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Overview of NYS Services System

- NYS Office of Children and Family Services oversees both Child Welfare and DV service systems
- 62 counties (Local Department of Social Services)
- 100 DV Programs
- CPS/DV Collaboration Projects administered by DV Program in conjunction with LDSS
Systems Prior to Collaboration

- Philosophical differences and resistance to collaborate
- Adults and children served by two different systems
- Negative perceptions due to misunderstanding
- Tensions around failure to protect vs. protective factors
- Tensions occasionally resolved superficially
- LDSS payee of service
Impetus for Change

• Increase in data and recognition regarding overlap and impact on case outcomes
• Child safer if Non-Offending Parent safer
• National and state priority through discretionary funding, conferences, etc.
• Pockets of providers attempting to collaborate
• Provided incentive ($$)
• 1996 - two co-location pilot programs
• Next RFP funded 12 counties
• Currently OCFS funds 11 county programs
• Average program cost is approximately $65,000 with a maximum of two full time advocates
• Federal Family Violence Prevention and Services Act funds
• Five counties continued and/or expanded using own county funding!
Goals of NYS Co-Location Project

- Improve joint case practice
- Improve safety outcomes for both adult and child victims
- Hold abusers accountable and provide opportunities to change
At least one Domestic Violence Advocate (DVA) must be co-located at the CPS office:

- employee of a Domestic Violence program
- one year of DV work experience
- stationed in close proximity to CPS workers
- at least three full days per week

DVA Role:

- Ongoing consultation and support
- Joint home visits
- Joint safety planning
- Cross-training
OCFS Requirements for Co-location Programs (cont.)

- Workgroup of line and supervisory staff representing both CPS and DV
- Protocol developed prior to collaborative work with families
- Ongoing cross-training/shadowing
- Management level commitment from both agencies
Lessons Learned

- Start with team building to establish trust; repeat when there is turnover
- Equal input from each system from day one
- Limit to CPS and DV systems
- Plan on time for DVA to develop relationships and deal with potential resistance
- Review and modify protocol regularly, with county attorney
- Spend significant time understanding information sharing protocol (benefits and risks)
- Clarify role of DVA – not investigative
- DVA to maintain contact with DV agency
- DVA needs on-site supervisor in addition to supervisor at DV agency
- Language – safety plan (and what to include in case record)
- Staff turnover = challenges in maintaining protocol and trust
- Annual roundtables/National trainers
Benefits

• Reduced myths and increased respect for complexity of jobs
• CPS learned why NOP may not leave or appear “uncooperative”
• DV learned that CPS doesn’t always remove children
• Better understand each others systems= better able to prepare families
• Supported CPS caseworker workload
• DVA less of threat and therefore may be easier to engage VDV
• Broader perspective for decision making
• Become resource to each other

More comprehensive and compatible approach
(both systems focused on adult and child safety)
What are benefits and challenges to CPS, DV programs, and families?

Dacey Bonney, Assistant Director: Non-Residential DV Services at Unity House, Troy, NY

Andrea Sandholt: Child Protective Services, Rensselaer County, NY
### Evaluation Questions

**Process: How do the co-location programs actually work?**

- What topics and practices are included in each county’s local co-location protocols?
- What types of contacts do DVA have with caseworkers and victims?
  - Consultations, joint home visits, team meetings, victim support, advocacy
- What were the major challenges and how did local programs solve them?
- How similar/different were local program operations to each other?

**Impact: How did co-location programs affect outcomes?**

- Did co-location result in:
  - increased understanding of DV and CPS by staff in the other system?
  - more frequent and better working relationships between CPS and DV workers?
  - more involvement of DV Advocates in CPS case practice?
- How did co-location impact CPS case decisions?
  - service referrals, substantiations, petitions, foster care
- How did co-location impact the safety of children and adults?
Two Evaluations of Co-location in NYS

First Study 2001-2004

Focus:
Client Characteristics, DVA Activities, and CPS Case Decisions

A. Protocol Review
B. Co-located DVAs completed form on 2,071 cases (13 co-location programs)
C. Review of CPS reports assigned to CPS-DV unit
   - before co-location (170 cases Sep 1999 to Oct 2000) and
   - after co-location initiation (153 cases Jan to Jun 2001)
   - in 1 large county with its own CPS hotline

Second Study 2011-2013

Focus:
System Relationships and CPS Case Practice

A. Telephone interviews with 54 Directors of Services in LDSS
B. Focus groups and interviews with CPS caseworkers and supervisors, DV Advocates and DV agency managers in 11 counties with OCFS-funded co-location program
C. Surveys of 1,121 CPS workers in 57 counties
D. Surveys of 458 DV Advocates in 58 counties
E. Case record reviews of 230 CPS reports with DV in 3 co-location counties and 3 comparable counties without program

Bureau of Research, Evaluation, and Performance Analytics
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Short Term Outcomes</th>
<th>Intermediate Outcomes</th>
<th>Long Term Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Cross Systems Training                                                   • Increase empathetic understanding of DV by CPS staff                              • Earlier identification of DV by CPS                                               • Decrease children’s exposure to violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regular Workgroup Meetings                                               • Increase DV staff’s understanding of CPS                                            • More accurate assessments of DV                                                  • Reduce repeat maltreatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Joint Home Visits                                                        • Increase skill and confidence of CPS to work effectively with families impacted by DV • More appropriate services offered • Improve family functioning and stability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Joint Safety Planning                                                    • Increase skill and confidence of DV staff to work effectively with CPS-involved clients • More timely access to services • Increase victim empowerment to protect self/children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Referral Process                                                         • Improve system coordination and communication                                        • Enhance family engagement in services                                             • Reduce substantiation of victim for child neglect due to DV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DV Screening and Assessments                                              • Improve system coordination and communication                                       • Improve victim knowledge and use of safety strategies and services               • Increase accountability of DV offenders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Written Protocols                                                        • Co-located DV Advocate at CPS office                                               • Decrease children’s exposure to violence                                           • Reduce repeat maltreatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Co-located DV Advocate at CPS office                                     • Increase empathetic understanding of DV by CPS staff                              • More accurate assessments of DV                                                  • Improve family functioning and stability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase DV staff’s understanding of CPS                                 • More appropriate services offered                                                  • More timely access to services                                                  • Increase victim empowerment to protect self/children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase skill and confidence of CPS to work effectively with families impacted by DV • Enhance family engagement in services • Improve victim knowledge and use of safety strategies and services • Reduce substantiation of victim for child neglect due to DV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve system coordination and communication                            • Improve system coordination and communication                                       • Improve victim knowledge and use of safety strategies and services               • Increase accountability of DV offenders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Decrease children’s exposure to violence                                 • Reduce repeat maltreatment                                                   • Improve family functioning and stability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase victim empowerment to protect self/children                      • Reduce substantiation of victim for child neglect due to DV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve accountability of DV offenders                                   • Increase accountability of DV offenders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NYS Counties with DV Co-location Programs

Legend
- OCFS-Funded Co-Locations
- Non-OCFS-Funded Co-Locations

Source: CHSR interviews with LDSS Directors of Services
Significant Findings

Compared to counties without co-location programs, in counties with co-location programs...

DV Advocates are more likely to be knowledgeable about CPS and to be included in CPS practice and decisions

- Participate in home visits
- Be invited to case conferences and family team meetings
- Be consulted by CPS on DV cases
- Know enough about CPS system to help clients
- Have a good understanding of what CPS can and cannot do

CPSWs are more likely to report positive relationships and to approach DVA or DV agency for help

- Have DV staff accompany them on home visits
- Consult with DV staff about CPS-DV cases
- Make referrals to DV agency
- Report positive experiences with DV agencies
- Agree DV staff effectively connect clients to services

Source: DV Advocate and CPS Caseworker Surveys by CHSR
Impact on CPS Case Practice with DV Victim

Compared to counties without co-location programs, in counties with co-location programs...

- CPS case notes are less likely to include victim-blaming language
- CPS is more likely to discuss the DV offender’s impact on the children with the DV victim
- CPS is more likely to identify offender behavior patterns through discussion with DV victim

Source: CPS Case Record Reviews by CHSR
Both DV Victims and DV Offenders are more likely to be referred to community-based services.

% Cases with DV Victims or DV Offenders Referred to Services by Co-location Status

- **DV Victims**
  - 44% (DV Cases without a co-location program)
  - 63% (DV Cases with a co-location program)

- **DV Offenders**
  - 23% (DV Cases without a co-location program)
  - 37% (DV Cases with a co-location program)

Source: CPS Case Record Reviews by CHSR
Impact on CPS Identification and DVA Contact with Families with DV

• A wider range of DV is identified by CPS after implementing co-location program
• More families with DV are identified by CPS
• More families with shorter/less injurious DV histories connect with DV Advocates

Contact with DV Advocate by DV History

Source for DV Type and Contacts: 1st OCFS Evaluation study pre/post case review
Impact of DVA on DV Victims and on CPS practice with DV Victims & Offenders

- Most DV victims will talk with DVA at home visit
- Victims do follow up with DVA after meeting at joint home visit
- Frequency of victim contact (phone or in-person) with DVA varies

The DVA’s help was mentioned in 39% of CPS cases reviewed in 3 counties with co-location (42 of 107). When DVA is mentioned, CPS is more likely to ...

- Refer DV Offender to services: 52% vs. 25%
- Refer Non-Offending Parent to services: 93% vs. 44%
- Speak in detail about DV to Offender: 57% vs. 29%
- Speak in detail about DV to NOP: 86% vs. 42%

Source: Case Review of 107 CPS cases in 3 co-located counties by CHSR
How similar were local co-location program operations to each other and to the OCFS model?

- Frequency of joint home visits varied widely between co-location sites
- Joint safety planning with CPS/DVA/Victim occurred less frequently than originally expected
- Confidentiality and information-sharing concerns and resolutions varied between sites

Of the 107 CPS case files reviewed in co-located counties in Study 2, percent that documented how DVA assisted CPS:

- Case Consultation: 24%
- Joint Home Visits: 9%
- Joint Safety Planning: 3%
- Other Help: 11%

Source: Case Review of 107 CPS cases in 3 co-located counties by CHSR
CPS was less likely to cite DV as the sole reason to substantiate DV victims for CA/N.

Source: CPS Case Reviews in 6 counties by CHSR
At 12 months after focal report, there were no significant differences between counties with co-location and those without co-location in the rate of:

• subsequent CPS reports
• subsequent CPS reports with DV
• child removals (very few removals)

Source: Case Reviews in both 1st and 2nd Evaluations
Continuing Challenges

• Working with abusive fathers
• New DVAs – New CPS staff
• Coordinating Joint Home Visits
• DV Agency policies on home visits
• DVA case load
• Confidentiality
Potential Program Adjustments Resulting from Evaluation

• Quality assurance tool
• Standard referral process
• Engage abuser as parent, not partner
• Provide safety training for DVA to conduct home visits
• Increase number of DVAs per site and number of bilingual DVAs
• Child abuse intake assessment improved
Transforming CW system

Progress made county by county, but needed CW System to take the lead to impact/transform systems statewide

OCFS created guidance documents and training for child welfare workers


• Video: “Domestic Violence: An Overview”


• Guidance Documents

• Revised mandated course on DV for CPS workers: Co-taught by CPS trainers and the NYS Office for the Prevention of Domestic Violence
For Further Information

- Pamela Jobin, Supervisor DV Unit, OCFS
  (518) 474-4787 or Pamela.Jobin@ocfs.ny.gov
- CHSR website has CPS/DV Co-location Evaluation Reports
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