2014-03-27 14.05 Collaboration Between TANF and Child Welfare to Improve Child Welfare Outcomes

March 27, 2014

Opening speaker: Jan Shafer, Director, Division of Program Innovation, Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Facilitator: Jack Denniston, Child Welfare Information Gateway
Presenters: Danna Fabella, M.S.W., Senior Project Consultant, Child and Family Policy Institute of California; Natalie Williams, M.P.A., Strategic Planning Organizational Development Manager, Jefferson County Human Services; Tara DeJohn, Ph.D., L.C.S.W., Assistant Professor, University of Arkansas-Little Rock School of Social Work; Cristy Willer, M.A., Senior Planning Director, Cook Inlet Tribal Council

Jack Denniston: [00:00:00] Thank you, Lisa. This is Jack Denniston. I'll be the moderator for today's webinar. I'd like to welcome you to the webinar. I'm a contractor at the Children's Bureau and also work with the Children's Bureau's clearinghouse Child Welfare Information Gateway, and I'm going to introduce our first speaker in just a moment. But first I would like to let you know that if you would like to ask questions during the webinar, you can enter them in the text box on the GoToWebinar screen, and we'll work to answer those towards the end. We also plan to leave some time at the end of the webinar so that you can unmute yourself and ask questions that way as well.

So I would like to introduce Jan Shafer who's the director of the Division of Program Information at the Children's Bureau, and take it away Jan.

Jan Shafer: [00:00:51] Thank you, Jack and thanks to our presenters. Thanks to all of the participants for joining us this afternoon or this morning, depending on where you are.

The Children's Bureau is really fortunate to have the opportunity to fund demonstration projects in various areas of child welfare, child abuse and neglect, adoption, and foster care. The purpose of our funding is usually to develop knowledge about strategies that work and to disseminate those to the field.

In this cluster of grants we undertook collaborations between TANF and child welfare, understanding that sometimes the same families are served by both systems and that their needs could probably be better met by a collaborative response. The grantees in this cluster really represent the best of what we expect to see in demonstration projects, and that's that the Children's Bureau really learned a lot about what it takes to implement these collaborations and that information will be very useful for the field but, more importantly, the grantees themselves really embraced the challenges and opportunities of their demonstration projects and made lasting changes in their communities.

So we're fortunate this afternoon to have four of the grantees join us to share their experiences with you. This webinar is one of our dissemination efforts. Other information about these grants is on the Children's Bureau website, where you can see syntheses of the final reports, site visit reports, and other information about their achievements.

So I would like to briefly introduce and thank for joining us today four of the grantees. From the California Department of Social Services in Sacramento, California, we have Danna Fabella. From the Cook Inlet Tribal Council in Anchorage, Alaska, we have Cristy Willer. From the Jefferson County Human Services in Golden, Colorado, we have Natalie Williams, and we also have from the Louisiana Department of Children and Families in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, Tara DeJohn.

So with that I'm going to turn it back over to Jack. Thank you again for joining us this afternoon.

Jack Denniston: [00:03:28] Thank you, Jan. I'll give you just a little insight into how the webinar's going to be organized, and you see before you the topics for discussion this afternoon and talking with the presenters, looking over the site visit reports and the synthesis that was written about these projects. These are the five topics that we all agreed would be of the most interest to you—the participants—in this webinar.

So each of the panelists will address one of these five questions and then, in most cases, several of the panelists will have some additional comments about that question before we move onto the next one.

As Jan said, there's a lot of information about these projects on the Child Welfare Information Gateway website. There'll be information at the end of this slideshow about how to find that on the Gateway website, how to contact Gateway for more information about these projects, what they did, how they did it, who they did it with—all that sort of thing.

So we're not going to tell you a lot about that today. What we're going to focus in on are these five topics. There's also a lot of information about each of the speakers in the bios that I think were sent to you when you registered for the webinar. So again we're not going to tell you a lot about each of the speakers. Please do read the bios. They're very, very well qualified, and I think you'll find them interesting.

So let's have the first speaker. Danna Fabella over to you.

Danna Fabella: [00:04:49] Hi, thank you, Jack. Hi, I'm Danna Fabella. I am with the Child and Family Policy Institute. It's the organization that the Department of Social Services in California contracted with to run the statewide linkages collaborative. Next slide Jack.

So how did we bring partners together to the table? Well, first of all, it is one that—this was a grant that we worked with the Department of Social Services to get and so we had a lot of county - county and State working together to bring this project to fruition. Next page please. Next slide.

So one of the I think important things and I think I'm going to say briefly also that the California project, which was the CalWORKs and Child Welfare Collaboration to Improve Outcomes for Children and Families and our CalWORKs program is our local name for the TANF program, which stands for California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids.

It's a program that was run across the State, and we are a State-supervised and county-administered child welfare and social services program, so there are 58 counties in California, and we have 33 that participated in the Federal project. And we brought people together, and the main thing is to have these two programs working together, and we had to have a shared vision—a joint vision that could resonate with both the programs. So the foundation for this vision is really that poverty is a risk factor for child abuse and neglect.

And we were able to pull our child welfare partners in by saying that child welfare can serve as an antipoverty program in helping families achieve self-sufficiency. So we had a goal there that would, you know, meet the needs of our CalWORKs partners. And so our CalWORKs partners—we really talked about that they can serve as a child abuse prevention program by providing families the resources that they need to promote safety and well-being for their children.

So this joint vision was really an important creation of how to bring these partners together. They both had to see what's in it for them and their programs and the families they served. Next slide please.

The other thing that we did is we really developed outcomes for both programs. Our Federal grant really only required outcomes for our child welfare programs, but we knew if we were going to keep our partner CalWORKs TANF program at the table, we really needed to show that there were some outcomes for the TANF program.

So, you know, you can see the child welfare services. These were three of the outcomes we strived for, which was to reduce substantiated reoccurrence of abuse, reduce the number of children removed from their home, and allow them to remain at home safely. That was really important so that if you had a child welfare referral, you may not have to remove if in fact you had your partners to the table to support the family and, if they were removed—the child was removed—we wanted to decrease time to reunification.

And for our CalWORKs partners it was really very much around looking at how you would resolve the sanctions that they receive sometimes while they're in their Welfare-to-Work plan. We wanted to look at the amount of the monthly cash grant, because sometimes they have worked programs where they receive some funding but the CalWORKs program still provided some cash grant, and we were looking at length of time on aid. And these were important to have outcomes for both programs. Next slide please.

We also created an oversight committee. We had our State partners that our State partners had Child Welfare and Office of Child Abuse Prevention and our employment bureau staff - the CalWORKs staff also at the table, and we also had county staff representing both the child welfare and the CalWORKs program on the oversight committee that provided guidance to the ongoing implementation of the grant.

We also required from the counties co-coordinator so each county had to have a coordinator assigned and the coordinators had to represent both programs—both the child welfare and the CalWORKs program. Next slide please.

One of our—we had actually two big events. We had regional convening's, and we had a big biannual—we had a big annual convening where everybody came together at the State. Because we're a large State one of the things we did like at the mid part of the year we had a regional convening. So we had three regional convening's.

We require that teams from the counties that were participating be brought to these convening's for sharing because the convening's were all about peer sharing best practices. So we had both CalWORKs and child welfare represented, and we said anyone else that was important to have your program running. Sometimes they brought training staff, sometimes fiscal staff, and almost always data and evaluation staff. Next slide.

And one of the things we also did was we developed tools and resources to support both programs and to support the collaboration from both points of views. So we had a toolkit that provided cross training, coordinated case planning, physical sharing, communication strategies. These were all ideas that we really asked them, and we actually used examples on the toolkit from all the different counties. So if one county had a really great fiscal sharing idea, we made sure that was on the toolkit.

We developed the linkages video, which I think is very good, and it really shows the positive impact of working together on this CalWORKs and child welfare collaboration. Another resource we developed—more guidelines—and these guidelines were developed by CalWORKs and child welfare staff from the counties to look at how joint engagement of clients should occur.

And the other thing we did to support the collaboration is really provide a monthly newsletter really featuring success stories and other pertinent information that would really resonate with both programs. Next slide. Our partner from Louisiana will talk.

Tara DeJohn: [00:11:28] Hello, this is Tara DeJohn representing the Louisiana project—our project focus on kinship caregivers in collaboration between child welfare and our program was called economic support initially that was our TANF serving agency and just wanted to kind of highlight a couple of things that struck me as similarities to California, you know, because Louisiana and California don't have a whole lot in common. And so when we see things that commonly work, we just kind of wanted to point those out.

And as Danna said, equivalent to their oversight committee we had a workgroup committee that was very purposeful in including all partners from State and parish, which is the equivalent of county. In Louisiana they call them parishes. But members of that workgroup were all put together to make sure there was representation across all levels and all program areas and also included all the members of the evaluation team.

So from the very beginning it was a key effort so that helped, we believe, keep people at the table because they talked a lot about how much they valued an opportunity to partner from the ground level all the way up. And we spent a big part of the beginning part of the project on just relationship development—having to identify common language instead of just assuming that we knew what each other were talking about because across child welfare, TANF—even in evaluation and academic settings—we would have different terms for the same thing or would talk about things and realize, "Wait, nobody knows what we're talking about."

And developing time to identify the common missions and goals across agencies and then especially what the workgroup identified at the end of the project is helpful is that we didn't rush it, and we took time for them to be able to talk about the different myths, which (unintelligible) included some resentment that they had across agency lines.

In Louisiana both the child welfare serving agency and the TANF serving agency were under a large departmental umbrella; however, they might as well have been almost in two different States because there was very little if any collaboration. A lot of assumptions related to caseloads, education requirements, pay scale, and so we really took time to work through all of that so that we could from the beginning of that workgroup model collaboration—developing those relationships—so that when we went out to the field that had a ripple effect to direct service workers as well as to our community partners.

The other aspect that we think really helped keep people to the table for five years—we had very little attrition in our workgroup—was that we intentionally when we met brought success stories so that they could continually see that the efforts and time that they were committing to this project really helped to keep them engaged and show that they're different than what they were doing with making a difference to families immediately.

It wasn't going to be "wait and see what happens" but for them to see right away how their efforts impacted the families that they all universally had concerns about. Next slide.

Jack Denniston: [00:14:50] I'd like to introduce our next speaker. Natalie Williams is the manager of strategic planning and organizational development at Jefferson County Human Services in Colorado. Natalie?

Natalie Williams: [00:15:02] Hello. Today I'm going to talk to you about how we use this demonstration grant to initiate and sustain cross-culture or cross-system culture change through this project. Next slide.

We are located in a suburban site—a lot of span of land that we oversee. We're one of the larger counties in Colorado, but we border Denver, which is the main urban site of the State. Next slide.

So in looking at that we knew that we needed to address poverty. We needed to address the child welfare issue—the number of reports. We looked at the areas that we had the most people that were—that were applying for food assistance as well as the highest number of child welfare reports.

Prior to this demonstration project we were a systems of care site for five years, so we weren't starting off brand new. We knew what it took to have a five-year demonstration grant, but we also knew what some of the barriers were to really having sustainable system change.

Within the—some of the initiatives within our systems of care were team decision-making, cultural competency, and in that we looked at our program practice through a lens of cultural competency, making sure that we connected to the communities that we were serving culturally. We used family assessments mostly used from the standpoint of the caseworker or the case manager. Didn't have a ton of direct family input.

The systems of care process was really child welfare owned. It wasn't in our agency fully integrated into TANF or other systems, and in that we knew that we needed to broaden our scope if we wanted to have larger system change. We needed to address these families that were going through multiple systems within our same building. Next slide.

And what we called our Jesco Community Connection Grant, which is the TANF child welfare integration grant—we looked at what other practices out there did we want to see that were more family oriented that were more driven by our customer. And so we learned and adopted the family group conferencing model. We looked at not just TANF and child welfare system integration, but where else did these families integrate. Were they in the justice system? Were they applying for food assistance? Were they in child support?

And we started tracking these families and how many doors and how many lines they had to stand in to get services, as well as how many case management plans they had to adopt or meet case managers for and how time consuming that was in an effort to get them to be self-sufficient.

We developed and implemented—which was on the heels of the systems of care grant—the parent partner program. So we wanted to create a little—a more robust parent partner program that could really inform not only our clients but also our community as to what are some of the issues or the barriers that the systems are presenting to these families that we don't know as system people, and what can we do to enhance our service to make sure that those barriers are not there.

And then we went to a shared case plan. This was difficult but seemed to work in some ways for our agency to have a TANF worker and a child welfare worker sit down and have a shared case plan so that families weren't coming in multiple times and so that families knew on both sides what resources they could tap into to help stabilize their family.

We collected data as to how many people in child welfare were falling into TANF because of the economic state of their family and how could we use our TANF resources and even our food assistant resources to be able to stabilize them and then provide those in-house services. Next slide.

One of my favorite things that we did was the Comprehensive Family Assessment because families were able to see their assessment. They were able to tap into and tell us directly what was going on with their family. It was not filtered through the lens of a case manager. That's powerful when you get that from that individual because how we assess sometimes is not accurate as to how they assess their situations.

It also allowed us to identify barriers and assets for those individuals so that we could put time and effort into increasing those assets and helping them get through the barriers with our integrated services and with the navigator helping them walk through systems.

We broadened our scope from cultural competency to inclusivity because we wanted to make sure that everybody was included in that, not negating that we saw that there were disparities in people of color that were families of color that were in our system—especially our child welfare system. But we had never looked at that number for our TANF system. So we broadened it to make sure that we had representation, and we allowed people the opportunity to represent who they were at the table.

It also allowed our agency to rally around. Everybody brings a level of diversity, and it's acceptable here and that we need to respect other peoples' diversity and be open to whatever needs that they have.

A big—another big thing that we did was the community involvement. We had a steering committee that met in our site that provided the most people with child welfare referrals as well as needing the TANF assistance, and we mobilized that group to be an independent group so that we gave them the data that our system showed that their community had, and we asked them how we wanted us to help them meet the needs of these families in a community that were struggling.

And so they began to look at their educational systems, their faith-based systems, and their senior systems to say, "How can we wrap all these supports around our families, and how can we decrease the number of people that need government services?" This was an agency-owned process. Nobody could say no to this process. We were going to integrate by any means, and it was difficult for the case managers, but the department executive director said, “You know what, we’re going to do this, and we’re not going to deal with the politics or with the attitudes of staff that don’t want to make this transition. We’ll give them the training, but we’re going to do this.”

And so we felt successful in our TANF and child welfare collaboration. Next slide.

Jack Denniston: [00:22:19] I believe that Danna and Tara have some additional comments on culture change. Danna? Tara do you want to go ahead and start with Louisiana?

Tara DeJohn: [00:22:47] Sure. In some of the looking at cultural change in our project was twofold. One was really looking at the culture of how services are delivered to clients, and then the other was looking at the culture across the two agencies. So one of the beginning things that we addressed in changing culture at that client level was moving systems from focusing on being eligibility determination drive, where clients get exactly what they apply and are eligible for, or in child welfare that it’s really driven by whether the standard requirements or court requirements, to moving those agencies to focusing on family sustainability and permanent from the very beginning.

And similar to what Natalie said about doing the comprehensive family assessment that we made that kind of focus in looking at what does the kinship family need to be able to thrive and survive, because so many of our children were placed in kinship settings whether they were in child welfare, TANF service agency, or both. And so that whole placement—that culture of focusing on assessing what is the need and how do we work together to meet the need—was a tremendous culture shift than what is the minimum of what we have to do.

And then at the organizational level just emphasizing and modeling that we were all partners in that project and we started out initially capturing that by allowing both agencies at that frontline workgroup and also at the recipient level to give input into the project design—what was going to happen.

We had focus groups with workers. We had focus groups with recipients. From those focus groups, data was rolled up into actually creating an environmental survey that was used across all workers, across all programs, and along with the Wilder Collaboration Survey just to see where is everybody at in their readiness to collaborate and then use that information to drive the project further.

((Crosstalk))

Danna Fabella: [00:25:04] Yes. I’m sorry. I had technical difficulties, but I’m back on. This is Danna with the California project.

Jack Denniston: [00:25:11] I heard it’s thunderstorms and floods where you’re at, so I’m glad you were able to get back.

Danna Fabella: [00:25:15] Well, in California we wish we had thunderstorms, but we are in a drought but okay. I’m sorry, but for the California project one of the things that we did to really try to impact the culture change issue was to really—we held focus groups. We hired a communication specialist, and we held focus groups with our child welfare and our CalWORKs supervisors and line workers and with our directors and managers. We held like three different focus groups to kind of understand what—how they saw this collaboration, what did they want from it, and what did we need to do—what needed to, you know, sell it if you will across the State to other folks.

So out of that we created some, you know, some key messages, collaborative checklists. We created a very good video that is online and you can actually see that as well. We created a mechanism for gathering linkages success stories. We really wanted to help the staff and the county agency understand why collaboration was really an important practice for the vulnerable families that they jointly served. And so we created this very—I think a very robust communication package that we actually have on our toolkit and is used pretty —quite a bit for right now with our linkages coordinators in the counties. So that was really what we tried to focus on in terms of culture change.

Jack Denniston: [00:26:57] Thanks' Danna and this is Jack. I'll just insert a comment that you're kind of teasing us here talking about this video, but we don't get to see it. You know, all that is going to—we'll show you at the end of the slideshow how you can find those and go to Information Gateway and find links to those resources in that toolkit.

And we're intentionally covering a lot of ground fast here and telling you about these things in hopes that you'll use the links at the end of the slideshow to go follow up on the ones that you're interested in, so thanks. Now I'd like to introduce Tara DeJohn who's the assistant professor at the University of Arkansas, Little Rock, School of Social Work. Tara.

Tara DeJohn: [00:27:41] Thanks, Jack. And at the time of this project I was working on my Ph.D. and so as part of the evaluation team for LA KISS project in Baton Rouge and still maintain some contacts with all the folks at DCFS.

And so now just focusing on some of the things that worked well, and this was considered a very successful project. We all were really engaged. It was focused on serving kinship families in the greater New Orleans area at the time of the grant proposal and continues through until today that over 50 percent of all kinship families—whether it's child welfare or in the TANF serving agency—reside within five parishes that are considered the greater New Orleans region.

So that was our rationale for focusing on that area because it's such a large population of kinship families, and there are also kinship families that are placed at a lot of risk, mostly because of economic and financial situations. Next slide.

So part of our—what we see has worked well is going back to that initial workgroup that I mentioned previously that it did consist of child welfare and TANF members across the State and regional levels, as well as the evaluators and members were involved from the proposal writing process all the way through to the final report. And we really worked on getting members that were ready to face changes that were invested in the agency but really have demonstrated in their years of service and were known throughout the community as being client centered and wanting to kind of make note that things needed to be changed.

We set up from the very beginning that we acknowledge that the workgroup had an equal voice to break down that traditional kind of bureaucratic hierarchical mentality that that didn't apply in the workgroup because there really was more of a circular management type of focus.

The workgroup met every month for three—for the first three years of the project, and then we met every other month through years four and five of the project. Before every meeting we had an agenda and minutes that were always sent out in advance, and we really think that helps keep people on board. We also had a website that had an internal component that only members of the project could access, and so there was a way to always be able to add information in or look at information if somebody happened to miss a meeting so that they could always stay connected. That open connection between everybody was considered vital to the success of the project.

The members were also added to the workgroup as needed. For example, when the workgroup first started, and the logic model and the relationships were developed, and it was identified that we would have care managers providing direct services to kinship families that those care managers, as they were hired, then were brought into the workgroup so that everybody, regardless of their involvement, still had that active role in participating in the life of the project and helped continue to improve it, so that it kind of kept an organic focus and didn't become stagnant.

We also from time to time invited stakeholders into the meeting to address certain agenda items as needed as well as kinship caregivers sometimes attended and provided input as well.

The care managers came from either the child welfare or TANF programs. We made sure we had a balance of both, and they really were cross-trained in how to address any issues that we needed to tweak to make the project go more fluidly.

At the client center focus—as mentioned previously—all members were committed to a cultural shift to go to being client centered rather than agency rule centered. And so that buy-in was obtained from the top administration with the help of the steering committee all the way down to the frontline workers. So it was a unanimous agreement that, yes, this was the direction that we wanted to go in. Next slide. Next slide.
We also looked at realizing to be client centered that clients were one partner, but being able to work with them we had to look at the client worker relationship. And so we made an effort to from the beginning assess what is the status of this relationship between workers and clients and not just go off of our assumptions and then take that assessment in what the current dynamics were and work from there. And so initially focus groups helped identify some beginning areas to look at, and then those focus group information then rolled in to the development of an environmental survey that was completed by workgroups and frontline supervisors across all programs.

The environmental survey was developed conjointly by the workgroup members, and then the evaluation team implemented the environmental survey. And we thought that was really important because the evaluation team members were not employees of DCFS. So we believe that helped to try to mitigate any kind of responder bias or hesitancy among staff to participate in the surveys.

We really emphasized confidentiality when we did the environmental survey, and we also used the Wilder Collaboration Readiness Survey at the same time, and when we went out to collect the surveys from the staff, we emphasized that our data would only be aggregated in large numbers. That is, that no one office would be reported on, because there was concern that would be too easy to be targeted. So if we just did it broadly this is, you know, the summary of data from the workforce from TANF, and this is the summary data from the workforce with child welfare.

Does that help give a cushion for more anonymity to allow clients to be - or not clients - more workers to feel more comfortable in responding? In the environmental survey there were four areas that were addressed in the survey. The first had questions about the respondent's agency and position. It was asking them information about which program they worked in, how long they had been employed, what their current position is, if they had any previous positions or employment with any other State agencies and just their general demographic.

Good questions on that perspective for child welfare and TANF working together asked about what their current experiences were in interacting with their counterprograms, what their beliefs in the quality of the two agencies working together were, and what their beliefs were for solutions or strategies to improve the working relationship across the system.

Then we also asked about what is their understanding of policies regarding relative caregivers. There were questions that were specific to the agency that they worked in and also the counteragency. So having them see what do they know about if they were a TANF worker, what did they know about their own rules about providing services to relative caregivers, as well as what did they know about child welfare rules for providing services to caregivers.

And then the last part asked about just their perspective in general on working with relative caregivers. With permission we got from (unintelligible) to adapt a survey that they had developed in 1999 and that survey was on child welfare professionals' attitudes towards caregivers and foster care systems, and we took that and just tweaked it a little bit to make sure the language would fit both staff from the TANF system as well as child welfare, because we know in the literature prior to starting this project that there are some biases both positively and negatively around the notion of kinship caregivers in foster care and TANF systems. So we wanted to see where they were at in that regard as well.

And as I mentioned, the environmental survey was just done as a pretest, and then we also used the Wilder Collaboration Readiness Survey, and that was done as pre- and posttest as a way to measure the success of our collaboration. Next slide.

Jack Denniston: [00:36:44] I hate to do this. I'm going to have to ask you to move a little more quickly through your last couple slides if you would please. This is great stuff, and I really, really hate to say that, but here's your next slide.

Tara DeJohn:[00:36:54] Thank you. So information from those surveys just really helped to drive the rest of the projects—the things that were considered most successful before we provided services to the kinship families and added cross-training to staff. We did a kickoff meeting that fed the information that they gave us back, and they considered that important because staff in both systems talked a lot about being survey—having survey burnout where people would ask them lots of questions. They'd never hear the responses, and they'd never see these changes.

So we gave that back to them in our regional kickoff meeting. Our care managers as I mentioned were cross-trained so that they understood the policies for both agencies before going out to serve any kinship families, and then we had training for both child welfare and TANF staff, and we put those trainings on neutral sites, and we feel like that was what helped make it successful. So we didn't do a training and expected TANF workers to come to child welfare offices or vice versa but really finding nice pleasant sites and having giveaways and making it as fun and interactive as possible.

Also we brought in community partners from the areas that they identified to be part of those trainings too. And so we had caregivers that attended, so it really helped to just push that client-centered client worker equitable partnership across the board in all of our actions, and in all of the trainings there were always models that they were co-facilitated by someone known from child welfare and by someone known from TANF, and using this community of resources to just emphasize we're all in this together focusing on moving towards the same ability and permanent. Next slide.

We—I'll skip past just the flexibility. It was considered to be a key point of our success. Even though we had a logic model, we had very well-designed plans. We had to be very flexible with those plans at the organizational level. The timing of being able to access something as simple as office space took much longer than we ever anticipated. So just being flexible with some of the dates, being flexible about how to go about getting information, being flexible in timings of trainings, and considering what else is going on in each agency.

The child welfare side of the program was having a lot of other rollout initiatives, so we really tried to match our trainings during times where they weren't already being saturated and increasing the stress of, you know, how do I manage all my cases and how do I attend these trainings. So we just looked at being flexible and getting all that kind of organizational information.

At the client level we had a lot of flexibility in how clients completed the different surveys. They were offered choices of us either coming to their homes, doing surveys over the phone, them coming to the office so that it was based on their needs. We had to be flexible in our timeframes. There was no such thing as working 8 to 5—not that I think there is probably in any area anymore. So we really just worked to fit in their schedules, what was their comfort zone, what helped decrease their fears or apprehensions as much as possible.

In the beginning of the project we had incentives built into the proposal for staff, but we didn't have incentives for the clients. And in the end, once we got in that recruitment phase or starting to bring in kinship families, we realized that that really is being off from what our focus was if we were going to have that client-worker equity focus if we were trying to push a culture change that we should be treating our clients as well as our staff.

And our staff incentives policy prohibited giving them actual cash, but we selected incentives based on what they said their needs were, which primarily were gift bags of office supplies. It's amazing how much Post-It notes and pens and little paper clips made a difference in just the brightness of the day for the worker. And for clients we added incentives that were attached to the satisfaction survey where they had a $10 increment for pretest and a $20 increment for posttest, and we actually had some caregivers that said they didn't want the money. They appreciated giving the input.

And most of the caregivers that did take the incentive would often comment that they were happy to have a little extra so now they could take the child in their care to the movies or get ice cream or something like that that they typically cannot afford to do with the children in their care. Next slide.

Jack Denniston: [00:41:47] Thanks, and I believe Danna has some additional comments on successful strategies.

Danna Fabella: [00:41:52] Can you hear me? This is from the California project. I think there were—I thought a lot of important strategies that were used, but I want to just briefly mention three. One is an agency director champions. I think any project you really need to find your champions, and we were really fortunate in the County Welfare Directors Association, and some of the linkages counties to find champions that could really carry the message to their colleagues.

Important also is putting the face to the success stories. We—the parent and the family that we feature in our video—our communication video on linkages —we really brought them back every year.

Everyone wanted to know how is Paul and the family doing, so we brought them back every year to give us an update. This success story—it was like, wow, we can do this and that was really important.

And of course the peer mentoring network. We really developed a network of coordinators across the State that would have quarterly calls. Actually this year we've been doing monthly calls, but we were doing—because we've continued—to let you know we've continued linkages collaborations—statewide collaboration in the State post the Federal project, and those peer mentoring networks have been very important. I'm finished. Next slide.

Jack Denniston: [00:43:15] Okay, and I think Tara you're going to talk about challenges and lessons learned.

Tara DeJohn: [00:43:22] Just some of the key and going again kind of from that system approach since we were a multi-systemic project at the organizational level and challenges in just not having planned in advance which program would be responsible for securing basic needs of staff like office space, telephone lines. So even though those were put in the grant proposal budget, it wasn't clarified who was responsible for that. And so lessons learned is to plan that in advance because those kinds of things can throw you off.

And then we ran into a lot of challenges with technology. None of the databases communicated to each other across the child welfare, TANF, or LSU systems, so we had to do a lot of adjustments in trying to find different technology software that we could use that would be compatible across all those agencies. And then in trying to pull data from their different databases we had to give a lot of extra support that we didn't anticipate and wound up having to do our own stripping of data and assisting especially the child welfare agency to be able to maintain our random design for the treatment and control group of the cases.

So, lesson learned, have IC reps from the beginning in the writing process all the way through to the end to help mitigate some of those challenges. At the organizational policy level it was identified that there were market differences in how kinship was defined and that the workers across agencies didn't realize those differences and that was causing a tremendous impact with our kinship families.

For example, we had a case where the caregiver was the third cousin of some children, and the judge ordered the case to be referred to the kinship subsidy program in TANF and closed the case. The worker just gave her the number. Well she wasn't approved.

Unfortunately, she became one of our treatment cases, and the caregiver was almost at the point of having to let go of the children because she couldn't financially make it without any support, and our care manager was able to advocate back to the child welfare agency to get the case reopened, have her certified as a foster parent, and throughout the course of our project she moved—we assisted with the TPR and getting her in the adoptive process just because she was considered too far removed biologically and couldn't meet that eligibility in the TANF program.

So just clarifying those differences was an important challenge and lesson learned. Another challenge we had in our overall design for a pre and posttest—the staff was having a mechanism to track staff movement and terminations. By the end of our five-year project there were multiple staff who had separated from one of the agencies for any number of reasons, and there wasn't a clear process of how to get in touch with them. So we had to work through and work through different policies, get different levels of approval.

And then once we got that approval to be able to get the contact information on the separated staff, then we were able to capture almost about 75% of those initially missing from the post survey. And so, lesson learned was just planning for that of how to keep touching base with staff when they're a part of a pre and posttest process, and then we also added giving an offer of an incentive to separated staff to complete the post surveys.

The other lesson learned was that we didn't develop a mechanism to track staff from beginning to end of the project to be able to coordinate which staff out of the staff that completed the pre and post surveys—how many of them actually had kinship cases that participated in our project and how many attended our cross-trainings. So we don't know for sure how much overlap between those three layers actually occurred, which limited then our reporting ability in the final analysis impacts, you know, at the organizational level. Also just looking at the challenges, getting through the commonality of clients took a while and took time. Next slide.

As far as the client-ordered/client-oriented focus, some of the challenges in trying to do a random design was really holding onto the control group cases. Everyone that was assigned to a control group received services as usual and in trying to recruit and retain them to participate in the project was very challenging because many reported they were too busy. They really didn't believe the system would ever change to respect their role and or meet their family needs. So it was a tremendous challenge in trying to figure out how to retain that substantial group in that control setting.

The other important lesson learned was being very sensitive to the realities of the kinship caregivers regardless of which systems they had received services in. There was a tremendous amount of fear or apprehension to participate in any project especially giving their input. A lot of them reported that they had fear that they would say something and that would lead to either their services being reduced or cut off or it would increase involvement of agencies.

Most of our treatment caregivers were in TANF only and had never had or had very limited involvement with child welfare, and they were afraid that if too much attention was called to them then somehow they would lose care of their relative children. And we learned that there was not any kind of appreciable difference between the reasons that brought kids in care with kinship relatives whether they had ever participated in child welfare or not.

But across the board most of them were caring for relative children because of parental incarceration, parental illness—either physical illness, mental illness, high rate of substance abuse among parents, and they were care that they had informal custody and so that kind of created some tensions.

So we learned, you know, just being very sensitive to the cultural and historical experiences of the caregivers, really affirming up front and validating their role as kinship caregivers because they said that they felt like nobody had ever done that and then being honest and up front about what our mandatory reporting conditions were and emphasizing the importance of hearing their voice for what their needs were and what they thought solutions for change would be.

And that was something that most of the caregivers—once we were able to engage them—said that they saw tremendous value because they felt like nobody had ever bothered to want to hear what they had to say before. Next slide.

Jack Denniston: [00:50:26] And I think Natalie has some additional comments.

Natalie Williams: [00:50:30] So we faced a significant amount of challenges within our project but the top four I believe were the turf issues between child welfare and TANF and that was just around the practice and who knew best for the families and how do we share information as well as how does the family drive the process. And so that I believe goes back to what Danna referred to as really having strong champions, beginning the project, really identifying those champions and making sure that you can call on them when people are not wanting to go along with the process.

The evaluation was difficult. It was not very flexible and we decided to go with a randomization model. So the families that are transient a lot of times being put into a random assignment as far as the treatment levels for the project. That was difficult because some of the families needed a higher level of treatment or lower level of treatment and we could not change that around.

And so the lesson learned from that is having an amazing evaluator in which we did to really look at the process and understand program development as well as evaluation to help us as the implementers know how to get around the barriers and the challenges of the evaluation.

The use of parent partners—this has been a hot topic in our agency because we've had parent partners for over ten years, and they have changed our culture just by having that program in general. It is people that have basically graduated from the system and are now informing the system and helping advocate for others and mentoring others who are currently going through the process.

Our case workers—our case managers had a difficult time in the beginning with having those parent partners have that strong of a voice at the table. So one end it was a challenge for us of how do we keep the dignity and respect for those individuals at the table as well as how do we change our worker's culture to say these people have a very strong voice and it's okay and so that was part of our culture shift as well.

And then the FGC versus the - the family group conferencing model versus the team decision making model. The family group conferencing we found to be incredibly effective, but we also found it to be very expensive and that's both in time and money. And so it was a dance between how do you have the family lead a process, which we know can take time, and have them having everybody at the table and it's a family-led meeting that we know is effective when we're on a time schedule for case planning and for implementation of using the TDM.

Where we are as an agency is we have people that are cross trained both in family group conferencing and TDM. At this point we use the team's decision making model more than the family group conferencing model but we have it available for families that we feel really need to have that time and that space to develop their own case plans. Thank you.

Jack Denniston: [00:53:38] Thanks Natalie. Next Cristy is going to talk to us about sustainability, and I just want to interject a note here that these projects ended three years ago. So one of the things that the whole group felt was real important to look at was so we had these five year grants. We tried a lot of things. We found out some things that really worked that we wanted to keep doing, and so what were those things that were working and that we wanted to keep doing and that we're still doing now.

So Cristy's going to talk about some of that from the Alaska perspective and then we'll have some other comments. So I'll introduce Cristy Willer who is senior planning director of the Cook Inlet Tribal Council.

Cristy Willer: [00:54:17] Thanks Jack. Yes, as to sustainability I wanted to say at the outset that it continues to astonish me that so much of our projects have not only been sustained but also continues to influence pretty much everything else we do. So but keeping that to12 minutes—I first need to tell you a little bit about who we are because not everybody knows what an Alaska native regional organization is.

Cook Inlet Tribal is a regional Alaska native social service organization. We serve the Anchorage Bull area of Alaska where one of 13 such regional organizations for very large States in a small population. We serve about 10,000 participants per year. Anchorage is in fact the city with proportionally the largest Alaska Native American Indian population in the country.

Within our operation we have four primary service areas—employment and training—in which our TANF—I'm sorry. My screen just went black. Okay, got it. Our TANF group is serving and also child and family services, recovery services, and education.

The project that we ran with this grant—we called it agency without walls—was intended to pull together not only TANF and child welfare but recognize that many of the people served by those departments were—could make use also of recovery services, education, and employment. It was also particularly good timing for us to initiate this project because that was the year that all those departments which had been housed in separate buildings all over Anchorage were combined into one new building.

So our people were used to operating as kind of independent systems for years. Essentially they had never met as a single integrated organization. So I was hired to make people feel integrated as a result of the grant that we received in 2006.

So, change slides please Jack. So over the course of the next five years we completely overhauled the management structure of the organization. We aligned the four service areas in terms of intake, processes, and quality improvement systems. We used what we learned from those internal changes to initiate several community-wide collaborative impact projects, and we developed a 25-years sustainability plan. So I will describe all of those in a bit more detail. Next slide please.

I said we overhauled our management structure, which is much more easy to say than to do of course. As I said, we were spread out all over town before coming together in one building. So we had quarterly meetings, which consisted of directors rather nervously and formally reporting out on what they had been doing, but they were virtually strangers to one another.

At that point, too, our CEO—actually both (Natalie) and (Danna) talked about champion. She's certainly one and continues to be. She said she wanted a more horizontal organizational structure, and she said she wanted to divest herself with 80% of her decision making power, which is kind of an extraordinary thing for a CEO to say.

Essentially, she wanted what's described in an excellent book I found called "Side by Side Leadership" by Dennis Romig. Over the course of a year, we formed our CITC leadership council. Kind of kicking and screaming we agreed to meet two times a month instead of every three months. We developed a process for consensus-based decision-making, and very importantly we shared food with every meeting.

We approved all company policy and created a form for cross-departmental case management, and essentially, of course, we increased our ability to communicate and built relationships. In my opinion, I think this was the most important thing that we did, and nothing that followed could have happened without this particular change.

So illustrating that - slide please. So basically we changed from what you see as a pretty classic square box square-cornered hierarchical chain of command to - slide again please - to a much more interactional circular. Tara mentioned a circular structure that became a more organic structure. This was more fitting for a native organization with our traditions of cooperation but also according to the side by side leadership, it's a more effective way of doing business for other types of organizations as well. In terms of sustainability, we still need in this configuration, and we now actually look forward to it. Slide please.

The second effort that was sustained was our service alignment. We had many strategies to align our TANF child family service, employment, recovery, and education. We first grappled with creating a standardized intake out of the little departmental feast-ins that I mentioned. Natalie talked about something similar.

We all know how unwelcome and unwelcoming and inefficient it is to ask the same participants the same questions over and over again. We also knew we could help our participants more if we knew more about them in the initial interview and could refer them to the right places to seek the right services.

So we undertook this. It took over a year to do it. We had to hire a group from Texas to help process map all our different intake processes. We compared all the program's intake questions, eliminated duplication and irrelevancies. We got IT on board and solved the seemingly insurmountable issues of releases of information and privacy protection.

We did in the end develop a standard intake form, and we realized that the form was more welcoming certainly and more efficient but the forum was not. We still had people bouncing around the various desks. So we brought in construction people, cut up our lobby. We actually broke down the walls literally and built a welcome center. It was a much more welcoming location to entice people in.

It included and includes to date cozy couches, a baby nursing room, a fireplace, and a fish tank. I think the fish have left us but everything else remains. We also had the issue of two separate databases as Tara's group did. The recovery services database was very complicated. It was developed by a guy in New Jersey that was hard to get hold of and it was not under our control. That was a problem. And we also needed to bring it in house so that we could identify participants who are using all of our different service departments.

In terms of sustainability, I think it's important to note that we got a start on this. It was a very complicated processes, but then we were able to use the beginnings of that process to write and acquire a different grant from the tribal management group to finish the project, so that was carried over from five years ago.

So one way to show the outcome of some of these management and interdepartmental changes is on slide 36 if you could switch it. So those of you who are familiar with the North Carolina Family Assessment Scale will recognize this kind of scale. These are the last three years of our grant and the chart scores are going down, which is indicating improved outcomes in all five domains.

Finally, on slide 36–37, sorry, you can switch. Our third sustainable outcome is our engagement in community outcomes and collective impacts. I'll describe a few ways that our efforts with agency without walls led us into breaking not only the internal walls between departments but the walls between our agency and the communities surrounding us.

The first example came from an excellent book called "Trying Hard Is Not Good Enough" by Mark Friedman. He describes the results-based accountability model that you're probably—many of you—are familiar with. It's a model that focuses on larger changes we want to make in the communities that we inhabit and describes how to tailor the programs to reach our goals in partnership with others.

It really forces us to use data to make decisions. For instance, on slide 38 is a chart that we found quite compelling as it showed very dramatically the amount of disproportionality in the out-of-home placement of Alaskan Native American Indian kids in Anchorage placed in out-of-home placement relative to the rest of the population. So it led us as an organization to focus our outcomes on children. Slide 39 please.

So it led us to work on three essential community outcomes that we wanted to achieve for all of our people—you can read them there—in terms of children in stable families prepared to enter school and the workplace and children connected to community. The small print at the bottom I think is important relative to our organizational changes is that these outcomes and others—this is only an example—were developed through much discussion and consensus agreement, so we continue to use that horizontal structure that I was talking about. Slide please.

Another critical element of results-based accountability is the program measures need to be determined that will connect to the overall community outcomes. These are our pieces of solution, and an important thing about the distinction between program and community outcomes is that no one group or agency can take responsibility or blame for the outcomes. It requires partnerships and collaboration to work effectively to achieve desired goals.

So these were our in house service area—sorry my screen is going blank again. There it is. The results that our child and family service group were able to attest to at the end of those years and the linkage between the community outcomes was (unintelligible). Slide please.

A couple of examples of engaging in other kinds of groups—community groups—is we had at the same time simultaneously the SAMHSA grant for strategic prevention, which required partnerships between the tribal, United Way, our native health operation, Volunteers of America, and the Anchorage school district. In this partnership we worked together for six years to produce an epidemiological profile of Alaska native people in Anchorage decide to focus on a common—common impact, which, at that point, was underage drinking for Alaska native kids and then support three strategies—slide please —which were to reduce demand, reduce supply, and build resiliency among kids relative to drinking.

All of these strategies which were funded through the SAMHSA grant continued today long—well, two years after that funding ceased. So, in terms of resiliency, these strategies through the school district, Volunteers of America, and the hospital were embedded and found to be so useful to the system that those organizations have taken them over and now fund them. Slide please.

One final example of community impact is a project we're currently working on called ARISE, which is an acronym for Anchorage Realizes Indigenous Student Excellence. Again, this is a community collaborative impact involving Cook Inlet, United Way, school district, and others wanting to impact Alaskan native and American Indian academic success.

Without going into too much detail, it's really safe to say that our experience with the agency without walls has made us the kind of place that takes the lead in these community efforts. Just last week in an ARISE data committee meeting, I found myself training civic leaders how to implement our consensus-based decision-making to sort of desired outcomes of the project. It's hard sometimes to remember that these processes were invented over time in hundreds of meetings and countless lunches. They do take time and patience and leadership and food we've found.

This picture that you see is on the beach of Bristol Bay, Alaska. It's what we do in the summer, and I think it exhibits a clear community effort to pull wild Alaska salmon out of the sea for our freezers and canning jars. Slide.

Finally, this slide represents the cover of CITC's 25-year sustainability plan. I thought for the topic of sustainability it was worth mentioning that as we became more adept at planning community organizing, we realized that we had to become more proficient long-range planning as well and thinking. So we worked with our board for about a year and a half to outline the necessary steps to meet our program and community goals for 2014—sorry—2034. If nothing else, I think that 25 years of planning in this day and age is a very hopeful thing to do. Thank you. I think there's some comments on this.

Jack Denniston: [01:09:22] Thank you very much Cristy. I think Danna and Tara has some additional comments on sustainability.

Danna Fabella: [01:09:29] Yes, hi. The California project began thinking probably halfway through our five-year grant about wanting to make sure there were tools to sustain this because we really felt the project was really important for vulnerable families. So we started working on a linkages toolkit—a web-based one—because we know a lot of times you have those toolkits that, you know, they're paper and you put them on the shelf and then really no one looks at them again.

But we wanted something that was easy to use that you go in and you could—if you hadn't been involved in the project—you could go to the toolkit and you could really learn how to implement. We really started it with six main module assessment and planning, training, communication, fiscal. So we have evaluations. So we have a toolkit that we developed for sustainability, and we're really quite proud of that, and it's I think well used.

We also made sure that there were co-coordinators, and that was a really important piece to sustain linkages practice at the local level—in other words, in the counties that those co-coordinators need to exist because these two programs don't normally naturally talk to one another, so you needed to have two champions in those core coordinators to keep it moving.

The implementation of joint case planning was really an important part of sustaining the project at the local level and very important also was collocation of staff. Those counties that began collocation of staff at the county level to implement have kept it that way, and we were very fortunate at the end of our Federal grant that our office of child abuse prevention—OCAP —funded the continuation of the collaborative, and that's been very successful and we're very fortunate.

At the end of this grant, the county welfare director's association has let us know that they want us to continue the collaborative support because working together really takes time and it takes focus and there's no other place that you get the kind of focus these two programs need in order to continue this kind of work without some sort of statewide effort. So those things are happening in our State now. So Louisiana.

Tara DeJohn: [01:11:47] I'll be brief because I want to allow time for questions. But just for sustainability things that have continued from the grant is now that the database is between both programs, talk to each other more and they actually even opened a cyber café that clients can access with the overall focus still on sustainability and permanent to the point that we even achieved 91% strength on the CFSR for relative placement.

The cross-training across child welfare and TANF programs is a requirement for all supervisors, and the supervisors mutually supervise that across those programs instead of it being isolated, and staff now go out and participate and have their time to help engage clients in services and linking them to community by actually spending some of their work hours in neighborhood centers. So that fluidity of partnership and we're all in this together is sustained across (unintelligible) of the program. And I'll just stop there to allow time for questions.

Jack Denniston: [01:12:52] Great. Thank you very much. We're going to have time for questions here in just a minute and so if you haven't already done so, you can write your questions in the text box in GoToWebinar, and we can respond to them that way or you can—on your phone I believe it's start one if you would like to get in the queue to ask a question out loud over the phone. And so we'll start that process in just a minute.

For those of you who usually sign off once the question and answer period starts, I'll skip to the closing slide here. When you log out of GoToWebinar, you'll have an opportunity to complete a survey. We really hope that you'll do that. We plan to have more of these grantee webinars and you can help us make them better so please do so.

You probably saw lots of tools, instruments, surveys, policies, videos, toolkits talked about during this webinar that you would love to see a copy of. You can contact Child Welfare Information Gateway staff. Our information specialists will help you locate those tools within site visit reports or in the synthesis or within final reports, or you can call that toll-free number you see in front of you and ask the specialist to help you find TANF child welfare collaboration resources.

There will be a recording of this webinar and a transcript. It usually takes about 60 days or so to get that posted. You'll find that also on the Child Welfare Information Gateway website and just thinking about ways to use these tools. If you're thinking you'd like to improve the collaboration within your community between these two systems, maybe you get together with your partners, watch this recording of this slideshow, work through some of the tools would be maybe one way to approach that.

So now we're going to go back to the question and answer slide and I'll introduce Penny Putnam-Collins who is a writer and site visitor for Child Welfare Information Gateway among other things—

20 years' experience as a child welfare program person in the State. And so I'll turn it over to you, Penny.

Penny Putnam-Collins: [01:15:06] Thank you, Jack. I just want to open up the line and see if there are any questions from the audience. And can you unmute your phone? Is it Star six?

Jack Denniston: [01:15:22] I think that—excuse me—go ahead. Operator, can you give—repeat the instructions for that please?

Conference Operator: [01:15:27] I can. Thank you. We will now begin the Q&A session. If you'd like to ask a question, please unmute your line and press Star one. Record your first and last name when prompted. Your name is required to introduce your question. To withdraw your question, you may press Star two. Once again if you'd like to ask a question, press Star one. One moment please for our first question.

Penny Putnam Collins: [01:16:26] Operator, are there any questions coming through?

Conference Operator: [01:16:30] Our first question comes from Anne Carter. Your line is now open.

Anne Carter: [01:16:33] Thank you. Yes, this is Anne Carter from Georgia, and I hear something about cross-training for child welfare and TANF. I'd really like some more information on that—how that happened.

Tara DeJohn: [01:16:51] This is Tara. We did cross-training on our child welfare and TANF. We had two levels. The care managers who provided the services got trained in the agency that they didn't come from and involved the policies, procedures, acronyms and everything related to working with caregivers. But then on a broader level, from the information that we got from the environmental survey, there were questions about, you know, definitions. What are the legal limits for confidentiality? What are services available for kinship caregivers? What are the requirements just working with child welfare in general as well as what are community services available to assist families to help them be more sustainable?

And so we developed cross-trainings across all of those items where we would find a neutral site that was easy to access for child welfare and TANF workers as well as kinship family caregivers and brought in representatives from legal from both agencies, community partners, a lot like representative for CHIP, which is the child's Medicaid insurance agency and had where they all went - attended those trainings together.

And since that time now as part of any kind of new supervisor training—new worker training—they receive information across programs about those issues. Does that answer your question?

Anne Carter: [01:18:13] Yes, it does. Thank you.

Danna Fabella: [01:18:14] I'd just like to also say from California, if you go on our linkages toolkit, if you get a chance to do that, you can see under the training section there's all kinds of examples of cross-training that counties have done and some of their curricula as well.

Anne Carter: [01:18:31] Okay, thank you.

Conference Operator: [01:18:35] I'm showing no further questions at this time.

Penny Putnam-Collins: [01:18:46] This is Penny. We actually have one that's come through on the—through the webinar. The question is: in Louisiana, were you able to provide services through child welfare to kin who receive TANF support and are caring for children outside of the child welfare system?

Tara DeJohn: [01:19:09] This is Tara. Yes, we were mainly a liaison in making sure that whatever the family need and providing an assessment whether they were a child welfare family or a TANF family, and actually a third of our kinship families had been involved or were currently involved in both systems, and we would help them serve the kin managers served as liaison or whatever the barriers were in addressing the children's needs.

Like often times it was around legal issues, guardianship, or around accessing services for mental health treatment or educational resources, and so they would link them to the resources in their community to meet that need. So they wouldn't provide counseling directly, but they would get them to whatever counseling agency fit in their financial and agency systems.

Penny Putnam Collins: [01:20:06] Okay, thank you. Did that answer the question? Okay.

I have a question here also about—the question is, how do we find out about Children's Bureau grants? Jack can you respond to that?

Jack Denniston: [01:20:27] You bet, happy to. On the Children's Bureau website, the homepage has several tabs and one of those tabs is called "Grants," and there's lots of information under—behind that tab about what funding opportunity announcements are being forecasted for this year in terms of discretionary grants. I assume that's what the question's about. Of course the Children's Bureau also awards formula grants and other types of grants. But the types of grants I think you would want to know about how to apply for you would find listed under grants on the Children's Bureau website.

And I'll show you the—there's the URL if you want to, or you could Google Children's Bureau, but that's how you get to the Children's Bureau's website and look under the grants tab.

Penny Putnam Collins: [01:21:22] Okay, we're about out of time. We can try to—we will respond to the rest of these questions, but at this point I think Jack do you want to make some closing remarks?

Jack Denniston: [01:21:34] You bet. Thanks. First of all I want to thank all of our presenters today. They did this on a voluntary basis. Their grants ended three years ago. They were good enough to come back and talk about their projects with great excitement and great information they were able to share.

Just a reminder that if you are interested in finding out more about these projects, if you want to see some of the tools, instruments, etcetera, that they developed and used, you can contact Child Welfare Information Gateway, and staff there will help you connect you to those tools. And finally I want to wish you all a successful collaboration. That's the end of the webinar, and good day to you all. Goodbye.

END