once completed, interview summaries will be distributed to interview participants in both counties for their review and input. Any feedback provided by the
participants will then be incorporated into the final draft of each summary. The resulting summaries are subsequently synthesized for *Annual Process Study Reports*.

**Ongoing Process Study Activities**

Future conference observations will continue to inform both the *Process* and *Impact Studies*. Conference observations are expected to continue in both counties. In addition, Process Study activities during the next report period will include focus groups with line staff in the Winter of 2002.

**Cost-Effectiveness Study**

During this period, the *Cost-Effectiveness Study* has focused on monitoring data collection and transmission and incorporating some of the data into the Fresno Central Cost database for Fresno County which is being maintained by the evaluation team. This has necessitated modifications to the database to accommodate the data received. Additionally, the data relating to worker contacts with study participants which was drawn by Fresno County IS personnel from CWS/CMS has required significant cleaning to put data into a uniform format for inclusion in the central database. To date, the evaluation team has received data on more than 22,000 worker contacts.

In addition, a Preliminary Analysis Plan Attachment 7 was created for the *Cost-Effectiveness Study* to provide early results by June 30, 2003. The cases included in the Preliminary Analysis will be all those for which six months have passed since enrollment by the data cut-off on March 31, 2003. For the *Cost-Effectiveness Study*, five questions will be addressed in this preliminary analysis:

1) What percentage of families refused services, what percentage used some services but for less than one month, and what percentage used services for more than one month? How do these percentages compare between the experimental and control groups? (All families eligible for inclusion in the preliminary analysis will have completed six weeks in the program well before December 31, 2002. Consequently, analysis for this question will begin in January, 2003.)

2) What was the average cost of a family conference in this experiment? (All families receive their family conferences very early in the intervention, generally within the first two weeks. Consequently, analysis for this question will also begin in January, 2003.)

3) Do the quantity of worker contacts vary between the groups? Do the quantity of worker visits vary between the groups?

4) How do the groups compare in their usage/attendance of/at select services (parenting classes, anger management classes, domestic violence classes, mental health counseling/therapy for parents and children)?

5) How do the costs of the above services received compare between groups?
The evaluation team is currently considering whether an earlier data cut-off (currently scheduled for March 31, 2003) may be needed in order to allow sufficient time for completion of data entry, transmission, cleaning, analysis and data reporting by June 30, 2003. While the questions proposed for the Preliminary Analysis Report do not provide a comprehensive picture of program costs, some significant cost issues will be examined, as well as some issues of interest regarding families’ participation in selected services and the level of contact they have received from workers.

Next steps for the Cost-Effectiveness Study include continuing to monitor data being collected through study specific databases maintained by Fresno County and continued work to incorporate data from additional sources to the Fresno Central Cost database. By the end of October, the evaluation team will pull complete data for at least one experimental and one control case and confer with caseworkers and other county personnel as needed to determine if current data collection methods are capturing all cost events. Strategies will be developed to ease cleaning of the worker contact data. By the beginning of 2003, work will begin to address questions (1) and (2) above, which should be answerable after December 31, 2002. By this time, all cases selected for the preliminary analysis will have completed sufficient time in the study to allow analysis of an initial 6-week service period. This time frame also allows sufficient time for the family conference to occur, as conferences typically are scheduled within the first 2 weeks following study enrollment. Some pre-programming for manipulating the data for question (3) will also be completed by March 31, 2003 to allow maximum time for the more complicated analysis work which will be required in late April 2003 and very early May 2003.
This report covers implementation progress for the period from April 1, 2002 to September 30, 2002.

Impact Study

During this project period, five counties were implementing the Wraparound IS sub-study: Alameda County, Humboldt County, Los Angeles County, Sacramento County, and San Luis Obispo County. Enrollment totals and enrollment patterns during this project period are shown in Attachment 8.

Sacramento County began implementing their Wraparound program in June 1999. At the end of this project period (August 31, 2002 for enrollment reporting purposes), 106 children are actively enrolled in the treatment group and 71 children are enrolled in the comparison group, with 31 closed cases in the treatment group and 10 closed cases in the comparison group. One hundred twenty children in the treatment group and 77 children in the comparison group are considered study children for the purpose of analysis (study children totals include closed cases). During this project period, 31 children enrolled in the study in Sacramento County, averaging approximately 6 enrollments per month. Foster care placement and child safety data, services data, and baseline behavioral data continued to be collected during this project period.

Alameda County also began implementing their Wraparound program in June 1999. At the end of this project period, 152 children are actively enrolled in the treatment group and 76 children are enrolled in the comparison group, with 19 closed cases in the treatment group and 9 closed cases in the comparison group. One hundred twenty-six children in the treatment group and 78 children in the comparison group are considered study children for the purpose of analysis. During this project period, 26 children enrolled in the study in Alameda County, averaging approximately 5 enrollments per month. Foster care placement and child safety data, services data, baseline behavioral data, child well-being data, and Wraparound model fidelity data continued to be collected during this project period.

Humboldt County began implementing their Wraparound program in June 2000. At the end of this project period, 9 children are actively enrolled in the treatment group and 2 children are enrolled in the comparison group, with 2 closed cases in the treatment group and 2 closed cases in the comparison group. Ten children in the treatment group and four children in the comparison group are considered study children for the purpose of analysis. During this project period, 3 children enrolled in the study in Humboldt County. Foster care placement and child safety data, services data, and baseline behavioral data continued to be collected during this project period.

San Luis Obispo County began implementing their Wraparound program in September 2000. At the end of this project period, 3 children are actively enrolled in the treatment group and 1 child is enrolled in the comparison group, with 4 closed cases in the treatment group and 2 closed cases in the comparison group. Seven children in the treatment group and 3 children in the comparison group are considered study children for the purpose of analysis. During this project period, 1 child enrolled in the study in San Luis Obispo County. Foster care placement and child
safety data, services data, and baseline behavioral data continued to be collected during this project period.

Los Angeles County began implementing their Wraparound program in December 2000. At the end of this project period, 60 children are actively enrolled in the treatment group and 33 children are enrolled in the comparison group, with 8 closed cases in the treatment group and 2 closed cases in the comparison group. Sixty-three children in the treatment group and 34 children in the comparison group are considered study children for the purpose of analysis. During this project period, 47 children enrolled in the study in Los Angeles County, averaging approximately 9 enrollments per month. Foster care placement and child safety data, services data, and baseline behavioral data continued to be collected during this project period.

A variety of activities were conducted during this project activity period to maintain the implementation of the evaluation and address issues affecting the Impact Study. These activities included (1) the continued implementation of data collection efforts; (2) preliminary planning and data preparation for data analyses activities; (3) the continued development and maintenance of a management information system; and (4) the provision of trainings and technical assistance to counties through on-site trainings, presentations, documents, phone calls, and email.

Data Collection

Wraparound data collection is comprised of six activities: Client Eligibility/Enrollment, Baseline Data, Services Tracking, In-depth Interviews, Wraparound Fidelity, and Administrative-level Data. A summary overview of each activity, including data collection responsibilities and start-date, by county is provided in Attachment 9. The activity for each data collection activity during this project period is discussed below.

Client Eligibility/Enrollment. Evaluation staff continued to work with counties as necessary (i.e., incomplete child enrollment forms) during this project period to secure the appropriate client identification numbers at the time of enrollment. Specific child identifiers are needed by the evaluation staff to access administrative-level data from the California Children’s Services Data Archive, as well as to track children during the course of the study.

The evaluation staff continued to provide assistance to counties during the enrollment process regarding eligibility for the study as it pertains to the evaluation. Evaluation staff continued to request notification and data on cases counties considered closed, through the use of the Closed Case Notification form, sent weekly to the counties. An enrollment reconciliation process continued during this project period to rectify any discrepancies between UCB and county enrollments. This process is ongoing and continues into the next project period.

Baseline Data. Baseline data collection continued during this project period in all counties. Alameda, Humboldt, and San Luis Obispo Counties continued to conduct baseline data collection internally, monitored by UCB evaluators. UCB evaluators assumed responsibility for collecting baseline data for children in the comparison groups in Los Angeles and Sacramento Counties due to the difficulty in collecting the data using internal county mechanisms. The private agencies providing Wraparound in those counties collect baseline data for children in the treatment groups.
Baseline data collection has been inconsistent across all of the counties (totals are based on the number of children eligible for a baseline measure—children ages 7 and older and enrolled between the start of baseline data collection in a particular county and August 31, 2002—and the number of CAFAS received by UCB evaluation staff). Attachment 10. Alameda County has collected 43 baseline measures from a possible 109 children. Humboldt County has collected 0 baseline measures from a possible 14 children. In Los Angeles County, 27 baseline measures have been collected for a possible 92 children. In Sacramento County, 72 baseline measures have been collected for a possible 100 children. San Luis Obispo County has collected 4 baseline measures from a possible 10 children.

Services Tracking. Services tracking data collection was developed in response to concerns about contamination—a condition that arises when both the treatment and comparison groups receive the same or similar intervention. Services received by children in the treatment and comparison groups continued to be tracked for one week each of the first three months a child is participating in the study, then again for one week of the sixth month of participation, and again for one week every subsequent six months until the child exits the study. Services continued to be tracked in all five Wraparound counties.

The evaluation staff continued to use a data collection infrastructure that includes a database for maintaining contacts and other information for the comparison group, and an automated services tracking report generation program. The program, on a weekly basis, notifies counties of subsequent, current, and past tracking requirements. At the end of this project period, three UCB staff members are responsible for services tracking data collection activities.

In Alameda, Los Angeles Counties, and Sacramento counties information on services received by children in the treatment group continued to be tracked by the private agencies providing Wraparound to those children. UCB evaluation staff tracked the services received by children in the comparison group. Evaluation staff and representatives from the counties continued to operate under the following procedures: (1) UCB informs private providers on a weekly basis of which children need to be tracked, (2) UCB receives case worker information for comparison group children from the enrollment documents or by phone from county representatives, (3) county representatives notify caseworkers of comparison group children that evaluation staff will be contacting them for data collection, and (4) UCB asks the caseworkers to make initial contact with the placement agencies affiliated with comparison group children.

Services data collection continued to be handled internally in Humboldt County and San Luis Obispo County during this evaluation period, with the counties relying on UCB for scheduling notifications.

As of August 31, 2002, 1549 service weeks had been tracked and entered into the services tracking database Attachment 11. This is a combined total that includes the treatment and comparison groups in all counties. Children may have been tracked more than once depending on their length of time in the study. Alameda County children had 775 service weeks tracked. Humboldt County children had 63 service weeks tracked. Los Angeles County children had 171 service weeks tracked. Sacramento County children had 500 service weeks tracked. San Luis Obispo County children had 112 service weeks tracked.

1 The March 31, 2002, Progress Report included in the totals CAFAS that county representatives indicated they had collected. The current report includes only CAFAS received by UCB staff from county representatives. Repeated efforts have been made by UCB staff to ensure CAFAS collection and transmission by county representatives.
Obispo children had 40 service weeks tracked. The disparity between counties in service weeks tracked is due to the number of children in the study, children’s length of time in the study, and the county’s start date of services tracking data collection.

In-Depth Interviews. Data collection in Alameda County during this project period has progressed smoothly. Attachment 12 shows the cumulative interview activity. During this period, a designated staff member was hired for scheduling all in-depth interviews and one UCB staff member continues to be responsible for conducting the interviews. By the end of this reporting period, 80 caregivers and 49 children had been interviewed for baseline (first) interviews. Another 25 caregivers and 14 children had been interviewed for follow up data. Thirty more interviews are scheduled for completion by 9/30/02 (with a two month window for completion as per the study protocol).

During this reporting period, a total of eight interviews had been “missed” or not completed. Two baseline interviews were missed due to group home staff canceling scheduled appointments, and by the time the interviews could be rescheduled the baseline interviews were past due. As a result, scheduling staff were instructed to notify the Wrap Coordinator and/or Principal Investigator if this occurred in the future, so that managers could notify county coordinators. The remaining six interviews could not be scheduled due to either an inability to reach caregivers or youth, or reluctance of a caregiver to participate.

Wraparound Fidelity. Fidelity to the Wraparound model, as defined by Goldman (1999) and SB 163, is being assessed using the parent/caregiver questionnaire of the Wraparound Fidelity Index (WFI). The WFI is also being used to help assess the differences in service receipt between the treatment and comparison groups. The WFI questionnaire is administered by UCB staff via telephone with a parent/caregiver after the family has been enrolled in the evaluation study for approximately nine months. UCB staff began WFI data collection in July 2001, in Alameda County with a cohort of families who entered the evaluation study in September 2000. UCB evaluation staff continued to conduct interviews with caregivers of children in the treatment (caregivers participating on child and family teams) and comparison groups Attachment 13. As of August 31, 2002, 58 of a possible 78 interviews have been conducted. In the treatment group, 37 of a possible 49 interviews were conducted, while in the comparison group, 21 of a possible 29 interviews were conducted. Twenty interviews could not be conducted for several reasons, including prolonged difficulty in reaching respondents, or children no longer actively enrolled in the study.

Administrative-level Data. Administrative-level child welfare services data serve as the source of foster care placement and child safety outcome measures for the evaluation study. Counties continued to collect the administrative-level data that will be used in the evaluation analysis through the use of the Child Welfare Services/Case Management System (CWS/CMS). Evaluation staff continued discussions regarding data merge activities between California Children’s Services Data Archive data and enrollment, baseline, and services tracking data.

---

Data Analysis

UCB evaluation staff began preliminary preparations for analyses to be conducted as part of a provisional report scheduled for completion in June 2003, and as part of the final evaluation report due in March 2004. Activities included the development of research questions and a timeline to guide subsequent analysis activities. The Evaluation Information System staff began the construction of an analysis data set integrating data from enrollment spreadsheets and supplementary databases with data from the California Children’s Services Archive.

Evaluation Information System (EIS)

EIS activities during this project period focused on four areas: (1) the continued development of an integrated data collection and management system for Wraparound, (2) supporting current data collection and data management efforts, (3) providing technical support and training, and (4) developing technical capacity.

The continued development of an integrated data collection and management system focused primarily on the development of database tracking mechanisms and financial reports to monitor the interview participation reimbursement account. EIS staff also developed the CAFAS database. EIS staff made modifications to the enrollment database to accommodate county changes, as well as modifications to the services tracking database to facilitate the analysis process. UCB evaluation staff received on-going training and technical support in the use of existing data collection and data management tools from EIS staff. Finally, EIS staff developed and maintained the technical capacity of the EIS by installing needed hardware and software and updating the existing programs.

Trainings and Technical Assistance

County Specific Trainings. Two trainings were conducted during this reporting period, both in Los Angeles County. The first training took place on June 19, 2002, and reviewed services tracking and baseline (CAFAS) data collection. The second training took place on September 10, 2002, and focused on services tracking data collecting. Both trainings were necessitated by the introduction of several new Wraparound provider agencies in Los Angeles.

Informal and Formal Technical Assistance. Technical assistance continued to be provided throughout this project period. UCB evaluation staff were contacted and subsequently responded to inquiries from participating counties, private providers, and CDSS via phone, fax, email, and meetings regarding all aspects of the evaluation.

UCB evaluation staff provided more formal technical assistance to the Title IV-E Waiver Extension Workgroup by providing information on the viability and strength of alternative evaluation research designs. Extension Workgroup meetings took place, and were attended by UCB evaluation staff, on May 8, and July 18, 2002.

Process Study

Preparations began, during this reporting period, for the final set of process study site visits. Additional questions were developed, after reviewing previous process study reports, to elicit
aspects of the counties’ implementation experience that may not have been identified in previous process studies. Letters notifying county liaisons of the impending site visits were sent and followed by phone calls to begin the process of scheduling site visits to take place during the first several months of the next reporting period.

Cost-Benefit Study

During this project period, work on cost-benefit has been focused on the Family Conferencing components. A cost-benefit study will not be conducted in any of the Wraparound counties.

Evaluation Activities During the Next Period

Many of the evaluation activities that began during this project period will be continued during the next project period.

Impact Study data collection activities will continue during the next project period. Data analyses plans and activities will continue during the next project period, with a focus on analyses to be conducted for a June 2003 provisional report. The EIS will continue to evolve as data management needs dictate. UCB evaluation staff will continue to provide trainings and technical assistance to counties, private providers, and the CDSS.

The process study site visits and the data analysis will take place during the next reporting period. The completion of the final process study report will coincide with the completion of the next progress report due March 31, 2003.
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## Fresno County: Family Conferencing Summary

From: April 1, 2002  
To: August 31, 2002

### IV-E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Activity 04/01/02 to 08/31/02</th>
<th>Cumulative Total at 08/31/02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Open</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Closed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling Open</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling Closed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Sibling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Participants Open</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Participants Closed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total (IV-E and State)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Activity 04/01/02 to 08/31/02</th>
<th>Cumulative Total at 08/31/02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Open</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Closed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling Open</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling Closed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Sibling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Participants Open</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Participants Closed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Refusals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IV-E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 04/01/02 to 08/31/02</th>
<th>Cumulative Total at 08/31/02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Open</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Closed</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Study Participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling Open</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling Closed</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Sibling Participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Participants Open</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Participants Closed</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total (IV-E and State)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 04/01/02 to 08/31/02</th>
<th>Cumulative Total at 08/31/02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Open</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Closed</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Study Participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling Open</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling Closed</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Sibling Participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Participants Open</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Participants Closed</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Refusals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Family Conferencing Power Analysis

Analysis: Proportions

one-tailed z-statistic
\( \alpha = .05 \)
\( \beta = .2 \)
Power (1-\( \beta \))=.8

Riverside County
What percentage of children will have achieved permanency by 12 months?

(Percentages in the kinship and non-kinship example are based on conversations with Riverside County. The example illustrates the change in sample size due to a change in percentages and effect size.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>kinship placement</th>
<th>non-Kinship placement</th>
<th>example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exp: 49%</td>
<td>Exp: 54%</td>
<td>Exp: 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp: 44%</td>
<td>Comp: 49%</td>
<td>Comp: 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff: .05</td>
<td>Diff: .05</td>
<td>Diff: .2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 1231/1231=2462</td>
<td>Table 1231/1231=2462</td>
<td>Table 73/73=146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 2050/1231=3281</td>
<td>N 2050/1231=3281</td>
<td>N 120/73=193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fresno County
What percentage of children will be placed in foster care by 12 months?

(Percentages and effect size in the first example were calculated by averaging the findings from three family preservation evaluations that conducted random assignment. The two other examples illustrate the change in sample size due to a change in percentages and effect size.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>family pres studies</th>
<th>example</th>
<th>example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exp: 28%</td>
<td>Exp: 30%</td>
<td>Exp: 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp: 39%</td>
<td>Comp: 45%</td>
<td>Comp: 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff: .11</td>
<td>Diff: .15</td>
<td>Diff: .2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 280/280=560</td>
<td>Table 128/128=256</td>
<td>Table 64/64=128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 465/280=745</td>
<td>N 210/128=338</td>
<td>N 107/64=171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fresno County
What percentage of children who will have at least one maltreatment referral since entering the study?

(The county has predicted percentages based on a review of 22 Family Conferencing cases [11 in each of the two groups]: 3 experimental and 5 comparison children had subsequent maltreatment referrals.)

Exp: 20%
Comp: 35%
Diff: .15
Table 108/108=216
N 180/108=288
California’s Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Project Evaluation: Assessing Model Fidelity in Family Group Decision Making

Karen L. Thomas, M.S.W.
Pamela Choice, Ph.D.
Center for Social Services Research
UC Berkeley School of Social Welfare

PRESENTATION OVERVIEW

- Model Fidelity
  - What is it?
  - Why do it?
- Existing FGDM model fidelity assessment efforts
- Overview of Waiver Evaluation
- Development of model fidelity assessment instruments for the Waiver
- Early model fidelity results
- Discussion and Conclusions

What does model fidelity mean?

- The extent to which program implementation proceeds in a manner consistent with the previously defined service model it intends to replicate

Program as planned
Program as implemented

AHA FGDM Roundtable - June 2-5, 2002
Research Benefits

- Defines
  - Model components
  - Program variations
- Discriminates from traditional practice
- Links process with outcome
- May clarify essential features

Current Approaches

- Lupton (1998)
  - Extent to which FGC empowers families
    - Family allowed control over process and outcome?
    - Conference observations, key informant interviews and questionnaires
- Vesneski & Kemp (2000)
  - Qualitative analysis of conference plans
    - Family-centered practice?
    - Strengths-based practice?
- Pennell (2001)
  - Defined FGC principles and practices to be used to assess model fidelity
THE WAIVER TESTS
A CENTRAL HYPOTHESIS

The flexible use of IV-E dollars will allow the implementation of "innovative" service delivery models that are:

- At least as effective as traditional child welfare services
- No more expensive than traditional child welfare services

THE EVALUATION CONSISTS OF FOUR SUBSTUDIES

1. Wrap-Around
2. Family Conferencing
3. Community Mentoring
4. Shared Family Care

Will the opportunity to utilize IV-E funds flexibly, to provide...

- Result in better outcomes for children & families?
- Ensure a more satisfactory process?
- Mobilize community supports?
- Achieve cost neutrality?
3 Interrelated Studies
Impact (Outcome) Study
Experimental Design

Process Study
Waiver Evaluation
Cost Study

WHY RANDOM ASSIGNMENT?

"I think you should be more explicit here in step two."

THE IMPACT STUDY LOOKS AT OUTCOMES

Child Outcomes
- Safety
- Placement type & level
- Permanence
- Well-being
- Client satisfaction

Family Outcomes
- Caregiver well-being
- Family functioning
- Use of informal supports
- Client satisfaction

Administrative Data
In-depth Interviews
Conference-Specific Data
THE PROCESS STUDY PROVIDES CONTEXT

OUTCOMES
- Organizational Structure
- Service Aspects
- Economic Factors
- Political Climate
- Consortium
- Focus groups
- Site visits
- Observation
- Interviews
- Questionnaires

THE COST STUDY

- Cost Neutrality
  - (California Department of Social Services)

- Cost Effectiveness
  - (University of California at Berkeley)

2 COUNTIES ARE PARTICIPATING

- Children maintained in-home, placement prevention
- Children in foster care, placement stability and permanence
Timelines

- **Fresno**
  - Family conference within 2-3 weeks
  - Plans re-evaluated at 90 days
  - Service provision <= 6 months

- **Riverside**
  - Family conference within 2 months
  - Follow-up conferences at 4, 6, 9 months from program entry.
  - Children exit program when case is closed to the court and agency

Enrollment Status
(as of 5/20/02)

- **Fresno**
  - 129 children total
  - 47 “study children”
    - 30 experimental
    - 17 control
  - 82 siblings
    - 52 experimental
    - 30 control
  - 66 closed cases

- **Riverside**
  - 101 children total
  - 43 “study children”
    - 29 experimental
    - 14 control
  - 58 siblings
    - 40 experimental
    - 18 control
  - 19 closed cases

2 UNIQUE CONTRIBUTIONS

- Experimental Design
- Model Fidelity Assessment
Developing instruments for the Waiver

- Step 1: What does the literature say?
- Step 2: Define research questions
- Step 3: Operationalize

Dimensions of FGDM

- Philosophies
- Goals
- Structure

Underlying Philosophies

- Families have the most complete information about themselves in order to make well-informed decisions
- Children have the right to safety, knowledge of their familial and cultural heritage and a voice in decisions that affect them
- The long-term protection and welfare of children are best served through collaboration between families and community and agency support systems
Goals of FGDM

- Recognize and respect families, their communities and their cultures
- Include children in the decision-making process
- Increase family support and mobilize extended family and community resources

Structural Components

- Referral
- Preparation and planning
- FGDM meeting
- Follow-up and event planning

2 Major Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Group Conferencing</th>
<th>Family Unity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Private family time</td>
<td>• Formal strengths assessment phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No formal strengths assessment phase</td>
<td>• No private family time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blended Models
County Models

- Fresno
  - Blended Approach
    - Formal strengths assessment phase
    - Private family meeting time

- Riverside
  - Family Unity
    - Formal strengths assessment phase
    - Family plans are developed and approved by all conference participants

Step 1→2

Philosophy:
Families have the most complete information about themselves to make well-informed decisions

Are family members allowed at least as much say as professionals in formulating the conference plan?

Step 2→3

Are family members allowed at least as much say as professionals in formulating the conference plan?

Who do you think had the most say in the plan?
- The family?
- The professionals?
- Family and professionals had equal say?
Step 1→2

**Goal:** Recognize and respect families, their communities and their cultures

Do family members indicate that efforts were made to adapt the meeting process to fit their needs and preferences for:
- Scheduling?
- Location?
- Language?

Step 2→3

Do family members indicate that efforts were made to adapt the meeting process to fit their needs and preferences for:
- Scheduling?
- Location?
- Language?

✓ Was the location, date and time convenient?
✓ Was the conference conducted in a language you understand?

Step 1→2

**Structure:**
- Family Group Conferencing vs.
- Family Unity vs.
- Blended Model

Does the conference structure include Private Family Time?

Are family strengths a focus of the conference discussion?
Step 2→3

- Does the conference structure include Private Family Time?

- Are family strengths a focus of the conference discussion?

Did the conference include Private Family Time during which:
- The family meets in private?
- Non family members attend only if invited?

Which topics were addressed?
- Family strengths
- Family pride

3 Sets of Tools

- Family Conference Surveys
- Follow-Up Survey
- Direct Observation Framework

Conference Surveys

- Participant perspectives essential
  - family-centered
  - community-based
  - collaboration

- Geographic distance
- Role differences
- Administered immediately following the conference
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Follow-up Survey

- Plan implementation
- Influence on outcomes
- Supplement face interview data
- Mailed 6-months following the conference

Observation Framework

- Intermittent administration
- Supplement and enrich survey data
- Parallel items on conference survey
- Coding by neutral observer

Conference participant survey results

- Data collection: April-01 - April-02
- Fresno: 108 surveys; 17 cases
  Riverside: 36 surveys; 7 cases
- Per conference:
  - 1-11 surveys
  - Average of 6
Structural aspects

- Preparation and planning
  - 95% - Purpose of conference was explained
  - 93% - Reason for participant's presence explained
- Information sharing
  - 95% - Got the information needed to participate
- Plan finalization
  - 98% - How the child would be cared for was clear

Conference model

FGC vs. FUM vs. Blended

- Private Family Time - 76%
  - 89% Strengths addressed: Blended Model
  - 11% Strengths not indicated: FGC Model
- No Private Family Time - 18%
  - 35% Strengths addressed: Family Unity Model
  - 65% Strengths not indicated: Facilitated discussion
Respect for Families, Communities and Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family members:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98% Location easy to travel to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97% Convenient time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98% Understood language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% All important participants included</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98% Felt respected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The long-term protection and welfare of children are best served through collaboration between families and community and agency support systems...

Conference Composition

- 70% family
- 13% community
- 11% other
- 6% friends

- Most conferences were attended by family and community members
Indicators of Collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Private Time</th>
<th>No Private Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Say what I wanted</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion dominated</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt unsafe</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with plan</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference format helpful</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Families have the most complete information about themselves to make well-informed decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Private Time</th>
<th>No Private Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professionals invited to attend Private Family Time?</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family had the most say</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and professionals had equal say</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mobilization of Family and Community Support + Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion, planning addressed:</th>
<th>Private Time</th>
<th>No Private Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family talking about problems</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family responsibility</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More family support</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More community support</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Early Results

- Respondents indicate fidelity to structural components
- Families appear to be highly satisfied with FGDM
- FGDM seems to embrace a high level of collaboration among families and professionals
- FGDM increases the role of families in plans for caring for children

Instrument plusses

- Pilot tested
- Strong face validity
- Easily administered on a broad scale
- Research representatives need not be present

+ + + + +

- Inclusive of all participants
- Longitudinal perspective
- Supplemental observational data
- Fine tune to fit a specific program
Instrument drawbacks

- Administration displaced on the conference facilitator or agency staff
- Literacy assumptions
- More testing needed

Opportunities

- Highlight differences between service innovations and traditional practice
- Facilitate replications
- Increase confidence in conclusions
- Policy Advocacy

Conclusions

- Model fidelity assessment ensures that implementation remains consistent with FGDM ideals
- Must reach beyond structural aspects
- Assessing family perspectives is crucial
- Future research is needed to discern which aspects of the FGDM models best serve families and achieve desired results
Questions and Answers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FGDM Dimensions</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Sample Instrument Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philosophies</td>
<td>Are family members allowed at least as much say as professionals in formulating the conference plan?</td>
<td>Who do you think had the most say in the plan? (check one)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Families have the most complete information about themselves to make well-informed decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>The family had the most say</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>The professionals had the most say</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>The family and the professionals had equal say</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the conference include participants representing the family, community and child welfare agency?</td>
<td>Log of conference participants’ relationships to the target child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The long-term protection and welfare of children are best served through collaboration between families and community and agency support systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td>During the discussion, did you have a chance to say the things you wanted to? Yes __ No __</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Did any person(s) seem to dominate the decision making process? Yes __ No __</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Were the family and professionals able to agree on a plan? Yes __ No __</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Do family members attending the conference indicate that efforts were made to adapt the meeting process to fit their needs and preferences, including such issues as the scheduling and location of the conference and the language in which the conference is conducted?</td>
<td>Was the location of the conference easy to travel to? Yes __ No __</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Recognize and respect families, their communities, and their cultures.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Was the date of the conference convenient for you? Yes __ No __</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Was the time of the conference convenient for you? Yes __ No __</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Was the conference conducted in a language you understand? Yes __ No __</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the participant group include individuals deemed essential to the decision making process by the family?</td>
<td>Do you think all the people who needed to be included in the decision making process for this family attended the conference? Yes __ No __</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are the roles of family members in addressing the current concerns explored during the conference discussion and planning?</td>
<td>Which topics were addressed as part of the conference discussion and planning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Increase family support and mobilize extended family and community resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Family talking about problems</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Responsibility taken by family</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>More support from family members</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are the roles of community supports in addressing the current concerns explored during the conference discussion and planning?</td>
<td>Which topics were addressed as part of the conference discussion and planning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>More support from people in the community</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Does the conference structure include Private Family Time?</td>
<td>Did the conference include private family time during which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Family Group Conferencing Model vs. Family Unity Model vs. Blended Model</td>
<td></td>
<td>_The family meets in private to discuss the plan for the child?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_Non-family members attend the private family time only if invited to do so by the family?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are family strengths a focus of the conference discussion?</td>
<td>Which topics were addressed as part of the conference discussion and planning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Family strengths</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Family pride</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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California Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Project
Intensive Services - Family Conferencing Component

CONSENT FORM

I have read the attached letter and agree to participate, and to allow my child to participate, in the University of California at Berkeley study on families’ experiences with child and family services in Fresno County. I understand that I will be assigned to a group that either receives services funded through the demonstration project or does not receive services funded through the demonstration project. If I am assigned to the group that receives services funded through the demonstration project, I agree to allow the researchers at the University of California at Berkeley to receive a copy of the demonstration project service plan created for my child and me. If I am assigned to the group that does not receive services funded through the demonstration project, I understand that I cannot receive these services from the Fresno County Department of Health and Human Services or Probation Department for four years (the duration of the study). I understand that participation is entirely voluntary and that my child and I are free to discontinue participation at any time. I also understand that there is a chance that we will be asked to participate in interviews. If asked, I agree to participate, and to have my child participate in these interviews. I understand that there will be no identifying information contained in any results of this study, and my family’s confidentiality will be protected to the full extent under the law. If I am interviewed, I expect to be paid $15 for each in-person interview and $10 for each telephone interview. I also expect that my child will receive a gift certificate worth $15 to a local store each time she/he is interviewed in person. I also know that neither my child nor I have to answer every question or complete every interview in order to be compensated for what has already been completed.

____________________________________ ____________________________________
Caregiver signature     Print name

____________________________________ ____________________________________
Relationship to Child     Today’s date

____________________________________ ____________________________________
Home telephone number    Work telephone number

____________________________________ ____________________________________
Child’s/Youth’s signature    Print child’s/youth’s name
INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY

TITLE: California Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Project

CO-INVESTIGATORS: Jill Duerr Berrick, M.S.W., Ph.D.; Ed Cohen, M.S.W., Ph.D.

SPONSOR: Center for Social Services Research, University of California, Berkeley.

PURPOSE: To conduct a five-year study to determine the benefits of services that are provided to children and their families. This will be done by comparing two groups of families involved in this study. One group of families will receive the regular services offered to all families and the second group of families will receive services funded through the demonstration project.

PROCEDURE: The Fresno County Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) or the Probation Department will make an initial evaluation of the possible children, families and/or caretakers who would qualify for this research study. Those selected will be assigned to either a group that receives the regular services that all families receive (this is called the control group) or the group that receives the services funded through the demonstration project (this is called the experimental group). If you are placed in the experimental group, the County will be able to use flexible funds to deliver a variety of services not previously available. If you are placed in the control group, you will continue to be able to use a range of services currently provided by the County.

How individuals are selected for the groups is by using a procedure called "random assignment." This means that the individuals will be selected by chance, almost like flipping a coin. This helps prevent any personal feelings influencing who gets assigned to a group. We also cannot predict what group individuals will be assigned to. We do want to give as many families as possible the opportunity to try the new services and therefore, there is a 62.5% chance of being assigned to the experimental group and a 37.5% chance of being assigned to the control group. In other word, the odds are in your favor. However, we can't predict which group individuals will be assigned, so you still have to be willing to take a chance.
If you are placed in the experimental group, staff from the evaluation team will request a copy of the demonstration project service plan created for your family.

Some of the families assigned to both groups will be interviewed by staff from the evaluation team to ask questions about how the services being provided affected their families. The researchers may also want to talk with the child or youth about their own experiences if they are between the ages of 7 and 17. If you are chosen to be interviewed, we will want to talk with you in person or over the phone 3 to 4 times. This will happen about every twelve months. Each interview will last between 30 minutes and an hour. Each interview with your child will last about 30 minutes. If we talk to you in person, the interview will occur in a place that is most convenient for you and your family. In the interviews, we will ask questions about services and support that you received, your physical and mental well-being, your neighborhood, and your family life.

If you agree to participate in this study, please sign this consent form. If your child is able, we also ask that he/she read and sign the consent form. For children under the supervision of the Juvenile Court, court permission to participate in the study will also be obtained.

**RISKS:** There are no expected risks. If any questions cause psychological discomfort you may choose not to answer the question or ask the interview to stop. If the psychological discomfort becomes overwhelming, referrals will be offered to you to help you with the discomfort.

**BENEFITS:** There is no direct benefit to those assigned to the control group. For those assigned to the experimental group, you may benefit from the extra services. The information obtained from this study may benefit society at large.

**COST/COMPENSATION:** There is no cost to you. For those selected for interviews, you will be paid $15 for each home visit and $10 for each telephone interview. Your child, if interviewed, will receive a gift certificate to a local store worth $15 for each in-person interview. Neither you nor your child need to answer every question or complete every interview in order to be paid for what has already been completed.

**CONFIDENTIALITY:** All information, which identifies you or your child, collected in this study will be entirely confidential and will not influence the services you receive from Fresno County DHHS or the Probation Department. The results of this study may be summarized at scientific meetings and your name/identity will not be revealed. No published materials that result from this study will ever contain identifying information about you or anyone else in your family. Your confidentiality will be protected in-so-far as the law allows. The exception to the protection of confidentiality is if the following information is presented:

1. Suspected abuse or neglect of an adult or child.
2. A person is a danger to self or others or is gravely disabled and unable to care for herself/himself.
If any of the above situations are presented in the interviews, we must contact the Fresno County DHHS or other appropriate agency.

**ALTERNATIVES/RIGHT TO REFUSE OR WITHDRAW:** Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary and you have a right to quit at any time even after agreeing to participate in this study. If you do not participate or quit participation in this study, this will not negatively influence the regular services that you receive from DHHS, the Probation Department or the Juvenile Court. If you are assigned to the group that does not receive the extra services, you cannot receive these extra services from the Fresno County Department of Health and Human Services or the Probation Department for four years (the duration of the study). If you quit the study after participation your child may not be able to continue to receive the extra services if she/he is in the experimental group.

**QUESTIONS:** If you have questions or want to find out more information about this study, you can place a collect call to Jill Duerr Berrick at (510) 642-1899. If you have any questions about your rights or treatment as a participant in this research project, please contact the University of California at Berkeley’s Committee for Protection of Human Subjects at (510) 642-7461, or e-mail subjects@uclink4.berkeley.edu.

Sincerely,

Jill Duerr Berrick
Co-Principal Investigator
Title IV-E Waiver Demonstration Evaluation Project

Ed Cohen
Co-Principal Investigator
Title IV-E Waiver Demonstration Evaluation Project
California Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Project  
Intensive Services - Family Conferencing Component

CONSENT FORM

I have read the attached letter and agree to participate, and to allow my child to participate, in the University of California at Berkeley study on families’ experiences with child and family services in Riverside County. I understand that I will be assigned to a group that either receives services funded through the demonstration project or does not receive services funded through the demonstration project. If I am assigned to the group that receives services funded through the demonstration project, I agree to allow the researchers at the University of California at Berkeley to receive a copy of the demonstration project service plan created for my child and me. If I am assigned to the group that does not receive services funded through the demonstration project, I understand that I cannot receive these services from the Riverside County Department of Health and Human Services of Probation Department for four years (the duration of the study). I understand that participation is entirely voluntary and that my child and I are free to discontinue participation at any time. I also understand that there is a chance that we will be asked to participate in interviews. If asked, I agree to participate, and to have my child participate in these interviews. I understand that there will be no identifying information contained in any results of this study, and my family’s confidentiality will be protected to the full extent under the law. If I am interviewed, I expect to be paid $15 for each in-person interview and $10 for each telephone interview. I also expect that my child will receive a gift certificate worth $15 to a local store each time she/he is interviewed in person. I also know that neither my child nor I have to answer every question or complete every interview in order to be compensated for what has already been completed.

______________________________  ______________________________
Caregiver signature     Print name

______________________________  ______________________________
Relationship to Child     Today’s date

______________________________  ______________________________
Home telephone number    Work telephone number

______________________________  ______________________________
Child’s/Youth’s signature    Print child’s/youth’s name
INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY

TITLE: California Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Project

CO-INVESTIGATORS: Jill Duerr Berrick, M.S.W., Ph.D.; Ed Cohen, M.S.W., Ph.D.

SPONSOR: Center for Social Services Research, University of California, Berkeley.

PURPOSE: To conduct a five-year study to determine the benefits of services that are provided to children and their families. This will be done by comparing two groups of families involved in this study. One group of families will receive the regular services offered to all families and the second group of families will receive services funded through the demonstration project.

PROCEDURE: The Riverside County Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) or the Probation Department will make an initial evaluation of the possible children, families and/or caretakers who would qualify for this research study. Those selected will be assigned to either a group that receives the regular services that all families receive (this is called the control group) or the group that receives the services funded through the demonstration project (this is called the experimental group). If you are placed in the experimental group, the County will be able to use flexible funds to deliver a variety of services not previously available. If you are placed in the control group, you will continue to be able to use a range of services currently provided by the County.

How individuals are selected for the groups is by using a procedure called "random assignment." This means that the individuals will be selected by chance, almost like flipping a coin. This helps prevent any personal feelings influencing who gets assigned to a group. We also cannot predict what group individuals will be assigned to. We do want to give as many families as possible the opportunity to try the new services and therefore, there is a 62.5% chance of being assigned to the experimental group and a 37.5% chance of being assigned to the control group. In other word, the odds are in your favor. However, we can't predict which group individuals will be assigned, so you still have to be willing to take a chance.

If you are placed in the experimental group, staff from the evaluation team will request a copy of the demonstration project service plan created for your family.
Some of the families assigned to both groups will be interviewed by staff from the evaluation team to ask questions about how the services being provided affected their families. The researchers may also want to talk with the child or youth about their own experiences if they are between the ages of 7 and 17. If you are chosen to be interviewed, we will want to talk with you in person or over the phone 3 to 4 times. This will happen about every twelve months. Each interview will last between 30 minutes and an hour. Each interview with your child will last about 30 minutes. If we talk to you in person, the interview will occur in a place that is most convenient for you and your family. In the interviews, we will ask questions about services and support that you received, your physical and mental well-being, your neighborhood, and your family life.

If you agree to participate in this study, please sign this consent form. If your child is able, we also ask that he/she read and sign the consent form. For children under the supervision of the Juvenile Court, court permission to participate in the study will also be obtained.

**RISKS:** There are no expected risks. If any questions cause psychological discomfort you may choose not to answer the question or ask the interview to stop. If the psychological discomfort becomes overwhelming, referrals will be offered to you to help you with the discomfort.

**BENEFITS:** There is no direct benefit to those assigned to the control group. For those assigned to the experimental group, you may benefit from the extra services. The information obtained from this study may benefit society at large.

**COST/COMPENSATION:** There is no cost to you. For those selected for interviews, you will be paid $15 for each home visit and $10 for each telephone interview. Your child, if interviewed, will receive a gift certificate to a local store worth $15 for each in-person interview. Neither you nor your child need to answer every question or complete every interview in order to be paid for what has already been completed.

**CONFIDENTIALITY:** All information, which identifies you or your child, collected in this study will be entirely confidential and will not influence the services you receive from Riverside County DHHS or the Probation Department. The results of this study may be summarized at scientific meetings and your name/identity will not be revealed. No published materials that result from this study will ever contain identifying information about you or anyone else in your family. Your confidentiality will be protected in-so-far as the law allows. The exception to the protection of confidentiality is if the following information is presented:

1. Suspected abuse or neglect of an adult or child.
2. A person is a danger to self or others or is gravely disabled and unable to care for herself/himself.

If any of the above situations are presented in the interviews, we must contact the Riverside County DHHS or other appropriate agency.
ALTERNATIVES/RIGHT TO REFUSE OR WITHDRAW:  Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary and you have a right to quit at any time even after agreeing to participate in this study. If you do not participate or quit participation in this study, this will not negatively influence the regular services that you receive from DHHS, the Probation Department or the Juvenile Court. If you are assigned to the group that does not receive the extra services, you cannot receive these extra services from the Riverside County Department of Health and Human Services or the Probation Department for four years (the duration of the study). If you quit the study after participation your child may not be able to continue to receive the extra services if she/he is in the experimental group.

QUESTIONS:  If you have questions or want to find out more information about this study, you can place a collect call to Jill Duerr Berrick at (510) 642-1899.  If you have any questions about your rights or treatment as a participant in this research project, please contact the University of California at Berkeley’s Committee for Protection of Human Subjects at (510) 642-7461, or e-mail subjects@uclink4.berkeley.edu.

Sincerely,

Jill Duerr Berrick      Ed Cohen
Co-Principal Investigator  Co-Principal Investigator
Title IV-E Waiver Demonstration  Title IV-E Waiver Demonstration
Evaluation Project            Evaluation Project
Proyecto de Demostración y Dispensa del Bienestar del Niño
Título IV-E de California
Componente de Conferencia Familiar

FORMA DE CONSENTIMIENTO

He leído la carta adjunta y estoy de acuerdo en participar, y dejar que mi hijo/a participe, en el estudio de la Universidad de California en Berkeley sobre las experiencias de las familias con los servicios de niños y familias en el Condado de Fresno. Comprendo que seré asignado/a a un grupo que ya sea reciba servicios pagados por el proyecto de demostración o que no recibe servicios pagados por el proyecto de demostración. Si estoy asignado(a) al grupo que recibirá servicios patrocinados por el proyecto de demostración, estoy de acuerdo a permitir que los investigadores de la Universidad de California en Berkeley reciban una copia del plan de servicio del proyecto de demostración creado para mi hijo(a) y para mi. Si soy asignado/a al grupo que no recibe los servicios pagados por el proyecto de demostración, yo comprendo que no puedo recibir estos servicios del Condado de Fresno, del Departamento de Servicios Sociales o del Departamento de Probación por cuatro años (la duración de este estudio). Comprendo que la participación es completamente voluntaria y que mi hijo/a y yo somos libres de descontinuar la participación en cualquier momento. También entiendo que hay una posibilidad de que se nos pida que participemos en entrevistas. Si me lo piden, yo estoy de acuerdo en participar, y permitir que mi hijo/a participe en estas entrevistas. Comprendo que no habrá información que nos identifique contenida en cualquiera de los resultados de este estudio, y que la confidencialidad de mi familia será protegida en toda su extensión bajo la ley. De ser entrevistado/a, anticipó que se me pague $15 por cada entrevista en persona y $10 por cada entrevista telefónica. También anticipó que mi hijo/a recibirá un certificado de regalo por un valor de $15 para una tienda local cada vez que el/ella sea entrevistado/a en persona y un certificado de regalo por un valor de $10 para una tienda local cada vez que el/ella sea entrevistado/a por teléfono. También sé que ni mi hijo ni yo tenemos que contestar cada pregunta o completar cada entrevista para poder ser compensados por lo que ya ha sido completado.

__________________________   _____________________________
Firma del proveedor del cuidado   Nombre en letra de molde

__________________________   _____________________________
Relación con el Niño/a    Fecha de hoy

__________________________   _____________________________
Teléfono de la casa    Teléfono del trabajo

__________________________   _____________________________
Firma del niño/a o del/la joven   Nombre del niño/a o del/la joven en letra de molde
INVITACION PARA PARTICIPAR EN UN ESTUDIO DE INVESTIGACION

TITULO: Proyecto de Demostración y Dispensa del Bienestar del Niño Título IV-E de California.

INVESTIGADORES: Jill Duerr Berrick, M.S.W., Ph.D. y Ed Cohen, Ph.D.

PATROCINADOR: Centro de Investigación para Servicios Sociales de la Universidad de California, Berkeley.

PROPOSITO: Conducir un estudio de cinco años para determinar los beneficios de los servicios que son proveídos a los niños y sus familias. Esto será hecho comparando dos grupos de familias envueltas en este estudio. Un grupo de familias recibirá servicios regulares ofrecidos a todas las familias y el segundo grupo de familias recibirá servicios pagados por el proyecto de demostración.

PROCEDIMIENTO: El Departamento de Salud y Servicios Humanos (DHSS) del Condado de Fresno o el Departamento de Probación harán una evaluación inicial de los posibles niños, familias y/o proveedores del cuidado que califiquen para este estudio de investigación. Los que sean seleccionados serán asignados ya sea a un grupo que reciba los servicios regulares que todas las familias reciben, (esto se llama el grupo de control) o el grupo que recibe los servicios pagados por el proyecto de demostración (esto se llama el grupo experimental). Si usted es colocado/a en el grupo experimental, el Condado podrá usar fondos flexibles para dar una variedad de servicios no disponibles anteriormente. Si usted es colocado/a en el grupo de control, usted continuará siendo capaz de usar una variedad de servicios actualmente proveídos por el Condado.

La manera como los individuos son seleccionados para los grupos es usando un procedimiento llamado “asignación al azar.” Esto significa que los individuos serán seleccionados por casualidad, casi como tirar una moneda al aire. Esto ayuda a prevenir cualquier sentimiento personal que pueda influir quién será asignado a un grupo. Tampoco podemos predecir a cual grupo los individuos serán asignados. Queremos dar a cuantas familias sea posible la oportunidad de probar los nuevos servicios y por lo tanto, hay un 62.5% de posibilidad de ser asignado al grupo experimental y un 37.5% de posibilidad de ser asignado al grupo de control. En otras palabras, las probabilidades
están a su favor. Sin embargo, no podemos predecir a cual grupo los individuos serán asignados, así es que usted todavía debe estar dispuesto/a a probar suerte.

Si usted está en el grupo experimental, personal del equipo de evaluación le pedirá una copia del servicio del plan del proyecto de demostración creado para su familia. Algunas familias asignadas a ambos grupos serán entrevistadas por los consejeros del equipo de investigación para hacerle preguntas acerca de cómo los servicios siendo proveídos afectaron a sus familias. Puede que los investigadores también quieran hablar con el niño o el/la joven acerca de sus propias experiencias si ellos están entre las edades de 7 y 17 años. Si es escogido para ser entrevistado, desearíamos hablar con usted en persona o por teléfono de 3 a 4 veces. Esto ocurrirá alrededor de cada doce meses. Cada entrevista durará entre 30 minutos y una hora. Cada entrevista con su niño/a durará alrededor de 30 minutos. Si hablamos con usted en persona, la entrevista ocurrirá en el lugar que sea más conveniente para usted y su familia. En las entrevistas, le haremos preguntas acerca de los servicios y del apoyo que usted recibió, su bienestar físico y mental, su vecindario, y su vida familiar.

Si usted desea participar en este estudio, favor de firmar la forma de consentimiento. Si su hijo/a es capaz, también le pedimos que el/ella lea y firme la forma de consentimiento. Para los niños que están bajo la supervisión de la Corte Juvenil, el permiso de la corte para participar en el estudio será también obtenido.

**RIESGOS:** No hay riesgos anticipados. Si alguna de las preguntas le causa incomodidad psicológica, usted puede escoger no responder a la pregunta o pedirle al entrevistador que pare. Si la incomodidad psicológica llega a ser intolerable, referencias serán ofrecidas para ayudarle con el malestar.

**BENEFICIOS:** No existe beneficio directo para los que sean asignados al grupo de control. Para los que sean asignados al grupo experimental, ustedes podrán beneficiarse de los servicios extras. La información obtenida por este estudio puede beneficiar a la sociedad en general.

**COSTO/COMPENSACIÓN:** No hay ningún costo para usted. Para los que sean seleccionados para las entrevistas, serán compensados con $15 por cada visita en el hogar y $10 por cada entrevista telefónica. Su hijo/a, de ser entrevistado, recibirá un certificado de regalo para una tienda local por un valor de $15 por cada entrevista en persona y un certificado de regalo para una tienda local por un valor de $10 por cada entrevista telefónica. Ni usted ni su hijo/a necesitan contestar todas las preguntas o completar todas las entrevistas para que se le pague por lo que ya haya sido completado.

**CONFIDENCIALIDAD:** Comprendo que toda la información, la cual me identifique, colectada en este estudio será completamente confidencial y no influirá en los servicios que yo recibo del Condado de Fresno DHHS o del Departamento de Probación. Los resultados de este estudio pueden ser resumidos en juntas científicas y su nombre/identidad no será revelado. Ningún material publicado que resulte de este estudio jamás contendrá información identificando a usted o a cualquiera en su familia. Su confidencialidad será protegida en cuanto la ley lo permita. La excepción a la
protección de la confidencialidad es si la siguiente información es presentada:
1. Sospecha de abuso o negligencia de un adulto o un niño.
2. Que una persona sea un peligro a sí mismo/a u otros o está gravemente desabilitada e incapaz de cuidarse a sí mismo/a.
Si cualquiera de las situaciones anteriores son presentadas en las entrevistas, debemos contactar al Condado de Fresno DHHS u otra agencia apropiada.

ALTERNATIVAS/DERECHO A NEGARSE O RETIRARSE: Su participación en este estudio es completamente voluntaria y usted tiene el derecho de negarse a participar en cualquier momento aún después de haber estado de acuerdo en participar en este estudio. Si usted no participa o retirara su participación en este estudio, esto no influenciará negativamente los servicios regulares que usted recibe del DHHS, del Departamento de Probación o de la Corte Juvenil. Si es asignado/a al grupo que no recibe los servicios suplementarios, usted no puedo recibir estos servicios suplementarios del Departamento de Salud y Servicios Humanos del Condado de Fresno o del Departamento de Probación por cuatro años (la duración del estudio). Si se retira del estudio después de la participación , su niño quizá no pueda continuar recibiendo los servicios suplementarios si el/ella está en el grupo experimental.

PREGUNTAS: Si tiene preguntas o si quiere saber más información acerca de este estudio, puede llamar por colectar a Karen Thomas al (510) 642-5041. Si Ud. tiene preguntas cualquier pregunta acerca de sus derechos o el tratamiento como un participante en este proyecto de investigación, favor de ponerse en contacto con la Universidad de California al Comité de Berkeley para la Protección de Sujetos Humanos en (510) 642-7461 o por correo electrónico a subjects@uclink4.berkeley.edu.

Sinceramente,

Jill Duerr Berrick, M.S.W., Ph.D.  Ed Cohen, M.S.W., Ph.D.
Co-Investigadora Principal   Co-Investigador Principal
Proyecto de Demostración y Dispensa del Bienestar del Niño  Proyecto de Demostración y Dispensa del Bienestar del Niño
Título IV-E de California   Título IV-E de California
Proyecto de Demostración y Dispensa del Bienestar del Niño
Título IV-E de California
Componente de Conferencia Familiar

FORMA DE CONSENTIMIENTO

He leído la carta adjunta y estoy de acuerdo en participar, y dejar que mi hijo/a participe, en el estudio de la Universidad de California en Berkeley sobre las experiencias de las familias con los servicios de niños y familias en el Condado de Riverside. Comprendo que seré asignado/a a un grupo que ya sea reciba servicios pagados por el proyecto de demostración o que no reciba servicios pagados por el proyecto de demostración. Si estoy asignado(a) al grupo que recibirá servicios patrocinados por el proyecto de demostración, estoy de acuerdo a permitir que los investigadores de la Universidad de California en Berkeley reciban una copia del plan de servicio del proyecto de demostración creado para mi hijo(a) y para mi. Si soy asignado/a al grupo que no recibe los servicios pagados por el proyecto de demostración, yo comprender que no puedo recibir estos servicios del Condado de Riverside, del Departamento de Servicios Sociales o del Departamento de Probación por cuatro años (la duración de este estudio). Comprendo que la participación es completamente voluntaria y que mi hijo/a y yo somos libres de descontinuar la participación en cualquier momento. También entiendo que hay una posibilidad de que se nos pida que participemos en entrevistas. Si me lo piden, yo estoy de acuerdo en participar, y permitir que mi hijo/a participe en estas entrevistas. Comprendo que no habrá información que nos identifique contenida en cualquiera de los resultados de este estudio, y que la confidencialidad de mi familia será protegida en toda su extensión bajo la ley. De ser entrevistado/a, anticipo que se me pague $15 por cada entrevista en persona y $10 por cada entrevista telefónica. También anticipo que mi hijo/a recibirá un certificado de regalo por un valor de $15 para una tienda local cada vez que el/ella sea entrevistado/a en persona y un certificado de regalo por un valor de $10 para una tienda local cada vez que el/ella sea entrevistado/a por teléfono. También sé que ni mi hijo ni yo tenemos que contestar cada pregunta o completar cada entrevista para poder ser compensados por lo que ya ha sido completado.

________________________________________________________________________
Firma del proveedor del cuidado

________________________________________________________________________
Relación con el Niño/a

________________________________________________________________________
Teléfono de la casa

________________________________________________________________________
Firma del niño/a o del/la joven

________________________________________________________________________
Nombre en letra de molde

________________________________________________________________________
Fecha de hoy

________________________________________________________________________
Teléfono del trabajo

________________________________________________________________________
Nombre del niño/a o del/la joven en letra de molde
INVITACION PARA PARTICIPAR EN UN ESTUDIO DE INVESTIGACION

TITULO:  Proyecto de Demostración y Dispensa del Bienestar del Niño Título IV-E de California.

INVESTIGADORES:  Jill Duerr Berrick, M.S.W., Ph.D. y Ed Cohen, Ph.D.

PATROCINADOR:  Centro de Investigación para Servicios Sociales de la Universidad de California, Berkeley.

PROPOSITO:  Conducir un estudio de cinco años para determinar los beneficios de los servicios que son proveídos a los niños y sus familias. Esto será hecho comparando dos grupos de familias envueltas en este estudio. Un grupo de familias recibirá servicios regulares ofrecidos a todas las familias y el segundo grupo de familias recibirá servicios pagados por el proyecto de demostración.

PROCEDIMIENTO:  El Departamento de Salud y Servicios Humanos (DHSS) del Condado de Riverside o el Departamento de Probación harán una evaluación inicial de los posibles niños, familias y/o proveedores del cuidado que califiquen para este estudio de investigación. Los que sean seleccionados serán asignados ya sea a un grupo que reciba los servicios regulares que todas las familias reciben, (esto se llama el grupo de control) o el grupo que recibe los servicios pagados por el proyecto de demostración (esto se llama el grupo experimental). Si usted es colocado/a en el grupo experimental, el Condado podrá usar fondos flexibles para dar una variedad de servicios no disponibles anteriormente. Si usted es colocado/a en el grupo de control, usted continuará siendo capaz de usar una variedad de servicios actualmente proveídos por el Condado.

La manera como los individuos son seleccionados para los grupos es usando un procedimiento llamado “asignación al azar.” Esto significa que los individuos serán seleccionados por casualidad, casi como tirar una moneda al aire. Esto ayuda a prevenir cualquier sentimiento personal que pueda influir quién será asignado a un grupo. Tampoco podemos predecir a cual grupo los individuos serán asignados. Queremos dar a cuantas familias sea posible la oportunidad de probar los nuevos servicios y por lo tanto, hay un 62.5% de posibilidad de ser asignado al grupo experimental y un 37.5% de posibilidad de ser asignado al grupo de control. En otras palabras, las probabilidades
están a su favor. Sin embargo, no podemos predecir a cual grupo los individuos serán asignados, así es que usted todavía debe estar dispuesto/a a probar suerte.

Si usted está en el grupo experimental, personal del equipo de evaluación le pedirá una copia del servicio del plan del proyecto de demostración creado para su familia. Algunas familias asignadas a ambos grupos serán entrevistadas por los consejeros del equipo de investigación para hacerle preguntas acerca de cómo los servicios siendo proveídos afectaron a sus familias. Puede que los investigadores también quieran hablar con el niño o el/la joven acerca de sus propias experiencias si ellos están entre las edades de 7 y 17 años. Si es escogido para ser entrevistado, desearíamos hablar con usted en persona o por teléfono de 3 a 4 veces. Esto ocurrirá alrededor de cada doce meses. Cada entrevista durará entre 30 minutos y una hora. Cada entrevista con su niño/a durará alrededor de 30 minutos. Si hablamos con usted en persona, la entrevista ocurrirá en el lugar que sea más conveniente para usted y su familia. En las entrevistas, le haremos preguntas acerca de los servicios y del apoyo que usted recibió, su bienestar físico y mental, su vecindario, y su vida familiar.

Si usted desea participar en este estudio, favor de firmar la forma de consentimiento. Si su hijo/a es capaz, también le pedimos que el/ella lea y firme la forma de consentimiento. Para los niños que están bajo la supervision de la Corte Juvenil, el permiso de la corte para participar en el estudio será también obtenido.

**RIESGOS:** No hay riesgos anticipados. Si alguna de las preguntas le causa incomodidad psicológica, usted puede escoger no responder a la pregunta o pedirle al entrevistador que pare. Si la incomodidad psicológica llega a ser intolerable, referencias serán ofrecidas para ayudarle con el malestar.

**BENEFICIOS:** No existe beneficio directo para los que sean asignados al grupo de control. Para los que sean asignados al grupo experimental, ustedes podrán beneficiarse de los servicios extras. La información obtenida por este estudio puede beneficiar a la sociedad en general.

**COSTO/COMPENSACIÓN:** No hay ningún costo para usted. Para los que sean seleccionados para las entrevistas, serán compensados con $15 por cada visita en el hogar y $10 por cada entrevista telefónica. Su hijo/a, de ser entrevistado, recibirá un certificado de regalo para una tienda local por un valor de $15 por cada entrevista en persona y un certificado de regalo para una tienda local por un valor de $10 por cada entrevista telefónica. Ni usted ni su hijo/a necesitan contestar todas las preguntas o completar todas las entrevistas para que se le pague por lo que ya haya sido completado.

**CONFIDENCIALIDAD:** Comprendo que toda la información, la cual me identifique, colectada en este estudio será completamente confidencial y no influirá en los servicios que yo recibo del Condado de Riverside DHHS o del Departamento de Probación. Los resultados de este estudio pueden ser resumidos en juntas científicas y su nombre/identidad no será revelado. Ningún material publicado que resulte de este estudio jamás contendrá información identificando a usted o a cualquiera en su familia. Su confidencialidad será pretegida en cuanto la ley lo permita. La excepción a la
protección de la confidencialidad es si la siguiente información es presentada:
   1. Sospecha de abuso o negligencia de un adulto o un niño.
   2. Que una persona sea un peligro a sí mismo/a u otros o está gravemente
desabilitada e incapaz de cuidarse a sí mismo/a.
Si cualquiera de las situaciones anteriores son presentadas en las entrevistas, debemos
contactar al Condado de Riverside DHHS u otra agencia apropriada.

**ALTERNATIVAS/DERECHO A NEGARSE O RETIRARSE:** Su participación en
este estudio es completamente voluntaria y usted tiene el derecho de negarse a participar
en cualquier momento aún después de haber estado de acuerdo en participar en este
estudio. Si usted no participa o retirara su participación en este estudio, esto no
influenciará negativamente los servicios regulares que usted recibe del DHHS, del
Departamento de Probación o de la Corte Juvenil. Si es asignado/a al grupo que no
recibe los servicios suplementarios, usted no puede recibir estos servicios suplementarios
del Departamento de Salud y Servicios Humanos del Condado de Riverside o del
Departamento de Probación por cuatro años (la duración del estudio). Si se retira del
estudio después de la participación, su niño quizá no pueda continuar recibiendo los
servicios suplementarios si el/ella está en el grupo experimental.

**PREGUNTAS:** Si tiene preguntas o si quiere saber más información acerca de este
estudio, puede llamar por colectar a Karen Thomas al (510) 642-5041. Si Ud. tiene
preguntas cualquier pregunta acerca de sus derechos o el tratamiento como un
participante en este proyecto de investigación, favor de ponerse en contacto con la
Universidad de California al Comité de Berkeley para la Protección de Sujetos Humanos
en (510) 642-7461 o por correo electrónico a subjects@uclink4.berkeley.edu.

Sinceramente,

Jill Duerr Berrick, M.S.W., Ph.D.                  Ed Cohen, M.S.W., Ph.D.
Co-Investigadora Principal                    Co-Investigador Principal
Proyecto de Demostración y Dispensa          Proyecto de Demostración y Dispensa
del Bienestar del Niño                        del Bienestar del Niño
Título IV-E de California                   Título IV-E de California
REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO OBSERVE AND/OR VIDEOTAPE FAMILY CONFERENCE

You and your child have previously agreed to participate in the Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Project. In this study, we are interested in learning about the benefits to children and their families of family conferences arranged by Fresno County Department of Children and Family Services.

We request your permission to:

- Videotape
- Observe

the family conference arranged by Fresno County Department of Children and Family Services for your family and your child, in order to learn more about the family conference process.

As described in the attached consent form, your family’s confidentiality will be strictly protected and your decision to allow (or not allow) your conference to be observed or videotaped will not affect the services you receive from Fresno County Department of Children and Family Services.

If you have questions about this request or the study, you may call Karen Thomas toll free at 1-800-887-7232.

Sincerely,

Jill Duerr Berrick
Co-Principal Investigator
Title IV-E Waiver Demonstration Evaluation Project

Ed Cohen
Co-Principal Investigator
Title IV-E Waiver Demonstration Evaluation Project
CONFERENCE OBSERVATION CONSENT FORM

I agree to allow researchers from the University of California at Berkeley, Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Project to observe the family conference arranged by Fresno County Department of Children and Family Services for my family and my child. I understand that the researchers will take notes regarding the family conference process during the conference, and that this information will be used in the Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Project evaluation. I understand that no identifying information regarding my family or my child will be reported in the research results, and that my family’s confidentiality will be protected to the full extent of the law. I am aware that I may refuse to allow the researchers to observe the conference for my family and my child at any time, and that this will in no way affect the services I or my child receive from Fresno County Department of Children and Family Services.

Signature
Date

Print Name
Telephone Number
I agree to allow the family conference arranged by Fresno County Department of Children and Family Services for my family and my child to be videotaped, so that the conference may be viewed by researchers from the University of California at Berkeley, Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Project. I understand that the researchers will take notes regarding the family conference process while viewing the videotape, and that this information will be used in the Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Project evaluation. I understand that no identifying information regarding my family or my child will be reported in the research results, and that my family’s confidentiality will be protected to the full extent of the law. I also understand that the videotape will be destroyed on or before April 1, 2004 (end of the Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Project), unless I have signed a separate written agreement that states otherwise. I am aware that I may refuse to allow the conference for my family and my child to be videotaped and/or viewed by the researchers, and that this will in no way affect the services I or my child receive from Fresno County Department of Children and Family Services.

Signature ________________________________ Date __________________________

Print Name ________________________________ Telephone Number ___________________
REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO OBSERVE AND/OR VIDEOTAPE FAMILY CONFERENCE

You and your child have previously agreed to participate in the Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Project. In this study, we are interested in learning about the benefits to children and their families of family conferences arranged by Riverside County Department of Public Social Services.

We request your permission to:
- Videotape
- Observe

the family conference arranged by Riverside County Department of Public Social Services for your family and your child, in order to learn more about the family conference process.

As described in the attached consent form, your family’s confidentiality will be strictly protected and your decision to allow (or not allow) your conference to be observed or videotaped will not affect the services you receive from Riverside County Department of Public Social Services.

If you have questions about this request or the study, you may call Karen Thomas toll free at 1-800-887-7232.

Sincerely,

Jill Duerr Berrick
Co-Principal Investigator
Title IV-E Waiver Demonstration Evaluation Project

Ed Cohen
Co-Principal Investigator
Title IV-E Waiver Demonstration Evaluation Project
California Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Project

CONFERENCE OBSERVATION CONSENT FORM

I agree to allow researchers from the University of California at Berkeley, Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Project to observe the family conference arranged by Riverside County Department of Public Social Services for my family and my child. I understand that the researchers will take notes regarding the family conference process during the conference, and that this information will be used in the Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Project evaluation. I understand that no identifying information regarding my family or my child will be reported in the research results, and that my family’s confidentiality will be protected to the full extent of the law. I am aware that I may refuse to allow the researchers to observe the conference for my family and my child at any time, and that this will in no way affect the services I or my child receive from Riverside County Department of Public Social Services.

__________________________________________  ____________________________
Signature                                              Date

________________________________________________________
Print Name

________________________________________________________
Telephone Number
California Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Project

CONSENT FORM FOR VIDEOTAPING AND VIEWING FAMILY CONFERENCE

I agree to allow the family conference arranged by Riverside County Department of Public Social Services for my family and my child to be videotaped, so that the conference may be viewed by researchers from the University of California at Berkeley, Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Project. I understand that the researchers will take notes regarding the family conference process while viewing the videotape, and that this information will be used in the Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Project evaluation. I understand that no identifying information regarding my family or my child will be reported in the research results, and that my family’s confidentiality will be protected to the full extent of the law. I also understand that the videotape will be destroyed on or before April 1, 2004 (end of the Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Project), unless I have signed a separate written agreement that states otherwise. I am aware that I may refuse to allow the conference for my family and my child to be videotaped and/or viewed by the researchers, and that this will in no way affect the services I or my child receive from Riverside County Department of Public Social Services.

____________________________________  ______________________
Signature                                           Date

____________________________________
Print Name

____________________________________
Telephone Number
SOLICITUD PARA PERMISO PARA OBSERVAR Y/O GRABAR A VIDEO LA CONFERENCIA DE LA FAMILIA

Usted y su niño previamente estuvieron de acuerdo a tomar parte en el Proyecto de Demonstración del Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver. En este estudio, nosotros somos interesados en aprender acerca de los beneficios a niños y sus familias de conferencias de familia arregladas por el Departamento de Servicios Sociales del Condado de Fresno.

Nosotros solicitamos su permiso a:

- Grabar a video
- Observar

la conferencia de la familia arreglada por el Departamento de Servicios Sociales del Condado de Fresno para su familia y su niño, para aprender más acerca del proceso de conferencia de familia.

Como es descrito en la adjunta forma de consentimiento, la confidencialidad de su familia será protegida estrictamente y su decisión de permitir (o no permitir) su conferencia a ser observado o grabado a video no afectará los servicios que usted recibe del Departamento de Servicios Sociales del Condado de Fresno.

Si usted tiene preguntas acerca de este pedido o el estudio, usted puede llamar a Karen Thomas sin cargo al 1-800-887-7232.

Sinceramente,

Jill Duerr Berrick
Co-Investigadora principal
Evaluación del Proyecto de Demonstración del California Title IV-E Waiver

Ed Cohen
Co-Investigador principal
Evaluación del Proyecto de Demonstración del California Title IV-E Waiver
Proyecto de Demonstración del California Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver

FORMA DE CONSENTIMIENTO DE LA OBSERVACION DE LA CONFERENCIA

Estoy de acuerdo a permitir investigadores de la Universidad de California en Berkeley, Proyecto de Demonstración del Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver a observar la conferencia de la familia arreglada por el Departamento de Servicios Sociales del Condado de Fresno para mi familia y mi niño. Entiendo que los investigadores tomarán notas acerca del proceso de la conferencia de la familia durante la conferencia, y que esta información será usada en el Proyecto de Demonstración del Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver. Entiendo que ninguna información de identificación con respecto a mi familia o mi niño será informado en los resultados de investigación, y que la confidencialidad de mi familia será protegida a la extensión repleta de la ley. Estoy enterado que puedo negar a permitir que los investigadores observan la conferencia de mi familia y mi niño a cualquier tiempo, y que esto en ninguna manera afectará los servicios que yo o mi niño recibimos del Departamento de Servicios Sociales del Condado de Fresno.

______________________________  ______________________
Firma                               Fecha

______________________________  ______________________
Nombre Escrito                      Número Telefónico
Proyecto de Demonstración del California Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver

FORMA DE CONSENTIMIENTO PARA GRABAR A VIDEO PARA OBSERVAR LA CONFERENCIA DE FAMILIA

Estoy de acuerdo a permitir que la conferencia de familia arreglada por el Departamento de Servicios Sociales del Condado de Fresno para mi familia y mi niño sea grabado a video, para que la conferencia pueda ser considerada por investigadores de la Universidad de California en Berkeley, Proyecto de Demonstración del Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver. Entiendo que los investigadores tomarán notas acerca del proceso de la conferencia de familia mientras ver al video grabado, y que esta información será usado en la evaluación del Proyecto de Demonstración del Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver. Entiendo que ninguna información de identificación con respecto a mi familia o mi niño será informado en los resultados de investigación, y que la confidencialidad de mi familia será protegida a la extensión repleta de la ley. Yo entiendo también que el video grabado será destruido en o antes del 1 de abril de 2004 (el fin del Proyecto de Demonstración del Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver), a menos que yo haya firmado un acuerdo escrito separado que indica de otra manera. Estoy enterado que yo puedo negar a permitir que la conferencia de mi familia y mi niño sea gravada a video y/o considerada por los investigadores, y que esto de ninguna manera afectará los servicios que yo o mi niño recibimos del Departamento de Servicios Sociales del Condado de Fresno.

Firma

Fecha

Nombre Escrito

Número Telefónico
SOLICITUD PARA PERMISO PARA OBSERVAR Y/O GRABAR A VIDEO LA CONFERENCIA DE LA FAMILIA

Usted y su niño previamente estuvieron de acuerdo a tomar parte en el Proyecto de Demonstración del Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver. En este estudio, nosotros somos interesados en aprender acerca de los beneficios a niños y sus familias de conferencias de familia arregladas por el Departamento de Servicios Sociales Públicos del Condado de Riverside.

Nosotros solicitamos su permiso a:
- Grabar a video
- Observar

la conferencia de la familia, arreglada por el Departamento de Servicios Sociales Públicos del Condado de Riverside para su familia y su niño, para aprender más acerca del proceso de conferencia de familia.

Como es descrito en la adjunta forma de consentimiento, la confidencialidad de su familia será protegida estrictamente y su decisión de permitir (o no permitir) su conferencia a ser observado o grabado a video no afectará los servicios que usted recibe del Departamento de Servicios Sociales Públicos del Condado de Riverside.

Si usted tiene preguntas acerca de este pedido o el estudio, usted puede llamar a Karen Thomas sin cargo al 1-800-887-7232.

Sinceramente,

Jill Duerr Berrick
Co-Investigadora principal
Evaluación del Proyecto de Demonstración del California Title IV-E Waiver

Ed Cohen
Co-Investigador principal
Evaluación del Proyecto de Demonstración del California Title IV-E Waiver
Proyecto de Demonstración del California Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver

FORMA DE CONSENTIMIENTO DE LA OBSERVACION DE LA CONFERENCIA

Estoy de acuerdo a permitir investigadores de la Universidad de California en Berkeley, Proyecto de Demonstration del Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver a observar la conferencia de la familia arreglada por el Departamento de Servicios Sociales Públicos del Condado de Riverside para mi familia y mi niño. Entiendo que los investigadores tomarán notas acerca del proceso de la conferencia de la familia durante la conferencia, y que esta información será usada en el Proyecto de Demonstration del Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver. Entiendo que ninguna información de identificación con respecto a mi familia o mi niño será informado en los resultados de investigación, y que la confidencialidad de mi familia será protegida a la extensión repleta de la ley. Estoy enterado que puedo negar a permitir que los investigadores observan la conferencia de mi familia y mi niño a cualquier tiempo, y que esto en ninguna manera afectará los servicios que yo o mi niño recibimos del Departamento de Servicios Sociales Públicos del Condado de Riverside.

Firma

Fecha

Nombre Escrito

Número Telefónico
Proyecto de Demonstración del California Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver

FORMA DE CONSENTIMIENTO PARA GRABAR A VIDEO PARA OBSERVAR LA CONFERENCIA DE FAMILIA

Estoy de acuerdo a permitir que la conferencia de familia arreglada por el Departamento de Servicios Sociales Públicos del Condado de Riverside para mi familia y mi niño sea grabado a video, para que la conferencia pueda ser considerada por investigadores de la Universidad de California en Berkeley, Proyecto de Demonstración del Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver. Entiendo que los investigadores tomarán notas acerca del proceso de la conferencia de familia mientras ver al video grabado, y que esta información será usado en la evaluación del Proyecto de Demonstración del Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver. Entiendo que ninguna información de identificación con respecto a mi familia o mi niño será informado en los resultados de investigación, y que la confidencialidad de mi familia será protegida a la extensión repleta de la ley. Yo entiendo también que el video grabado será destruido en o antes del 1 de abril de 2004 (el fin del Proyecto de Demonstración del Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver), a menos que yo haya firmado un acuerdo escrito separado que indica de otra manera. Estoy enterado que yo puedo negar a permitir que la conferencia de mi familia y mi niño sea gravada a video y/o considerada por los investigadores, y que esto de ninguna manera afectará los servicios que yo o mi niño recibimos del Departamento de Servicios Sociales Públicos del Condado de Riverside.

Firma          Fecha

Nombre Escrito       Número Telefónico
Technical Team Update: Family Conferencing Substudy
Bill Dawson, Meghan Howe
04/01/02 to 09/30/02

1. **Supported current data collection and data management efforts; provided technical support and training to team members**
   - Assisted team members in use of existing data collection and management tools (Enrollment spreadsheets, In-depth Interview databases, Family Conferencing (FC) baseline database, FC conference instruments database); cleaned, appended, and backed up data
   - Created database tracking mechanisms and financial reports to monitor interview participation reimbursement account

2. **Began construction of an analysis dataset integrating data from enrollment spreadsheets and supplementary databases with data from California Children’s Service Archive (the Archive)**
   - Used CWS/CMS xTools software to convert test county client numbers from 22-character display format to 10-character internal CWS/CMS format
   - Developed SAS code to link enrollment spreadsheet data to corresponding records in Enhanced Longitudinal File (ELF) dataset (using child client number)
   - Developed SAS code to display test dataset to confirm and count matched ELF records
   - Drafted plan for locating records that do not match on child client number

3. **Modified, maintained, and supported use of the FC contact database**
   - Met with team members to review suggestions and questions
   - Modified database per decisions from meeting
   - Reviewed documentation and practices with primary users

4. **Modified, maintained, and supported use of the FC Conference Instruments database**
   - Trained users in use of database
   - Added additional instrument to database
   - Restructured database for all instruments due to new information about the relationships between number of participant entries per instrument
   - Assisted users in use of the database

5. **Maintained network installation of Cardiff Teleform (for processing of In-depth Interviews)**
   - Trained users in procedures for verification of In-depth interviews
   - Modified In-depth interview field constraints as requested by users
Focus Group/Interview(s) with Program Administrators

– Time 4 –

Organizational Structure

Implementation Status, Strategies

1. What is the current status of your Waiver Family Conferencing program?

2. a. What is the current status of your non-Waiver Family Conferencing program?

   b. How are you ensuring that families assigned to the Waiver project control group do not receive a family conference?
3. Some families entered the Waiver program more than a year ago… What outcomes are you now seeing for these families?

4. a. Is your Waiver Family Conferencing program supporting the outcomes you hoped to see?
   b. If yes, please describe.
   c. If no, why do you think this is the case?

5. a. Have you made any further changes to your enrollment process for families enrolling in the Waiver project? (Review enrollment process).
   b. If so, what changes were made?
6. a. Have you made any further changes to your family selection criteria for the Waiver project? (Review selection criteria - attached).
   b. If so, what changes were made?

7. a. Has the intervention provided by your program changed in any way during the past year?
   b. If so, what changes were made?

8. How would you describe the guiding philosophy of your Waiver Family Conferencing program?

9. a. Has the guiding philosophy of your program changed at all since implementation began?
   b. If so, how?
10. How does the structure of your Waiver Family Conferencing program reflect the program philosophy?

11. What factors do you feel facilitate the conferencing process for families receiving a Waiver family conference?

12. What factors make the conferencing process more challenging?
13. What do you perceive to be the unique advantages of the specific family conferencing model you have chosen for your Waiver Family Conferencing program, as compared with other available models?

14. What are your perceptions about the model’s disadvantages?

15. How does the family conference facilitate the goals of your Waiver program? (Explain.)
Title IV-E Waiver – Family Conferencing – Process Study

**Funding**

1. How have you used Title IV-E flexible funding to implement your Waiver Family Conferencing program?

2. How do you plan to use Title IV-E flexible funding in the future?

3. a. Have non-IV-E funding sources been used to implement your Waiver Family Conferencing program?

   b. If so, what sources have been used? How?
Oversight and Monitoring

1. a. Have there been any changes in the methods you use to supervise and monitor service provision to families who participate in your Waiver Family Conferencing program? (Explain).

   b. If so, do your current methods differ from methods you have used to oversee previous programs? (Describe).

2. Please describe the ways in which community stakeholders have been involved in your Waiver Family Conferencing program.

3. Who are the key community stakeholders for your Waiver program?
4. How do you envision the ongoing role of community stakeholders in your Waiver Family Conferencing program?

Problem Resolution

1. What implementation challenges have you encountered, if any, during the past year?

2. a. Have you been able to resolve the challenges you have encountered thus far?
   b. If so, how?

   c. If not, how do you plan to address the challenges you have encountered?
3. Have you encountered any recent challenges that impact your ability to enroll families in your Waiver Family Conferencing program? (Describe).

4. a. Have you been able to resolve the enrollment challenges you have encountered thus far?
   b. If so, how?
   c. If not, how do you plan to address the challenges you have encountered?

**Staffing Structure**

1. a. Have there been any recent changes to the staffing structure of your Waiver Family Conferencing Program?
   b. If so, how were changes made?
   c. What impact, if any, do you expect these changes to have on your Waiver Family Conferencing program?
Service Factors

Characteristics, Roles, Training of Staff

1. What staff are currently involved in providing direct services to families enrolled in your Waiver Family Conferencing program?

2. Have direct service staff involved in your Waiver Family Conferencing program received any training related to the experimental intervention? (Describe).

3. Do you plan to offer trainings to direct service staff involved in your Waiver Family Conferencing program in the future? (Describe).

4. What staff are involved in coordinating and facilitating family conferences for families enrolled in your Waiver Family Conferencing program?
5. Have you provided specific training for coordinators and facilitators involved in your Waiver Family Conferencing program? (Describe).

6. Do you plan to offer trainings to coordinators and/or facilitators involved in your Waiver Family Conferencing program in the future? (Describe).

7. What are the roles of agency staff who attend family conferences for families enrolled in your Waiver Family Conferencing program?

8. What are the roles of community stakeholders who attend family conferences for families enrolled in your Waiver Family Conferencing program?
9. Have you provided specific training for community stakeholders involved in your Waiver Family Conferencing program? (Describe).

10. Do you plan to offer trainings to community stakeholders involved in your Waiver Family Conferencing program in the future? (Describe).

Type and Duration

1. How do the services provided to experimental and control families differ? (Describe.)

2. What “unique” services have been provided to experimental group families as a result of their participation in your Waiver program?
3. What services have been provided to client families by family and community support persons attending family conferences?

4. a. In what ways are family plans generated at Waiver family conferences similar to the case plans of participant families?

b. In what ways are family plans and case plans different?

5. How long do families receive the experimental intervention before exiting your Waiver Family Conferencing program?
Timeliness and Scheduling

1. Once a family is assigned to the experimental group, when do Waiver program services begin?

2. Once a family is assigned to the experimental group, how soon is the family conference scheduled?

3. What factors have an influence on the timing of Waiver service provision and conference scheduling?
Contextual Factors

Social and Economic Factors at the Client Level

1. How do the social and/or economic challenges experienced by families participating in the Waiver program impact your ability to deliver the experimental intervention?

2. What social and/or economic resources do family members bring to their participation in the Waiver program that have an impact on your ability to deliver the experimental intervention?

3. Does the impact of these challenges and/or resources on the experimental intervention differ in any way from their impact on child welfare services in general?
Community and Neighborhood Resources

1. How do the social and/or economic challenges that are evident in the communities you serve influence your ability to deliver the experimental intervention?

2. How do the social and/or economic resources available in the communities you serve have an impact on your ability to deliver the experimental intervention?

3. Does the impact of these challenges and/or resources on the experimental intervention differ in any way from their impact on child welfare services in general?
Social and Economic Factors at the County, State, and Federal Levels

1. How have your agencies’ policies and procedures affected implementation and maintenance of your Waiver Family Conferencing program?

2. How might these policies and procedures affect future implementation of your Waiver Family Conferencing program?

3. How have CDSS policies and procedures affected implementation and maintenance of your Waiver Family Conferencing program?

4. How has contact and/or collaboration with Family Conferencing program coordinators in other California counties affected the implementation of your Waiver Family Conferencing program?
**Political Factors**

1. What types of political issues have arisen in the past year that have had an impact on your ability to deliver the experimental intervention?

2. Does the impact of these political factors on the experimental intervention differ in any way from their impact on child welfare services in general?

**Factors Related to the Demonstration Project**

1. How have the guidelines for the demonstration project and evaluation impacted the implementation of your Waiver Family Conferencing program?
2. How do you plan to approach the fiscal, staffing and service issues that may arise as the conclusion of the demonstration project approaches?

3. a. Do you plan to continue your experimental program after the demonstration project concludes? If so, how?

b. If not, why?

This marks the end of our focus group. Thank you!
PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS FOR COST STUDY

Cases to be included for report: All cases for which six months have passed since enrollment (therefore, enrolled by September 30, 2002)

Can control by:
- One or two parent family
- Number of children
- Age (parent, youngest child, oldest child, average age of children)
- Other demographic variables available from impact study data

Questions:
1. What percentage of cases refused services, used some services but for less than a month, and used services for more than one month? How do these percentages compare between the experimental and control groups?
2. What was the average cost of a family conference in this experiment?
3. Do the quantity of [successful] worker contacts vary between the groups? Do the number of [successful] worker visits vary between the groups?
4. How do the groups compare in their usage/attendance of various services?
   - Parenting classes
   - Anger management classes
   - Domestic violence classes
   - Mental health counseling/therapy
     - Per parent
     - Per child
     - Family (family counseling)
5. How do costs of above services received compare between groups?

TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify cases with six months completed since entry by March 31, 2003</td>
<td>January 15, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify cases which have refused services</td>
<td>January 15, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify cases which have used some services but for less than one month</td>
<td>January 15, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify cases which have used services for more than one month</td>
<td>January 22, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code or program control variables</td>
<td>January 31, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze data to answer question 1 above (all cases will have completed more than six weeks in program by December 31, 2002)</td>
<td>February 15, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze data to answer question 2 above (all cases will have received family conference within first two weeks, well before December 31, 2002)</td>
<td>April 7, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-program for analysis of question 3</td>
<td>March 31, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pull service and contact data from Fresno County through March 31, 2003</td>
<td>April 7, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean data</td>
<td>April 17, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete first data analysis run</td>
<td>May 7, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete first draft of “Preliminary Analysis Report”</td>
<td>May 22, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce final “Preliminary Analysis Report”</td>
<td>June 30, 2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Wraparound Enrollment Totals and Patterns

### Wraparound Enrollment Totals (08.31.02)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Sibs</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Closed*</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Sibs</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Closed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total/sibs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>17/2</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>228/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>93/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>29/2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>177/41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Counties</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>60/4</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>513/89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* study/siblings

### Wraparound Enrollment Patterns (08.31.02)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>April 2002</th>
<th>May 2002</th>
<th>June 2002</th>
<th>July 2002</th>
<th>August 2002</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Counties</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Wraparound Data Collection Activities

#### Counties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>Client Enrollment</th>
<th>Baseline (CAFAS)</th>
<th>Services Tracking</th>
<th>In-Depth Interviews</th>
<th>Wraparound Fidelity</th>
<th>Administrative Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>County/UCB (June 2000)</td>
<td>County (November 2000)</td>
<td>County (September 2000)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>County/UCB (June 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>County/UCB (September 2000)</td>
<td>County (October 2000)</td>
<td>County (October 2000)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>County/UCB (September 2000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CAFAS Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Eligible</th>
<th>CAFAS*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>10/01/00</td>
<td>08/31/02</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>11/01/00</td>
<td>08/31/02</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>12/01/00</td>
<td>08/31/02</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>05/01/01</td>
<td>08/31/02</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>10/01/00</td>
<td>08/31/02</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Children ages 7 and older as of August 31, 2002.  
(n) = percent of eligible
## Services Tracking Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Service Weeks Tracked*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Service weeks tracked and entered into the services tracking database as of August 31, 2002
### WFI Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Eligible</th>
<th>WFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>07/01/01</td>
<td>08/31/02</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n) = percent of eligible
Wraparound In-Depth Interview Data Collection Activity
April 1 – September 30, 2002 and Cumulative to Date

WRAP Collected Interviews through March 31 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Caregiver</th>
<th>Baseline Youth</th>
<th>18 Mo. Caregiver</th>
<th>18 Mo. Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interviews Completed April 1 – August 30 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Caregiver</th>
<th>Baseline Youth</th>
<th>18 Mo. Caregiver</th>
<th>18 Mo. Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interviews Pending Collection (Due by September 30 2002)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline Caregiver</th>
<th>Baseline Youth</th>
<th>18 Mo. Caregiver</th>
<th>18 Mo. Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Due dates have a two month window for data collection.