

PEI Well-Being Workgroup

Jurisdiction Interview Guide

45-Minute Interview Format

June 2026

Prepared to support consistent interviews with selected jurisdictions and inform California Child Welfare Council recommendations related to prevention, early intervention, and child and family well-being.

PEI Well-Being Workgroup Jurisdiction Interview Guide

For Interviewers | 45-Minute Interview Format | June 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Purpose of the Interview	2
What We Must Know by the End of Each Interview	2
Pre-Interview Instructions for Interviewers.....	2
Interview Assignments	3
45-Minute Interview Flow.....	3
Core Questions for All Jurisdictions	3
Outcome Definitions for Interviewers	4
Jurisdiction-Specific Gaps and Follow-Up Prompts	5
Allegheny County	5
Calaveras	5
Colorado.....	5
New York City	6
Ohio	6
San Diego.....	6
PEI Jurisdiction Interview Template.....	7
Interview Information	7
Opening Script.....	7
Core Questions for All Jurisdictions	7
Close-Out Next Steps.....	9
Possible Fit for September CWC Presentation	9

Purpose of the Interview

Use this guide to conduct consistent, targeted interviews with selected jurisdictions. The aim is to verify the comparison spreadsheet, address key information gaps, and extract lessons to guide California's recommendations toward child and family well-being.

Information gathered through these interviews will help the PEI Well-Being Workgroup improve its understanding of the selected jurisdictions, assess whether one or two jurisdictions may be a strong fit for a September Child Welfare Council presentation, and support the development of recommendations expected later this year.

What We Must Know by the End of Each Interview

1. What motivated the jurisdiction to adopt a child and family well-being strategy?
2. How the change occurred, who was involved, and how community voice and people with lived experience shaped the work.
3. Whether the work extended beyond child welfare and, if so, how they made the cross-system structure happen, and how it functions.
4. How the work is funded, braided, or supported administratively, including which funding streams contribute to the effort and whether new funding, policy, legislation, or authority was necessary.
5. What outcomes or signs of progress exist to date, including process, structural, and measurable/quantifiable outcomes? See page 4 for outcome definitions.
6. How sustainable the work is now, including what is needed to maintain, scale, or protect the effort over time.
7. The top one or two things they believe California must do to advance this type of work.

Pre-Interview Instructions for Interviewers

1. The [Chapin Hall: Meeting-Family-Needs-At-A-Glance](#) resource is included as a reference only. Use it as a lens for listening to cross-system collaboration, shared accountability, community, and lived-experience leadership; economic and concrete supports; community pathways; accessibility; and efforts to reduce unnecessary child welfare involvement. The full report is available here: [Chapin Hall:Meeting-Family-Needs-Framework](#)
2. Review the [Current Synthesis Spreadsheet](#) and the [Detailed Research Document](#) before the interview to the extent you are willing and able.
3. Send the jurisdiction contact only the information relevant to your jurisdiction in advance and ask them to review it for accuracy, corrections, and key gaps. ([See attached Jurisdiction Interview Prep Packet](#))
4. Start with the Core Questions. Use the Jurisdiction-Specific Gaps and Follow-Up Prompts only as needed to fill gaps not already addressed.
5. Avoid reading the spreadsheet aloud to the contact during the interview. Instead, ask them to confirm what is accurate, correct any errors, and address the most critical gaps.

Interview Assignments

Jurisdiction	Interview Pair
Colorado	Hillary + Michael W.
San Diego	Aimee + Sid
Ohio	Kathy + Beth
New York City	Dana + Lori
Allegheny County	Sid + Beth; Dana helping with Allegheny contact
Calaveras	Tabitha + Derek

45-Minute Interview Flow

Although interviews will most likely be scheduled for one hour, this guide is designed around a 45-minute interview flow. This allows flexibility for introductions, natural follow-up, clarification, and closing next steps without rushing the conversation.

Time	Section	Focus
0-5 min	Opening	Purpose, introductions, confirm time available.
5-15 min	Spreadsheet validation	Confirm key design features and correct anything that may be inaccurate about their jurisdiction.
15-30 min	Core questions	Focus on why/how, cross-system structure, funding, outcomes, and lessons for California.
30-42 min	Jurisdiction-specific gaps	Use the tailored bullets and follow-up prompts.
42-45 min	Close	Ask what California should not miss and confirm follow-up materials/contact.

Core Questions for All Jurisdictions

Note to interviewers: An interview notes template is included at the end of this guide to help capture responses in a consistent format for synthesis. Use the template as needed while moving through the core and jurisdiction-specific questions. These questions will help you get answers to the “must know” list on page 2. This list may be too long for the time allotted, so use it as a guide for the conversation rather than a rigid script.

1. Validate the summary: Looking at your jurisdiction column in the comparison spreadsheet, what is accurate, what needs correction, and what is missing?
2. Origin and impetus: What prompted this work? Was there a crisis, legislative action, leadership priority, funding opportunity, community push, or another catalyst? How did the change occur, and who was involved?
3. Scope beyond child welfare: Is this work focused solely on child welfare, or does it operate within a broader child and family well-being system? If it moved beyond child welfare, how did that happen?

4. Governance, accountability, and community voice: Who owns the work now? What cross-agency authority, shared accountability, or decision-making structure keeps it moving forward? How are community voices and people with lived experience involved in development, implementation, and ongoing efforts?
5. Funding, administrative structure, and sustainability: How is the work funded or braided? Which funding streams contribute to the effort, including state, federal, local, philanthropic, or other sources? Did the jurisdiction need new funding, new authority, legislation, policy changes, or changes to fiscal or contracting structures? How sustainable are the efforts now?
6. Community pathways and access: If applicable, how do families access support before a child welfare investigation or case? Are there community pathways, system-of-care approaches, no-wrong-door access points, warm lines, family resource centers, or navigation hubs?
7. Economic and concrete supports: How are economic supports, concrete goods, housing, child care, cash assistance, or other basic needs supports connected to the well-being approach?
8. Outcomes and signs of progress: What outcomes or signs of progress have been observed to date? These can include numbers, policy changes, new stakeholder support, process changes, stronger infrastructure, sustainability markers, or other indicators that the system is shifting.
9. Barriers and course corrections: Where did the work get stuck? Do you believe the change is sustainable? Are there sustainability risks related to funding, legislation, policy, leadership, authority, or implementation capacity? Is funding established to help sustain the changes implemented? What would you do differently if you were starting over?
10. Advice to California: What are the top one to two things California must do to make this type of child and family well-being work possible, effective, and sustainable?

Outcome Definitions for Interviewers

When asking about outcomes, do not limit the conversation to formal evaluation results. Capture any of the following:

- Quantitative or measurable results, such as referrals, removals, service reach, utilization, family outcomes, cost shifts, or child welfare entries.
- Process outcomes, such as new pathways, referral mechanisms, training, contracting, governance, or data systems.
- Structural outcomes, such as legislation, dedicated funding, consolidated offices, shared fiscal structures, or permanent administrative authority.
- Momentum outcomes, such as broader stakeholder support, new champions, invitations to present, unlikely supporters joining, or stronger public/private partnerships.

Jurisdiction-Specific Gaps and Follow-Up Prompts

Use this section **AFTER** the core questions. Do not ask every bullet if the contact has already answered it. The goal is to fill the highest-value gaps efficiently.

Allegheny County

Gaps to fill:

- Clarify which components could transfer to California without full consolidation of agency.
- Confirm current governance following leadership transitions.
- Clarify data governance and equity safeguards.
- Clarify how the Family Support Center financing operates now.
- Clarify how Allegheny's county-level structure interacts with the state child welfare agency and other state-level systems.

Follow-up prompts:

- What parts of the Allegheny model depend on consolidated county authority, and what parts could work in a less consolidated environment?
- What has helped the model sustain itself through leadership changes, and what remains vulnerable?

Calaveras

Gaps to fill:

- Clarify current Community Pathway operations.
- Confirm referral volume and referral criteria.
- Confirm current CARE Team service numbers.
- Clarify how FFPS replaced MHSA funding.
- Confirm whether the fiscal arrangement has changed since the research notes were written.

Follow-up prompts:

- What state actions, including AB 2083 or FFPS-related supports, made the work possible or easier?
- What would Calaveras ask the state to do differently to help counties move faster or sustain the work?

Colorado

Gaps to fill:

- Confirm the current Family Resource Center statutory and funding structure.
- Confirm whether there is a dedicated funding stream.
- Clarify details of early childhood consolidation.
- Clarify how funding works after consolidation.
- Identify outcomes since consolidation.
- Clarify public/private relationships supporting the work.
- Clarify the role of county engagement in Colorado's state-supervised structure.

Follow-up prompts:

- How did Colorado move from local/community-based FRC work to a broader statewide prevention infrastructure?
- What funding or governance decisions made the FRC network durable rather than optional?
- How are counties engaged in implementation, decision-making, funding, and accountability within Colorado's state-supervised structure?

New York City

Gaps to fill:

- Clarify program-specific funding and braiding for CFWB initiatives.
- Confirm the current scale and coverage of Family Enrichment Centers.
- Confirm the current scale and coverage of CPP.
- Identify updated results since the evaluation and budget sources cited in the research.
- Clarify sustainability concerns or program changes, including any recent reductions in prevention funding.
- Clarify whether any CFWB, Family Enrichment Center, CPP, or other prevention-related initiatives will be reduced, eliminated, or targeted for reduction in the next fiscal year, and why.

Follow-up prompts:

- What explains the recent shifts in prevention funding or programming, and what should California learn from that sustainability challenge?
- Which parts of NYC's approach produced the strongest evidence of value, and which were hardest to justify or sustain?
- If these initiatives demonstrated their value, why were they reduced or targeted for cuts? What should California learn to safeguard its prevention infrastructure and ensure long-term commitment?

Ohio

Gaps to fill:

- Validate long-term changes in outcomes after the full transition.
- Assess how local counties experience the consolidated state structure.
- Examine detailed funding mechanics.
- Determine whether administrative integration has reduced duplication as intended.

Follow-up prompts:

- How did Ohio integrate or align funding and administrative authority across formerly separate child and family-serving functions?
- From the county perspective, what changed in practice after consolidation, and what did not change?

San Diego

Gaps to fill:

- Clarify the implementation date/year.
- Clarify legal and administrative permanence.
- Confirm the current scale beyond families known to child welfare.
- Clarify current CARES, FFPSA, and CalAIM status.
- Identify reported outcomes beyond tracking measures.

Follow-up prompts:

- What can San Diego do because of local leadership or county structure, and what still requires state action?
- How are prevention pathways connected to Medi-Cal/CalAIM, FFPSA, Community Schools/CYBHI, or other non-child-welfare supports?

PEI Jurisdiction Interview Template

Opening Script and Core Questions

Interview Information

Jurisdiction:	
Interview Date:	
Interviewers:	
Interviewees/Roles:	

Opening Script

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us. We are part of California’s Prevention and Early Intervention Well-Being Workgroup, which is exploring ways to strengthen prevention, early intervention, and broader child and family well-being efforts. We are speaking with selected jurisdictions to inform recommendations to the California Child Welfare Council.

The California Child Welfare Council is a statewide advisory body that brings together public agencies, courts, advocates, providers, and other partners to improve outcomes for children, youth, and families. This interview aims to help us better understand the “why,” “how,” outcomes, lessons learned, and the potential relevance of your jurisdiction’s work to California.

We shared the comparison spreadsheet in advance and would appreciate your help confirming accuracy, identifying anything that should be revised, and filling in key gaps we could not address through research alone.

Core Questions for All Jurisdictions

Use the questions below to guide the conversation and capture key notes. Add additional notes or follow-up items in the boxes provided. The interview notes template in the full guide can also be used to support consistent synthesis across interviews.

- 1. Validate the summary:** Looking at your jurisdiction column in the comparison spreadsheet, what is accurate, what needs correction, and what is missing?

Notes:

- 2. Origin and impetus:** What prompted this work? Was there a crisis, legislative action, leadership priority, funding opportunity, community push, or another catalyst? How did the change occur, and who was involved?

Notes:

3. Scope beyond child welfare: Is this work focused solely on child welfare, or does it operate within a broader child and family well-being system? If it moved beyond child welfare, how did that happen?

Notes:

4. Governance, accountability, and community voice: Who owns the work now? What cross agency authority, shared accountability, or decision-making structure keeps it moving forward? How are community voices and people with lived experience involved in development, implementation, and ongoing efforts?

Notes:

5. Funding, administrative structure, and sustainability: How is the work funded or braided? Which funding streams contribute to the effort, including state, federal, local, philanthropic, or other sources? Did the jurisdiction need new funding, new authority, legislation, policy changes, or changes to fiscal or contracting structures? How sustainable are the efforts now?

Notes:

6. Community pathways and access: If applicable, how do families access support before a child welfare investigation or case? Are there community pathways, system-of-care approaches, no-wrong-door access points, warm lines, family resource centers, or navigation hubs?

Notes:

7. Economic and concrete supports: How are economic supports, concrete goods, housing, child care, cash assistance, or other basic needs supports connected to the well-being approach?

Notes:

8. Outcomes and signs of progress: What outcomes or signs of progress have been observed to date? These can include numbers, policy changes, new stakeholder support, process changes, stronger infrastructure, sustainability markers, or other indicators that the system is shifting.

Notes:

9. Barriers and course corrections: Where did the work get stuck? Do you believe the change is sustainable? Are there sustainability risks related to funding, legislation, policy, leadership, authority, or implementation capacity? Is funding in place to sustain the implemented changes? What would you do differently if you were starting over?

Notes:

10. Advice to California: What are the top one to two things California must do to make this type of child and family well-being work possible, effective, and sustainable?

Notes:

Close-Out Next Steps

Before we close, we want to confirm whether there are any additional materials or next steps that would help us accurately reflect your jurisdiction's work.

- Is there a document, dashboard, evaluation, budget summary, legislation, or contact you recommend we review next?
- Is there anything in the comparison spreadsheet that you would want us to revise or clarify before we use it with the Child Welfare Council?
- As part of this process, the workgroup may identify one or two jurisdictions to share their experience at the September Child Welfare Council meeting. If your jurisdiction were selected, would you be open to a brief presentation? If so, who would be the best person or people to present?

Close-out notes / follow-up:

Possible Fit for September CWC Presentation

- Yes/No/Maybe:
- Suggested Presenter:
- Additional Notes: