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PART 1

The California Problem,
Brief Review of the Literature, and
Strategy for Training Evaluation
The Problem Defined: Ethnicity and Path through the Child Welfare System
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California: Substantiated Referrals per 1,000 by Age and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Substantiated Referrals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1yr</td>
<td>Black (23.3)*</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native American (16.0)*</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL (11.6)*</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2yrs</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5yrs</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10yrs</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15yrs</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17yrs</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Series total

(10.6)* (11.5)* (4.2)*
2004 First Entries

California: Entries to Foster Care per 1,000 by Age and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian/PI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1yr</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2yrs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5yrs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10yrs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15yrs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17yrs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Series total
## California: Children in Care per 1,000 by Age and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>ALL</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian/PI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1yr</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2yrs</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5yrs</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10yrs</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15yrs</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-18yrs</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Series total

**Percentages:***
- Black Children: 31.8%
- Native American Children: 12.1%
- ALL Children: 7.9%
- White Children: 6.7%
- Hispanic Children: 6.8%
- Asian/PI Children: 1.8%

**Percentages with Star:**
- Black Children: 31.8% (significant)
- Native American Children: 12.1% (significant)
- ALL Children: 7.9% (significant)
- Hispanic Children: 6.8% (significant)
- Asian/PI Children: 1.8% (significant)
Trend in Workforce Diversity
Brief Review of the Literature

- See bibliography/ref list in packet
- Researched several fields (mental health, child welfare, education, medicine, business, etc.)
- What does the literature say?
So far 4 cultural competency measures stand out in the mental health literature:

- Multicultural Awareness Knowledge Skills Survey (MAKSS) by D’Andrea et al., 1991
- Multicultural Counseling Awareness Scale (MCAS-B) by Ponterotto, et al, 1991
- Multicultural Counseling Inventory (MCI) by Sodowsky, et al, 1994
- Cross-Cultural Counseling Inventory, Revised (CCCI-R) by LaFramboise, et al, 1991
Brief Review of the Literature, cont’d

- **Strengths of these measures:**
  - Foundation of these measures grounded in theoretical framework for development of multicultural counseling competencies by Sue et al (1982)
  - In continuous validation process over the past 10-15 years

- **Limitations of these measures:**
  - Self-report Likert measures for all but CCCI-R (social desirability effects a factor in responses)
  - Many studies done with college students, results not necessarily generalizable to public human services clients
  - Seem to measure global constructs which may or may not apply to the reality of serving clients from specific cultures (Boyle & Springer 2001)
  - Unclear if changes in self-reported attitudes is correlated with an effect on outcomes for clients
Considerations in Training & Evaluation re: Attitude Change

- Course
- Satisfaction/Oppinion
- Knowledge
- Skill
- Transfer
- Outcomes
Course Content:
Attitudes, Values & Beliefs

■ Strengths:
  – Coverage re: sensitivity to cultural/ethnic/racial differences is very important; incorporation by trainers indicates this subject matter is a priority

■ Limitations:
  – At this level alone, one cannot evaluate whether or not a change in course content/methodology is actually correlated with a change in behavior (skill/TOL), and eventually, to outcomes for children and families.
  – Rigorous evaluation and comparison of different teaching methods is necessary to yield which methods are best for assisting behavior change/skill integration (e.g., what is the most effective way of teaching ‘demonstrate respect’ or ‘demonstrate sensitivity’ to trainees?)
Satisfaction/Opinion: Attitudes, Values, Beliefs

- **Strength:**
  - Quick snapshot of trainee responses to the training

- **Limitations of evaluation at this level:**
  - Trainees’ positive responses to a satisfaction survey may decrease as a result of being challenged on tough issues like racism, ethnocentrism, and the like.
  - Trainees’ responses on an opinion survey of attitude change (e.g., Likert-type scale, possibly pre- and post-) may reflect social desirability factors.
  - Most importantly, at this level, one cannot evaluate whether or not a change in opinion is actually correlated with a change in behavior (skill/TOL), and eventually, to outcomes for children and families.
Knowledge: Attitudes, Values, & Beliefs

- **Strengths:**
  - Depending on the course competencies and knowledge LOs, a change in knowledge will provide the foundation and context for the need for further skill development in certain arenas. *(E.g., history of oppression and how this affects families’ responses to CWWs…knowledge which should contribute to the development of engagement skills such as respectful and sensitive interactions with families)*

- **Limitations:**
  - At this level alone, one cannot evaluate whether or not a change in knowledge is actually correlated with a change in behavior (skill/TOL), and eventually to outcomes for children and families.
Skill: Attitudes, Values, & Beliefs

- **Strengths:**
  - Theoretically, actual change of an attitude or belief will result in some type of behavior change. If behaviors are operationalized well, then we can measure this.

- **Limitations:**
  - At this level alone (or even combined with knowledge and satisfaction), one cannot evaluate whether or not a change in skill is actually correlated with a change in outcomes for children and families.

- **Note:** This is one of the training levels we want to focus on in California, because actual change in attitudes, values or beliefs will theoretically result in a change in behavior (skill).
Transfer of Learning: Attitudes, Values, & Beliefs

- **Strengths:**
  - One step closer to affecting outcomes for kids & families
  - If behaviors are operationalized well, then we can measure this not just in the classroom, but also in the field with actual families.

- **Limitations:**
  - At this level alone (or even combined with satisfaction, knowledge, and skill), one cannot evaluate whether or not a change in TOL is actually correlated with a change in outcomes for children and families.

- **Note:** This is one of the training levels we want to focus on in California, because actual change in attitudes, values or beliefs will theoretically result in a change in behavior (skill/TOL).
Outcomes: 
Attitudes, Values, & Beliefs

- Strengths:
  - This is where we want to be!
  - If we can link training to positive changes in outcomes for children and families, then we’re supposedly on the right track in terms of training.

- Limitations:
  - We’re not here yet – it will take time to build a chain of evidence to support the link between changes in attitudes - knowledge - skills - TOL and outcomes for children and families (we want the graph at the beginning of this presentation to look very different!)
Part 2

Beginning Steps:
Asking for input from trainers and community members on operationalizing knowledge and skills - because if you can’t operationalize it, you can’t measure it...
CalSWEC IV-E Competency 1.2

- 1.2: “Student demonstrates the ability to conduct an ethnically and culturally sensitive assessment of a child and family and to develop an appropriate intervention plan…”

- Knowledge (sugg): Define culture, ethnicity, race, bias, prejudice, discrimination, stereotype, etc.; Describe models of identity development – e.g., Minority ID Development and White ID Development; Articulate how culture, immigration, and history of different groups in U.S. affects help-seeking behaviors of clients; Articulate differences in communication styles – verbal & nonverbal – of five major ethnic/racial groups in U.S. and how this might affect assessments and interventions, etc.

- Skills (sugg): Demonstrate respect, sensitivity, open-mindedness, willingness to learn, non-defensive communication, tolerance for ambiguity, and diminish defensiveness
1.4: “Student understands the influence and value of traditional, culturally-based childrearing practices and uses this knowledge in working with families…”

Knowledge (sugg): Describe childrearing practices of five major ethnic/racial groups in U.S. and how they might be different and similar to majority cultural childrearing practices; Articulate how culture, immigration, and history of different groups in U.S. affects present-day childrearing practices of different groups; Knowledge of culturally-relevant family resources available for specific client populations

Skills (sugg): Able to ask Qs that demonstrate sensitivity to cultural values (e.g., ethnographic interviewing skills) and simultaneously doesn’t impose one’s own values on client families
Interesting... and important

- Did you notice anything interesting about the previous suggestions for operationalizing skills?

- Basic social work skills!

- Which means even though at first glance it might sound daunting to address systemic racism and ethnocentrism via training (not to mention how to evaluate these trainings), we’re really talking about evaluation of basic social work skills...
The Challenge for Evaluation

- We can’t measure that which is not operationalized, so the challenge now is to further refine the operationalization of basic social work skills.

- Since we’re going to focus on Skill/TOL:
  - In what ways could we operationalize “respect”?
  - What are some creative ways we could measure this in training?
  - In what ways could we operationalize “sensitivity”?
  - What are some creative ways we could measure this in training?
Questions to ponder:

- At each level, what are some ideas on how to evaluate attitudes, values, and beliefs?

- Any particular issues that might arise (in addition to the lists provided at each level)? What else comes up when trying to measure attitudes, values, and beliefs at each level?
All disproportionality data retrieved from:
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California Social Work Education Center
University of California, Berkeley
School of Social Welfare
Marchant Building, Suite 420
6701 San Pablo Ave.
Berkeley, CA 94720-7420
Phone: 510-642-9272    Fax: 510-642-8573
http://calswec.berkeley.edu