



CALIFORNIA CHILD WELFARE COUNCIL

PREVENTION/EARLY INTERVENTION COMMITTEE STATEWIDE CITIZEN REVIEW PANEL

DISCUSSION HIGHLIGHTS June 3, 2015 1:00PM – 4:00PM

The PEI-CRP reported to the Council that for this cycle we have selected two policy review areas for consideration:

1. Review of prevention policy to **identify core elements of practice** that are a fit for California. Identification of the core elements of prevention practice could serve to unite prevention providers for a greater collective impact. It could also serve to inform policy and resource decisions regarding prevention practices.
2. **Review of prevention cost/benefit policy** and determination of whether a cost/benefit analysis of prevention practices in California could set the stage for improving return on investment of federal, state, and county funds. Identification of cost effective prevention practices could serve to promote greater uniformity of prevention practice among community-based organizations, networks, family strengthening organizations, family resource centers and others, leading to improved outcomes.

The PEI/CRP met following the Council and discussed the following:

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
<u>General Discussion</u>	Lori Clarke welcomed members and guests and facilitated introductions.
<u>Community Maltreatment Prevention Study:</u>	<p>Dr. McCroskey and Dr. Hulburt (USC School of Social Work) presented an overview of their study on community-based child abuse prevention. This study is jointly funded by Price Charities and the Administration for Children and Families Children’s Bureau through October 2016. The goal is to learn more about how characteristics of local community environments influence rates of child maltreatment in diverse areas of Los Angeles County, <i>above and beyond</i> well-known population characteristics such as education, poverty, single parenthood, limited labor force involvement, and housing transiency.</p> <p>The researchers used “hot spot” data analysis to identify neighborhoods with atypically high and low rates of referrals to child protection agencies. Key informant interviews were conducted with leaders and residents within each neighborhood to learn, “What makes this place different?” and “How did things get to be this way?” Findings</p>

from this study could be used in the future to guide community level maltreatment prevention strategies considering risk and protective influences.

Statewide Citizen’s Review Panel:

Feedback on 2014 Recommendations to CDSS

Working Session—*Core elements of prevention practice*

Working Session—*Cost of Prevention*

Greg Rose thanked the PEI-CRP for their insightful recommendations to CDSS as required by CAPTA. Although the internal review cycle is still underway, he stated the 2014 recommendations were useful in describing responsibilities and how they could be sequenced to coincide with the PEI/CRP’s policy review cycle. While there is an appreciation for efforts to align recommendations with OCAP priorities, he invited the group to take latitude to explore other areas within CDSS and to feel free to challenge current realities, from which good ideas often emerge.

Practice Subcommittee Chair, Sheila Boxley, summarized highlights of the interim call on May 27th. The subcommittee will need to engage in research and review outside of committee meetings to explore prevention practice core elements currently in place and suggested in the literature.

A point of discussion was raised that core elements should be framed within the context of a comprehensive prevention strategy for California, which is not currently articulated. For example, the DR Framework does not cover messaging, primary prevention, and how to change social norms.

Questions were raised as to definition of a “core element of practice” and whether core elements are dependent upon program context. A host of candidate core elements were named, including:

▪ Framing	▪ Political Will	▪ Performance/ Outcomes
▪ Values Context	▪ Social Norms	▪ Family bubble vs intrusive gov’t
▪ Federal Funding	▪ Reactive elements ie child fatalities	▪ Prevention or promotion?
▪ Cultural Proficiency	▪ Data/Research	▪ Charismatic, passionate leaders

The prevention program contexts include:

▪ Home visitation	▪ Family Resilience
▪ Preschool/Early Childhood Programs	▪ Protective Factors
▪ Parent Training	▪ FRCs
▪ Trauma-informed Care	▪ Engagement/Empowerment
▪ Community Programming	▪

Cost/Benefit Subcommittee Chair, Steve Wirtz, shared that credible work is happening that can inform our effort. Other efforts for review include:

- Washington State Policy work
- FaCT Orange County, CA
- Hagman (Economist)
- Cost Calculators (CDC, CFPIC, John Landsverk)
- Ted Miller's cost analysis (Consultant to CDPH)

Cost data is necessary but not sufficient; must clearly identify audience and purpose for review. A cost/benefit analysis of prevention efforts could be advantageous to California:

- By demonstrating savings
- As an educational tool
- To help establish funding priorities
- Builds credibility
- Adds to science, evidence-basis

Wrap Up

Co-Chairs will circulate materials for review prior to next meeting.

Next Meeting: December 9, 2015