



CALIFORNIA SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WELFARE

Statewide Training and Education Committee (STEC)
Doubletree Hotel | Sacramento, CA
December 11, 2006 | 10:00 am to 3:00 pm

Summary

MEETING SCHEDULE, ACTION ITEMS & DECISIONS

MEETING SCHEDULE:

- Next STEC: March 5, 2007 in Oakland

ACTION ITEMS:

CDSS

- Will meet internally to discuss public comment and feedback to regulations as well as confer with CWDA on the length of they core.

CalSWEC

- Incorporate feedback into training modules on teen parent placement (SB 500) and the prudent parent standard and post.
- Schedule CDOG conference calls to discuss T4T's.

Lead Organizations

- For presentation at the next meeting, lead organizations will revise the learning objectives for *Basic Interviewing*, *Substance Abuse*, *Mental Health*, and *Educational Advocacy* based on STEC's recommendations. (Contact Phyllis Jeroslow if you have questions)

STEC Members

- Send comments regarding revision of the Title IV-E competencies to Elizabeth Gilman (egilman@berkeley.edu)

DECISIONS:

- Spousal and Partner Abuse will remain titled "Domestic Violence"
- CWS/CMS will be finalized at the next meeting.
- Discuss federal tracking requirements further
- If materials from Immigrant Legal Resource Center are available, present to CWDA for discussion.
- Provisional approval granted for: *Basic Interviewing*; *Educational Rights & Achievement*; *Substance Abuse*; *Mental Health*; *Court Procedures*.
- Table decision about CWS Documentation for Use in the Legal System until discussed at next meeting.

I. Attendance:

CalSWEC: Barrett Johnson, Phyllis Jeroslow, Elizabeth Gilman, Jennifer Uldricks

CDSS: Linne Stout, Elizabeth Newby, Jeanne Espil, Glenn Jue, Donna Kennerly, Dave Godzina

Counties: Dennis Bozanich (Contra Costa), Diane Ferreira, Lisa Fulmore (San Diego), Helen McClain (San Mateo), Linda Martinez (Santa Clara), Amabel Baxley (San Mateo), Laura Lund-Webb (Riverside); Stuart Young (San Bernardino);, Kelly Woodard (Madera)

CWDA Reps: Tuey Lee (Southern, Orange), Mary DeSouza (Mountain Valley, Sacramento), Judy Rutan (Central Valley, Tulare), Anne Herendeen (Bay, Monterey)

RTAs: David Foster (Central), Liz Quinnett, Laurel Brown (PCWTA), Rodger Lum, Judith Lefler, (BAA), Susan Brooks, Margo Macklin (Northern)
LA/IUC: James Ferreira (CSU-Long Beach); Mark Miller (LA-DCFS), Linda Liu (CSU-LA)
Other attendees: Amy Okamura (SDSU Title IV-E PC), Kerry Doyle (California Judicial Council), Stuart Oppenheim (Child & Family Policy Institute), Sylvester Bowie (CSU Sacramento Title IV-E PC)

II. Welcome and introductions

- No additions were made to the agenda.
- The summary of the STEC meeting of 10/6/06 was reviewed. No changes were made.

Announcements:

- “So you want to be a trainer” is scheduled to be offered twice in the spring, with a possible third date (3/8/07 in the Bay Area and 3/23/07 in Oceanside)
- The Curriculum Development training is intended for experienced trainers and is scheduled for 4/25/07-4/26/07 in San Diego.
- The Symposium on Fairness and Equity Issues in Training is scheduled for April 12 – 13, 2007 at UC Berkeley.

III. CDSS Report (*Linne Stout*)

Regulations Update

- Copies of current training regulations were distributed. The discussion is summarized below

Titles of Curricula

- The current titling of the Common Core courses aren't necessarily reflected in the regulations. In general, it is better if course titles are more generic.
- **DECISION:** *Spousal and Partner Abuse* will be changed back to *Domestic Violence*
- *Educational Needs* vs. *Educational Rights and Achievements* - CDSS will assess what the optimal (i.e. most flexible for delivery) and include it in the regs.

CWS/CMS

- The intent of the CWS/CMS training requirement was to require counties to deliver a one-day overview, with the remainder of the training left to the counties. RTAs do not generally deliver CWS/CMS training.
- Although the regulation does not name who will deliver training, the flow of Section 14-611.1 does not clearly distinguish that CWS/CMS training is not a part of the core training delivered by the RTAs.
- Soledad submitted LOs to CalSWEC, which need to be checked for consistency and may be blended with CDSS competencies.
- **ACTION:** CDSS will consider renumbering/re-wording this section to clarify.
- **DECISION:** STEC will discuss the learning objectives/competencies for approval at the next meeting.

General discussion – Scope of Regulations - Non-Big 7 content areas/Section 14-611.13.

- The group reviewed the list of topics that has been distributed at previous STEC meetings.
- From the county perspective, want increased flexibility. From the advocacy perspective (and the perspective of the Federal Government), too much flexibility leads to too much variation between counties. The goal is to balance these two sometimes conflicting perspectives, while providing flexibility in the regulations to address training needs as they change over time. Want to preserve discretion to elevate topics to core, which is identified in the regulations as “additional topics as identified by CDSS.”
- ICWA/MEPA: there was some concern about the level of the ICWA training (previously discussed as an overview, and not a detailed review), and whether MEPA should also have such an overview.

ACTION: This should be decided by CWDA and CDSS, to be reported back to STEC.

- The group discussed concerns about trying to cram too much content into core training: Many of the topics in core are not meant to be all that trainees will need to know. The purpose of reviewing and editing and revising the learning objectives and competencies over the past year has been to make them appropriate to the level necessary for the first year.
- Discussion about the role of the regulations in telling counties what needs to be addressed. Is there a way to add a process into the regulations as to how certain topics are elevated/required? Need to make sure that the process is not too bureaucratic to add or delete content that is required.
- Concern about the number of days required for new social workers to complete in the first year, especially the impact to small and rural counties. Is it possible to consider requiring the Big 7 in the first 12 months and then extending the timeline for the remainder to take place within the first 2 years?
- The Big 7 takes 11 days. There is variation in the estimates that different RTAs made for how long it will take to complete the non-Big 7 topic areas.
- In addition to the Common Core, there are county specific induction trainings and SDM/CAT trainings. With travel time and smaller staff sizes, additional required days in the first 12 months are harder on small and mid-size counties due to smaller staff sizes and increased travel times to training.
- The group discussed the option of crafting language for the regulations to make it a bit more general. (e.g. specify that trainees must receive training in a certain number of topics, but not necessarily specify which ones.)
- Any revisions must consider the next Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) - one of the primary goals of these regulations is to demonstrate greater statewide consistency to the federal government.
- ACTION: CDSS will meet internally to discuss and amend and will communicate with CWDA and STEC.

Supervisor Core (14-611.5)

- This section specifies that newly hired supervisors will complete a standardized training program, however, there should be a distinction between standardized training curricula content and standardized delivery (in *Casework Supervision*), similar to the language used for line workers.
- For example, *Casework Supervision* is a standardized curriculum with an embedded evaluation and is different from the other content areas.
- Topic areas in 14-611.51 need to be stable in the long term and language needs to be generic enough for the regulations/statutes to stand the test of time.
- *Evidence-Based Practice* may be too specific. The others are general enough that even if the content changes, the title could remain the same.
- ACTION: Change wording of *Evidence-Based Practice* to *Research-Informed Practice*

Reporting Requirements (14-915)

- Depending upon the level of detail required, this may be an onerous requirement for counties as not all counties have systems in place already to track this information and/or to track training modalities by participant.
- RTAs report on training completed via them, but that won't always represent all of the training that workers receive.
- The goal is to report how many employees have reached their first year of employment, and how many of those have completed the common core.
- Ongoing training is more complicated, since some counties do not keep track of training at all, and very few if any keep track of some of the modalities that are allowed by the regulations (structured self-study, for example)
- CLARIFICATION: The description of modalities in section 14-915.11 is meant as a general description of the modalities that the county offers/counts for ongoing training, not as a mandate to track the modality for each hour of each employee.
- DECISION: Need to discuss tracking training in the regulations further, find out what minimum federal tracking requirements are in order to avoid loss of federal funding if we can't track.

Other:

- Correction to page 6, in 14-915.11 the reference should be to 14-611.13, however, with changes to sequencing in 14-611.1, 14-611.12 will be correct.

III. CWDA Report

Prudent Parent and SB500

- These training tools are intended to be used either by a trainer or a supervisor, and can be completed in an hour.
- They are both completing final CWDA review, and will be posted on the CalSWEC website after 1/1/07.

SIJS

- Reviewed handouts about SIJS (Legal Immigrant Status) prepared by Kerry Doyle.
- Thank you to Stuart and to Kerry for working on this.
- This, along with the other materials that Kerry provided, may be used as a resource for the Court Procedures curriculum as well.
- Now we need to decide if CWDA would like a brief training tool on this topic, or would just like to distribute these materials.
- Also, need to find out if curriculum from Immigrant Legal Resource Center are available. They may be a resource that counties could contract with if they wanted additional training on this topic.
- ACTION: Stuart Oppenheim will find out about the status of this curriculum, and discuss with Children's Ops Committee.

Permanency Options

- This training resource is currently under development, and will cover the different permanency options for caregivers. The idea is to launch it to coincide with the advent of KinGAP Plus.
- There have been some delays with KinGAP Plus implementation, so this may be delayed a bit.
- Thank you to those who provided resource material, options and legal/financial obligations for caregivers.

IV. Common Core

Big 7

- Discussion deferred until the next meeting.

Non-Big 7 competencies and learning objectives

Title IV-E Competency Language

- Title IV-E curriculum competencies were moved to the end of the Competencies/LOs section, and language was inserted to clarify the intent of including them.
- The group reviewed and approved the language.

Process:

- The group decided on the following process for final review:
 1. Review the competencies and LOs that have not yet been approved
 2. For each of these, also estimate the amount of time it might take to train them
 3. After these are done, complete a time estimate for the topics that have already been granted approval.
 4. The time estimates can then be used as an estimate in discussions with CWDA about implementation issues for the regulations.
- The goal is to honor the fact that STEC has been reviewing these topic areas for the past 3-4 meetings, and we need to respect that process. We also want to make sure that we get all the input that we need..
- The table below summarizes the discussions.

Content area and notes on revisions	Approval Decision	Est. # of days
-------------------------------------	-------------------	----------------

<p>SACWIS (CWS/CMS) ✓ See earlier notes – basic overview delivered by counties in most cases</p>	Deferred to 3/07	1
<p>Basic Interviewing (<i>Phyllis Jeroslow; see set of yellow Comp/LO handouts</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This document has been revised since the last STEC meeting on 10/6/06. Made the comps/los more generic (getting more specific was beyond the scope of the training). The objectives address the interview process for adults and children of different ages; fairness and equity concerns are also incorporated. <p>STEC recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Competency 1: expand idea that development consideration in interviewing beyond age-appropriate to include other factors such as developmental disability, mental health, substance abuse. Suggestion to focus more on the differences in interviewing adults. ✓ S2: emphasize interviewing skills to take into account values, beliefs, etc. ✓ K3: Debate about wording of interviewing children, to at least recognize that you can't interview children the same way that you would as adults 	Provisional approval granted; to review again at next meeting	1
<p>Educational Rights & Achievement (<i>Phyllis Jeroslow; see set of yellow Comp/LO handouts</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This document has been revised since the last STEC meeting on 10/6/06. <p>STEC recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The learning objectives should be made more basic. ✓ K1, K3, and K4: Change learning objectives from “describe” to “recognize.” ✓ The emphasis is on a brief introduction to the values, referring to the advanced class on Educational Advocacy for more training 	Provisional approval granted	.5
<p>Substance Abuse (<i>James Ferreira; see set of yellow Comp/LO handouts</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This document has been revised since the last STEC meeting on 10/6/06. It has been pared down to more basic learning objectives to eliminate/reserve some for advanced training. <p>STEC recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ K10: Change to recognize rather than explain, perhaps “recognize the elements”. ✓ S4: Needs a wording change or add clarification/bullets. Paring the words down. Is case plan redundant vs. case plan objectives/service activities. Simplify the language ✓ V2. Wording about self-efficacies is confusing; include families and recognize that families are the experts on themselves. 	Provisional Approval granted.	1
<p>Mental Health (<i>Judith Lefler; see set of yellow Comp/LO handouts</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This content area has been revised since the STEC meeting on 10/6/2006 based upon comments from last meeting. K2 reworded, K3 changed back, reinstated K4, deleted K6. S2 reserved for an advanced training. Reworded V2/V3. ▪ Concern about inclusion/detail of children, adolescents, and adults. Intended as a brief overview – not extensive. ▪ No reference to the DSM – previous discussion removed from LO. <p>STEC recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ K1. change “found” to “occurring” ✓ K2. change “treatment” to “intervention” ✓ Leave K5. 	Provisional approval granted.	1

<p>Court Procedures (<i>Phyllis Jeroslow; see set of yellow Comp/LO handouts</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This content area received provisional approval in April, but has been revised since the STEC meeting on 10/6/2006 as recommended by Donna Toulman and Kerry Doyle. ▪ Must remember that you need to include enough time demystifying court, increasing comfort with roles, courts, attorneys, etc. <p>STEC recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Discussion about the wording of V4, which may be subject to varying interpretations. ✓ “Trainee will value providing culturally relevant information to the court about families...dependency hearings, particularly at decision points...” ✓ V7. question about the wording “evolution” the connotations of the word as well as looking at the CWWs role in the process. Either eliminate or transform to a knowledge objective. ✓ Change to “...will recognize that case law and legislation affect child welfare law on an ongoing basis.” <p>AOC Handouts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Handouts from AOC, to provide as an appendix – the glossary, notice checklist (see ICWA checklist – to be forthcoming), title IV-E to ensure legal citations (should be gray) that ensure federal foster care reimbursement. ✓ Add similar resource to ICWA materials - requirements (preexisting document from AOC, but will change because the rule of court just changed) ✓ Add “dual jurisdiction” to the glossary? And 241.1 ✓ <u>ACTION</u>: Submit suggested changes for the court procedures glossary to Kerry ✓ <u>ACTION</u>: Kerry will work on ICWA checklist tool and additional citations 	<p>Provisional approval re-granted</p>	<p>2 (Up to 2 .5)</p>
<p>CWS Documentation for Use in the Legal System (<i>see set of yellow Comp/LO handouts</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This content area has been revised since the STEC meeting on 10/6/2006. New K/S Los created in response to a consensus about the need for court report writing. However, may not be relevant to the roles of all new CWWs. However, that is role specific, everyone needs documentation skills and applicability to roles across service components. Can’t assume, though, that some workers don’t need preparation in core training for court. <p>STEC recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Emphasized documentation in broader sense – understand that everything is court documentation. ✓ Suggestion to eliminate S1 – S4 – as the intent of skill based training are much more advanced. ✓ Another suggestion to keep S1 & S2. ✓ Reword to “essential” vs. the most critical ✓ K2. Reword to convey that recognize that all documents are used for the legal system. ✓ K3. recognize vs. explain ✓ K4. should be a value ✓ K5. Is this a skill objective in disguise? Eliminate and reword to a skill objective: ✓ Given a case scenario, the trainee will be able to identify bias-free 	<p>Revisit at next STEC meeting</p>	<p>1</p>

written language that can be used for writing		
CW Practice in a Multicultural environment ✓ suggestion to add socio-economic to Comp 2	Previously approved	1
ICWA ✓ Recognizes that ICWA is covered in multiple places	Previously approved	.5
Domestic Violence ✓ Needs some revision/reduction in scope to be 1 day ✓ ACTION: Susan Brooks will send suggested revisions to Barrett	Previously approved	1
Self Care ✓ Includes Time Management, Stress Management & Worker Safety	Previously approved	1
Values & Ethics ✓ May be woven in to other modules. ✓ Some re-phrasing necessary to be more specific in K2, K3, and K4	Previously approved	.5
Total Estimated days		11.5
Big 7 days		11
Total estimated for Core ✓ 18 days was estimated to determine the allocation for backfilling staff – this was the best estimate at the time that the backfill was calculated.		21-22

V. Next steps for common core/regs

- Regulations: will still have one more opportunity for feedback on the regulations.
- Need to discuss now within CWDA and CDSS
- The group clarified a few of the issues that will need to be addressed:

RTA resources:

- Curriculum development capacity
- Trainer capacity
- Ability to structure training differently, so that counties could receive it more frequently.

County capacity/Resources:

- Small county feasibility especially rural counties (includes travel time, and inability to backfill due to lack of a pool of candidates)
- Consider in context of other required training, including CWS/CMS, county-specific training

VI. IV-E Competency Revisions/STEC Member participation

- Request for participation in the revision process to see if there are inadequacies or language changes that you may have.
- Feedback has been solicited from multiple constituents including CYC, IV-E project coordinators and field directors.
- ACTION: Please send feedback to Elizabeth Gilman by the end of January.

VII. Next Steps

- Next meeting – March 5, 2007 in Oakland
- Issue that remains about tracking core and ongoing training. Take the question to CWDA HR committee.
- Will schedule CDOG conference calls to discuss T4Ts.

VIII. Deferred until the next meeting:

Big 7 items

- Tentative release dates: before Christmas for Assessment, Case Planning, Placement, and CMI1; mid-January for Framework; mid-February for CMI-2.
- CMI-2 duration
- Assessment& SDM/CAT
- T4Ts will go through CDOG offline (Phyllis). Question about scheduling in person vs. web conferencing for the T4Ts for revised curricula.

Other:

- Revision plans for common core and supervisor core
- Tracking core and ongoing training
- Recommended sequencing of common core
- Evaluation update