

**SUBMITTAL TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

906



FROM: Department of Mental Health

SUBMITTAL DATE:

November 2, 2009

SUBJECT: Approve the First Amendment to the Agreement between the Department of Mental Health and National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD)/Children's Research Center (CRC).

RECOMMENDED MOTION: Move that the Board of Supervisors:

- 1) Approve the first amendment to the agreement between the Department of Mental Health and National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD)/Children's Research Center (CRC) for \$145,630 for FY 2009/10;
- 2) Authorize the Chairman of the Board to sign and execute the agreement amendment;
- 3) Authorize the Riverside County Purchasing Agent to increase, decrease, amend and/or renew this agreement for an amount not to exceed 10% of the approved agreement amount of \$145,630 for FY 2009/10.

On December 9, 2008, Agenda Item 3.43, the Board of Supervisors approved the Riverside County Department of Mental Health's (RCDMH) contract with National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD)/Children's Research Center (CRC) for FY 2008/09. The contract with NCCD/CRC was a sole source procurement to utilize NCCD/CRC's Structured Decision Making (SDM) tool to assist in generating greater, future participation and success for the CalWorks Welfare-To-Work Program (WTW) and its recipients.

(Continued on Page 2)

JW:KAS

Jerry Wengerd
Jerry Wengerd, Director
Department of Mental Health

FINANCIAL DATA	Current F.Y. Total Cost:	\$45,000	In Current Year Budget:	Yes
	Current F.Y. Net County Cost:	\$ 0	Budget Adjustment:	No
	Annual Net County Cost:	\$ 0	For Fiscal Year:	2009/2010

SOURCE OF FUNDS: State 100% (CalWorks)	Positions To Be Deleted Per A-30	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Requires 4/5 Vote	<input type="checkbox"/>

C.E.O. RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE
BY: *Debra Cournoyer*
Debra Cournoyer
County Executive Office Signature

Policy	Policy
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Consent	Consent
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

FORM APPROVED COUNTY COUNSEL
BY: *ARISA R-MCKENNA*
DATE: *11/2/09*
Departmental Concurrence

Purchasing: *Mark Seiler*, Assistant Director
DPSS: Susan Loew, Director

ATTACHMENTS FILED
WITH THE CLERK OF THE BOARD

PAGE: 2

SUBJECT: Approve the First Amendment to the Agreement between the Department of Mental Health and National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) / Children's Research Center (CRC).

BACKGROUND:

In collaboration with the Department of Public Social Services (DPSS), RCDMH has a contract with NCCD/CRC to conduct research, and to determine the feasibility of a risk assessment to classify GAIN participants into low, moderate, or high likelihoods of non-participation in work requirements. This project also includes development of a Family Service Evaluation to provide Employment Services Counselors with a systematic assessment process for identifying priority needs and strengths of participants to address barriers to self-sufficiency.

As a result of a recent NCCD/CRC analysis, NCCD/CRC determined an additional employability assessment and two decision trees are necessary for RCDMH to have a comprehensive set of assessment tools.

Therefore, RCDMH is requesting the Board of Supervisors approve the agreement amendment with NCCD/CRC to increase their contract maximum by an additional \$45,000 to cover the cost of the employability assessment and two decision trees.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

In FY 08/09, RCDMH received Board approval on December 9, 2008, Agenda Item 3.43, for a three (3) year contract agreement with NCCD/CRC's for a total combined contract amount of \$260,950. However, the FY 09/10 contract amount needs to be increased to \$145,630 to accommodate additional services required during this fiscal year only. The contract with NCCD/CRC will be funded through CalWorks funds the RCDMH receives from DPSS through a previously established Memorandum of Understanding. No additional County funds are required.

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

**FY 2009/2010
FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE AND NATIONAL COUNCIL ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY
(NCCD)/CHILDREN'S RESEARCH CENTER (CRC)**

That certain Professional Services Agreement between the County of Riverside (COUNTY) and National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD)/Children's Research Center (CONTRACTOR) approved by the Board of Supervisors on December 9, 2008, Agenda Item 3.43 for FY 2008/2009; renewed by the Riverside County Purchasing Agent for FY 2009/10 is hereby amended for the first time effective July 1, 2009 and shall continue to June 30, 2010, in consideration for mutual obligations:

The agreement is hereby amended as follows:

1. Section 2 of this agreement shall be amended to read as follows:

▪ **PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE**

This Agreement shall be effective upon signature of this agreement by both parties and continue in effect through June 30, 2010, with the option to renew for two (2) years, renewable in one (1) year increments by written amendment, unless terminated earlier. CONTRACTOR shall commence performance upon signature of this Agreement by both parties and shall diligently and continuously perform thereafter.

2. Section 3.1 of this agreement shall be amended to read as follows.

▪ **COMPENSATION**

The COUNTY shall pay the CONTRACTOR for services performed, products provided and expenses incurred in accordance with the terms of Exhibit B, payment provisions. Maximum payments by COUNTY to CONTRACTOR shall not exceed One Hundred Forty Five Thousand Six Hundred and Thirty Dollars (\$145,630) for FY 2009/10 including all expenses. The COUNTY is not responsible for any fees or costs incurred above or beyond the contracted amount and shall have no obligation to purchase any specified amount of services or products. Unless otherwise specifically stated in Exhibit B, COUNTY shall not be responsible for payment of any of CONTRACTOR's expenses related to this Agreement.

3. Rescind the previous Exhibit A in its entirety, and replace it with the new, attached Exhibit A.

4. Rescind the previous Exhibit B in its entirety, and replace it with the new, attached Exhibit B with contract maximum obligation of \$145,630 for FY 2009/2010.

1 All other provisions of this entire Agreement shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

2 **IN WITNESS WHEREOF**, the Parties hereto have caused their duly authorized representatives
3 to execute this amendment.

4 COUNTY ADDRESS:

5 County of Riverside
6 Board of Supervisors
4080 Lemon Street, 5th Floor
Riverside, CA 92501

INFORMATION COPY:

County of Riverside
Department of Mental Health
P.O Box 7549
Riverside, CA 92503-7549

7 CONTRACTOR: NCCD/CRC

8 Signed: Toni Aleman

9 Print name: Toni Aleman

10 Date: 10/22/09

11 Title: Director of Administration
12 Address: 426 S. Yellowstone Drive, Ste #250
13 Madison, WI 53719

COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE:

14 Jeff Stone, Chairman, Board of Supervisors

15 ATTEST:
16 Kecia Harper-Ihem, Clerk

17 Deputy

18 COUNTY COUNSEL

19 PAMELA J. WALLS

20 Approved as to Form

21 By: Jamie R. Mc
22 Deputy County Counsel

Exhibit A

**Riverside County
Department of Mental Health**

**Proposal for Developing a
Risk Assessment for Welfare-to-Work Program Participation, Implementation of a
Strengths and Needs Assessment, and Technical Assistance and Training**

Submitted July 18, 2008

Revised August 21, 2008

Revised and resubmitted October 1, 2009



Children's Research Center

A non-profit social research organization and division of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency

426 S. Yellowstone Drive, Suite 250, Madison, WI 53719

voice (608) 831-1180, fax (608) 831-6446

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	APPROACH	3
A.	Welfare-to-Work Risk Assessment Feasibility Study	3
1.	Advisory Group Selection.....	3
2.	Research Plan.....	4
3.	Sampling	4
4.	Data Collection and Analysis.....	5
5.	Presentation of Findings	6
B.	Development of a Family Strengths and Needs Assessment.....	7
C.	Web-based Data Collection System for Completion of SDM® Assessments.....	8
D.	Training on Use of the Preliminary Risk Assessment (or Data Collection Instrument) and the Family Strengths and Needs Assessment	9
E.	Process Evaluation and General Technical Assistance and Support During Initial Implementation	10
1.	Process Evaluation	10
2.	General Technical Assistance and Support.....	11
F.	Maintenance and Support for the Web-based Data Collection System.....	11
G.	Prospective Validation Study of the Preliminary Risk Assessment or Analysis of Data From the Data Collection Instrument to Construct a Risk Assessment	12
III.	TIMELINE.....	13
IV.	CAPABILITY STATEMENT	15
V.	STAFFING	17
VI.	BUDGET	19
A.	Budget.....	19
B.	Budget Narrative	21

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Professional References

Appendix B: References

I. INTRODUCTION

In California, CalWORKs recipients, unless exempt, are required to participate in welfare-to-work (WTW) program activities as a condition of receiving cash aid.¹ A number of clients, however, may have issues that impede successful engagement in WTW program activities, such as substance abuse, mental health concerns, or domestic violence (Danziger et al., 2002). More than half of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) clients have multiple barriers to employment, and the likelihood of employment decreases as the number of barriers increases (Danziger et al., 2002). Johnson and Meckstroth (1998) identified that TANF agencies' use of standardized assessments and case management services, including structured needs assessments and individualized service plans with frequent client contacts, were crucial for helping clients find and maintain employment. TANF agencies have limited resources, however. These agencies will make more effective use of limited resources if they can accurately identify those clients most likely to struggle with WTW participation, then target supportive services toward these clients.

In Riverside County, California, the Riverside County Department of Mental Health (RCDMH) works collaboratively with the Riverside County Department of Public Social Services (DPSS) to identify and provide services to CalWORKs recipients to address mental health related barriers to work participation and self-sufficiency. These barriers include mental health conditions, domestic violence, substance abuse, and learning disabilities. Both RCDMH and Riverside County DPSS have identified five core system improvement goals to guide the collaborative service delivery system. System improvements include:

1. Improving early identification of mental health, substance abuse, domestic violence, and learning disability barriers to employment in the CalWORKs population by Employment Service Counselors (ESC) and Mental Health staff.

¹ <http://www.dss.cahwnet.gov/CDSSWEB/PG141.htm>

2. Improving the type and kind of referral made by the ESC, leading to more streamlined access to specific services, decreasing the time between identification of specific issues and access to that specific MH staff.
3. Increasing early intervention of mental health, substance abuse, domestic violence, and learning disability services.
4. Improving system communication between ESC and MH staff, leading to more comprehensive service delivery for the client.
5. Decreasing no show and dropout rates of clients by improving system communication and client follow-up by ESC and MH staff.

The proposed work is a joint research project between the RCDMH and Riverside County DPSS. This purpose of the research is to develop an assessment model that will improve early identification of CalWORKs clients at high risk of WTW participation non-compliance due to client barriers to employment; and, provide a structured assessment process to improve the development of coordinated service plans. This project will support RCDMH and Riverside County DPSS' efforts to more comprehensively identify client barriers to employment, engage clients in qualified mental health, substance abuse, domestic violence, and learning disability services, and provide earlier and more comprehensive interventions to DPSS identified clients to increase the likelihood of successful welfare-to-work program participation. Activities included in this proposal are as follows:

- Conduct research to determine the feasibility of developing an objective actuarial assessment procedure for estimating risk of non-compliance with WTW program participation among CalWORKs recipients in Riverside County, California. The initial research study will result in either a preliminary risk assessment or a data collection instrument to be implemented by workers for subsequent analysis (Year 1);
- Develop a family strengths and needs assessment to assess high and very risk WTW clients, which will help target services toward identified barriers to self-sufficiency and support successful WTW participation (Year 1);
- Design and build a web-based data collection system for completion of Structured Decision Making® (SDM) assessments (Year 1);

- Conduct training on use of the preliminary risk assessment (or data collection instrument) and the family strengths and needs assessment (Year 2);
- Conduct a process evaluation and provide general technical assistance and support during initial implementation (Year 2); and
- Conduct a prospective validation study of the preliminary risk assessment or analyze data from the data collection instrument to construct a risk assessment; and provide general technical assistance and support (Year 3 – 3.5).

This joint project has the potential for achieving the multiple system improvements into the current CalWORKs Mental Health process by improving the accurate identification of clients with client barriers to work participation and increased achievement of self-sufficiency.

II. APPROACH

A. Welfare-to-Work Risk Assessment Feasibility Study

The primary objective of this research effort would be to determine whether there are characteristics that can be observed at the time a client applies for CalWORKs that strongly relate to successful and/or unsuccessful completion of work activity requirements (e.g., orientation/job club), and whether a risk assessment to classify clients by the likelihood of program completion can be constructed based on available information. Workers could use this risk assessment to identify those clients less likely to complete program activities and increase contact with them to encourage participation. The following outlines the proposed work plan to conduct this research.

1. Advisory Group Selection

The first step in the research design process is the appointment of an advisory group. The Children's Research Center (CRC), a division of the nonprofit National Council on Crime and

Delinquency (NCCD), views a risk assessment study as a collaborative work effort in which agency staff must be closely involved. If possible, the 10-12 person group should include key district managers, unit supervisors, and field staff from RCDMH and DPSS. The advisory group will be responsible for meeting as necessary with CRC staff via conference calls to review and approve the research design, including sampling methodology and timelines; identifying policy and practice issues that may arise as a result of implementation; developing a training plan; and creating a post-implementation support plan, including quality assurance activities. Participating in the advisory group will help RCDMH and DPSS staff understand the principles of the study design and the findings of the study. One member of the advisory group should be appointed as chairperson and assume responsibilities for onsite coordination of the research effort. CRC will facilitate an initial web meeting with the committee to review the objectives of the research effort and discuss the proposed research design.

2. Research Plan

CRC staff will conduct a literature review as well as an analysis of existing Riverside County DPSS program data. The literature review will determine whether any assessments exist that estimate the likelihood of program completion, and if so, what research has been conducted on these assessments. The review will also identify known characteristics related to WTW program completion to ensure that the analysis of data is based on up-to-date knowledge of the characteristics of and issues faced by WTW clients.

3. Sampling

Approximately 2,000 approved applications for CalWORKs will be sampled, and each applicant's subsequent involvement in services and the WTW program will be observed for a

standardized period (approximately 6 to 12 months). Outcomes will depend on measures available in the data, but will focus on WTW program involvement and completion. Some applicants (such as those from ethnic groups with less representation) may be oversampled to ensure a sufficient sample size.

4. Data Collection and Analysis

To determine whether a risk assessment can be constructed that accurately classifies clients by the likelihood that they will successfully complete participation in work activities, CRC will examine the relationship between characteristics of the client and his/her situation at the time of eligibility determination and subsequent WTW program completion. *Analysis will be based on administrative data supplied by Riverside County DPSS, and is therefore limited to information that is regularly collected by workers.*

CRC staff will assemble data collected in the administrative database for each sampled client, such as past employment and schooling information, applicant demographics, household characteristics (e.g., number of children and adults in the household), arrest history, and, if information is available, the nature of identified barriers to employment. This will make it possible for CRC to conduct a comprehensive validation study of outcomes (such as program completion) in Year 3 for the sample clients. If a risk assessment that estimates the likelihood of program completion can be developed, the research will examine assessment validity for major ethnic groups as well.

The analysis will also profile the sample of clients required to participate in WTW program activities. This will be based on information available in the administrative data system and may include prior schooling and employment background, criminal history, and household composition.

CRC anticipates that this analysis will result in the development of a preliminary risk assessment that can be implemented by program staff to identify clients at high risk of non-compliance with WTW program participation requirements. However, if there is insufficient outcome data available for analysis, CRC will alternatively develop a data collection instrument based on findings from the data analysis and from the literature review. The purpose of the data collection instrument will be to enable workers to systematically observe and record information that can be referenced for a future risk assessment validation study. Once implemented electronically, workers should complete the data collection instrument for a designated sample period. The data collection instrument would include identifying information required to match administrative data so that outcomes could be determined.

5. Presentation of Findings

CRC staff will produce one report to include the following:

- A description of the final sample and research methods;
- Presentation of a preliminary risk assessment (or data collection instrument), including definitions, for use by program staff; and
- Recommended policies and procedures to guide use of the assessments.

CRC staff will meet via web meeting with the advisory group and program administrators for a presentation of the study findings. During this session, CRC staff will make recommendations related to next steps for consideration by the agency. For example, CRC may suggest steps that need to be taken to enable future validations, collecting additional factors to be evaluated in future studies, and/or identifying what is necessary to prepare staff for use of the risk assessment.

Cost: \$58,000

This estimate assumes all communication will occur via conference call or web meeting. If RCDMH and DPSS would like to add an onsite meeting at project end to discuss the findings and possible next steps, the additional cost is estimated at \$4,700.

Timeframe: January – September 2009

B. Development of a Family Strengths and Needs Assessment

Once clients are identified as being at high or very high risk of non-compliance with WTW program participation requirements, RCDMH and DPSS wishes to have a systematic approach to assessing this population's needs in an effort to target services toward identified barriers to self-sufficiency and support successful WTW participation. CRC staff will work with the advisory group to review the adoption of the existing SDM[®] family strengths and needs assessment currently being implemented by CalWORKs intake workers in San Luis Obispo and Orange counties to assess family needs and develop service plans. This assessment is a modification of the SDM family strengths and needs assessment used by child protection workers in California. The assessment provides a structured and systematic process for workers to follow when assessing and prioritizing family needs, which can then be integrated into the client's service plan to address barriers to self-sufficiency and support WTW program participation. As part of the proposed work, CRC will facilitate a web-based workgroup meeting to review the assessment for any necessary adaptations and to develop policies and procedures for its use. CRC will also work with Riverside County staff to conduct reliability testing on the assessment.

Cost: \$12,500

Cost assumes minor modifications to the existing assessment and definitions.

Timeframe: February - June 2009

C. Web-based Data Collection System for Completion of SDM® Assessments

CRC maintains a web-based data collection system (DCS) that is used to support research, caseload, and other data-intensive activities. CRC will modify this existing system to include the preliminary risk assessment (or data collection instrument) and the family strengths and needs assessment as defined by the finalized policies and procedures manual.

The CRC DCS provides a secure, web-based environment for users to complete, edit, print, and manage assessments. Assessments hosted within the DCS are interactive, self-scoring, and self-validating.

Features of the DCS are as follows:

- Users may save incomplete forms and complete them during a later session. Incomplete items are highlighted when the user saves the assessment.
- Users may locate completed assessments by client name and ID number.
- Users may view a list of incomplete and recently completed assessments.
- Counties may opt into an available export system that provides regular exports of all assessment data. The data will be exported and posted to CRC's secure FTP site on a weekly basis.

Because it is a generic system that was not custom-built for any one purpose or client, the DCS does have some limitations. These include the following:

- The DCS is independent from any other data collection or case management system. This means that there is not and cannot be a system for populating data into the assessments from other systems. All identifiers must be entered by the user.
- All users within a county may see, edit, and delete any assessment completed within that county. There are no facilities to limit access to assessments or otherwise make them "read-only."
- There is no system for supervisor approval.

The assessments that will be included in the Riverside County Welfare-to-Work program system are the following:

- Welfare-to-Work program participation preliminary risk assessment (or data collection instrument); and
- SDM family strengths and needs assessment (SDM TANF version).

Cost: \$22,000

Cost includes DCS maintenance and support from March–June 2009 (see description under item six below for services provided under DCS maintenance and support).

Timeframe: September 2009–January 2010

D. Training on Use of the Preliminary Risk Assessment (or Data Collection Instrument) and the Family Strengths and Needs Assessment

CRC staff will conduct eight one-day training sessions on the SDM WTW model for up to 30 staff per session. These sessions will be scheduled to occur over the course of two selected weeks (four sessions per week). CRC will provide RCDMH and DPSS with all developed curriculum and training materials for future use and integration into new worker training. RCDMH/DPSS will be responsible for duplication of all training materials for training participants, securing a training facility, and provision of audio/visual equipment.

Cost: \$32,500

Cost includes curriculum development, eight days onsite work for two CRC staff, plus travel time and expenses.

Timeframe: February - April 2010

E. Process Evaluation and General Technical Assistance and Support During Initial Implementation

1. Process Evaluation

Approximately four months post-implementation, CRC staff will conduct a process evaluation to assess the extent to which SDM assessments are being implemented according to design, and to ascertain worker feedback about implementation and practice. Specific recommendations for whether to continue and/or expand the SDM system and specific modifications will be provided. Methods may include use of data, staff surveys, focus groups, and observations. The process evaluation report will be completed no later than 60 days after all focus groups, surveys, and observations are concluded. The final report will be presented to the advisory group via web meeting and will include discussion of recommendations to improve and strengthen implementation. General areas to be covered by the process evaluation include the following:

- **Staff surveys.** CRC will develop survey instruments for RCDMH and DPSS staff. CRC will conduct the survey, enter data, analyze data, and incorporate results into a process evaluation report.
- **Focus groups.** CRC will develop a protocol and conduct three half-day focus groups. The first two focus groups will be conducted with DPSS staff and will address each of the two assessments being implemented. The third focus group will be conducted with RCDMH staff. Each focus group will discuss the extent to which the assessments support and facilitate collaboration between RCDMH and DPSS and effectiveness at identifying high risk clients. Sessions may include onsite observation and/or interactive discussion with selected staff. The focus groups will elicit staff feedback, observations, insights, questions, concerns, and suggestions. CRC will analyze focus group results and incorporate into a process evaluation report.
- **Case review.** CRC staff will complete a qualitative review of completed SDM assessments for a random sample of cases to inform the quality of implementation and identification of implementation issues. Results of the case review will be incorporated into the process evaluation report.

Cost: \$36,000

Timeframe: August - December 2010

2. General Technical Assistance and Support

CRC staff will provide ongoing offsite technical assistance and support during the first year of implementation while data are being collected from completed assessments (or the data collection instrument). This includes bi-monthly conference calls and/or web meetings with the advisory group to monitor implementation of assessments, and to address policy and procedures and ongoing training issues.

Cost: \$16,500

Timeframe: May 2010–June 2012

F. **Maintenance and Support for the Web-based Data Collection System**

Services rendered will include the following:

- Co-location costs: Network connectivity, hardware, security, data backups, vendor licenses, system administration, and database administration costs.
- Help desk: Telephone and email support from CRC help desk personnel. The help desk is available during normal CRC hours (9 a.m. to 5 p.m. central) and all requests will be acknowledged within two working days.
- Bug fixes: This is a change that corrects application functionality such that it behaves in accordance with the system design specifications:
 - » Severity 1 bugs: Defined as bugs that have a potential loss of data or prevent the successful completion of an assessment. CRC will make every attempt to correct these problems within one to five working days.
 - » Lesser severity bugs: Will be handled on a quarterly basis. See below.
- Quarterly maintenance updates: Every third month from the effective date of the service contract, CRC will have the opportunity to deploy an updated version of an application. This includes ongoing maintenance and improvements to the DCS framework as well as minor language changes, typographical errors, and lesser severity bugs.
- Enhancements: Functionality outside the scope of an agreed-upon system design specification will not be covered by this maintenance agreement. Requests for enhancements should be submitted to the project/program manager for consideration.

- Data extracts: A complete export of all collected data will be provided on a weekly basis. Any changes in the format of the exported data (i.e., changes that would change the import and/or analysis process) will be accompanied by a revised data dictionary.

Cost: January – June 2010 = \$8,190
July 2010 – June 2011 = \$16,380
July 2011 – June 2012 = \$16,380

G. Prospective Validation Study of the Preliminary Risk Assessment or Analysis of Data From the Data Collection Instrument to Construct a Risk Assessment

The first step of the risk assessment validation study is to sample clients assessed using the preliminary risk assessment (or data collection instrument) and obtain information on the sampled clients as well as each client's WTW participation outcomes. For example, the study may sample families initially assessed during May through October 2010, and observe outcomes for each client during a standardized 9- to 12-month period.

CRC's general approach is to identify a sample event (initial assessment) for a case and then secure complete case data describing prior and subsequent WTW participation events. This research will reference Riverside County's administrative data. The sample criteria will be decided on in conjunction with the advisory group. A rough sample size estimate is 2,000 cases, but we may wish to oversample some families (such as rural families or families from specific ethnic groups). This will make it possible for CRC to conduct a comprehensive validation study of case outcomes (including, at minimum, WTW program participation rates, achievement of self-sufficiency, etc.) for the sampled clients.

A final report will include a review of study methods and classification findings for the current risk assessment. Study findings and suggested modifications to the current risk assessment policies and procedures will be reviewed with the advisory group via web meeting.

Cost: \$53,500
Timeframe: May 2010 – June 2012

H. Additional Tool Development and Automation (Amendment for FY 09-10)

During the course of project work that occurred during FY 08-09, Riverside County DMH and DPSS requested that CRC work collaboratively to develop, design, and automate three additional tools: 1) employability assessment, 2) activity assignment matrix, and 3) decision tree/tool to guide ESC decisions about sanctioning and determination of good cause. Based on preliminary data analysis, CRC will provide the following additional services in FY 09-10.

1. Development of an employability assessment and decision trees

- a. CRC will work with DPSS and DMH to construct a preliminary employability assessment that contains actuarial items. The employability assessment will be integrated with the preliminary participation assessment. CRC will facilitate development and design of the integrated assessments (participation and employability) via remote, web-based meetings. The total cost for this deliverable will be \$17,000. Decision tree development for activity assignment, and good cause/sanctioning will be integrated into these workgroup meetings.

Cost: \$17,000

- b. Automation of the employability assessment as an integrated index within the participation assessment into the web-based application.

Cost: \$6,000

- c. Automation of 1) an activity assignment matrix that is integrated within the participation/employability screening assessment, and 2) a tool/decision tree to guide workers in the sanctioning/good cause determination decision. This will require a timeline of approximately three months from the finalization of the activity assignment matrix and sanctioning/good cause decision tree.

Cost: \$12,000

Cost: \$35,000

Timeframe: September 2009 – April 2010

III. TIMELINE

Work on this project will begin upon receipt of the contract and covers a three-and-one-half year period. This proposal assumes a contract start date of January 1, 2009. Some aspects of the suggested schedule are dependent upon county activities. For example, data analysis cannot begin until receipt of a data extract from DPSS. In such cases, a delay in the beginning of the project may alter the remaining schedule. While aspects of the schedule may be adjusted as work on the project begins, the following timeline summarizes the main tasks of the projects and anticipated time frames for completion.

Task/Activity	Month	Staff
<i>Risk Assessment Feasibility Research Study</i>		
• Conduct literature review	Jan. 2009	CRC
• Send data extract	Jan. 2009	DPSS
• Prepare and finalize a study design	Feb. – Apr. 2009	RCDMH/DPSS/CRC
• Conduct data analysis	May – Jun. 2009	CRC
• Draft preliminary risk assessment (or data collection instrument)	Jun. 2009	CRC
• Review and preliminary feedback	Jul. 2009	RCDMH/DPSS
• Finalize preliminary risk assessment (or data collection instrument)	Aug. 2009	CRC
• Present findings and deliver research report to advisory group	Sept. 2009	RCDMH/DPSS/CRC
<i>Additional tool development</i>		
• Development of an employability assessment	Sept 2009	RCDMH/DPSS/CRC
• Development of activity matrix	Oct 2009	RCDMH/DPSS/CRC
• Integration of participation/employability assessments and activity assignment matrix into one single-stream assessment	October 2009	CRC
• Development of sanctioning/good cause decision tree/tool	Dec 2009	RCDMH/DPSS/CRC
<i>Family Strengths and Needs Assessment (FSNA) Development</i>		
• FSNA development	Feb. – Mar. 2009	RCDMH/DPSS/CRC
• Conduct FSNA inter-rater reliability testing	Apr. 2009	DPSS/CRC
• Finalize FSNA	May – Jun. 2009	CRC

Task/Activity	Month	Staff
<i>Web-based Data Collection System (DCS)</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop assessment specifications for the web-based DCS for integrated participation/employment assessment with activity assignment matrix recommendations and the FSNA (FSE) 	Sept.-Oct 2009	CRC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programming for integrated participation/employment assessment with activity assignment matrix recommendations and the FSNA (FSE) 	Oct. – Nov. 2009	CRC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Testing for integrated participation/employment assessment with activity assignment matrix recommendations and the FSNA (FSE) 	Dec. 2009	RCDMH/DPSS/CRC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop assessment specifications for the web-based DCS for the sanctioning/good cause decision tree/tool 	Dec. 2009	CRC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalization (release) of for integrated participation/employment assessment with activity assignment matrix recommendations and the FSNA (FSE) 	Jan. 2010	CRC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Programming for the sanctioning/good cause decision tree/tool 	Jan. – Feb. 2010	CRC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Testing for the sanctioning/good cause decision tree/tool 	March 2010	CRC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalization (release) of the sanctioning/good cause decision tree/tool 	April 2010	CRC
<i>Training</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Curriculum development 	Feb. – Mar. 2010	CRC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delivery of onsite training 	Apr. 2010	RCDMH/DPSS/CRC
Implementation of assessments (data collection period)	May. – Oct. 2010	DPSS
Bi-monthly web meetings/TA with advisory group	May. 2010– Jun. 2012	RCDMH/DPSS/CRC
<i>Web-based DCS Maintenance (Year 2)</i>	Jan. 2010–Dec. 2010	CRC
<i>Process Evaluation</i>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Onsite process evaluation activities (focus groups, case review) 	Aug. 2010	RCDMH/DPSS/CRC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Worker web survey 	Sept. 2010	RCDMH/DPSS/CRC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compile data and draft report 	Oct. 2010	CRC
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and preliminary feedback 	Nov. 2010	RCDMH/DPSS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Present and deliver final report 	Dec. 2010	RCDMH/DPSS/CRC
<i>Web-based DCS Maintenance (Year 3)</i>	Jan. 2011–Dec. 2011	CRC
<i>Prospective Validation Study</i>		

Task/Activity	Month	Staff
• Observation of case outcomes	May 2010–Oct. 2011	CRC
• Send data extract	Aug. 2011	DPSS
• Preliminary examination of nine-month outcomes	Aug. 2011	CRC
• Send data extract	Nov. 2011	DPSS
• Examination of 12-month outcomes	Nov. – Dec. 2011	CRC
• Conduct analysis	Jan. – Feb. 2012	CRC
• Write preliminary report	Mar. 2012	CRC
• Review and preliminary feedback	Apr. 2012	RCDMH/DPSS
• Finalize report	May. 2012	CRC
• Present findings and discuss next steps	Jun. 2012	RCDMH/DPSS/CRC
<i>Web-based DCS Maintenance (Year 4)</i>	Jan. 2012–Jun. 2012	CRC

IV. CAPABILITY STATEMENT

CRC was established to help federal, state, and local child welfare agencies reduce child abuse and neglect by developing case management systems and conducting research that improves service delivery to children and families. CRC is a division of NCCD, which was established in 1907 to perform a similar role for private and public agencies serving delinquent children. NCCD, which employs more than 50 staff at offices in Oakland, California, and Madison, Wisconsin, is one of the oldest nonprofit research and advocacy agencies in the United States. Agency policy is established by a Board of Directors consisting of national leaders from government, business, and academia. Juan Sanchez is the chairman. Barry Krisberg serves as president, and Christopher Baird is the executive vice president. CRC is located in Madison, Wisconsin, and Raelene Freitag is the director. The agency's mission statement, approved by the Board of Directors, reads as follows:

The National Council on Crime and Delinquency conducts research and initiates programs and policies to reduce crime and delinquency and improve the lives of children and their families. The Council encourages citizen involvement in effective, humane, fair, and economically sound solutions to criminal justice and child welfare problems.

In recent years, CRC has collaborated with a number of state and county agencies to develop, implement, and maintain SDM case management procedures and service delivery policies or practices that reduce child maltreatment and improve child welfare case outcomes. The SDM system employs structured client assessments designed to maximize the impact of available service interventions and enable agencies to more effectively deploy resources. CRC has also engaged in collaborative research and development partnerships with several state and county child welfare agencies. This work includes the construction and revalidation of risk assessment instruments for several states, the development of case monitoring procedures, and

the evaluation of child welfare service delivery. Each of these efforts relied heavily on maximizing the use of existing information systems to help agencies more effectively manage their service delivery operations. NCCD/CRC has developed similar case management systems and risk assessment processes for juvenile justice, adult corrections and TANF agencies.

In addition, NCCD/CRC has conducted major research studies for the national Office on Child Abuse and Neglect, the Annie E. Casey Foundation, and the Children's Rights, Inc. legal services agency (formerly the child welfare section of the American Civil Liberties Union). Recently completed and ongoing projects in child welfare services are described briefly in appendix A.

NCCD/CRC is committed to helping states and counties develop child protective services risk assessment tools and related policies and practice that improve outcomes for clients. Since launching its first project in child welfare (Alaska in 1986), NCCD/CRC has maintained a strong focus on improving the scope and effectiveness of its SDM case management model, which employs actuarial risk assessment as a central component. Evidence of jurisdictions' satisfaction with NCCD/CRC's work can be found in the long-term partnerships the agency maintains with its clients and in follow-up requests for new, expanded, or updated case management components.

NCCD/CRC conducted risk assessment research as part of its effort to develop case management systems in a number of child welfare jurisdictions including New Mexico, Oklahoma, Colorado, California, Minnesota, Michigan, Rhode Island, New York, and Wisconsin. NCCD/CRC has also conducted risk assessment research for juvenile justice agencies including Michigan, the Missouri Juvenile Court Administrator, Maryland, New Mexico, and Arizona. In addition, NCCD/CRC has recently completed a study to develop an actuarial risk assessment for foster care providers in New Mexico.

V. STAFFING

The following agency personnel will act as principal staff for this project.

Dennis Wagner, Ph.D., Director of Research for NCCD/CRC, will provide technical assistance and oversight of research and data analysis. He recently completed the development of workload management systems for child welfare service agencies in Georgia and Oklahoma and the construction of research-based risk assessment systems for CPS agencies in New Mexico, California, Rhode Island, Michigan, and South Australia.

Dr. Wagner has also conducted several case planning and evaluation studies for child welfare and juvenile corrections agencies. These include a study to develop new foster care case management procedures for Michigan, impact evaluations of the use of actuarial risk assessment and focused service intervention on protective service outcomes in Michigan and Wisconsin, and a four-state study of CPS risk assessment approaches, funded by the Office on Child Abuse and Neglect (formerly the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect).

Before joining NCCD/CRC in 1989, Dr. Wagner was the evaluation officer for community programs at the Wisconsin Department of Health and Social Services for eight years. In this capacity, he was responsible for assessing the impact of the state's child welfare, social service, and correctional programs. Prior to 1980, he was a Ph.D. student and graduate fellow at the University of Wisconsin's Center for Evaluation Research and Training. During his tenure at the Center, he conducted studies of Wisconsin's foster care and adoption services, served as a research analyst for the child abuse reporting project, and taught research methods. Dr. Wagner has a B.A. and an M.S.W. degree from the University of Iowa and a Ph.D. in Social Welfare from the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Kristen Johnson, Senior Researcher with NCCD/CRC, has extensive experience with completing initial risk assessment studies and revalidation studies, SDM training, workload

training, data analysis, project management, data collection, and technical support. Since joining NCCD/CRC in 1996, Ms. Johnson has worked on a variety of CPS and juvenile justice projects and studies, including risk assessment research for the New Mexico Children, Youth and Families Department; California's Department of Social Services; South Australia's Child Protective Services; Colorado's Department of Human Services; Maryland's Department of Juvenile Justice; and Missouri's Office of State Court's Administrator Juvenile Offender Program. She recently completed work on an evaluation of the State of Michigan's foster care services and research for the development of New Mexico's foster care provider risk assessment.

Katherine Park is assistant director of the Children's Research Center (CRC), a division of NCCD. She has worked with state and local child welfare jurisdictions on the development and training of SDM case management systems in CPS. Katherine has helped develop and implement SDM assessments in New Hampshire; Missouri; Vermont; New Jersey; and Queensland, Australia. She has also provided SDM technical assistance to jurisdictions in California, Minnesota, and Michigan. Katherine comes to CRC with field and administrative experience in both public and private social service settings in the state of Georgia. Her field experience in social service spans the continuum from CPS investigation and ongoing case management to supervision of both child and adult protective services at the county level. Additionally, she worked at the State of Georgia Division of Family and Children Services as a CPS policy consultant, managing the state's family preservation budget and programs and providing training and technical assistance to county CPS staff throughout the state. Within the private sector, Katherine was the administrative director of Pathways Transition Programs, Inc. in Atlanta, GA, specializing in developing and providing model programs for abused, neglected, and delinquent youth and their families.

VI. BUDGET

A. Budget

This budget reflects accurate estimates for services to be delivered over a 3.5 year contract period covering fiscal years 2008–2009, 2009–2010, 2010–2011, and 2011–2012 assuming a start date no later than January 1, 2008. The total cost for all 3.5 years is \$306,950.

See Exhibit B for Payment Schedule.

Task/Activity	% of deliverable	Payment Schedule
Fiscal Year 2008–2009		
<i>Risk Assessment Feasibility Research Study</i>		
1. Conduct literature review and prepare and finalize a study design (includes web meeting with advisory group)	15%	20% due upon contract signing; balance invoiced upon completion of the advisory group meeting.
2. Data analysis and report production a. Cleaning of collected data b. Analysis of collected data and any available electronic data c. Written preliminary report	35%	20% due upon contract signing
3. Finalize preliminary risk assessment (or data collection instrument), present findings, and deliver research report to advisory group	50%	20% due upon contract signing
<i>B. Family Strengths and Needs Assessment (FSNA) Development</i>		
1. Conduct FSNA development meeting	15%	20% due upon contract signing; balance invoiced upon completion of the advisory group meeting.
2. Conduct FSNA inter-rater reliability testing	35%	20% due upon contract signing
3. Finalize FSNA	50%	20% due upon contract signing
Fiscal Year 2009–2010		
<i>Additional Tool Development</i>		
1a. Develop an employability assessment and integrate with the participation screening/risk assessment; develop an activity assignment matrix and integrate into the employability/participation screening tool	80%	20% due upon contract amendment signing; balance invoiced upon finalization of the tools (estimated October 2009)
1b. Develop a sanctioning/good cause determination decision tree/tool.	20%	20% due upon contract amendment signing; balance invoiced upon finalization of the tools (estimated December 2009)

<i>Web-based Data Collection System (DCS)</i>		
1a. Developing assessment specifications, programming, and testing for the web-based DCS for integrated participation/employment assessment with activity assignment matrix recommendations and the FSNA (FSE). Finalization (release) of the integrated participation/employability assessment with activity assignment matrix and FSNA (FSE).	70%	20% due upon contract signing; balance invoiced upon delivery of the application test site (estimated January 2010)
1b. Developing assessment specifications, programming, and testing for the web-based DCS for the sanctioning/good cause decision tree/tool. Finalization (release) of the sanctioning/good cause decision tree/tool.	30%	20% due upon contract signing; balance invoiced upon delivery of the live application site (estimated April 2010)
<i>Training</i>		
1. Curriculum development	50%	20% due upon contract signing; balance invoiced upon completion of training curriculum (estimated March 2010)
2. Delivery of onsite training	50%	20% due upon contract signing; balance invoiced upon delivery of onsite training (estimated April 2010)
<i>DCS maintenance</i>		
Maintenance and support (January – June 2010)	100%	20% invoiced January 2010; balance invoiced June 30, 2010
Fiscal Year 2010–2011		
<i>Process Evaluation</i>		
1. Onsite process evaluation activities (focus groups, case review)	30%	20% invoiced July 2010; balance invoiced upon completion of onsite activities (estimated Aug 2010)
2. Worker web survey	15%	20% invoiced July 2010; balance invoiced upon completion of web survey (estimated September 2010).
3. Compile data and draft report	30%	20% invoiced July 2010; balance invoiced upon completion delivery of preliminary report (estimated October 2010).
4. Present and deliver final report	25%	20% invoiced July 2010; balance invoiced upon delivery of final report (estimated December 2010)
<i>DCS maintenance</i>		
Maintenance and support (Jul. 2010 – June 2011)	100%	20% invoiced July 2010; 50% of balance invoiced December 2010; balance invoiced June 2011

Fiscal Year 2011–2012		
<i>Prospective Validation Study</i>		
1. Observation of case outcomes and preliminary examination of nine-month outcomes	25%	20% invoiced July 2011; balance invoiced upon completion of preliminary analysis (estimated August 2011).
2. Conduct analysis	25%	20% invoiced July 2011; balance invoiced upon completion of final analysis (estimated February 2012)
3. Write preliminary report	25%	20% invoiced July 2010; balance invoiced upon delivery of preliminary report (estimated March 2012)
4. Finalize report and present findings	25%	20% invoiced July 2010; balance invoiced upon delivery of final report (estimated June 2012)
<i>DCS maintenance</i>		
1. Maintenance and support (Jul. 2011 – Jun. 2012)	100%	20% invoiced July 2011; 50% of balance invoiced December 2011; balance invoiced June 2012

B. Budget Narrative

Costs include travel associated with onsite deliverables as follows: one trip for two people from Wisconsin to California to conduct training.

This budget covers all costs associated with the design, sample identification, data review, analysis, report writing, and presentation to DPSS staff. Personnel costs are based on actual salaries plus fringe benefits based on the time projected for each staff member. This budget includes costs associated with materials needed for the study's design, sampling, analysis, and presentation of results. It also includes office occupancy, and expenses associated with the agency's executive management and administrative functions, which are required for the agency to operate as a tax-exempt nonprofit corporation. NCCD is a 501(c)(3) tax-exempt nonprofit corporation. The agency's federal tax identification number is 13-1624111.

Appendix A

Professional References

Development of a Case Management System and Risk Assessment Study Design for New Hampshire's Bureau of Elderly and Adult Services (2007–present)

Currently, NCCD/CRC staff is working with New Hampshire's Bureau of Elderly and Adult Services to develop SDM assessments for workers investigating allegations of adult maltreatment. The case management system includes development of a screen-in and response priority assessment, a safety assessment to be completed after the first face-to-face contact with an alleged victim, and a needs and strengths assessment to help determine priorities for services. A field test of the assessments will be conducted. The project also includes a review of the literature and current practices regarding risk assessment in adult protective services, and design of a future risk assessment study, including design of a data collection instrument to enable workers to systematically record information about future adult protection investigations.

Contact: Sally Varney, Quality Improvement Grant Project Manager, (603) 271-3264
New Hampshire Bureau of Elderly and Adult Services
129 Pleasant St., Concord, New Hampshire 03301-3857

California Department of Social Services Risk Assessment Research and Case Management System Development (1998–present)

The California Department of Social Services has contracted with NCCD/CRC since 1998 to design and implement a comprehensive child protection structured decision making system in more than 15 counties, including Alameda, Fresno, Los Angeles, Humboldt, Lassen, Orange, Merced, Monterey, Sacramento, Kern, San Luis Obispo, Santa Cruz, Sutter, Trinity, Riverside, and Santa Clara. During the first year of the project, workgroups developed a new case management system including response priority decision trees, a research-based risk assessment instrument, a family needs assessment, and other tools to guide decisions made in the protective service or foster care system. Other case management components include workload accounting and a management information system to assist agencies in monitoring service delivery performance. All counties receive regular management reports and are implementing a supervisory case reading model to improve the quality of SDM implementation. California completed a preliminary risk research study in 1998–99. NCCD/CRC staff revalidated the California risk assessment tool based on data collected by SDM counties since 1999. This risk validation study and report was finalized in 2003.

Contact: Barbara Eaton, Chief, (916) 323-0537
California Department of Social Services, Children's Services Operations Bureau
State of California, Financial Planning Branch
744 P Street, MS 19-90, Sacramento, California 95814

Michigan Family Independence Agency's Child Protective Services: Risk Assessment Research and Five-Tier Protective Service Initiative Project (1999–present)

NCCD/CRC was contracted by Michigan's Family Independence Agency to provide technical assistance and evaluation for a new protective service initiative mandated by the state legislature. The five-tier initiative employed risk assessment procedures to divert families who were not substantiated for abuse or neglect to preventive intervention services provided by private agencies. CRC staff assisted in developing case management and assessment procedures necessary to implement this initiative and conducted an evaluation of the program's impact. In

2004, NCCD/CRC conducted a validation of Michigan's child protective services risk assessment to ensure that the assessment accurately classified all families by their risk of future child maltreatment.

Contact: Ted Forrest, Child Protective Services Program Manager, (517) 335-6199
Michigan Family Independence Agency
235 South Grand Avenue, Suite 510, Lansing, Michigan 48909

**Michigan Family Independence Agency's Department of Foster Care Services:
Development of an SDM[®] System for Foster Care Case Management (1996–2002)**

The Department of Social Services (now called the Family Independence Agency) contracted with NCCD/CRC to assist in redesigning the agency's foster care case management systems. NCCD/CRC staff assisted the agency in the design of standardized procedures to assess the service needs of families with children in foster care; development of structured case service plans and decision-making protocols for returning children home; establishment of case service and workload standards; and the design of a new computerized system for monitoring foster care case outcomes and service activity.

The case management system was implemented in several demonstration counties in 1997. To support implementation of the demonstration project, NCCD/CRC provided training to foster care workers and maintained a computerized management information system to produce quarterly reports describing case activity including service needs profiles, service referral activity, and case outcomes.

Contact: Mary Chaliman, Foster Care Program Manager, (517) 335-4652
Michigan Family Independence Agency
235 South Grand Avenue, Suite 510, Lansing, Michigan 48909

**Michigan Family Independence Agency's Impact Evaluation of SDM[®] in Foster Care
(2000–2002)**

NCCD/CRC was contracted by Michigan's Family Independence Agency to assess the impact of SDM implementation in foster care. The evaluation was a quasi-experimental design that assessed the pre- and post-implementation performance for pilot and comparison foster care offices. The key outcomes were observed for 15 months following case opening and included whether or not and what type of permanency was achieved for children, as well as the rate at which children who were returned home reentered foster care within 15 months.

Contact: Mary Chaliman, Foster Care Program Manager, (517) 335-4652
Michigan Family Independence Agency
235 South Grand Avenue, Suite 510, Lansing, Michigan 48909

**State of New Mexico Children, Youth and Families Department: Risk Assessment
Research and Child Protective Services Case Management Implementation (1996–1999;
2002–2004)**

NCCD/CRC assisted the New Mexico Children, Youth and Families Department in the development and implementation of a new CPS caseload management system. Components of

the system include standardized case decision-making protocols based on client risk and needs assessments, case-opening procedures on risk and family needs, case service monitoring, and a computerized case-tracking system. A risk assessment study was conducted of 1,400 sample cases to develop classification protocols for assessing the potential of continued abuse/neglect among New Mexico families. In addition, NCCD/CRC staff trained agency protective service workers in the use of the case management procedures and conducted a process evaluation of the implementation process for monitoring service delivery.

Most recently, NCCD/CRC staff produced management reports for the Department to monitor the use of SDM assessments in practice. NCCD/CRC staff gave technical assistance, targeting areas of practice for follow up, and also re-validated New Mexico's CPS risk assessment.

Contact: Donda Wallace-Pool, SDM Coordinator, (505) 827-6984
New Mexico Children, Youth & Families
300 San Mateo Northeast, Suite 700, Albuquerque, NM 87108

State of New Mexico Children, Youth, and Families Department: Risk Research and Assessment Development for Foster Care Providers (2002-2003)

The New Mexico Children, Youth and Families Department contracted with NCCD/CRC to conduct a risk assessment study of 642 sampled foster care providers, which included new and renewing as well as relative and non-relative providers. The objective of the research was to develop classification protocols for assessing the potential of inadequate caregiving and/or child maltreatment among New Mexico foster care providers. NCCD/CRC staff worked with departmental staff to develop a risk assessment with policies and procedures to structure its use and impact on practice, while recommending that data collection be ongoing to allow for future validation efforts.

Contact: Donda Wallace-Pool, SDM Coordinator, (505) 827-6984
New Mexico Children, Youth & Families
300 San Mateo Northeast, Suite 700, Albuquerque, NM 87108

Rhode Island Department of Children, Youth, and Families: Risk Assessment and Case Management Project (1991-1994; 2003)

NCCD/CRC assisted the Rhode Island Department of Children, Youth, and Families in the development and implementation of a new system for managing CPS cases. Components of the system included standardized case decision-making protocols based on family risk and needs assessments, workload standards based on risk and family needs, and a case monitoring and evaluation system. A study was conducted in 1992 that observed 1,000 families substantiated for abuse and neglect to develop a risk assessment tool for the agency. Rhode Island contracted with CRC to subsequently validate the risk assessment in 2003 to ensure that the assessment accurately classified families by their risk of future child maltreatment.

Contact: Thomas Dwyer, Associate Director, (401) 528-3543
Rhode Island Department of Children, Youth & Families
650 Ten Rod Road, North Kingstown, Rhode Island 02852

Minnesota Department of Human Services Case Management System Development (1999–2003)

Seven metro counties with Minnesota's Department of Human Services contracted with NCCD/CRC to design, implement and provide technical assistance for a comprehensive child protection SDM system.² During the first year of the project, workgroups developed a new case management system, including priority response decision trees; a research-based risk assessment instrument; a family needs assessment; and other tools to guide decisions at each point in the protective service or foster care system. The project included workload accounting and a management information system to assist the county agencies in monitoring service delivery performance. In 2002, the State of Minnesota contracted with NCCD/CRC to assist with the training and implementation of SDM assessments in every county.

Contact: Dorothy Renstrom, Deputy Director, (651) 297-5303
Minnesota Department of Human Services, Family and Children's Services
Division
444 Lafayette Road North, St. Paul, Minnesota 55155

Vermont Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services (2002–2003)

The Vermont Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services contracted with NCCD/CRC to design and implement a comprehensive child protection SDM system throughout the state. During the first phase of the project, several workgroups were convened to develop a comprehensive case management system, including a screen-in tool; response priority decision trees; a research-based risk assessment instrument; a family strengths and needs assessment; and other tools to guide decisions made throughout the protective service and foster care system. The design of this system included a new series of tools that assisted workers with decisions related to the placement of children in appropriate levels of care. Upon completion of the design sessions, NCCD/CRC conducted Training of Trainer sessions using a curriculum designed for training line staff and supervisors. After implementation, NCCD/CRC provided CPS staff with technical assistance and management information reports to assist with SDM implementation and monitoring service delivery performance.

Contact: Cindy Walcott, Policy and Planning Chief, (802) 241-2126
Vermont Agency of Human Services, Department of Corrections
SRS - Social Services
103 South Main Street, Waterbury, Vermont 05671

New Hampshire Division of Children, Youth and Families (2000–2003)

The New Hampshire Division of Children, Youth and Families contracted with NCCD/CRC to design and implement a comprehensive child protection SDM system throughout the state. During the first phase of the project, workgroups developed a new case management system, including a screen-in tool; several response priority decision trees; a research-based risk assessment instrument; a family strengths and needs assessment; and other tools to guide decisions made throughout the protective service and foster care system. NCCD/CRC also conducted Training of Trainer sessions. NCCD/CRC provided CPS staff with technical

² The pilot counties include Anoka, Carver, Dakota, Hennepin, Ramsey, Scott, and Washington.

New York State Department of Social Services: Child Protective Services Risk Assessment Study (1996–1997)

NCCD/CRC completed a joint research project with the Office of Program Evaluation in New York State, which developed a risk assessment protocol for assessing families substantiated for abuse or neglect. The study examined the characteristics and protective service outcomes of more than 1,000 families to develop an assessment tool to help agency staff prioritize families for service intervention based on the risk of future child abuse or neglect.

Contact: George Falco, Director, (518) 486-6340
New York Department of Social Services
New York Office of Temporary and Disability Assistance
40 North Pearl Street, 16th Floor, Albany, New York 12243

Oklahoma Department of Human Services: Development of Abuse/Neglect Risk Assessment Instruments (1990–1991)

NCCD/CRC completed a research project in Oklahoma that developed risk assessment protocols to help CPS workers estimate the potential for continued abuse/neglect. The study examined the characteristics and case outcomes of 1,200 Oklahoma families to develop an assessment tool that could prioritize families for service intervention based on the risk of future child abuse or neglect.

Contact: Michael Moore, DHS-DCFS-CQI, (405) 767-2553
Oklahoma County Juvenile Center
5905 North Classen Boulevard, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73118

Appendix B

References

<i>D. Web-based Data Collection System (DCS)</i>		
1a. Developing assessment specifications, programming, and testing for the web-based DCS for integrated participation/employment assessment with activity assignment matrix recommendations and the FSNA (FSE). Finalization (release) of the integrated participation/employability assessment with activity assignment matrix and FSNA (FSE).	70% (\$28,000)	20% (\$5,600) due upon contract signing; balance (\$22,400) invoiced upon delivery of the application test site (estimated January 2010)
1b. Developing assessment specifications, programming, and testing for the web-based DCS for the sanctioning/good cause decision tree/tool. Finalization (release) of the sanctioning/good cause decision tree/tool.	30% (\$12,000)	20% (\$2,400) due upon contract signing; balance (\$9,600) invoiced upon delivery of the live application site (estimated April 2010)
<i>E. Training</i>		
1. Curriculum development	50% (\$16,250)	20% (\$3,250) due upon contract signing; balance (\$13,000) invoiced upon completion of training curriculum (estimated March 2010)
2. Delivery of onsite training	50% (\$16,250)	20% (\$3,250) due upon contract signing; balance (\$13,000) invoiced upon delivery of onsite training (estimated April 2010)
<i>F. DCS maintenance</i>		
Maintenance and support (January – June 2010)	100% \$8,190	20% (\$1,638) invoiced January 2010; balance (\$6,552) invoiced June 30, 2010
Fiscal Year 2010–2011		Maximum \$68,880
<i>A. Process Evaluation</i>		
1. Onsite process evaluation activities (focus groups, case review)	\$15,750	20% invoiced July 2010; balance invoiced upon completion of onsite activities (estimated Aug 2010)
2. Worker web survey	\$7,875	20% invoiced July 2010; balance invoiced upon completion of web survey (estimated September 2010).
3. Compile data and draft report	\$15,750	20% invoiced July 2010; balance invoiced upon completion delivery of preliminary report (estimated October 2010).
4. Present and deliver final report	\$13,125	20% invoiced July 2010; balance invoiced upon delivery of final report (estimated December 2010)
<i>B. DCS maintenance</i>		
1. Maintenance and support (Jul. 2010 – June 2011)	\$16,380	20% invoiced July 2010; 50% of balance invoiced December 2010; balance invoiced June 2011

Fiscal Year 2011–2012		Maximum \$69,880
<i>A. Prospective Validation Study</i>		
1. Observation of case outcomes and preliminary examination of nine-month outcomes	\$13,375	20% invoiced July 2011; balance invoiced upon completion of preliminary analysis (estimated August 2011).
2. Conduct analysis	\$13,375	20% invoiced July 2011; balance invoiced upon completion of final analysis (estimated February 2012)
3. Write preliminary report	\$13,375	20% invoiced July 2010; balance invoiced upon delivery of preliminary report (estimated March 2012)
4. Finalize report and present findings	\$13,375	20% invoiced July 2010; balance invoiced upon delivery of final report (estimated June 2012)
<i>B. DCS maintenance</i>		
1. Maintenance and support (Jul. 2011 – Jun. 2012)	\$16,380	20% invoiced July 2011; 50% of balance invoiced December 2011; balance invoiced June 2012