

# Community collaboration and differential response:

Canadian and international research  
and emerging models of practice

---

*Nico Trocmé, Della Knoke, and Catherine Roy, Editors*



Centre of Excellence  
for Child Welfare

Centre d'excellence pour  
la protection et le bien-être des enfants

## National Library of Canada Cataloguing in Publication

National Child Welfare Symposium on Community Collaboration and Differential Response (4<sup>th</sup> : 2003 : Banff, Alta.)

Community collaboration and differential response: Canadian and international research and emerging models of practice/Nico Trocmé, Della Knoke, and Catherine Roy, editors.

Includes proceedings from the 4<sup>th</sup> National Child Welfare

Symposium on Community Collaboration and Differential Response, sponsored by the Centre of Excellence for Child Welfare and the Alberta Ministry of Children's Services, held Mar. 20–21, 2003, in Banff, Alta.

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 1-896297-13-7

1. Community-based child welfare—Canada. 2. Community-based family services—Canada. 3. Community-based child welfare. 4. Community-based family services.

I. Trocmé, Nicolas Maurice, 1959- II. Knoke, Della, 1964- III. Roy, Catherine, 1973- IV. Child Welfare League of Canada. V. Alberta. Alberta Children's Services VI. Centre of Excellence for Child Welfare. VII. Title.

HV713.N37 2003

362.7'0971

C2003-907044-1

© Child Welfare League of Canada, 2003

Également disponible en français sous le titre : *Collaboration communautaire et approches différentielles : recherches et pratiques novatrices canadiennes et internationales*

Design and layout by Leah Gryfe

The Centre of Excellence for Child Welfare is one of the Centres of Excellence for Children's Well-Being funded by Health Canada. The CECW is also funded by Canadian Institutes of Health Research and Bell Canada. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the official policy of Health Canada.



Health Canada Santé Canada

The Centre gratefully acknowledges Alberta Children's Services and IBM Canada for co-sponsoring the 4<sup>th</sup> National Child Welfare Symposium: Community Collaboration and Differential Response, held in Banff, AB in March 2003. Alberta Children's Services and IBM Canada worked in partnership with the Centre of Excellence for Child Welfare to bring together researchers and practitioners from Canada, the United States, and the United Kingdom with the best available information about innovative approaches and alternative models of child welfare service delivery.



For information about the Centre of Excellence for Child Welfare, visit [www.cecw-cepb.ca](http://www.cecw-cepb.ca). Copies of this publication are available at cost from:

Centre of Excellence for Child Welfare  
c/o Child Welfare League of Canada  
209 – 75 Albert Street  
Ottawa, ON K1P 5E7  
Tel.: (613) 235-4412, ext 24  
Email: [info@cecw-cepb.ca](mailto:info@cecw-cepb.ca)

---

# Table of Contents

## Foreword

*Peter Dudding* ..... v

## Introduction

*Nico Trocmé, Della Knoke, and Catherine Roy* ..... vii

## Part 1: Research and policy

### New directions in child welfare

*Provincial and Territorial Directors of Child Welfare,  
with editing by Jay Rodgers* ..... 1

### Avenues for positive innovations in Canadian child welfare: Lessons from the Partnerships for Children and Families Project and international jurisdictions

*Gary Cameron, Nancy Freymond, and Catherine Roy* ..... 14

### Re-involving the community: The need for a differential response to rising child welfare caseloads in Canada

*Nico Trocmé and Claire Chamberland* ..... 32

### Evaluating the implementation of assessment tools in the Australian child protection system

*Jim Barber and Della Knoke* ..... 49

### Alternative response to child protective services investigations in the United States

*Diana English, John D. Fluke, and Ying-Ying T. Yuan* ..... 64

### Mobilizing communities to prevent child abuse and neglect: A cultural shift in child protection

*Liesette Brunson and Camil Bouchard* ..... 75

## Part 2: Emerging models

### Community based child welfare services in Guelph and Wellington County

*Maurice D. Brubacher and Jasma Narayan* ..... 89

### Alberta Response Model: Transforming outcomes for children and youth

*Suzanne Anselmo, Russ Pickford, and Phil Goodman* ..... 98

USMA: Cherished ones, precious ones, the children  
A First Nations approach to child, family, and community well-being  
*Debra Foxcroft and Cindy Blackstock* ..... 105

The inclusive approach of the Outaouais Centres jeunesse  
*Gilles Clavel, Luc Cadieux, and Catherine Roy* ..... 112

Integrating children’s services: A perspective from England  
*Helen Jones, Ellen Chant, and Harriet Ward* ..... 119

**References** ..... 132

**Contributors** ..... 145

---

# Foreword

*Peter Dudding*

Is child welfare truly an enigma wrapped inside a riddle? For many of its planners and practitioners, it must seem to be, as many strategies to reform child welfare encounter significant difficulties and have unplanned results.

Managing change in child welfare is complicated and complex. It is complicated in that there are many interdependent variables both inside and outside the system that affect the safety and well-being of children and families. It is complex in that we know a great deal about successful approaches to raising children and supporting families but our knowledge is limited and there are significant information gaps. Even with the best available knowledge there are both predicted and unintended consequences of reform. Managing a child welfare system is part art and part science, much like raising a child.

The current emphasis on child protection in Canadian child welfare has dominated policy and practice for the past decade. The shift in emphasis originated from public concerns about the safety of children living in high risk families and has spread quickly throughout Canada, United States, and England. Most jurisdictions have implemented improved standards of child protection, focused training for child welfare workers, and risk assessment tools. While family preservation approaches were being discredited, access to a range of community-based services for families in need were also being limited due to a lack of funding. The “better safe than sorry” approach to child welfare has significantly increased the number of children in public care in Canada. Further, the focus on child protection has had an isolating effect, shifting the emphasis to the family court and management of growth within organizations. Currently, there is increasing concern within Canada about fundamental questions of the sustainability of child protection services, due to the growing demands for funding, human resources, and substitute care. There are also questions about whether we are helping children or further victimizing them through child protection interventions and if we are improving the quality of life outcomes for children growing up in substitute care.

Child welfare policy and practice have largely been influenced by values and ideology, experience, and the resources available. To date, the influ-

ence of research and evidence-based practice has been limited, although a growing body of social science research in Canada and internationally is beginning to have some positive effect. It is of critical importance that child welfare policy makers and practitioners place greater emphasis on research, evaluation and outcome methodologies to gain a better understanding of the complicated and complex aspects of child welfare services.

At the Community Collaboration and Differential Response symposium in Banff, Alberta on March 20 and 21, 2003, information was presented regarding innovations in First Nations, Canadian, American and English child welfare practice. A common theme was the development of approaches predicated upon the idea that child protection is a community responsibility. This involves the development of an effective network of formal and informal community partners, distinguishing between high and low risk situations, and providing a wider range of services responsive to the different needs of children and families.

These initiatives have tremendous potential and promise for creating a “virtuous cycle” of child welfare services, promoting optimal child development, family strengths, and positive communities. However, integral to their design is thoughtful and well conceived applied research programs to provide a critical evaluation of effectiveness and outcomes.

Increasing our knowledge and understanding of what works in child welfare and of the broader trends and patterns will enhance our ability to manage a human services system that is both complicated and complex.

---

# Introduction

*Nico Trocmé, Della Knoke, and Catherine Roy*

Child welfare services across Canada are responding to growing numbers of referrals involving an increasingly broad array of problems. The increase has been driven primarily by cases involving neglect or exposure to domestic violence, while severe physical harm and sexual abuse represent a declining proportion of cases. Although urgent protective responses continue to be a priority in situations involving severe abuse, the majority of children and families who come to the attention of child welfare are ineligible for services under the narrow child protection mandate that characterizes the current system. There is growing interest in developing responses that are more effective in meeting the diverse needs of maltreated children through effective collaboration with other community service providers.

Differential response models, sometimes referred to as alternative response models or multi-track systems, have been implemented in jurisdictions in the United States, Australia, and most recently, in Alberta, Canada. These models include a range of potential response options customized to meet the diverse needs of families reported to child welfare. Differential response systems typically use multiple “tracks” or “streams” of service delivery, with at least one investigative track for high-risk cases and an alternative “assessment” or “community” track for less urgent cases, where the focus of intervention is on brokering and coordinating other community services to address the short- and long-term needs of children and families.

Systematic evaluation of the impact of differential response models is at an early stage. While there have been some positive results, the value of differential response is contingent upon engaging accessible and effective community resources. In an effort to examine emerging models in Canada and internationally, the Centre of Excellence for Child Welfare (CECW) in collaboration with the Alberta Ministry of Children’s Services, with additional funding from IBM and Health Canada, held a two-day research and policy forum in Banff, Alberta in March 2003. The CECW’s 4<sup>th</sup> *National Child Welfare Symposium on Community Collaboration and Differential Response*, presented in partnership with Alberta Children’s Services and IBM Canada, brought together senior policy makers from across Canada with researchers and service providers from Canada, the United States,

England, and Australia. Information presented at the symposium has been compiled in this publication and appears in two sections.

The first section describes key policy and research issues that have emerged from efforts to develop community collaboration and differential response models in child welfare. The first three chapters discuss the limitations of the current system and document the need for change. The opening chapter, by the provincial and territorial Directors of Child Welfare with editing by Jay Rodgers, provides a historical and policy context for the development of child welfare alternative response models. Shifts in funding structures, growing caseloads, and an increasingly risk adverse environment are creating an impasse. Investigation and evidence gathering take precedence and the lion's share of resources, at the expense of direct services for children and families. The voices of parents and service providers echo these concerns in the chapter by Cameron, Freymond, and Roy and argue for a more positive, strengths-based approach to serving children and families in difficulty. Drawing upon lessons learned from a project implemented in Ontario and from successful international experiences, the authors highlight possible avenues for more positive child welfare outcomes. These include increased collaboration between formal and informal partners working with children and families and reforming mandated child protection agencies. Reviewing service trend data from across Canada, Trocmé and Chamberland argue that urgent protective responses are required only for a small portion of child welfare cases. Non-urgent cases, however, are equally in need of services to ensure the long-term well-being of children. Coordinated community-based services that can address long-term needs are required through more collaborative responses that do not alienate other professionals and community partners as a result of rapid and intrusive investigations.

Although the need to shift away from narrowly focused protection models is clear, there are several key challenges in developing alternative approaches. Differential response models require the reliable differentiation between urgent high-risk situations and less urgent situations. Barber and Knoke's analysis of decision-making tools used in Australia to classify child protection cases into different response tiers shows they do not automatically lead to reliable decisions. Pilot testing and post-implementation evaluation revealed that the assessment processes and instruments were not implemented entirely as intended. This chapter documents the processes used to assess the application of decision-making criteria and the validity of priority ratings.

The widespread application of alternative response models in the United States has led to a number of critical implementation issues described by English, Fluke, and Yuan. Evaluation of alternative response services (ARS) implemented in Washington State found that a minority of the ARS families



actually engaged in services and that the rate of re-referral among families receiving ARS was comparable to families not served or families receiving child protection services “as usual.” This chapter underscores the need for systematic evaluation to determine the extent to which differential response services are meeting their intended objectives. In their chapter on community mobilization, Brunson and Bouchard look beyond the child welfare system to neighbourhoods and broader community groups which are instrumental in bringing about the type of cultural and attitudinal changes required to ensure that children and parents become community priorities. Through a review of past and current initiatives, the authors highlight some key elements required to mobilize communities so that strong and sustainable structures can be put in place to ensure the protection and well-being of all children and their families. After discussing some inherent difficulties and dilemmas associated with community mobilization, this chapter concludes that by combining efforts and pluralistic expertise—both formal and informal—maximal child protection becomes an attainable goal.

The second section of the book presents five innovative Canadian and British initiatives developed to provide more flexible and collaborative approaches to child welfare practice. Brubacher and Narayan present a number of community programs developed by the Family and Children’s Services of Guelph and Wellington County in Ontario. Through these initiatives, families in difficulty are identified earlier, provided with more prevention services, and community resources are mobilized to avoid unnecessary placements of children in out-of-home care. This chapter illustrates that children, families, communities, and service providers can benefit substantially from community based child welfare services. Anselmo, Pickford, and Goodman present the Alberta Response Model, a province-wide initiative that includes a new differential response option for child welfare services as well as enhanced investments and emphasis on accessing community-based programs. Foxcroft and Blackstock describe the development of the Nuu-chah-nulth First Nation’s community-based child welfare program in British Columbia and highlight the challenges encountered when establishing Aboriginal child welfare services within the limits of provincially imposed legislation and a federally imposed funding framework. Clavel, Cadieux, and Roy present a series of community based collaborations developed in the Outaouais region of southwestern Quebec. Through a strong commitment to developing individualized service plans for each youth referred to the protection authorities and well-developed service protocols with community programs, the Outaouais program has achieved one of Quebec’s highest rates of diversion to alternative services. Finally, Jones, Ward, and Chant argue that child welfare agencies alone can-

not be responsible for meeting all the needs of vulnerable children and families. The authors present an integrated child assessment framework developed in North Lincolnshire, England, which ensures that all service providers approach families from a common perspective and that children and families have access to better coordinated services and supports.

Inherent in the renewed emphasis on community collaboration and differential response is the promise of alternatives to a Canadian child welfare system narrowly focused on protection investigations. From the chapters included in this book a consensus emerges about the value of partnerships among child protection agencies, medical services, education resources, community based organizations and communities themselves, to ensure not only the maximal protection of children but maximal opportunities for optimal development and self-enrichment. Effective service innovation is facilitated by knowledge of the strengths and limitations of the program options available and an understanding of the implementation process and the obstacles encountered. The innovative programs described here demonstrate that child welfare systems can develop more flexible service approaches and make better use of community resources. It is important, however, to keep in mind the implementation issues identified by English, Fluke, and Yuan in the United States and by Barber in Australia. Reliable methods must be implemented and tested to ensure that children and families are referred to the appropriate service track. Service protocols and adequate resources must be put in place to ensure that services are indeed provided. Intervention must be evaluated to ensure that the services provided lead to positive outcomes for children and families. As stated by Brunson and Bouchard, we must learn from the constraints and dilemmas associated with past experiences and build on their strengths to develop even more successful programs. Successful collaborations require time and energy.

The initiatives presented at the *4<sup>th</sup> National Child Welfare Symposium on Community Collaboration and Differential Response* show tremendous potential for improving child welfare services in Canada. The Centre of Excellence for Child Welfare is committed to supporting these initiatives through research and evaluation. Critical analysis and systematic evaluation of emerging models and services contribute to the development of a system that provides effective responses to the diverse needs of maltreated children. But to build such a system, investments of time, resources, and energy must converge. The following chapters suggest that the time is right for all institutions devoted to the protection and well-being of children—be they universities, funding agencies, governments, child welfare agencies, or community based organizations—to move towards that “new direction” in child welfare.

## **New directions in child welfare**

*Provincial and Territorial Directors of Child Welfare,  
with editing by Jay Rodgers*

This chapter presents an historical overview of the major paradigm shifts in delivering child welfare services in Canada, including the child rescue era, the family preservation era and more recently, a renewed focus on child protection. These shifts are examined within the context of the social, economic, and intergovernmental factors that influenced change. The paper argues that while child welfare legislation in Canada has evolved over time, certain environmental factors have prevented the delivery systems from keeping pace with the core intent of the legislative changes. Common to all eras is that governments struggle with how best to meet the range of needs of children and families referred to the child welfare system. Within the narrow “better safe than sorry” mandate that characterizes the current system, workload pressures have increased as have the number and complexity of family needs. Services tend to be organized to respond to allegations of physical and sexual abuse, although neglect and emotional maltreatment account for the majority of substantiated cases. A disproportionate amount of time is spent on investigation and the collection of evidence to mobilize protective services, while the vast majority of cases are closed at intake, with no services provided. The current “one size fits all approach,” like those that preceded it, fails to recognize the diverse set of needs that characterize children and families referred to child welfare services. A “narrowing plus” strategy is advocated to provide a broader and more flexible set of responses.

## **Avenues for positive innovations in Canadian child welfare: Lessons from the Partnerships for Children and Families Project and international jurisdictions**

*Gary Cameron, Nancy Freymond, and Catherine Roy*

Child welfare in Canada has been shaped by dichotomized visions promoting either child protection or parent assistance, emphasizing the legal system or welfare services. In this chapter, authors argue that this child protection paradigm projects a false image of what is possible or desirable. Themes drawn from the experiences of parents and service providers participating in the Partnerships for Children and Families Project, a collaborative project involving universities, children’s aid societies, children’s mental health centres, and associations of parents, are presented. Descriptions of selected

international positive systems of child and family welfare follow. Based on these data, avenues for positive innovations in Canadian child and family welfare are proposed. The discussion points to more acceptable reforms for parents and children that provide them a broader range of useful resources and allow direct service providers to spend most of their time helping families. The need for developing collaborative partnerships among informal and formal service providers is also highlighted.

## **Re-involving the community: The need for a differential response to rising child welfare caseloads in Canada**

*Nico Trocmé and Claire Chamberland*

This chapter describes the increase in child welfare caseloads that has been observed in Canada over the last decade. The authors argue that the current increase in investigations and children in need of protection provides an incomplete picture of the changes that have been occurring over a longer period of time. Data from the 1993 and 1998 Ontario incidence studies of reported child abuse and neglect are highlighted to provide a more detailed breakdown of some of the factors underlying these increases. A careful analysis of the data suggests the increases have not been uniform across all types of maltreatment. A detailed analysis of trends specific to types and severity of maltreatment as well as potential harm to children is also presented. In the second section, the authors argue for a broader array of intervention and prevention strategies that move beyond the actual child welfare system to mobilize community based services and supports. Challenges and benefits associated with alternative strategies are discussed. Potential benefits include improved partnerships among families, communities, and service providers; continuity of services; the assessment of children's needs rather than risks; and increased access to preventive services for vulnerable children and families.

## **Evaluating the implementation of assessment tools in the Australian child protection system**

*Jim Barber and Della Knoke*

Actuarial instruments are being widely implemented within child welfare to inform and guide decisions about whether and/or what form of services are most appropriate for children and families. The promise of improved

decision making with the use of actuarial instruments derives from their empirical foundations and demonstration of adequate validity and reliability. However, the extent to which these psychometric properties are preserved in the field depends on how these instruments are implemented. This chapter describes the introduction in two Australian states of tiered responding based upon actuarial assessment instruments. In the state of South Australia, some degree of training was provided prior to implementation of new processes and instruments. However, no pilot testing was performed on the instruments and no provision was made for modifications to the system in the field. An internal case audit recently suggested that the system is not operating as its proponents had hoped. In contrast, the introduction of actuarial safety and risk assessment instruments in Queensland was accompanied by some effort to monitor implementation of the new system and its effectiveness. The identification of difficulties facilitated the development of strategies to improve validity and reliability of case prioritization.

## **Alternative response to child protective services investigations in the United States**

*Diana English, John D. Fluke, and Ying-Ying T. Yuan*

In the United States, numerous states have implemented alternative responses to child protective services (CPS). The present chapter examines two aspects of these initiatives. First, the findings of a two-year National Study of CPS and Reform Efforts revealed the scope and characteristics of alternative response services (ARS) implemented across the United States. ARS are being practised more than expected and nearly one-half of the states reported having alternative response policies. Implementation of ARS varied across agencies surveyed. However, in general, ARS initiatives sought to provide less intrusive services and to facilitate access to and engagement in services for families with lower risk or lower severity of maltreatment, without labeling caretakers as perpetrators. Second, an evaluation of the ARS model implemented in Washington State underscores the importance of assessing outcomes of these new initiatives and the assumptions underlying ARS models.

This study revealed that a minority of the ARS families actually engaged in (i.e., used) services. The rate of re-referral among families receiving ARS

was comparable to families not served or families receiving CPS services as usual. In addition, many more families were identified as needing service than received services. Though ARS presents the potential for a broader more flexible set of responses to child welfare referrals, the processes and objectives of alternative models must be clearly articulated and evaluated.

## **Mobilizing communities to prevent child abuse and neglect: A cultural shift in child protection**

*Liesette Brunson and Camil Bouchard*

In extending protection for children beyond the minimal child protection that can be afforded by the child welfare system, numerous preventative community based approaches have been implemented across North America. Through illustrations of several community based models, the authors examine strategies for community mobilization. In addition, this chapter raises interesting issues regarding the ways in which community and community interests are defined. Finally, critical elements for community collaboration and some predictable dilemmas are discussed in light of a maximal protection model (Projet Béluga), which is currently being implemented in Montreal neighbourhoods.

## **Community based child welfare services in Guelph and Wellington County**

*Maurice D. Brubacher and Jasma Narayan*

The provision of services to children and families in need at the Family and Children's Services of Guelph and Wellington County is based on the belief that child protection is a community responsibility. As such, the agency strives to mobilize community resources to protect children, assist families in difficulty, and provide care for children. Through an illustration of the Shelldale Centre, which brings 16 agencies and community organizations together to meet the needs of high-risk children and families, the components of a successful community based service model are described. Child-centred interventions, in which the parents and service providers act as partners and provide outreach to families most in need, are key components of the successes achieved by the Shelldale Centre.

Positive outcomes for parents and children, as well as significant improvements in neighbourhood safety have been identified. Finally, positive and significant impacts on child welfare services have been observed. Referrals are made earlier and more children are protected within their own homes, which decrease the number of children that need to be placed in care. Overall, the experience in Guelph and Wellington County suggests that children, families, communities, and service providers can benefit substantially from community based child welfare services.

## **Alberta Response Model: Transforming outcomes for children and youth**

*Suzanne Anselmo, Russ Pickford, and Phil Goodman*

The Alberta Response Model (ARM) is based on the principle that protecting children, preventing maltreatment, and strengthening families form a service continuum. ARM retains as a fundamental objective providing protection to children at risk for future maltreatment. However, within this model, children identified as lower risk, whose families are willing to work at solving their own problems, are no longer left to manage with few supports. ARM is comprised of four inter-related core strategies. First, a differential response will ensure children and youth at high risk of physical or emotional harm are protected and those at lower risk, along with their families, are supported and strengthened through their community or neighbourhood networks. Families may be assigned to either child protection or family enhancement streams based upon assessment of risk and family willingness to engage with services to ameliorate difficulties or concerns identified during the assessment process. Second, strengthening links between local community based child and family services and better coordination of referral systems enables families to access a full range of services. Third, earlier permanency planning, developed in consultation with extended family, clinical specialists, and community partners, is emphasized to provide the opportunity for stable, permanent relationships for children in care. Finally, the implementation of processes and criteria to monitor outcomes, based on the national Child Welfare Indicator Matrix is a central component of ARM.

## **USMA: Cherished ones, precious ones, the children—A First Nations approach to child, family, and community well-being**

*Debra Foxcroft and Cindy Blackstock*

This chapter examines emerging models of Aboriginal child welfare in British Columbia, particularly the development and implementation of a model of delegated authority in the USMA child welfare agency that serves the member bands of the Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council. In 1987, the USMA Nuu-chah-nulth Family and Child Services built upon provincial child welfare authority to develop child welfare programs that were based on Aboriginal values and traditions. Developing an Aboriginal system of child and family services that would be embraced as an integral part of the movement to strengthen families and communities required a set of community engagement processes to engage community participation and support. This chapter explores three essential features of this process including community education, community consultation, and the integration of holistic perspectives and concludes with a discussion of how Aboriginal self-government and empowerment require changes in the distribution of power and authority for determining child and family services legislation, policy, and practice.

## **The inclusive approach of the Outaouais Centres jeunesse\***

*Gilles Clavel, Luc Cadieux, and Catherine Roy*

Quebec's legislation and regulations define child welfare and child protection as collective community responsibilities. The Centres jeunesse, which are the provincial agencies mandated to identify children at risk and ensure their protection, seek the support of community organizations to assist and support them in fulfilling their responsibilities. However, it is difficult to achieve the accessibility, continuity, and consistency of social services for children and families due to a fragmented system. This chapter details the efforts to overcome barriers to services by the Outaouais Centres jeunesse in western Quebec, through the adoption of an inclusive approach. This approach is family-focused and has three guiding principles for interventions. Efforts must be made to understand the positive and negative aspects of an individual child's situation, mobilize all available and necessary com-



munity resources, and involve parents and/or other caregivers in the development of the child's individualized service plan. This chapter also outlines collaborative intervention programs, inspired by the inclusive approach.

## **Integrating children's services: A perspective from England**

*Helen Jones, Ellen Chant, and Harriet Ward*

Growing numbers of children in the United Kingdom are experiencing difficulties which affect their well-being and achievement, whether in relation to education, health, or quality of care. It is beyond the capacity of child welfare agencies to be solely responsible for meeting these levels of need in their communities. Cross-government policy for children is therefore focused increasingly on multi-agency early intervention for children and their families. Effective early intervention strategies require close, collaborative working between universal, targeted and specialist services to ensure that appropriate and timely responses are provided.

This chapter explores the challenges to the effectiveness of prevention posed by the fragmentation of policy and services for children and their families at central and local government levels. It also describes how a systems approach to child welfare and an outcomes framework which applies to all children and is based on their developmental needs are key to the development of multi-agency collaboration and service delivery. These and other elements which are required to support integrated working are illustrated and explored through a detailed case study of the development of a common methodology for assessing need used in one locality, North Lincolnshire, by all agencies working with children and families.

---

## Contributors

**Suzanne Anselmo** is currently Senior Manager of Intergovernmental Initiatives for Alberta Children's Services. Educated at Georgetown University in international law and human rights theory and at the University of Virginia in political philosophy and international relations, Suzanne Anselmo has been able to apply this knowledge in the area of social policy development. Over the last 15 years, she has worked in the areas of early childhood development, services to persons with disabilities, community capacity building, and supports for persons requiring income assistance. Most recently, Suzanne has been part of the project team supporting the development and implementation of the Alberta Response Model, whose goal is to transform outcomes for children, youth, and families receiving child welfare services.

**Jim Barber** is currently Dean of Social Work at the University of Toronto. He holds post-graduate qualifications in social work and psychology and has extensive experience as a practitioner, including in street work with young homeless people and alcoholic men. He has also lived and worked with Australian Aborigines in the Australian desert, with patients in a hospice for the dying, with high school students in an inner city high school, and with schizophrenia sufferers in a psychiatric hospital. Jim Barber began his academic career at James Cook University in tropical North Queensland and has since worked at a number of Australian universities, including, La Trobe University in Melbourne where he became the only social worker in La Trobe's history to be promoted to the rank of Reader. Jim lists among his various research projects over the years: the development of social modeling programs for Australian Aboriginal children, the development of a relapse prevention program within the Australian prison system, and a large tracking study of children in foster care. He is very committed to evidence-based practice and to outcome evaluation generally.

**Cindy Blackstock**, BA (University of British Columbia), MM (McGill University) is a member of the Gitksan Nation and has worked in the field of child and family services for over 20 years. In her current capacity, Cindy is honoured to be the Executive Director of the First Nations Child and Family

Caring Society of Canada (FNCFCFS). This national organization seeks to promote and support the works and knowledge of First Nations child and family service agencies and regional organizations in Canada by providing research, professional development, and networking services. Cindy was privileged to participate in numerous provincial and national research projects and task forces. These include appointments to the Assembly of First Nations/Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development National Policy Review Committee, the Centre of Excellence for Child Welfare Steering Committee, and the First Nations Summit Child Welfare Committee.

**Maurice D. Brubacher** is the Executive Director of Family and Children's Services of Guelph and Wellington County and has over 25 years of extensive experience in all areas of child welfare services. With a Master of Social Work, his training and experience includes clinical service, community development, social administration, and Native services. Moe has a passionate commitment to the development of programs and services that keep children safe while supporting families to protect and care for their own children wherever possible. He believes that child welfare is a collective community responsibility and has done a lot to mobilize formal and informal community resources to support high-risk families. Moe has also provided leadership and support to Tikinagan Child and Family Services, a Native children's aid society in northwestern Ontario for the past four years, assisting with a major redevelopment process and the establishment of a customary care service model.

**Liesette Brunson**, PhD, is Project Coordinator of Boscoville 2000. She obtained her doctorate in community psychology and developmental psychology from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign in 1999. Her research interests focus on community social capital, the social integration of adolescents and young families, and the development of innovative interventions to promote the optimal development of children, youth, and families. Since completing her PhD, she has focused on developing community-based research projects that examine the quality of environments for families and the development and evaluation of local social innovations. She has communicated these research results to community members and decision-makers as well as to the scientific community, writing numerous research reports for community audiences as well as publishing in internationally recognized scientific journals. Dr. Brunson is currently Project Coordinator for Projet Béluga, a program that seeks to prevent child abuse and neglect using a strategy of local community mobilisation.

**Luc Cadieux** received a master's degree in criminology from the University of Ottawa in 1978 and a master's in project management from the *Université du Québec en Outaouais* in 1994. Mr. Cadieux has worked for Outaouais youth centres (*Centres jeunesse*) in western Quebec since 1978, where he has held a number of positions, including youth liaison, youth protection worker, chief of non-institutional services (foster families), assistant director of child protection, and director of regional services. He has been a Director of Youth Protection since September 1997. He is a firm believer in community participation and the inclusion of vulnerable children and families in the provision of services for the population as a whole and that collaboration and partnership are solid values in the development of quality services for children and youth in difficulty.

**Gary Cameron** is a professor with the Faculty of Social Work, Wilfrid Laurier University (WLU) in Waterloo, Ontario. He has been the principal investigator for a variety of major research and demonstration projects focusing on interventions with vulnerable children and families, including, studies of family support in child welfare, parent mutual aid organizations, intensive family preservation services, promising programs and organizational realities in child welfare, and project/program development in the Better Beginnings, Better Futures Prevention Project. He served as Director of the Centre for Social Welfare Studies at WLU from 1986 until 1996. Currently, he is the Project Director for the Partnerships for Children and Families Project, a community-university research alliance. Dr. Cameron has authored numerous research reports, is the co-editor of four volumes and has co-authored two books as well as numerous book chapters and journal articles. His latest publications focus on program models for disadvantaged adolescents, program implementation and replication challenges, international comparisons of systems of child and family welfare, and the experiences of disadvantaged families involved with child protection and residential care services.

**Claire Chamberland** has a PhD in psychology from the Université du Québec à Montréal. Claire is a full professor at the School of Social Work, Université de Montréal. She was the director of the Institut de recherche pour le développement social des jeunes in Montreal from 1995 to 2001. She is Co-director of the Centre of Excellence for Child Welfare as well as Co-director of the Groupe de recherche et d'action sur la victimisation des enfants. Claire has contributed to the development, implementation, and evaluation of innovative prevention and promotion programs for children

and families. Her research interests include family violence, intersectoral and multidisciplinary approaches, and the continuum of social action and innovation in child and family issues.

**Ellen Chant** has a background in nursing and after working as a Registered General Nurse in an accident and emergency department, she went on to qualify as a Health Visitor in 1993 and subsequently a Community Practice Teacher in 1996. It was her work with vulnerable children and families that motivated her interest in the research and piloting of an inter-agency assessment process within North Lincolnshire, undertaken by Harriet Ward and Mark Peel. After a successful piloting of the assessment, Ellen took up the post of Common Assessment Development Co-ordinator in 1999 to extend the use of the Common Assessment throughout North Lincolnshire. Her role includes the strategic and operational development of the assessment of children in need as well as being a trainer and facilitator for professionals in the Common Assessment process. North Lincolnshire's Common Assessment for children in need has been highlighted as an innovative and successful achievement in the development of integration within children's services.

**Gilles Clavel** has a master's degree in criminology from the University of Ottawa and a master's in public administration from the *École Nationale d'Administration Publique*. He began his career with a community organization for ex-offenders. From 1978 to 1984, he taught at both the university and college levels. In 1979, he started as a front-line worker at the same time as the introduction of Quebec's new youth protection law and finished as a Director of Youth Protection. For six years, he was the executive director of the *Centres jeunesse de l'Outaouais*. For a number of years, he has been engaged in the development of services for children at risk and in working collaboratively with community partners.

**Directors of Child Welfare** are designated by the minister responsible for social services in each province and territory to oversee and administer each jurisdiction's child welfare legislation. The provincial and territorial Directors of Child Welfare meet regularly as a group to discuss issues of common concern and interest and to undertake joint projects in an effort to enhance child welfare service delivery and promote the prevention of child maltreatment.

**Peter Dudding** is Executive Director of the Child Welfare League of Canada and has held senior management positions in child welfare, public

health, and international development during the past 30 years. He has a passionate interest in children's services and is dedicated to improving the quality of life for children and youth. He has a master's degree in social work and recently completed a Master of Management in national voluntary sector leadership. Mr. Dudding is Co-director of the Centre of Excellence for Child Welfare. He is currently involved with conducting applied research, establishing best practice models, policy and program development, evaluating outcomes, advocacy, disseminating information, building awareness, and social marketing. Mr. Dudding has worked with Aboriginal and multicultural populations in Canada and internationally.

**Diana J. English** completed a PhD in social welfare at the University of Washington in 1985. Since 1987 she has been Director of the Office of the Children's Administration Research (OCAR) with the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services, Children's Administration. During the past 15 years, OCAR has conducted over 30 research projects related to public child welfare issues including studies related to risk assessment, child protection system decision making, re-referral, recurrence, placement stability, and re-entry and the effectiveness of services. Dr. English has been researching the effectiveness of alternative response systems since 1989 and has published numerous articles and reports on this and other child welfare related topics. In addition, Dr. English has been a member of national committees addressing questions of interest related to public child welfare including, a National Research Council Committee examining the effectiveness of interventions in family violence including, domestic violence and child maltreatment.

**John D. Fluke**, PhD, has been the Director of Research for Walter R. McDonald & Associates, Inc. since 1999 and has over 20 years of experience in social service delivery research, especially in the area of child welfare. His responsibilities emphasize his background in the development and analysis of social services performance data, decision support technology, and evaluation design and implementation. Prior to joining Walter R. McDonald & Associates, Dr. Fluke was employed in a similar capacity by the American Humane Association where he directed numerous state and national projects. Throughout his entire career he has been involved in the collection and analysis of child maltreatment reporting data for the US federal government up through his current analytic role on the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System. He has published widely in the field, presented at numerous national and international forums, and participated on several

advisory, policy making, and corporate boards. Dr. Fluke holds BA and MA degrees in anthropology from the University of Northern Colorado and the Pennsylvania State University respectively. His PhD is in the area of organizational decision science from the Union Institute Graduate School.

**Debra Foxcroft** is a member of the Tseshaht Tribe and has been a central force in British Columbia First Nations child and family services. As a senior manager of Community Human Services for the Nuu-chah-nulth Tribal Council in the early 1980s, she was involved in activities which led to the delegated authority of child welfare and the creation of USMA Nuu-chah-nulth Child and Family Services. In 1992, Debra was project coordinator for an Indian child and family services standards project which resulted in much needed discussion and documentation of Indian child welfare standards of services. She is the Chair of the First Nations Child Welfare Committee of the First Nations Summit, Chair of the Vancouver Island Aboriginal Transition Team and Co-chair of Vancouver Island Planning for the BC Ministry for Children and Families. She is currently completing a bachelor of social work at the University of Victoria.

**Nancy Freymond** is a doctoral student at Wilfrid Laurier University and a research associate with the Partnerships for Children and Families Project, a community-university research alliance, dedicated to fostering appropriate helping relationships in child welfare. Her research centres on placement experiences from the perspective of both the child welfare worker and the birth parents. She is the co-author of a paper that examines positive possibilities for child and family welfare and sole author of papers on international comparison of practice in child protection, worker experiences in making placement decisions, and parents' experiences with child placement. Nancy's interest in this research stems from her experiences as a front-line child protection worker in Ontario.

**Phil Goodman** has dedicated his career to working with children, families, and communities, spearheading change as a child welfare specialist in a variety of roles, including senior official and political advisor. His pursuits in the field of social work span over 30 years. Phil has been with Alberta Children's Services since April 2000, first as director of the Best Practices Branch and currently as Assistant Deputy Minister of the Community Strategies Division. Prior to working in Alberta, Phil was employed in Manitoba as the director of child welfare and was a leader in the child welfare transformation. He has worked as executive director of Child and

Family Services with Manitoba Family Services; the Manitoba Adolescent Treatment Centre; and the Manitoba Foster Parents' Association.

**Helen Jones** has a background in social work with children and families which includes practice, the management of family placement services, and policy development and implementation. For the past nine years she has been a professional advisor on child welfare policy at the UK Department of Health and has worked on the development of outcome and performance measures for children's services, the Looking After Children system, and the Integrated Children's System.

**Della Knoke** is a PhD student at the Faculty of Social Work at the University of Toronto and a Research Assistant at the Centre of Excellence for Child Welfare. She attained a BSc with a specialty in psychology and an MA in applied (school) psychology. Her clinical experience includes treating anxiety, stress-related disorders, and alcohol dependence. In addition, she has several years experience in the assessment of psychological and cognitive functioning in children and adults who have been affected by medical conditions or physical trauma. Della has extensive research experience and has co-authored several peer-reviewed publications, primarily in addictions and psychopharmacology. Her research interests in child welfare include identifying factors associated with recurrent maltreatment, the development of empirically-based risk assessment approaches, and the evaluation of outcomes for children and families receiving child welfare services.

**Jasma Narayan** is currently a social work consultant and trainer and recently retired as executive director of Better Beginnings, Better Futures in Guelph, Ontario. After immigrating from Guyana with her family in 1965, Jassy chose to stay at home to take care of her three young girls and provide private child care to many other young children. Later she undertook the Early Childhood Education Diploma program at Conestoga College in Kitchener, Ontario and went on to earn a BA and a master's in social work in community development and social planning at Wilfrid Laurier University in Waterloo, Ontario. Jassy has volunteered for a number of community groups, including, the YWCA, the Social Planning Council, Anselma House, the Centre for Research and Education in Human Services, Calvin Church Refugee Resettlement Committee, Women in Crisis, Ontario Immigrant and Visible Minority's Network, and Focus for Ethnic Women. She has received many community service awards, including the Queen's 50<sup>th</sup>



Jubilee Medal, the Ontario Provincial Government Award, Women of Distinction (Kitchener-Waterloo and Guelph), Guelph Police Services Award, and the Rotary Club of Guelph Paul Harris Fellowship.

**Russ Pickford** is in his thirteenth year with the Government of Alberta, Ministry of Children's Services. As Project Manager for the Alberta Response Model, Russ is in the enviable position of being part of a dynamic service delivery change that seldom happens in one's career. Russ is a recent addition to the Accountability and Program Support Division in the department, having previously been the manager of the Spruce Grove Child and Family Service Centre. Having also worked as a screener, investigator, case manager, and supervisor, Russ brings the front-line perspective and application needs to the forefront of the Alberta Response Model.

**Catherine Roy** has a PhD in social work. Social support of vulnerable children and their families, development of protective factors and resiliency within these families, as well as children's views of maltreatment constitute her main research interests. Since completing her doctoral degree, Catherine Roy has been the scientific coordinator for the Centre of Excellence for Child Welfare.

**Nico Trocmé** is an Associate Professor at the Faculty of Social Work, University of Toronto and the Director of Centre of Excellence for Child Welfare and of the Bell Canada Child Welfare Research Unit. Dr. Trocmé is the principle investigator for Canadian Incidence Study of Reported Child Abuse and Neglect (CIS), the first national survey of investigated maltreatment ever conducted in Canada. Additional research activities include pilot testing a national framework for tracking child welfare outcome indicators funded by the provincial and territorial Directors of Child Welfare and Human Resources Development Canada, comparative analysis of maltreatment rates in Canada and the US, the development and evaluation of a home based comprehensive treatment model in situations of chronic neglect, and a survey of risk and resilience for youth receiving child welfare services. Dr. Trocmé was as a member of the Minister's Panel of Experts on Child Protection in Ontario, presented expert evidence at several coroner inquests, and has been assisting in the development of a province-wide client information system that will track outcomes for children and families receiving child welfare services. Prior to completing his PhD, Dr. Trocmé worked for five years as a child welfare and children's mental health social worker.

**Harriet Ward** is a Senior Research Fellow in Social Sciences at Loughborough University and Director of the Centre for Child and Family Research, which conducts policy-relevant research on services for vulnerable children and adults. There are currently four main areas of work within the centre, with individual studies funded by government departments, charities, and national and local child welfare agencies: (i) cohort studies of outcomes for children in need; (ii) development of methodologies for identifying need and assessing outcome; (iii) costing child welfare services; (iv) young carers and their parents. Much of Dr. Ward's research has developed from the Looking After Children project, which she has led since 1992. This program for gathering information, monitoring the services and assessing outcomes for children looked after away from home has now been implemented throughout the United Kingdom, in several Canadian provinces and Australian states, and in parts of Eastern Europe, with pilots underway in Sweden, New Zealand, and Germany.

**Ying-Ying T. Yuan**, PhD, is Senior Vice President of Walter R. McDonald & Associates, Inc. Dr. Yuan conducts research on human services program management and service delivery for federal, state, and local governments, private non-profit agencies, and foundations. She received her doctorate from the Department of Social Relations, Harvard University. Dr. Yuan is nationally recognized as an evaluator and child welfare expert. She has been the lead evaluator for several cluster evaluations including several latch-key children programs in California, several family preservation programs in Connecticut and California, perinatal services in eight communities, and adoption reform in nine states for the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. Currently, she leads an evaluation of educational systems reform for the W.K. Kellogg Foundation and recently completed the National Study of Child Protective Services Systems and Reform Efforts. She has been the Technical Director of the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System (NCANDS) since 1990. In that role she directs a team of analysts and technical assistance providers who work directly with the 50 states and the District of Columbia.