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How to use this Handbook:

The Table of Contents contains links that will allow you to paginate to a specific section of the handbook. Simply press and hold your control key on your keyboard and click on the link; you will be taken directly to that section.

This handbook also contains links to external documents/resources outside of the handbook. To access those links, which are throughout the handbook, simply click on the link and you will be directed to the external document/resource.
ADMINISTRATION OF PENNSYLVANIA’S CHILD WELFARE SYSTEM

The purpose of children and youth social services is to provide for the care, protection, safety, and mental and physical development of children coming within the child welfare and juvenile justice system in our Commonwealth. The Federal Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA), which is the major federal law enacted to assist the states in protecting and caring for abused, neglected and dependent children, establishes the following three primary tenets related to the delivery of child welfare services:

- To ensure that child safety is of paramount concern;
- That efforts are made to provide permanency for children in a timely manner; and
- That a child’s well-being needs are addressed.

With these tenets in mind, emphasis is placed on preserving the unity of the family whenever possible and separating the child from his or her parents only when necessary for the child’s welfare, health or safety or in the interest of public safety. When the unity of the family cannot be maintained, an alternative permanent family is vital to the health and development of children.

Pennsylvania’s child welfare system is state-supervised and county-administered. State law prescribes the minimum standards for the county offices, state child welfare and juvenile justice services are organized, managed, and delivered by County Children and Youth Agencies (CCYA) and county Juvenile Probation Offices.

Services to children, youth, and their families may be provided by the CCYAs, purchased from provider agencies or a combination of both.

The Department of Public Welfare’s (DPW) Office of Children, Youth and Families (OCYF) is the agency that administers the state’s child welfare program.

The mission of the DPW is to protect and serve Pennsylvania’s most vulnerable citizens, to promote, improve and sustain the quality of family life, and to break the cycle of dependency, while managing resources effectively and promoting respect for employees.

The primary focus of OCYF is always on the safety, permanency, and well-being of the children they serve. Through annual reviews of CCYAs, as well as OCYF-licensed child-serving homes and agencies, OCYF ensures the quality of services provided to and purchased for Pennsylvania’s children and families.

Additionally, through reviews of annual county needs-based plan and budget (NBPB) requests and subsequent expenditure reimbursement, OCYF monitors the financial commitment and spending of the counties with regard to the children and youth services they deliver. The financial review focuses on the reasonableness and necessity of the
CCYA request and whether the CCYA plan and budget focuses on the state’s goals of: increasing safety, improving permanency, safely reducing reliance on out-of-home care (particularly residential institutional programs), and decreasing re-entry into placement.

OCYF also is responsible for the administration of the state-operated juvenile justice facilities. These facilities are designed to provide state-of-the-art treatment, care, and custody services to some of Pennsylvania’s most at-risk delinquent youth.
OVERVIEW OF PENNSYLVANIA CHILDREN & YOUTH ADMINISTRATORS

The mission of PCYA is to enhance the quality of service delivery for children, youth, and their families by providing for its members: (1) a forum for the exchange of information; (2) assistance in educating the general public and its constituencies; and (3) an environment of support for the Association members.

What is PCYA?
The Pennsylvania Children and Youth Administrators (PCYA) association is a 501(c) (4) nonprofit corporation incorporated in 1969 and an affiliate of the County Commissioners Association of Pennsylvania since 1983. The association represents all sixty-seven CCYAs in activities with other organizations and government officials and it facilitates ongoing networking and information-sharing among its membership.

Services to Our Members
The PCYA organizes quarterly statewide meetings, as well as regional and ad hoc meetings, to disseminate information to and from members including administrators, program staff and fiscal officers. The PCYA prepares a weekly one-page newsletter regarding child welfare related issues, initiatives, and concerns. The weekly update is sent via email to all the members. The PCYA also utilizes video and audio conferencing, ListServes, and a website to assist members in sharing their innovations and concerns regarding practice, interpretations of regulations, funding and other matters.

The website address is www.pcya.org. The website has a public section that offers information in various categories, such as Emerging Issues, Pennsylvania Highlights, Calendar of Events, Job and Internship Postings, a list of all Children and Youth agencies in Pennsylvania and their contact information, information on the PCYA organization, and on the County Commissioners Association of Pennsylvania.

Administrators must register for permission to access the “Members Only” section. As a member you will find information such as the results of surveys, ListServe questions, conference registrations, and the sharing of forms and information on legislative policy positions.

The ListServe enables administrators and selected staff to interact around current practice and share experiences. Discussions range from specific inquiries regarding placement facility options for a child to analysis of new policy or allocations. Administrators must register for the ListServe through the PCYA staff.

The By-Laws of the PCYA were last amended on October 27, 2010. The By-Laws can be found by visiting www.pcya.org.
County Commissioners Association
As an affiliate of the County Commissioners Association of Pennsylvania (CCAP), PCYA works in partnership with CCAP members to assure that their positions are coordinated with the other county human services affiliates. There is a wide network of other public and private human services providers, community stakeholders, and local, state and federal government officials who work together to enhance the effectiveness, cooperation and collaboration of human services delivery to families and children. PCYA lobbying efforts are also coordinated with the CCAP.

Questions Regarding PCYA
Questions regarding PCYA and its services can be directed to Charles R. Songer, Jr., Executive Director, csonger@pacounties.org. The PCYA also can be contacted at 17 North Front Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17101; Phone: (717) 232-7554; or Fax: (717) 232-2162.
MEMBERSHIP OF PCYA

PCYA Officers and Board of Directors
The PCYA officers and board of directors provide leadership for the association. The officers are elected by the PCYA membership during a biennial election. The officers of the association and board members serve a two-year term. Each regional division may select up to two members to represent them on the board. A listing of the current board of directors is provided on the PCYA website and on the resource disk.

PCYA Membership
The PCYA represents all sixty-seven CCYAs in activities with other organizations and government officials. A complete listing of the Children & Youth administrators and their phone numbers by county is provided on the PCYA website and it is also available on the resource disk.

Your Leadership Role as a County Children and Youth Administrator
Because of the rich diversity and wide variety of county-administered child welfare agencies, an administrator’s role may vary considerably. What is effective in Westmoreland County, may not work in Lehigh County. What is standard practice in Philadelphia County, may not apply in Cameron County. Regardless of your location or size, it is an administrator’s role to assure that children and families in your county achieve safety, permanence, and well-being in the most effective and efficient means possible.

The PCYA created the Leadership Academy Certificate Program to support administrators and key staff in leadership roles. This 27-hour voluntary certificate program begins with the Foundations of Leadership, a two-day (12.0 hours) session designed to introduce administrators to leadership and to principles and techniques of organizational effectiveness. The Foundations of Leadership training is offered up to four times a year.

To complete the voluntary certificate program, administrators or key staff must complete an additional 15.0 hours of elective courses, offered throughout the year at the PCYA quarterly meetings or at other locations. The elective workshops are typically rotated among five knowledge tracks: Leadership; Fiscal; Organizational Development; Systems Integration and Human Resource Development. As with all Leadership Academy offerings, administrators are encouraged to bring their management teams to the program.

At our quarterly meetings, completed administrators receive a lapel pin, a certificate and recognition. The local commissioners are also made aware of this accomplishment.

Children and Youth administrators meet quarterly to receive information, plan for the
future and discuss topics of interest to all. The quarterly meetings provide administrators the opportunity to meet with peers, network, and make contact with OCYF personnel.

To facilitate participation at your first PCYA meeting:

- Contact PCYA staff at (717) 232-7554 to introduce yourself and get the dates for the next quarterly meeting. The staff will also be able to identify your PCYA regional representatives.

- Most participants dress in business casual attire. Appropriate attire for the meetings varies with the season, travel requirements, and personal preference.

- The meetings typically begin on Wednesday at 1:00 pm. and end on Friday by noon. Training sessions are offered in conjunction with the meeting and are at no cost. However you do need to register for the training sessions.

- If possible, plan to have your director(s) of social services, other manager(s) or fiscal officer(s) attend with you. Their background, understanding of the terminology, and general knowledge will be helpful during the meeting.

Meetings at the regional level are also held periodically. You can contact your board representative for a schedule.
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To carry out its various duties, OCYF is organized into four separate bureaus: The Bureau of Children and Family Services (BCFS), The Bureau of Budget and Fiscal Support (BBFS), The Bureau of Policy, Programs and Operations (BPPO), and The Bureau of Juvenile Justice Services (BJJS).

**Bureau of Children and Family Services (BCFS)**

BCFS is primarily responsible for monitoring the delivery of services by county and private children and youth social service agencies, including foster care agencies, adoption agencies, residential services, secure care, secure detention, transitional living, outdoor, mobile, day treatment, and supervised independent living facilities throughout the commonwealth. Oversight of these programs is conducted by the four OCYF Regional Offices.

The essential functions and responsibilities of the four OCYF Regional Offices:

- Monitoring, licensing, and providing technical assistance to the public and private children and youth social service agencies and facilities;
- Investigating child abuse when the alleged perpetrator is a county children and youth agency (CCYA) employee or one of its agents;
- Ensuring regulatory compliance of agencies and facilities by investigating complaints and conducting annual inspections;
- Assisting county and private agencies in the interpretation and implementation of DPW regulations;
- Conducting reviews of all Child Fatalities and Near Fatalities as a result of suspected child abuse that occur within the Commonwealth;
- Providing recommended levels of funding for CCYAs as a result of programmatic analysis of the county’s Needs Based Plan and Budget Submission;
- Provide State Leadership in the Quality Service Reviews of county agencies;
- Responding to inquiries and providing information to families, providers, stakeholders, and the general public regarding the statutes, regulations, and DPW requirements and processes for operating a public or private children and youth agency, child residential and day treatment facility, foster care agency or adoption agency;
- Inspecting and monitoring regulated facilities and agencies for continual compliance;
- Providing technical assistance and consultation to facilities and agencies;
• Conducting complaint investigations to determine validity of allegations, and performing follow-up as needed;
• Reviewing applications for new facilities and agencies from prospective providers;
• Preparing detailed reports of survey findings, recommendations for licensure status, and enforcement actions; and
• Providing information regarding the certification or licensing history of a facility or agency.

Contact:
Roseann Perry, Bureau Director
11 Stanwix Street, Room 260
Pittsburgh, PA 15222
412-565-5168
rosperry@pa.gov

Regional Children Youth and Families Offices
Southeast Region
Office of Children, Youth and Families
801 Market Street
6th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19107
Tel: (215) 560-2249 or (215) 560-2823
Fax: (215) 560-6893

Contact:
Raheemah Shamsid-Deen Hampton, Director
rshamsid-d@pa.gov

Counties Served: Bucks, Chester, Delaware, Montgomery, and Philadelphia.

Western Region
Office of Children, Youth and Families
707 State Office Building
300 Liberty Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15222
Tel: (412) 565-2339
Fax: (412) 565-7808

Contact:
Elaine Bobick, Director
ebobick@pa.gov

Northeast Region
Office of Children, Youth and Families
Scranton State Office Building
100 Lackawanna Avenue, 3rd Floor
Scranton, PA 18503
Tel: (570) 963-4376
Fax: (570) 963-3453

Contact:
Jacqui Maddon, Director
jmaddon@pa.gov


Central Region
Office of Children, Youth and Families
3 Ginko Drive
PO Box 2675
Hilltop Building, Second Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17110
Tel: (717) 772-7702
Fax: (717) 772-7071

Contact:
Gabi Williams, Director
gawilliams@state.pa.gov

Counties Served: Adams, Bedford, Blair, Cambria, Centre, Clinton, Columbia, Cumberland, Dauphin, Franklin, Fulton, Huntingdon, Juniata, Lancaster, Lebanon, Lycoming, Mifflin, Montour, Northumberland, Perry, Snyder, Somerset, Union, and York.

Bureau of Budget and Fiscal Support (BBFS)
BBFS provides support functions for OCYF including: budgeting, personnel, management of federal grants and revenue, fulfillment of needs-based budget mandates, and administrative, financial and operational support. The BBFS increases fiscal accountability through cost reporting, recovery, containment, justification, and redistribution.
Bureau of Policy, Programs and Operations (BPPO)

Cindi Horshaw, Acting Bureau Director
Bureau of Policy, Programs and Operations
Tel: (717)-787-3985

The Bureau of Policy, Programs and Operations develops and publishes program procedures and directives governing child welfare activities in the Commonwealth related to:

- The administration of public and private children and youth agencies;
- Foster family care;
- Adoption;
- Child residential and day treatment programs; and
- Child Protective Services.

The BPPO plans, develops, and implements new and revised regulations. In addition, it provides program clarifications, conducts training, and orientation on new/revised procedures, provides analysis of and recommendations for proposed legislation, develops program reports and publications, and coordinates and provides technical assistance and training materials for OCYF regional office staff and service providers.

The Bureau is responsible for programs required by Pennsylvania’s Child Protective Services Law and departmental regulations governing services to dependent and neglected children.

The Bureau oversees and manages special grants including the Statewide Adoption and Permanency Network (SWAN), Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence, Pennsylvania Coalition Against Rape, Family Centers and the Chafee Foster Care Independence Program. The Bureau also coordinates with OCYF’s Bureau of Budget and Program Support in applying for and managing grants for the development of child welfare services.

The Bureau is responsible for coordinating the data collection and analysis of child welfare data for OCYF, as well as for the county and private children and youth social services agencies.

The Bureau serves as the lead for the Federal Child and Family Services Review (CFSR). The Bureau also works closely with the University of Pittsburgh, School of Social Work’s Pennsylvania Child Welfare Resource Center in Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania to improve child welfare services and outcomes.

The Bureau is responsible for managing and operating the ChildLine and Abuse Registry and the three Interstate Compacts for Pennsylvania, which is located within the Division of Operations.

Terry L. Clark, Director
Office of Children, Youth and Families - Division of Operations
(717)-783-1964
**Interstate Compact Office**

Tel: (717)-772-5505

- The Interstate Compact on Adoption and Medical Assistance provides legal guidelines and requirements for ensuring that adopted special needs children are provided medical assistance in a timely manner when they move into or out of Pennsylvania. This compact also ensures that children who are placed into foster or residential care, and are Title IV-E eligible, receive medical cards either in Pennsylvania or the state in which they are placed.

- The Interstate Compact on Juveniles coordinates the interstate movement of delinquent juveniles who are moving into or out of Pennsylvania and are being referred between courts on a probationary status. This compact allows for courtesy supervision to be provided in another jurisdiction to carry out the orders of a home jurisdiction. This compact also returns runaways and arranges transportation for the juveniles served by this compact.

- The Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children oversees the transfer and continued supervision of children who are moving between states for the purpose of adoption, foster care, or institutional placement. This compact also assures that all Pennsylvania requirements are met prior to placing a foreign child in Pennsylvania for the purpose of adoption.

**ChildLine**

Toll Free: (800)-932-0313  
TDD (hearing impaired): (866)-872-1677

- ChildLine operates a toll-free hotline for reporting child abuse. ChildLine personnel provide public or mandated reporters counseling and referrals to appropriate agencies for assistance. Reports of abuse are referred to the appropriate office for immediate investigation, including CCYAs or OCYF Regional Offices. ChildLine maintains a system of child abuse data that is current and organized for use in required reporting documents, such as the annual Child Abuse Report, and special child abuse studies. ChildLine processes over 100,000 calls per year.

**Verification (Background Checks) Unit**

Tel: Local: (717)-783-6211 or Toll Free: 1-(877)-371-5422

- The Verification or Background Checks Unit of ChildLine processes Child Abuse History Clearance Applications (CY-113 forms) that have been submitted to DPW for processing. In processing these applications, this unit identifies matches between applicants and those child abuse perpetrators listed on the Central Child Abuse Registry. Child Abuse History Clearance Applications are submitted for various reasons including: child care positions, foster care, adoption, school positions, and volunteers who will have direct contact with children. Based upon
the clearance results, perpetrators of certain offenses are prohibited from being hired or serving in the requested capacity. Applicants submitting an application due to volunteer activities will also need to submit a Pennsylvania State Police Criminal History Clearance or Federal Bureau of Investigation Criminal History Clearance along with their Child Abuse History Clearance to DPW for processing. DPW collects a fee for processing Child Abuse History Clearance Applications.

Appeals Unit

(717)-425-2992

- Persons whose names appear on Founded or Indicated child abuse reports can exercise their right to appeal, expunge, or amend a report of child abuse as permitted by the Child Protective Services Law. This unit tracks each appeal until a final decision is made.

Information and Data Management Section
Susan Stockwell, Section Chief
(717)-772-6902

The Information and Data Management Section is responsible for managing and coordinating the information technology and data reporting needs for OCYF. These areas include:

- Project management and business analysis support for all IT system operations and development. This includes supporting all OCYF legacy applications and overseeing the Child Welfare Statewide IT Strategic Plan/Project;
- Acting as the liaison between OCYF and the Bureau of Information Systems/OIT and IT contractors for all IT development, operations, and telecommunications. Represents OCYF on Enterprise IT system initiatives;
- Oversight for the collection and submission of federal reports including the Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS), National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System (NCANDS), National Youth in Transition Database (NYTD), and Caseworker Visitation Tracking;
- The development of the Annual Child Abuse Report and other state level reporting;
- Review and approval of County Children and Youth Information Technology Grants and Invoices; and
- The OCYF Portal providing an internet accessible website for county and state child welfare staff to access work related materials and applications in one location.
Bureau of Juvenile Justice Services (BJJS)

BJJS is responsible for the management, operations, program planning and oversight of all the Youth Development Center (YDC)/Youth Forestry Camp (YFC) facilities. The youth entrusted to BJJS' care are male and female adolescents who have been adjudicated delinquent by their county judicial system. From the time that a resident is referred to the BJJS, they ensure that every resident receives individualized treatment services based on strengths and needs. The BJJS' State Court Liaison Specialists work closely with Pennsylvania’s county juvenile court system, the Youth Development Center/Youth Forestry Camp (YDC/YFC) system and private provider agencies to ensure residents are placed in the least restrictive and most appropriate setting.

BJJS has mandated the implementation of the Master Case Planning System (MCPS). Within the framework of Restorative Justice principles, this system is designed to accomplish four tasks:

1. To ensure maximum participation on the part of the resident, families, courts, probation officers, clinical and educational staff in the development of the competency-based continuum of services;

2. To ensure standardization in documentation and the case planning process for all facilities;

3. To provide services that are designed to return the resident to the community better equipped to be a productive member of society; and

4. To ensure that each resident be held accountable to the victim, the community, the court and family.

Juvenile Justice: Loysville Youth Development Center

Loysville Youth Development Center (LYDC) is a residential facility with a separate secure facility located in Perry County. Within the framework of the Juvenile Court Act, delinquent males from any of the Commonwealth's juvenile courts may be committed to LYDC.

Contact:
Loysville Youth Development Center
Tel: (717) 789-5500
**Juvenile Justice: South Mountain Secure Treatment Unit**

South Mountain Secure Treatment Unit (SMSTU) is located on the grounds of the South Mountain Restoration Center in Franklin County. SMSTU is a secure facility that provides treatment programming for adjudicated delinquent males which is designed to meet their individual and diverse needs. The facility is charged with managing and treating aggressive and behaviorally challenging juveniles who have experienced difficulty adjusting to less secure environments and/or have extensive placement histories.

**Contact:**
South Mountain Secure Treatment Unit  
Tel: (717) 749-7904

**Juvenile Justice: Youth Forestry Camp #3**

Youth Forestry Camp #3 (YFC #3), located in Huntingdon County, supports positive change through a multi-program approach in a safe and open environment. Two distinct treatment options are available; the B-Dorm Residential program and the First Step program. The B-Dorm Residential program is an open program designed to emphasize individual strengths while helping the resident prepare for a productive reentry into society. The First Step program is a twelve-week program, for residents whose delinquent history contains a significant substance-related component.

**Contact:**
Youth Forestry Camp #3  
Tel: (814) 658-3492

**Juvenile Justice: Cresson Secure Treatment Unit**

Justice Resource Institute (JRI) operates Cresson Secure Treatment Unit (CSTU) under contract with the Pennsylvania DPW. CSTU is a male facility that houses juvenile offenders who may pose a safety and security threat in more traditional treatment programs. The facility is located on the grounds of the State Correctional Institute Cresson, in Cambria County.

**Contact:**
Cresson Secure Treatment Unit  
Tel: (814) 886-6247
**Juvenile Justice: North Central Secure Treatment Unit**

North Central Secure Treatment Unit (NCSTU) provides secure treatment programming for adjudicated delinquent youth. It is located in Montour County. Included in NCSTU are specific programs that address substance abuse and criminal behavior issues, gender-responsive services for female offenders, and programming for residents who have lower cognitive functioning and treatment for issues related to chronic delinquent behavior and mental health disorders.

**Contact:**
North Central Secure Treatment Unit  
Tel: (570) 271-4700

**Juvenile Justice: Youth Forestry Camp #2**

Youth Forestry Camp #2 (YFC #2), located in Carbon County, is an open residential facility for adjudicated delinquent males. Residents committed to YFC #2 generally have less extensive and less severe delinquent histories. Residents committed to the facility typically have either violated probation or been adjudicated with one or more drug-related, property-related, and/or minor violent offenses. YFC #2 renders services to residents ranging from one-time users to residents with serious dependency issues.

**Contact:**
Youth Forestry Camp #2  
Tel: (570) 443-9534
LAWS, BULLETINS, AND REGULATIONS

Legal Mandates Framework

The laws and regulations that guide our child welfare system begin with the Federal government providing the statutory and regulatory framework in regard to the children and families and the child welfare system. Once the federal government passes legislation, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families publishes regulation to implement the legislation. As the federal government provides the framework, the Pennsylvania DPW guides the child welfare system within the Commonwealth. When Federal legislation is passed, the Pennsylvania DPW analyzes the new legislation to determine what changes need to occur to ensure compliance with the federal law. Changes can be made through enacting or revising legislation, regulation or bulletins. In addition to changes prompted by newly enacted federal legislation, DPW is continually seeking to improve the child welfare system by constant evaluation and analysis of statute, regulation, procedure and practice. Below are terms with which to be become familiar:

Law is a series of rules that govern the behavior of people in a society, that allow for resolution of disputes between the members of a society and between individuals and the government, and that provide a means for the state to control the behavior of its citizens.

Statutory law is enacted by the United States Congress or the legislatures of each state and signed into law by the president or state governor.

Administrative law arises from governmental agencies that have rule-making authority delegated to them by Congress or the state legislature. These directives are issued by administrative agencies such as the United States Department of Health and Human Services and the Pennsylvania DPW.

Levels of Policy Issued by OCYF

The following is a list of the levels of policy that are issued by OCYF and the process implemented by OCYF in developing each level of policy:

Regulation implements the law and has the full force and effect of law. Approval of regulation is a lengthy process which culminates with review by the Independent Regulatory Review Commission and Standing Committees of the Legislature before the final regulation is published in the Pennsylvania Bulletin with an effective date.

Bulletins establish policy and procedure and provide guidance which are used, for the most part, until regulations are published as final rulemaking. Bulletins arise from the convening of a workgroup, development of a draft, and review by the workgroup. The Pennsylvania DPW reviews and approves the Bulletin, which is signed by the Deputy Secretary.
Policy clarifications provide further guidance regarding implementation of statute and regulation. They are requested by a public or private children and youth agency through their regional office of the Pennsylvania DPW.

Special transmittals are used to disseminate information and provide guidance. The transmittals are vehicles for sharing information, announcing a change in procedures of OCYF, and/or announcing new initiatives. Some of the transmittals may be developed and reviewed by a stakeholder group or an ongoing, standing committee.

Process for Developing Regulations (6 month to 2 year process)
1. The need for regulatory amendment is identified based on statutory amendment, review of current regulation or system evolution.
2. A stakeholder group of affected parties is convened.
3. The draft regulations are developed with the stakeholder group.
4. Executive staff from the Governor’s Office and the Pennsylvania DPW, including the Attorney General’s Office and Office of General Counsel, review and approve the regulation package.
5. The proposed regulation package is published in the Pennsylvania Bulletin allowing a 30-day public comment period, including comments from the General Assembly and the Independent Regulatory Review Commission (IRRC).
6. OCYF/DPW reviews and responds to each and every public comment and revises proposed regulation as necessary.
7. Final form regulation is reviewed by Independent Regulatory and Review Commission (IRRC) and Standing Committees of the Legislature.

Process for Developing a Bulletin
1. A stakeholder workgroup is convened.
2. A draft bulletin is developed.
3. A draft is reviewed by stakeholder workgroup for comment and suggestion.
4. DPW reviews draft and approves the bulletin.
5. The bulletin is signed by the Deputy Secretary(s)

Special Transmittals
1. A vehicle for information sharing, announces a change in OCYF Procedure, and/or announces new initiatives.
2. Some may be developed and reviewed by a stakeholder group or a standing committee such as the Risk Assessment Task Force.
Current Laws, Bulletins, and Regulations

DPW provides access to current laws, bulletins, and regulations on their Internet site as well on the OCYF Portal. Currently, each CCYA has several staff registered who can access the Portal and documents.

New legislation and bulletins are issued and updated frequently and are distributed to CCYAs through the Office of Children, Youth and Families (OCYF) Regional Offices and the DPW/OCYF Listserv, as well as being posted on DPW’s web site and internal portal site.

For bulletins and laws not included in this folder or to obtain updated bulletins and laws, contact your OCYF Regional Office, or go http://pabulletin.com/.
OVERVIEW OF THE PENNSYLVANIA CHILD WELFARE RESOURCE CENTER

The Pennsylvania Child Welfare Resource Center (Resource Center) is a collaborative effort of the Pennsylvania DPW, University of Pittsburgh, School of Social Work, and the Pennsylvania Children and Youth Administrators, Inc. The Resource Center is centrally managed by the University of Pittsburgh and administered through the Pennsylvania Child Welfare Resource Center’s office in Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania. Ongoing planning for the Resource Center is provided by the Child Welfare Resource Center Steering Committee (CWTSC).

Mission:


In partnership with families, communities, public and private agencies, we prepare and support exceptional Child Welfare Professionals and systems through education, research and a commitment to best practice.”

Vision:

The vision of the Child Welfare Resource Center is “Every child, youth, and family experiences a life rich with positive opportunities, nurturing relationships, and supportive communities.”

The Child Welfare Resource Center uses a systemic and systematic approach to continuously improving its organization’s performance, performance capacity and consumer outcomes as we work with stakeholders that serve children and families promoting safety, permanency, and well-being. The Resource Center does this by the use of key strategies including:

• Conducting research and evaluation;
• Training child welfare professionals;
• Providing consultation and support;
• Organizing and sponsoring events;
• Advocating for policy and practice improvements;
• Developing and revising tools, materials and curricula
• Integrating youth and family engagement;
• Developing and implementing a quality improvement process; and
• Providing resource coordination.

The Resource Center provides training for the certification of Direct Service Workers, Supervisors of Direct Service Workers, and Administrators for the state of Pennsylvania, in addition to a continuum of services to facilitate positive growth and change in the child welfare system. Services include training to enhance knowledge and skills,
transfer of learning to build skill competence, consultation, technical assistance on statewide initiatives and CCYA requests, research on evidence-based practices and organizational assessment and development. Our services are focused on:

- Facilitating and sustaining change;
- Continuous Quality Improvement;
- Pennsylvania Practice Model;
- The Safety Assessment and Management Process;
- Youth and family engagement including Family Group Decision Making, Family Finding, Teaming, Youth Advisory Boards, and Families and Communities United;
- Caseworker visitation and mobile technology;
- Citizen Review Panels;
- Classroom training and online education; and
- Supporting implementation and monitoring of Pennsylvania’s Child and Family Service Review and 5 year plan.

This is accomplished by collaboration with system partners and internal resources, as well as a consultant pool of practitioners with experience in child welfare.

The Resource Center provides a 126-hour core training series for new casework staff, called Charting the Course Towards Permanency for Children in Pennsylvania and a 60-hour core training series for new supervisors called the Supervisor Training Series. The Resource Center also offers specialized and related topic training sessions to meet the ongoing training needs of child welfare professionals. The Resource Center is increasing opportunities for distance learning. To learn more about the Resource Center and to review a current listing of workshops, visit our web-site www.pacwcbt.pitt.edu.

Technical Assistance that assists CCYAs to improve practice is also offered. The Organizational Effectiveness/Regional Team (OE/RT) Department of the Resource Center is part of Pennsylvania’s response to the needs noted in the 2002 Federal CFSR. In 2009, restructuring of the OE Department took place to better meet the diverse needs of its customers by formulating geographical teams comprised of Practice Improvement Specialists, Training Delivery Specialist and a Regional Team Supervisor; now known as the Organizational Effectiveness Regional Team (OE/RT) Department. Through a number of initiatives and best practice applications, the OE/RT Department assists counties in a systemic and systematic approach to continuously improve its organization’s performance capacity and consumer outcomes as they ensure children are safe, find permanency, and have their well-being needs met.

The OE/RT department provides training, consultation, technical assistance on statewide initiatives and CCYA requests, research on evidence-based practices, and organizational assessment and development. This is accomplished by collaboration with systems partners and internal resources, as well as a Pennsylvania trainer and consultant pool of practitioners with experience in child welfare.
CCYAs and the Pennsylvania DPW can access the Resource Center’s OE/RT services by contacting the Regional Team Supervisor or the Practice Improvement Specialist county lead at the Resource Center, (717) 795-9048, with any questions about how to request services and discuss CCYA needs.
CONTINUOUS QUALITY IMPROVEMENT

Continuous quality improvement (CQI) is —the complete process of identifying, describing, and analyzing strengths and problems and then testing, implementing, learning from, and revising solutions. It relies on an organizational culture that is proactive and supports continuous learning. CQI is firmly grounded in the overall mission, vision, and values of the county children and youth agency (CCYA). Perhaps most importantly, it is dependent upon the active inclusion and participation of staff at all levels of the CCYA, children, youth, families, and stakeholders throughout the process. (The National Resource Center for Organizational Improvement, 2005).

Ongoing CQI efforts occur at the federal, state, and local levels. It is widely recognized that in order to improve outcomes for children and families, any CQI effort needs to ultimately impact change at the practice level where services to children, youth, and families occur. This requires a high degree of collaboration at the federal, state, and county levels. On August 27, 2012, the Administration for Children and Families, The Children’s Bureau, disseminated an informational memorandum regarding Continuous Quality Improvement in Title IV-B and IV-E Programs. Click here to access the informational memorandum. The next section entitled Practice Improvement Efforts highlights the many efforts underway at various organizational levels aimed to improve outcomes for children, youth, and families.

PRACTICE IMPROVEMENT EFFORTS

Federal: Child and Family Services Review (CFSR)

History

The 1994 Amendments to the Social Security Act (SSA) authorize the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to review state child and family service programs to ensure conformity with the requirements in titles IV-B and IV-E of the SSA. Traditionally, reviews focused primarily on assessing state agencies' compliance with procedural requirements, as evidenced by case file documentation. In addition, past reviews did not provide states with opportunities for making improvements before imposing penalties.

Now, however, the focus is on states' capacity to create positive outcomes for children and families and on the results achieved by the provision of appropriate services. On January 25, 2000, HHS published a final rule in the Federal Register to establish a new approach to monitoring state child welfare programs. Under the rule, which became effective March 25, 2000, states are assessed for substantial conformity with certain federal requirements for child protective, foster care, adoption, family preservation and family support, and independent living services.
The Children's Bureau, part of HHS, administers the review system, known as the Child and Family Services Review (CFSR).

Purpose

The CFSR enables the Children's Bureau to: (1) ensure conformity with federal child welfare requirements; (2) determine what is actually happening to children and families as they are engaged in child welfare services; and (3) assist states to enhance their capacity to help children and families achieve positive outcomes.

Ultimately, the goal of the review is to help states improve child welfare services and achieve the following outcomes for families and children who receive services:

Safety
- Children are, first and foremost, protected from abuse and neglect.
- Children are safely maintained in their homes whenever possible and appropriate.

Permanency
- Children have permanency and stability in their living situations.
- The continuity of family relationships and connections is preserved for families.

Family and Child Well-Being
- Families have enhanced capacity to provide for their children's needs.
- Children receive appropriate services to meet their educational needs.
- Children receive adequate services to meet their physical and mental health needs.

The Federal Government conducts the review in partnership with CCYA staff; consultant reviewers supplement the Federal Review Team. The reviews are structured to help States identify strengths and areas needing improvement within their agencies and programs.

The Review Process

Each CFSR is a two-stage process consisting of a Statewide Assessment and an onsite review of child and family service outcomes and program systems. For the Statewide Assessment, the Children's Bureau prepares and transmits to the State the data profiles that contain aggregate data on the state's foster care and in-home service populations. The data profiles allow each state to compare certain safety and permanency data indicators with national standards determined by the Children's Bureau.

After the Statewide Assessment, an onsite review of the state child welfare program is conducted by a joint Federal-State team. The onsite portion of the review includes: (1) case record reviews; (2) interviews with children and families engaged in services; and
(3) interviews with community stakeholders, such as the courts and community agencies, foster families, and caseworkers and service providers.

At the end of the onsite review, states determined not to have achieved substantial conformity in all the areas assessed are required to develop and implement Program Improvement Plans (PIPs) addressing the areas of nonconformity. The Children's Bureau supports the states with technical assistance and monitors implementation of their plans.

States that do not achieve their required improvements sustain penalties as prescribed in the federal regulations. All 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico completed their first review by 2004. No state was found to be in substantial conformity in all of the seven outcome areas or seven systemic factors. Since that time, states have been implementing their PIPs to correct those outcome areas not found in substantial conformity. The second round of reviews began in the spring of 2007 and was completed in the fall of 2010.

**CFSR in Pennsylvania**

Pennsylvania’s first CFSR was held in 2002 and Pennsylvania participated in the second round of CFSR in 2008.

**Self-Assessment**

Stakeholders from across the child welfare system were asked to participate in the CFSR. These efforts began with the formation of the CFSR Steering Committee that began meeting monthly in April 2007, to conduct and write the Self-Assessment. Subcommittees were formed based on the sections of the statewide assessment. Each subcommittee drafted separate sections of the report. The Quality Improvement Committee (QIC) was also consulted and is involved in the CFSR process. This committee drove many of the initiatives that later became part of PA’s Program Improvement Plan (PIP). A youth workgroup comprised of Youth Ambassadors representing counties from across the state has also been formed. The youth ambassadors attend the CFSR Steering Committee meetings and also meet independently each month to plan the youth engagement efforts. The youth ambassadors drafted their own responses to each of the systemic factors based upon the findings of focus groups that they led with youth across the state. The youth perspective sections included within the systemic factors of the statewide assessment were written by the youth to provide an opportunity for their voice to be heard. Twenty-two focus groups were conducted with a variety of stakeholders across the state. Over 400 stakeholders participated from every region of the Commonwealth between July and October of 2007. Participants included the following: youth in foster care; advisory boards; birth families; county administrators; caseworkers and supervisors; county commissioners; the courts; DPW staff; JPO staff; kinship, permanent legal custodian (PLC) and foster parents; foster parent associations; other county service providers; private provider administrators, supervisors and caseworkers. The groups varied in size from seven to more than forty. Some of the groups were preexisting; such as systems of
care planning groups, while others were pulled together for this purpose. Levels of staff were separated by role to help ensure they felt free to speak openly about all issues. The groups responded to questions regarding the systemic factors and new initiatives. The groups were facilitated by staff from DPW and the Child Welfare Resource Center. The feedback from the focus groups was incorporated into sections III and IV of the Self-Assessment. Eight focus groups were conducted with youth. The majority of these focus groups were held at a statewide summer youth conference where a diverse group of youth were available. Youth Ambassadors, who are youth currently in or formerly in foster care, assisted in the development of youth focus group questions and were then trained to facilitate the focus groups. Staff supported the Youth Ambassadors during the focus groups by recording the feedback. Additional focus groups with youth were conducted during state and regional Youth Advisory Board (YAB) Meetings. PA’s YAB began meeting six years ago to provide ongoing feedback on the effectiveness of services, as well as advocating for systemic improvement through training, legislative, and collaborative efforts.

OCYF also developed a series of surveys for stakeholders. Five surveys were administered through an online data collection tool. Surveys were distributed through various ListServes in an effort to reach as many child welfare stakeholders as possible. The rate of response cannot be determined because the number of stakeholders receiving the survey cannot be determined.

The surveys were targeted to the following groups:

- Advisory boards and advocates (101 responses);
- CCYA administrators (48 responses);
- CCYA caseworkers and supervisors (223 total responses: 136 from caseworkers and 87 from supervisors);
- Resource parents (49 total responses: 2 from kinship caregivers, 3 from PLCs, 21 from foster parents, and 23 from adoptive parents); and
- Private providers (51 total responses: 6 from caseworkers, 12 from supervisors and 33 from administrators).

A sixth survey was administered to 316 respondents to look specifically at the effectiveness of practices, initiatives, and policies. The individuals completing this survey were not asked to identify which group they belonged to and therefore, we are unable to determine how many of each targeted group responded to this survey. The results of the survey are woven into this report by area of content, but can mainly be located in the Systemic Factors section.

Pennsylvania completed the self-assessment in May 2008. The self-assessment can be found at: [www.pacwcbt.pitt.edu/CFSR/PaFinalSelfAssessment5_08.pdf](http://www.pacwcbt.pitt.edu/CFSR/PaFinalSelfAssessment5_08.pdf).
On-Site Review/Final Report

The Pennsylvania onsite review was conducted the week of July 28, 2008. The period under review was from April 1, 2007, to August 1, 2008. The findings were derived from the following documents and data collection procedures:

- The Statewide Assessment, prepared by the Pennsylvania OCYF
- The State Data Profile, prepared by Children’s Bureau, which provides state child welfare data for fiscal year (FY) 2004, FY 2005, and the 12-month CFSR period ending March 31, 2007
- Reviews of 64 cases (39 foster care cases and 25 in-home services cases) at three sites (30 cases in the Philadelphia County office, 17 cases in the Allegheny County office, and 17 cases in the Northumberland County office)
- Interviews or focus groups conducted at all three sites and at the state level with stakeholders including, but not limited to, children, youth, parents, foster and adoptive parents, all levels of CCYA personnel, collaborating CCYA personnel, service providers, court personnel, child advocates, Tribal representatives, and attorneys

The final report can be found at: www.dpw.state.pa.gov/ucmprd/groups/webcontent/documents/report/p_003006.pdf

Program Improvement Plan (PIP):

In preparation for the second round, Pennsylvania evaluated the 2002 Program Improvement Plan (PIP) and the approach that was used during this first round of the CFSR. While Pennsylvania successfully completed its first PIP from round one, many of the findings from round one were the same in round two. While the round one PIP primarily focused on policy development and built an infrastructure for programming, Pennsylvania took a broader approach to addressing the areas of concern in the round two PIP. The plan focused on shifting the evaluation of practice from being compliance driven to focusing on continuous quality improvement through the implementation of established outcome-based indicators to measure progress.

As indicated by the statewide self-assessment and the findings from round two, Pennsylvania’s child welfare system has considerable strengths and has improved in significant ways since the last CFSR review in 2002; from the rapid expansion of county-driven quality improvement efforts to the increase of evidence-based practices and state supported initiatives. Pennsylvania will continue to build upon its strengths, but this improvement plan focused on implementation of change at the local level; an enhanced challenge to a county-administered, state-supervised child welfare system. We also recognized that sustaining positive and lasting change takes time. Therefore, many of the PIP strategies were also carried over into Pennsylvania’s Title IV-B five-year plan so that we remain focused on continuing our efforts and monitoring the impact of these strategies on our outcomes. We worked to develop the PIP and five-year plan.
simultaneously with our stakeholders who were asked to identify strategies and actions steps.

The PIP is highlighted by several themes, which will frame our work as we move forward with implementation. These themes include: Quality Practice, Sustaining Change, Child, Youth and Family Engagement, Collaboration, Enhancing Assessments, and Timely Permanence. Pennsylvania used the seven CFSR outcomes related to Safety, Permanency, and Well-Being, as well as the Systemic Factors to center our strategies and link them to the findings.

The PIP can be found at: www.dpw.state.pa.gov/ucmprd/groups/webcontent/documents/document/p_003004.pdf
The Title IV-B five-year plan can be found at: www.dpw.state.pa.gov/ucmprd/groups/webcontent/documents/report/s_002149.pdf

State: Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI Effort)

Safety Efforts

Safety Assessment and Management Process

The Pennsylvania Safety Assessment and Management Process (SAMP) was developed in collaboration with the Action for Child Protection, Inc., National Resource Center for Child Protective Services (NRCCPS). The process will help move Pennsylvania beyond incident-focused investigations, require greater engagement of all family members, and guide assessment of safety threats and caregiver protective capacities to improve safety planning. This process is grounded in our child welfare values and principles. With the implementation of this new process comes a paradigm shift in safety assessment practice. Some of these paradigm shifts include: a shift from allegation-based investigation/assessment to an information-based, analytical approach; a shift from compliance-based Family Services Plans to change-based, individualized, behavioral-specific plans; and understanding that safety is the responsibility of all staff regardless of their role and function within an agency – that is, safety concepts and practice provide the focus for all interventions.

The purpose of SAMP is to assure that children are protected from harm. Safety assessments, conducted by child welfare professionals, are completed throughout the entire case process beginning with Child Protective Services (CPS) and/or General Protective Services (GPS) investigations/assessments through to case closure. The primary purpose of this process is to ensure that caregivers have the necessary Protective Capacities to protect the children in their care. The implementation of SAMP has been divided into four phases: In-Home Safety Assessments, Out-of-Home Safety Assessments, Congregate Care Assessments and Older Youth Assessments.

In-Home Safety Assessments are currently completed at every contact in conjunction with other assessments, including Risk Assessments. While Risk Assessments focus on
the likelihood (chance, potential, or prospect) of future child maltreatment, In-Home Safety Assessments focus on threats that are occurring now or in the near future. When conducting an In-Home Safety Assessment, child welfare professionals gather information to determine whether or not there are active Present or Impending Danger Safety Threats. Information that is gathered to inform safety threat identification is centralized around six assessment domains: Type of Maltreatment; Nature of Maltreatment – Surrounding Circumstances; Child Functioning; Adult Functioning; General Parenting; and Parenting Discipline. Once threats are identified, child welfare professionals determine what Protective Capacities, which are currently either diminished or absent, need to be enhanced through services (detailed on the Family Service Plan) in order to mitigate the identified Safety Threats. Child welfare professionals then analyze the existing Safety Threats and Protective Capacities to determine the level of intervention needed to control the Safety Threats and to inform the safety decision. There are three safety decisions associated with the In-Home Safety Assessment: Safe, Safe with a Comprehensive Safety Plan and Unsafe. The latter two decisions require the development of a Safety Plan inclusive of specific interventions that are available and immediately accessible to control identified threats. Once a Safety Plan is developed it is necessary to continue to monitor the plan for its effectiveness. When a child is determined to be unsafe in their own home, child welfare professionals are required to petition the court for custody and placement in an out-of-home setting.

The Out-of-Home Care Safety Assessment and Management Process was developed by the Out-of-Home Care Committee, a partnership between county caseworkers and supervisors, staff from OCYF and the Resource Center, private provider representatives, and Action for Child Protection, Inc. NRCCPS. The process was piloted. After pilot revisions were made, county staff were trained on the process. However, at this time, the implementation of the Out-of-Home Care Safety and Assessment Management Process has been extended to allow OCYF, PCYA, and other stakeholders the opportunity to assure the process best meets the needs of counties to assure the safety of children and youth in out-of-home care.

Even though a child is placed in an out-of-home setting, it is still necessary for child welfare professionals to complete In-Home Safety Assessments. These are completed as if the child was in the home to determine if the conditions that caused the Safety Threats are still active or if enough change has occurred (e.g. enhanced Protective Capacities) to eliminate the Safety Threat or to allow for an in-home Safety Plan. SAMP reinforces the practice of planned reunification. This practice includes engaging the in-home caregivers to understand what needs to happen to have their children returned home and then to identify supports and/or safety actions that could be put in place to help caregiver’s and children once they are returned home. Emphasis on planned reunification should lower the number of children who re-enter care since the underlying causes of the Safety Threats have been addressed.

The final two phases of the implementation of SAMP relate to assessing children and youth in congregate care settings and assessing the safety of older youth. Prior to
implementation of these types of assessments, consultation from Action for Child Protection, Inc. NRCCPS and the NRC for Youth Development will take place to determine the best methods for conducting these types of assessments. It is logical that the framework identified in both the In-Home and Out-of-Home Care Safety Assessments (information gathering, assessment, analysis, decision-making and planning) will also apply to congregate care and older youth safety assessments, but during PIP implementation, the strategies pertaining to assessment of children/youth in congregate care and assessment of safety for older youth will include technical assistance consultation to gather recommendations.

Each phase of SAMP is reliant on good social work practice and is congruent with family-centered and strength-based, solution-focused practice. Child welfare professionals need to be able to engage family members and supports, and other systems and community partners. Supervisors play a vital role in SAMP, as they play a critical role in ensuring that enough information is gathered, regardless of the type of assessment, to make informed decisions about child safety, the need for placement, and to determine if a child can be reunified. Supervisors also play a vital role in ensuring that the necessary protective capacities and any moderate or high risk factors are addressed in the Family Service Plan and/or Child’s Permanency Plan. This oversight works to guide reunification efforts and other casework decisions. In addition, the supervisor helps to clarify for the worker the policies, procedures, and related intervals provided by OCYF for each component of SAMP. Supervisory support sessions will be held regionally to support supervisors and their workers in the implementation of SAMP, including technical assistance surrounding practice examples shared by supervisors. In conclusion, it is important to reiterate that PA’s SAMP will have a direct correlation to improving our safety outcomes; furthermore, it is believed that SAMP will impact Well-Being outcomes as well, as this practice includes the utilization of engagement strategies, enhanced assessments that focus on reported allegations as well as underlying issues, the caregiver’s protective capacities and the safety analysis which leads to a safety decision and ultimately connects to effective service planning and appropriate service interventions to mitigate safety threats.

Due to the implementation of the new SAMP, Pennsylvania plans to conduct further research and evaluation to examine the relationship between the current Risk Assessment and the SAMP. We are committed to doing an independent review of the application of SAMP to identify strengths, as well as any gaps in the practice of assessing the child’s safety (including the information gathering, assessment, analysis, decision making, and/or planning) so that Pennsylvania can strengthen the quality of the Safety Assessment and Management Process. This independent review may take a closer look at the Risk Assessment process and examine how to best continue to assess risk in conjunction with the Safety Assessment and Management Process.

**GPS Response Times**

OCYF convened a workgroup of county agency and OCYF staff to develop a statewide policy related to response times for general protective service cases. The workgroup
convened on July 19, 2011 and worked diligently to develop the statewide policy contained in OCYF Bulletin 3490-12-01 entitled Statewide General Protective Services (GPS) Response Times. This OCYF Bulletin was issued in April 2012. The purpose of this bulletin is to establish a statewide policy regarding response times for reports made to county agencies that are designated as General Protective Services (GPS) reports.

The development of these response times came from the 2008 Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) due to the timeliness of initiating investigations of reports of child maltreatment being identified as an area needing improvement within Pennsylvania. Please note that the effective date of the bulletin and full implementation of the response times is July 1, 2012.

The Child Welfare Resource Center, with the assistance of the GPS Response Times Workgroup, created a web-based training for county staff to take in order to begin implementation of the intervals July 1, 2012.

**Permanency Efforts**

*National Governor's Association (NGA)*

In 2008, Pennsylvania was selected by the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices (NGA) with five other states – Arkansas, Florida, Ohio, Oregon, and South Carolina – to participate in a policy academy to safely reduce the number of children in foster care. The academy is being conducted in partnership with Casey Family Programs, a Seattle-based foundation committed to safely reducing nationwide, the number of children in foster care by 50 percent by the year 2020.

Recognizing the intricacies of being a state-supervised/county-administered child welfare system and the diversity within the Commonwealth, Pennsylvania realized that to reach this goal of reducing safely the numbers of children and youth in out of home placement by 20% by the end of 2010, OCYF had to prioritize the work with 16 participating counties to ensure they meet their targeted placement reduction goals. The 16 counties are: Erie, McKean, Allegheny, Philadelphia, Bucks, Montgomery, Clarion, Clinton, Lawrence, Dauphin, York, Luzerne, Lehigh, Lancaster, Schuylkill, and Northampton. These 16 counties were chosen for many reasons, including a large population of children in out of home care, and use of effective practices that could be modeled in other counties.

Each NGA county had met regularly to develop both internal and external community teams that helped to create their county-specific placement reduction plan and strategies, and participating in placement reviews of individual dependency and delinquency cases to identify trends and barriers, to better plan for local placement reduction efforts. Each NGA team had been led by Commonwealth child welfare and juvenile justice staff, with assistance from other CCYA administrators, who help to mentor the NGA counties. Each team also had access to intensive TA from the Commonwealth offices for education, mental health, drug and alcohol, as well as from
Child Welfare Resource Center staff, other CCYAs, Juvenile Probation Offices (JPO), and others as needed. This collaborative network of teams supports the NGA goals and outcomes.

Pennsylvania’s NGA work is not a single, standalone initiative, but rather is directly linked to Pennsylvania’s integrated, outcomes-based strategic plan. Pennsylvania has continued these efforts in a variety of locations even after the NGA expires. Pennsylvania’s NGA work exemplifies the practice principles for collaboration, which include the following:

- We believe children, youth, and families are best served by agencies working together to provide a single, coordinated delivery system;
- We believe children, youth, and families are best served by agencies that create partnerships to guarantee the best possible, and most effective, services to achieve optimal outcomes; and
- We believe children, youth, and families are best served by a system that demonstrates a commitment to teamwork through inclusion and meaningful collaboration.

**American Bar Association’s (ABA) PA Barriers to Permanency Project**

In 2003, Pennsylvania contracted with the ABA to conduct the Pennsylvania Permanency Barriers Project (Project) based on the highly successful New York model. This project undertakes five major tasks in the counties:

1. Identifying and analyzing delays - Through case reviews and interviews with stakeholders, the Project identifies and examines each step in the life of a case and analyzes possible causes for delay.

2. Interactively developing recommendations and implementing reforms - Once problems are identified, a local multidisciplinary advisory board meets regularly to examine the delays and propose potential reforms. Project staff design action plans and help the CCYA start making recommended changes. Everyone in the system must work together to get changes and reforms accepted in the field.

3. Establishing written protocols, procedures, and providing multidisciplinary training - These typically include topics such as:
   - Identifying, locating, and providing outreach to missing parents and relatives;
   - Addressing increases in adolescent population;
   - Preparing written procedures;
   - Front-loading services;
   - Implementing concurrent planning; and
   - Decreasing delays in court procedures.
4. Monitoring reforms and changes - Change is difficult for large systems. Making sure that proposed reforms are actually implemented is crucial. Project staff works with counties to ensure progress and address any resistance.

5. Sharing Project results - The Project helps develop an informal county network to share common challenges, solutions, and other actions throughout the state. Sharing results by telling advocates, affiliated professionals, and the larger community what the Project is doing is another key component of success.

This award-winning Project helps children move through the foster care system into permanency and helps states save foster care dollars. Children in foster care need permanency quickly and safely. Children deserve to go home when it's safe -- but if they can't, then they must be provided with the most permanent home that meets their needs. The ABA Permanency Barriers Project is helping states do this for their children. In New York and Pennsylvania, the Project cut about 12 months from a child's stay in foster care and saved over $18 million dollars.

The county's Juvenile Court Judge, Child Welfare Administrator, and Child Welfare Agency Solicitor must all agree to participate in the Project. An ABA Attorney will be assigned to work with the CCYA and will visit on a monthly basis for a two year period.

Counties interested in learning more about the Barriers to Permanency Project can contact Anne Marie Lancour at 202-662-1756 or AnneMarie.Lancour@americanbar.org.

Administrative Office of the Pennsylvania Court's (AOPC) Permanency Practice Initiative

The Pennsylvania Permanency Practice Initiative (PPI) began with the implementation of Phase One in March 2009. Components of PPI, which are strategies meant to improve timely permanence and reduce re-entry, include: Three month court reviews, Children’s Roundtables (local leadership and oversight team), Common Pleas Case Management System Dependency Module, Family Finding, Family Group Decision Making, and Family Development Credentialing. PPI county staff, including the Dependency Court Judge and Child Welfare Administrator, is required to receive training in all practice areas of the initiative to better understand and in so doing, better lead local reform.

- Phase Two counties include: Forest, Warren, Armstrong, Cumberland, Adams, Indiana, Franklin, Fulton, Tioga, Bucks, Luzerne, and Montgomery.
- Phase Three counties include: Philadelphia, Beaver, Fayette, Union, and Lycoming.
- Phase Four counties include: Columbia, Monroe, Montour, and Westmoreland.
Family Finding

The Pennsylvania Child Welfare Resource Center (in conjunction with the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts (AOPC) and OCYF developed a training series based largely on the Family Finding training delivered by the creator of the Family Finding model: Kevin Campbell (Seneca Center). The full Family Finding curriculum is 24 hours in length and is comprised of four separate parts described in the next paragraph. The series was piloted in the central and western regions of Pennsylvania. Kevin Campbell attended days one and two of the central region training and provided feedback. Revisions to the curriculum were made at various points based on the feedback offered by participants at both pilots. A two-day Training on Content (TOC) was held on October 27-28, 2010 with prospective Family Finding trainers approved by key stakeholders.

Although days one and two are offered as one curriculum, it is truly comprised of two separate parts. Day one is an overview of Pennsylvania’s interpretation of Kevin Campbell’s Family Finding model. Day two reveals information and practice associated with steps one and two of the Family Finding model: respectively Discovery and Engagement. Day three offers information and consultation associated with step three of the model: Planning. Day four offers information and consultation associated with step four of the model: Decision Making. Day five offers information and consultation associated with step five of the model: Evaluation. Finally, day six offers information and consultation associated with step six of the model: Follow up on Supports. The full Family Finding curriculum is available on the Resource Center’s website at: www.pacwcbt.pitt.edu/Curriculum/207FamilyFindingSeries.htm.

OCYF, as well as AOPC (through its Permanency Practice Initiative (PPI)) continue to support the implementation of Family Finding to locate kin/non-kin resources for children and youth.

Concurrent Planning

Concurrent planning is the process of working towards one legal permanency goal (typically reunification) while at the same time establishing and implementing an alternative permanency goal and plan that are worked on concurrently to move children/youth more quickly to a safe and stable permanent family. (Permanency Roundtable Project, 2010). This process involves concurrent rather than sequential permanency planning efforts. It involves a mix of meaningful family engagement, targeted case practice, and legal strategies aimed at achieving timely permanency, while at the same time establishing and actively working a concurrent permanency plan in case the primary goal cannot be accomplished in a timely manner. It is not a fast track to adoption, but to permanency (http://www.nrcpfc.org/cpt/overview.htm).

OCYF issued a Concurrent Planning bulletin in May 2012 that outlines the implementation guidance and the eight core components of concurrent planning.
agencies need assistance with concurrent planning implementation, they should contact their regional office.

**Well-Being Efforts**

**Quality Visitation**

The Child & Family Services Improvement Act of 2006 (CFSIA) addressed findings from the first round of CFSRs. Data collected demonstrated “a strong correlation between frequent caseworker visits with children and positive outcomes for these children, such as timely adherence to permanency and other indicators of child well-being”. To support monthly caseworker visits with every child in foster care, 55 million federal dollars were authorized to be spent during 2007-2012. Funding is to be targeted toward caseworker retention and recruitment issues, as well as access to mobile technology.

Pennsylvania used a portion of this funding to develop a field guide for caseworkers to use when conducting monthly visits with children in foster care settings. The concept of the *Field Guide for the Practice of Quality Visitation with Children and Families* originated from recommendations made by a workgroup of key stakeholders, including youth and public and private child welfare workers and supervisors. The intent is to ingrain the practice of quality visitation into all aspects of child welfare practice, including children in foster care. The field guide will be rolled out in conjunction with the Out-of-Home Safety Assessment. For more detailed information on the *Field Guide for the Practice of Quality Visitation with Children and Families*, refer to pp. 32-35.

The funding was also used to increase caseworker’s access to mobile technology. The Office of Children Youth and Families (OCYF) partnered with the University of Pittsburgh’s School of Social Work, Child Welfare Research and Education Programs to conduct research on the use of technology.

The research study entitled “Use of Mobile Technology in Caseworker Visits to Children in Federally Defined Foster Care” began in 2009 and is designed to examine two different questions:

- What are the current visitation practices in Pennsylvania?
- Does the use of technology in the field impact caseworker visitation practices related to engagement, job satisfaction, and a sense of professionalism?

Four hundred computer tablets were distributed to thirty-two counties across the Commonwealth. Training was conducted on use of the tablets and engagement strategies. In 2011, additional technology is being purchased including; speech recognition upgrades, tablets, headsets, and mobile printers. Pennsylvania will continue efforts to improve the quality and frequency of visitation in 2012, which is the last year of federal funding.
**Educational Screening Tool**

The 2008 CFSR conducted in Pennsylvania revealed that while Pennsylvania did well in assessing children’s educational needs, an area that needed improvement was assuring that appropriate services were provided or arranged. As a result, Pennsylvania developed a screening instrument that not only assists child welfare professionals in assessing whether the educational needs of children actively involved in child welfare system are being met, but also offers guidance to assist child welfare professionals in their efforts to ensure that appropriate services are provided or arranged. The Educational Screening Tool has been revised to streamline the areas to be addressed, as well as being written in strength-based language. The accompanying Manual is also being revised and once finalized, will be rolled out within counties. Final decisions regarding roll-out and implementation are pending.

**Systemic Factors Efforts**

**Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI Effort)**

Implementing change at the local level is critical to the achievement of positive child, youth and family outcomes, particularly in a state-supervised and county-administered state. A well-developed Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) process will be a vehicle to drive change forward in Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania's Continuous Quality Improvement effort is not a time limited project or initiative.

Casey Family Programs and the National Resource Center for Organizational Improvement define continuous quality improvement as the complete process of identifying, describing, and analyzing strengths and problems and then testing, implementing, learning from, and revising solutions. It relies on an organizational culture that is proactive and supports continuous learning. CQI is firmly grounded in the overall mission, vision, and values of the CCYA. Perhaps most importantly, it is dependent upon the active inclusion and participation of staff at all levels of the CCYA, children, youth, families, and stakeholders throughout the process.

Pennsylvania’s CQI approach is therefore not another new initiative, but an effort to reshape the system at the local and state level to support the achievement of positive outcomes for our children, youth, and families. We believe that the CQI process that has been developed in Pennsylvania will support staff in improving their practice which will ultimately lead to healthy children, youth, and families.

The Quality Service Review (QSR) is one critical component of the CQI process that will be used to assess and monitor progress. The Quality Service Review (QSR) Protocol uses an in-depth case review method and practice appraisal process to find out how children, youth, and families are benefiting from services received and how well locally
coordinated services are working for children, youth, and families. The QSR serves as a measure of Pennsylvania’s Practice Model and standards for child welfare practice. The QSR provides a basis for promoting and strengthening best practice. The QSR Protocol for Examination of Family-Centered Services for Children, Youth, and Families contains qualitative indicators that measure: The current status of the focus child/youth and the child/youth’s parents and/or caregivers, and the quality and consistency of core practice principles. QSR findings are used for providing safe, positive feedback to frontline staff, supervisors, and program managers. To be effective, the QSR process should not use the QSR Protocol for the purpose of compliance enforcement, but rather, the QSR Protocol should be used to evaluate case-specific outcomes and practice performance. Feedback from that case-specific review should stimulate and support practice development and capacity-building efforts leading to better practice and results for children, youth, and families receiving services. Pennsylvania’s CQI process is foundationally based on our practice model and standards which define quality practice.

Defining quality practice is a key component in shifting Pennsylvania’s quality improvement efforts away from compliance based requirements. We have learned that if quality practice isn’t defined, it is too easy to fall back into a compliance based way of evaluating practice. Furthermore, we have learned that “true CQI goes beyond basic compliance and focuses on continuous learning about practice and outcomes” (Casey Family Programs, 2005). For quality practice to be internalized and exhibited at the local level, organizations will need to create an environment in which quality practice is supported. All organizational levels within the Child Welfare System, including state, county, and private providers, will need to be committed to improving outcomes for children, youth and families and we must create a system to support this work.

Pennsylvania’s efforts to implement a statewide CQI process represents a multi-year effort that is reflected in both the two year PIP and the five year IV-B plan. The development of a coherent, effective CQI process at the state and local level began with the Sustaining Change Workgroup who consulted with key state stakeholders and received technical assistance and support from the Child Welfare Policy and Practice Group (CWPPG), Human Systems and Outcomes (HSO), the American Public Human Services Association (APHSA), and Casey Family Programs to aid in the development of the CQI process, QSR tool, and how best to implement Pennsylvania’s practice model.

Full implementation of CQI will be conducted utilizing a phased-in approach across the Commonwealth over multiple years and implementation began in October 2010. Implementation will be individualized for each county in collaboration with the regional OCYF staff and technical assistance providers/collaborators that support the county. As each CCYA joins the CQI effort, they participate in a state-supported QSR. During Phase I, there were six counties that joined the CQI effort. Those counties included:
Allegheny, Butler, Lackawanna, Philadelphia, Venango, and York. During Phase II, there were five counties that joined the CQI effort. Those counties included: Beaver, Dauphin, Lebanon, Washington, and Wyoming. We are currently in Phase III of the CQI effort. The counties that have joined the CQI effort include: Clarion, Crawford, Erie, Luzerne, Montgomery, Schuylkill, and Snyder. Once involved in the CQI effort, each CCYA determines their frequency of participation in state-supported QSRs. State-supported QSRs must occur at least every 3 years, but cannot occur more than once every year.

**Technical Assistance (TA) Collaborative**

On July 27, 2010, a group of technical assistance (TA) providers from the American Bar Association, the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts, the Pennsylvania Child Welfare Resource Center, Hornby Zeller Associates, Inc, the Juvenile Court Judges Commission, OCYF, the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency, and the Statewide Adoption and Permanency Network convened to establish a forum of collaborative partners within the child welfare community. During that meeting, participants shared information regarding their respective roles and responsibilities. OCYF provided a brief overview for a vision for a cohesive group of TA providers, working in conjunction with child welfare agencies, to improve outcomes for the children, youth, and families in Pennsylvania.

A TA Collaborative Steering Committee was chartered to: develop a cohesive group of Technical Assistance providers who work in collaboration with CCYAs to enhance the quality of child welfare services and improve outcomes for children, youth, and families, and improve communication, increase knowledge level, and enhance coordination of TA and other support services provided to CCYAs. PCYA and representatives from CCYAs and JPO also joined the TA Collaborative Steering Committee.

Leadership from multiple technical assistance agencies meet regularly to improve communication and coordination of efforts to better serve CCYAs. Their aim is to support counties in a way that is most helpful to them.
Overview of DAPIM™

DAPIM™ is the framework that Pennsylvania uses to drive change at the local level. American Public Human Services Association (APHSA) developed the DAPIM™ framework. It is built on years of experience using the Organizational Effectiveness (OE) approach in their work. Since 2004, APHSA has developed Organizational Effectiveness (OE) models and tools and to support organizations in building OE capacity. In 2009, the APHSA OE Department compiled the models and tools into the OE Handbook that uses DAPIM™ as the primary APHSA OE model.

The overarching purpose of the OE Handbook is to serve as a resource for organizations who are making continuous improvement a way of doing business. APHSA has defined OE as a systemic and systematic approach to continuously improving an organization’s performance, performance capacity, and client outcomes. “Systemic” refers to taking into account an entire system, or in the case of OE an entire organization; “systematic” refers to taking a step-by-step approach. In simple terms, therefore, OE is a step-by-step approach to continuously improving an entire organization. The DAPIM™ model, visually depicted on the next page is the primary vehicle to effect positive change at the local level.
DAPIM™ enables real life work teams to drive continuous improvement. The approach involves defining what the organization wants to improve; assessing strengths and gaps in performance capacity, performance actions, outputs, and outcomes; prioritizing gaps and identifying root causes and remedies to close gaps; planning for remedies includes identifying quick wins, and medium and longer term improvements that leverage strengths and address root causes for gaps; implementing plans for maximum impact and sustainability; and, monitoring progress, impact, and lessons learned to sustain follow-through and continuous improvement.

Defining what a system seeks to improve in operational terms means engaging key stakeholders in discussion to strategically identify specific and meaningful issues that system partners are interested in improving. Once those issues are defined, the system then proceeds in assessing the current and desired state or situation. This model requires the system to engage in thoughtful discussion about the current strengths and gaps the system has in order to reach the desired state. The locally driven assessment process will therefore, be an inclusive process, as we have learned that the achievement of positive outcomes will only be realized when the full resources of a community is garnered. Through formal and informal means, the Commonwealth will support the counties’ ability to utilize existing data and other forms of assessment. This model does not require the creation of additional assessments for counties, but rather streamlines existing forms of assessment that will better inform strategic decision-making.
making and planning. Our CQI process will be strengthened by applying concepts outlined in APHSA’s DAPIM™ model.

The assessment process will lead to the planning process, which also will be an inclusive process, culminating in the completion of each county children and youth agency’s (CCYA) County Improvement Plan (CIP), which will drive the Needs Based Plan and Budget (NBPB). The counties will be developing their own improvement plan based on mutually identified needs of the CCYA, community, and system partners by engaging in a discussion to explore the root causes and possible remedies for the identified gaps. The discussion should lead to the development of commitments and plans that result in the desired improvements to address both rapid and long-term progress.

Successful implementation of these plans will require the CCYA to engage key internal and external stakeholders who will actively support the implementation of both quick win action steps, as well as the long term plans. Internal strategies will focus on enhancing overall quality assurance while emphasizing the role of the child welfare supervisor in improving outcomes. Externally, the counties will be supported during the implementation of their plan(s) through coordinated efforts of all those external entities providing technical assistance to the CCYA. Work within the Sustaining Change Workgroup has already begun to better define how these technical assistance efforts can become more coordinated and there will continue to be state and local strategic planning sessions surrounding enhancing the coordination of these efforts.

Monitoring plan progress for accountability and on-going adjustments assists the CCYA in determining the impact of the improvement effort. Re-adjustments of action steps and plans also can be developed as needed. During this phase, the CCYA will engage in monitoring activities that allow for evaluation and measurement of progress and impact. The evaluative process will be driven by both internal and external quality reviews. Externally, a Pennsylvania-specific Quality Service Review (QSR) tool will be utilized to drive the evaluative process. Information gathered from the QSR process will include data that will then be applied to improve case specific outcomes while also providing data about agencies systemic issues. The external evaluative processes will validate and complement the internal quality improvement efforts. Internal quality improvement efforts will focus on integrating the evaluative results into daily practice in addition to building capacity to self-evaluate. This improved structure and format will enhance the CCYA’s ability to support and manage systemic change resulting from the locally driven CQI processes.

Self-Assessment

Casey Family Programs and the National Resource Center for Organizational Improvement define continuous quality improvement as the complete process of identifying, describing, and analyzing strengths and problems and then testing, implementing, learning from, and revising solutions. It relies on an organizational culture that is proactive and supports continuous learning. CQI is firmly grounded in the overall mission, vision, and values of the CCYA. Perhaps most importantly, it is dependent
upon the active inclusion and participation of staff at all levels of the CCYA, children, youth, families, and stakeholders throughout the process. (The National Resource Center for Organizational Improvement, 2005).

Pennsylvania is in the process of enhancing the child welfare system to assure that all organizational components of the state, CCYAs, private children and youth agencies and technical assistance communities are committed and able to effectively improve outcomes for children, youth, and families. Implementing change at the local level is critical to the achievement of positive outcomes and the success of this effort, especially in a state-supervised and county-administered system.

For quality practice to be integrated, internalized, and exhibited fully, organizations must create an environment that supports quality practice. Counties will complete a self-assessment of organizational readiness to support their thoughtful participation in Pennsylvania’s Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) effort. In partnership, the following will be explored:

- The CCYA’s understanding of the process and identification of resources already in place in the county to support the effort; and
- The identification of resources that will be needed by the CCYA to support the effort.

Consequently, each CCYA is being asked to take a systemic (i.e. taking into account the entire system) and systematic (i.e. step-by-step) approach to assessing organizational readiness in preparation for the CCYA’s participation in the statewide CQI effort.

**Onsite Quality Service Review (QSR)**

The onsite QSR is the review of randomly selected case records that includes interviews with involved parties, case ratings based on findings, recommendations to the CCYA, exit interviews, and debriefing sessions with CCYA staff. The QSR Protocol uses an in-depth case review method and practice appraisal process to determine to what extent children, youth, and families are benefiting from services received and how well locally coordinated services are working for children, youth, and families. The QSR uses a combination of record reviews, interviews, observations, and deductions made from fact patterns gathered and interpreted by trained reviewers regarding children, youth, and families receiving services. The QSR Protocol contains qualitative indicators that measure the current status of the focus child/youth and the child/youth’s parents and/or caregivers. In a sense, the measures of current status may be used to reveal outcomes achieved thus far in the life of the case. The QSR Protocol provides a set of qualitative indicators for measuring the quality and consistency of core practice functions used in the case. The QSR serves as a measure of Pennsylvania’s Practice Model and standards for child welfare practice.
The status indicators measure the extent to which certain desired conditions relevant to safety, permanence, and well-being are present in the life of the child/youth and the parents/caregivers. Changes in status over time may be considered the near-term outcomes at a given point in the life of a case. In measuring child/youth and family status, the QSR typically focuses on the most recent 30 days. Practice indicators, on the other hand, measure the extent to which core practice functions associated with recognized best practice guidelines are applied successfully by members of the team serving the family and child/youth. Regardless of any change or lack of change in the status of the cases examined, these indicators identify the quality of the work being done within the 90 days immediately prior to the review (there are a few exceptions to these timeframes which are specified within the QSR Protocol). The QSR Protocol uses a rating scale of 1 to 6 for each indicator, regardless of type. A rating of 1 or 2 indicates that improvement is needed, a rating of 3 or 4 indicates refinement is needed and a rating of 5 of 6 indicates the current status or level of performance should be maintained. In addition, the percentages of cases rated as “acceptable” and “unacceptable” is calculated for each indicator, with scores between 4 and 6 representing the “acceptable” range. More detailed information on the QSR methodology, including sampling, definitions of indicators and scoring, may be found in the QSR Protocol and Manual.

Final Report

The QSR Final Report provides the finalized quantitative data collected during the week(s) of the onsite QSR, as well as relevant data from other sources. This report includes demographic information and the final indicator scores for the Child/Youth and Family Status Indicators, as well as the Practice Performance Indicators. The QSR Final Report acts as a springboard for the Continuing Quality Improvement (CQI) process.

Full implementation of the CQI effort across the Commonwealth represents a multi-year effort that will be conducted in a phased-in approach. As each CCYA joins the CQI effort, they participate in a state-supported QSR. During Phase I, there were six counties that joined the CQI effort. Those counties included: Allegheny, Butler, Lackawanna, Philadelphia, Venango, and York. During Phase II, there were five counties that joined the CQI effort. Those counties included: Beaver, Dauphin, Lebanon, Washington, and Wyoming. We are currently in Phase III of the CQI effort. The counties that have joined the CQI effort include: Clarion, Crawford, Erie, Luzerne, Montgomery, Schuylkill, and Snyder. Once involved in the CQI effort, each CCYA determines their frequency of participation in state-supported QSRs. However, state-supported QSRs must occur at least every 3 years, but cannot occur more than once every year.

Next Steps Meeting

The Next Steps Meeting is designed to be an opportunity for the CCYA’s efforts to begin/continue their CQI process by developing an action plan for enhancing case practice and system performance. The Next Steps Meeting is the kickoff to the development of the County Improvement Plan.
County Improvement Plan

The development of the County Improvement Plan (CIP) should occur utilizing the DAPIM™ framework to help identify the strategies and action steps that a CCYA wants to address within the CIP to help improve their priority outcomes. The CIP outlines the priorities the CCYA chooses to focus on to improve specific outcomes as a result of a comprehensive review of their practice. This review is not limited to the QSR findings, and may also include a review of additional data such as the CCYA data packages, quantitative measures produced. Once the CIP is accepted, the following documents will be posted to the Pennsylvania DPW’s website:

- CCYA’s QSR Final Report
- CIP

To see examples of a CCYA’s final report and County Improvement Plan, click here. Then go to the Service Code drop down box and click on "County Children and Youth Agencies." Then go to the County drop down box and click on the name of the county that you are searching for Click on the button that says, Submit Search. Under the Status and License column, click on "Quality Service Review"

Continuous improvement efforts rely heavily on strong internal sponsorship to become a way of doing business. Counties should consider the establishment of Sponsor Team and Continuous Improvement Teams if such groups do not already exist.

- Executive teams often become “Sponsor Teams,” who are accountable for defining the high level vision of continuous improvement efforts and securing resources required for success.

- Continuous Improvement Team(s) is/are the coach and guide of continuous improvement. Members of this team set the direction for and guide continuous improvement work day-to-day. This team has hands-on responsibility for the improvement efforts and maintains ongoing responsibility for monitoring the continuous improvement efforts.

Best Practice

Pennsylvania has strived to improve safety, permanency, and well-being of children by providing guidance and resources. Pennsylvania continues to work toward evidenced-based practice through the Needs-Based Plan and Budget process.

To assist Pennsylvania in understanding how to identify and implement evidence-based practices, OCYF has received consultation from the Child Welfare League of America
(CWLA). The following information has been provided by the CWLA to assist you in identifying and implementing evidence-based practices for your CCYA.

**Distinguishing Evidence-Based Practices from Evidence-Based Practice**

Evidence-based practices are broadly defined simply as practices having some level of empirical support for their effectiveness. That is, the practices have been tested and considered effective based on an objective standard. The term is used in the medical field where research designs are typically quite rigorous and involve a number of replications. Rigorous research designs are more likely to rule out explanations for effects other than the variable that is being tested.

Research in child welfare and human services settings do not typically approach the standard achieved in medical research. While increasingly better designs in child welfare occur today, much of the research in the social work field leaves many questions unanswered. Child welfare research is typically “correlation research” which informs practitioners about the degree and way in which factors are associated with one another. While these findings cannot inform practitioners whether certain factors or activities cause a particular outcome, they do provide important information to guide both practice and further research.

Evidence-based practice, as a way of approaching work in child welfare, implies more, however, than just using practices having some demonstrated effectiveness. It includes posing thoughtful questions about the needs of service recipients, involving them in the planning of interventions and monitoring of progress, conducting ongoing evaluation, revising practices as indicated by evaluation, and adding to the knowledge base. Resources for more information and clarification regarding Evidence-Based Practice include the following:

- The California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse for Child Welfare (CEBC) provides up-to-date information on evidence-based child welfare practices.

**Promising Practices/Programs**

“Promising” in relation to evidence-based practices, is the term often applied to practices or program models that appear to have positive effects, but for which research is preliminary. Findings usually rest on only one or a few studies that used a weak design, a small sample size, or had other limitations. Positive findings from such studies provide a basis for using a practice while continuing to test it to better understand whether, with whom, and under what conditions it is effective.

Some research centers have developed specific criteria for practices and programs that they consider “promising” to distinguish them from those that are better defined and more rigorously tested. Two examples of criteria for making this distinction may be found on RAND Corporation’s Promising Practices Network website and on the Blueprints for Violence Prevention website.
**Blueprint Practices/Programs**

The term Blueprint, as applied to human services practice models, refers to programs that have been found to be effective based on very rigorous research criteria including random assignment to treatment and control groups, large sample sizes, strict adherence to program design, and replication.

The term is drawn from the Blueprints for Violence Prevention project at the University of Colorado’s Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence. The Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency was one of the original supporters of this project, which was later funded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. The project identified violence prevention programs having very strong empirical support of their effectiveness. The eleven programs that have been selected as models are called *Blueprints*. The term *promising* is applied to other reviewed programs that appear to be effective, but do not meet these more stringent research criteria.

More about the Blueprints project, the model and promising programs it has identified may be learned by visiting the website at [http://www.colorado.edu/cspv/blueprints/](http://www.colorado.edu/cspv/blueprints/).
Budgeting and Fiscal

Funding Your CCYA

CCYA funding comes from a complicated combination of federal, state, and local tax dollars. The expenses of the county children and youth agency (CCYA) are paid for by the county and then reimbursed by the federal and state governments, assuming the expense is eligible for federal and state reimbursement, once a net expense has been established. The net expense is calculated by applying program income, which are primarily child support payments paid by the parents of those children placed outside of the home (if the Court determines that the parents are able to pay a share of the placement costs) and social security benefits (SSI, SSD or SS Survivor) received on behalf of a child in care, to the entire expense. The net expense is then reimbursed by federal revenue first (if possible), and then state and local dollars are used to offset the remaining costs. The state share of allowable costs are established in §3140.22 of the Title 55 PA Code. For example, for every dollar spent by the county on child protective services after other funding sources are used, the state will reimburse the county eighty cents of every net county dollar, if the services delivered comply with applicable laws, policies, and regulations. The budget for CCYAs is developed through the Needs-Based Plan and Budget Process (NBPB). State funding is limited to the county’s state allocation determined through the NBPB process.

CCYA requests federal and state funding through the Needs-Based Plan and Budget (NBPB) process. This process integrates the analysis of service trends and outcomes with planning and budgeting in each county. CCYA and Juvenile Probation Offices (JPO) must analyze their Adoption and Foster Care Analysis and Reporting System (AFCARS) and other data, identify program trends and relevant reasons for those trends, propose program changes, and submit a budget request that includes relevant justification for any increases or new expenditures.

The NBPB process covers three fiscal years: the fiscal year that is ending (“actual year”), the fiscal year currently being implemented (“implementation year”), and the fiscal year being planned (“NBPB year”). Fiscal years run July 1 through June 30. The NBPB process officially begins in the spring of each year (the end of the “actual” year). CCYA begins revising their “implementation” year budget (which was submitted to the state the previous August) once they receive their tentative allocations (reimbursement limits) from the Department. Simultaneously, the CCYA begins analyzing service needs and expenditures as they plan for the “NBPB” year. The NBPB process results in the development of a plan for the CCYA that proposes the services to be delivered and the funds needed to provide services and to improve outcomes for children and families in the county. This plan is submitted to the state for approval in August of each year. These NBPB requests are analyzed by the OCYF’s regional offices and reviewed by the OCYF Bureau Director and Deputy Secretary.
After the OCYF certifies an amount that they determine is the CCYA's justified need, this amount is forwarded to the Governor and to the legislature as they put together the statewide budget packages. Once the final budget is signed, allocations are given to the CCYAs and their service and spending plans are modified accordingly. The agencies have the right to appeal the certified amounts set by OCYF. The final recommendations comprise the OCYF budget for each CCYA.

The following chart is designed to assist you in understanding the multiple tasks taking place each month with regard to the yearly fiscal planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>State Budget Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Beginning of 3rd Quarter for the current fiscal year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Governor presents upcoming fiscal year budget to Legislatures including the CCYAs certified services and recommended allocations from the CCYAs submission from the previous August. These certified services and recommended allocations are provided to the CCYAs in a tentative allocation letter for the coming fiscal year starting July 1st.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>DPW issues plan and budget guidelines to counties for the following year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Beginning of 4th Quarter current fiscal year, CCYAs begin formal planning of changes to plan and budget to be implemented July 1 and forecasting needs for the following fiscal year being planned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Planning continues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Planning continues for Implementation Year starting July 1st and the year starting in 13 months, Legislature approves state budget effective next month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Beginning of new fiscal year, July 1st. Final allocations for fiscal year beginning July 1 received from DPW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Submit amended budget to DPW for previous fiscal year that ended June 30th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Beginning of 2nd quarter of current fiscal year, make modifications as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Budgets approved by DPW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>DPW forwards budget amounts for fiscal year being planned to Governor’s Budget Office for integration into State budget.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COLLABORATION WITH PARTNERS

New administrators will want to become familiar with the many community partners with whom they will need to collaborate as they begin to plan their leadership of their CCYA. Near the end of fiscal year 2004, DPW instructed the offices of Children and Youth Services, Juvenile Probation, Mental Health/Mental Retardation, and Drug and Alcohol to develop a plan to pool county resources to assure a more efficient service delivery system for children and families. The vision was a combined and coordinated service delivery system for children and families within the existing categorical funding and mandates. To that end, each county is required to submit an Integrated Children’s Services Plan (ICSP) which includes the following components: an executive summary, a vision statement, identification of planning participants, success and failures in coordination and integration of services across categorical, organizational charts and inventory of service providers by service type, and a work plan for further coordination and integration. Some of these elements were previously included in the Children and Youth and Juvenile Probation budget submission and were moved to the ICSP. The process requires collaboration of all county departments and inclusion of other county and private partners: county commissioners, the courts, contracted providers, clients, (children, youth, and families) resource parents and schools.

Below is some general information about a few of the community service providers. Your regional DPW office and PCYA also can assist you in learning more about these services.

County Commissioners

Children and Youth Service agencies must develop and maintain partnerships with many entities. One partner—the County Board of Commissioners or County Council, also directs the work of the CCYA. These commissioners or councils often will appoint a specific member as a liaison to the CCYA. The most effective strategy in working with the Board/Council will be those expected of any employee. Deep and Sussman, in their book Smart Moves, suggest that you learn what is important to them. Your colleagues and people in the know suggest that you pay attention to the realities of county government—the budget, election cycles, community sensitivities and priorities, majority and minority status, and working with informal power systems. Wise directors also know what their employers expect of them. Your colleagues suggest that you determine early on what the Board/Council wants to know or expects you to report. Effective communication skills are important here. That means you only "pitch" worthwhile ideas, you do not ask for unnecessary guidance, you make sure the good and bad news comes from you (there are no surprises), and that you accept your share of responsibility for errors and resolve the problems.

Know your community and understand its needs. Build an organization that can respond to those needs. In other words, be very good at your job. (As an old saying reminds us, we should think more about how we can be valuable rather than how valuable we are.)
Building an effective organization requires us to be good leaders, make sound fiscal decisions, and resolve problems before they come to the attention of the Commissioners/Council. Price Pritchett—in his *New Work Habits for a Radically Changing World*—suggests that you behave like an owner. “Consider how you can help cut costs, serve the customer better, improve productivity, and innovate.”

Finally, consider the Japanese concept of kaizen—continuous incremental improvement—making small improvements over a course of time using the resources at hand. And never miss the chance to add value. “Prove your worth to the organization. Make a difference. Add enough value so everyone can see that something very important would be missing if you left.”

**Collaborating with Citizen Review Panels**

The Pennsylvania’s Child Protective Services Law (Title 23 Pa.C.S., Chapter 63) was amended by Act 146 to address the establishment, function, membership, meetings, and reports relating to Citizen Review Panels (CRPs) in Pennsylvania. This legislation was enacted to support Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) compliance, as well as to make Pennsylvania eligible for Children’s Justice Act funding. The legislation requires that each panel examine policies, procedures, and practices of state and local agencies and, where appropriate, specific cases to evaluate the extent to which state and local child protective system agencies are effectively discharging their child protection responsibilities under Section 106 (b) of CAPTA. The role of the CRPs is to develop recommendations to the Department of Public Welfare. The legislation mandates the state to respond in writing to the CRPs’ recommendations on an annual basis. The recommendations and responses are included in the Pennsylvania Annual Child Abuse Report.

There are three panels established in Pennsylvania which are located in the Northeast, Northwest, and South Central Regions. These regions are slightly different from the OCYF regions and can be viewed by clicking here. The CRP’s represent a wide array of citizen volunteers who join together to conduct comprehensive reviews of the policies, procedures, and practices in our state and county child welfare system and to collaboratively offer solutions to challenges.

Even though the CRP’s are considered independent entities from the child welfare system, it is important for CCYA administrators to work closely with them as collaboration enables CRPs to develop thoughtful recommendations for change. They work collaboratively with Office of Children, Youth, and Families, and CCYA administrators to ensure concrete recommendations are made that will have a positive impact on the system. The CRP’s panels are supported through a liaison at the University of Pittsburgh Child Welfare Resource Center. If you have any questions or need more information about the citizen review panels, please send an email to the liaison at pacrp@pitt.edu.
Collaborating with Your Courts

It is important to become aware of the position that their court holds in your county, especially the role of the court in overseeing CCYA’s actions. This influence and control varies greatly from county to county. It is important to meet with the county judges and personnel to learn of their expectations for your CCYA when bringing cases before the court and to determine which services the judges may order be provided to children and families.

It is imperative that you meet with the CCYA solicitor to determine your court’s procedures. Becoming familiar and adhering to the court’s expectations can enhance CCYA’s ability to advocate for and serve children and families. Should you wish to provide a new or expanded service to children and families, it is advisable to discuss the specifics of the proposed program prior to implementation with the court. If you are aware of such a program in another county or state, it is important to note it. Judges often will contact a colleague in another jurisdiction to find out how the program is doing. You will benefit from the input of the court and judicial support for establishing and expanding programs and services.

When possible, it is useful for your CCYA and for the court to meet periodically to determine how the court perceives your staff’s performance and whether the court wants specific changes in services or procedures. In some counties, these meetings already may be in place. It is important to work collaboratively with the court to achieve the best results for your clients.

The permanency initiatives previously discussed, American Bar Association’s (ABA) PA Barriers to Permanency Project and Administrative Office of the Pennsylvania Court’s (AOPC) Permanency Practice Initiative seek to enhance the CCYA/court collaboration.

Collaborating with Your Juvenile Probation Office

Children and Youth should develop and maintain a positive working relationship with the Juvenile Probation Office (JPO) for many reasons. First, you will be working together to prepare budget plans, program, and financial requests. Also, you will want to maximize the revenues available to your county for both agencies. This relationship with JPO might be a challenge for you for historical reasons in your county or because the Juvenile Probation Office reports to the court rather than to the County Commissioners. However, it is important to communicate to understand the roles and responsibilities for delivering essential services in your community and to identify opportunities to work together effectively.

There will also be times when both agencies will share case responsibility for the same child and family. A dual adjudication may be appropriate in some cases. Research that indicates a relationship between child abuse and neglect, truancy and subsequent delinquency.
Juvenile Probation also is mission driven, performance based, and outcome focused. **Balanced and Restorative Justice** (BARJ) is the foundation for probation services and has three components: community protection, accountability/Victim Awareness, and competency development.

**Collaborating with Your Mental Health System**

To understand the importance of Children and Youth Services developing and maintaining a positive working relationship with the mental health system, it is important to understand that the foundations of that system are built upon the idea that practice is focused on the mental illness of the caregiver, but there is a potential for the child and the family also to be affected by the parent’s mental illness. Mental illness often is considered to be a family problem, and the needs of the entire family must be assessed in terms of safety and risk to the children under the care of an adult with a diagnosis of mental illness. Many reactions and behaviors indicative of a mental illness affect other areas of a person’s life and must be addressed as to their effect on the children in the home. Child welfare professionals must be able to understand the impact of mental illness on other family systems to accurately assess safety and risk factors related to child abuse and neglect. Your county has a local mental health agency that can assist you in assessing and planning services for the families to whom you provide services.

It is also important to collaborate with the mental health system around meeting the mental health needs of children the CCYA serves. Local mental health agencies provide many services that treat and support children’s mental health. Medical Assistance covers many of these services.

**Collaborating with Your Drug and Alcohol System**

When chemical dependency threatens a child’s safety, services must be provided to the child and family to restore stability and promote optimal development in healthy family functioning. When collaborating with the drug and alcohol system in your community, you can develop an understanding of the treatment programs available to assist families. Treatment programs often are based on “12-step models” that encourage open disclosure to a group by family members and the chemically dependent individual. While treatment programs understand the importance of involving the family in the recovery process it may be difficult to engage them in this process due to the child’s or the family’s reluctance to participate, distance to the treatment program, associated costs, etc. Thus treatment programs are more client-centered. In child welfare:

- Policies and services must reflect the needs of children who are effected either by prenatal alcohol or drug exposure related to their parents’ chemical involvement or dependency;
- Parental chemical dependency does not alter the requirements of state and federal laws. Recommendations for improved services to chemically involved children
and families must be addressed within existing legal frameworks, such as the Juvenile Act, which establishes timelines under which permanency must be achieved;

- The complex needs of the chemically dependent family must be considered in planning. Family involvement is essential and must be supported beginning with the delivery of preventive services, through treatment intervention, permanency planning, and final implementation of the permanency plan; and

- Child welfare services to chemically dependent children and families should be comprehensive, community-based, and coordinated through an active case manager who can provide linkage with a range of alcohol and drug prevention, treatment, and aftercare services.

Your county has a local drug and alcohol agency that can assist you in providing services to families in which drug and alcohol issues have been identified.

**Collaborating with the Education System**

School systems are built upon the premise of connecting various subject matters with diverse populations to meet the education, emotional, developmental, and social needs of children. The primary focus of school district personnel is child-centered, but the educational success of the children only can be met if education becomes a family-centered approach to learning and parents are involved in their child’s schooling. When a child encounters learning difficulties, it becomes even more critical to involve parents and other support systems to meet their needs. Involvement with a CCYA due to abuse and neglect issues, adds yet another dimension to the already demanding academic life of the child, as well as to the family dynamics. It is in the best interests of the child and the family if representatives from various support systems view themselves as members of a team whose objective it is to formulate a plan to assure the child’s safety and well-being.

For child welfare professionals to assist parents in being part of a team, it is crucial that they know basic educational rights, the support systems for these rights, and how to work with schools in securing access to programs and services that will benefit their clients educationally, emotionally, and socially.

Some of these support systems working together with school district personnel on behalf of a mutual client may include parents, child welfare professionals, psychologists, mental health counselors, medical personnel, drug and alcohol counselors, occupational and/or physical therapists, Pennsylvania Child and Adolescent Service System Program (CASSP), school nurse, and speech and language therapists.

Get to know the superintendents, principals, teachers, and counselors in the schools located in your county. This will assist you in building positive working relationships that will assist the families and children you serve.
Collaborating with Your Domestic Relations Section

The relationship between the CCYA and the Domestic Relations Section (DRS) primarily is related to the role of the DRS in establishing and enforcing support orders and payments for dependent children in the custody of CCYAs. The DRS will also perform genetic testing for CCYA clients as ordered by the court. There is a fee billed to the CCYA for genetic testing. The DRS also can be a source to locate missing parents and families. Conference officers and hearing officers determine support obligations in accordance with the support guidelines found in the Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure. It is helpful to identify liaisons from both offices for this purpose.

- **Accessing the Paternity Tracking System (PTS) for Certified Acknowledgment of Paternity (AOP) Forms**
  
  CCYA staff has direct access to paternity data stored on the PTS and the electronic images of stored AOP forms. The PTS is a database application that stores paternity data from voluntary AOP forms executed for children born out-of-marriage. The PTS is maintained by the Office of Income Maintenance (OIM), Bureau of Child Support Enforcement (BCSE). Electronic images of AOP forms are stored and may be accessed directly from the PTS.

- **Rescission of Acknowledgment of Paternity (AOP) Forms**
  
  If there is a valid AOP form on file for the child in question and the mother and/or father request DNA testing, the AOP must be rescinded prior to DNA testing. The mother and/or father must provide a signed rescission request to the Bureau of Child Support Enforcement (BCSE).

  Rescission of the AOP form will only occur if the rescission request is dated within sixty days of the date the AOP was signed or the date of a judicial proceeding related to the child. Additionally, the rescission request must be signed and dated. A coversheet providing the contact's name and direct telephone number along with the request must be faxed to BCSE at 717-787-0297.

  After the expiration of the sixty day rescission period, an AOP form can only be challenged in court on the basis of fraud, duress, or material mistake of fact. Should the court uphold the challenge and rescind paternity, the court would issue an order that contains the mother's, father's, and child's names and dates of birth, and one of the aforementioned reasons for the rescission. A coversheet providing the contact's name and direct telephone number along with the court order must be faxed to BCSE at 717-787-0297.

Collaborating with Your County Assistance Office
The relationship between the CCYA and the **County Assistance Office** (CAO) serves two purposes. At the in-home services level, the CCYA and the CAO are expected to identify a liaison within each agency to streamline communication, pursuant to Bulletin 99-99-01. The purpose of this bulletin is to coordinate the efforts of both agencies to serve mutual clients. An Agreement of Mutual Responsibility is developed by the TANF recipient and the CAO caseworker and is shared with the CCYA caseworker. Likewise, the CCYA caseworker develops the Family Service Plan (FSP) with the family and shares it with the CAO caseworker. The liaisons will work together to resolve conflicts between the Agreement of Mutual Responsibility and FSP requirements as they arise. Release forms are required and are directed to the appropriate liaison.

The CCYA caseworker and the CAO caseworker also work jointly to determine TANF and IV-E eligibility for dependent children in the custody of the CCYA. Any changes in the children’s living situation must be reported to the CAO. These changes may impact the children’s physical and/or behavioral health care coverage.

It is important to maintain positive working relationships between the two agencies. The CAO often has pertinent information regarding the child’s name, social security number, date of birth, and parentage. They can also assist Children and Youth Service agencies with locating missing families by withholding benefits or contacting the caseworker when appointments are scheduled.

**Collaborating with The Pennsylvania Council of Children, Youth, and Families Services**

The Pennsylvania Council of Children, Youth, and Families Services (**PCCYFS**) is a statewide membership association of private agencies. The mission of PCCYFS is to improve the quality of life for Pennsylvania’s children, youth, and families who are at-risk by supporting and promoting an accessible service delivery system within communities.

PCCYFS presents a united voice on behalf of the private provider community and works to influence **public policy** and the regulatory and funding environments. Creating opportunities for professional development and networking are also priorities. The Council is an advocate for service providers in child welfare, behavioral health, prevention, and juvenile justice.

Originally incorporated in 1976 as the Pennsylvania Council of Voluntary Child Care Agencies, a new name was adopted 10 years later - the Pennsylvania Council of Children’s Services. In 1999, through partnership with a regional association, the Children, Youth and Family Council, a stronger, statewide association was created. This new structure was made official in 2000.

The **membership** of the Council is diverse in agency size, scope of services, and geographic location. This adds greatly to the effectiveness of the united voice on behalf of children and families. The Council supports more than **125 members** statewide and
maintains relationships with all 67 counties. Through the members directly, an extensive collection of resources, skills and experience is available. Staff provides representation, information, and support.

Council members serve non-adjudicated, dependent, and delinquent populations and the families of these children and youth. They provide a broad range of residential, therapeutic and supportive services, ranging from prevention and in-home services to foster and campus-based residential and residential-treatment services. Member agencies also offer a variety of behavioral health services and educational programs. The Council supports all safety, permanency, and well-being efforts to ensure that the needs of Pennsylvania’s most vulnerable children, youth, and families are appropriately and effectively met.

Many CCYAs build collaborative relationships with the private providers in their community and contract for services to improve outcomes for the children and families served. To learn more about the PCCYFS visit their website at www.pccyfs.org. Administrators also can contact the association by email at hbgoffice@pccyfs.org or phone (717) 651-1725.

**Collaborating with The Rehabilitation & Community Providers Association**

The [Rehabilitation and Community Providers Association](https://www.pccyfs.org) (RCPA) is an association whose members are community agencies providing services including mental health, substance use disorder, intellectual and developmental disability, autism, vocational, residential, medical rehabilitation, and brain trauma. RCPA is among the nation’s largest and most diverse state health and human services associations, with more than 350 members that serve one in six Pennsylvanians annually.

RCPA serves as a forum for the exchange of information and experience, represents providers on legislative and administrative matters, and serves as a point of contact with other related statewide organizations. RCPA maintains an active Children’s Committee with subgroups focused on early childhood mental health, youth forensic issues, residential treatment, and a range of other child-adolescent service areas. The key contact for children and youth related matters is Connell O’Brien at cobrien@paproviders.org.
In an effort to create more positive outcomes for foster children, the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania created the Office of Children and Families in the Courts (OCFC) within the Judicial Programs Division of the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts (AOPC).

The principal goal of the OCFC is to minimize the length of time dependent children must spend in foster care or in other temporary living situations where they have been removed from their parents under court order because of abuse or neglect. The OCFC assists and supports judicial districts in the identification of best practices that promote timely permanence.

A primary function of the OCFC is to support the Children’s Roundtable Initiative. The Children’s Roundtable Initiative is comprised of a three tiered infrastructure that allows for effective administration and communication between Local, Leadership and State Roundtables. The OCFC’s priorities are set by the State Roundtable. This overarching Roundtable is comprised of representatives from each Leadership Roundtable along with other leaders who have specific expertise in dependency matters.

Pennsylvania Child Welfare Resource Center (Resource Center)

Hornby Zeller Associates, Inc. (HZA)

Juvenile Court Judges Commission (JCJC)

The Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency (PCCD) and Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP)

Office of Children, Youth, and Families (OCYF)

Pennsylvania Children and Youth Administrators (PCYA)

Statewide Adoption and Permanency Network (SWAN)
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