County of Los Angeles
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES

425 Shatto Place, Los Angeles, California 90020
(213) 351-5602

PHILIP L. BROWNING
Director

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District
MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS
Second District
ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District
DON KNABE
Fourth District
MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

June 25, 2012

To: Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky, Chairman
Supervisor Gloria Molina
Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas
Supervisor Don Knabe
Supervisor Michael D. Antonovich

From: Philip L. Browning, Director

RESPONSE TO THE JUNE 19, 2012 ADMINISTRATIVE REQUEST FROM THE BOARD TO REPORT BACK ON AGENDA ACTION ITEMS 22, 23, 24, 25, 63 AND 72.

On June 19, 2012, at the Board of Supervisors meeting, the Board continued agenda items number 22, 23, 24, 25, and 63 and directed the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) to report back by Friday, June 22, 2012 on all the questions raised for each agenda item. An extension was approved for the submission of the report for Monday, June 25, 2012 in order to provide a more comprehensive response. The agenda items in question consist of the following:

1. Agenda Item No. 22: Youth Development Services (YDS) contract extensions.
2. Agenda Item No. 23: Affiliated student intern placement agreements between DCFS and local universities.
3. Agenda Item No. 24: Inter-University Consortium (IUC) contract extensions.
4. Agenda Item No. 25: Family Preservation contract extensions.
5. Agenda Item No. 63: Pena v. Los Angeles County Settlement and Corrective Action Plan (CAP).
6. Agenda Item No. 72: Emergency Response Command Post (ERCP) Report. This item was included for a response on this report based on questions received from the Board.

Agenda Item No. 22 Youth Development Services (YDS)

The Department is requesting Board approval to prepare and execute eight form amendments to the Youth Development Services (YDS) contracts in the amount of $1,846,634, for a period of six months from July 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012, and to grant authorization to the Director to further extend the contracts an additional six months from January 1, 2013 through June 30, 2013 if necessary, to complete the solicitation and negotiation of new contracts.

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective and Caring Service"

The new solicitation for the redesigned model is expected to be released in August 2012 for an open solicitation process. Due to the sensitive nature of the questions and responses, which disclose content information of an unreleased contract solicitation, the responses to the six questions were prepared and routed for submission under a confidential cover memo dated June 25, 2012.

<u>Agenda Items No. 23 and 24 Inter-University Consortium (IUC) Contracts</u>

For agenda item number 23, the Department is requesting for the Board to approve Affiliation/Placement Agreements with nine local universities, and to authorize the Director of the Department of Children and Family Services to execute the agreements for the provision of Master of Social Work and Bachelor level field placement internship program services and training in basic social work practice under the direct supervision of an agency Field Instructor. No funding is required for these agreements. For agenda item number 24, the Department is requesting Board approval to execute contract amendments with six current Inter-University Consortium (IUC) contractors for the provision of training and the Master of Social Work Internship Program services at an aggregate Maximum Contract Amount of $4,154,500, financed by 75% Federal revenue, 17.5% State revenue, and 7.5% Net County Cost, for a six month period effective July 1, 2012, through December 31, 2012. The Department is also requesting authorization be granted to the Director to further extend the contracts for an additional six months from January 1, 2013 through June 30, 2013 by amendment in order to complete the redesign of the contracts to meet the changing needs of the Department and its workforce.

The IUC contractors consist of six local public and private universities with accredited social work programs. The concerns raised by the Board are related to the services procured through the contract including field internship experience, training, financial assistance in the form of a stipend, and the Department's ability to offer employment to graduating IUC-trained students whom received stipends.

1. **Please provide a line item budget for Training and Field Education provided by each school as part of these contracts?**

Attached please find the line item budgets for Training and Field Education provided by each of the six schools of social work that comprise the Inter-University Consortium. The contract extension recommendations before you are for existing contracts with *two of six* universities to provide Master of Social Work internship services only; and with *four of the six* universities to provide training and Master of Social Work internship services. The line item budgets reflect expenditures for each six-month contract term. The line item budgets do not provide the estimated percentages dedicated to Field Education and Training, which slightly differ from university-to-university, as detailed below:

UNIVERSITY	MSW FIELD EDUCATION %	FUNDING AMOUNT	TRAINING SERVICES %	FUNDING AMOUNT	TOTAL
Cal-State Dominguez Hills	100%	$170,500	0%	$0.00	$170,500
Cal-State Northridge	100%	$170,500	0%	$0.00	$170,500
Cal-State Long Beach	38.7%	$340,173	61.3%	$538,827	$879,000
Cal-State Los Angeles	38.2%	$338,452	61.8%	$547,548	$886,000
University of Southern California	37.24%	$282,093	62.76%	$475,407	$757,500
University of California at Los Angeles PROGRAM: CENTRAL ADMIN: TOTAL:	40.5%	$379,168	59.5%	$557,049	$936,217 $354,782 $1,291,000
TOTALS		$1,680,886		$2,118,831	$4,154,500

Federal training regulations support partnerships with accredited schools of social work for Master of Social Work preparation and entry into the child welfare workforce. The partnerships are enforced through regulations that allow for 25% cost-matching by public universities **in addition to** federal reimbursement. The 25% cost matching regulation effectively reduces net county cost to a minimum. Additionally, in the interest of maximizing improvements to organizational performance, as currently structured, these contracts allow the Department to direct and re-allocate resources within these budgets and deliverables in order to meet priority needs throughout the contract term.

2. **How many students participated in this program last year and how many were subsequently hired by the Department?**

In academic year 2010-2011, 75 students participated in the Inter-University Consortium Field Placement. Of these, 72 were eligible for hire. An additional 10 students, who had completed their Field Placement during the first year of their Master of Social Work program, also became eligible for hire. The Department hired all 82 students.

Master of Social Work programs are two years in length. A Master of Social Work student may be placed with the Department for their Field Internship (which includes at least 500 hours of direct services experience) during either the first or second year of their program. A student is not eligible for hire by the Department until both their academic Master of Social Work program and pre-hire Field Internship are satisfactorily completed.

3. **How many participants of the (current) program does the Department plan to hire this year?**

Contingent upon available funding and consistent with a June 21, 2012 letter to the University Social Work Program Directors, the Department has determined that employment for all IUC students may not be offered upon graduation. For this year the Department has sufficient vacancies to hire all 80 Inter-University Consortium interns. Hiring will occur in phases. As an initial phase, the Department plans to hire 50 Children's Social Workers from both the Inter-University Consortium Master of Social Work Intern pool and existing hiring/promotional lists. An additional 70 vacant Children's Social Worker positions have been identified and will be filled in subsequent phases of hiring, further drawing from the pool of Inter-University Consortium Master of Social Work graduates. The Department will also determine which offices have significant staffing needs in order to fill vacancies specifically designated to alleviate the needs of those identified offices.

4. **Does the Department have a sufficient budget and vacancies to hire the most recent class of graduates from this program?**

Based on the scope of the contract extension recommendations before you; it is presumed that this question pertains to the hiring of those interns who will become eligible for hire upon completion of their academic Master of Social Work programs at the end of academic year 2012-2013. While hiring patterns and need cannot be precisely forecasted into the future, historically, the Department has always had sufficient vacancies to hire the Inter-University Consortium Master of Social Work Interns who successfully complete the minimum 500 hours of supervised direct services with the Department prior to graduation.

5. **Of those participants from the program who moved on to work for the Department how many passed the Department's Academy?**

Of the 82 newly-hired Inter-University Consortium Master of Social Work Interns in 2010-2011, 73 advanced from academy/probation status to permanent status; and 9 did not advance to permanent status.

In 2011, timed in part to coincide with the hiring of the above-referenced 82 Master of Social Work Interns, the Department redesigned the Academy to ensure that no one is advanced to permanent employment without a demonstrated ability in the classroom setting and field experiences of the redesigned Academy. The Department continues to partner with the Inter-University Consortium, line operation managers, and Department Personnel to continue improving and strengthening the redesigned Academy approach.

The Academy Redesign incorporated an increased number of structured field days, linking classroom training with increased opportunities for direct practice under the coordinated guidance of a Training Unit Supervising Children's Social Worker and Field-Based Trainers. Essentially, the Academy was transformed to a nine-month "probationary" Academy period, which progressively shifts from a classroom and structured field experience to actual case-carrying duties under the supervision of an assigned Training Supervising Children's Social Worker.

This approach anticipated an improved transfer/application of learning to practice; and an earlier and more rigorous assessment, feedback, coaching and evaluation of a new-hire's capacity to carry out actual casework, judged against the probationary standards of the Children's Social Worker classification.

6. Is the Department confident these contracts prepare Social Workers to work for DCFS? Why?

As of January 2012, of the 3,222 Children's Social Workers employed by the Department, 995 (31%) hold a Master of Social Work degree. The Department is aggressively pursuing more effective new-hire recruitment efforts as it is confident that the university Master of Social Work programs effectively prepare students for child welfare services as evidenced by the following research:

- Caseworkers with Master's degrees (specifically Master of Social Work) perform a variety of social work tasks significantly better when compared with caseworkers without a Master of Social Work degree (Ryan, Garnier, Zyphur & Zhai (2005).
- Child welfare staff with social work degrees are more effective at developing successful permanency plans as compared with non-social work degreed caseworkers (Albers, Reilly, and Rittner (1993).
- Master of Social Work-level caseworkers are better prepared to accomplish a variety of complex tasks in social work settings, relative to caseworkers without a Master of Social Work. (Booz-Allen and Hamilton Inc. (1987)
- Further evidence supports the hypothesis that graduate training (and perhaps the internship experience) provides Master of Social Work-level social workers with a variety of skills and coping mechanisms necessary to succeed within an environment that is often characterized by high stress, large caseloads, inconsistent appreciation and low pay.
- Workers with undergraduate degrees or those without degrees were more than twice as likely to have high burnout scores as those with a graduate-level education. Specifically, only 24% of the workers with advanced degrees had high burnout scores, whereas over 50% of the workers without advanced degrees had high burnout scores. (Streepy (1981)
- Children associated with Master of Social Work-level caseworkers spend significantly less time in foster care (on average 5.15 months less time) as compared with the children not associated with an Master of Social Work-level caseworker. The outcomes associated with Master of Social Work-level workers (e.g. less time in foster care) suggest that child welfare systems need to identify strategies for recruiting and retaining employees with advanced degrees in social work (Ryan, Garnier, Zyphur & Zhai (2005).
- UCLA research professor Dr. Todd Franke compared the performance of Inter-University Consortium graduates to non-Inter-University Consortium Master of Social Work graduates, Bachelor of Social Work graduates, Master of Art graduates, and Bachelor of Art graduates, measuring the differences on child welfare knowledge. His findings were that the Inter-University Consortium Master of Social Work graduates performed the best of all groups.

- This demonstrates the research and evaluation capacities of the university partners, who are also able to bring in best practices and knowledge to inform both the education, as well as, training side of these contracts (July 2008).

In order to support a well-trained public child welfare workforce and in recognition of the critical nature of the child welfare role, the needs of the field, and the inability of bachelor's level social workers to afford master's level of social work degrees without assistance, over twenty years ago Congress passed legislation to support the Title IV-E-funded training of Master of Social Work interns. Many interns come from the same communities most represented in the child welfare and foster care populations, including communities of color. A significant number of Inter-University Consortium students would not be able to pursue a Master of Social Work degree without the Inter-University Consortium stipends enabled by the Title IV-E legislation. The Department and their University partners engage in a highly-competitive, rigorous selection of prospective students, through application and interview, who demonstrate a sincere commitment to work with diverse and disadvantaged populations; many of whom possess bi-lingual/multi-cultural skills and who have both education and life experiences. All these qualities facilitate the student's ability to engage well with families who come to the Department's attention.

The Inter-University Consortium internship experience consists of over 500 hours of direct service "practice" that provides interns with a saturated experience of the Department's culture; its array of services; exposure to the communities served; and the challenges and stressors faced by Children's Social Workers. They learn how to engage clients, assess client strengths, needs, and protective capacities; team with one another and their departmental preceptors and supervisors; and re-team and re-assess with their clients. Additionally, each University has crafted a specialized curriculum for interns in the form of a concentration or sub-concentration in public child welfare, to ensure that they receive state-of-the-art and evidence-based competencies for their practice in public child welfare. All these components allow the Department and Universities to jointly and rigorously evaluate the capacity and ability of each student to carry out the casework responsibilities of a Children's Social Worker. This pre-service training is followed by the continuum of learning that Master of Social Work interns receive as part of the Inter-University Consortium In-Service contract extension recommendations before you.

> **7. The Department reports they are in negotiations to redesign these contracts, and therefore need a one year extension of the contracts to complete those negotiations. Is it possible to extend these contracts for only an additional three months and complete an expedited redesign within that time? If not, please explain why?**

While initial discussions between the University Principal Investigators and the Director of the Department of Children and Family Services are taking place to ensure that the future direction of the Inter-University Consortium will reflect the changing needs of the Department, it will take longer than three months, and probably up to one year to ensure that the forthcoming new three-year contracts both retain what is working well but also incorporate the needed flexibility and innovation required to accomplish the Department's evolving vision, which is to ensure a workforce well-versed in specialized and analytical skills, and critical

thinking. While the current family and child concentration offered by Master of Social Work programs already includes sound, state-of-the-art, knowledge on domestic violence, substance abuse and mental health interventions; and our Master of Social Work interns receive additional seminars on these topics; the universities are always interested in deepening this exposure to ensure that child safety and well-being are secured. Throughout the process, the probability of enhancing positive outcomes for families may take the form of using University community partners to focus on specific clients, especially those in high-risk situations with limited community supports.

The following are examples of recent initiatives in which the Inter-University Consortium is partnering with the Department to accelerate practice change:

Partner in Katie A Settlement Training and Coaching Deliverables: The Inter-University Consortium co-designed and developed the Department's Core Practice Model; developed and provided Enhanced Skill-Based training for staff; and established in-office coaching and mentoring for line staff that reinforces critical thinking and creative problem solving in engaging and teaming with families in identifying underlying needs and in assessments (both mandates of the Katie A legal settlement).

Partner in Providing Training and Coaching for DCFS Emergency Response Staff: The Inter-University Consortium developed and provided Emergency Response policy review training for all Emergency Response Staff, established in-office coaching to address "ER over 60" issues and coached Emergency Response Supervising Children's Social Workers in creative problem-solving and triage strategies that helped decrease number of open referrals over 60 days.

Partner in Academy Redesign: The Inter-University Consortium partnered with SEIU Local 721 and Regional Office staff to design the Academy away from a largely classroom-based format to a fully integrated classroom and field based approach. The Inter-University Consortium further assisted in the development of an evaluation process implemented in the Academy. Evaluation is based on classroom and field-based performance as assessed initially by Field Based Trainers and (ongoing) by Training Unit Supervising Children's Social Workers, utilizing an Ongoing Skill Assessment (OSA) Tool that links classroom/field activities and performance to Probationary Standards. Gaps or deficits are addressed with the Children's Social Worker and specific measures and expectations are set to improve performance. If deficits cannot be ameliorated, an Interim Performance Evaluation documenting the Children's Social Worker is prepared, in consultation with the Department's Performance Management Section, and in accordance with progressive discipline steps pursuant to Department of Human Resources Policy/Civil Service Rules associated with employees on Probationary status. Initial hiring orientations and early training set clear expectations regarding the Core Academy experience and Probationary period.

Partner in "Eliminating Racial Disportionality and Disparity"(ERDD): The Inter-University Consortium is working with Dr. Cheryl Grills, a graduate of Yale and UCLA; and current faculty at Loyola Marymount University, to provide an overview and context of the impact of disproportionality and disparity from a historical perspective to the present. This training looks at the race/ethnicity of children and families and the strategies to intervene in populations from the various departmental Service Bureaus, where disproportionality occurs.

Partner in Emergency Response Investigative Interviewing: The Inter-University Consortium is working with Dr. Thomas Lyon, a graduate of Harvard Law School and Stanford University, and current faculty of USC School of Law, to provide workers with techniques of interviewing children in an age-appropriate manner, based on evidence-based interview practices.

Partner in Improving Skills for Assessing Domestic Violence in an Emergency Response Context: The Inter-University Consortium is working with Commissioner Jacqueline Lewis to look at Reasonable Efforts required in Domestic Violence cases and expectations of the Dependency Court. The training will also look at the effects of DV on children and how DCFS can partner with community agencies to ensure children and families are connected with appropriate services to meet their needs.

As part of the redesign, future directions under consideration include, but are not limited to:

Mobilizing Inter-University Consortium resources towards "adopting" a high-needs DCFS office: For example, in the Compton Office, the Inter-University Consortium provides in-office coaching in both Emergency Response and ongoing services; and has been asked to move an Inter-University Consortium field unit to Compton to service both Compton East and West. The Inter-University Consortium also provides training in the Compton Office and the community, representing a full spectrum of Inter-University Consortium resources devoted to a regional office, both preparing interns for employment and coaching experienced and seasoned staff and managers.

Further analyzing, evaluating and devising solutions for the issues that have culminated in staff turnover, poor casework decisions, or other issues which may be confronting the department: Inter-University Consortium interns are exposed to advanced child welfare practice knowledge gained from their Master of Social Work education and field training. While they are exposed to training and learning experiences on safety and risk assessments; engaging and teaming with families; contacts and documentation; case planning and management on substance abuse, domestic violence, and mental health concerns, all of which integrate critical thinking strategies, enhanced learning could occur with more practice opportunities throughout the 500+ hour internship.

Improving the training of Supervising Children's Social Workers so that they are better able to coach and guide their staff towards achieving better outcomes: The Inter-University Consortium is best positioned to access best practice information and build curriculums tailored to the needs of the Department and to continue to adapt them.

Agenda Item No. 25 Family Preservation Contract Extensions

The Department is requesting Board approval to execute amendments to the Promoting Safe and Stable Families' Family Preservation Program contracts at a maximum annual contract cost of $42,894,254 for Fiscal Year 2012-13, financed using 15%Federal revenue, 32% State revenue, and 53% Net County Cost, with an extension at the County's option until December 31, 2013, at a maximum contract amount for the additional six-month period of $21,447,127.

The extension of the current contracts includes the extension of 6 contracts to be placed on an automatic month-to-month basis for a one-year period unless terminated earlier as provided under the contract terms and a non-renewal for one agency due to fiscal issues.

The concerns related to the contract extensions for the Family Preservation Services program focus on the timeframes cited to complete a new solicitation process, and whether the results of the recent evaluation were incorporated into the Statement of Work. The solicitation for the newly redesigned model is expected to be released for an open solicitation process in the latter part of June 2012. Due to the sensitive nature of the questions and responses, which disclose content information of an unreleased contract solicitation, the responses to the six questions were prepared and routed for submission under a confidential cover memo dated June 25, 2012.

Agenda Item No. 63 Pena v. L.A. County Corrective Action Plan (CAP)

Due to the sensitive and confidential nature of information related to this litigation matter, the responses to the questions were prepared and routed for submission through a formal report by County Counsel.

Agenda Item No. 72 Emergency Response Command Post Report Back

The June 5, 2012 report by the Director of Children and Family Services regarding the proposed exploration and implementation plans to overhaul the Emergency Response Command Post operations in order to ensure the safety of children as they await placement was scheduled for discussion at the Board meeting on June 19, 2012. The matter was continued for one week and the following 27 questions were raised by the Board for a response from the Department regarding seven main issues.

High-Risk Children Tracking System--The Department has created a database that compiles data from six independently maintained databases within the Department. The database takes information from all these databases and ranks the youth's "risk factor" on a scale of 1 through 7; with 7 being those most at risk. Based on the information in this database the Department's Medical Director will lead a multidisciplinary team (DCFS/DMH/DPH) to develop case plans for these high risk children.

1. **Why is the Department confident the information being pulled from the other databases is up-to-date with accurate information?**

The Department's confidence in the accuracy of the information is based on the source of most of the data. The great majority of fields from which the data is drawn are found within the Statewide Child Welfare Services/Case Management System (CWS/CMS). While the accuracy of information in any database is always subject to human error, by sheer virtue of CWS/CMS' sophistication, we have confidence in the reliability of information drawn from CWS/CMS.

Of the various sources, five are directly pulled from various fields in CWS/CMS; one is from the Structured Decision Making system; and one is from the ERCP web-based Child Awaiting Placement Tracking System.

The High-Risk Youth Tracking System is soon-to-be further enhanced to include, as an additional eighth risk factor, information on pregnant and parenting teens. The reason we term the sources of our data "independently-maintained" is that, historically, the five CWS/CMS fields and the pertinent information from the two other databases were never strategically correlated or "data mined" to create a comprehensive risk profile on a single youth, as follows:

(1) **Frequency of replacements within the last 12 months** draws data from the CWS/CMS Out-of-Home Placement table, connected directly to the payments made to the placement homes/agencies.

(2) **Current placement (whether D-rate, Rate Classification Level (RCL) 12 or RCL-14 Group Home)** draws data from the CWS/CMS Out-of-Home Placement table, connected to payments made to the placement homes/agencies.

(3) **Assignment to the Runaway Outreach Unit** draws data from the CWS/CMS Assignment Table. There is high motivation among Department staff to ensure that only their cases show on their caseloads, and supervisor oversight minimizes the number of cases assigned in error to their units.

(4) **Assignment to [one of the Department's three pilot] Youth Permanency Units** draws data from the CWS/CMS Assignment Table. As also noted above, there is high motivation among Department staff to ensure that only their cases show on their caseloads, and supervisor oversight minimizes the number of cases assigned in error to their units.

(5) **Frequency of Psychiatric Hospitalizations within the last 12 months** draws data from the Non-Foster Care Placement table on CWS/CMS, based on hospital names. There is a possibility of data entry error when hospital names are entered incorrectly. We are currently developing a web-based application to track and report psychiatric hospitalizations, similar to the web-based ERCP Child Awaiting Placement Tracking System.

(6) **Frequency of ERCP entries** draws data from the web-based ERCP Child Awaiting Placement Tracking System, developed in December 2011. While certain fields of this database are linked to CWS/CMS, others are dependent upon data entry by ERCP staff. The possibility of data error exists, particularly related to the data fields entered by ERCP staff as the definitions and criteria of information for those fields continue to evolve in quality. However, the latter-mentioned fields are unrelated to the *frequency* field for ERCP entries.

(7) ***Structured Decision Making (SDM) risk level*** draws data from the SDM database, which the Department has used for the past eight years. Data input by the Children's Social Worker is reviewed and approved by his/her Supervising Children's Social Worker and, as a safeguard under certain circumstances, by an Assistant Regional Administrator. While definitions on how to determine risk level assignments exist to ensure consistency in the ratings, since data entry is manual, the inherent possibility of data entry error or a possible creeping in of certain biases remain.

While fully-acknowledging the sum of the aforementioned limitations, we affirm that the High-Risk Youth database is a valuable automated predictive analytic tool that, in accordance with parameters set by the Department, formulates the profile of a child under the Department's care who merits ***immediate and proactive self-assessment*** for the quality of service provision in the child's best interest.

Through the High-Risk Youth database, the 35,199 children under the Department's supervision are being ranked according to 7 risk factors. As a result of evolving risk ranking methodology that now appropriates greater weight to higher frequencies of certain risk factors, risk is being currently assigned by a score of 0 to 9; with 9 being the highest risk. The seven risk factors are:

(1) Frequency of replacements within the last 12 months
(2) Frequency of psychiatric hospitalizations within the last 12 months
(3) Frequency of ERCP entries within the last seven months
(4) Assigned Structured Decision Making Risk – "Very High" or "High"
(5) Current Assignment – Runaway Outreach Unit
(6) Current Assignment – Youth Permanency Unit
(7) Current Placement – D-Rate Home; RCL 12 Group Home; RCL 14 Group Home

As of the High-Risk Children Database report of June 22, 2012, of the 35,199 children under the Department's supervision, 30,338 (86%) rank between 0 to 2; 4,805 (13%) rank between 3 and 6; and 56 (1%) rank between 7 and 9. (see table below).

RISK SCORE	NUMBER OF CHILDREN
0	3,178
1	12,212
2	14,948
3	3,370
4	949
5	366
6	120
7	43
8	10
9	3
TOTAL	35,199

2. Please explain specifically how Dr. Sophy's team will work, i.e. how many cases will be reviewed on a weekly basis, what is the timeframe to properly assess and create case plans for all identified high risk youth and how will these youth's needs be addressed in the interim?

As of the writing of this document, the 56 children identified through the High-Risk Youth Database form the High-Risk Youth Pilot. The number has been increasing on a weekly basis based, in part, upon evolving risk determination methodology. Once the data regarding the pregnant and parenting teens is added to the High-Risk Youth database, effectively increasing the number of risk factors from 7 to 8, we anticipate that the scoring will change and the pool for high-risk youth will grow even further.

As part of the pilot, the Department's Medical Director has and will lead a High-Risk case conference for each High-Risk youth who scores between 7 and 9. Present at each High-Risk case conference are the responsible Deputy Director and Regional Administrator; and as key participants, a Revenue Enhancement Manager and the Wraparound Division Chief.

As necessary, the Departments of Mental Health, Public Health and Health are consulted in instances when their respective involvement is pertinent to the services and/or placement needs of the identified High-Risk youth.

High-Risk case conferences occur at a frequency of three to four per week. The assessment is conducted consistently based upon a Core Practice Model questionnaire (please see attached) that assesses whether the high-risk youth's family is fully involved and engaged; whether relevant and important information has been gathered to accurately identify the high-risk youth's *underlying* needs; whether interventions have been planned based upon the high-risk youth's strengths and preferences; and whether the Department has effectively collaborated with partnering agencies and communities in the child's best interest.

The purpose of the *initial* High-Risk case conference is to gather relevant information comprehensively. For 100% of all pilot cases, the Department's Medical Director provides a clinical assessment, diagnostic, and medication recommendations; explores former caregivers, relative caregivers and Non-Related Extended Family Members as potential placements; evaluates the efficacy of the current array of services; employs high-level administrative interventions, as necessary, to expedite the delivery of any additional new stabilization services; and identifies intervention needs, not within the current service array available to this population.

Completion of a High-Risk case conference prompts the Department's Medical Director to submit an initial assessment report with an action plan to the Director (please see attached High-Risk Case Summary form). Upon receipt of weekly input from the responsible regional staff on progress, by the tenth of each month, the Medical Director submits a monthly update to the Director on each case reviewed during the previous month.

In the interim, a list identifying each High-Risk Youth has been released to the responsible Deputy Director and Regional Administrator requiring closer attention to the case and the gathering of pertinent information in advance of the forthcoming scheduled High-Risk case conference. Unless the pool of High-Risk youth based upon evolving methodology increases significantly, the projected timeframe to complete all *initial* High-Risk Youth case conferences is approximately four months, or no later than the end of October 2012. Accordingly, the six-month pilot is projected to conclude on or about March 2013.

3. **How many case plans has the team created to date?**

To date, four High-Risk youth case plans have been created.

4. **Can a case plan be shared for the Board offices to review?**

Yes, the Department of Children and Family Services will provide an example of such a document which Board offices may review.

5. **What performance measures and/or outcomes have been developed in order to determine whether the pilot is going to be successful?**

Success will be measured through regular tracking of the following performance measure and outcome over a 6-month period of a High-Risk youth's initial case conference:

Performance Measure:
- **Reduced ERCP Visits** by pilot youth in the 6 months following the intervention compared to the 6 months preceding the intervention.

Outcome:
- **Increased Placement Stability/Permanency** for pilot youth in the 6 months following the intervention compared to the 6 months preceding the intervention.

6. **What observations can be made based on the information compiled in the database to date?**

Observations from data compiled in the database, to date, reveal that the majority of high-risk youth are female, between the ages of 16 and 18, placed in an RCL-12 level group home, with an average frequency of between 1 to 3 ERCP entries within the last seven months; a frequency of between 6 to 10 replacements within the last 12 months; with a tendency to run away from placement, as evidenced by a current assignment to the Runaway Outreach Unit. Action plans emerging from the four initial High-Risk youth case conferences conducted, to date, include, but are not limited to placement assessments for a lower level of care or stabilization through a return to home of parent with around-the-clock wraparound or therapeutic behavioral services; full diagnostic treatment plan development in conjunction with the existing current mental health provider, including referrals to substance abuse services and appropriate case management to ensure service delivery; initiation of an Intensive Treatment Foster Care placement process; and the initiation of a walk-on petition to juvenile court seeking placement in a residential drug rehabilitation facility.

Placement Options for Older Kids--The June 5, 2012 ERCP report states that once the younger children are moved to the VIP clinic, then the Department plans to reconfigure the existing space at ERCP to focus on the continued safety of the older youth.

1. **Is the current location a safe and suitable place to house the older kids? Why?**

The ERCP site is a safe location for the older children; however, there are additional security measures planned for implementation to further safeguard the older children while awaiting placement. Similar to all of the Department's regional offices, the ERCP site at the Broadway building was designed as a business office. Children removed from endangering situations are either transported by Children's Social Workers, Law Enforcement or caregivers to the ERCP after normal business hours; or they arrive on their own. The time these children then spend at ERCP is to await alternative placement. The ERCP site at Broadway does not house children.

The Department's ERCP staff utilizes the physical environment of the ERCP site at Broadway to the best of its ability to ensure the physical safety and restful comfort of children awaiting placement in either cribs, chairs, or cots, by making snacks for the children, and by having

clothes and showers available to those children who need or want them throughout the time they await placement.

Once the 41% of younger children begin utilizing the Child Awaiting Placement Center adjacent to the LAC-USC Medical Hub, projected for July 16, 2012, there will be more space to possibly divide the two children's rooms at the ERCP site at the Broadway building, by gender. In addition, the Child Awaiting Placement Center adjacent to the LAC-USC Medical Hub will operate during a two-month interim period between July 16, 2012 and September16, 2012 utilizing in-kind staff from DHS and volunteer DCFS staff borrowed from regional operations. In fact, the July 16, 2012 opening of the Child Awaiting Placement Center adjacent to the LAC-USC Medical Hub anticipates a future ability to obtain additional permanent staff in order to afford a better ratio of staff-to-youth at the ERCP site at the Broadway building, ensuring closer supervision and enhanced safety and comfort of older children.

2. What measures will be implemented to adequately screen these youth for drugs and weapons before they enter ERCP?

The Department has drafted a policy on conducting safety searches at the ERCP which is currently undergoing review, and the Department has purchased magnetometers (metal detector wands) to use in conducting safety searches. Additionally, the ERCP Strike Team and management drafted a memo and intake protocols, currently undergoing review, instructing all regional offices to alert youth on open cases, originating from regional office replacements, to the new procedures prior to their ERCP arrival.

3. What are the plans to reconfigure the current space and how will the reconfiguration ensure safety?

On June 28, 2012 a meeting has been scheduled to take place between the Chief Executive Office Real Estate Division and the Department Property Management Staff to discuss the costs and plans. We will provide additional information as discussions solidify on the space reconfiguration.

4. What is the timeframe for the reconfiguration?

This information will be provided at a future date since the first meeting with the CEO Real Estate Division has not yet occurred.

5. How will the older youth's needs be assessed while they wait at ERCP?

There are currently a number of strategies being devised to improve the manner in which an older youth's needs are assessed to determine the most appropriate placement. The ERCP Strike Team is developing an Aggressive Placement Team, centralized at ERCP, to conduct placement searches for all age populations. The purposes of the Aggressive Placement Team are to prevent ERCP entries by supporting regional placement efforts and to shorten ERCP lengths-of-stay for those children detained by ERCP staff. The Aggressive Placement Team will include expertise in medical, psychiatric and behavioral factors that challenge the process of placing a child in a timely manner.

Particularly for youth originating from DCFS' regional offices, the Strike Team is reinforcing the use of the ERCP Screening and Intake Form, which includes sections that the Children's Social Worker completes. The ERCP Screening and Intake Form includes critical factors that challenge a child, such as developmental, social or behavioral, psychological/psychiatric and medical factors; and medications. This information is used in the search for appropriate homes that can meet the youth's needs.

The ERCP Strike Team is further exploring the co-location of after-hours Public Health Nursing and Mental Health staff, similarly to regional office operations. The direction sought is to replicate at the after-hours ERCP, on-site multi-disciplinary expertise to consult when a child is in the office, awaiting placement. Given the barriers associated with staff from these other Departments not being available for after-hour shifts, and the experiences gained from the planning and implementation process of the 23-hour Child Awaiting Placement Center adjacent to the LAC-USC Medical Hub where after-hours staff are readily available, the Department is contemplating a number of alternatives to assessing older youth needs at the ERCP site at the Broadway building. These alternatives will be issued in an overall plan by mid-July, 2012.

On Friday, June 29, 2012, a Placement Resource Subcommittee of the ERCP Task Force, consisting of departmental managers and contracted providers, will meet to explore both short- and long-term alternatives to having older youth await placement at the ERCP site at the Broadway building.

Through the inter-agency ERCP Task Force, accelerated analyses are currently underway to create a profile of ERCP older youth needs, based upon which a gap analysis of specialized placements to meet these unique needs is also being developed. The results of those analyses are due by Wednesday, July 24, 2012.

6. **How will the older youth be engaged in age-appropriate activities while they wait for placement at ERCP?**

Many of the youth who arrive at ERCP come stressed or tired; and want to decompress, eat, get clean clothes, and rest or sleep. The Department acknowledges the need to further enhance age-appropriate activities for children as they await placement at the ERCP site at the Broadway building.
The ERCP Strike Team and ERCP management have begun discussions with the Juvenile Court Shelter Care staff to replicate activities utilized at that location. This information too will be included in the overall ERCP Strike Team Plan, projected for mid-July 2012.

7. **The report refers to an up-to-30 day alternative pediatric psychiatric assessment center. What is that? How does it fit into this discussion?**

The Department of Health Services (DHS) will continue to partner on the development of a safe, effective, implementable and sustainable system for assessing hard to place older children especially when a medical or acute mental health issue is preventing or delaying placement.

DHS believes that such an effective system will require assessments that will take many days up to weeks to adequately complete. Therefore, such an assessment cannot occur in the bounds of the current Emergency Response Command Post restrictions of stays of less than 23 hours.

DHS will continue to offer, when available and appropriate, its capital assets in order to ensure the prompt implementation of a plan developed for older children who are difficult to place.

Daily "Real Time" Inventory of Placements

1. **Will the Foster Care Placement Search Engine be a real time inventory of available placements?**

Yes, the Foster Care Search Engine (FCSE) is designed to be in real time. However, the timeliness and accuracy of the information is dependent on various respondents to the system updating information in the system.

The Strike Team will continue to collaborate with the Department's Bureau of Information Services (BIS) and Out-of-Home Care Management Division (OHCMD) to determine full capability of the FCSE to accurately and quickly identify appropriate vacant placement resources, as well as, to determine which unit within the Department will provide the most efficient oversight of the FCSE. Details regarding the exact staffing composition and specific functions of the unit are still being developed; the next planning meeting will be held June 29, 2012 meeting of the ERCP Task Force Placement Resource Subcommittee.

2. **For the 51 Foster Family Agencies (FFAs) who are supposed to update their number of certified homes and vacancies, what process has been put in place to ensure these agencies have successfully updated the information? How will DCFS validate the information imputed by FFAs is accurate? Would it make more sense for DCFS to update this information?**

The Foster Family Agencies are aware that the Foster Care Search Engine will be utilized to search for vacancies and that the Department is tracking the updates entered by each Foster Family Agency. Failure to enter updates will lead to the implementation of a corrective action plan. It is in the best interest of Foster Family Agencies, from both a services and financial standpoint, to ensure that the information contained in the Foster Care Search Engine is accurate.

Besides information on vacancies that is not found in the Foster Care Search Engine, it is not uncommon to also encounter outdated or inaccurate information. To resolve that, the Department has created an email link within the Foster Care Search Engine for the purpose of error notification for use by any one searching for a placement who encounters an error. While validation of all errors being corrected is not inherent in the system, this electronic error notification is less time-consuming and more user-friendly than the previous manual Foster Care Search Engine record error correction process. Further below, under question #3, there are additional details clarifying the Department's current technological challenges associated with the Foster Care Search Engine.

Finally, while it may logically make more sense for the Department to update the Foster Family Agency certified home information, unfortunately, the Department does not currently have access to the list of homes certified under the umbrella of each Foster Family Agency. The Department will explore this further during the Friday, June 29, 2012 meeting of the ERCP Task Force Placement Resource Subcommittee.

2. **Besides the FFA self -updates, how will DCFS ensure other placement resources and their vacancies are updated daily?**

When the Department's Technical Assistants enter and "end-date" placement paperwork, the Foster Care Search Engine information on vacancies also automatically updates. However, a vacancy that exists in reality will not appear in the Foster Care Search Engine as a consequence of a lag in paperwork processing. As a result, this matter has been prioritized by the ERCP Strike Team to further review and develop a viable solution.

3. **The report refers to "other internal technological challenges related to a limited number of data fields as well as to update contract information in the database". What are these challenges?**

The Foster Care Search Engine (FCSE) system uses 10-year old technology that is not supported by the software vendor; thus making it difficult to apply required programming changes and enhancements.

The Foster Care Search Engine is being converted to a **.NET** platform, which will allow programmers to apply required changes and enhancements and integrate the new mapping services. The target date for the mapping services is August 31, 2012.

Some of the increased capabilities will be as follows:
- Additional filters to provide more detailed home information. For example the searches will be able to populate results (homes) with just one of the selected search criterion or all the selected search criteria. This new functionality is expected to be completed on June 30, 2012;
- Ability to populate comprehensive placement profiles in the Print Search Report such as the Licensing and County Preference descriptions. This functionality is expected to be completed on June 30, 2012;
- Accurate License Placement Home age range in CWS/CMS. Previously this information could not be extracted by the Foster Care Search Engine because it was being entered into a text file. The Department is updating this information into the appropriate CWS/CMS age data fields. This functionality is expected to be completed on June 30, 2012.

Implementation status of DMH Report--The June 5, 2012 ERCP report does not address an implementation plan for the recommendations outlined by DMH in their report from their review of ERCP.

1. **What is the implementation plan for the recommendations?**

Attached please find the plan from the Department of Mental Health.

2. **Why will it take 9-12 months to implement?**

Two Suicide Prevention/Intervention Trainings have already taken place for ERCP staff, as follows:

- On June 13, 2012, 33 ERCP staff trained; and
- On June 20, 2012, 28 ERCP staff trained;

However, for the remainder of the trainings, it will take several months for the Department of Mental Health to complete the required training of the large number of DCFS staff, Group Home staff, Wraparound and other provider staff. In addition, for several proposed Department of Mental Health strategies, funding sources outside existing resources are under exploration; for example, to ensure the availability of staff to work afternoons and evenings to help with mediation and conflict resolution and to provide for placement of a specialized mental health provider at ERCP. Without question, the Department will work as rapidly as possible to implement all recommendations, as feasible.

Amend Group Home, FFA, and Foster Home Contracts to remain available 24/7

1. **Part of the response in the report back is that "many providers already have extended intake capacity in place." If that's the case why has DCFS stated that a large part of the problem is that agencies won't answer phone calls after eight p.m.?**

Extended intake is not a requirement in the current provider contract. Regardless, the ERCP site at the Broadway building has a list of 22 Foster Family Agencies that, in fact, have extended intake capacity and staff, in place, and do provide the service. It came to light that, while other contracted agencies also included extended intake capacity in their program statements, they may not be staffed to provide the service by virtue of the fact that it is not a *requirement* in the current contract. This inconsistency is currently being corrected through contract amendments that are projected to be executed no later than September.

2. **The report back states there is an existing stipulation that within Group Home and FFA statements of work that prior to discharge a child, the Group Home and/or FFA is to provide DCFS with a Notice of Intent to Discharge. What is the current process once DCFS receives this "Notice" and how will the process be enforced?**

Once DCFS receives a "Notice of Intent to Discharge," the notice is forwarded to the Resource Utilization Management Children's Social Worker, co-located in the regional office and to the assigned Regional Children's Social Worker. The Resource Utilization Management Children's Social Worker is instructed to immediately initiate "Teaming" to develop a solution,

including discussion with the group home/placement agency to learn if the placement can be continued. At the same time, the OHCMD monitors for adherence to the contractual 7-day notice requirement.

3. **The report back states the contracted Group Homes and FFAs have developed "viable solutions" to ERCP Placement barriers – what are these "viable solutions."**

In addition to requiring and monitoring Foster Family Agency data entry of their vacancies into the Foster Care Search engine, the Department is working with seven group home providers to develop emergency shelter care beds. There are currently 28 beds and the Department is working on developing 30 additional beds for a total of 58 beds. Four group home providers have indicated they will also develop 12 additional beds in 2013 which would bring the total number of shelter care beds to 70.

Recognizing, one-size does not fit-all, as a member of the inter-agency ERCP Task Force, the provider network is joining the Department in exploration of even further solutions. On Friday, June 29, 2012, a Placement Resource Subcommittee of the ERCP Task Force, consisting of departmental managers and contracted providers, will meet to explore both short- and long-term alternatives to having older youth await placement at the ERCP site at the Broadway building.

4. **Why will it take until September 30 for the amended contracts to be completed – please explain the process and timeline?**

County Counsel confirmed that the Department *does not* have delegated authority to amend the existing Foster Family Agency contracts. Accordingly, the Department is currently drafting a Board Letter, recommending contract amendments for 19 Foster Family Agencies. The amendments will be for the purpose of matching the 24 hour per day, 7 day per week intake provisions, specified within these contractors' Foster Family Agency Program Statements, with the requirements in their current contracts. Because the change cannot be legally accomplished under delegated authority, rather it requires Board action, it will take until September 30, 2012.

DCFS CAP on A-C Report--The Auditor-Controller found that DCFS was not tracking the total time children are awaiting placement, i.e. the time spent at **both** ERCP and at the regional offices. In response, DCFS developed the Child Awaiting Placement Tracking System – which tracks the children that come into ERCP, how long they are at ERCP, where they come from, etc.

1. **How does the tracking system work – is it a web based system or an excel spreadsheet? Who is responsible for inputting the data?**

The system is a web-based system. Currently, an administrative level ERCP staff is responsible for data entry. Once ERCP is fully-staffed, the plan is to have dedicated and trained clerical data entry staff responsible, with administrative oversight.

2. **Does the tracking system track the total time that children await placement, for example 8 hours at ERCP, 10 hours at Regional Office, another 8 hours at ERCP for a total of 26 hours or just the time that a child is at ERCP?**

The Child Awaiting Placement Tracking System captures data specific to each episode of a child's entry and exit at ERCP. The number of ERCP entries the system tracks is not an "unduplicated" count. If a child spends time at ERCP; exits ERCP; then returns to ERCP, the dates and times of entry and exit for each episode are tracked individually.

Since the tracking system captures origin and destination data at the time of entry and exit; and also tracks hours and length-of-stay, the pattern detailed in the question is easily discernible from printouts of aggregate tracking system data and is overseen by ERCP management.

ERCP Task Force/Strike Team

1. **How will the Strike Team work with each regional office to determine why the majority of kids at ERCP are sent from the regional offices?**

The Strike Team, in conjunction with ERCP management, is conducting a survey of children arriving at ERCP on open cases. A limited review of recent information from the Child Awaiting Placement Tracking system revealed that the majority of children coming from regional offices were concentrated (46%) in three offices: Wateridge, Vermont Corridor, and Metro North.

A variety of likely reasons are currently under review, which include but are not limited to the physical proximity of these three offices to the ERCP site at the Broadway building, increasing the possibility of law enforcement deliveries or a child on an open case walking in to ERCP; the additional training needs of Children's Social Workers in these offices; and/or resource limitations challenging "inner city" Service Planning Areas.

Starting with these three Regional Offices and expanding to other offices, the Strike Team will compare ERCP's placement success strategies to unsuccessful regional efforts on the same case in order to develop mitigation strategies that will reduce and prevent children on open cases from entering ERCP.

2. **How will the Strike Team ensure the regional offices reduce the number of children they send to ERCP?**

There are a number of concrete steps that the Strike Team has initiated to support improved management oversight at the regional offices to assist in reducing the number of children taken to ERCP.

- The Strike Team, in conjunction with the Department's Resource Utilization Management Unit, Wraparound and D-Rate staff; and Department of Mental Health staff, is working on coordinating processes to locate appropriate placement resources for children.

- The Strike Team is also working with contracted agencies to increase their acceptance rates of children for placement.
- The Strike Team is currently reviewing its draft memo to Regional Management that reinforces a process requiring management approval prior to transporting children to ERCP, reminding staff that these children need to be transported with the appropriate ERCP Transport Packet forms, including a thoroughly completed ERCP Intake and Screening form and the placement list of the searches the regional office has already attempted. (Rather than an attempt to stop regional offices from bringing children to ERCP, this is a measure that will ensure that ERCP is efficiently and properly used only as a "last resort.")

To date, anecdotal information from the ERCP managers indicates that the "word is out." With the focus on ERCP and the supports being provided to ERCP, ERCP staff report that they have already seen improvements since regional offices are working at finding alternative and creative (and safe) placement solutions.

CONCLUSION

The Department of Children and Family Services thanks the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors for the opportunity to respond to the concerns on each agenda item. The Department recognizes that many of the strategies and actions detailed above were already in various stages of planning and progress, the opportunity to reassess each item and respond to the questions raised by the Board has increased and brought forth the awareness for the need to develop and implement service delivery systems that provide child welfare services in an integrated and comprehensive approach to safeguard children within their families and within their communities. If you have any questions, please call me or your staff may call Aldo Marin, Manager, DCFS Board Relations Section, at (213) 351-5530.

PLB:HB

c: Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors
   Chief Executive Officer
   County Counsel

UCLA

PERSONNEL	SALARY COSTS
Principal Investigator-(50% training/50% field education)	4,339
TC Director (90% training/10% field education)	56,718
UCLA TC Associate Director (100% training)	37,551
Director of Field Work (100% field education)	10,197
Social Work Faculty Instruction (100% field education)	25,883
Eval Researcher (100% field education)	4,974
Field Consultant/Liaison I(100% field education)	36,394
Field Consultant/Liaison II (100% field education)	41,176
Consultant/Trainer I (100% training)	34,275
Consultant/Trainer II (50% training/50% field education)	19,002
Consultant Trainer III (100% training)	7,449
Consultant Trainer IV (100% training)	7,203
Consultant Trainer V (100% training)	7,266
Consultant Trainer VI (100% training)	2,380
Consultant Trainer VII (100% training)	22,627
Administrative Analyst (90% training/10% field education)	26,718
Fiscal Officer (90% training/10% field education-stipends)	10,885
Fiscal Assistant (90% training/10% field education)	3,642
Student Affairs Officer III (100% field education)	2,545
Student Affairs Officer II 100% field education)	2,653
Program Assistant (100% training)	20,835
Unit Clerk I (100% field education)	21,790
Unit Clerk II 9100% field education)	21,790
Administrative Analyst (100% field education)	1,267
Administrative Specialist (100% field education)	1,400
Grad Student Res I (100% field education)	9,536
Programmer (Web Master) (90% training/10% field education)	9,751
Work Study Assistant I 100% training)	1,733
Sub-Total Personnel	451,974

Various Deliverables Part-Time Training Personnel
Core Training Academy, Core Writing, Diagnostic Exam, ER/DI Core Academy
    CSW / BCP / TUS / DX Writing
Specialized Sequence-POE, Core Enhancement, Log-In Service
Cross-level Training, CSW In-Service, SCSW In-Service
Specialized In-Service Adoptions, Specialized In-Service PHN
    CSW / SCSW / BCP / TUS / LOG
Specialized In-Service Joint Training, CSW Advanced In-Service
    CSW / SCSW
    Adoptions / Hotline / Deaf Svs Unit / PHN /
TOTAL Personnel & Fringe Benefits

M.S.W. STUDENT SUPPORT
Stipends 16 @ $18,500

Supplies and Expenses (80% training/20% field education)
Curriculum Library/Textbooks/Learning Materials, Audio Visual Services
postage, duplicating, phones, phones-training center
expendable supplies, repair/maintenance services,
other off-site training venues and other expenses

Other Expenses (Subcontractor) - 100% training

Equipment - Computers/Photocopier

Travel (domestic travel/local mileage) 90% training/10% field education

Training Site Lease - 100% training

Total Direct Costs for Center on Child Welfare

	SALARY COSTS
CENTRAL OFFICE PERSONNEL - 100% training	
IUC Director	58,765
Fiscal Officer	5,607
Administrative Analyst	26,581
Evaluation Coordinator	24,480
Faculty Advisor	0
Evaluation Assistant	7,713
Programmer/ Analyst	37,260
Administrative Assistant	12,907
Fiscal Assistant	1,754
Data System Clerk	21,970
Data System Clerk	21,970
Grad Student Res I	1,374
Web/Tech Support	22,751
Sub-Total Personnel	243,130

Supplies and Expenses - 100% training
Photocopier rental, IUC copier rental, postage, telephones
Telephone @ Santa Fe Springs, expendable
supplies, printing and copying
software, instant personnel
Equipment - 100% training
Data System Equipment
TDS Software Maintenance
Subcontract
Travel - 100% training

Total Direct Costs for IUC Central Office

Total Direct Costs for Center on Child Welfare AND IUC Central Office
37% of Direct Costs

Modified Total Direct Cost
Total Costs
UCLA Portion
Department of Children and Family Services Portion

FRINGE BENEFITS	TOTAL	SALARY COSTS	FRINGE BENEFITS	TOTAL
391	4,729	4,339	391	4,729
15,314	72,032	56,718	15,314	72,032
10,514	48,065	37,551	10,514	48,065
1,835	12,032	10,197	1,835	12,032
0	25,883	25,883	0	25,883
0	4,974	4,974	0	4,974
13,466	49,859	36,394	13,466	49,859
16,470	57,646	41,176	16,470	57,646
14,396	48,671	34,275	14,396	48,671
3,610	22,612	19,002	3,610	22,612
	7,449	7,449		7,449
	7,203	7,203		7,203
1,526	8,791	7,266	1,526	8,791
809	3,189	2,380	809	3,189
2,715	25,342	22,627	2,715	25,342
11,489	38,207	26,718	11,489	38,207
3,919	14,803	10,885	3,919	14,803
1,238	4,880	3,642	1,238	4,880
636	3,181	2,545	636	3,181
822	3,475	2,653	822	3,475
6,875	27,710	20,835	6,875	27,710
9,588	31,378	21,790	9,588	31,378
10,241	32,031	21,790	10,241	32,031
0	1,267	1,267	0	1,267
0	1,400	1,400	0	1,400
191	9,727	9,536	191	9,727
1,950	11,701	9,751	1,950	11,701
18	1,750	1,733	18	1,750
128,013	579,987	451,974	128,013	579,987
	52,229			52,229

632,216			632,216
148,000			148,000

	FRINGE BENEFITS	TOTAL COSTS	SALARY COSTS	FRINGE BENEFITS	TOTAL COSTS
		71,430			71,430
		12,500			12,500
		16,370			16,370
		84,251			84,251
		964,767			964,767
	20,568	79,333	58,765	20,568	79,333
	2,019	7,626	5,607	2,019	7,626
	13,556	40,137	26,581	13,556	40,137
	11,261	35,741	24,480	11,261	35,741
	0	0	0	0	0
	2,314	10,026	7,713	2,314	10,026
	10,805	48,065	37,260	10,805	48,065
	4,776	17,683	12,907	4,776	17,683
	596	2,350	1,754	596	2,350
	8,129	30,098	21,970	8,129	30,098
	12,523	34,492	21,970	12,523	34,492
	14	1,388	1,374	14	1,388
	4,550	27,302	22,751	4,550	27,302
	91,110	334,240	243,130	91,110	334,240
		16,278			16,278
		1,395			1,395
		2,870			2,870
		354,782			354,782
		1,319,549			1,319,549
		401,784			401,784

1,085,904	1,085,904
1,721,333	1,721,333
430,334	430,334
1,291,000	1,291,000

Inter-University Consortium on Child Welfare
California State University, Long Beach
School of Social Work, Child Welfare Training Centre
Period: July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013 (Yr. 22 ONLY)

	Salary	Fringe	Total	County Share	CSULB Share	7/1/12 to 12/31/2012	1/1/13 to 6/30/2013
			Fiscal Year 2012/13			Fiscal Year 2012/13 County Share	
PERSONNEL							
Director, Social Work, Christian Molidor, PhD, MSW *(P/T 10% FTE)*	13,500	1,080	14,580	14,580	-	7,290	7,290
Evaluation, Julie O'Donnell, PhD, MSW *(P/T 25% FTE)*	36,233	2,899	39,132	39,132	-	19,566	19,566
Director, CWTC, James Ferreira, MSW *(Full Time)*	95,022	47,511	142,533	142,533	-	71,267	71,267
Trainer, Therese Pekala, LCSW *(Full Time)*	82,980	41,490	124,470	124,470	-	62,235	62,235
Trainer, Pam Walker, LMFT, MSW *(Full Time)*	86,820	43,410	130,230	130,230	-	65,115	65,115
Trainer, Mike Walker, LMFT, *(Part Time/Temp)*	57,800	4,624	62,424	62,424	-	42,448	19,976
Trainer, Monica Malin, MSW *(Full Time)*	69,460	34,730	104,190	104,190	-	52,095	52,095
Field Coordinator, Venetta Campbell, PsyD,LCSW *(P/T 75% FTE)*	59,430	29,715	89,145	89,145	-	44,573	44,573
Field Consultant, Rashida Crutchfield, MSW *(Full Time)*	68,220	34,110	102,330	102,330	-	51,165	51,165
Social Work Faculty Instruction *(various)*	70,557	24,695	95,251	-	95,251		
Fiscal Administrator, Stella Corrales *(Full Time)*	57,816	28,908	86,724	86,724	-	43,362	43,362
Administrative Assistant, Chuck Hulsey *(Full Time)*	43,760	21,880	65,640	65,640	-	33,148	32,492
Administrative Assistant, Annie Radzicki *(P/T 5% FTE)*	3,144	252	3,395	3,395	-	1,698	1,698
Evaluation/Research Assoc, Sandra Kirkner, MAR *(P/T 75% FTE)*	38,370	19,185	57,555	57,555	-	29,065	28,490
Field Educ Unit Clerk, Elizabeth Robles *(Full Time)*	31,720	15,860	47,580	47,580	-	24,028	23,552
Field Educ Unit Clerk, Roshell McKevie *(Full Time)*	31,720	15,860	47,580	47,580	-	24,028	23,552
Office Student Assistant *(Part Time)*	10,000	800	10,800	10,800	-	5,314	5,486
Part-time training staff Training Academies *(P/T hrly as needed)*	12,000	960	12,960	12,960	-	12,960	-
Part-time training Inservice and Advanced *(P/T hrly as needed)*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL PERSONNEL	868,552	367,968	1,236,520	1,141,268	95,251	589,356	551,913
STIPENDS (16 @ $18,500)			296,000	296,000	-	131,520	164,480
SUPPLIES & SERVICES							
Supplies, services, materials, resources	27,000						
Duplicating	19,000						
Telephone and postage	10,000						
LOG, Cross Level, Cross System Conference costs	20,000						
Trainee parking costs	8,987						
TOTAL SUPPLIES & SERVICES			84,987	84,987	-	32,494	52,494
TRAVEL (mileage and travel costs)			7,500	7,500	-	3,750	3,750
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS			1,625,007	1,529,755	95,251	757,119	772,636
FACILTIES AND ADMIN COSTS							
Modified Total Direct Costs (Direct less stipends)	1,329,007						
F&A Rate: on-campus instruction	54.10%						
TOTAL F&A COSTS			718,993	228,245	490,748	115,736	112,509
TOTAL PROJECT COSTS			2,344,000	1,758,000	585,999	872,855	885,145
				75.00%	25.00%		

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
INTER-UNIVERSITY CONSORTIUM
BUDGET
[JULY 1, 2012 - JUNE 30, 2013]

	JULY 1, 2012 to DECEMBER 31, 2012		JANUARY 1, 2013 to JUNE 30, 2013		TOTAL	
1. SALARIES & WAGES [S&W]:						
CENTER PERSONNEL						
Center Director	$	24.272	$	24.272	$	48.544
Training Director	$	52.116	$	52.116	$	104.232
Research Director	$	5.000	$	5.000	$	10.000
Business Manager	$	35.105	$	35.105	$	70.210
Training Consultant I	$	38.003	$	38.003	$	76.006
Training Consultant II	$	41.223	$	41.223	$	82.446
Program Assistant	$	22.744	$	22.744	$	45.488
Secretary	$	14.000	$	14.000	$	28.000
IUC FIELD UNITS PERSONNEL						
Field Consultant	$	31.252	$	31.252	$	62.504
Field Secretary	$	16.000	$	16.000	$	32.000
Field Faculty Liaisons (2)	$	22.206	$	22.206	$	44.412
PART-TIME PERSONNEL (DELIVERABLES)						
In accordance with the Grant's Section A-1	$	25.000	$	25.000	$	50.000
SUBTOTAL SALARIES & WAGES:	$	326,921	$	326,921	$	653,842
FRINGE BENEFITS (32% OF S&W)	$	104,615	$	104,615	$	209,229
TOTAL SALARIES & WAGES + FRINGE BENEFITS:	$	431,536	$	431,536	$	863,071
3. GRADUATE STUDENTS' SUPPORT						
Stipends (15 Students @ $18,500 per student)	$	138,750		138750	$	277.500
Research Assistants Support (4 RAs)	$	17.856		17856	$	35.712
TOTAL GRADUATE STUDENTS' SUPPORT	$	156,606	$	156,606	$	313,212
4. SUPPLIES AND EXPENSES	$	54,588		54588	$	109,176
Office and training supplies, photocopy/postage/ shipping/telephone charges, publications/ subscriptions, parking, repair and maintenance services, computer and equipment visual equipment and furniture =/> $5.000, other expendables						
5. TRAVEL (domestic travel and mileage costs)	$	2,000		2000	$	4,000
6. OTHER DIRECT COSTS	$	72,500		72500	$	145,000
Off-campus training facilities lease and rental						
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS						
	$	717,230	$	717,230	$	1,434,459
INDIRECT COSTS [IC] RATE (8.25%)						
[Total Direct Costs **less:** Graduate Students' Support and Other Direct Costs]	$	40,270	$	40,270	$	80,540
TOTAL AMOUNT	$	757,500	$	757,500	$	1,515,000

Los Angeles County Detailed Budget
Principal Investigator: Dale Weaver
"Inter-University Consortium - Child Welfare Training Project"
Project Period: 07/01/12 - 12/31/12
Year 1: 07/01/12 - 12/31/12 - 6 months

		Salary Unit/Hourly Rate	# of Units/Hours	Cost-Shared Units/Amounts	Requested Amount	CSLA Costsharing$	Total Project Cost
A.	**PERSONNEL**						
1	P.I. - Department Chair, Dale Weaver (only Year 3)						
	Cost-Share Effort		23.100%	$43,368.08		$ 10,018	$ 10,018
	OL (50% Field, 50% Training)	$ 1,927	2.80000		$ 5,396		$ 5,396
3	Assoc. Dean, Eleanor Ferguson		12.00%	$62,500	$ -	$ 7,500	$ 7,500
4	Director of Field, To be announced				$ -		
	Cost-Share Effort		23.00%	$33,522	$ -	$ 7,710	$ 7,710
	OL (100% Field)	$ 1,490	2.790		$ 4,157		$ 4,157
6	Admissions Coord., Michelle Lightburn		20.00%	$20,477	$ -	$ 4,095	$ 4,095
7	Trainer, Marc Mendoza	$ 35,564	1.0		$ 35,564		$ 35,564
8	Part-Time Trainer, Lilli Miles	$ 23,420	1.0		$ 23,420		$ 23,420
9	Field Education Staff, Tasha Willis (100% Field)	$ 36,964	1.0		$ 36,964		$ 36,964
10	Field Education Staff, Nayiri Nahabedian (100% Field)	$ 38,801	1.0		$ 38,801		$ 38,801
11	Field Education Research, TBN (100% Field)	$ 947	14		$ 13,258		$ 13,258
12	Faculty Instructional Cost, TBN		42	$502	$ -	$ 20,084	$ 20,084
13	Business Manager, To be announced				$ -		
	Cost-Share Effort		11.5%	$18,396	$ -	$ 2,116	$ 2,116
	Requested Funds (50% Field, 50% Training)		452		$ 4,000	$ -	$ -
14	Admin. Asst. of Social Work, Melinda Vasquez		12.00%	$15,040	$ -	$ 1,100	$ 1,100
15	Training Center Director, Linda Liu (90% Training, 10% Field)	$ 48,866	1.0		$ 48,866	$ -	$ 48,866
16	Fiscal Services Analyst, Luis Franco (20% Field, 80% Training)	$ 24,758	1.0		$ 24,758	$ -	$ 24,758
17	Admin Asst, Peggy Neiman (90% Training, 10% Field)	$ 22,313	1.0		$ 22,313	$ -	$ 22,313
18	Field Education Clerk, David Hernandez (100% Field)	$ 14,997	1.0		$ 14,997	$ -	$ 14,997
19	Field Education Clerk, Nelly Carrillo (100% Field)	$ 17,739	1.0		$ 17,739	$ -	$ 17,739
20	Program Asst - Oswaldo Pena (100% Training)	$ 19,903	1.0		$ 19,903	$ -	$ 19,903
21	Graduate Asst / Part-Time Clerical, TBN (90% Training, 10% Field)	$ 22,500	1.0		$ 22,500	$ -	$ 22,500
	SUBTOTAL PERSONNEL				$ 332,636	$ 52,623	$ 385,259
B.	**FRINGE BENEFITS +**						
1	P.I - Department Chair, Dale Weaver (only Year 3)						
	Cost-Share Effort	0.3401				$ 3,300	$ 3,300
	OL (50% Field, 50% Training)	0.14			$ 384		$ 384
3	Assoc. Dean, Eleanor Ferguson	0.25			$ -	$ 1,875	$ 1,875
4	Director of Field, To be announced				$ -	$ -	$ -
	Cost-Share Effort	0.3595			$ -	$ 2,772	$ 2,772
	OL (100% Field)	0.14			$ 313	$ -	$ 313
6	Admissions Coord , Michelle Lightburn	0.25			$ -	$ 1,024	$ 1,024
7	Trainer, Marc Mendoza	0.35			$ 12,447	$ -	$ 12,447
8	Part-Time Trainer, Lilli Miles	0.14			$ 3,279	$ -	$ 3,279
9	Field Education Staff, Tasha Willis (100% Field)	0.35			$ 12,937	$ -	$ 12,937
10	Field Education Staff, Nayiri Nahabedian (100% Field)	0.35			$ 13,580	$ -	$ 13,580
11	Field Education Research, TBN (100% Field)	0.35			$ 4,640	$ -	$ 4,640
12	Faculty Instructional Cost, TBN	0.25			$ -	$ 5,021	$ 5,021
13	Business Manager, To be announced				$ -	$ -	$ -
	Cost-Share Effort	0.25			$ -	$ 529	$ 529
	Requested Funds (50% Field, 50% Training)	0.14			$ 559	$ -	$ 559
14	Admin. Asst. of Social Work, Melinda Vasquez	0.25			$ -	$ 274	$ 274
15	Training Center Director, Linda Liu (90% Training, 10% Field)	0.35			$ 17,103	$ -	$ 17,103
16	Fiscal Services Analyst, Luis Franco (20% Field, 80% Training)	0.35			$ 8,665	$ -	$ 8,665
17	Admin Asst, Peggy Neiman (90% Training, 10% Field)	0.35			$ 7,810	$ -	$ 7,810
18	Field Education Clerk, David Hernandez (100% Field)	0.35			$ 5,249	$ -	$ 5,249
19	Field Education Clerk, Nelly Carrillo (100% Field)	0.35			$ 6,209	$ -	$ 6,209
20	Program Asst - Oswaldo Pena (100% Training)	0.35			$ 6,966	$ -	$ 6,966
21	Graduate Asst / Part-Time Clerical, TBN (90% Training, 10% Field)	0.35			$ 7,875	$ -	$ 7,875
	SUBTOTAL FRINGE BENEFITS				$ 108,016	$ 14,795	$ 122,811
	SUBTOTAL PERSONNEL & FRINGE BENEFITS				$ 440,652	$ 67,418	$ 508,070
C.	**OTHER PERSONNEL: TRAINERS/CONSULTANTS**						
1	Consultant: Training Academies				$ 6,000		$ 6,000
2	Consultant: Katie A/CFT Currriculum Development				$ 12,800		$ 12,800
3	Consultant: CSW In-Service, Advanced, SCSW, Management				$ 37,500		$ 37,500
	SUBTOTAL OTHER PERSONNEL				$ 56,300		$ 56,300
							$ -
D.	**SUBCONTRACTS**						
1	Not Applicable						$ -
	SUBTOTAL SUBCONTRACTS						$ -
E.	**PARTICIPANT COSTS**						$ -
1	Student Participant Stipends, TBN (16 students @ $9,250 each)				$ 148,000		$ 148,000
	SUBTOTAL PARTICIPANT COSTS				$ 148,000		$ 148,000
F.	**TRAVEL**						
1	Mileage (70% Training, 30% Field)				$ 4,748		$ 4,748
2	Parking Expenses (100% Training)				$ 999		$ 999
3	Travel In-State (85% Training, 15% Field)				$ 3,500		$ 3,500
4	Travel Out-of-State (100% Training)				$ 1,500		$ 1,500
	SUBTOTAL TRAVEL				$ 10,750		$ 10,750
G.	**EQUIPMENT**						
1	Not Applicable						$ -
	SUBTOTAL EQUIPMENT						$ -
H.	**SPACE**						
1	Training Center Space Rental				$ 61,301		$ 61,301
	SUBTOTAL Space				$ 61,301		$ 61,301
I.	**OTHER DIRECT COSTS**						
1	General Materials & Supplies (90% Training, 10% Field)				$ 18,177		$ 18,177
2	Telephone/Communications (90% Training, 10% Field)				$ 11,500		$ 11,500
3	Printing/Copying/Duplicating (90% Training, 10% Field)				$ 7,000		$ 7,000

	4	Conference/Meeting Expenses (100% Training)				$	50,000		$	50,000
	5	Baseline Computers(80% Training, 20% Field)				$	1,250		$	1,250
	6	Office Equipment: Copier, Scanner, Printer(90% Training, 10% Field)				$	750		$	750
	7	Utilities (Training Center) (100% Training)				$	7,500		$	7,500
		SUBTOTAL OTHER DIRECT COSTS				$	96,177		$	96,177
						$			$	-
J.		**DIRECT COST**				$	813,179	$	67,418	$	880,597
K.		**MODIFIED TOTAL DIRECT COST** (MTDC - excludes Participant Costs and Space Rental)				$	603,879	$	67,418	$	671,297
L.		**FACILITIES & ADMINISTRATIVE COST** (MTDC x 12%)*	12.00%			$	72,465		$	72,465
M.		**UNRECOVERED F&A COSTS** (44.5%-12%=32.5%)*¶	0.16					$	226,253	$	226,253
N.		**TOTAL COST**				$	885,645	$	293,671	$	1,179,316
		Cost-Sharing Percentage (25% Match Required)					75%		25%		100.00%
		Notes:									
		† A fringe benefit rate of 25% is used for faculty/staff release time as it is the present billing rate for the College of Health and Human Services. A fringe benefit rate of 35% is used for Personnel # 5, 7-9, 13-19, and 14% for Personnel # 6 because these are the estimated average billing rates for these UAS/CSULA positions									
		The University requests that the above salary information not be distributed outside of the Agency.									
		Minor difference in totals may exist due to rounding									

Los Angeles County Detailed Budget
Principal Investigator: Dale Weaver
"Inter-University Consortium - Child Welfare Training Project"
Project Period: 01/01/13 to 06/30/13
Year 1: 01/01/13 - 06/30/13 6 months

		Salary Unit/Hourly Rate	# of Units/Hours	Cost-Shared Units/Amounts	Requested Amount	CSLA Costsharing§	Total Project Cost
A.	**PERSONNEL**						
1	P.I. - Department Chair, Dale Weaver (only Year 3)						
	Cost-Share Effort		23.100%	$43,368.08		$ 10,018	$ 10,018
	OL (50% Field, 50% Training)	$ 1,927	2.80000		$ 5,396		$ 5,396
3	Assoc. Dean, Eleanor Ferguson		12.00%	$62,500	$ -	$ 7,500	$ 7,500
4	Director of Field, To be announced				$ -		
	Cost-Share Effort		23.00%	$33,522	$ -	$ 7,710	$ 7,710
	OL (100% Field)	$ 1,490	2.790		$ 4,157		$ 4,157
6	Admissions Coord., Michelle Lightburn		20.00%	$20,477	$ -	$ 4,095	$ 4,095
7	Trainer, Marc Mendoza	$ 35,564	1.0		$ 35,564		$ 35,564
8	Part-Time Trainer, Lilli Miles	$ 23,420	1.0		$ 23,420		$ 23,420
9	Field Education Staff, Tasha Willis (100% Field)	$ 36,964	1.0		$ 36,964		$ 36,964
10	Field Education Staff, Nayiri Nahabedian (100% Field)	$ 38,801	1.0		$ 38,801		$ 38,801
11	Field Education Research, TBN (100% Field)	$ 947	14		$ 13,258		$ 13,258
12	Faculty Instructional Cost, TBN		42	$502	$ -	$ 20,084	$ 20,084
13	Business Manager, To be announced				$ -		
	Cost-Share Effort		11.5%	$18,396	$ -	$ 2,116	$ 2,116
	Requested Funds (50% Field, 50% Training)		452		$ 4,000	$ -	$ -
14	Admin. Asst. of Social Work, Melinda Vasquez		12.00%	$15,040	$ -	$ 1,100	$ 1,100
15	Training Center Director, Linda Liu (90% Training, 10% Field)	$ 48,866	1.0		$ 48,866	$ -	$ 48,866
16	Fiscal Services Analyst, Luis Franco (20% Field, 80% Training)	$ 24,758	1.0		$ 24,758	$ -	$ 24,758
17	Admin Asst, Peggy Neiman (90% Training, 10% Field)	$ 22,313	1.0		$ 22,313	$ -	$ 22,313
18	Field Education Clerk, David Hernandez (100% Field)	$ 14,997	1.0		$ 14,997	$ -	$ 14,997
19	Field Education Clerk, Nelly Carrillo (100% Field)	$ 17,739	1.0		$ 17,739	$ -	$ 17,739
20	Program Asst - Oswaldo Pena (100% Training)	$ 19,903	1.0		$ 19,903	$ -	$ 19,903
21	Graduate Asst / Part-Time Clerical, TBN (90% Training, 10% Field)	$ 22,500	1.0		$ 22,500	$ -	$ 22,500
	SUBTOTAL PERSONNEL				$ 332,636	$ 52,623	$ 385,259
B.	**FRINGE BENEFITS +**						
1	P.I. - Department Chair, Dale Weaver (only Year 3)						
	Cost-Share Effort	0.3401				$ 3,300	$ 3,300
	OL (50% Field, 50% Training)	0.14			$ 384		$ 384
3	Assoc. Dean, Eleanor Ferguson	0.25			$ -	$ 1,875	$ 1,875
4	Director of Field, To be announced				$ -	$ -	$ -
	Cost-Share Effort	0.3595			$ -	$ 2,772	$ 2,772
	OL (100% Field)	0.14			$ 313	$ -	$ 313
6	Admissions Coord., Michelle Lightburn	0.25			$ -	$ 1,024	$ 1,024
7	Trainer, Marc Mendoza	0.35			$ 12,447	$ -	$ 12,447
8	Part-Time Trainer, Lilli Miles	0.14			$ 3,279	$ -	$ 3,279
9	Field Education Staff, Tasha Willis (100% Field)	0.35			$ 12,937	$ -	$ 12,937
10	Field Education Staff, Nayiri Nahabedian (100% Field)	0.35			$ 13,580	$ -	$ 13,580
11	Field Education Research, TBN (100% Field)	0.35			$ 4,640	$ -	$ 4,640
12	Faculty Instructional Cost, TBN	0.25			$ -	$ 5,021	$ 5,021
13	Business Manager, To be announced				$ -	$ -	$ -
	Cost-Share Effort	0.25			$ -	$ 529	$ 529
	Requested Funds (50% Field, 50% Training)	0.14			$ 559	$ -	$ 559
14	Admin. Asst. of Social Work, Melinda Vasquez	0.25			$ -	$ 274	$ 274
15	Training Center Director, Linda Liu (90% Training, 10% Field)	0.35			$ 17,103	$ -	$ 17,103
16	Fiscal Services Analyst, Luis Franco (20% Field, 80% Training)	0.35			$ 8,665	$ -	$ 8,665
17	Admin Asst, Peggy Neiman (90% Training, 10% Field)	0.35			$ 7,810	$ -	$ 7,810
18	Field Education Clerk, David Hernandez (100% Field)	0.35			$ 5,249	$ -	$ 5,249
19	Field Education Clerk, Nelly Carrillo (100% Field)	0.35			$ 6,209	$ -	$ 6,209
20	Program Asst - Oswaldo Pena (100% Training)	0.35			$ 6,966	$ -	$ 6,966
21	Graduate Asst / Part-Time Clerical, TBN (90% Training, 10% Field)	0.35			$ 7,875	$ -	$ 7,875
	SUBTOTAL FRINGE BENEFITS				$ 108,016	$ 14,795	$ 122,811
	SUBTOTAL PERSONNEL & FRINGE BENEFITS				$ 440,652	$ 67,418	$ 508,070
C.	**OTHER PERSONNEL: TRAINERS/CONSULTANTS**						
1	Consultant: Training Academies				$ 6,000		$ 6,000
2	Consultant: Katie A/CFT Curriculum Development				$ 12,800		$ 12,800
3	Consultant: CSW In-Service, Advanced, SCSW, Management				$ 37,500		$ 37,500
	SUBTOTAL OTHER PERSONNEL				$ 56,300		$ 56,300
							$ -
D.	**SUBCONTRACTS**						
1	Not Applicable						$ -
	SUBTOTAL SUBCONTRACTS						$ -
E.	**PARTICIPANT COSTS**						$ -
1	Student Participant Stipends, TBN (16 students @ $9,250 each)				$ 148,000		$ 148,000
	SUBTOTAL PARTICIPANT COSTS				$ 148,000		$ 148,000
F.	**TRAVEL**						
1	Mileage (70% Training, 30% Field)				$ 4,748		$ 4,748
2	Parking Expenses (100% Training)				$ 999		$ 999
3	Travel In-State (85% Training, 15% Field)				$ 3,500		$ 3,500
4	Travel Out-of-State (100% Training)				$ 1,500		$ 1,500
	SUBTOTAL TRAVEL				$ 10,750		$ 10,750
G.	**EQUIPMENT**						
1	Not Applicable						$ -
	SUBTOTAL EQUIPMENT						$ -
H.	**SPACE**						
1	Training Center Space Rental				$ 61,301		$ 61,301
	SUBTOTAL Space				$ 61,301		$ 61,301
I.	**OTHER DIRECT COSTS**						
1	General Materials & Supplies (90% Training, 10% Field)				$ 18,177		$ 18,177
2	Telephone/Communications (90% Training, 10% Field)				$ 11,500		$ 11,500
3	Printing/Copying/Duplicating (90% Training, 10% Field)				$ 7,000		$ 7,000

	4	Conference/Meeting Expenses (100% Training)					$	50,000		$	50,000
	5	Baseline Computers(80% Training, 20% Field)					$	1,250		$	1,250
	6	Office Equipment: Copier, Scanner, Printer(90% Training, 10% Field)					$	750		$	750
	7	Utilities (Training Center) (100% Training)					$	7,500		$	7,500
		SUBTOTAL OTHER DIRECT COSTS					$	96,177		$	96,177
										$	-
J.		**DIRECT COST**					$	813,179	$ 67,418	$	880,597
K.		**MODIFIED TOTAL DIRECT COST** (MTDC - excludes Participant Costs and Space Rental)					$	603,879	$ 67,418	$	671,297
L.		**FACILITIES & ADMINISTRATIVE COST** (MTDC x 12%)*	12.00%				$	72,465		$	72,465
M.		**UNRECOVERED F&A COSTS** (44.5%-12%=32.5%)*¶	0.16						$ 226,253	$	226,253
N.		**TOTAL COST**					$	885,645	$ 293,671	$	1,179,316
		Cost-Sharing Percentage (25% Match Required)						75%	25%		100.00%
		Notes:									
		† A fringe benefit rate of 25% is used for faculty/staff release time as it is the present billing rate for the College of Health and Human Services. A fringe benefit rate of 35% is used for Personnel # 5, 7-9, 13-19, and 14% for Personnel # 6 because these are the estimated average billing rates for these UAS/CSULA positions.									
		The University requests that the above salary information not be distributed outside of the Agency.									
		Minor difference in totals may exist due to rounding.									

California State University, Northridge
Inter-University Consortium
L.A. Department of Children and Family Services

2012-13 Budget	July 1, 2012-December 31, 2012	January 1, 2013-June 30, 2013
Administrative Assistant	13,942	13,942
Coordinator	37,080	37,080
Faculty Release Time	3,959	3,959
Total Salaries	**54,981**	**54,981**
Admin Asst. @ 42.3%	5,897	5,897
Coordinator @ 42.3%	15,685	15,685
Faculty Release Time @ 47%	1,860	1,860
Total Benefits	**23,443**	**23,443**
Total Personnel	**78,423**	**78,423**
Instructional-Book Supplies	3,152	3,152
Printing and Photocopy	1,250	1,250
Travel	2,636	2,636
Telephones	100	100
Stipends-Student	74,000	74,000
Expendable Equipment	576	576
Total Operating	**81,713**	**81,713**
Total Direct Costs	**160,136**	**160,136**
Indirect Costs @ 15%	12,920	12,920
TOTAL COSTS	173,057	173,057

Salary/Wages/Benefits	FTE	Salary	Benefits	Contract SWB	07/01/12 thru 12/31/12 County Share	CSUDH Share	01/31/13 thru 06/30/13 County Share	CSUDH Share	Total
Director	0.1	109,000	30,520	13,952			13,952		13,952
Dean	0.04	140,000	39,200	7,168				7,168	7,168
FisMan	0.04	70,000	19,600	3,584				3,584	3,584
Field Dir	0.2	75,000	21,000	19,200			19,200		19,200
Field Con	1	58,000	17,400	75,400			75,400		75,400
Trng Eval	0.1	62,000	17,360	7,936			7,936		7,936
Fac Instr	0.1	66,000	18,480	8,448				8,448	8,448
Fac Instr	0.1	66,000	18,480	8,448				8,448	8,448
Fac Instr	0.1	66,000	18,480	8,448				8,448	8,448
Fac Instr	0.1	70,000	19,600	8,960				8,960	8,960
Fac Instr	0.1	70,000	19,600	8,960				8,960	8,960
Fac Instr	0.1	80,000	22,400	10,240				10,240	10,240
Fac Instr	0.1	80,000	22,400	10,240				10,240	10,240
Grad St Res	0.25	24,000	6,720	7,680			7,680		7,680
Clerical	1	30,000	8,400	38,400	19,200		19,200		38,400
SWB				237,064	19,200		143,368	74,496	237,064
Stipends					49,333		98,667		148,000
Supplies/Serv									
Supplies					2,690		2,690		5,380
Telephones					750		750		1,500
					3,440		3,440		6,880
Computer					3,000		0		3,000
Travel									
Travel									
Mileage					1,250		1,250		2,500
					254		254		508
					1,504		1,504		3,008
Tot Direct Costs					76,477	0	246,979	74,496	397,952
Modified Dir Costs					27,144		148,311		
					10%	22%	10%	22%	
F&A Costs @ 32%					2,714	6,060	14,831	33,110	56,715
Tot Project Costs					79,191	6,060	261,810	107,606	454,667
County Share					79,191	17%	261,810	58%	
CSUDH Share					6,060	1%	107,606	24%	
Total					85,251	19%	369,416	81%	

HIGH RISK CASE SUMMARY
_____ Office

Date of Case Conference:

Child's Name:

Child's DOB:

CSW:

Current Placement:

Facility Type: Group Home _   Regional Center Home _   FFA _   Other:_____

Rate Classification Level (RCL):

Length of time at this placement:

# of Prior Placements:

Mental Health

Current Diagnosis:

Behavioral Problems:

Psychotropic Medications:

Mental Health Provider(s):

# of Psychiatric Hospitalizations:

Medical

Current Diagnosis:

Signs and Symptoms:

Medications:

Primary Physician/Pediatrician:

# of Medical Hospitalizations:

Core Practice Model

1. <u>Engagement</u>:
   a. What is the level of engagement and/or quality of the relationship between the CSW and the youth and his/her family?

   b. What could be done to further improve it?

2. <u>Teaming</u>:
   a. Is there a well-formed and well-functioning child and family team?

   b. Are there informal supports involved with and supporting the child/youth?

   c. What can be done to improve teaming and the level of involvement from informal supports?

3. <u>Assessment and Understanding</u>:
   a. What are the youth and family's strengths and underlying needs?

   b. Is there a good understanding by the child and family team of what may be driving any negative behaviors?

   c. What can be done to improve the team's assessment and understanding of the child and family situation?

4. <u>Planning</u>: What is the long-term view for this child and family?

Other Comments (in bullet points):

Action Plan (to be completed <u>after</u> High Risk Case Conference):

1.
    a.

    b.

    c.

2.
    a.

    b.

    c.

3.
    a.

    b.

    c.

High Risk Case Summary

Date of Case Conference:	DCFS Office:
Child's Name:	DOB:
CSW:	

PLACEMENT INFORMATION	
Current Placement:	
Facility Type:	Rate Classification Level:
Length of time at this placement:	Total # of prior placements:

# of types of placement: (Please indicated the # of each placement type below)

Foster Home   Foster Family Agency   Group Home   D-rate home   MTFC/ITFC

Psychiatric Hospitalizations   Regional Center Home

Relative   Home of Parent   Other

MENTAL HEALTH INFORMATION
Current Diagnosis:
Behavioral Problems:
Psychotropic Medications:
Mental Health Provider:
# of Psychiatric Hospitalizations:

MEDICAL INFORMATION
Current Diagnosis:
Signs and Symptoms:
Medications:
Primary Physician/Pediatrician:
# of Medical Hospitalizations:

ACTION PLAN

CORE PRACTICE MODEL INFORMATION

1. <u>Engagement</u>: a) Describe the level of engagement and/or quality of the relationship between the CSW and the youth and his/her family. b) If there are engagement concerns, what can be done to improve the relationship?

2. <u>Teaming</u>: a) Is there a well formed and well functioning child and family team? b) Who are the team members? c) Are there informal supports involved with supporting the child/youth? d) What can be done to improve the teaming and the level of involvement from informal supports?

3. <u>Assessment and Understanding</u>: a) What are the youth and family strengths and underlying needs? b) Is there a good understanding by the child and family team of what may be driving any negative behaviors? c) What can be done to improve the team's assessment and understanding of the child and family situation?

4. <u>Planning</u>: What is the long-term view for this child and family?

DMH Recommendations Within Existing Resources

Involve existing mental health intensive treatment program clinicians

Status: The initial focus of this effort will be to work with DMH co-located staff, Wraparound and Full Service Partnership providers, along with DCFS ERCP and Regional office staff to identify Wraparound and Full Service Partnership clients who are at risk of ERCP overstays and to implement a shared plan to address client needs in a way that minimizes the potential for youth to enter ERCP. This will require the development of shared protocol and training. DMH and DCFS anticipate full implementation within 9 to 12 months.

Addition: DMH will need to re-train Wraparound and Full Service Partnership provider agencies about the need to begin service planning upon entry into these intensive programs to implement service plans with children and families/caregivers prior to replacement becoming a potential issue. Because this service planning will require convening child and family teams, DMH will need to develop a shared protocol with DCFS. In the meantime DMH will emphasize these issues in the coaching and mentoring pilots for the Core Practice Model, in the monthly meetings with the DMH District Chiefs who supervised the DMH co-located staff, and in the quarterly DMH Katie A. provider meetings.

Train ERCP staff in
   a. Shared Core Practice Model
   b. Non-violent crisis intervention and suicide prevention/intervention, supported by ongoing coaching to enhance and maintain skill development

Revised Status: Using existing curricula, DMH will work with DCFS to schedule trainings for DCFS ERCP staff in non-violent crisis intervention and suicide prevention/intervention to occur between June 13, 2012 through September 30, 2012.

DMH will coordinate with DCFS and the Los Angeles Training Consortium which provides the coaching and mentoring for the Shared Core Practice Model, to develop coaching strategies to extend the learning from the suicide prevention/intervention trainings for ERCP staff. This is anticipated to take 6 to 9 months to implement.

DMH recommendation (outside existing resources)

1. Establish a dedicated effort to preserve placements:
<u>Revised</u>: DMH and DCFS will begin by coordinating trainings for group home providers (Rate Classification Level 12 and above) regarding managing children with mental health issues. There is an existing model for this which has recently been used in Service Area 3 that has significantly reduced inappropriate calls to the DMH Psychiatric Mobile Response Team. DMH will begin by training those group homes believed by DMH and DCFS to have issues with management of children with mental health issues. DMH will then proceed to roll out trainings to other group home providers, focusing next on the higher level group homes that have contracts with both DMH and DCFS since they would be anticipated to have the most residents who might benefit from group home staff receiving the training. Because of the large number of group homes this effort can be expected to take 6 to 9 months.

In the meantime DMH and DCFS will continue to explore funding sources for staff to be available late afternoons and evenings to help with mediation, conflict resolution, de-escalation and resolving acute crises for youth with emotional disturbance. These teams of staff would function similarly to the previous Children's Crisis Teams that used to help stabilize placements. Ideally these teams could also help coach and mentor foster families and group home staff in how to apply these skills to new situations that might arise in their settings. This is anticipated to take 12 months to implement because of the need to identify funding, appropriate staffing and procurement methods.

2. Build a seamless transition to a new placement with mental health involvement by placing a specialized mental health provider at ERCP:

<u>Revised</u>: DMH and DCFS are continuing to explore funding sources for staffing this project, potential models, and what the procurement method(s) should be. This is anticipated to take 12 months to address.