

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

744 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814



NOV 16 2001

TO: BOARDS OF SUPERVISORS
 COUNTY CAPIT/CBFRS LIAISONS
 CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION COUNCILS

FROM: SYLVIA PIZZINI, Deputy Director
 Children and Family Services Division

SUBJECT: **COUNTY CAPIT ALLOCATIONS AND GUIDELINES FOR APPLYING
 FOR CAPIT AND CBFRS PROGRAMS FUNDING
 (COUNTY THREE-YEAR PLAN FOR JULY 1, 2002 – JUNE 30, 2005)**

This is a follow-up to the May 23, 2001, letter which provided county CAPIT allocations and advance notice of requirements for preparing and submitting the Child Abuse Prevention, Intervention and Treatment (CAPIT) and Community Based Family Resource and Support (CBFRS) Programs' county three-year plan/application.

As a result of the county CAPIT allocations contained in the May 23, 2001, letter and suggestions received, the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) researched several alternative methodologies for determining the county CAPIT allocations. After reviewing various options, the methodology selected by CDSS incorporates elements of the recommendations received from the County Welfare Director's Association (CWDA), the Greater Bay Area Coalition of Child Abuse Prevention Councils and the Prevention Advisory Council. Please see Attachment A for county CAPIT allocations and Attachment B for the methodology used to calculate the allocations.

This letter provides specific instructions for completing the CAPIT/CBFRS Three-Year Plan/application (the plan is the application). Counties must submit complete three-year plans/applications. Plans/applications that do not fully address each item in the guidelines will not be accepted. Counties will continue to be required to complete and submit an annual report to the Office of Child Abuse Prevention (OCAP) for review and approval.

Prior to the three-year plan/application due date, counties may provide draft copies of the three-year plan to their OCAP consultant for review and comment. **The CAPIT/CBFRS three-year plan must be received by OCAP no later than February 28, 2002.** For ease of administration and to reduce county workload, counties applying for both programs must submit one application that includes all the required information for both CAPIT and CBFRS. The CBFRS allocation information will be released to counties in October 2002.

As described in the May 23, 2001, letter, the first requirement for receiving CAPIT funds effective July 1, 2002, is for the Board of Supervisors to submit a county Notice of Intent form for the 2002 – 2005 CAPIT grant cycle (Attachment F). Additionally, when completing this form, the Board of Supervisors must designate the public agency that will administer the CAPIT and CBFRS programs. In most counties the public agency providing social services is best able to ensure that prevention activities are part of the continuum of services available to families and children.

To be eligible for CAPIT/CBFRS funding after June 30, 2002, counties must complete and return the following:

- Notice of Intent form no later than January 11, 200²~~1~~. If the county has already submitted a Notice of Intent form, there is no need to submit another Notice of Intent.**
- CAPIT/CBFRS Three-Year Plan approved by the County Board of Supervisors.**
- County Board of Supervisors Resolution identifying the Child Abuse Prevention Council and the commission that administers the County Children's Trust Fund.**

The CAPIT and CBFRS programs are NOT entitlement programs. Counties must voluntarily apply for available funding through the development, submission and approval of a three-year plan as described in the attached application guidelines/instructions.

Please contact your OCAP consultant (see Attachment E) if you have questions regarding the three-year planning process.

List of Attachments

- A. County CAPIT Allocations
- B. Allocation Methodology
- C. Plan/Application Checklist
- D. Plan/Application Review Tool to be used by OCAP
- E. OCAP Consultant List
- F. Notice of Intent Form
- G. Outcome Accountability and Principles of Family Support
- H. CAPIT/CBFRS Service Goals and Outcome Plan Summary

- c: County Welfare Directors
County Welfare Directors Association
Small County Initiative Grantees
Prevention Advisory Council

OFFICE OF CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION

CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION, INTERVENTION AND TREATMENT AND COMMUNITY BASED FAMILY RESOURCE AND SUPPORT PROGRAMS

THREE-YEAR PLAN/APPLICATION (JULY 2002 – JUNE 2005)

GUIDELINES

NOVEMBER 14, 2001

IMPORTANT DATES

DATES

ACTION

May 23, 2001

OCAP provided counties initial three-year plan information.

November 14, 2001

OCAP provided counties guidelines for three year plan/application.

January 11, 2001

Deadline for counties to submit Notice of Intent (If not already submitted).

February 28, 2002

Deadline for counties to submit three-year plan.

March/April, 2002

OCAP will review and approve county three-year plans.

May/June, 2002

OCAP and counties will execute CAPIT grants.

July 2, 2002

Start date for CAPIT/CBFRS services.

October, 2002

CBFRS allocations released to counties.

OFFICE OF CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION

**CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION, INTERVENTION AND TREATMENT AND COMMUNITY
BASED FAMILY RESOURCE AND SUPPORT PROGRAMS**

**THREE-YEAR PLAN/APPLICATION
(JULY 2002 – JUNE 2005)**

GUIDELINES

NOVEMBER 14, 2001

OFFICE OF CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION
CAPIT/CBFRS THREE-YEAR PLAN/APPLICATION

GUIDELINES
(July 2002 – June 2005)

NOVEMBER 14, 2001

- I. THREE YEAR PLANNING TEAM – KEY REQUIREMENTS
- II. NEEDS ASSESSMENT - DEMOGRAPHICS/INDICATORS
- III. DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES
- IV. GOALS AND OUTCOMES – CONTINUUM OF OUTCOMES
- V. ADMINISTRATIVELY COMBINE CAPIT/CBFRS
- VI. CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION COUNCILS
- VII. QUALITY ASSURANCE MANAGEMENT – PEER REVIEW
(Oversight/Monitoring)
- VIII. FISCAL/ADMINISTRATIVE
- IX. REVIEW TOOL

In order for the county application to be reviewed, scored and approved, all of the above items must be fully addressed.

I. COUNTY CAPIT/CBFRS THREE-YEAR PLAN TEAM/KEY REQUIREMENTS

The three-year plan that each participating county will develop should reflect the Office of Child Abuse Prevention's (OCAP) efforts to support the integration of local prevention/family support resources and activities. Protecting children requires a comprehensive commitment at the local level to integrate prevention/family support activities as a means of improving child and family well-being. The OCAP will continue to provide training and technical assistance to counties in order to ensure the continuation of ongoing local efforts to plan and coordinate these services.

The local planning activities for the three-year plan must include a team that will assist the county CAPIT/CBFRS liaison with completion of the plan. This team should include, but not be limited to, local stakeholders such as the Child Abuse Prevention Council, consumers, Promoting Safe and Stable Families recipients and public/private agencies. The planning, implementation and evaluation of prevention/family support services at the local level must be multidisciplinary, inclusive of consumers, collaboratively designed and delivered and integrate/coordinate local resources. Local prevention/family support services that are woven together can more efficiently identify families, assess risk level and type of intervention needed and provide appropriate services that will strengthen families and communities. It is critical that all members of the three-year planning team become familiar with the Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) Sections that authorize prevention services/activities, e.g., WIC Section 18960 et. seq. The three-year plan must include the names of all the team members and the agencies that they represent.

The CAPIT grant requires that a competitive process (request for proposals) be used to select agencies that will provide direct services. As a result, counties need to be mindful of any potential conflict of interest for agencies that help develop the three-year plan and compete for CAPIT funds.

As the county three-year planning team develops the plan, please review the key CAPIT/CBFRS features/program requirements listed below.

CAPIT – Key Requirements

There have been no recent legislative changes to the CAPIT program and the key requirements remain:

In 1998 the Legislature augmented CAPIT funding to a total of \$14,840,000 per year (Chapter 329, Statutes of 1998, AB 2779, Aroner). With this increase in funding came additional requirements. The following WIC Sections contain the key requirements.

- A. WIC Section 18963 (c) authorizes the California Department of Social Services to withhold approval of CAPIT funding until the formation of a Child Abuse Prevention Council, Board or Commission established by the County Board of Supervisors.
- B. WIC Section 18960 (a)(3) "Priority shall be given to prevention programs through nonprofit agencies, including, where appropriate, programs that identify and provide services to isolated families, particularly those families with children five years of age or younger...."
- C. WIC Section 18963 (c)(1) ensures that each county allocates revenues through the use of an accountable process that utilizes a multidisciplinary approach particularly strengthening child abuse councils and allocates revenues in a manner consistent with a county expenditure plan for all Child Abuse Prevention, Intervention and Treatment program revenues. The county plan shall explain how services funded under this article are coordinated with the array of services available in the county and are based on unmet need. The OCAP shall review and approve these plans prior to authorizing county expenditure of funds and shall require counties to submit annual reports on program services.
- D. WIC Section 18963 (c)(2) ensures CAPIT program compliance and accountability to the county plan and legislative intent by providing for administrative oversight and consultation.

CBFRS – Key Requirements

There have been no recent legislative changes to the CBFRS program and the key requirements continue to be:

- A. Recipients of funds must demonstrate the existence of and/or expansion of an existing, effective network of community based family resource and support programs. These networks must be composed of local, collaborative, public-private partnerships directed by interdisciplinary structures with balanced representation of private and public sector members, consumers, nonprofits, individuals and organizations with experience serving families with special needs children. The scope of these statewide networks must include all program participants.
- B. Participants are required to explore methods for leveraging additional resources and blending appropriate funds to maximize grant funds.

- C. A peer review process designed to ensure quality assurance in services and service delivery must exist. The OCAP will continue to refine this process in partnership with county liaisons and local service providers.
- D. Participants are required to have a process that ensures meaningful involvement by parents as consumers in prevention/family support planning and decision-making.
- E. A process to assess client satisfaction with services provided through these funding streams must exist. CDSS/OCAP, through the program instructions provided to counties, is requiring the use of a Consumer Satisfaction Survey for all funded service providers.

II. NEEDS ASSESSMENT

The county three-year plan must be based on a countywide needs assessment (data collected in the last three years) which identifies local unmet prevention needs. Effective change requires communities to maintain focus on the needs of their families as they identify resources and then direct those resources toward unmet needs. It also requires that all local stakeholders maintain an outcome-based focus when making decisions regarding the allocation of resources. Counties may choose to conduct a new needs assessment or use a current needs assessment completed for another commission, board or agency (e.g., Prop 10 Commission, Head Start, Child Care Planning Council, Promoting Safe and Stable Families (FPSP) or CalWORKs) as long as unmet prevention needs are clearly identified. The needs assessment should include, but not be limited to, all of the following county demographics/indicators:

- County Population
- Age 0 – 18 Population
- Number of Children Attending School
- Number of Children Born to Teen Parents
- Number of Children Attending Special Education Classes
- Number of Children Dropping Out of School
- Number of Child Abuse Reports
- Number of First Entries Into Foster Care
- Number of Families in CalWORKs
- Number of Families Living Below Poverty Level
- Number of Children Participating in Subsidized School Lunch Program
- Number of Children on Child Care Waiting List
- Number of low birth weight babies
- Number of children receiving age-appropriate immunizations

A copy of the county needs assessment must be included with the three-year plan.

III. DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES

The county three-year plan must clearly describe each CAPIT and CBFRS service to be provided. This description must link each service to unmet needs identified in the needs assessment.

The priority for CAPIT and CBFRS funds during the next grant cycle is prevention services. The OCAP will assist counties in their efforts to find appropriate sources of funds for non-prevention services, e.g., treatment services, Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA), etc.

IV. GOALS and OUTCOMES

The OCAP approaches the evaluation of CAPIT and CBFRS programs as a critical function in assuring program effectiveness and efficiency. An evaluation is a multi-dimensional process which requires that information be collected and analyzed to accomplish the following:

- Determine what is and is not working in individual programs;
- Communicate to the community what services are available from prevention programs and how these services benefit participants and the community;
- Support program staff by identifying agency/program strengths and weaknesses;
- Add to the existing body of knowledge lessons learned about what does and doesn't work for specific programs/participants;
- Provide the basis for input/recommendations for public policy development; and
- Provide accountability to the funding source.

The OCAP believes that family support outcomes are best viewed as a continuum of results, beginning with engagement, followed by short term outcomes, which lead to intermediate outcomes, and which ultimately result in long-term outcomes or impact. In an effort to maximize the favorable impact child abuse prevention programs may have on participants, the OCAP has continued to promote public/private sector partnerships to enhance the effective delivery of services. The philosophical underpinning of services and the manner in which they are delivered are predicated on the Principles of Family Support Practice developed by Family Support America (Attachment G).

Engagement Outcomes

Since participation in family support programs is generally voluntary, the OCAP will continue to emphasize the importance of recruitment and high participant satisfaction. Examples of engagement outcomes include developing trust with the service provider staff, feeling welcome while receiving services, and attending programs voluntarily.

Counties must document their effectiveness through the use of consumer satisfaction surveys. County liaisons will continue to be required to collect and analyze all surveys and include this data in their annual report to OCAP.

Short-Term Outcomes

Counties must capture the changes in knowledge, attitude, skills and aspirations of participants. Examples of short-term outcomes include increased knowledge of positive discipline techniques, increased motivation to succeed in school, or increased job readiness skills. Counties will capture short-term outcomes by administering pre/post assessment tools measuring participant knowledge, attitudes, skills and aspirations. County liaisons will continue to include this data in their annual report to OCAP.

Intermediate Outcomes

Many programs report favorable intermediate outcomes as captured on self-assessment tools administered to participants at regular intervals during and after accessing services. Examples might include improved family functioning as a result of reduced stress levels or completion of a job-training course. County liaisons will include this data in their annual reports to OCAP.

Long-Term Outcomes

Many counties have developed a local process that produces a county Report Card that identifies demographics, risk factors, trends, program services, and service effectiveness. This valuable information on the health and well-being of families and children is critical in determining the changing social, political and economic landscape of the community; and, it provides a basis for local planning efforts to address these changes. Examples of long-term outcomes include a decrease in the incidence of child abuse, establishment of safe and supportive family environments and a decrease in substance abuse. County liaisons will include copies of county Report Cards or other community indicators that monitor countywide progress in supporting at-risk families and children in their annual report to OCAP.

Based on the county's needs assessment and resulting identified services, state the projected goals for the first year of the grant (July 2002 – June 2003). As an example, the needs assessment identified parent education as an unmet need and the planning team included parent education as a service requirement in the RFP. The GOAL would be the number of families/children that the service provider has projected to service. Counties should use Attachment H to submit projected GOALS for the first year of the grant. At the end of each year, counties must report to OCAP on the actual number of families/children receiving services. The number served is one outcome measure; however, a more important measure is how have the services impacted/strengthened the family. Counties should develop outcome measures to capture this information on service impact.

V. ADMINISTRATIVELY COMBINE CAPIT/CBFRS PLANNING AND FUNDING ACTIVITIES

Based upon the positive results experienced by counties and CAPIT/CBFRS program requirements, all county three-year plans for the next grant cycle must be based on administratively combining CAPIT and CBFRS planning and reporting activities.

It will remain important to track separately all service providers' expenditures, services provided and individual/families served on forms provided by OCAP. Counties will continue to report CAPIT and CBFRS data separately on an annual basis.

Please note that the State-funded CAPIT and Federally-funded CBFRS programs both operate on the State Fiscal Year (SFY) of July-June and all funds must be expended during the SFY they are received.

VI. CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION COUNCILS

Child Abuse Prevention Councils (CAPC) definitely have a role in the integration/coordination of the counties prevention and family support efforts. As an example, CAPC's must be represented on the team that develops the CAPIT and CBFRS three-year plan.

The responsibility for establishing and funding CAPC's rests with the County Board of Supervisors. The county three-year plan must include a Board of Supervisors Resolution affirming the existence of a CAPC and identifying the group that the Board of Supervisors has identified as the CAPC (WIC 18980 et seq.). Additionally, the CAPIT and CBFRS three-year plan must include a Board of Supervisors Resolution establishing a commission, board or council to administer the County Children's Trust Fund (WIC 18965 et seq.). The Board of Supervisors has a number of funding resources that may be used to support CAPC's and some of these resources are CAPIT, CBFRS, County Children's Trust Fund and KidsPlate (funds received from specialty license plates).

The California Department of Social Services (CDSS) is authorized (WIC Section 18963) to withhold approval of CAPIT funding until the formation of a child abuse prevention council, board or commission by the County Board of Supervisors.

Through our Child Abuse Training and Technical Assistance (CATTa) grantees (CSU Sonoma and San Diego Children's Hospital) and in collaboration with the Office of Criminal Justice Planning (OCJP), the OCAP has supported CAPC's by providing a variety of content-specific training events and technical assistance.

During the next grant cycle the OCAP and our CATTa grantees will continue to work with the CAPCs to develop regional approaches to supporting the CAPC's growth and development.

VII. QUALITY ASSURANCE MANAGEMENT (Oversight and Monitoring)

Accountability will continue to be a major requirement of the CAPIT and CBFRS programs. To ensure that counties are meeting the legislative requirements described in Chapter 329, Statutes of 1998, AB 2779, the OCAP will provide oversight and monitoring of the CAPIT and CBFRS programs. However, responsibility for monitoring of the CAPIT and CBFRS subcontractors, integration of local services, grant compliance, data collection, preparing amendments to the county three-year plan, preparing annual reports and outcomes evaluation rests with the public agency designated by the County Board of Supervisors to administer the CAPIT and CBFRS programs. The oversight and monitoring section of the county three-year plan must include a detailed description of how the public agency will ensure subcontractor accountability for the CAPIT and CBFRS programs. This description must be CAPIT and CBFRS specific and not limited to a general description of current county practices.

The CAPIT grant requires that a county liaison be assigned and that the county will meet all established report due dates. Failure to comply with either of these contractual requirements will result in the county being in noncompliance.

The public agency staff person assigned to be the CAPIT and CBFRS liaison will be responsible for collecting data from subcontractors, compiling subcontractor data, analyzing subcontractor data and preparing required reports. The liaison is also responsible for dissemination of prevention/family support information throughout the county. The liaison's responsibilities are not intended to be limited to contract management activities.

In pursuit of promoting best practices and quality assurance in program services, the OCAP will continue the development, refinement and implementation of the Peer Review process. In partnership with Family Support America, the OCAP has completed the Peer Review Training Manual for Family Resource Centers and is launching the implementation of this peer review process through all Answers Benefiting Children grantees. Concurrently, the OCAP will continue to work with Family Support America to expand the application of the Peer Review process to programs that are non-center-based. To accomplish this, a pilot program has been completed in eight counties. The OCAP will contract with Family Support America to provide training and technical assistance to all counties and agencies choosing to participate in the Peer Review process.

VIII. FISCAL/ADMINISTRATIVE

The CAPIT grant is a contractual agreement between the County Board of Supervisors and the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) and must be administered by the public agency designated by the Board. The CAPIT program is funded entirely by State General Funds and these funds are subject to approval through the annual State Budget process. The public agency designated by the Board of Supervisors is expected to take an active role in the integration of all the county's prevention efforts and not delegate all responsibility for prevention activities to the CAPIT and CBFRS subcontractors.

The CBFRS program is entirely federally-funded and these funds are subject to the annual federal budget process. CBFRS funds are released annually to each county as a lump sum after the county has met all program requirements.

The CAPIT and CBFRS Programs are NOT entitlement programs. Counties must voluntarily apply for available funding through the development, submission and approval of a three-year plan.

The public agency must maintain complete financial records of the CAPIT and CBFRS costs and operating expenses. The public agency must submit CAPIT invoices monthly or quarterly at their option. Failure to submit invoices on a monthly or quarterly basis will result in county noncompliance.

Counties have expressed a need for an increase in CAPIT and CBFRS administrative costs. **As a result, effective July 1, 2002, the OCAP will approve up to 10 percent of county CAPIT and CBFRS funds for administrative costs.** Additionally, counties are reminded that the CAPIT program requires ten-percent cash or in-kind match and the match amount must be included on the CAPIT invoice.

County CAPIT and CBFRS administrative agencies must develop a comprehensive expenditure plan (budget) that identifies all service providers, services and proposed expenditures. This expenditure plan must also include funds for the county liaison and consumers to attend meetings, conferences and training events.

The public agency designated to administer CAPIT/CBFRS and all subcontractors must have the capacity to transmit information electronically (e-mail). Public agencies currently have this capability and all nonprofit agencies competing for CAPIT and CBFRS funds must include in their proposals/budgets to the county how they will meet this requirement. If necessary, a portion of the CAPIT and CBFRS allocation can be used by the nonprofit agency selected to provide direct services to purchase the equipment needed to meet this requirement.

The purchase of equipment (other than that described above) with CAPIT and CBFRS funds is discouraged. Service providers should seek alternative funding for equipment.

Typically, counties wait until the CAPIT grant is executed to begin the RFP process. This can result in gaps in prevention services since no services are provided during the period that counties are selecting a provider. It is highly recommended that counties consider developing a process that will address potential gaps in prevention services. As an example, the county could fund CAPIT providers until the RFP process is completed and the contract is executed or the county could start its RFP process to select CAPIT/CBFRS service providers as soon as the three-year plan is completed. By utilizing either of these processes, counties will ensure that there is no gap in the delivery of prevention services.

As part of the 2000/2001 annual report, the OCAP is requiring that counties provide detailed information on the County Children's Trust Fund. This will be an ongoing annual requirement and the OCAP will be working with counties to maximize use of these funds during the 2002 – 2005 grant cycle.

The county plan/application will be reviewed and scored by the OCAP using the attached review tool (Attachment D).

CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION, INTERVENTION, AND TREATMENT
COUNTY ALLOCATION
SFY 2002 - 2005

COUNTY	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
	7/01/02 - 6/30/03	7/01/03 - 6/30/04	7/01/04 - 6/30/05
ALAMEDA	\$394,122	\$405,068	\$410,589
ALPINE	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000
AMADOR	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000
BUTTE	\$112,485	\$92,635	\$75,000
CALAVERAS	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000
COLUSA	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000
CONTRA COSTA	\$282,673	\$290,524	\$294,484
DEL NORTE	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000
EL DORADO	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000
FRESNO	\$293,542	\$301,695	\$305,807
GLENN	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000
HUMBOLDT	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000
IMPERIAL	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000
INYO	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000
KERN	\$244,167	\$250,948	\$254,369
KINGS	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000
LAKE	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$70,000
LASSEN	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000
LOS ANGELES	\$2,986,803	\$3,069,762	\$3,111,602
MADERA	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000
MARIN	\$102,507	\$84,418	\$75,000
MARIPOSA	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000
MENDOCINO	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$70,000
MERCED	\$142,209	\$117,113	\$87,168
MODOC	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000
MONO	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000
MONTEREY	\$166,784	\$137,352	\$132,208
NAPA	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000
NEVADA	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$70,000
ORANGE	\$844,499	\$867,955	\$879,785
PLACER	\$75,236	\$77,326	\$78,380
PLUMAS	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000
RIVERSIDE	\$537,156	\$552,076	\$559,600
SACRAMENTO	\$393,459	\$404,388	\$409,899
SAN BENITO	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$70,000
SAN BERNARDINO	\$630,469	\$647,980	\$656,812
SAN DIEGO	\$833,574	\$856,727	\$868,404
SAN FRANCISCO	\$202,705	\$166,933	\$131,709

CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION, INTERVENTION, AND TREATMENT
 COUNTY ALLOCATION
 SFY 2002 - 2005

COUNTY	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
	7/01/02 - 6/30/03	7/01/03 - 6/30/04	7/01/04 - 6/30/05
SAN JOAQUIN	\$198,120	\$203,623	\$206,398
SAN LUIS OBISPO	\$104,398	\$85,975	\$75,000
SAN MATEO	\$177,874	\$182,814	\$185,306
SANTA BARBARA	\$133,596	\$116,408	\$117,995
SANTA CLARA	\$461,636	\$474,458	\$480,925
SANTA CRUZ	\$117,001	\$96,354	\$75,000
SHASTA	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000
SIERRA	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000
SISKIYOU	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000
SOLANO	\$133,911	\$128,899	\$130,656
SONOMA	\$154,812	\$127,181	\$128,915
STANISLAUS	\$167,415	\$163,748	\$165,980
SUTTER	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$70,000
TEHAMA	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$70,000
TRINITY	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000
TULARE	\$166,680	\$148,852	\$150,881
TUOLUMNE	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$70,000
VENTURA	\$238,407	\$245,028	\$248,368
YOLO	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$75,000
YUBA	\$70,000	\$70,000	\$70,000
TOTAL	\$12,356,240	\$12,356,240	\$12,356,240

CAPIT Funding Methodology

OPERATIONAL ASSUMPTIONS

- Total annual funding available to counties - \$12,356,240
- Based on 2000 Census, there are twenty-five (25) rural counties with total population under 125,000. Alpine (1,208), Amador (35,100), Calaveras (40,554), Colusa (18,804), Del Norte (27,507), Glenn (26,453), Inyo (17,945), Lake (58,309), Lassen (33,828), Madera (123,109), Mariposa (17,130), Mendocino (86,265), Modoc (9,449), Mono (12,853), Napa (124,279), Nevada (92,033), Plumas (20,824), San Benito (53,234), Sierra (3,555), Siskiyou (44,301), Sutter (78,930), Tehama (56,039), Trinity (13,022), Tuolumne (54,501), Yuba (60,219).
- Minimum annual funding available to rural counties are as follows: total population less than 50,000 - \$60,000; total population less than 100,000 - \$70,000; total population less than 125,000 - \$75,000.
- Minimum annual funding available to the remaining thirty-three (33) large counties is \$75,000.
- Based on 2000 Census, the two data sets (indicators) used in the methodology are: 1). County child population and 2). Total number of referrals in the county.
- At a minimum, Year 1 funding will not reflect a greater than 15 % reduction in allocation to any county when compared to current year allocation. However, an exception exists for those counties with total populations under 50,000. Their allocation will be \$60,000 vs. \$63,358 (85% of \$74,539)
- At a minimum, Year 2 funding will not reflect a greater than 30% reduction in allocation to any county when compared to current year allocation.
- Year 3 funding will reflect full methodology formula without further adjustment.

PROCESS

- If a county falls into the rural county category, it is awarded the minimum annual funding amount identified above (based on total population). These counties and amounts are removed from the funding pool.
- The next step is to apply the indicator data set calculation to all remaining large counties with populations greater than 125,000. Some of these will have results awarding them amounts less than the 15% safety net for Year 1 and possibly less than the 30% safety net in year 2. They need to be awarded this safety net amount

and removed from the funding pool. However, these counties should not receive any less than the \$75,000 established as minimum funding for large counties. When considering funding for counties that are in this situation, they should be awarded the greater amount and removed from the remaining funding pool.

- All remaining counties will have the indicator data set calculation applied to the remaining allocation pool to determine their funding amounts.

METHODOLOGY SUMMARY

- The total annual allocation for rural counties is \$1,610,000. This amount is removed from the funding pool; a balance of \$10,746,240 remains.
- The two data sets (indicators) are considered for the remaining large counties. A county's pro rata share of these two figures is totaled and then divided by two to arrive at their combined factor. This factor is applied to the funding pool (\$10,746,240) to determine the distribution to each of the large counties.
- However, if a county falls below the safety net of 15% for Year 1 and 30% for Year 2 OR below the minimum funding amount of \$75,000, it is awarded the greater of the two possible funding levels and removed from the funding pool. The calculations are re-computed for the remaining counties and funding pool.

OFFICE OF CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION

CAPIT/CBFRS COUNTY THREE-YEAR PLAN/APPLICATION

CHECKLIST

NOVEMBER 14, 2001

- A Notice of Intent form was completed and submitted to OCAP.
- The county CAPIT/CBFRS three-year plan was developed by a team of stakeholders using OCAP guidelines and the names of all the stakeholders are included in the plan.
- The three-year plan contains all of the required elements as described in OCAP's instructions and guidelines.
- The three-year plan is based on and includes a copy of the county's recent needs assessment.
- The three-year plan describes the competitive process (RFP) that will be used to select direct service providers.
- The three-year plan has been reviewed and approved by the Director of the public agency designated by the County Board of Supervisors to administer the combined CAPIT and CBFRS programs.
- The three-year plan has been reviewed and approved by the County Board of Supervisors and a Board Resolution is attached to the plan.
- The County Board of Supervisors has prepared a Board Resolution establishing a commission, board or council to administer the County Children's Trust Fund (WIC 18965 et seq.) and the Board Resolution is attached to the three-year plan.
- The County Board of Supervisors has prepared a Board Resolution identifying the Child Abuse Prevention Council (WIC 18980 et seq.) and the Board Resolution is attached to the three-year plan.

CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION, INTERVENTION AND TREATMENT PROGRAM (CAPIT)/COMMUNITY BASED FAMILY RESOURCE AND SUPPORT PROGRAM (CBFRS) THREE-YEAR COUNTY PLAN REVIEW TOOL

Demonstrates applicant's ability to develop an effective multi-year plan as identified in the County Plan Instructions.

A. County Plan	Element Present	Element Not Present
1) Applicant submits copy of Board of Supervisors resolution approving 3-year plan.		
2) Applicant submits evidence plan was reviewed by the Director of designated Local Government Agency.		
3) Applicant submits copy of Board of Supervisors resolution establishing a Child Abuse Prevention Council.		
4) Applicant submits copy of Board of Supervisors resolution establishing a County Children's Trust Fund.		
5) Applicant submits copy of Child Abuse Prevention Council roster.		
6) Applicant describes how the administrative functions of CAPIT and CBFRS are combined		
7) Applicant describes how funds will be leveraged.		
8) Applicant submitted "Notice of Intent" letter identifying the lead LGA.		
9) Applicant describes how the local Child Abuse Prevention Council will be strengthened.		
10) Applicant clearly describes existing collaborative and/or the process used to create and establish needed collaboratives. The description includes consumers and public/private partnerships with balanced representation.		
11) Applicant describes the existence of an effective or expansion of network of community based family resource and support programs.		
12) Applicant submits copy of planning team roster that includes name, agency and positions and is inclusive of parent/consumers of services and the Child Abuse Prevention Council.		
B. Needs Assessment		
1) Needs assessment is based on data collected within the last three years		
2) Needs assessment clearly identifies unmet prevention needs within the county		
3) Needs assessment identifies services that do not supplant current services provided with public funds.		
4) Needs assessment clearly identifies needs for minority populations		
5) The Child Abuse Prevention Council was used to provide recommendations regarding funding to the Board of Supervisors.		
6) The need assessment includes the demographic indicators as outlined in the County Plan Instructions.		
C. Description of Services		
1) Applicant clearly describes the relationship of the proposed prevention services strategies to the identified child abuse prevention needs.		
2) Applicant indicates priority for funding will be to prevention services		
3) Applicant clearly identifies how services will be delivered for special needs children and their families		

4)	Applicant describes how services will not supplant existing publicly funded programs and service	
5)	Applicant describes how services are prioritized to children at high risk of abuse and neglect	
6)	Applicant describes how services are related to the needs of children under the age of 14.	
7)	Applicant describes how the services are based on unmet need.	
D. Request for Proposals (RFP) Process		
1)	Applicant describes how priority for funding is given to non-profit agencies	
2)	Applicant describes how agencies funded will be supported by a Local Government Agency	
3)	Applicant describes how services will address unmet need	
4)	Applicant indicates how agencies funded will submit evidence of broad-based community support	
5)	Applicant describes how priority is given to NPO's with demonstrated effectiveness in child abuse and neglect.	
6)	Applicant indicates that if priority for funding is for isolated families particularly those with children under age 5, how programs are based on research-based models.	
7)	Applicant describes the competitive process for selecting sub-contractors.	
8)	Applicant indicates that the non-profit agencies have the capacity to transmit data electronically or a plan to ensure the capability	
9)	Applicant describes how training and technical assistance is provided to sub-contractors	
D. Goals and Outcomes		
1.	Applicant indicates how programs and services will be evaluated	
2.	Applicant indicates engagement outcomes to be employed	
3.	Applicant indicates short-term outcomes to be employed	
4.	Applicant indicated immediate outcomes to be employed	
5.	Applicant indicates long-term outcomes to be employed	
6.	Applicant indicates how outcomes are directly related to the need assessment.	
E. Quality Assurance		
1)	Applicant describes the process for monitoring and oversight	
2)	Applicant describes how the LGA will ensure sub-contractor accountability to the CAPIT and CBFERS programs.	
3)	Applicant indicates the person assigned to be the liaison and indicates their responsibilities in this capacity including collecting and analyzing data, preparing required reports, dissemination of prevention/family support information.	
F. Fiscal/Administrative/Budgets		
	Applicant describes how they will ensure the electronic capacity of sub-contractors	
	Applicant submits an expenditure plan that is comprehensive	
	Expense plan identifies all service providers, services and proposed expenditures	
	Expenditure plan includes identified fund for liaisons and consumers to attend meeting, conference and training events	
	The Board of Supervisors designated the LGA to administer the CAPIT/CBFERS funds	

OFFICE OF CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION (OCAP) COUNTY CONSULTANTS
OCTOBER 2001

C O U N T Y	ALAMEDA CONTRA COSTA IMPERIAL NAPA ORANGE RIVERSIDE SAN BERNARDINO SONOMA STANISLAUS	ALPINE AMADOR FRESNO LOS ANGELES PLACER SAN DIEGO SOLANO YOLO	CALAVARAS MARIN MODOC SAN JOAQUIN SANTA BARBARA SHASTA SISKIYOU TRINITY TUOLUMNE	DEL NORTE HUMBOLDT LASSEN MONTEREY SAN BENITO SAN FRANCISCO SAN LUIS OBISPO SAN MATEO SANTA CLARA SANTA CRUZ VENTURA	EL DORADO KINGS LAKE MADERA MARIPOSA MENDOCINO MERCED MONO NAVADA SIERRA SUTTER TULARE	BUTTE COLUSA GLENN INYO KERN PLUMAS SACRAMENTO TEHAMA YUBA
C O N S U L T A N T	DIXIE FERGUSON (916) 445-2903 Dixie.Ferguson@dss.ca.gov	GEORGE CHANCE (916) 445-2921 George.Chance@dss.ca.gov	KIM RELPH (916) 445-2877 Kim.Relph@dss.ca.gov	LARRY GRANDSTAFF (916) 445-2863 Larry.Grandstaff@dss.ca.gov	ERNIE LYNCH 916) 445-0460 Ernest.Lynch@dss.ca.gov	MARK WONG (916) 322-8345 Mark.Wong@dss.ca.gov

OCAP FAX: (916) 323-8103

NOTICE OF INTENT FOR _____ COUNTY
(STATE FISCAL YEARS 2002 – 2005 GRANT CYCLE)

The undersigned agrees that the County intends to contract or not contract with public or private nonprofit agencies to provide services in accordance with Welfare and Institutions Code Article 4 (Section 18960-et. seq.).

In addition, the undersigned assures that allocations made by the County under the Child Abuse Prevention, Intervention and Treatment Program and Community Based Family Resource and Support Programs will be used in the development, implementation, expansion or enhancement of a local network of child abuse prevention programs.

Please check the appropriate box.

- The County intends to contract with public or private nonprofit agencies to provide prevention services.
- The County does not intend to contract with public or private nonprofit agencies to provide prevention services.

The County Board of Supervisors designates _____ as the public agency to administer the combined Child Abuse Prevention, Intervention and Treatment and Community Based Family Resource and Support Programs.

In order to receive funding effective July 1, 2002, please sign and return the Notice of Intent by January 11, 2001 to:

California Department of Social Services
Office of Child Abuse Prevention
744 P Street, MS 19-82
Sacramento, CA 95814

County Board of Supervisors Authorized
Signature

Date

Print Name

Title



Outcome Accountability

for Family Support Programs

Outcome Accountability

It is important for family support programs to be accountable for the outcomes of their services. Programs need to be able to demonstrate to funders that desired outcomes are indeed occurring. Programs also need information about their outcomes in order to improve their services.

It is our belief that, if adequately funded, over a sufficient period of time, in enough communities, family support programs (like respite and crisis care, mutual self-help parent support groups, parent education classes, home visiting, etc.) can be expected to produce a progression of outcomes beginning with short-term outcomes (engagement and learning). Over time these will lead to intermediate outcomes (behavior change) and will eventually result in long-term outcomes (population-wide impact, such as reduced risk/incidence of child abuse and neglect).

While it is important that family support program outcomes be evaluated in a rigorous manner, we believe that the appropriate initial level of evaluation rigor for family support programs is relative to the size, duration, and funding level of the program. In other words, a small community-based program that is not experienced in the methods of outcome evaluation, can not be expected to immediately conduct a rigorous, long term experimental model evaluation, with random assignment to control and treatment groups, and high level statistical analysis of the data. Instead, the appropriate initial level of rigor for these small community-based programs would be that which is described in the FRIENDS guide to outcome accountability.

The **FRIENDS** Guide to Outcome Accountability for Family Support Programs

The FRIENDS Outcome Accountability guide, written by Ann Peisher, Meg Sewell and Ray Kirk, was published in April, 2001. It includes everything that a family support program needs to start identifying, measuring and reporting the outcomes of their services.

Volume I

- An in depth reference manual on outcome accountability

Volume II

- A "Quick Start" guide for busy program staff who are new to outcome accountability
- A brief introduction to outcome accountability
- A glossary which provides definitions of terms used in the guide
- Worksheets for identifying desired outcomes & developing an evaluation plan
- Examples of completed worksheets
- Forms for collecting demographic, service and customer satisfaction data
- Outcome measurement instruments that can be photocopied and used
- Samples of copyrighted standardized instruments and ordering contact information
- Instructions for constructing scales
- Instructions for collecting and analyzing outcome data
- Instructions for writing an outcome report for funders
- Instructions for using outcome data to make program improvements
- Resources for further information on outcome accountability



NATIONAL RESOURCE CENTER FOR COMMUNITY BASED FAMILY RESOURCE & SUPPORT (CBFRS)

Outcome data is gathered by asking participants and direct service staff to respond to surveys which ask them to rate the condition and status of the family in a variety of domains both before receiving the service, and after receiving it. In some of the surveys, a retrospective pre-test model is used, which is preferable to the traditional pre-post test model in several ways.

- It is less intrusive than gathering baseline data at the beginning of service, when relationships are being established.
- It provides more accurate data since service consumers are much better able to accurately assess their initial condition once they have received some education and support.
- It has the advantage of producing a large amount of high quality data in a very short period of time.
- It allows collection of baseline data on participants who were already receiving services when the evaluation began and would otherwise be excluded using the pre-post test model.

The outcome evaluation model used in the FRIENDS guide *does not* require a rigorous, experimental, long term evaluation, with random assignment to control groups and treatment groups, or high level statistical analysis of the data. It *does* provide data expected to accurately and reliably demonstrate progress on short term and intermediate term outcomes which are expected to contribute to improvements in long-term outcomes/impact. For small community-based programs that are new to the world of outcome evaluation, the FRIENDS guide will provide all the help that is needed to achieve their first steps toward outcome accountability.

Next Steps

This initial ability of programs to begin demonstrating the outcomes of their services is not intended to replace the more rigorous research that will eventually be needed in order to provide proof of a cause-effect relationship between services and results, and convincing evidence of long-term impact. Indeed, once programs have successfully taken their first steps in outcome accountability, using the FRIENDS guide, they will be more ready and able to take the next steps toward implementing and/or participating in more rigorous studies.

Plans are currently underway to field test the FRIENDS guide. Once funding is secured, selected sites will receive intensive on-site training and technical assistance in using the FRIENDS guide, with follow up technical assistance provided by phone and e-mail. Programs will receive an electronic data entry system, and send their data to FRIENDS for aggregate analysis. Participants will be surveyed, and their input will be used to make improvements in the next edition of the FRIENDS guide.

As programs use the FRIENDS guide they will gain competence in outcome accountability, become more clear and precise about the outcomes they expect to achieve, and gain an appreciation for the benefits of outcome evaluation. It is anticipated that these experienced programs will then be ready, willing and able to move up to the next level of outcome accountability. This next level could involve the development of a variety of research designs that would guide a longer-term, more rigorous study of the impact of these family support programs.

Contact Information

For more information on the FRIENDS outcome evaluation initiative, contact Jack Denniston, FRIENDS Project Manager at (919) 933-7716 <jldenniston@intrex.net>

To order a copy of the FRIENDS Outcome Accountability Guide, send a check or purchase order for \$25 plus \$6 postage and handling (sorry, we can't accept credit cards) to Tom Cabarga, 800 Eastowne Drive, Suite 105, Chapel Hill, NC 27514.

Premises & Principles of Family Support

The Premises of Family Support

- 1. Primary responsibility for the development and well-being of children lies within the family, and all segments of society must support families as they rear their children.**

The systems and institutions upon which families rely must effectively respond to their needs if families are to establish and maintain environments that promote growth and development. Achieving this requires a society that is committed to making the well-being of children and families a priority and to supporting that commitment by allocating and providing necessary resources.

- 2. Assuring the well-being of all families is the cornerstone of a healthy society, and requires universal access to support programs and services.**

A national commitment to promoting the healthy development of families acknowledges that every family, regardless of race, ethnic background, or economic status, needs and deserves a support system. Since no family can be self-sufficient, the concept of reaching families before problems arise is not realized unless all families are reached. To do so requires a public mandate to make family support accessible and available, on a voluntary basis, to all.

- 3. Children and families exist as part of an ecological system.**

An ecological approach assumes that child and family development is embedded within broader aspects of the environment, including a community with cultural, ethnic, and socio-economic characteristics that are affected by the values and policies of the larger society. This perspective assumes that children and families are influ-

enced by interactions with people, programs, and agencies as well as by values and policies that may help or hinder families' ability to promote their members' growth and development. The ecological context in which families operate is a critical consideration in programs' efforts to support families.

- 4. Child-rearing patterns are influenced by parents' understandings of child development and of their children's unique characteristics, personal sense of competence, and cultural and community traditions and mores.**

There are multiple determinants of parents' child-rearing beliefs and practices, and each influence is connected to other influences. For example, a parent's view of her or his child's disposition is related to the parent's cultural background and knowledge of child development and to characteristics of the child. Since the early years set a foundation for the child's development, patterns of parent-child interaction are significant from the start. The unique history of the parent-child relationship is important to consider in programs' efforts.

- 5. Enabling families to build on their own strengths and capacities promotes the healthy development of children.**

Family support programs promote the development of competencies and capacities that enable families and their members to have control over important aspects of their lives and to relate to their children more effectively. By building on strengths, rather than treating deficits, programs assist parents in dealing with difficult life circumstances as well as in achieving their goals, and in doing so, enhance parents' capacity to promote their children's healthy development.

6. The developmental processes that make up parenthood and family life create needs that are unique at each stage in the life span.

Parents grow and change in response to changing circumstances and to the challenges of nurturing a child's development. The tasks of parenthood and family life are ongoing and complex, requiring physical, emotional, and intellectual resources. Many tasks of parenting are unique to the needs of a child's developmental stage, others are unique to the parent's point in her or his life cycle. Parents have been influenced by their own childhood experiences and their own particular psychological characteristics, and are affected by their past and present family interactions.

7. Families are empowered when they have access to information and other resources and take action to improve the well-being of children, families, and communities.

Equitable access to resources in the community—including up-to-date information and high-quality services that address health, educational, and other basic needs—enables families to develop and foster optimal environments for all members. Meaningful experiences participating in programs and influencing policies strengthen existing capabilities and promote the development of new competencies in families, including the ability to advocate on their own behalf.

The Principles of Family Support Practice

- 1. Staff and families work together in relationships based on equality and respect.**
- 2. Staff enhance families' capacity to support the growth and development of all family members—adults, youth, and children.**
- 3. Families are resources to their own members, to other families, to programs, and to communities.**
- 4. Programs affirm and strengthen families' cultural, racial, and linguistic identities and enhance their ability to function in a multicultural society.**
- 5. Programs are embedded in their communities and contribute to the community-building process.**
- 6. Programs advocate with families for services and systems that are fair, responsive, and accountable to the families served.**
- 7. Practitioners work with families to mobilize formal and informal resources to support family development.**
- 8. Programs are flexible and continually responsive to emerging family and community issues.**
- 9. Principles of family support are modeled in all program activities, including planning, governance, and administration.**

